Trustees: Black Presence Funding...South Africa Forum

At Friday's full board meeting, the Trustees unanimously approved a resolution to raise $6 million in the next five years to enhance the Black Presence at Penn (see full text on back page, with the report of Development Committee Chairman Reginald Jones).

South Africa Update: While over 200 demonstrators chanted outside Furness Building, South Africa and the divestment issue surfaced in two places on the Trustees agenda:

During the President's Report, Dr. Sheldon Hackney announced that South Africa's Bishop Desmond Tutu has accepted an invitation to speak at Penn's Martin Luther King Memorial in January, opening the 1986 President's Forum on racism and racial issues. The President also outlined some activities of U.S. college and university presidents that he has joined in (stressing his role as individual, when urging President Reagan to adopt economic sanctions, then arguing for the sanctions at Senate Banking Committee hearings). Penn itself, he said, has had only a couple of the South African Educational Fund scholars but would like to have more; has two graduate students here outside the Fund; joined a consortium led by Wesleyan, subscribed to the Investment Responsibility Research Center; and met with South African university rectors under Carnegie Corporation auspices. On campus, he said, Penn is developing an option for faculty and staff to have their pension funds invested only in South Africa-free funds.

Richard P. Brown, Jr., who heads the Trustees Committee on University Responsibility, announced three forthcoming steps in his committee's preparations for January full board discussion of investment policy in firms doing business with South Africa:

- Mr. Brown will participate in the Undergraduate Assembly's forum on South Africa Wednesday, October 30.
- The Committee will also sponsor a forum of its own, tentatively set for early December. And, in preparation for this . . .
- The Committee will shortly announce about half a dozen key questions the Board needs to consider in reviewing South African issues; it will publicize the questions, inviting members of the University to write their views and/or attend a forum where the questions will be on the agenda.

Mr. Brown said the Committee is looking not just at divestment, but at what Penn should do as an educational institution to help black South Africans. "We want the input of all," he said; and, later, "We expect to produce a thoughtful, well-reasoned report for the January meeting. And I have no idea now what it is going to say."

In the closing minutes of the stated meeting, a dozen or more demonstrators filed into the Ross Gallery and circled the room; one fired questions at Chairman Paul F. Miller, Jr., and he replied that the topic was not on this agenda but on January's.

Academic Freedom: In his report, President Hackney alerted Trustees to the activities of a pressure group called Accuracy in Academia, which reportedly recruits students to "report on their professors." In a recent newsletter the group piloted a policy professor at Arizona State. "We think in a place so feisty, yeasty and lively as Penn it couldn't happen, but we will watch out." On another front, he mentioned federal efforts to limit the access of foreign nationals to federally-funded research projects, potentially troublesome for Penn's participation in a regional Supercomputer contract. He said the "Star Wars" threat of retroactive classification of research appears to have been resolved by a new agreement in Washington, but Penn will be watchful.

Fiscal/Physical Topics: Walter Arader, chair of the Trustees Committee on Facilities and Campus Planning, emphasized deferred maintenance as a serious concern. "Cost increases as time passes," he said, adding that the Committee will be discussing the issue further. He also said the Irvine Project is "at risk."

For the Budget and Finance Committee, Chairman John W. Eckman presented two successful resolutions on computing resources—one to ratify the purchases of DEC Vax 8600s for Wharton and Medicine, the other to approve a similar purchase for SAS. Two land purchases were voted: one, the northeast corner of 34th and Walnut Streets (now a commercial parking lot) for $750,000, with use to be determined; and the other, a parcel in the Old Small Animal Hospital at Veterinary Medicine, and passed a motion to refinance the University's general mortgage.

Election: Former alumni trustee Gordon S. Bodek was elected a term trustee, to take office immediately, and Dr. Gloria Twine Chisum, a former term trustee, was elected to take another term starting in January.
Tuition Benefits: Once More With Feeling

By now most faculty members should have noticed that an important change was introduced over the summer to the tuition benefits provisions for faculty children and spouses at the undergraduate level. Simply put, a three-year waiting period was introduced to the program for all the new faculty at Penn.

The Federal Tax Reform Act of 1984 introduced a new section, 117(d), to the Internal Revenue Code, which includes a nondiscrimination provision for tuition benefits similar to the ones that exist elsewhere in the IRS. Because exactly the same language is used, as in other provisions of the IRS, it is impossible to apply the new regulations to the universities as they apply them to such organizations as General Motors or the local supermarkets. Section 117(d) says that tuition benefits are not taxable if they are "available on substantially the same terms to each member of a group of employees which is defined under a reasonable classification set up by the employer which does not discriminate in favor of officers, owners or highly compensated employees." This provision includes two imprecisions which are producing considerable amount of confusion in the field and which the IRS has shown no inclination to clarify as yet by issuing clarifications. The imprecisions are found with reference to "substantially the same terms" and to "reasonable classification" of employees. An additional ambivalence is added by using the term "highly compensated employees."

Penn's plan, as it was in effect on June 30, 1985, was the most evenly distributed tuition benefits program known to us. The only difference across employee classifications was related to a three-year waiting period which all A-3 and A-1 employees had to go through before family dependents tuition benefits were available to them. This difference was judged by the Provost's Office as an important discriminatory provision that was introducing a risk of taxability to the highly compensated members of the faculty, and the highly paid administrators who will receive tuition benefits after July 1, 1985, for their children and spouses. Further, it was concluded by the Provost's Office that the decision for any change should be made in July 1985, and implemented as of July 1, 1985.

