

Almanac

Tuesday, March 3, 1987

Published by the University of Pennsylvania

Volume 33, Number 25

The tuition increase proposal below will be on the agenda for vote when the Trustees Executive Board meets Friday, March 13, at 2 p.m. in the Faculty Club. At right, for background, are FY1987 Budgeted and FY1988 Projected revenue and expense in the Unrestricted Operating Budget (University only; does not include Hospital or Clinical Practices). Salary guidelines

for faculty and staff are normally issued later in the Spring term. The complete FY1988 budget goes before the full Board of Trustees for vote in June.

Preliminary Tuition and Fees For Academic 1987-88

	1985-86	1986-87	% Change	1987-88	% Change
Undergraduate					
Tuition	9,525	10,258	7.7%	10,968	6.9%
General Fee	875	942	7.7%	1,008	7.0%
Total	\$10,400	\$11,200	7.7%	\$11,976	6.9%
Average Double Room	2,052	2,196	7.0%	2,305	5.0%
15 Meal Plan					
Fall Commitment	1,686	1,736	3.0%	1,804	3.9%
Total	\$14,138	\$15,132	7.0%	\$16,085	6.3%
Graduate					
Tuition	10,355	11,165	7.8%	11,936	6.9%
General Fee	645	695	7.8%	744	7.1%
Total	\$11,000	\$11,860	7.8%	\$12,680	6.9%

Preliminary University Unrestricted Operating Budget FY 1987 vs. FY 1988

(in thousands of dollars)

	FY1987 Budget	FY1988 Budget	% Change
Revenues			
Tuition and Fees	198,037	211,802	7.0%
Commonwealth Appropriation	31,524	33,242	5.4%
Investment Income	9,779	10,194	4.2%
Gifts	9,703	10,210	5.2%
Indirect Cost Recoveries	39,761	42,167	6.1%
Sales and Services	66,390	70,075	5.6%
Other Sources	5,543	5,863	5.8%
Total Revenues	360,737	383,553	6.3%
Expenditures			
Schools	193,492	207,554	7.3%
Resource Centers	24,063	24,728	2.8%
Auxiliary Enterprises	46,671	47,768	2.4%
Allocated Costs & Student Services	96,511	103,503	7.2%
Total Expenditures	360,737	383,553	6.3%

Budgeting for FY1988: Graduate and Undergraduate Tuition Up 6.9%

The Administration will take to the Trustees Executive Board next week a proposal to increase undergraduate tuition and fees by 6.9%, from FY1987's \$11,200 to \$11,976 in FY1988. Room and board rise by 5% and 3.9% respectively, so that the overall increase for a residential undergraduate year at Penn will be 6.3% in tables above released by Executive Director of Budget Glen R. Stine.

Graduate student costs also rise 6.9% in these projections, starting with a higher tuition base for a new annual cost of \$12,680 plus living expenses. And SAS and Nursing are instituting \$100/semester technology fees matching those of SEAS and Wharton—but these will not start until the second semester, Dr. Stine said.

"The outline budget for 1987-88 is the result of careful consultation with faculty, staff and students," President Sheldon Hackney said. "Our deliberations pit every item in the budget against every other item. Because resources are limited, the inevitable result is a compromise in which we try to accomplish as many of our goals as possible, balanced against each other."

"For 1987-88, we wanted to continue the progress we have achieved on faculty salaries, to maintain our rate of investment in undergraduate education and our research facilities, to provide adequate funds for the upkeep of buildings, to retain Penn's need-blind admissions policy by providing sufficient funds for undergraduate student aid, to close the gap between Penn and other major research universities in graduate student support, and—very

importantly—to continue to cut the rate of increase in tuition and fees," the President continued. "We have not been able to do as much in any one of these areas as we would like, because of the constraints under which we operate. But the proposed budget is fair and will allow the University to maintain its momentum while holding tuition increases to moderate levels."

This is the fifth year in a row that the rate of increase has come down, Dr. Stine said (in FY1987 the increase was 7.7%), and over the past ten years Penn has increased tuition less than six of the seven other Ivy League schools have. However, an Undergraduate Assembly petition with some 2200 signatures asked the University to contain the increase to 5.5%, according to *The Daily Pennsylvanian*. UA leadership will meet this week with the President and Provost on proposals concerning uses

of the increased fee.

Although no overall budget totals have been projected for comparison with FY1987's \$863 million (including Hospital and Clinical Practices), the unrestricted operating budget rises from \$360.7 million to \$383.5 in the new projections (above, right).

Provost Thomas Ehrlich said the budget shows a "major effort to squeeze on every non-academic front we could," with emphasis on sparing funds to enhance faculty salaries and contain the tuition increase as far as possible. Central administrative offices have been held to an average of 4% increase in operating budgets for their continuing activities. But the total for "Allocated Costs & Student Services" rises by 7.2% because of new items not in the 1987 budgets, generally representing the operating cost of new undertakings—such as the campus-wide data transmission network, Career Planning and Placement Center, and other facilities and services.

OF RECORD

After a Snow Closing

The University was officially closed on Monday, February 23, 1987, because of snow. As a result, no student, faculty or staff member should be penalized for not being present that day in a class, office or elsewhere on the campus.

—Thomas Ehrlich, Provost

—Helen O'Bannon, Senior Vice President

INSIDE

- Senate Chair: Busy Docket, p. 2
- Senate Restructuring Proposals, p. 2
- Council: March 11 Agenda Items, p. 2
- Speaking Out: Pennflex, Snow, Protection in Sexual Harassment Reporting, pp. 3-5
- Federal Tax Law & Grad Support, pp. 4-5
- Of Record: Staff Grievance Procedure, pp. 6-7
- Update, CrimeStats, p. 8

**Pullouts: Investing in Academic Excellence
Medicine's Five Year Plan**

SENATE

From the Chair

Spring is Coming and the Senate is Busy

The first crocus has not yet been sighted and Punxatawny Phil, the woodchuck, has stated, as accurately as usual, that there are three more weeks to winter. This is the season that the docket is most full for SEC and the Senate committees.

