Social Work Dean: Michael Austin of Seattle

In June the President and Provost will take to the Trustees the nomination of Dr. Michael Austin of the University of Washington (Seattle), to succeed Dr. Louise Shoemaker as Dean of the School of Social Work.

Dr. Austin has been at Washington since 1976 as professor of management in School of Social Work, also directing the Center for Social Welfare Research and serving as principle investigator on the Mental Health Administration and Planning Project. Earlier he taught at Florida State University, 1970-76.

Before he took up teaching, Dr. Austin was a management consultant to the National Institute of Mental Health in Denver and to Florida's Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, and a planner for United Way planning agencies in California. He has continued wide-ranging consulting projects, such as one on youth and family services in Alaska, several on mental health services, and one for the Council of Jewish Federations in New York.

His research in social services, mental health administration and social work education has produced nine books and numerous articles.

Dr. Austin took his bachelor's degree at California/Berkeley, then took a master's degree in social work there and another in public health from Pittsburgh. His Ph.D. is from Pittsburgh's Graduate School of Social Work.

"I am looking forward to the opportunity to help build upon the rich history of the School of Social Work and to assist the faculty in preparing the social work leaders of the next century," Dr. Austin said on a visit to Penn last week. "We shall continue to build bridges of collaborations with agencies and foundations in the community and region."

Dr. Alexander Hersh, who co-chaired the search committee that unanimously endorsed Dr. Austin, said the dean-elect is "the national figure in the administration of social services." Provost Thomas Ehrlich singled him out as an innovative leader in research and teaching, and President Sheldon Hackney said "He will bring to Penn... the leadership qualities that will enable the School to continue to be preeminent in its field." Dr. Austin's predecessor as dean for 12 years, Dr. Louise Shoemaker, will continue on the faculty.

In the recent 75th Anniversary celebration Dr. Hackney called her "a voice of social consciousness among the deans. . . . She has kept all of us aware of our responsibilities as part of a larger community."

Honorary Degrees: Nine for the 229th Commencement

Two distinguished emeritus professors of the University, Dr. Britton Chance of biochemistry/biophysics and Composer George Rochberg of music, are among the nine men and women who will receive honorary degrees at Penn's 229th Commencement on May 20.

Some 3000 degrees will be conferred at the convocation, which starts at 10:15 a.m. in the Civic Center after a procession piped down Locust Walk starting at 9:15. President Reagan's chief of staff, Donald T. Regan—a former Penn Trustees chairman who received an honorary degree in 1972—is the Commencement Speaker.

Novelist John Wideman, the 1985 Baccalaureate Speaker (3:30 p.m. Sunday in Irvine Auditorium) and Penn's Hall-of-Fame football coach, George Munger, are two other familiar campus figures receiving honorary degrees this year. Dr. Wideman, now at the University of Wisconsin, is a 1963 alumnus who started his teaching career in English here. Mr. Munger, who coached Penn football to an Ivy record of 52-7-4 between 1938 and 1953, is a 1933 alumnus. Completing the list:

- Two trustees—Former U.S. Chief of Protoco仑Lexon Annenberg and Henry Salvatori, the SEAS alumnus who founded and led Western Geophysical Company and other corporations.
- A neighboring president, Dr. Mary Patterson McPherson of Bryn Mawr College.
- Two scholars from other East Coast institutions—Dr. Samuel Eilenberg of Columbia, the Polish-born mathematician known as "master theory builder" for his contributions to and linkages among topology, algebra, category theory and computer science; and Dr. Hilary Putnam, a 1948 alumnus of the College who as professor of philosophy and mathematics at Harvard has advanced the interrelationship of logic, math and the philosophy of science.
- Dr. Chance, University Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry and Biophysics, holds three degrees from Penn and has spent his 54-year career on its faculty. In 1943 he rose to world prominence by demonstrating the existence of enzyme-substrate intermediates, laying the groundwork for understanding chemical catalysis in living systems. A prolific writer and one of the most cited in the world, he is also known for his work in nuclear magnetic resonance, instrumentation development and synchrotron activity.
- Mr. Rochberg, Annenberg Professor Emeritus of Music, is one of the best-known U.S. contemporary composers, frequently performed and recorded by major orchestras. The First Symphony; the Trio for Violin, Cello and Piano; the Violin Concerto premiered by Isaac Stern; and his "Night Music" and "Blake Songs" are among the more familiar works. His first opera, based on Herman Melville's The Confidence Man, had its premiere with the Santa Fe Opera three years ago.
On the Tables Prepared by the Senate Committee on Economic Status

We agree fully with the Committee that Penn faculty salaries must be competitive with those at peer institutions. Over each of the past four years, we have met the goal of real growth in faculty income. We recognize, however, that some disciplinary areas need particular attention. For the next year, special efforts will be made in those areas.