This decision produced lively controversy over the summer. Objections were raised on both the substance of what was decided and on the speed with which the decisions were being made.

Many universities with tuition benefits only for their faculty have concluded that they do not need to take any action or that the action they take need not involve decreasing faculty tuition benefits. Brown, for instance, although believing that they have a discriminatory tuition plan, decided to make no changes, accepting that the tuition benefits for those at the top 10% of the salary scale may be taxable. Columbia, on the other hand, believes that its plan is not discriminatory because of the salary overlap that exists between staff and faculty, in a similar fashion as at Penn. MIT also concluded that its plan is discriminatory but they are planning changes that for internal courses, the children of faculty and staff will have equal accessibility. For external courses the difference in waiting period will continue, and everyone is informed about the possible taxability of these benefits for the top 10% of salary earners. Finally, Tufts reversed its stand and concluded that although their tuition benefits are available only to the faculty, and some staff people, nothing need be done until specific directives are issued by IRS. Meanwhile, faculty and staff will be notified that some of them (the top 10%) may be subject to an eventual tax.

Concerning Penn specifically, I have had extensive discussions with the AAUP's Alvin Sumberg, associate executive director of the Office on Government Relations, who has been the AAUP point-man in all these matters and who after studying Penn's programs advised that the tuition benefits at Penn do not require any modification. The three-year waiting time difference between staff and faculty can easily be explained and justified on the different employment conditions of the two employment classifications (i.e., no standing faculty is hired for less than a three-year contract). An additional insurance for the high level A-1's can be built by establishing a uniformity of tuition benefits within that employment classification.

During discussions of the issue with the Provost several options were presented. Among them the following:

a) that Penn do nothing, as so many other schools have done, beyond the point of (i) informing each individual whose family receives tuition benefits in 1985-86 about the 1984 law and its risks for the top 10% of salary earners, and (ii) issuing a statement expressing its belief that the present program "as is," is not discriminatory, and the three-year waiting period is simply associated with the different employment conditions applicable in each employment classification;

b) that Penn recognize that the only potential doubt concerning discriminatory aspects of the present program might be found in the highly compensated A-1 executives who receive tuition benefits immediately instead of waiting for three-years as the other A-1's are doing. In response to this recognition Penn moves to establish a uniform availability of tuition benefits for all A-1's;

c) that Penn recognizes the potential taxability of tuition benefits for highly-paid A-1's, and proceeds undertaking the initiative of paying the corresponding taxes of the few high executives (top 10%) involved in the program from time to time;

d) that Penn decide to eliminate the three-year waiting period for the student, and establish a totally uniform program by bringing everybody upwards, and

e) that Penn decide to introduce the three-year waiting period for the faculty too, and establish a totally uniform program by trimming the tuition benefits of the faculty.

The matter of proper faculty consultation and the speed with which the change was introduced also produced also considerable objections from me and others. Basically, I could not understand (and still I cannot) why the change had to be decided and implemented in the summer of 1985 and before IRS issues specific directives. Of the five options presented only the fifth involved squarely the faculty, trimming its benefits, and therefore if that option was going to be chosen it ought to have been discussed extensively with the proper faculty committees before any action. The extensive discussions produced, finally, a public statement that characterizes the changes as "interim," that promises further consultations with the faculty during the academic year, that excludes from the new provisions faculty already hired, or committed, and that promises that in case future IRS or court actions prove that the introduction of the three-year waiting period is not necessary for the non-taxability of these benefits, Penn will reverse its stand to what was in effect before July 1, 1985. At present the plans call for the Senate Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty to review the situation in the coming weeks and report to the Senate. In addition, the Council Committee on Personnel Benefits will examine the matter this fall.

The whole matter was a frustrating experience, but also an enlightening, experience indeed. It indicated to me how easy it is for the faculty to lose ground in situations in which lack of empathy for the faculty and/or a set of corporate requirements tend to find minimalist solutions to employee benefits. On the matter at hand there are clearly many options which don't involve trimming of employee benefits and/or which are based on trade-offs of several types. Under no circumstances should we acquiesce in accepting lopsided solutions whose main characteristic is the trimming of employee benefits, won after many years of hard bargaining.

Since then the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty has also examined this problem and concluded that while for the time being the university may continue the interim solution of last summer, it is imperative to join the efforts of other universities and the AAUP in order that the "faculty employment classification" be explicitly recognized by IRS and thus render the previous program of tuition benefits non-taxable for everyone.

Anthony E. Tommasini
Response to Faculty Senate Chair on Tuition Benefits

The Chair of the Faculty Senate is understandably troubled by provisions of the Tax Reform Act of 1984; so is the University administration. Together with other institutions of higher education, Penn has vigorously opposed any taxation of tuition benefits. Although Congress rejected several other proposed revisions in the Internal Revenue Code, it changed the tax status of tuition benefits provided by educational institutions. Congress, therefore, caused the problems cited by the Faculty Senate Chair. In the face of those problems, the University administration is continuing to try to ameliorate any adverse consequences for faculty and staff.

