The Decisions on Benefits Redesign

To the University Faculty and Staff

We are pleased to acknowledge a set of recommendations that represent the first thorough review of our benefits package in more than 15 years. The University’s benefits package is vitally important to our ability to retain and recruit outstanding faculty and staff. We believe that the recommended changes will substantially modernize our benefits package and increase its value for faculty and staff. The package will offer greater choice and be more responsive to the preferences of the community, and will also be more cost-effective and consistent with current best-practices of benefits design.

The recommendations are the product of a long and deliberative period of study and consultation stretching over the last year. They were first developed and approved by a specially constituted Benefits Advisory Committee and then endorsed by the University’s standing Academic Planning and Budget Committee. The recommendations were then provided to the Ad Hoc Committee of the Faculty Senate on February 5, to the Personnel Benefits Committee of University Council on February 7, and to the University community in Almanac on February 11, 1997. Members of the Benefits Advisory Committee have met with each school’s faculty and staff from throughout the University—altogether more than 3,000 people—to explain the recommendations and gather feedback. The Benefits Advisory Committee and the Academic Planning and Budget Committees were reconvened for final sessions last week to consider this feedback before sending their recommendations to us for action.

On Medical Insurance we accept in full the recommendations. The University will:

- retain Plan 100, PENNCare, and the Keystone and US Health Care HMO’s
- offer the new UPHS/Keystone Point-of-Service Plan
- institute the recommended employee payroll contributions for all plans
- introduce a prescription drug plan for those electing the HMO plans
- discontinue the BC/BS Comprehensive plan and the QualMed HMO.

We recognize that these changes are complex and will require an intensive educational program during open enrollment at the end of April. Given the range of choices being offered, we will also enhance our current monitoring of the quality of care in each plan and provide alternative plan designs if needed.

On Tuition Reimbursement, we accept, with one exception, the recommendations. The University will:

- retain the undergraduate tuition program without change
- establish special qualifying courses for employees whose admission to CGS or Wharton is deferred
- eliminate the graduate and professional tuition reimbursement for spouses and dependents of faculty or staff hired on or after July 1, 1997
- retain the graduate and professional tuition reimbursement for spouses and dependents of faculty or staff hired before July 1, 1997.

This last bullet represents the single point on which we depart from the original recommendations. We do this on the advice and counsel of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, the Benefits Advisory Committee and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee after receiving the feedback of the University community.

On Life Insurance, we accept in full the recommendations. The University will:

- provide all employees, at no charge, with life insurance coverage at one-times annual benefits base salary, up to $300,000.
- allow employees to purchase additional life insurance at group rates up to an additional four times pay
- raise the current insurance maximum from $300,000 to $750,000
- eliminate flex credits and replace them with an equivalent increase in benefits base salary for each employee.

In instituting this change, we will communicate to employees the salary increase due to the elimination of flex-dollars separately from the annual salary increase.

On Paid Time Off, we accept in full the recommendations of the Committees. The University will:

- maintain the current winter vacation
- end the practice of reduced summer hours and the compensatory days off associated with them
- reduce the number of categories for paid time off
- adopt a single accrual schedule for new staff (A1s and A3s) hired on or after July 1, 1997.

On Part-Time Benefits, we accept in full the recommendations of the Committees. The University will:

- maintain the current benefits package for regular part-time employees
- permit part-time employees with at least two years of continuous service to participate in the health care pre-tax account with a maximum of $1000.

In the future, benefits redesign will occur in a more continuous, but also more comprehensive fashion, in the context of the principles enunciated by the Benefits Advisory Committee and in the context of total compensation. The goal will continue to be to maintain a highly competitive total compensation package in order to recruit and retain excellent faculty and staff.
News in Brief

A Challenge to the Ratings?

A new book on ratings, which challenges the use of peer voting systems such as those mixed with hard data in the National Research Council studies, shows Penn would move from 14th place to 7th among private research universities under the authors’ largely quantitatively measures such as federal grants for research, number of articles in scholarly journals and in sets of journals treated as most-prestigious, and awards in the arts and humanities.


Leaving in April: David Morse

David Morse, the associate vice president for policy planning who shaped Penn’s first major federal relations program and led it over the past 14 years, will leave the University late in April to join the Pew Charitable Trusts. (See story, p. 8.)

Changing the PennCard

By fall the University will introduce a new multifunction “smart” PennCard, in partnership with PNC BankCorp., MBNA America Bank N.A., and the Penn Student Federal Credit Union.

To prepare for the changeover, an oversight committee is being formed (see page 8). Any school or center that has a stake in the use of PennCard’s magnetic stripe is particularly asked to contact planners (details on page 8).

Tuition/Fee Increases

Undergraduate tuition and fee increases of 5.3%—the lowest at Penn in 29 years—were voted at the March 14 meeting of the Trustees Executive Committee, bringing the combination of tuition and fees from FY98’s $21,130 to $22,250 for FY1999.

Along with 2% increases in residential charges (from $4,342 to $4,428) and in the 15-meal dining plan (from 2,624 to $2,676), the overall cost increase for room and board is 4.5% (from $28,096 to $29,354).

President Judith Rodin said Penn will maintain the need-blind admissions policy.

Graduate tuition and fees will also increase 5.3%, from $21,992 to $23,158.

NCAA Team Open Interviews: April 2

Members of the campus community will have an opportunity to interact with members of the peer review team as part of the NCAA Athletics Certification, according to Stephen T. Golding, vice president for finance and chair of the NCAA Certification Committee at Penn.

The team will be on campus April 1-4. The open interview has been scheduled for Wednesday, April 2, from 4:30-5 p.m. in Suite 200 of Houston Hall. It is open to all members of the campus community. Copies of the final self-study report, with its appendices, are available for inspection at Van Pelt-Dietrich Library. The study without the appendices (Almanac December 10, 1996), is on the web at http://www.upenn.edu/pennnews.

Major Changes to Franklin and Library Databases

To All Faculty, Staff and Students:

Since its creation in 1985, Penn’s online library catalog, and later the Library’s core information bases, have relied on 1970s mainframe technology to deliver growing amounts of information electronically. Today, mainframe costs and capacity limitations are hampering our ability to support the changing information needs of teaching and research. To address this problem and provide a more secure foundation for Penn’s growing Digital Library, we plan to retire the outdated mainframe system. By early summer, Franklin and the other mainframe-mounted bases will reside on new computing platforms searchable on the World Wide Web.

The Library will use the coming weeks to report in greater depth on the reasons and benefits underlying the computing migration. We’ll also work to reduce the uneasiness it may cause users. I’d like to begin this process by urging faculty to watch for our reports—published on our Web site and in print—and to provide input into our system designs and goals, when, in a few weeks, we’re able to offer a preview of the new Franklin.

Inevitably, a few potholes will mark the transition to more powerful, distributed computing systems. But the investment in new technologies will pay dividends long after we correct any initial problems that may arise—problems we’re working overtime to anticipate and minimize. In the short term, the new systems will enable the Library to take fuller advantage of the Web and the current move to client/server computing on campus. They will provide greater capacity to store and deliver electronic information at lower costs than presently possible. Over the long term, the new systems will allow us to respond quickly to software and hardware innovations, networking improvements and the emergence of new digital media. And they will aid us in converting redundant paper-based activities to more effective and cost-beneficial electronic processes, thus changing the Library work place for the benefit of users. Technology will free librarians to increase instructional outreach and help faculty and students negotiate the expanding universe of print and digital information. It will also help us deliver many frequently-requested paperless services to the desktop, as our new systems mature.

The new Franklin will contrast sharply with the mainframe system. Some of the major differences include:

- the graphical Web interface, featuring icons, pull-down menus and point-and-click commands,
- the ability to recall books using Web pages,
- the ability to view your borrower record and monitor books you currently have on loan or recalled,
- a new keyword search capability that ranks by relevancy, in addition to traditional author, title, subject, call number and full Boolean keyword searching,
- the ability to limit searches by date, library location and type of material,
- hypertext links on subjects and authors, and
- hypertext links to online resources, including more than 1,200 electronic journals.

The software supporting Franklin is marketed under the name Voyager and engineered by Endeavor Information Systems. Endeavor is unique in its willingness to partner with a group of academic libraries in developing the Voyager catalog. As a contributor to this partnership, our goal is to achieve the most effective online catalog possible—one that combines the best elements of known systems with features customized for the specific information needs of the Penn community. If you’d like to explore a similar implementation of Voyager today, visit the University of Rochester Library on the Web at http://library.rochester.edu.

For the citation bases that also reside on the mainframe, the Library is presently testing a Web-searchable system designed by OVID Technologies. OVID will feature a sophisticated Java interface which operates within the Web environment to accelerate and enhance the functionality of database searching. Over time, OVID also will provide the capacities needed to increase the number of networked bases we offer. The files migrating to OVID include ABI/Inform, Current Contents, PsychInfo, and the five Wilson bases.

The transition to OVID will be phased in over the summer months, with parallel access to the mainframe versions of ABI/Inform and the other citation files available through September 1997. Please note that the Library will continue to provide character-based, telnet access to both Franklin and the OVID files for users who cannot or prefer not to search over the Web.

The Franklin migration to Voyager will take place in June. Given the size of our local systems, some level of service disruption is inevitable as we convert large data sets, and transfer acquisition funds, account ledgers, in-process files and circulation records between platforms. To minimize inconveniences for our users during this complex migration, we’ll be sensitive to the academic calendar and the need for continuous, reliable service. We’ll also make communication a high priority, and disseminate regular updates of our progress and advance notice of potential service interruptions. Training is another important issue. Our librarians and developing outreach programs now to teach students, faculty to make optimal use of our changing resources.

I’ll be delighted to answer your questions regarding this announcement and our future plans; please contact me at 898-7091 or by e-mail via mosher@pobox.upenn.edu. Also, I urge you to discuss these changes with staff in any of our Libraries. We’ll do our utmost to provide informative answers.

— Paul H. Mosher, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries
Benefits Redesign: Background Documents in the Debate

Before arriving at the final recommendations which informed the decision announced on page 1, representatives of the Benefits Advisory Committee met with the Senate Executive Committee on March 19, where the report of SEC’s Ad Hoc Committee on Benefits Redesign was the first item on the agenda (below). During that meeting SEC passed the resolution at right. The Ad Hoc Committee Report itself is on pages 4-6, and is followed by a response from Dr. Barbara Lowery, Associate Provost, and Dr. Michael Wachter, Deputy Provost.

The March 19 SEC consultation was the last in a long series of deliberations involving faculty and staff, some of them summed up in Almanac issues of February 18 and 25, and March 4, 11 and 18.—Ed.