Two weeks ago, I reviewed some of the proposals of the Committee on Administration for alterations in the Senate Rules. These changes were proposed to speed the decision process and increase your involvement in these decisions through the use of referenda. The proposals were presented to SEC which gave advice, the committee met again and developed further modifications with this advice in hand. The report published at right is a product of this interaction and represents, in my view, an improvement in several areas of concern. It should be read carefully. We encourage your comments in letters and through the Speaking Out column in *Almanac*. The proposals will be debated and acted upon at the Spring meeting of the Faculty Senate on Wednesday, April 15, at 3 p.m. in 200 College Hall. I urge you to set this time aside on your calendars and attend so that we can consider these important changes in the way that we operate and other significant issues.

In addition to its work on the Senate Rules, the Committee on Administration is considering the effects of the proposed changes in the recreation and parking fees. It is gathering testimony on these topics from a number of sources and will be presenting recommendations. Professor Martin Pring, the chair, and I will be happy to receive your views on these subjects.

The Committee on the Faculty is completing work on a recommendation for guidelines concerning how to incorporate the concept of "goodness of fit" into the tenure decision process. It is reviewing the experience of a clinical track in the Law School and considering a proposal from the School of Social Work to create a clinician educator track. The committee will then initiate discussion of the effects of the new federal law requiring discontinuation of mandatory retirement at age 70 on the faculty appointment, promotion and retention process. Although the recent legislation has given colleges and universities a seven-year period to make adjustments, we must examine all aspects of this complex issue as soon as possible. I believe that this issue will require our best efforts for the next several years. If we do not contribute actively to a solution for this looming problem, you may be sure that others will do it for us. You can look for suggestions from this committee early in the next academic year.

The Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty continues to push your interests on salary as well as benefits. Although progress is being made in the field of salary to partially compensate for that extended period of time when we fell sadly behind in salary levels, pressures are mounting from a number of sources to limit or even reduce benefits to faculty and staff. The activities of this committee provides the major assurance for you that your interests will continue to be advocated and that administration policies will continue to be monitored.

The Committee on Students and Educational Policy is actively undertaking a review of the role of the faculty in the student recruitment process. It is assessing how the faculty can support the recruitment of the brightest undergraduate students to the University and how the University can be made more attractive to minority students. In addition, it is undertaking a comprehensive study of the Honor Code and how plagiarism and cheating can be reduced.

In summary, all committees of the Faculty Senate are active and functioning with your interests and those of the University in mind. As members of the University Committee on Consultation, your Chairs (past, present and future) are in a position to effectively relate the concerns of the faculty to the President and Provost on a regular basis since we meet formally every two weeks and can meet informally as the need arises. This mechanism works effectively and we stand ready to serve you. Many of the above issues have been suggested by your colleagues. You have the opportunity to initiate discussion and investigation by the Senate topics of personal interest. As I have stated throughout the year, I welcome your views on any issue and hope to learn from your point of view. Please communicate.



COUNCIL

March 18: Recreation Fee, Judicial Charter

On the University Council agenda for discussion March 18 are two formal reports:

- The proposal to institute an annual fee for faculty and staff users of recreation facilities, pegged to a program of maintenance and renovation of pools, gyms, etc. (*Almanac* February 10, page 2).

- A two-year statistical report on the operation of the Judicial Charter, with recommendations from the Office of the University Judicial

System for changes to the Charter (to be published March 17).

Undergraduate Assembly Chair Eric Lang is also expected to submit information on a decline in funding of student activities as a percentage of a rising General Fee.

A proposed change of by-laws, to alter the make-up in Council to reflect changes made in the constituency membership of the Senate Executive Committee, will be circulated to members shortly, with a view to voting April 8.

Senate Committee on Administration Restructuring Proposals

February 25, 1987

In accordance with Section 15 of the Rules of the Faculty Senate, the Committee on Administration gives notice that it will propose the following modifications to those Rules at the spring plenary meeting on Wednesday, April 15 at 3 p.m. in 200 College Hall:

1. Reduce the requirement for regular plenary meetings to one per year in the spring.
2. State that the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) will act routinely on behalf of the Senate.
3. Permit SEC to discharge its responsibility at its discretion by a binding mail ballot of the Senate membership with accompanying explanatory material.
4. Require the publication of as complete and as descriptive as possible an agenda of SEC meetings in advance in *Almanac*.
5. Require that all actions taken by SEC, not subject to restrictions of confidentiality, be published in *Almanac*.
6. Require the publication in *Almanac* of annual summaries of members' attendance records at SEC meetings.
7. Permit 50 members at a regular or special plenary meeting to vote to refer an item on the agenda to a mail ballot of the Senate membership. (The quorum of 100 members would be retained for all other actions.)
8. Provide that any proposal to change the Rules of the Faculty Senate that is properly introduced at a plenary meeting that lacks a quorum be automatically referred to a mail ballot of the Senate membership.

The background to these proposals was presented in *Almanac* February 17, 1987, and further discussion will be published prior to the spring meeting. They differ in some details from those announced earlier consequent to consultation with SEC and subsequent deliberations of the Committee on Administration. A copy of the Rules showing the amendments required to accomplish these changes is available for inspection in the Faculty Senate Office, 15 College Hall (please call Carolyn Burdon on Ext. 6943 to arrange to see them).

—Martin Pring, Chair, Senate Committee
on Administration

Separate Item from Professor Pring

This is to give the required 30-day notice that I intend to reopen the questions of the reinstatement of the at-large seats on SEC and the composition of the Senate Nominating Committee (From the Chair, *Almanac* September 30, 1986, p. 2) in conjunction with the restructuring proposals of the Senate Committee on Administration. I will recommend that the new Rules be adopted conditionally, subject to the approval of the Senate membership by mail ballot, and that the same mail ballot be used to resolve these issues. I have also been asked at meetings of past Senate chairs to consider a Rules change allowing 100 Senate members to initiate by petition a mail ballot to occur after three weeks for discussion in *Almanac*.