Previously, the undergraduate tuition benefits that Penn offers have not been taxable. The Tax Reform Act of 1984 makes those benefits taxable unless they are available on substantially the same terms to each member of a group of employees that is defined under a reasonable classification and that does not discriminate in favor of "highly compensated employees." Under regulations concerning fringe benefits, the "highly compensated" group includes faculty members and others who earn over $40,000 annually.

All of these faculty members and others would be taxed on tuition benefits if Penn were found to have a discriminatory undergraduate tuition benefits plan. It was obvious, therefore, that every appropriate step needed to be taken to avoid that result. Two issues were involved. First, was the Penn plan discriminatory? Second, if it was discriminatory, what was the best way to avoid discrimination?

The feature of the Penn arrangement that might plausibly have been labelled as discriminatory is that most newly-hired A-1 and A-3 employees, unlike newly-hired faculty members, had to wait three years before becoming eligible for undergraduate tuition benefits. The General Counsel's Office and Benefits Office consulted extensively both here and at other universities. Based on that advice, we concluded that we could not provide the assurance sought by the Faculty Senate Chair that the Penn arrangement was non-discriminatory. To the contrary, in our best judgment, the Penn arrangement, with different initial waiting periods, could well have been deemed discriminatory, and this would have subjected many faculty members and others to additional tax burdens.

The University administration hoped to delay acting on this matter until new Treasury regulations were issued interpreting the Act. Unfortunately, the Act took effect on July 1, 1985, without those regulations, and further delay was not possible.

The administration considered with care the approach that would be most likely to protect faculty members and others from taxation on undergraduate tuition benefits. The conclusion we reached was that the wisest course was to require, effective July 1, 1985, that all employees, including faculty, complete three years of continuous full-time service before becoming eligible for tuition benefits for their spouses and dependent children. This revision was, therefore, adopted on a tentative basis, pending full consultation with the appropriate faculty groups this fall. At the same time, we also established a separate "grandfather plan." That plan provides tuition benefits for spouses and dependent children of current faculty members and other employees and all those faculty members and other employees who have been or will be offered appointments prior to January 1, 1986, and who do not satisfy the three-year waiting period but would have been eligible under the old arrangement for tuition benefits immediately on employment at Penn. The "grandfather plan" was also adopted on a tentative basis, pending full consultation with the appropriate faculty groups this fall.

The purpose of changing the University's arrangement in this way is to protect from taxation the undergraduate tuition benefits received by families of faculty members and others who have been at Penn more than three years. We hope that faculty members and other employees in the "grandfather plan" will not be taxed on this benefit, though there is some uncertainty in this area.

This approach seemed and still seems to us, pending further consultation this fall, the most likely to protect the faculty. No faculty member who is currently at the University or who will receive an offer of an appointment before January 1, 1986 will lose any benefits. The General Counsel's Office and Benefits Office considered carefully the other options outlined by the Faculty Senate Chair—and several in addition. The first option, "that Penn do nothing," could result in significant federal taxes for many faculty members and others. That result should obviously be avoided if possible. The second option, "to eliminate the waiting period for all newly-hired A-1 and A-3 employees" would be costly. The exact financial impact cannot be determined since many individuals might seek Penn staff positions to gain tuition benefits. Another suggested option involves paying the taxes of the few A-1 employees receiving tuition benefits. This step might well not avoid the discrimination problem and would also be expensive.

We reviewed these conclusions with the Chair-elect and the Chair of the Faculty Senate before the new arrangements were adopted on a tentative basis. The Chair-elect concurred with our judgement, although the Chair objected. As my administrative colleagues and I stated during those discussions, the University's sole purpose in this matter is protecting Penn faculty and staff. We stressed that the new plan was being adopted on a temporary basis pending full consultation with the appropriate groups on the campus—particularly the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty and the University Council Personnel Benefits Committee.

I wrote to the members of both Committees in early September, suggesting that these consultations should take place as promptly as possible and asking that the Committee arrange meetings to discuss the matter. The Personnel Benefits Committee has met with some of those in the University administration, and I understand that the Committee has concurred in the approach followed by the administration. The Chair of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty has now written to me stating the Committee's unanimous conclusion: "We recommend that these interim measures [as described above] remain in effect up until the Internal Revenue Service further clarifies its interpretation of the Tax Reform Act. Meanwhile, however, we believe the University must take a very active part, in cooperation with other universities and the AAUP, in achieving the legal recognition of university faculty as a "reasonable employment classification" as provided in Sec. 117(D). We believe that this is the real solution to the problem." The University has supported this interpretation in the past through its memberships in associations, and the University will continue to urge those associations to pursue the approach.

In the interim, no current faculty or staff member will lose any benefits. The temporary arrangements for newly-hired faculty and staff will be in place unless a clarification of the Tax Reform Act of 1984 reveals that the former arrangement is non-discriminatory. In that case, of course, the University will revert to the former arrangement. In the interim, we are also continuing to investigate ways of mitigating the impact of the three-year waiting period on new faculty members. My administrative colleagues and I stand ready, of course, to discuss these matters with any appropriate groups.

Thomas E. Leighton
AAUP Alert: Tax Reform Proposal

I have just received the following legislative alert from the National Office of the AAUP. It deals with proposed legislation that will affect the well being of all of us and I believe that it is important that we respond by getting in touch with our representatives in Washington. As you can see from the alert which is abstracted below, this is an urgent matter.