SENATE From the Senate Office

Background Documents in the Debate

Benefits Redesign: Background Documents in the Debate

The following statement is published in accordance with the Senate Rules. Among other purposes, the publication of SEC actions is intended to stimulate discussion among the constituencies and their representatives. Please communicate your comments to Senate Chair Peter Kuriloff or Executive Assistant Carolyn Burdon, Box 12 College Hall 6303, 898-6943 or burdon@pobox.upenn.edu.

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee

Wednesday, March 19, 1997

1. Benefits Redesign. Discussion continued from the last meeting with a report by the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee to Review the Benefits Redesign Report (see pp. 4-6). SEC members reiterated their primary concerns about grandfathering graduate tuition and changes in health care plans and the jump in cost for some. Present to respond to questions and clarifications were the Deputy Provost, Associate Provost, and representatives of the consultant Towers Perrin. SEC discussed and modified a resolution (at right) drafted by the Chair, Past Chair and Chair-elect. The amended resolution was unanimously adopted and forwarded to the administration.

2. Nominees for Next Year’s Committees. SEC added to the lists of nominees recommended by the Senate Committee on Committees. A mail ballot will be circulated to members of SEC.

3. Academic Planning and Budget Committee and Capital Council. It was agreed to defer the report to publication in Almanac.

Since the last report the Academic Planning and Budget Committee has held seven meetings devoted to the following topics: briefing on West Philadelphia; residences and food services; new professional degrees (e.g., Bioethics and Biomedical Technology); undergraduate retention; responsibility center budgeting; Annenberg Center; and Ph.D. programs.

Capital Council approved the following projects: Lewis Hall at the Law School; Delta Tau Delta Fraternity renovation; Biomedical Research Building Three: phase II & IV renovation of Van Pelt-Dietrich Library; basement, first & second floors of Franklin Building; and Gateway Building A/E fees.

4. Deferred Items. The balance of the agenda was deferred. Those items were: Proposed Procedural Principles for School Academic Freedom and Responsibility Committees (Almanac February 25, 1997); Nominations for one 1-year vacancy on the Senate Committee on Conduct; and proposed faculty exit questionnaire.

Resolution

After careful review of the proposed benefits redesign and following the advice of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Benefits Redesign Report, the Senate Executive Committee calls on the administration to take the following steps to improve the proposed plan.

1. Agree to reexamine and redesign the benefits package for the following years, in a comprehensive fashion, according to the following principles:
   a. Consider the entire benefits package comprehensively when restructuring retirement and disability benefits.
   b. Affirm Penn’s commitment to maintaining compensation at highly competitive levels with peer universities in order to attract and retain highly distinguished scholars and staff members.
   c. Ensure that the benefits program and salary levels separately remain highly competitive with those offered by peer institutions, even though the mix in amounts spent on benefits and salary within total compensation will vary over time.
   d. Make any future changes in benefits and salary levels to ensure that the total level of compensation does not decline and remains highly competitive.
   e. Examine the feasibility of developing adequate mental health, hospice, and institutional and community long-term care coverage using conventional and alternative delivery systems.
   f. Develop a set of principles that can be used to identify that sub-set of regular, part-time employees for whom an appropriate benefits plan should be provided.
   g. If the Keystone POS, PennCare or US Healthcare substitutes for the BC/BS Comprehensive Plan do not perform satisfactorily, consider reintroducing BC/BS Comprehensive as a mid-range alternative between BS/BS 100, PennCare and the HMO options.
   h. Adopt state-of-the-art techniques for monitoring quality of care and member satisfaction in the health care plans.
   i. Provide major immediate education to all Penn employees about the nature of the various health care choices and greater access to benefits counsellors. Also provide improved education about plans in future years.
   j. Affirm Penn’s current commitment to the undergraduate tuition benefit.

4. Grandfather the graduate tuition benefit for all current faculty and staff and for faculty and staff hired to begin work by January 15, 1998.

5. In reporting the amount of annual salary increases commencing July 1, 1997, to individual employees, identify specifically the component in dollars or percent that is due to the one-time increase caused by the conversion of flex dollars to salary and the component that reflects the annual increase.

6. Recognize that any “savings,” from the current benefits redesign should be distributed equitably. Deans should not have discretion in distributing such savings.

7. Reconsider developing an appropriate flexible benefits plan.

SEC also endorses the administration’s commitment that the Benefits Advisory Committee work in coordination with a high-level Faculty Senate committee to be appointed by the end of the Spring term 1997. These two committees should work separately but collaborate fully with each other. Their first order of business should be to develop a long-term benefits philosophy to guide Penn’s future work in benefits redesign.

Peter Kuriloff, Faculty Senate Chair

SENATE From the Chair

Senate Executive Committee Resolution on Benefits Redesign

Adopted Unanimously March 19, 1997

There now has been extensive opportunity to discuss the benefits redesign report among all constituencies of the University. Over the last two weeks the Chair, Past Chair and Chair-elect of the Faculty Senate have had frank and useful discussions with the president and provost around benefits redesign and have reached agreement that the administration and the faculty will create separate committees to work in close collaboration on the next phase of the process. The Senate Executive Committee welcomes this development and will appoint the faculty committee by the end of this term.

SEC received the report of the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee to Review the Benefits Redesign Report on March 17 (see text, pp. 4-7 of this issue). After extensive discussions with faculty from across the University, feedback from the various schools and full and complete discussions with the Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee, the president, provost, deputy provost and associate provost, the Senate Executive Committee unanimously adopted the following resolution.

Resolution

After careful review of the proposed benefits redesign and following the advice of the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Benefits Redesign Report, the Senate Executive Committee calls on the administration to take the following steps to improve the proposed plan.

1. Agree to reexamine and redesign the benefits package for the following years, in a comprehensive fashion, according to the following principles:
   a. Reconsider the entire benefits package comprehensively when restructuring retirement and disability benefits.
   b. Affirm Penn’s commitment to maintaining compensation at highly competitive levels with peer universities in order to attract and retain highly distinguished scholars and staff members.
   c. Ensure that the benefits program and salary levels separately remain highly competitive with those offered by peer institutions, even though the mix in amounts spent on benefits and salary within total compensation will vary over time.
   d. Make any future changes in benefits and salary levels to ensure that the total level of compensation does not decline and remains highly competitive.
   e. Examine the feasibility of developing adequate mental health, hospice, and institutional and community long-term care coverage using conventional and alternative delivery systems.
   f. Develop a set of principles that can be used to identify that sub-set of regular, part-time employees for whom an appropriate benefits plan should be provided.
   g. If the Keystone POS, PennCare or US Healthcare substitutes for the BC/BS Comprehensive Plan do not perform satisfactorily, consider reintroducing BC/BS Comprehensive as a mid-range alternative between BS/BS 100, PennCare and the HMO options.
   h. Adopt state-of-the-art techniques for monitoring quality of care and member satisfaction in the health care plans.
   i. Provide major immediate education to all Penn employees about the nature of the various health care choices and greater access to benefits counsellors. Also provide improved education about plans in future years.
   j. Affirm Penn’s current commitment to the undergraduate tuition benefit.

4. Grandfather the graduate tuition benefit for all current faculty and staff and for faculty and staff hired to begin work by January 15, 1998.

5. In reporting the amount of annual salary increases commencing July 1, 1997, to individual employees, identify specifically the component in dollars or percent that is due to the one-time increase caused by the conversion of flex dollars to salary and the component that reflects the annual increase.

6. Recognize that any “savings,” from the current benefits redesign should be distributed equitably. Deans should not have discretion in distributing such savings.

7. Reconsider developing an appropriate flexible benefits plan.

SEC also endorses the administration’s commitment that the Benefits Advisory Committee work in coordination with a high-level Faculty Senate committee to be appointed by the end of the Spring term 1997. These two committees should work separately but collaborate fully with each other. Their first order of business should be to develop a long-term benefits philosophy to guide Penn’s future work in benefits redesign.

Peter Kuriloff, Faculty Senate Chair

ALMANAC March 25, 1997

3
Introduction

The Faculty Senate ad hoc Committee to Review the Benefits Redesign Report was appointed by the Chair of Faculty Senate, Peter J. Kuriloff. The Committee was charged with the limited task of reviewing and analyzing recommendations made by the Benefits Advisory Committee (Almanac, February 11, 1997) for changes in four components of the current benefits program that impact directly on the welfare of members of Penn’s Faculty Senate. In view of this specific charge, the ad hoc Committee did not consider other components of the entire benefits program or the relationship between the benefits and salary components of total compensation. Accordingly, the review and analysis reported here only addresses changes recommended by the Benefits Advisory Committee in
(a) health care insurance, (b) graduate tuition remission for spouses and dependent children of Penn employees (c) life insurance, and (d) benefits for regular part-time employees.

Since receiving an advance copy of recommendations for benefits redesign on February 5, 1997, the ad hoc Committee met several times during the past month to review and analyze these recommendations. During the course of this review, the Committee requested, and received, additional information from the Office of the Provost and the Division of Human Resources in its efforts to understand information and principles used by the Benefits Advisory Committee in forming its recommendations. Nonetheless, the work of the ad hoc Committee was constrained by the short period of time and incomplete detail information available to perform its task. The content of this report, therefore, is necessarily limited by these conditions under which the Committee was obligated to function.

The ad hoc Committee performed its review and analysis of recommended changes in selected benefits from the perspective of the faculty as a whole. Of course, the Committee understood that the changes as proposed will have differential effects on individual faculty members, but it judged that the general welfare of the members of Faculty Senate should be its overriding concern.

Health Care Insurance

The primary rationale for the University’s benefits redesign is a contention that, compared to other employers with whom Penn competes in various labor markets, Penn’s compensation package is overly rich in benefits.

The health benefits redesign therefore involves two changes: 1) a modest alteration in the set of health plans among which employees can choose and 2) a substantial increase in the fraction of the cost of these plans to be paid by employees. This increase in employee contribution is not distributed evenly across plans.

Compared to the current set of health plan offerings, two plans which were chosen by a modest number of employees were deleted: the higher deductible “comprehensive” indemnity plan and some of the HMO options, most importantly the HMO offered by QualMed. A new option, an HMO with a Point of Service option supplied by Keystone Health Plan East, has been introduced.

The fraction of the cost (premiums for outside plan and benefits paid for self-insured plans) expected to be paid by employees has been increased from the 11% level which prevailed in FY 1997 to the level of 17%, approximately equal to the level in FY 1994. Some plan options experienced very modest increases in premiums. The lower deductible indemnity “Plan 100” will have increases in employee contributions of only a few dollars a month. The Keystone and US Healthcare HMOs, which had zero employee premiums in 1997, will require annual premiums of $120 for individuals and $312 for families. The redesign plan document claims that these increases are virtually identical to the expected cost for adding a prescription drug benefit that was formerly lacking only from this option.

The largest increases in employee paid premiums will come from people who chose any plan but Plan 100 in 1997 and who in 1998 chose either the PENNCare plan or the new Keystone Point of Service (POS) plan. All plans except Plan 100 had virtually zero premiums in 1997, while the annual employee premiums for 1998 are proposed to be set at $240 for individual coverage and $624 for family coverage for the Keystone POS option, and at exactly twice these levels for the PENNCare option.