This notice is given via a personal statement, since the Committee on Administration has not yet discussed these proposals. —Martin Pring,
Associate Professor of Physiology

Speaking Out

Complainants at Risk

The undersigned have been deeply concerned for the past two years with problems of harassment and with the dilemma of how to deal with them effectively, while fully protecting civil rights and academic freedom. Included among us are members of the Committees on Sexual and Racial Harassment, the ad hoc Senate Committee on Behavioral Standards and current or recent members of the Senate Executive Committee.

The reports on sexual and racial harassment recently received by the University Council contain a number of valuable recommendations. We hope they will be implemented. However, there is one unresolved problem of very serious concern to us. No effective and acceptable way has been found to address the numerous cases in which the fear of reprisal makes the complainant unwilling to be identified to the person complained of.

If we ignore these cases, we are dealing with not much more than the tip of the iceberg. The Sexual Harassment Survey has documented the extent to which incidents, even of the most serious nature, go unreported. Many of us, who have been the recipients of confidential complaints, can confirm from this personal experience how powerfully the fear of retaliation inhibits the reporting of complaints in any official way.

The proposals of the two committees, as modified in the light of Council and other discussion, would help in two important ways. First they would widen and publicize the availability of confidential counseling for those who feel themselves harassed. Not only does such counseling give complainants a chance to be listened to and possibly to receive some guidance as to how they might deal with their problems on their own, but also it provides them with information about the options available for mediation or access to formal procedures. Second, the proposals would establish an explicit formal mechanism that should generate considerably more trust than currently exists in the fairness of the outcomes, even for those who perceive themselves on the bottom rung of the status structure.

Both of these factors should increase the willingness of complainants to bring their complaints into the open. But they do not deal with the crucial cases in which the complainants feel themselves too vulnerable to reprisal to be willing to be identified to the respondent. Particularly at risk are female or minority Ph.D. students and A-1s or A-3s with complaints about a supervisor. Undoubtedly the University would offer what protection it could to those who seek mediation or bring formal charges, but it is not clear that retaliation can be effectively prevented. What can the University do if a faculty member writes a negative letter of evaluation about a new Ph.D. searching for a job?

We have a proposal that would permit the collection and maintenance of some informa-

tion on harassment incidents, while protecting the complainant from reprisal and avoiding any infringement of the civil rights of individuals accused. When the complainant does not wish to be identified to the person complained of, a record should nevertheless be made, describing the incident and naming the School/Administrative Unit involved but not the individual accused. In the case of a large department in a large school, the department should also be identified. All designated recipients of confidential complaints, such as the school panels suggested in the harassment reports, would be responsible for submitting such information to a central repository, with the consent of the complainant, who would be named in the report. Cumulative information of this kind would assist the Provost and the Deans in identifying trouble spots and bringing appropriate pressure to bear through normal administrative channels. A particular attraction of this approach is that it imposes some responsibility for undesirable behavior on the collectivity which tolerates it. We believe that where there is sufficient peer pressure against harassment, it is very unlikely to occur.

We would further propose that for academic/administrative units identified as potential trouble spots, exit surveys of females and minority group members should be undertaken (including faculty and staff as well as students). These surveys would be along the lines of the Sexual Harassment Survey, but could be considerably briefer. Possibly a group of senior female and minority faculty members should be designated as persons available to those surveyed for confidential discussion of any incidents reported. While such a group would not maintain written records, they might become aware of repeated charges against a particular individual and might then encourage the complainants to come forward collectively with a formal complaint. They might also be invited by the President and/or Provost to give their judgment as to the seriousness of any problems which may exist in a particular academic/administrative unit.

—Jean Adelman, Librarian, Museum

—Jean Crockett, Professor of Finance

—Adelaide Delluva, Professor of Biochem.

—Michelle Fine, Assoc. Professor of Education

—Mark Giesecke, Director, Psych

Student Health

—Orneice Leslie, Assistant Dean and

Admissions Officer, School of Social Work

—Daniel Malamud, Professor and Chair

of Biochemical Dentistry

—Kim Morrison, Associate Vice Provost

for University Life

—Phyllis R. Rackin, General Honors

Professor of English

—Jack Reece, Assoc. Professor of History

—Ann Strong, Associate Dean, Graduate

School of Fine Arts, Professor of City and

Regional Planning

—Susan Wachter, Assoc. Professor of

Finance

Concurrence

I agree with Professor Jean A. Crockett that it would be helpful and appropriate for the University to collect and maintain certain types of information concerning alleged harassment, as proposed in her letter to the editor.

—Neil J. Hamburg,
Associate General Counsel

Pennflex Campaign

I am offended by the advertising campaign to which we are being subjected in the name of Pennflex. Not by Pennflex itself; as far as I can tell, it is a perfectly reasonable and even desirable development. But the publicity campaign seems to have been elaborately designed (perhaps by a consultant?) to waste my time and the University's money. It gives new meaning to the term excess.

First there came to my home, by first-class mail, a sturdy corrugated cardboard mailer, with a specially-printed glossy mailing label. What did it contain? A glossy, specially-printed file folder, and a flyer giving me a list of all the other things I was going to get, at home, by first-class mail, over the next couple of months. Nothing more.

Shortly thereafter, the second mailing arrived. It consisted of a glossy four-page newsletter, with lots of empty space on the pages, a nice color logo, and perhaps—a by a generous estimate—half a page of real information.

So far, everything I have received could have fit nicely into a one-page memo delivered through the University mail service. A program that ought to be providing me with important information is being treated at the intellectual level of a Publishers' Clearing-house sales campaign. I especially resent the fact that this nonsense is being paid for with money that could be better used to buy library books or fix leaking roofs.

—C. D. Graham, Jr., Professor,
Materials Science and Engineering

Ed. Note: Human Resources refers readers to Speaking Out last week (February 24, p. 2) in which James J. Keller of Benefits responded to similar letters on this subject.
—K.C.G.

Snow Job

The University seems to be able to find new and unique ways to officially screw things up. On Monday February 23, while the radio was telling me about a 10 to 18 inch snowfall and that all Philadelphia public schools were closed, I called the MELT line, and I was told the University was open. A number of people did the same thing, and we all came into work.