—Morris Mendelson, Professor of Finance

1984 brought permanent tax-free status for tuition remission programs. We are required to monitor the tax-writing congressional committees closely. Among the many subjects of interest and concern to faculty in the President's tax reform proposals of May 29 is the one affecting pension plans provided to the employees of public and private colleges and universities. The staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation, which provides both technical data and recommendations to the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, has proposed additional options to the President's proposals that would also affect college and university pension plans. The House Ways and Means Committee is currently marking up a proposed tax reform bill and therefore has the proposals for pension tax reform under consideration.

The changes proposed by the President and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation require special attention by faculty at this time for two reasons: (1) faculty, like most insurance policyholders and participants in pension programs, pay little attention to the details of their pension programs until required to do so by impending retirement; and (2) insurance companies suffer from an incurable disease that prevents them from explaining legislation affecting pension programs in non-technical language. If we are unable to concentrate the faculty's attention on these proposed changes, the unique retirement and pension programs that A A U P has helped to create since its founding in 1915 will be severely damaged, perhaps destroyed.

What to do Now?

We ask you to tell your faculty and administrative colleagues that the proposed changes in the Internal Revenue Code affecting pensions endanger the viability of your institutional pension and retirement programs. We need many voices on the telephone directed to your Representative in Congress.

(continued past insert)

SENATE

To: Members of the Faculty Senate

From: Irving B. Kravis, Chair,
1984-85 Senate Committee on Administration

The following resolutions revising the rules of the Faculty Senate will be offered at the Senate meeting on November 20, 1985. They embody the changes recommended by the 1984-85 Senate Committee on Administration in its report published in the Almanac of October 1, 1985.

1. Resolved, that the twelve at-large seats on the Senate Executive Committee be abolished and that the Executive Committee consist of 45 members: 36 elected by constituencies defined in the Almanac report [reprinted below]; 6 officers, past officers and officers-elect; and 3 representatives of assistant professors.

2. Resolved, that the Nominating Committee should consist of twelve persons elected by the Senate from nominees chosen by the Executive Committee from its membership and from nominees put forward by petition.

3. Resolved, that there be a Committee on Committees consisting of the Chair and Chair-Elect of the Senate and seven members of the Executive Committee elected by the Executive Committee. The Chair of the Committee shall be selected by the Executive Committee upon the recommendation of the Chair of the Senate.

4. Resolved, that nominations for constituency representatives shall not be considered valid unless accompanied by a statement that the nominee has agreed to stand for election.

It will be moved also that the administrative arrangements suggested in the report to accomplish these changes be accepted for those of the above resolutions that the Faculty Senate approves.

The Senate rules incorporating the proposed changes will be available at the Senate meeting or may be obtained from the Faculty Senate Office, 15 College Hall (Ext. 6943).

Appendix, Rules of the Faculty Senate

Members of the Senate Executive Committee

Officers of the Senate: Chair of the Senate Chair-elect of the Senate Secretary of the Senate Secretary-elect of the Senate Past Chair of the Senate Past Secretary of the Senate

Constituency Members: Thirty-six faculty, elected by constituency for two-year terms.

1. Annenberg School
2. Arts & Sciences: American civilization, history
3. Arts & Sciences: anthropology, history of art, music
4. Arts & Sciences: astronomy, mathematics
5. Arts & Sciences: biology
6. Arts & Sciences: chemistry, geology, history & sociology of science
7. Arts & Sciences: classical studies, German, Romance languages, Slavic languages
8. Arts & Sciences: economics
9. Arts & Sciences: English, general honors
10. Arts & Sciences: folklore & folklife, linguistics, philosophy
11. Arts & Sciences: Oriental studies, religious studies, South Asia regional studies
12. Arts & Sciences: physics
13. Arts & Sciences: political science, regional science
14. Arts & Sciences: psychology
15. Arts & Sciences: sociology
16. Dental Medicine
17. Education
18. Engineering: computer and information science; electrical engineering, systems engineering
19. Engineering: bioengineering, chemical engineering, civil engineering, materials science and engineering, mechanical engineering and applied mechanics
20. Fine Arts
21. Law School
22. Medicine: allergy & immunology, cardiology, diabetes, endocrinology, infectious disease, gastroenterology, pulmonary, renal
23. Medicine: anatomy, biochemistry & biophysics, pathology
24. Medicine: anesthesia, obstetrics & gynecology, radiation therapy
25. Medicine: dermatology, ophthalmology, orthopaedic surgery, otolaryngology, psychiatry, research medicine
26. Medicine: general medicine, hematology-oncology, hypertension, rheumatology, neurology, physical medicine & rehabilitation
27. Medicine: human genetics, microbiology, pharmacology, physiology, therapeutic research
28. Medicine: pediatrics
29. Medicine: radiology, surgery
30. Nursing
31. Social Work
32. Veterinary Medicine: animal biology, pathology
33. Veterinary Medicine: clinical studies-New Bolton Center, clinical studies-Philadelphia
34. Wharton: accounting, decision sciences, health care systems, insurance, statistics
35. Wharton: finance, legal studies, public policy & management
36. Wharton: management, marketing, social systems sciences
What Would be the Impact of the Proposed Changes on Faculty?

1. Would effectively eliminate the portability of pensions now available to faculty under tax-sheltered annuity programs (e.g., TIAA-CREF)?