Because the consultants calculated the premium costs in each year using two entirely different methods, it is impossible to determine precisely the extent to which any higher employee premiums match higher expected benefits for each of the plans. The annual increase in total health care benefits costs is expected to be very modest (almost 5%), while the employee premium share is forecasted to increase by about 50%, so one must conclude that the increase in employee premiums must be considerably greater than the increase in expected benefits or costs. Beyond this conclusion, the following discussion of the plan-level changes must be regarded as somewhat speculative. Nevertheless, it does appear, based both on data in the description of the plan changes and statements by the Administration, that the proposed new premiums for Plan 100 and the USHC/Keystone HMO reflect almost none of the increased premiums for current benefits. That is, after adjusting for the cost of the prescription drug benefits added to the HMO plan, employees who formerly chose these plans and stay in them are bearing little or none of the increased employee premiums. Instead, those who pay additional premiums of from $240 (individual, POS) to $1,248 (family, PENNCare) bear the great bulk of the burden of the additional employee premiums.

There appear to be two major problematic features of this benefits redesign. Employees are being asked to bear more of the cost of their benefits without receiving any increase in money wages as an offset, and the burden of that cost is distributed very unevenly across employees depending on their benefits choices. It appears that those employees who formerly chose the comprehensive or PENNCare options bear all of the cost of the increased employee contributions in excess of any increased anticipated total costs to the University. A third issue is whether the proposed blending of plan costs is the appropriate pricing strategy or whether each plan option should be self-supporting.

Increases in employee premium contributions have the same effect on gross pay as reductions in money wages. Because employee premium contributions are tax shielded, the two are not exactly equivalent, but it is clear that when employee payments for health benefits are increased in excess of any increased cost of those benefits, the value of total compensation has been reduced. Other things equal, employees may be expected to oppose reductions in the value of their total compensation. Had the increased employee contributions been distribu-
uted approximately evenly across employees, it would be possible to offset these higher contributions by an increase in the money wage increases in 1998 in excess of the raises that would otherwise have been paid. While it is still possible to provide such offsets, they will overcompensate those who remain in Plan 100 and the US Healthcare/Keystone HMO, and under compensate those who were in the Comprehensive or PENNCare plans and who do not switch to the HMO or Plan 100.

Evaluation

The primary problem in Penn’s current health benefits offering is that, except for Plan 100, all other offerings carry approximately zero employee premiums. This is alleged to result in distorted choices across plans (since employees have no incentive to take into account the difference in costs to the University for different plans) and a compensation package which induces employees with working spouses to elect family coverage at Penn, rather than at the spouse’s employer. This situation arose because Penn’s employer contribution policy was based on a fraction of the cost for Plan 100; as premiums for that plan have risen relative to other premiums in recent years, the employer’s contribution has exceeded the total premium for the other insurance options, resulting in zero or in some case negative premiums for them. The redesign is intended to correct this design flaw. However, one may argue that these negative contributions can serve as an incentive encouraging employees into the most cost-effective plans.

While acknowledging that Penn has experienced the same problem in its benefits design as have other employers (including the Federal government and the large California Public Employees system, two common benchmarks), the proposed solution is open to question. The reasons for skepticism are indicated in the description above; the increased employee contributions to correct the acknowledged design flaw are not distributed evenly across employees or in proportion to a health plan’s cost to the University, and are not proposed to be offset by higher money wage increases.

With regard to the issue of money wages, the argument made in the description of the proposed plan for raising the average employee contribution and not promising a money wage offset is only that the proposed employee contribution level of 17% is “still well below the average in the private sector,” with no mention of comparative wage levels. If the problem with Penn’s current package is that it is too benefits-rich and cash-poor, the solution would seem to involve both a reduction in University benefits contributions and an increase (compared to what otherwise would have occurred) in money wages. It seems likely that the high increases in University contributions which occurred in FY 1995-1997 were offset by lower increases in money wages (compared to what would have occurred if benefits costs had increased less rapidly), so that attempting to correct matters by actually raising the employee payment for benefits, re-capturing some of the excess contribution of previous years, without returning some of the wage offset, will not in fact redress the balance. The alternative hypothesis is that during the period of excessive benefits contribution money wages were for some reason not reduced in an offsetting fashion; this would lead to the conclusion that Penn employees are currently over-compensated in total relative to the labor market. No evidence was provided that would support this contention; indeed, the assertion in the introduction that “the cost of employee benefits is negatively affecting Penn’s ability to ... (achieve) competitive salary for faculty and staff” implies that it is not so.

The more controversial issue concerns the uneven pattern of employee premium increases. While nowhere stated in the explanatory documents, the University appears to have chosen to keep the employee premium contributions for the HMOs low because these plans are disproportionately (though not exclusively) chosen by low wage employees. It is less obvious why it has chosen to keep the Plan 100 premiums low, since those plans are disproportionately chosen by higher salaried faculty. It has been suggested that, if the University wishes to cushion the blow of higher employee premium contributions on lower wage employees, a preferable way to do so would be to raise the money wages of those employees—since this would avoid “subsidizing” the employees who chose the HMO option but are not low-wage. Others have questioned the desirability or the feasibility of using compensation policy to redistribute income among employees when compensation policy is also supposed to be competitive at all wage levels.

Owing both to the complexity of the problem and the little time available to secure needed information for this review, no specific alternative for redesign of health benefits can be suggested at this time. The objective of correcting the design flaw associated with the former contribution policy is a worthy one, but those design flaws need to be clarified and verified to a greater extent to assure that the new design does not itself contain implicit flaws. In addition to the concerns already mentioned, there was fear that the proposed modest increases in employee contributions to Plan 100 premiums cannot be sustained, if the costs of that plan continue to rise at both its historical and projected rates. Paying more attention to wage offsets overall and to real economics for health plans ought to guide the “redesign of the redesign” which we favor. Additionally, there should be reconsideration of the contents of the various plans as well as their pricing, especially in light of concerns that have been raised about the price of Penn’s plans in respect to mental health benefits, nursing home care, home health care and the size of the lifetime cap on benefits. Long-term care and quality of care issues also should be considered in a potential redesign. In the meantime, and probably for FY 1998, the proposed moratorium by SEC on changes should probably apply to health benefits, unless and until a more satisfactory alternative can be developed. In the absence of a complete moratorium on change, perhaps a less dramatic movement in plan pricing could occur in FY 1998.

Graduate Tuition for Spouses and Children

The rationale for the elimination of the graduate tuition benefit for spouses and dependent children is that this is a costly benefit ($1.3 million a year) that is used by a very small percentage of Penn employees at any one time and exceeds what is offered by peer institutions. On the basis of the additional information that we received, we conclude, however, that the actual net cost of this benefit to the University is considerably less than what is claimed and we note that, while the number of employees using it at any one time is small, the percentage who use it at some point over the course of their entire career at Penn may be considerable. Furthermore, eliminating this benefit has a high price in the lost trust of those employees who came to Penn in the expectation that it would be available to them. In addition, there is an advantage for recruitment and retention of the faculty in a relatively inexpensive benefit that outstrips what peer institutions offer.

We suggest that the existing benefit be grandfathered for all employees arriving at Penn through January 1998, and not available for employees hired after that date. A further possibility is that the benefit could be made available to employees arriving after January 1998 in a somewhat reduced and streamlined form, namely an across-the-board benefit of 50% of tuition for spouses and dependent children alike (instead of 50% for spouses, and either 75% or 100% for children depending on the school), although the resulting savings would be small.

Life Insurance

Under the current life insurance program, faculty and staff receive flex credits equivalent to purchase a multiple of 1 to 4 times salary depending upon their age. The age brackets are as follows:

- Under 36: 4.0 X benefits base
- 36 to 45: 3.5 X benefits base
- 46 to 50: 3.0 X benefits base
- 51 to 64: 2.5 X benefits base
- Over 65: 2.0 X benefits base
- Over 70: 1.0 X benefits base

Once Flex Credit allotments are received, staff may choose to purchase $50,000 in coverage, or any multiple of salary from 1 X to 5 X salary provided this multiple does not exceed the cap of $300,000. There is a core amount of required insurance coverage which is the lesser of $50,000 or 1 X benefits base.

The proposed changes to the University’s group life insurance program are designed to move to a system whereby the University funds a life insurance benefit of one times salary for employees with the balance of Flex Dollars providing a one-time increase in base salary.
This change to the group life insurance program basically eliminates the PennFlex (flexible benefits) program. An individual may also purchase up to $500,000 at existing age-related rates during fiscal year 1997-1998. Future rates most likely will depend on plan experience so that it is very difficult to assess the long-term effect of the proposed change.

The overall implications of this change for individual faculty members are difficult to assess because there is so much individual variation in the benefit. The current program provides a level of coverage determined as a varying multiple of salary based on a participant’s age. Age also determines the cost per thousand dollars of life insurance. The multiplication of the age cost of the coverage determines the Flex Dollars that can be used to purchase life insurance or spend on other PennFlex benefits. The proposed recommendation suggests that this benefit could be purchased with after-tax dollars, saving participants a portion of the tax associated with imputed income on group life insurance coverage over $50,000. This saving would occur if the premium rates at which an individual purchases insurance in the University group are less than the rates on which imputed taxable income is based. It is not clear that everyone would be better off with this change, although many participants may well be advantaged by the tax effect. A lower paid employee not subject to taxes may be marginally worse off. Also, the change calls for a one-time salary adjustment giving participants the dollars used to fund their life insurance. Under the present system, the Flex Dollars increase with age. A participant close to retirement and about to cross an insurance price threshold may be better off under the old system. However, there are countervailing beneficial effects. A participant may have a contribution to their retirement plan increased by the proposed one-time change in salary.

As the preceding paragraph indicates, detailed actuarial computations would be necessary to judge whether the community is better or worse off. Introducing the time element in terms of how long one continues working and the pension impact makes the problem particularly cumbersome. In all likelihood, there are some beneficially impacted and some who are marginally worse off.

There are some other policy implications of the change in the life insurance program. It would eliminate the Flex Credit pool associated with the PennFlex program. The Flex Credit was designed to manage benefits for a diverse workforce since multiple benefit programs can be offered and contributions can be made to a credit pool. Employees then pick and choose which benefits they want and where they will spend their Flex Dollars. A decision on whether to disassemble the flex benefit mechanism should be made in connection with a long-range plan. Some consideration should be given to the efficiency of a credit pool, how benefits will be managed in the future, and how new benefit options will be added and paid for. If the proposed change is enacted, it is recommended that a new more inclusive flexible benefits program be studied for possible future implementation.

It is recommended that the amount of any salary increase awarded because of the additional Flex Dollars added to base salary be reported to individual employees as a specific percentage of base salary along with the specific percentage increase in base salary (if any) awarded as an annual increment.