It is now 9 a.m., the sun is shining brightly, the streets around the University are wet, but there is no snow on them, and the MELT line has been changed to tell us that

Speaking Out continues

Speaking Out

(continued from page 3)

the University is closed.

I am not saying that the decision to close was wrong, even though it plays havoc with the science lab schedules, and students will go crazy trying to make up their missing lab. Someone has to stick their neck out and make a decision. Just make that decision before we leave for work in the morning.

—Howard Brody, Professor,
Physics

Ed. Note: In response to query, a Human Resources spokesperson said the University's decision to close was recorded on MELT lines by 5:50 a.m., shortly after the decision was reached on the basis of then-current weather predictions indicating that aside from morning traffic problems, there would be a mid-day warm-up followed by freezing that would create severe driving hazards for the homeward bound. Also at 5:50 a.m. the University initiated radio closing notices via the City of Philadelphia Emergency Headquarters School Closing Service. (On the radio, the number 102 indicates daytime closing; 2102 indicates closing of evening classes.)

—K.C.G.

For Pedestrians and Cyclists

The following letter to President Hackney was also sent to *Almanac* by the author.

As one of the bicycle-concerned persons whose letter was earlier published in *Almanac*, I feel moved to respond to your very thoughtful letter to Sheldon Jacobson, Chair of the University Council Safety and Security Committee (*Almanac* February 10, 1987).

Many faculty members and students wrote or spoke to me after my letter to Ruth Wells was published. All comments I had were sympathetic to the concerns of pedestrians, but there was also concern for responsible bicyclists.

I agree with you that a total ban of cycling would be nearly unenforceable. I also believe that the combination of some physically designed deterrence (bumps) along with the request for conformity to separate lanes (marked cycle paths) would function best both for pedestrians and cyclists. These methods seem to work well in many European cities and universities. I think they would also work well here.

If the Safety and Security Committee has a better solution, I would welcome it.

Meanwhile, I am pleased that careful attention has been given to this issue which is not a trivial one in view of the physical dangers and potential civil suits that could occur.

Thank you for your concern.

—Marvin E. Wolfgang, Director,
Sellin Center for Studies in Criminology
and Criminal Law

Faculty Surveillance

SAS will examine "the use of faculty time in such areas as undergraduate and graduate instruction, research and scholarship, and service" (Draft of the SAS Five Year Plan, p. 56).

The scene is the Faculty Records and Surveillance Center in a sub-basement deep under College Hall. The Duty Officer is showing a visitor around.

—Visitor: "What are those machines over there?"

—D.O.: "Those computers keep a running record of the faculty's personal and professional data, upgraded weekly. These data are used for many purposes, including salary determination. The faculty gets so much for each published word, so much for each

continued past inserts

To The University Community:

Effect of the New Federal Tax Law on Graduate Student Support

The Tax Reform Act of 1986, signed by President Reagan on October 22, 1986, makes significant changes affecting the Federal tax status of scholarship and fellowship awards and assistantships provided to graduate students. At the request of the President and Provost, we have been considering steps the University might take to limit the potential impact of the new law on scholarship and fellowship recipients, while conforming with its requirements.

The purpose of this notice is to inform members of the University community, particularly graduate students, of our understanding of the new law and its impact on students. Some of the effects of the new law on graduate students are clear, but much of the new law remains subject to further clarification by the Internal Revenue Service, which has not yet issued guidelines as to how universities are to implement these changes. Waiting to inform the University community until the IRS issues such guidelines could, however, affect planning by graduate students and their departments. Therefore, we believe it is prudent for the University to offer its interpretation and preliminary plans for implementation at this time.

The new law will affect students differently, depending on the type of appointment they hold, the amount of their support from the University, their family status, and other sources of income. While it remains each student's responsibility to file an accurate tax return, the University will offer guidance, under the auspices of outside tax experts, for graduate students in need of assistance in understanding their responsibilities under the new law. Guidance sessions will be scheduled and announced in the near future.

The following is our current understanding of the provisions of the new Federal law regarding the different categories of graduate student support, when these provisions will take effect, and our preliminary interpretation of Penn's responsibilities for reporting and recordkeeping. Students should be aware that, at this time, the current treatment of graduate support for state and city tax purposes has not changed. We emphasize that what follows represents our best judgment, based on extensive consultation with colleagues at Penn and at other universities, and with experts in Washington. It is not a guarantee that the IRS will agree with this judgment.

Taxation of Graduate Student Support for the 1986-87 Academic Year

The new law provides that prior law will continue to apply for awards "granted" prior to August 17, 1986, regardless of when paid to the student.

Therefore, students in the categories of "Educational Fellowship Recipient" and "Pre-Doctoral Trainee" who received notice of their award prior to August 17, 1986 and were not taxed under prior law should not be taxable on any part of their grant for the current academic year. We also believe that awards granted prior to August 17, 1986 and which apply beyond the 1986-87 academic year (i.e., multi-year awards) will continue to be non-taxable for the full term of the award.

Prior law will also apply to tuition and stipends provided to graduate students in the categories of "Teaching Assistant", "Research Assistant", and "Research Fellow" for the 1986-87 academic year, if notification of the award was made prior to August 17, 1986. Therefore, tuition paid on behalf of students in these categories will continue to be non-taxable. Stipends paid to such students for the 1986-87 academic year will continue to be non-taxable, if the teaching or research services performed are required of all candidates for the degree. If such services are not required of all degree candidates, the stipend portion of the award will remain taxable for the 1986-87 academic year, as for prior years.

Awards granted after August 16, 1986 and before January 1, 1987 are not taxable for amounts received and attributable to educational expenses which were incurred prior to January 1, 1987.

Likewise, stipends paid to students whose awards for the current academic year were granted after August 16, 1986 and received after December 31, 1986 will be taxable under the conditions described below.