2. Could require that all institutional employers be included in one pension plan. [Such an impact would fall heavily on faculty in public institutions, in which faculty frequently have access to a pension plan that includes immediate vesting and portability while all other employees have access to the state pension plan that covers similar employees in other state agencies.]

3. Would effectively eliminate tax-deferred payments to supplemental retirement accounts, 401(k) accounts, and individual retirement accounts.

4. Would establish a maximum limit on annual contributions by institutions to tax-sheltered annuity programs and thus prevent institutions from providing "catch-up" contributions for faculty who had begun their teaching careers at low salaries or were negotiating early retirement.

5. Would prevent private colleges and universities from using unfunded deferred compensation plans to supplement benefits under a tax-sheltered defined contribution plan.

6. Would substantially change the requirements for distribution of pension funds under state, local government deferred compensation plans.

7. Would impose a new 20% excise tax on individuals for funds distributed to a participant in a tax-sheltered annuity program (e.g., TIAA-CREF Research Dialogues, No. 5 September 1985). Write to TIAA-CREF Educational Research Unit, 730 Third Avenue, New York, 10017 for a copy.

On the Survey Questionnaire

I would like to start this letter with a clear indication that I share the concerns that Professors H. Davies and R. Davies expressed in their October 1 letter. I also add here the hope that their basic point in the October 22 letter is indeed correct and that the actual numbers derived from the survey on sexual harassment are 249 and 77 correspondingly of females on campus at any given time who have been harassed "for sexual favors" or actual "attempts of rape or sexual assault" by people of authority. Certainly the numbers 249 and 77 are much smaller than their multiple by four or five; although these numbers are still big enough to create real anxiety in anyone concerned about this campus.

Yet the issue is not completely clear. The original Davies and Davies letter includes no time specification in the paragraph that presents their extrapolation of the numbers 29 and 9 which are the basis of the numbers 249 and 77, although the rest of the letter clearly specifies the time references of all other calculations. One is left unaided in trying to understand the time reference of the two numbers presented in that paragraph. For this reason the clarification by Professors H. Davies and R. Davies is welcome indeed.

Still, however there is a complication. I do not know, of course, the exact source of the Davies and Davies calculation, but going back to the Survey Report one finds a pertinent paragraph on page 30 (of the typescript) which reads as follows: "Touching, request for favors, and attempted or actual assault were reported by 171 of our respondents. Only two respondents, one a graduate student, the other a faculty member, reported their experience to a University official. Of the 29 women who described 'unwanted press-
varya are indeed new in the field and usually reflect great concerns and great challenges in terms of the pioneering aspects they include. From what I know Penn’s survey represents a distinctive improvement over that of Harvard and an advance in the field. For that we should sincerely thank the committee.

—Anthony R. Tomazinis, Chair, Faculty Senate

Response from Committee Members

We want to thank Professor Tomazinis for his appreciation of the quality of our survey and report. Independent of the use of our data by Professors Davies and Davies, it is important to note that the rates of sexual harassment reported in Tables 1 and 2 in our report are not based on Questions 8, 9, or 10. They are based on Question 6. These data were then corrected for time-of-exposure to make estimates of rates per person-year.

The Sexual Harassment Survey Committee remains committed to the analysis and data presented in our report (Almanac, September 24, 1985). Persons interested in closer examination of the survey questionnaire can request a copy of it from Judy Gerstl (Ext. 7699).

We plan to complete our final report by the end of the fall semester.

—John deCani, Co-Chairperson, Professor of Statistics
—Michelle Fine, Assistant Professor, Psychology and Education
—Phil Sagi, Co-Chairperson, Professor of Sociology
—Mark J. Stern, Assistant Professor Social Work and History

Response from Professors Davies

We regret that Dr. Tomazinis’ current letter perpetuates several more errors. We associate ourselves with the above letter of Professor deCani, et al, and will be pleased to discuss our data and conclusions in detail with anyone who is interested.

—Helen C. Davies, Professor of Microbiology
—Robert E. Davies, Benjamin Franklin Professor of Molecular Biology and University Professor

A Room by Any Other...

In the beginning there was the faculty, and they were lonely. No place to meet, they complained. No place to eat and drink, they moaned. Then these professors thought: let us establish a Faculty Club. And for days and months they labored to establish their Club which they called Lenape. The name Lenape came from history and geography, and bespoke the concern for tradition which these sages from west of the Schuylkill gloried in.

Many years passed, and soon the Faculty Club had moved into a new and spacious building. Generations had come and gone, but the faculty, and other denizens of the campus, had a place to go, a site for meetings and social intercourse, and it was good. As the campus grew, so did inflation and other costs. The close-knit faculty became larger, the difficulties of managing a club more complex. Soon the members said: let us hire professional managers. And this was done. In many great and wonderful things were done in the Club, and the members were pleased.

Then one day, the members awoke to find the walls of the Club painted, new carpets, and even more improvements done. Although staggered by the bill, they were pleased and happy that their Club was as good as new. Now they could use the Club Room, the Lenape, and Alumni Hall with pride and pleasure. No longer need they be embarrassed by peeling paint in the soup, or unkempt carpets on the floors.

But lo, what’s this? “Baltzell Meeting in South Carolina,” “Klein Meeting in New Jersey,” “Wharton Meeting in Vermont.” “Engineering Meeting in Virginia”? Have we no meetings on campus anymore? But they are! Why are we still meeting? Or do we need a new Faculty Club? Are we all away on vacation, someone else did, but we’ll just have to live with it because otherwise that would only create more controversy, and we might have to make a decision. By the way, have you read the new Faculty Club anthem? (below): “Why, it’s so appropriate.” “Yes, we thought so.”