Benefits for Regular Part-Time Employees

In the judgment of the ad hoc Committee, the addition of the option of a Health Care Pre-Tax Account for regular part-time employees improves significantly the very limited benefits offered to this group. Under current circumstances, restricting this account to a maximum of $1000 appears to be reasonable.

However, the benefits provided for regular part-time employees should be given further consideration. Within this group of part-time employees are some who no doubt need and have a justifiable claim to more generous treatment, while there are others who have little need or justification for more generous treatment. For example, the Committee has heard of couples who share a full-time position as their primary source of employment and who are long-term employees in vital and valued positions. By contrast, the Committee has also heard of others who hold minor part-time appointments in marginal positions and who have full-time employment (and associated benefits) elsewhere. Consideration should be given to developing principles that can be used to identify subsets of regular part-time employees for whom more generous benefits should be provided.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the members of the ad hoc Committee do not believe that Penn has a "benefits philosophy," or, even more important, a "total compensation philosophy." By this we mean a set of long-term principles that can be used in the design of periodic changes to the benefits program and salary levels. By contrast, the current set of recommendations in selected benefits, as published in Almanac, certainly is not framed by a stated philosophy, and no such philosophy has been made public. One apparent consequence of the lack of a total compensation philosophy is the use of the piecemeal strategy for making changes in the components of a benefits program (as represented by the current round of recommended changes). Next year, this strategy will again be used in a scheduled review of retirement and disability benefits. The ad hoc Committee fundamentally disagrees with, and disapproves of, the piecemeal strategy because of two main problems with it: (a) changes in one benefit may impact on one or more other benefits not under review, and (b) reductions in benefits without offsetting adjustments to salary may well reduce total compensation.

The ad hoc Committee recommends that a "total compensation philosophy" be developed and published, and that changes to benefits and salary be made in accordance with this philosophy. In the view of the Committee, such a philosophy should embrace the following elements as a minimum:

• Penn should be committed to maintaining faculty compensation at a highly competitive level in comparison with peer universities as part of its efforts to attract and retain highly distinguished scholars for each of its faculties.

• While changes in the structure of faculty benefits and in salary levels are constructive and inevitable, any changes should be made with regard to their impact on all components of compensation, and should ensure that the level of total compensation does not decline and remains at a highly competitive level.

• Although the mix between amounts spent on benefits and salary within total compensation are expected to vary over time, the benefits program and salary levels separately should be very competitive with those offered by peer institutions.

• Since there are many individual differences in the needs of faculty members for particular components of a broad-based benefits program, considerable flexibility should be provided within the package of benefits for faculty members to tailor a set to benefits that is most responsive to personal needs. Thus, if the current Flexible Benefits Plan (PennFlex) is discontinued as recommended by the Benefits Advisory Committee, steps should be taken immediately to design and implement an improved and broader flexible benefits plan.

Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Benefits Redesign Report

Erling E. Boe, Professor of Education
Sheila H. Murnaghan, Associate Professor of Classical Studies
Mark V. Pauly, Bendheim Professor of Health Care Systems, Public Management, Insurance, and Economics
Jerry S. Rosenbloom, Frederick H. Ecker Professor of Insurance and Risk Management
Response to the Ad Hoc Committee Report on Benefits Redesign

by Barbara J. Lowery, Associate Provost, and Michael L. Wachter, Deputy Provost

We are pleased to have the opportunity to respond to the report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Senate Committee on Benefits Redesign. We are also pleased to acknowledge the substantial commitment of time and energy of those Faculty Senate designees who worked on this issue through their membership on the Benefits Redesign Committee and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee.

The starting point for our response to the Ad Hoc Committee’s report is with their starting point. The Committee states that they were given the “limited task of reviewing and analyzing recommendations made by the Benefits Advisory Committee for changes that impact directly on the welfare of members of Penn’s Faculty Senate.” The University Benefits Advisory Committee had the broader focus of all University employees, and that Committee included representatives of the A-1 and A-3 communities. The Academic Planning and Budget Committee, which is a faculty dominated committee, also had a broader focus than the Ad Hoc Committee, since AP&B is the designated University committee to deal with a full range of academic planning and budgetary issues facing the University.

We organize our response following the outline of the Ad Hoc Committee’s report:

Health Care Insurance

The Ad Hoc Committee questions the pricing rationale adopted by the Benefits Redesign Committee. They argue that the recommended payroll contributions for FY 1998 fall unevenly: with only a slight increase for those in Plan 100, virtually no change for the HMO population, once the effect of the new prescription plan is included, and a substantial increase for those in PENNCare.

The Ad Hoc Committee seems to be confusing price changes with price levels in analyzing changes in the contribution for Plan 100. It is the case that Plan 100 participants will experience only a small increase in cost-sharing under these recommendations. However, they will still have a greater cost-sharing percentage than in other plans.

The idea of subsidizing the HMO’s more heavily than other plans was discussed at length by both committees. The explanation for the cost-sharing strategy for the HMO’s was based on the principle that the University should offer a low cost plan option that would be affordable to all employees. There was considerable concern that the individuals in those plans, most of whom are lowered salaried employees, would experience hardship if the cost-sharing was too great.

Under the “normalized” approach, total premium rates are “normalized” to spread the health insurance risk across the entire Penn population. Another way of stating this is that each plan is rated as if the entire Penn population (good risks and bad) were in that plan, thereby removing from the rates of each plan the underlying health care utilization of that plan’s specific enrollees. This eliminates adverse selection effects. Total plan cost “budget rates” are then set to reflect the expected value of each plan in terms of both its benefit levels and managed care features (e.g., provider discounts, restrictions on choice). In this way the total cost for each plan more closely reflects the true value of that plan irrespective of the health status of its enrollees. It was the opinion of the Towers Perrin Consulting firm that the “normalized” approach is more accurate from a technical perspective than the pricing strategies that have been employed in the past.

Finally, the Ad Hoc Committee was concerned about faculty being asked to bear more of the cost of their benefits without receiving any increase in money wages as an offset in FY 1998. They justify this concern by arguing that the high increases in University contributions to health care in past years were likely offset by lower increases in money wages, so that a wage offset for benefits increases in the next fiscal year will not redress the balance in lost compensation. It is argued, alternatively, that wages might not have been reduced in an offsetting fashion leading to a conclusion that Penn faculty are currently overcompensated in total relative to the labor market.

The first argument is contradicted by the Faculty Senate’s own work. In January, 1996, the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty reported that on the AAUP weighted index (which adjusts the salary structures of each of the other universities to Penn’s mix of Assistant, Associate and Full Professors) in 1994-95 Penn ranked fourth moving up from sixth ten years ago. The committee also reported that “...Penn’s relative dollar gain on the index over the ten year period was larger than nine of the other eleven institutions.” In their discussion of total compensation, they report that “Penn’s ratio of total compensation to salary of 127.6% was the highest among the comparable schools, between 3.4 and 6.8% higher than others of the top five [Harvard 124.2, MIT 124.1, Chicago 123.9, Stanford 120.8].” That report goes on to discuss concerns about differences in salaries across schools. But, in the aggregate, the Senate report suggests that, at least with respect to the faculty, salary increases were not being reduced to offset the health care insurance pricing problem that emerged after 1989.

Graduate Tuition for Spouses and Children

The Ad Hoc Committee advocates grandfathering, for current employees, the graduate tuition benefit for spouses and children. The original recommendation to eliminate this benefit was based on the fact that the benefit is highly unusual among Ivy Plus institutions, is...
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one of those discretionary items that makes Penn’s employee benefit rate relatively high, and is enjoyed by relatively few employees. Tuition reimbursement was also mentioned prominently in the recent Time magazine article, “Why Colleges Cost Too Much,” which featured Penn in its discussion of the high cost of education.

Although most faculty and staff understand and appreciate the recommendation to eliminate this benefit, we have heard considerable support in the community for retaining this benefit for current employees. Of all the recommendations, this was the only one that arose regularly as a source of concern in our meetings with faculties in the different schools.

Life Insurance

The Ad Hoc Committee’s primary recommendation with respect to life insurance is that the salary increase resulting from the elimination of flex-dollars be reported separately from the regular annual adjustment. This has been our working assumption and we are studying the mechanics of accomplishing that objective.

The Ad Hoc Committee also suggests “that a more inclusive flexible benefits program be studied for possible implementation.” Although it is not our intention to reopen issues resolved this year, the Benefits Redesign report does contain a recommendation that “the benefits package in its entirety should be reviewed annually.” In that spirit, the University will continue to analyze the value of implementing other benefits program designs.

Benefits for Regular Part-Time Employees

The Ad Hoc Committee is supportive of the change made to benefits for part-time employees and favors continued consideration of additional benefits for part-time employees. The benefits for part-time employees will continue to be a topic for regular benefits review in the future.

Conclusion

In its conclusion, the Ad Hoc Committee faults Penn for not having a benefits philosophy or more specifically, for not having a total compensation philosophy.

The recommendations for benefits redesign, published in Almanac on February 11, 1997, do contain a set of specific principles. These principles played an integral role in developing the entire set of recommendations.

The issue of a total compensation philosophy is more complex. Benefits are a complex topic, and the Benefits Advisory Committee and the Academic Planning and Budget Committee focused on benefits and did not do a separate and new study of wage trends or trends in other factors that affect Penn’s faculty. Both committees, however, were aware of wages of Penn faculty and the high relative standing of those wages, as noted, for example, in the AUPP data cited above. The idea of the development of a total compensation philosophy is a good one and one that should guide future benefits discussions.

Federal Relations’ David Morse to the Pew Charitable Trusts

David Morse, who joined Penn 14 years ago as its first full-time director of federal relations, will leave the University on April 21 to become director of public affairs at the Pew Charitable Trusts, one of the nation’s largest private foundations.

A search for a successor has begun, and in the interim, the federal relations function will continue to be led by Vice President Carol Scheman, with the assistance of Carl Maugeri, Associate Director, and Micheline Murphy, Policy Analyst, both in the Office of Federal Relations.

As federal relations director and then as associate vice president for policy planning, Mr. Morse has been a leader in many of the joint higher education efforts that deal with national policy, such as those of the Consortium on Financing Higher Education and the Association of American Universities (AAU). Since 1995, he has been one of the key strategists behind the Science Coalition, a Washington-based group of more than 400 universities, scientific and engineering societies, voluntary groups, corporations, Noble Laureates, former Cabinet officers and other prominent individuals organized to advocate on behalf of robust federal support for university-based research as a matter of national interest. The Coalition, initiated at the behest of President Rodin, Trustee Chairman P. Roy Vagelos, and leaders of several other universities, has been cited by media as one of the most significant forces behind renewed interest and support for basic science and technology funding.