Taxation of Graduate Student Support for the 1987-88 Academic Year and Beyond

Under the new law, graduate student support will be subject to the following provisions:

For students in the categories of "Educational Fellowship Recipient" and "Pre-Doctoral Trainee", awards will be taxable to the extent they exceed tuition, general fees, and course-related expenses—other required fees, books, supplies, and equipment. The University will not withhold

continued past inserts

(continued from page 4)

paper read, according to venue, so much for their standing in the Popularity with Students Index, etc. Cuts in salary are determined automatically as well."

—Visitor: "Impressive. And how about those machines on the other wall? They're certainly active. All that clicking and blinking!"

—D.O.: "Ah, those are my special babies. Each faculty member has sensors and scanners surgically implanted throughout their body. That way, we can tell not only where they are at any given moment, but also, via the brain scanners and other sensors, if they are working, or, at least, using their brains in some active way."

—Visitor: "Is there some way to cheat? Faculty types can be pretty crafty."

—D.O.: "That's the beauty of our cross-checking system. There was a guy in some cockamamie department who was putting up some fantastic figures. All kinds of publication and papers and stuff. Of course, nobody reads that crap, but the computer automatically flags unusual numbers, so we compared those numbers with the Physiosurveillance data, and found a huge discrepancy."

—Visitor: "Ah, ha! What happened then?"

—D.O.: "Just routine. We sent a few goons from the Faculty Development Team to interview him. They persuaded him to enroll in the Voluntary Enforced Early Retirement Plan. He's in an institution somewhere, trying to knit a stove out of steel wool."

—Visitor: "Serves him right, but you must have a jumbo staff to take care of the whole faculty."

—D.O.: "Naw, the faculty has shrunk a lot since our system went into effect. Same thing with the graduate students. When they find out what life in the academic profession is like, they go into business. One told me that she preferred the relative autonomy of Burger King."

—Visitor: "Probably had something to hide."

—D.O.: "Damn right! We may have lost faculty, students, and our academic standing, but we run the tightest surveillance system in the country."

—Visitor: "You must be very proud."

—Clifton Cherpach, Professor,
Romance Languages

SPEAKING OUT welcomes the contributions of readers. Almanac's normal Tuesday deadline for unsolicited material is extended to THURSDAY noon for short, timely letters on University issues. Advance notice of intent to submit is always appreciated.—Ed.

(continued from page 4)

income tax on these excess amounts, but will report any such amounts to the IRS if required.

Graduate students in the categories of "Teaching Assistant," "Research Assistant," or "Research Fellow" will be taxed on their stipends, because such students perform services, regardless of whether these services are required of all candidates for their degree. Therefore, for awards granted after August 16, 1986 and paid as of January 1, 1987, the University will withhold tax on stipends paid to graduate students in these categories. The University anticipates that the IRS may rule that not all of the stipend will necessarily be compensation for services. To the extent that the non-compensation portion of the stipend is used for course-related expenses, that portion can be excluded from tax. If the IRS so rules, the University will withhold tax only on that portion of the stipend that represents compensation. As the University presently considers tuition and fee support to be merit-based and not compensation for services, and in the absence of IRS clarification to the contrary, we intend to treat tuition and fees provided on behalf of graduate students in these three categories as non-taxable. In order to ensure that graduate students' general fees, which in many schools are paid by students from their stipends, will not be subject to tax, they will in future be paid by the University as part of the student's fellowship.

Stipends will not be subject to Social Security (FICA) tax.

Exclusion from Tax of Fees and Course-Related Expenses

As stated above, graduate support not considered compensation will be taxable *only* to the extent that it exceeds tuition, general fees, and course-related expenses. The law defines "course-related" expenses as fees, books, supplies and equipment required for courses of instruction. It seems reasonable to include in this list such items as educational technology fees and laboratory fees. It is *essential* that students keep receipts and accurate records of their expenses for such items, so that they can document these expenses at tax reporting time.

Status of Graduate Support for Nondegree Candidates

The changes described in the preceding sections apply to degree candidates only. Under prior law, nondegree candidates not performing services could exclude from tax an award up to \$300/month for 36

months. The new law provides that an award made to a nondegree candidate will be fully taxable, except that the partial exclusion from tax (up to \$300/month for 36 months) for nondegree candidates under prior law will continue to apply if notice of the award was given prior to August 17, 1986. We believe that multi-year awards made before that date will also remain subject to the prior partial exclusion.

Status of Graduate Support for Foreign Students

Beginning with the 1987-88 academic year, awards that exceed tuition, general fees, and course-related expenses, made to non-immigrant students holding "F" or "J" visas, will be subject to withholding at a rate of 14%. Foreign students entitled to the benefits of an income tax treaty with the United States may be exempt from such withholding, and students should contact the Office of International Programs or the Office of the Comptroller to obtain information as to whether their nation is party to such a treaty and, if so, to apply for an exemption.

General Tax Considerations for Students

As mentioned above, the new tax law will affect graduate students differently, depending on the type and amount of their award, their family status, and their other income. Under the new law, students whose income is below the aggregate of the new zero bracket amount (standard deduction) and personal exemption will pay no tax. In general, a student's "income" from a graduate award will be the stipend, less fees and course-related expenses. In 1987, the zero bracket amount will be \$2540 for a single individual (\$3760 for married couples filing jointly) and the personal exemption will be \$1900.

The University recognizes the considerable complexity of the new law as it affects graduate students and that the new law may in many cases prove some financial hardship. We will continue to make every effort to increase support for graduate students, and to help them cope with the burdens and complexities of the new law.

Alfred F. Beers, Comptroller
Debra F. Fickler, Esq., Assistant General Counsel
Dr. Donald D. Fitts, Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, SAS
David J. Morse, (Chair), Director Federal Relations
William M. Schilling, Director Student Financial Aid
Gary F. Truhlar, Director Human Resources Project, UMIS

Illustration, Design, Photography

The Department of Biomedical Communications in the School of Medicine is a growing centralized facility serving the University Medical Center, campus and Delaware Valley area. Under my directorship, BMC's professionals work closely with all clients to produce photography and illustration to achieve the highest publication and teaching standards in Health Care Communications.