And now in 2085 a new faculty member arrives and is brought to the Club for her first luncheon. “What is the significance of the names on the rooms in the Faculty Club?” she asks. Her guide, Stanley Baltzell Luckenbill Matthews Davis IV, replied: “Oh, nothing really, I think the rooms were originally endowed by a famous chain of what they used to call motels, or something like that.” “And why is all the furniture orange and black?” “Fire sale.” “Oh.”

—Thomas T. Winant, Assistant to Vice President, Development and University Relations

Introduction: O Lord, grant that this day we come to no decisions, neither run into any responsibility, but that all our doings may be ordered to establish new and exciting menus, for ever and ever, Amen.

Answer: O thou who scatterest all things, may thy servants study to serve with House rules until they die.

Teach us, O Lord, to reverence Committees more than common sense. Impress our minds to do no harm, but pass the baby when we can.

And when the tempter seems to give us feelings of initiative, or when alone we go too far, chastise us with a circular.

Mid war and tumult, fire and storms, strengthen us, we pray, with norms. Thus will thy servants ever be a flock of perfect sheep for thee.

University of Pennsylvania, Faculty Club: Anthem, composed by Aaron Burr (College of New Jersey, 1770), words by Anonymous (College of Philadelphias, 1985).

“Oh, we can’t name anything after someone who has lived or is alive. That’d be too controversial. Anyway, we’ve already ordered the brass plaques with the names on them.” “You mean the Board has done that?” “No, we were all away on vacation, someone else did, but we’ll just have to live with it because otherwise that would only create more controversy, and we might have to make a decision. By the way, have you read the new Faculty Club anthem? (below): “Why, it’s so appropriate.” “Yes, we thought so.”

Honorary Degree Reminder

The deadline to submit nominations for honorary degrees is October 31, 1985. Submit nominations to the Office of the Secretary, 121 College Hall 6382.

Discussion of Harassment Survey

The School of Social Work Feminist Collective has invited Ellie DiLapi, director of the Penn Women’s Center and Mark Stern, assistant professor, School of Social Work and member of the Women’s Center and Mark Stern, assistant professor, School of Social Work and member of the University Council Committee to Survey Harassment to discuss the Sexual Harassment Survey and its implications, on October 30, 1:30-3 p.m. at Room D-26, School of Social Work. The entire Penn community is invited to join in this discussion.

For more information call Emily McDonell (686-8374) or leave a message at the School of Social Work, Ext. 5511.

Penn on WFLN

On Sunday, November 3, 5-7 p.m., radio station WFLN (Philadelphia’s classical music station) will broadcast music from Penn’s Distinguished Artist Series concerts held so far. Featured on the program will be an interview about the Series and about music at Penn, with three of Penn’s composers—George Crumb, Jay Reise, and Richard Wernick.

Correction: In last week’s supplement on Council and Independent Committee reports, the percent of chi-square figures in both sections of the Long Term Disability Report are missing their decimals. For the University, the correct figure is 0.33% and for the Hospital, 0.65%.
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Albin M. Aukerlund, technical director of Annenberg Center, died October 21 at the age of 56. Mr. Aukerlund came to Penn in 1971 and served as research electrician and designer of the lighting for the Annenberg Center's early productions. Since the fall of 1977 he taught lighting design in the Theatre Arts major. In 1979 he assumed the additional responsibilities of technical director. Mr. Aukerlund had been involved with lighting design since the late 1940's when he was the lighting designer for the Barter Theatre in Abingdon, Virginia, where he designed lighting for 320 professional productions and toured extensively. In 1957 he served as technical director for Arena Stage in Washington, D.C. before joining Century Lighting in Clifton, N.J., where he was director of research and development and manager of the optical laboratory. While there, he developed optical systems and reflector designs for utilization of tungsten-halogen lamps in theatrical lighting equipment, such as those in use at Annenberg.

Mr. Aukerlund designed and patented "Optica," an optical system which provides an even, wide-spread light distribution from a concealed light source at close range and is in use in architectural lighting applications. Among his designs was the optical system for all internal lighting at Newark Airport in New Jersey, and the optical equipment for St. Mary's Cathedral in Los Angeles.

He is survived by his sister, Joan Cardoni, his nephew, John Cardoni, and his companion, David Montgomery-Shepley.

Virginia Wireman Curtin, emeritus professor and acting chair of occupational therapy in the School of Allied Medical Professions, died September 14 at the age of 77. Mrs. Curtin came to SAMP in 1953, was named associate professor in 1958, and served as both associate professor and acting director of SAMP from 1959 until her retirement in 1973. Mrs. Curtin had received both her Certificate in Occupational Therapy and her Master of Fine Arts from Penn. She is survived by a stepson, John J. Curtin, and two sisters, Mary W. Remington and Henrietta W. Shuttleworth.

Dr. James D. Hardy, a professor in the Graduate School of Medicine from 1953 to 1961, died September 5 at the age of 81. His years at Penn saw him hold several positions, including professor of physiology, fellow in physiology and chemistry, and lecturer in physiology and chemistry. In 1953, while directing graduate studies in physiology, he was also involved in the training of Apollo astronauts at the Naval Air Development Center at Johnsville, Pa.