“David’s expertise and leadership on key issues have positioned Penn to be a major player in some of the most significant higher education policy issues of our time,” said President Judith Rodin. “His deep appreciation for the concerns and needs of students, faculty and administrators—the entire enterprise of higher learning—have made him an asset not only to Penn, but to all concerned with improving higher education in our country.” VP Scheman praised Mr. Morse’s work with all levels of government, “building bridges between Congress and the education community at a time when the public perception of the role of colleges and universities was undergoing tremendous change. He leaves the University a legacy of excellent relations with our federal elected leaders.”

Preparing to Make the PennCard a ‘Smart Card’

In Progress: A Campus Card Steering Committee

As the University’s PennCard is readied for upgrade to a “smart card” with new functions, Vice President for Business Services Steve Murray has announced preparations for a Campus Card Steering Committee with purview over the policies, procedures and services related to the card’s use. ‘The PennCard has historically served as the official University identification card,” said Mr. Murray. “It is now used widely for building access, especially in residence halls; but it is also used with dining meal plans, recreation and library services, and purchases at the Bookstore and other locations.

Newer cards have digital photos and these photos may also be used for other purposes, including class rosters and school yearbooks. In August 1997, the PennCard will provide a variety of new financial services to students, faculty, staff and alumni as the new PennCash program is rolled out for Fall 1997.

“The charge of the Campus Card Steering Committee will be to review the current policies and business rules governing PennCard use, to provide input into the rollout of the new PennCash services, and to provide ongoing oversight of future uses of the PennCard,” Mr. Murray said. “Initial areas of discussion will include privileges granted by each type of card, use of SSN, card fees, and digital photos.

The Campus Card Steering Committee will be chaired by Laurie Coursart, Director of Telecommunications, who will now also have administrative responsibility for the PennCard Department, headed by Frank Neithammer. Membership of the PennCard Steering Committee will include representatives of the Offices of the President, Provost, VPUL, ISC, Student Financial Serices, Student Information Services, Public Safety, University Libraries, Human Resources, Development & Alumni Relations, and Intercollegiate Athletics. Represenation will also be invited for undergraduate and graduate student leaders, the University Council on Communications, and the Faculty Senate.

To the University Community: Re Uses of the Magnetic Stripe

Business Services and Information Systems & Computing will soon begin modifications to the information that is encoded on the magnetic stripe of the PennCard. These changes will permit the introduction of additional services using the PennCard that are expected for Fall 1997. The PennCard Alternate Identification Number—formerly the Social Security Number that is currently in use as an identification number for students, faculty and staff.

These changes will be implemented in such a way to prevent any disruption of services that currently use the encoded data on the PennCard magnetic stripe, including dining meal plans, building and room access, Van Pelt Library, and purchases at the Bookstore, Wharton Reprographics, Chats, Stern Dining, and High Rise Commissaries. Provisions are being made for the card readers and systems that are linked to and managed by PennCard (dining, access, library, bookstore, etc.).

We are concerned, however, that there may be other areas of campus that are swiping the PennCard and using the data on the magnetic stripe for purposes of which we are unaware. The planned changes to the PennCard magnetic stripe will impact those services.

If you are aware of any use of the PennCard magnetic stripe in your school or center, please immediately contact Frank Neithammer, Director, PennCard Center, at 898-9810 or at fneitham@penn.edu that arrangements can be made to include your area’s use of the PennCard in the planned modifications. Thanks for your help.

— Steve Murray, Vice President for Business Services
— Jim O’Donnell, Acting Vice Provost for Information Systems & Computing
Aging — both population aging and individual aging — is a fundamental social, financial, and demographic characteristic of contemporary society. It is widely recognized that the quality of life of aging individuals and aging societies is intertwined with the acquisition and depletion of human resources, including financial resources. Of equal importance are the subjective characteristics of financial resources which can be instrumental as their objective characteristics in affecting a person’s quality of life. This awareness directs concern to such life-span issues as employment and retirement; spending and saving; planning for health, illness, and death. Attention must be paid to relationships among private sector institutions and public policies—especially as these influence personal and family decision making.

Note that the focus here is on the dynamics of aging: gerontology is the study of the multiple processes of aging. It is not simply a focus on “the aged” or “the elderly.” Financial gerontology, therefore, is as interested in middle aging as in older aging, and in social and family inter-relationships among men and women of different ages and generations.

The Boettner Center of Financial Gerontology was established in 1986 through the interest and generosity of the late Joseph E. Boettner and his wife Elizabeth Boettner, to advance understanding of the relationships among aging, financial issues, and quality of life. In pursuing a comprehensive program of applied research in financial gerontology the Boettner Center’s aim is to support systematic investigation of the impact of both population aging and individual aging, on patterns of financial well-being within and across generations. The Boettner Center became affiliated with the University of Pennsylvania in 1992 and with the School of Social Work in 1995. The goal of the Boettner Financial Gerontology Research Fund is to support social research by senior researchers, faculty and doctoral students which promises both to promote knowledge and to enhance professional practice and social policy, with the broader societal goal of enhancing the financial well-being and life satisfaction of aging persons in contemporary society.

Proposal Guidelines
A major objective of the Boettner Center is to encourage research that explores the linkages among aging, financial dynamics, and the quality of life of aging individuals, families, and populations. In pursuit of this objective, the Boettner Financial Gerontology Research Fund was established at the School of Social Work to support a program of small research grants in three important categories: (1) seed money for innovative pilot projects that can lead to proposals that will be competitive for external funding; (2) projects requiring modest support for completion and publication; (3) dissertation support for Ph.D. Candidates.

Priority will be given to projects that develop new initiatives in one of three main areas: (1) research on policy and practice issues relevant to the major themes of financial gerontology, including but not limited to socioeconomic variations in retirement preparation, intergenerational care-giving, factors influencing patterns of spending and savings, and patterns of health care needs of middle-age and older-age populations; (2) conferences for either professional or public audiences on topics exploring linkages among aging, financial dynamics, and quality of life; and (3) curriculum development for graduate-level courses in social work and financial gerontology.

Eligibility for Boettner Research Awards: proposals for the spring 1997 competition are invited from university faculty and full-time research staff, conducting or planning research in the areas listed above.

Doctoral students are encouraged to submit proposals to the Boettner Fund. To be eligible: by the start date of the proposed award, the student’s dissertation proposal must have been accepted by the appropriate graduate committee. Boettner dissertation fellowships may include full or partial support for the appropriate academic period, thesis fees, and limited research expenses (the justification for which should be clearly identified in the budget).

Requirements for proposals: the guidelines for proposals are as follows:
1. Size of awards (maximum per award): Faculty and senior researcher awards: $20,000; student awards: $10,000
2. Use of funds: data collection and analysis, research assistance, salary (including benefits), essential research-related travel, and manuscript preparation and publication costs
3. The proposal: limited to 10 single-spaced pages
   i) Cover page: Name and title of principal investigator
   ii) Title of proposal
   iii) Amount requested

Requirements for proposals:
1. Cover page: Name and title of principal investigator
2. Brief curriculum vitae of principal investigator (2 pages)
3. Introduction: (2-3 pp.): statement of the objectives and significance of the work and its relevance to financial gerontology
4. Description of the project (including research design, data sources, methods of analysis)
5. If the grant is for a pilot study, how will the project facilitate acquisition of future research funds, including funding agencies to be approached.
6. Brief plan for the completion, publication, and dissemination of results/materials generated by the project; if a conference, how conference proceedings will be edited and disseminated
7. Budget (one-page): explicit as to amounts, use of, and Rationale for requests; include timetable (one year preferred, two-year plan acceptable)

4. Submit 10 copies of the proposal, plus a disk with the proposal in WordPerfect or Microsoft Word format to:
   Steven J. Devlin, Ph.D., Acting Director
   Boettner Center of Financial Gerontology
   School of Social Work
   3701 Locust Walk, Cluster Building
   Philadelphia, PA 19104-6214

5. Reports: a report is required at the proposed termination date of the project, and upon completion if there is an extension. To meet the public dissemination goals of the Boettner Center, two brief (one-page) descriptions of the project, aimed at the educated non-specialist, are required. The first, describing the proposed project, must be submitted prior to release of funds; the second, describing outcomes and results, must be submitted upon completion of the project. Individuals receiving Boettner Financial Gerontology Research Fund Awards will also be asked to prepare a one-hour presentation on their projects as part of the lecture series sponsored by the boettner center and the School of Social Work.

6. Human subjects: all research projects involving human subjects must receive Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval prior to funding. Applicants are not required to receive IRB approval prior to submission of their proposal. However, funds will only be released to awardees following IRB review and approval.

Review Procedures: proposals will be reviewed by the financial gerontology research committee which includes representatives of the various academic centers in the university community applicants will be notified of the decision of the committee approximately one month after the submission deadline. Funding will begin July 1, 1997. We anticipate funding three or four projects.

For additional information about the Boettner Center or the Boettner Financial Gerontology Research Fund, please contact: Steven J. Devlin, 898-6475, Fax: 573-3418, or E-mail: sdevlin@ssw.upenn.edu.
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OPPORTUNITIES at PENN

Where to Find the Job Opportunities—Here and Elsewhere

Listed below are the new job opportunities at the University of Pennsylvania. Where the qualifications are described in terms of formal education or training, prior experience in the same field may be substituted.

There are approximately 280 additional open positions for examination at the Job Application Center, Funderberg Information Center, 3401 Walnut St. (215-898-7285). Hours of operation are Monday though Friday, 9 a.m.-1 p.m. New openings are also posted daily at the following locations: Blockley Hall, the Wharton School and the Dental School.

A full listing of job opportunities is at the Human Resource Services website: www.upenn.edu/hr. Current employees need only access the Hiring Center from the Computer Resource Center at 3732 Locust Walk with your PENNCARD to obtain a list of computer labs on campus available for your use.

In addition, almost every public library in the Delaware Valley now provides web access. In the near future, as our office remodels the Job Application Center, we hope to have computers available for current employees and others to peruse the current job openings. Openings are also mailed to approximately 50 community sites weekly.

Please note: Faculty positions and positions at the Hospital and Health Systems are not included in these listings. For Hospital and Health System openings, contact 662-2999.