The Medical Illustration and Graphic Design section creates detailed anatomical and surgical drawings, scientific diagrams and realistic renderings for medical journals, brochures, audiovisuals, and poster sessions. We prepare creative products such as cartoons and graphic design. Our illustrators work closely with Hospital and University personnel to plan and produce teaching tools with maximal impact.

The Biophotography section works with medical and scientific professionals to meet their needs for location and studio photography of patients and specimens, documentation of surgical and experimental procedures, preparation of slides, custom enlargements, and other technical photography. We also provide traditional photography such as individual portraits and departmental group photographs.

We are dedicated to expanding our media services to meet the increased demand from health care professionals. Since 1963, we have been committed to growing creatively with new technology. We believe that only in this way can we maintain our professional quality at cost effective prices.

—Ari Siegel, Director,
Department of Biomedical Communications



Staff Grievance Procedure

The following is a reprint of the policy which went into effect in January of 1984.

In accordance with the University's Staff Grievance Procedure, the Manager, Staff Relations is to maintain a listing of members of the full-time faculty and non-academic staff who have volunteered to be advisors under this procedure and a listing of full-time members of the non-academic staff with at least six months of University service, who have volunteered to be grievance panel members.

Individuals willing to serve in either capacity, should send their name, indicating whether advisor or panel member, campus address and phone extension to:

Barbara Johnson
Manager, Staff Relations
Room 516, Franklin Building 6288

Individuals who have volunteered previously will remain on the active list unless Staff Relations is notified otherwise. Any questions about being an advisor or a panel member or any other aspect of the Staff Grievance Procedure, should be addressed to Barbara Johnson at Ext. 6093.

The cooperation of every staff member of the University community is essential to insure that the Staff Grievance Procedure provides a fair and equitable process in attempting to resolve a problem of a member of the non-academic staff.

I. Introduction

There should be several means by which a question, problem, or concern of a staff member may be resolved. The first and most preferable is through some sort of informal process. There are certain offices at the University well-equipped to facilitate informal discussions of employment difficulties. However, there will be a few cases which cannot be resolved on an informal basis. In these instances, therefore, a formal grievance procedure is necessary and desirable.

II. Purpose

The University of Pennsylvania believes that a member of the nonacademic staff should not have to resort to an external procedure for the airing and the resolution of questions, concerns, and problems relative to his or her employment here. At all times it should be the fundamental consideration of the University and the staff member to promote a satisfactory resolution, as quickly as possible, of the problem within the framework of University policies and fairness to the parties involved.

III. Informal Procedure

It is expected that a staff member will first attempt to resolve the matter with his or her supervisor. The Office of Staff Relations and the Office of the Ombudsman, among others, are well equipped to facilitate or aid in such discussions to resolve the matter. The staff member should attempt to resolve the matter in this informal procedure within twenty (20) working days from the day the staff member first knew or could reasonably be expected to have known of the circumstances giving rise to this grievance. If the matter involves an allegation of sexual harassment or discrimination this time period may be extended to provide sufficient time to attempt to resolve the matter. If the matter cannot first be resolved in this manner, the staff member has the right to file a formal grievance.

IV. Formal Procedure

Definition of a Grievance: A grievance is defined as an unresolved problem concerning application of University policy, practice or procedure, excluding position classification decisions, but including disciplinary action, involuntary termination, allegations of sexual harassment or discrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual or affectional preference, age, marital status, ethnic or national origin, religion or handicap.

Eligibility: This procedure is applicable to grievances arising out of the employment of any regular, full-time or part-time exempt (monthly paid) or non-exempt (weekly paid) staff member holding a nonacademic appointment in a PA or G salary grade but excludes staff members covered by collective bargaining agreements.

Filing Process: The staff member must initiate the formal grievance procedure within twenty-five (25) working days from the date the staff member first knew or could reasonably be expected to have known of the circumstances giving rise to the grievance. The staff member, with the aid of a representative of the Office of Staff Relations or their advisor, completes and signs the grievance form (Form SR-1), which includes the following:

- a) a summary of the grievance;
- b) a summary of the steps taken to resolve the matter through discussions in the informal procedure and any other action, including any actions taken under any statute or governmental regulation;
- c) a summary of all factual information appropriate and necessary for further consideration of the issue.

If the grievance involves a charge of discrimination, the Office of Affirmative Action will be notified by the Office of Staff Relations and will participate in the investigation and resolution of the staff member's grievance. In such a case, the time period for Step 1 may be extended in order to provide time for such efforts.

The formal grievance procedure:

Step 1. The staff member shall submit the written grievance to his/her immediate supervisor, who shall have ten (10) working days to meet with the staff member and respond in writing to the grievance. A copy of the supervisor's written answer will be forwarded to the staff member and the Office of Staff Relations.

Step 2. If the grievance is not resolved to the staff member's satisfaction at Step 1, the staff member may submit the written grievance, with the supervisor's answer, to the Department Head/Chairperson (or a designated representative).^{*} The written grievance must be presented within five (5) working days of the Step 1 answer. The Department Head/Chairperson or the designated representative shall have ten (10) working days in which to meet with the staff member and respond in writing to the grievance, with a copy to the staff member and to the Office of Staff Relations.

^{*}If the immediate supervisor is the Department Head/Chairperson, Step 2 shall be omitted and the grievance shall move to Step 3.

Step 3. If the grievance is not resolved to the staff member's satisfaction at Step 2, the staff member may submit the written grievance to the appropriate Dean, Vice President, Director or other designated administrative head of the unit within five (5) working days after the Step 2 answer. The staff member and the identified administrative head will review the matter with the Manager, Staff Relations. The administrative head will reply to the grievance in writing within fifteen (15) working days after the date it is presented, with a copy to the supervisor, staff member and Manager, Staff Relations.

Step 4. If the grievance is not resolved to the staff member's satisfaction at Step 3, the staff member may submit a written request to the President of the University for a hearing before a five-member panel within fifteen (15) working days following the receipt of the decision in Step 3. Copies of such a request, at the same time, shall be submitted to the supervisor and the Manager, Staff Relations.