Dr. Hardy's research was responsible for removing uncertainty about the relative importance of skin temperature and internal body temperature in detecting and reacting to heat and cold. He began his work in 1932 at Cornell University Medical School. After spending time as a lieutenant in the Navy and during his stint as a rear admiral in the Naval Reserve, Dr. Hardy joined Penn in 1953. He remained here until 1961, when he accepted a position at Yale University Medical School and also joined the Pierce Foundation Laboratory. He is survived by two sons, James D. Hardy, Jr. and George F.; a sister, Laura Crites; and a brother, Leonard.

George Kidd, Sr., a retired employee in The Book Store from 1971 to 1976, died October 5 at age 73. Mr. Kidd was hired by the University in February 1971 as a clerk in The Book Store, and in August was promoted to head stock keeper. He held that position until a long-term disability in 1976 and his retirement in 1977. He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Edith Kidd; a son, George, Jr.; a daughter, Gail; and three grandchildren.

To Report a Death
Almanac receives most of its obituary notices through the Office of the Chaplain, which is the central office for reporting deaths in the University family. The Chaplain's Office can assist families in a number of ways including various notification services to personnel benefits staff. For advice or assistance, contact Dorothy Townsley, Memorial Towers, 6054, Ext. 8456.

Dependent Dental Benefits
Effective July 1, 1985, family dental benefits were extended for eligible faculty and staff. Dependent children attending college can be included up to June 30 of the plan year in which the student attains age 23. The plan year is defined as July 1 to June 30. The benefits include all covered dental services except orthodontic benefits. Orthodontic benefits continue to be limited to dependents up to June 30 of the plan year in which the dependent attains age 19.

Participants in the Penn Faculty Plan receive notification of this change from the Plan Director during the summer.

The coverage was automatically extended to college students age 19-23 of family subscribers in the Prudential Dental Plan as well, although the Plan did not notify its subscribers individually.

If you have questions about dental coverage for your college student dependents between age 19 and 23, please get in touch with the Benefits Office, Ext. 7281 for assistance.

Simon Kuznets, a professor in the Wharton School from 1930 to 1954, died July 9 at the age of 84. Dr. Kuznets became an associate professor in the statistics department in 1934, and advanced to full professor in that department in 1936. His stay at Penn was interrupted twice during World War II, when he served as associate director of the War Production Board's Bureau of Planning and Statistics; and from December 1953 to March 1954, when he acted as a technical consultant to the U.N., served the Economics Commission for Asia and the Far East, and supervised the Falk Foundation's Economic Research in Israel.

Dr. Kuznets devised the system of measurement that the Commerce Department now uses in its estimates and revisions of growth in GNP. For that effort, he was awarded the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Science in 1971. His major work, National Income and Its Composition, 1919 to 1938, was published in 1941.

In addition to posts held while on leave from Penn, Dr. Kuznets had been president of the American Economic Association, the American Statistical Association, and the Econometric Society. He taught at Johns Hopkins University from 1945 to 1940, after which he joined the Harvard faculty until his retirement from active teaching in 1971. Several honorary degrees, including two from Penn, were bestowed on him by prominent universities.

He is survived by his wife, Edith Handler; a son, Paul; a daughter, Judith; and four grandchildren.

Hermann J. Weigand, a professor in The College of Arts and Sciences from 1919 to 1928, died September 3 at the age of 83. In 1922, he became an assistant professor in German Literature. Six years later, he advanced to full professor, and later that same year accepted a position at Yale, where he eventually became Sterling professor emeritus of Germanic Literature.

Dr. Weigand was a leading scholar of Germanic Literature in the U.S., as well as an internationally respected scholar and critic in modern German literature. In 1939, he was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature. He was a member of the American Economic Association, the American Statistical Association, and the Econometric Society. He taught at Johns Hopkins University from 1945 to 1940, after which he joined the Harvard faculty until his retirement from active teaching in 1971. Several honorary degrees, including two from Penn, were bestowed on him by prominent universities.

He is survived by his wife, Mary Koenig Weigand; a brother, Martin; and a sister, Margaret Becter.

### Personal Financial Planning

**December 4 & 5, 5-7:30 p.m., $15 per person**

Make check or money order payable to Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania Your registration will be confirmed prior to the program.

**Name** (please type or print)

**Campus Address** **Mail Code** **Extension**

**Return to:** Rita Doyle, Human Resources/Benefits, 116 Franklin Building/6282
As of October 17 gifts and subscriptions to the University stood at $22.8 million or 19% ahead of last year. This is most encouraging since gift support to Penn reached an all time high in FY85. Over $82 million was raised and we are determined to better that mark in this the third, and final year of the Building Penn's Future Program. Our goal is $85 million which, if achieved, would represent a 37% increase in gifts and subscriptions over the designated timeframe.

It is a bit too early to draw conclusions about the pattern of gift distribution among the key constituency groups. At this moment, however, gifts from individuals stand at $6.2 million, 48% ahead of last year. Several handsome bequests, one of which I will comment on in a moment, are responsible for this increase. Combined corporate and foundation support is off by an insignificant 7% and now stands at $13.0 million. Although the corporate portion of this total is almost 30% behind last year we are forecasting a record fundraising year for business and industry support. Our corporate goal is $22 million which attests to Penn's growing reputation and competence in areas of teaching and basic research that are especially valued by the business and industry community.