New Jobs for the week of March 25, 1997

ARTS AND SCIENCES

FISCAL COORDINATOR II (03309SH) Generate and analyze accounting reports in FinMis and salary reports in Salary Management; manage grant and department funds and resolve problems; enter journals; assist B.A. in budget planning; manage payroll for weekly and monthly employees; process payroll reallocations; interact with offices inside and outside the university in ensuring compliance with University policies and federal regulations; establish and modify data systems for department administrative use; determine current needs of business office, enacting policies and procedures to meet. Qualifications: BA/BS, preferably in accounting or equivalent; one to three years experience in fiscal operations or equivalent; strong decision-making and analytical abilities; excellent interpersonal and organizational skills; familiarity with University policies and procedures preferred; working knowledge of FinMis and Salary Management preferred. Grade: P2; Range: $22,351-29,098 3-17-97 Economics

LAN SPECIALIST (03310SH) Provide system maintenance for the central SAS PC network servers; advise and assist the departmental liaisons in supporting department’s LAN; assist DL’s in developing training plans and procedures for: pre-ventive maintenance, software/hardware evaluation and correction, disaster recovery; provide backup support for network staff. Qualifications: BA/BS, technical knowledge of networks, operating systems, Ethernet, TCP/IP, network cabling; excellent interpersonal and communications skills; problem solving ability with a minimum of five years of experience in computer networking/communications; PC Windows experience required; 4+ years experience in computer networking/communications; B.S. or equivalent education & exp.; three to five years experience in administration; thorough knowledge of office standards & practices; willingness to work with confidential material with discretion; knowledge of WordPerfect, Lotus 1-2-3, & FinMis preferred. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 3-19-97 Office of Comp-troller

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATOR (03323SH) Assist in budget preparation; responsible to Comp-troller for all administration, management & budgeting for office working under broad guide lines and exercising own judgement & discretion; monitor & reconcile budgets & reallocate funds; review & analyze data & develop alternatives & recommendations; process all personnel data on-line including HR-1’s & HR-2’s for department; interpret policies & procedures on a regular basis to field personnel. Qualifications: BA/BS, preferably in accounting, business or finance or equivalent education & exp.; three to five years experience in administration; thorough knowledge of office standards & practices; willingness to work with confidential material with discretion; knowledge of WordPerfect, Lotus 1-2-3, & FinMis preferred. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 3-19-97 Office of Comp-troller

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

PROJECT MANAGER II — FACILITIES MANAGEMENT (02262SH)(02263SH) Responsible for management of design, engineering, legal, construction, and other professionals employed in the planning and construction of capital projects; manage financial records, and the development and maintenance of project budgets and reports. Qualifications: BA/BS, preferably in construction management, engineering, architecture or related field or equivalent; ten years progressively responsible experience; supervision of major building renovation or construction of new facilities and capital project budget preparation and administration; excellent supervisory skills; interpersonal, organizational and communication skills. Grade: P9; Range: $43,560-57,217 Project Management
PROJECT MANAGER III (03323CP) Conduct research projects independently as a principal investigator; lead project development (including writing proposals and meeting with sponsors); supervise research staff; coordinate research with other senior researchers; represent CPRE at meetings and conferences and present research findings. Qualifications: Ph.D. in social science discipline, educational research or a related field; five to seven yrs experience in education or related research; experience with management of research projects preferred; demonstrate excellent presentation and writing/communicating in the field of education research; knowledge of both qualitative and quantitative techniques preferred; experience with survey design and analysis of large databases desirable; excellent writing and communication skills necessary; this position will require much travel; submit writing samples as well as cover letter with vita and references. (On-going contingent upon grant funding) Grade: P8; Range: $39,655-52,015 CPRE.

RESEARCH SPECIALIST III (03322CP) (03349CP) Conduct research projects with high degree of autonomy; project development (including writing proposals and proposal support); coordinate research with other CPRE researchers; represent CPRE at meetings, conferences and present research findings. Qualifications: Masters degree required, Ph.D. preferred, in social science discipline, educational research or a related field; three to five yrs experience in education, government or related research preferred; experience conducting qualitative research and/or in project management would be highly desirable; knowledge of both qualitative and quantitative techniques preferred; experience with survey design and analysis of large databases desirable; excellent writing and communication skills necessary; proficient using a personal computer and experience with Windows 95, WordPerfect or Word, highly desirable; knowledge of SAS, SPSS or similar statistical package and Ethnograp GIS; this position will require travel. (On-going contingent upon grant funding) Grade: P4; Range: $26,986-35,123 CPRE.

GRADE School of Fine Arts

CLERK V (03337CP) Act as building contact and call in all the necessary items to the plant and housekeeping; maintain building logs on repair request; schedule additional physical plant services for special events and special cleaning times; notify administrative offices and departments when services will effect their areas or activities; coordinate the movement of furniture from office to office; receive sort and distribute mail department mail boxes. Qualifications: HS diploma; two years of office experience in high client contact environment; must have good interpersonal and communication skills; must be able to lift reams of paper, handle packages up to 25 lbs and be able to move small furniture such as chairs and tables. Grade: R4; Range: $16,171-20,240 3-18-97 Dean’s Office.

MEDICAL SCHOOL

OFFICE SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR I (0197RS) Provide information systems technical support to end users; install and configure server hardware; perform maintenance on servers including regular back-ups, physical security, virus protection, hardware and software upgrades; identify, troubleshoot and resolve network failures and problems; refer more complex problems to supervisor; plan and monitor server capacity; maintain user and group accounts; administer network security; purchase, install, configure and troubleshoot hardware and software suites; research, evaluate, recommend and test pilot hardware and software. Qualifications: Associate degree in computer science or equivalent; two years experience in related computer support; experience with LAN’s, preferably AppleTalk and/or Novell; previous work experience in an academic environment helpful; knowledge of various hardware and software applications, including word processing, spreadsheets, databases and other productivity tools; Word, Excel, Mail, Netscape, Filemaker, Eudora, Mac strongly preferred; ability to work independently and collaboratively; excellent communication, interpersonal and organizational skills. Grade: P2; Range: $18,986-23,068 3-18-97 Pathology/Laboratory Medicine.

RESEARCH SPECIALIST I (03367RS) Perform procedures in histology and immunohistochemistry, including cutting paraffin plastic embedded & frozen tissue; handle troubleshooting & staining of new antibodies; perform special staining of tissues; handle breeding animals (mice); maintain equipment related to the above procedure. Qualifications: BA/BS in scientific or related field; three to five yrs. experience in similar project; at least three yrs. of histology related experience. Grade: P3; Range: $24,617-31,982 3-21-97 Medicine/G.I.

RESEARCH SPECIALIST I (03368RS) Act as Technical Director of the Morphology Core; perform procedures in histology and immunohistochemistry including cutting paraffin plastic embedded & frozen tissues; handle troubleshooting the staining of new antibodies; perform special staining of tissues; handle breeding animals (mice); maintain related equipment; develop and catalog animal and human tissues; establish computer database of tissues & slides; aid in preparation of grants & proposals; ability to work independently & act as supervisor for technicians. Qualifications: BA/BS; three to five yrs. experience in scientific or related area; at least five yrs. of histology laboratory experience; good communication skills and computer proficiency. Grade: P4; Range: $26,986-35,123 3-21-97 Medicine/G.I.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT I (03344RS) (40 HRS) Provide telephone services, take messages; receive and greet patients; make patient appointments; receive and record patient payments, provide follow-up; answer questions about patient registration and the operation of the facility and insure accurate completion of registration materials by patient; prepare receipts and maintain records. Qualifications: HS diploma; two years experience at the AA II level or comparable background. (On-going contingent upon grant funding) Grade: G1; Range: $21,961-27,866 3-18-97 CPRE.

GRADUATE SCHOOL

HEALTH PROFESSIONS

QUALIFICATIONS:

GRADE School of Education

PROJECT MANAGER III (03323CP) Conduct research projects independently as a principal investigator; lead project development (including writing proposals and meeting with sponsors); supervise research staff; coordinate research with other senior researchers; represent CPRE at meetings and conferences and present research findings. Qualifications: Ph.D. in social science discipline, educational research or a related field; five to seven yrs experience in education or related research; experience with management of research projects preferred; demonstrate excellent presentation and writing/communicating in the field of education research; knowledge of both qualitative and quantitative techniques preferred; experience with survey design and analysis of large databases desirable; excellent writing and communication skills necessary; this position will require much travel; submit writing samples as well as cover letter with vita and references. (On-going contingent upon grant funding) Grade: P8; Range: $21,961-27,866 3-18-97 CPRE.

RESEARCH SPECIALIST III (03322CP) (03349CP) Conduct research projects with high degree of autonomy; project development (including writing proposals and proposal support); coordinate research with other CPRE researchers; represent CPRE at meetings, conferences and present research findings. Qualifications: Masters degree required, Ph.D. preferred, in social science discipline, educational research or a related field; three to five yrs experience in education, government or related research preferred; experience conducting qualitative research and/or in project management would be highly desirable; knowledge of both qualitative and quantitative techniques preferred; experience with survey design and analysis of large databases desirable; excellent writing and communication skills necessary; proficient using a personal computer and experience with Windows 95, WordPerfect or Word, highly desirable; knowledge of SAS, SPSS or similar statistical package and Ethnograp GIS; this position will require travel. (On-going contingent upon grant funding) Grade: P4; Range: $26,986-35,123 CPRE.

PART-TIME (EDITOR) (03321CP) (25 HRS) Lead CPRE’s publication and outreach programs in an autonomous and highly proactive manner for our highly visible national research and dissemination center; represent CPRE at meetings and conferences; organize and conduct press conferences; maintain a relationship with the education media; organize collaborative dissemination efforts through affiliated organizations; manage CPRE’s publication activity; supervise staff; write CPRE policy briefs and similar publications; substantively edit CPRE reports/articles/documents. Qualifications: BA/BS; Masters degree in education, graduate course work or degree in education or related field; demonstrated experience editing, preparing and producing publications; three to five yrs pro active experience in health education and related research; experience in editing; knowledge and experience in education and awareness or current education reform efforts is highly desirable; mechanical and substantive editing; strong oral and written communication skills; proficient using a personal computer with experience in Windows 95, WordPerfect and Word; demonstrate facility with the Internet as outreach and information gathering tool; submit writing samples as well as cover letter with vita and references. (On-going contingent upon available funding) Grade: P5; Range: $21,188-27,626 CPRE.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT III (03320CP) (37.5 HRS) Lead office and support staff; represent CPRE/secretarial duties; exercise considerable judg-
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Classifieds

FOR SALE
— Home for Sale! 6 BR, 2.5 BA, updated kitchen. 2 car garage, photographic darkroom, security system, an ideal home in University City, $129,900 with 3% SA. Call Todd (610) 394-6888.

HELP WANTED
— University of Pennsylvania—American Musical Society: Secretary/Receptionist (part-time, temporary). Duties: receptionist (telephone and general inquiries); basic accounts payable/receivable; routine correspondence; publications preparation; sales fulfillment. Qualifications: high school diploma or equivalent; one year secretarial experience; excellent communication skills; PC skills, including word processing; data-base experience preferred. EOE/ADA. Send cover letter, resume to: American Musical Society, 201 S. 34th St., Philadelphia, PA 19104-6313.