The panel shall consist of five (5) members including the Chairperson. The Chairperson will be appointed by the President of the University within ten (10) working days of receipt of the request.

The decision of the panel shall be reported in writing to the President within thirty (30) working days of the appointment of the chairperson. This decision shall be final and binding on all parties unless the President responds in writing within fifteen (15) working days to the Chairperson setting forth his decision in the matter and the reasons for modifying or rejecting the decision of the panel. The Chairperson shall immediately notify in writing all parties involved of the decision of the President which shall become final and binding on the parties.

V. Comments

1. Compliance with University Policy: If the grievance is directed against a specific change in the staff member's employment status, such change may be effected if a determination is made by the Manager, Staff Relations that University procedures relevant to the matter were substantially followed.

2. Protection Against Discriminatory Action: No staff member will be discriminated against or otherwise adversely treated because he or she has filed a grievance. In the event a staff member claims discriminatory treatment for grieving or participating in a grievance hearing for any purpose, the claim will be immediately heard at Step 3 of this procedure.

3. Confidentiality: The record of any grievance shall, as applicable, be covered by the policy pertaining to the confidentiality of records.

4. Advisor to a Staff Member/Immediate Supervisor: The grievant and the responding administrative unit head may each select an advisor from the full-time faculty or nonacademic staff. Throughout the informal processes, and Steps 1 to 3 of the formal procedures, the advisors may assist the grievant and/or the responding administrative unit head to prepare for formal meetings and discussions. They may actively participate in any formal meetings or formal discussions, although only to the extent of asking questions to elicit facts, but in no way can the advisor impede this process. During panel hearings, legal representatives and advisors to both parties are expected to remain silent, and they are not permitted to participate actively in the dialogue of discussions unless so requested by the Chairperson to insure fair representation.

The most effective and timely way to bring about an equitable resolution of any dispute is for the offended party and the appropriate administrative head to discuss the issue directly. At panel hearings, direct dialogue, questioning, and discussion between the grievant and the panel, between the administrative head and the panel, as well as between the parties, should facilitate the discussion of essential issues in each particular case and lessen the likelihood of diversions from central issues and into procedural maneuvering. The

panel hearings need not follow strictly legal guidelines or courtroom procedures. Rather, fairness and openness are to be the guiding principles of panel hearings. All communications shall be between the grievant and the applicable representative of the University.

The Manager, Staff Relations shall maintain a listing of members of the full-time faculty and nonacademic staff who have volunteered to be advisors under this procedure.

5. Chairperson of Staff Grievance Panel: The Chairperson shall have the responsibility of obtaining the remainder of the panel members from the appropriate lists. The Chairperson may call such meetings as necessary for the orderly functioning of the panel, insure the composition of the panel and the provision of fair and complete representation of all relevant points of view involved in the grievance.

6. Panel: The list of panel members shall contain at least twelve (12) members from the administrative and professional categories (A-1, exempt) and at least twelve (12) members from the technical, clerical, and service categories (A-3, non-exempt, weekly-paid). Volunteers will be solicited from the University community at large and from appropriate University organizations. All members of the panel must be full-time University staff members with at least six (6) months of University service. A panel member may remain on the list until the member serves on a panel. Once a panel member serves on a panel, that member cannot again serve on a panel for at least twelve (12) months from the date of the panel's written recommendations. The Manager, Staff Relations shall maintain at all times twelve (12) names from each grouping indicated above.

7. Selection of the Panel: Upon receipt of a grievance, the Chairperson shall contact the grievant and the immediate supervisor to obtain the name of their respective panel representative; these two named representatives must be full-time University staff members with at least six (6) months University service. The panel representatives of the staff member and the immediate supervisor cannot be advisors or from the department that was involved in the first two steps of the formal grievance procedure. The panel representatives so named shall be contacted by the Chairperson and each shall select one additional panel member from the current panel list. The panel shall be five (5) persons in total, including the Chairperson.

8. Panel Hearing: The Chairperson shall control and direct hearings in as informal a manner as possible. Both parties to the grievance are required to be present during the proceedings. The Chairperson shall preside at the hearing and shall rule on motions, procedural questions, and admissibility of evidence. At the discretion of the Chairperson a record of the proceedings may be kept in the form of stenographic notes or tape recordings and may be transcribed. For questions pertaining to University policies and procedures, the Chairperson shall consult with the Manager, Staff Relations.

9. Time Limitations: All parties involved in the Staff Grievance Procedure should adhere to the time limitations as set forth. However, it is recognized that sickness, vacation, other personal leaves or the nature of the grievance might interfere with the strict adherence to these time limitations. Therefore, additional time may be granted, but only by the Manager, Staff Relations, and then only before the time limit sought to be extended has expired. If a grievance is not answered in or extended in a timely fashion it shall be deemed denied at that level and may be processed into the next step of the grievance procedure.

10. Questions or Interpretations: All questions relating to any aspect of this grievance procedure shall be directed to the Manager, Staff Relations, unless expressly stated otherwise. The Manager, Staff Relations has the responsibility to provide interpretations as to the meaning or applications of any portion of this procedure.

11. Reports: The Manager, Staff Relations shall submit an annual report to the Vice President for Human Resources, limited to occurrences and issues raised under this procedure during the preceding fiscal year and making any recommendations concerning any aspect of this Staff Grievance Procedure.

FILMS

International House

Films are shown at 7:30 p.m. at International House. Admission: \$3.50. Members, students, and senior citizens: \$2.50. Information: 387-5125, Ext. 2222.

4 *New Video Japan: Program IV.*

5 *Focus on Jean Renoir: Rules of the Game.*

ON STAGE

6 *The Crucible* by Arthur Miller; Zellerbach Theatre Annenberg Center. Tickets: \$13.50 to \$26. *Through March 29.* Information: Ext. 6791 (Philadelphia Drama Guild).