Actual gift receipts are also well ahead of last year and total nearly $11.0 million. Because of the sizable number of major capital pledges that were secured last year, particularly from our own Trustees, we should sustain a healthy cash flow throughout the year. Last year alumni giving soared by almost 100%, a substantial portion of which was contributed by the Board in specific response to the Building Penn's Future appeal. This, of course, presents a real challenge to us as we endeavor to improve upon our FY85 performance. We would like to see total alumni giving advance from $20 to $23 million.

The Board's commitment to Penn's current development effort has been truly inspiring. The Trustees, both active and emeritus, have contributed over $17 million to the Building Penn's Future program since its inception in FY84.

I would like to mention several outstanding gifts that have been received this year from outside the Board circle. They include:

- A bequest of $1.8 million from the Estate of Marie J. Newberry. Mrs. Newberry was the wife of Edgar A. Newberry who received a degree in architecture from Penn in 1910. Although Mr. Newberry practiced architecture in Wilkes-Barre for a period of time, he eventually became totally involved in managing the family's business, the J. J. Newberry Company chain of variety and department stores. He eventually served as Chairman of the Company.

- The gift will be used by the Graduate School of Fine Arts to endow the Edgar A. Newberry Fellowship Fund.

- Edward Snider, non-alumni parent, and owner/founder of the Philadelphia Flyers and Spectator, has honored his late father by endowing the Wharton School's Sol C. Snider Entrepreneurial Center. Mr. Snider's gift of $1.5 million will insure a solid financial footing for the Center and provide seed capital for students in their final year of study who qualify and plan to start their own businesses.

- The RCA Corporation has created a fully endowed professorship in the School of Engineering. Their gift of $1,250,000 will support a Chair in Artificial Intelligence, a key feature of the School's renowned work in Computer and Cognitive Science. This is only the third Chair the Company has established and the very first in the field of Engineering.

- The Pew Memorial Trust has awarded a grant of $2 million to support the renovation of four undergraduate laboratories in the Department of Chemistry, part of a $14 million program to preserve Penn's margin of excellence in this discipline.

- A grant of $750,000 has been received from the Kresge Foundation to assist with the continued renovation of the Quad residences. This is among the largest grants Kresge has ever awarded to a college or university and the second they have made to this phase of Penn's capital development program.

Last June the Development Committee agreed to initiate the analysis and creation of a fundraising program to help increase minority presence at Penn, specifically through gifts directed toward minority graduate fellowships, faculty support, research in Afro-American studies, and programs to improve the quality of campus life for minority students.

This charge was given us by the Trustee Committees on Academic Policy, Student Life, and University Responsibility who strongly supported the search for these funds. Accordingly a resolution was passed calling for a careful examination of the prospects for raising these monies with the objective of setting "realistic stretch" goals. Since then the Development Office in collaboration with the Provost (and with appropriate input from a Black Faculty Steering Committee) has produced a case for minority presence, prescribed a goal, and set forth the basic assumptions upon which the program's success must be predicated. It is not a fundraising plan, but rather a description of how funds would be used to address minority presence concerns, the rationale for seeking these funds, the potential donor pool, and the broad strategic and tactical considerations that should factor in the program.

During our meeting this morning we reviewed the case document. We are now ready to propose a resolution on a Development Program to Increase and Support Minority Presence at Penn. The proposal calls for a five-year effort to try and attract $6 million for these purposes.

The program is predicated on a number of assumptions that are absolutely critical to successful realization of the fundraising goal. (1) Development research and analysis suggests that a goal of $5 million is probably the conjectural goal. (2) Either goal, the $5 million or the $6 million, will demand the fullest possible cooperation of the Trustees and the University's senior administration. (3) The effort will also require the thoughtful and concerted participation of individual schools and deans. (4) The use of unrestricted gifts to meet at least a portion of our needs is deemed essential. (5) The program constitutes a major addition to the University's already large and diverse fundraising agenda. Provision for appropriate personnel and budgetary resources must be made. The overall effort will be carried out within the framework of the University's overall development program. It will not be conducted as a separate campaign.

**Minority Presence Resolution**

Passed Unanimously at the Stated Meeting October 25, 1985

The University of Pennsylvania, recognizing that blacks and other minorities are not sufficiently represented among its faculty and its graduate and undergraduate student bodies, proposes to undertake a program to increase their numbers and support their presence on campus. This effort will involve recruitment of senior and junior faculty in certain targeted departments; additional fellowship support for minority graduate and postdoctoral students; increased scholarship funds for minority undergraduate students; and support for special programs such as Afro-American Studies.

Having conducted a survey of donor prospects, the University believes that over the next five years it can raise $5 million for these purposes and that a "stretch" goal of $6 million is reasonable. This belief rests on certain assumptions: (1) that the University's top leadership, including the administration and Trustees, will be actively involved; (2) that individual schools and deans will participate; (3) that some unrestricted gifts will be allocated to meet specific goals; and (4) that provision will be made for appropriate personnel and budgetary resources within the Development Office. Therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the University of Pennsylvania commits itself to seeking $6 million over the next five years specifically for the purpose of attracting a greater number of underrepresented minority students and faculty and supporting activities that will make their lives at Penn more fulfilling so that the University as a whole will be enriched and the University will provide a model for the nation in the integration of minorities into our higher educational system.