WANTED
— Native Chinese looking for students studying Chinese language for conversation and language partner. (302) 292-8821 or qwang@hopi.dlcc.edu

inquires; schedule meetings; organize and maintain filing systems and databases; type and proofread correspondence and other materials. Qualifications: Associate's degree or college background; three to five years as AA I; type 60 wpm and dictaphone experience preferred; Word, WordPerfect, Excel, Meeting maker, PowerPoint, File maker Pro preferred. Application deadline: 3-24-97 Grade: G11; Range: $23,425-29,723 3-17-97 Psychographics

CLERK II (03343RS) Under direct supervision, perform general clerical duties following standard procedures; duties include, but are not limited to: copying of simple to complex materials, answering telephones; ability to operate office equipment; act as messenger to ensure delivery and return of reports; assist in maintaining patient charts, pull, fill and duplicate; other duties as assigned. Qualifications: BA/BS graduate; three to five years as AA I; type 60 wpm and dictaphone experience preferred; Word, WordPerfect, Excel, Meeting maker, PowerPoint, File maker Pro preferred. Application deadline: 3-24-97 Grade: G11; Range: $12,875-15,811 Cancer Center

DATA ENTRY OPERATOR (03303RS) Perform data entry; review new data packets for identifying information; maintain flow of data entry system; file data packets; organize and maintain filing system; copy data packets; provide administrative support to the coordinator; maintain organization of the Data Management Unit's office. Qualifications: HS diploma or equivalent; post high school training in data entry or equivalent experience; proficiency in computer use, especially in data entry programs; certificate in data entry preferred; strong computer skills desirable. Grade: G7; Range: $14,935-18,592 3-17-97 Psychiatry

OFFICE ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT (03345RS) (40 HRS) Provide website data coordination and searches; provide administrative clerical support to IOA administrative staff and fellows; answer and screen incoming calls; greet and screen visitors and provide campus escort; assist financial administrator in the preparation of requests for disbursements, including account coding; provide back-up for entering purchasing on FinMis system; enter data into database; provide support for grant and research activities process letters, memos, reports, and spreadsheets using required software packages; develop and maintain filing systems; coordinate and schedule meetings/conferences; purchase office supplies and equipment. Qualifications: HS required; BA/BS preferred; for sys-administrative office assistant experience; working knowledge of office equipment and machinery; working knowledge of PCS and software; good written/verbal communication skills; good organizational coordination; must handle multiple priorities simultaneously and efficiently. Grade: G10; Range: $22,013-27,427 3-17-97 Anesthesia

SYSTEMS PROGRAMMER III (03306CP) Participate in design/development of WAN strategies for campus Internet connectivity and for Penn's participation in research networks like vBNS and Internet II; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet II; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus network strategies enabling QoS data networking and remote-use/remote-of Internet; campus

Copyright © 2023 ALMANAC, All Rights Reserved. Please do not distribute this document without permission.
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR VI (03348AB) Recruit & manage consulting staff of 15-20; develop appropriate training programs & execute for all new consulting staff; responsible for all aspects of developing the Center’s client base; assist Director in overall operation & administration of the Center, and oversee database. Qualifications: BA/BS required; advanced degree preferred; 3-5 years of relevant business management experience preferred; expertise in accounting, finance, marketing, and new venture, and demonstrated interest in entrepreneurship. Grade: P7; Range: $36,050-$46,814 3-20-97 WCIT

PROG. ANA. I: 1-3 yrs. progressively responsible programming and system experience, preferably with production-level multi-user systems. PROG. ANA. II: 2-3 yrs. progressively responsible programming and system experience, preferably with production-level multi-user systems. Grade: P4/P6; Range: $26,986-$35,123/ $32,857-$42,591 3-20-97 WCIT

PROGRAMMER ANALYST III (03345AB) Perform detailed needs analysis, system design, coding, testing, debugging, documentation, implementation & support of administrative information systems on PC, LAN, client/server & Web environments; support administrative users & their IS requirements for data storage, manipulation, report and analysis; analyze, customize, implement and support vendor-supplied information systems; provide front-line support to users, Novell or NT networks and data access. Qualifications: BA/BS, pref in computer science or management information system or comparable experience; Strong expertise in C, Perl or Pascal req.; highly preferred: knowledge of additional language/tools, object oriented development tools such as Visual Basic or Visual C++; thorough working knowledge of RDBMS technologies; Oracle, Ingres, Informix or Sybase highly preferred; thorough knowledge of UNIX or NT; experience working with multiple constituencies, conflicting priorities & user support highly preferred; strong desire to solve users’ IS problems & provide good customer service; knowledge of various project life cycle management techniques highly desirable; knowledge of code management software a plus; experience creating and managing users project time schedules desirable; demonstrated ability to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing with users & IS staff. Grade: P4/P6; Range: $26,986-$35,123/ $32,857-$42,591 3-21-97 WCIT

A Nonviolent Response to Violence: March 31

A program called From Fear to Hope: A Nonviolent Response to Violence is being presented at the Newman Center on March 31 at 7:30 p.m., open to all members of the University community. Families and friends of victims are guest speakers. They include:

John and Kathy Polec, parents of Eddie Polec, a teenager killed in Northeast Philadelphia; Richard Rosin, Esq., a friend of Moez Alimohamed, the Penn graduate student murdered in University City; and Corine Toms, whose son was killed in West Philadelphia.

Co-sponsors are the University’s Department of Public Safety, Office of Community Relations, Chaplin’s Office, and community groups including the Jewish Social Action Committee, Anti-Violence Partnership of Philadelphia, Mantua Against Drugs (MAD), South of Market Against Drugs (SOMAD), Intercultural Family Services, Neighborhood Development Project, Covenant Community Church, Maryknoll, St. Agatha St. James Church, and Drexel Newman.

 Sign-up
Sports: Golfing, Fishing and Volleyball

The Department of Recreation announces three April events open to faculty and staff, all with sign-up deadlines:

- **Golf Scramble on April 5** at the Primary Course at Cobs Creek. The 18-hole game begins at 8 a.m. and all students, faculty and staff are welcome. An entry fee of $40 per person includes a golf cart. Deadline for entries: March 31.

- **Deep Sea Fishing Trip on April 12** on the “Miss Avalon II,” leaving from the Avalon Fishing Center at 7 a.m. for a 6-hour expedition, with an upper limit of 50 people. The cost of $20 per person includes bait; rental of fishing rods is $3.

- **Spring Volleyball Tournament, April 15 and 16 at Hutchinson Gym.** Sign-up is by teams (men’s, women’s or co-ed); $25 refundable deposit per team must be turned in at Gimbel Gymnasium. Entry deadline is April 11.

For further information on these events, contact Murray Grant at the Recreation Department at 898-8331.
MARCH AT PENN

CONFERENCE CHANGES
31 Yiddish in the University; Dan Ben-Amos, folklore & folklore, moderator, Kathryn Hellerstein, Germanic languages and literature, Rakhmiel Peltz and Jeffery Shandler, Center for Judaic Studies & Columbia, Ellen Prince, linguistics, Chava Weissler, Lehigh, speakers; 5-7 p.m.; Room B-21, Stulter Hall (Jewish Studies Program and Germanic Languages and Literature).

MUSIC
31 Penn Baroque and Recorder Ensembles; directed by Gwyn Roberts; 8 p.m.; Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall; free.

SPORTS
25 Men’s Tennis vs. Swarthmore; 5 p.m.; Levy Lott Courts.

Women’s Tennis vs. Lafayette; 7 p.m.; Franklin Field

28 Baseball vs. Columbia; noon; Bower Field.

Softball vs. Lehigh; 1:30 p.m.; Warren Field.

Women’s Tennis vs. Princeton; 2 p.m.; Levy/Lott Courts.

The University of Pennsylvania Police Department
Community Crime Report

About the Crime Report: Below are all Crimes Against Persons and Crimes Against Society from the campus report for March 10 through March 16, 1997. Also reported were Crimes Against Property, including 15 thefts (including 3 thefts of auto, 4 thefts from auto, 5 burglaries, 1 theft of bicycles and parts, 1 incident of trespassing & loitering). Full crime reports are in this issue of Almanac on the Web (www.upenn.edu/almanac/v43/n27/crimes.html).—Ed.

This summary is prepared by the Division of Public Safety and includes all criminal incidents reported and made known to the University Police Department between the dates of March 10, 1997 and March 16, 1997. The University Police actively patrols from Market Street to Baltimore Avenue and from the Schuylkill River to 43rd Street in conjunction with the Philadelphia Police. In this effort to provide you with a thorough and accurate report on public safety concerns, we hope that your increased awareness will lessen the opportunity for crime. For any concerns or suggestions regarding this report, please call the Division of Public Safety at 898-4482.

Crimes Against Persons

34th to 38th/Market to Civic Center: Threats & Harassment—1
03/11/97 1:41 PM Medical School Complainants reports being harassed

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Sexual Assaults—1; Robberies (& Attempts)—2
03/09/97 4:16 PM 3925 Walnut St Complainant grabbed on buttocks
03/11/97 12:00 PM 41st & Spruce Complainant sprayed with pepper spray by unknown person
03/12/97 8:26 PM 3941 Chestnut Unwanted phone calls received
03/14/97 1:57 PM 4000 Blk Locust Unknown suspect took property from complainant
03/16/97 7:56 PM 3800 Blk Sansom Wallet taken by unknown suspect with gun

30th to 34th/Market to University: Simple Assaults—1; Threats & Harassment—1
03/13/97 9:42 AM Towne Bldg Complainant reports continuous harassment
03/14/97 5:56 AM Chemistry Bldg Dispute between workers

Outside 30th-43rd/Market-Baltimore: Robberies (& Attempts)—1; Aggravated Assaults —1
03/13/97 9:22 PM 3315 Market 2 complainants shot in arm by unknown person/stolen to HUP
03/14/97 7:08 PM 4254 Regent Sq Complainant struck on head during robbery by unknown person

Crimes Against Society

38th to 41st/Market to Baltimore: Disorderly Conduct—2
03/10/97 8:30 PM 39th & Chestnut Male acting disorderly/arrest
03/15/97 8:47 PM 39th & Sansom Male acting disorderly/arrest

18th District Crimes Against Persons

6 Incidents and 1 arrest were reported between March 10, 1997 and March 16, 1997, by the 18th District; covering Schuylkill River to 49th Street, Market Street to Woodland Avenue

03/13/97 1:12PM 3400 Spruce Aggravated Assault
03/14/97 10:20AM 4529 Spruce Rape [Assaulted]
03/14/97 1:11PM 310 48th St. Aggravated Assault
03/14/97 2:00PM 4040 Locust Robbery
03/16/97 7:55PM 3820 Sansom Robbery
03/16/97 11:30PM 4502 Chestnut Robbery

Deadlines:
The deadline for the May at Penn calendar is April 15. The deadline for the weekly update is the Monday prior to the week update.

Gyms Closed March 30
Both Hutchinson and Gimbel Gyms will close at 7 p.m. on Friday, March 28. Both facilities will be closed for the week of March 30. Saturday, March 29 from noon until 6 p.m. Both facilities will be closed on Sunday, March 30.