The tables prepared by the Committee underscore that those efforts are needed, and we agree with the Committee in its concerns about the matter. Two points should be understood, however, in considering Penn’s competitive position.

First, comparative salary studies obviously are affected by the set of the schools selected for analysis. Cornell University, for example, recently reviewed its faculty compensation and defined its peer group as the 27 leading Ph.D. granting institutions. In that study, using 1984-85 salary data, Penn ranked third for both assistant and associate professors and eighth for full professors—ahead, incidentally, of Cornell in all three categories.

Second, we are committed to maintaining and strengthening the competitiveness of Penn’s faculty salaries, but we face formidable problems. Compared with the twelve institutions in the Committee’s sample, the value of Penn’s endowment is next to the lowest and the endowment dollars per non-medical faculty is the lowest. With the Federal government threatening to reduce support for research and student financial aid, our budgets will be painfully tight in the next few years. Nevertheless, faculty salaries will continue to be a key priority.

Sheldon Hackney

FOR COMMENT

Proposed Revision: Conflict of Interest Policy

The Corporate Sponsored Research Board and the University Council Committee on Research seek comments on a revised text, italicized below, proposed as an amendment to Section V of the Conflict of Interest Policy.

V. Conflict of Interest In Externally Sponsored Research

Detailed information and regulations concerning sponsored research may be found in the 1977 Research Investigator’s Handbook, modified by the “Guidelines for the Conduct of Sponsored Research,” published in Almanac 4/7/81. Copies of both are available from the Office of Research Administration.

Present Text

All faculty members, including those in part-time employment, participating in externally sponsored research projects contracted with the University should refrain from any use of their employment that is motivated by, or gives the appearance of being motivated by, the desire for private gain for themselves or other persons, including particularly those with whom they have family, business, or financial ties. The potential for private gain is present when any private agencies or enterprises in which they have significant financial interests or consulting, managerial, or other employment relationships stand to benefit.

Examples of situations from which conflicts of interest may arise include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Undertaking or orientation of sponsored research to serve the needs of a private agency or enterprise in which a responsible staff member has an interest.
2. Purchase of major equipment, instruments, materials, or other items for externally sponsored research from any agency or enterprise in which a responsible staff member has an interest.
3. Acceptance of any limitations on the free publication of and access to the results of any sponsored research. Exception may be granted by the provost for privileged information, but only in the form of a delay in the release of such information. The delay will only be on rare occasions extended for three months. Those wishing to engage in research of a kind whose results cannot be so disseminated may only do so as an extramural consulting activity under the conditions described in Section II.
4. Transmission to any private agency or enterprise, use for personal gain, or other unauthorized use of the work product, results, materials, records, or information gathered from sponsored research that is not made generally available through publication or other free access.
5. Acceptance of gratuities or special favors from a private agency or enterprise with which the University conducts business in connection with a sponsored research project.

This portion of Section V has been revised to clarify University policy and procedure in recognition of the importance of externally sponsored research to the University research effort.

Proposed Revision

The University encourages its faculty members, including those in part-time employment, to participate in externally sponsored research projects whether supported by government agencies, foundations, associations or other non-profit organizations, or by corporations, partnerships, or other for-profit entities. In any sponsored project, faculty members are expected to avoid use of the project for their private financial gain other than in the form of salary support or of royalties resulting from commercialization of intellectual property in accordance with University policies. However, there may be unusual circumstances where the interests of the University would be served if a faculty participant in a sponsored project were to assume an entrepreneurial role, as, for example, by direct participation in a private enterprise providing funds in support of the project. Assumption of such a role would not be a violation of these guidelines if approved in advance and reviewed periodically by the relevant Dean and the Vice Provost for Research.