TALKS

3 *Molecular Genetics of Ets Oncogene*; Shyam Reddy, Frederick Cancer Research Facility, Bethesda, MD; 11 a.m., Wistar Institute Auditorium (Wistar Institute).

Direction of Electron Transfer in Modified Cytochrome c Derivatives; Stephen Isied, department of chemistry, Rutgers University; noon, Room 404, Anatomy-Chemistry Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

5 *Metaphysical Poetry and American Poets: Emily Dickinson and Robert Lowell*; Gerd Rohmann, University of Kassel, Germany; 4:30 p.m., Penniman Library, Bennett Hall (English Department).

Formate: A Critical Intermediate for Sodium-Coupled Chloride Transport in the Renal Proximal Tubule; Peter S. Aronson, M.D., departments of

medicine and physiology, Yale University, School of Medicine; noon, Hirst Auditorium, 1 Dulles Building, HUP (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

10 *Electron Transfer in the Reaction Center Protein: Temperature and Free Energy Dependence of the Rate*; Marilyn Gunner, department of biochemistry and biophysics; noon, Room 404, Anatomy-Chemistry Building (Department of Biochemistry and

Biophysics).

12 *Mechanisms of Insulin Receptor-Mediated Endocytosis Differ From Among Various Cell Types and from Other Ligands: A Possible Relationship to Insulin Action*; Leonard Jarett, department of pathology and laboratory medicine; noon, Hirst Auditorium, Dulles Building, HUP (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

17 *An Alternate Approach to the Assignment of 2D NMR Spectra of Proteins: The Main Chain-Directed Assignment of Human Ubiquitin*; A. Joshua Wand, Institute for Cancer Research, Fox Chase Cancer Center; noon, Room 404, Anatomy-Chemistry Building (Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics).

Deadlines

The deadline for the weekly calendar update entries is Tuesday, a week before the date of publication. The deadline for the April pullout is Tuesday, March 17. Send to *Almanac*, 3601 Locust Walk/6224 (second floor of the Christian Association).

W-4 Workshop: Location Changed

The March 12 W-4 Workshop scheduled for Room 200, College Hall from noon-1 p.m. has had to be changed to the Chemistry Auditorium; the time and date remain the same. The Payroll Department regrets any inconvenience this may have caused.

Almanac

3601 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104-6224
(215) 898-5274 or 5275.

The University of Pennsylvania's journal of record, opinion and news is published Tuesdays during the academic year and as needed during summer and holiday breaks. Guidelines for readers and contributors are available on request.

EDITOR Karen C. Gaines
ASSISTANT EDITOR Marguerite F. Miller
EDITORIAL ASSISTANT Mary Corbett
STUDENT ASSISTANTS Catherine E. Clark, Mary A. Downes, Amy E. Gardner, Michelle Y. Holloway, Michael S. Markowitz, Leonard S. Perlman, Daniel B. Siegel
ALMANAC ADVISORY BOARD Chair, Lucienne Frappier-Mazur; F. Gerard Adams, Dan Ben-Amos, Linda Brodkey, Jean Crockett, Michele Richman, Roger D. Soloway, Michael Zuckerman, for the Faculty Senate; William Epstein for the Administration; Carol Carr for the Librarians Assembly; John Hayden for the A-1 Assembly; Joseph Kane for the A-3 Assembly.

Department of Public Safety Crime Report

This report contains tallies of Part I crimes on campus, a listing of Part I crimes against persons, and summaries of Part I crimes occurring in the five busiest sectors on campus where two or more incidents occurred between February 23 and March 1, 1987.

Total Crime: Crimes Against Persons—1, Burglaries—1, Thefts—16, Thefts of Auto—0

Area/Highest Frequency of Crime

Date	Time Reported	Location	Incident
Crimes Against the Person:			
02-27-87	12:20 PM	3800 Blk Locust	Robbery/no injuries.
South St. to Walnut St., 32nd St. to 33rd St.			
02-23-87	5:40 PM	Palestra	Unattended backpack taken.
02-24-87	7:39 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Unattended coat/watch/bag/books taken.
02-27-87	9:22 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Unattended wallet and contents taken.
02-28-87	1:04 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Two complainants/wallet taken while playing ball.
02-28-87	4:25 PM	Hutchinson Gym	Personal property taken from secured locker, no forced entry.
Civic Center Blvd. to Hamilton Walk, 34th St. to 36th St.			
02-24-87	11:10 AM	Medical School	Various tools removed from secured office.
02-25-87	10:34 AM	Kaplan Wing	Power saw taken from secured storage area.
02-26-87	8:51 AM	Medical School	Master key taken from housekeeping ring.
02-27-87	8:58 AM	Med Ed. Bldg.	VCR and headsets taken from rear of auditorium.
Locust Walk to Walnut St., 36th St. to 37th St.			
03-01-87	1:51 AM	Theta Xi	Property taken from house while members out.
03-01-87	7:40 PM	Phi Gamma Delta	Coat, keys and ID taken while unattended.
Baltimore Ave. to Walnut St., 40th St. to 42nd St.			
02-23-87	3:54 PM	Levy Building	Microwave taken from building.
02-28-87	1:02 PM	Sigma Phi Epsilon	Student's coat taken while at party.
Walnut St. to Market St., 30th St. to 34th St.			
02-23-87	8:06 PM	Hill House	Unattended wallet taken from purse.
02-27-87	12:38 PM	Lot #37	Suitcase missing from trunk/no forced entry.

Safety Tip: If you will be staying on campus over the spring break, don't give someone who has the desire, the opportunity to make you a victim. Keep your dorm door locked, don't admit a stranger(s) to your room and report all questionable persons to the Penn police immediately; dial 511 or Ext. 7333. Have an enjoyable and safe vacation.



Two performances at the University Museum this month include Carol Thompson on Irish Harp (right), and Flamenco, Ole! with Julia Lopez, Carlos Rubio and Company (left). The first is part of the University Museum's Concert and Croissants Series and will take place, in honor of St. Patrick's Day, on March 15, at 11:30 a.m. The traditional Flamenco dance can be seen March 20, at 8 p.m. Call Ext. 3024 for more information.