Summer Employment Opportunities
The Department of Recreation is looking for lifeguards and operation workers for their office and front desk. Students and college-aged children of faculty and staff who are interested in a fun employment opportunity in a recreational sport setting are encouraged to call Gloria Chapman at 898-6101 or send e-mail to gloria@dining1.dining for more information.

Vanpools
The Department of Transportation and Parking is seeking additional riders for its vanpool #4. The vanpool originates in Phoenixville, PA, and travels through Valley Forge, King of Prussia and the Main Line. If you are interested in riding, please call Stuart Watson at 898-7293 or e-mail to ws@wpsbox.upenn.edu.
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The Teacher Training Program in the Penn Mathematics Department aims to provide immediate help to beginning graduate students before they start teaching, and continuing help to all graduate students throughout the year. It evolved to its present structure after experimentation here and consultation with leaders of similar programs at other schools, and has been functioning in roughly the format described below for the past half dozen years.

We’ve organized ourselves so that the program is administered by a faculty member chosen by the department chairman, and he in turn is assisted by the departmental undergraduate and graduate chairmen, and by four senior graduate students who are themselves exceptionally successful and skilled teachers. These four graduate students are the “make-it-or-break-it” backbone of the program, and we select them very carefully. Each year we aim to choose two with prior experience in TA training, and two who are new to it.

At the end of August, a week before classes begin, three successive days are devoted to the first stage of the Teacher Training Program. Follow-up during the academic year involves videotaping, classroom observation, group and individual meetings.

First a word about the scope of our program. In the Math Department, we’ve got about 35-40 TAs. Most teach recitation sections for freshman and sophomore calculus or problem sessions for junior level courses, in each case assisting the faculty who are responsible for the lectures and the overall conduct of the course. In addition, some TAs teach full calculus courses during the summer. Each year, our training program involves 10 to 20 graduate students, who are either new to teaching or have been invited back for further training.

It Starts with Pre-Semester Training

The pre–semester training program begins on a Wednesday morning, with a brief introduction by the faculty leaders. The very first thing we stress is attitude. “Love teaching...and let it show,” we say. “Be genuinely concerned for the well-being and learning of your students... and let it show. If you can’t feel this way,” we tell our prospective TAs, “then you need to consider seriously whether you are headed down the right career path.”

Then we get down to the nitty-gritty, and turn the program over to the four senior graduate students, who conduct demonstration teaching sessions displaying various styles for leading the recitation sections attached to our calculus courses. One style is mostly lecturing with some student involvement, another has students working in groups together at their desks, yet another has some students coming to the blackboard to demonstrate solutions to homework problems, and finally there is the three-ring circus, with all students at the blackboard at the same time, and the TA as ringmaster.

The first time I saw our master TAs conduct this session, I was flabbergasted at how good they were. While demonstrating the different styles of teaching, they made everyone else in the audience (including faculty) play the role of an undergraduate, with the new graduate students in particular given scripted questions to ask. Ten minutes into the session, by prearrangement, one of the old hands let it show, perhaps visit while it’s going on, and steal any ideas I can.

And the Follow-up Is...

(1) Classroom visitation of all TAs by faculty members. We do this at the beginning of October and aim to finish before Fall Break. All calculus professors visit the TAs teaching for them, and try to sit down with them the same day for one-on-one discussion. Our goal is to catch problems early and help our TAs finish the semester on a positive note, and with a positive self-image.

(2) A lunch meeting with all the new graduate student teachers in the middle of the first semester, to hear problems and share advice in a group setting.

(3) Videotaping of the TAs in the classroom. Tapes become the property of the student teacher, who is free to view them alone or with advisors of his or her choice. TAs may be taped again to see the changes in their performance.

I can’t say enough good things about videotaping! Several years ago I arranged to videotape a particular student on both a Tuesday and the immediately following Thursday. After the videotaping on Tuesday, we both watched the entire tape and discussed it in exquisite detail, as if we were coaching a public performance. We stopped the tape many times for extended discussion of content, style, teacher-student interaction, language, voice, body motion, posture, and so on. There was plenty of room for improvement. Then we did it again on Thursday and watched the tape a second time. I will not say much about the changes, because they cannot be believed except by doing this experiment yourself. But the result of Thursday was so good that we now use excerpts from this second tape as a demonstration video during our TA training.

A parting message: Come visit us during our next TA training session, Wednesday–Friday, August 27–29, 1997. You can contact me by e-mail—gluck@math.upenn.edu—and I’ll give you the details. Also, if you run a TA training program in your own department, I’d love to hear about it, perhaps visit while it’s going on, and steal any ideas I can.
CALENDAR

Advanced Registration for fall and summer classes: Through April 6.

Spring Term Classes End: 28 Reading Days: Through April 10

CHILDREN’S ACTIVITIES

3 Monday Games: see the Stage. Repeated April


5 Clowing and spring: kids ages 8-12 learn about the cultural significance of clowning both past and present. Attire: Informal. Information: 222-2103. Repeated April 17.


EXHIBITS

Admission donations & hours Arthur Ross Gallery: Free. Firehouse Art Library: Free. Tues., Fri., 10 a.m.-5 p.m. Sat., 11 a.m.-5 p.m.

Esher Eklund Gallery: Free. Thurs., 2-5 p.m.

Forest Museum: Free Mon.-Sat., 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

Kimmel Center: Free. Thurs., 2-5 p.m.

Museum of Art: Free. Tues., 2-5 p.m.

Music

April 3: The Video Installation by Marvin Newton, Tony DeRuiter and Victoria Hellman, "Tales of the Wailing Wall," free, 8 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 4: "Weaving and the Textile" tour. Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 6: "Dancing in the Feet of the Gods" performance. Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 7: Four performances of "The Nutcracker." Free, 10 a.m., 12:30 p.m., 3 p.m., 6 p.m.; Cowles Center.

April 8: "The Last Supper" performance. $15-$20; Cowles Center.


April 12: "The Nutcracker." Free, 10 a.m., 12:30 p.m., 3 p.m.; Cowles Center.

April 18: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 19: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 20: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 21: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 22: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 23: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 24: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 25: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 26: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 27: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 28: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 29: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 30: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

April 31: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 1: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 2: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 3: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 4: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 5: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 6: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 7: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 8: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 9: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 10: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 11: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 12: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 13: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 14: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 15: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 16: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 17: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 18: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 19: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 20: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 21: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 22: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 23: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 24: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 25: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 26: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 27: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 28: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 29: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 30: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.

May 31: "From the Heart of the Earth." Free, 1 p.m., Cowles Center.
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On Stage

Mystery Rewrite: Its final shows of Mark and Wig Club’s 10th annual season will be April 21-25 at 8 p.m., with one special Saturday matinee at 2 p.m., April 18. Admission: $2; Seniors and students $1. Information: 898-5791.


At the Philadelphia Antiques Show: Mercer Museum's Centennial

For the second consecutive year, the Philadelphia Antiques Show, held April 12-15, will benefit a new Marcello Breuer Center at the Mercer Museum, a 100-year-old landmark in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

The Philadelphia Antiques Show is held at the 1001 Engineers Artery on 3rd and Market Streets in Philadelphia, PA. The show is open to the public from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. April 12-15, 2012.

The Philadelphia Antiques Show is an annual event that features the work of more than 100 dealers from across the country, showcasing their collections of fine and decorative arts, antiques, and collectibles. The show is open to the public from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. April 12-15, 2012.

For more information about the Philadelphia Antiques Show, please visit our website at www.philadelphiaantiques.org or call 215-787-7577.

TALKS

Newman Center

2 The Economy of Art Market: Labor Markets, Infant Luxury Characteristics, and the Commissioning of Compositional Encomiums in the Performing Arts in Japan. Ming-Pei Michel Chao. CMRS, noon; Room 103, Newman Center (sadler).

3 6-9 p.m.; 4th floor lounge; High Rise North; The Politics of the Present: The Role of the State in the Production of Nationalist Expositions. Amy Gross (University of Pennsylvania).

Small Business Development

Wharton SBC courses meet weekly; 6,000 business professionals; noon and 1 p.m. April 10-24.

2 Course Management: Managing a Family-Owned Business.

5 Management Team Building. 9 a.m.

conf 208 (FRCP). 9:30 a.m.-4:30 p.m.; $85.

8 L.B. Stahli, Antipathy. 10 a.m.-noon; Room 111; Williams Hall (Center for Early Dance).

24 How to Create Your Profitability. Through May.


TALKS

1 Reithinking Adam Smith, Steinberg Symposium: Adam Smith's Moral Philosophy. Adam Smith Research Project. 10:30 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 12, 10 a.m.-noon.

2 The Global Economy. Adams Smith and the Wealth of Nations. Robert Holston. 11 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 13, 10 a.m.-noon.

3 The Right Cox. Progressive Mindset. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 14, 10 a.m.-noon.

4 A Practical Guide for Business Start-Ups. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 15, 10 a.m.-noon.

5 The Personal Essay. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 16, 10 a.m.-noon.


7 Study Group. This Gift and the Next. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 17, 10 a.m.-noon.

8 Robert Lucky. Who's Who. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 18, 10 a.m.-noon.

9 Chinese Philosophy: Confucianism and Daoism. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 19, 10 a.m.-noon.

10 International Borders. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 20, 10 a.m.-noon.

11 Poets and Poets. English Literature, Victorian Poetry. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 21, 10 a.m.-noon.


13 Partnership, the Business Relationship. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 22, 10 a.m.-noon.

14 One of These Things is Not Like the Other. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 23, 10 a.m.-noon.

15 Through April 13.

16 Behind the Scenes in the Web Library. 10 a.m.; Faculty Club; April 24, 10 a.m.-noon.

17 Through April 15.

18 “I Pity the Poor Child…” Three Inner Asian Examples from the C. Elegans Mesoderm. Andy Fire, Carnegie Institute. 10 a.m.-noon, Thursday, April 19.

19 Where Have all the Flowers Gone? Knowing About Knowing About the Brain. Gary Hack, Harvard Medical School. 10 a.m.-noon, Friday, April 20.

20 Bethany Street. The Philadelphia Antiques Show is held at the Mercer Museum, a 100-year-old landmark in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

21 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Saturday, April 21.

22 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Sunday, April 22.

23 The Philadelphia Antiques Show is held at the Mercer Museum, a 100-year-old landmark in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

24 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Monday, April 23.

25 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Tuesday, April 24.

26 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Wednesday, April 25.

27 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Thursday, April 26.

28 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Friday, April 27.

29 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Saturday, April 28.

30 In the Afternoon. 10 a.m.-noon, Sunday, April 29.

FITNESS/LEARNING

April in the Park

Call 247-7777 for information, class times and locations.

Guided Walking Tours: Saturdays and Sundays throughout April

Walking DNW-Link: Information, registration, queries, 888-476-2521.
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