The Senate Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty

Table 1

Penn’s Rank in Average Salary Relative to Peers,* 1973-85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977-78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978-79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979-80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-82</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, Princeton, Yale, Chicago, Johns Hopkins, MIT, Northwestern, Stanford

Table 2

Salary Increases for Continuing Faculty by Rank at Peer Institutions,* 1982-83 to 1984-85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982-83</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983-84</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984-85</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Penn, Princeton, Harvard, Chicago, MIT, and Northwestern deleted due to missing information

Source: American Association of University Professors data as reported annually by Academe.
Interim Report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy
(April, 1985)

The 1984-85 Committee attempted to complete the investigation of the Greek System that was initiated by the 1983-84 Committee. Specifically, the Findings and Recommendations on Fraternities and Sororities, published in the April 17, 1984, issue of Almanac provided background and direction for the Committee’s efforts. Reactions to that document were solicited from numerous constituencies of the University Community including the Office of Student Life, Vice Provost for University Life, Residential Living, Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs (OFSA), Counseling Service, Student Committee on Undergraduate Education, Women’s Center, Women’s Studies, Interfraternity Alumni Council (IFAC), Black Inter-Greek Council (BIG-C), and the Interfraternity Council (IFC).

In an attempt to follow-up on the recommendations delineated by the 1983-84 Committee in a systematic and efficient manner, the current committee communicated with numerous individuals and groups who were: a) charged with the task of investigating selected aspects of the Greek system; b) targeted as sources of additional information and/or viewpoints on the Greek system and student life; c) active in the day-to-day operations of Greek organizations.

During the fall (1984) semester, the Committee met with the National Interfraternity Conference Consulting Team. Invited by the Interfraternity Council (IFC), with the approval of University administration, this team conducted a review and a survey of selected components of the Greek system. The results of this external review were subsequently shared with the committee.

The Committee established ongoing communications with the Fraternity and Sorority Advisory Board on the issue of “adult involvement” with Greek organizations. Attendance at the Board-sponsored open forums on adult involvement and discussions with Board members provided useful information on this aspect of Greek life. The results of the Board’s comprehensive investigations will be shared with the Committee.

Individual and group meetings with Greek and non-Greek students including representatives from the Black Inter-Greek Council, the Interfraternity Council, and student-residents of several College Houses were conducted. The purpose of these meetings was to examine students’ perceptions of University life including the Greek system, the differences among the various student residential-living options, the quality and diversity of social opportunities available for all University students, and the adequacy of available facilities for student gatherings.

In an attempt to examine how individual chapters interpret and implement the University’s Recognition Policy, a survey-questionnaire was distributed to each fraternal organization. Questions regarding educational and leadership development programs, adult involvement with chapter activities, residential living, and contributions to the University community were also included. As of April 12, approximately 10 (28%) completed questionnaires had been returned to the Faculty Senate Office. A second mailing was done in early April; completed surveys will be received until mid-May, 1985.

Preliminary “Findings and Recommendations”

The final report of this committee will be issued after the results of the survey questionnaires are summarized. In addition, the committee will review the final report of the Fraternity and Sorority Advisory Board, the Interfraternity Alumni Council Survey results, and the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs Five-Year Plan. It is our understanding that each of these documents is nearing completion. Hence, it is anticipated that our final report on the Greek System should be issued during the fall semester, 1985.

Preliminary analyses of the results of the committee’s investigative efforts suggest the following:

1) The University administration is committed to maintaining the Greek system at Penn. The service-related contributions to the University and the West Philadelphia community are highly valued. In addition, the contributions of local alumni and alumni corporations to the development, leadership and governance of individual chapters and the University as a whole are acknowledged.

2) The Greek governing and advisory bodies (OFSA, FSAB, IFC, IFAC, BIG-C) promote and support positive and worthwhile goals and initiatives for the Greek system. Attempts to implement these goals system-wide and to eliminate violations of the Recognition Policy and other University behavioral codes have not always been successful. Suggested mechanisms for remedying these problems include, but are not limited to:

   A) Encouraging model chapters, those that have distinguished records of service to the University community and strong leadership development and educational programs to work closely with weaker chapters, those that have not been as successful in these areas.

   B) Intensifying the leadership role and accountability of the Interfraternity Council (IFC) in monitoring the activities of individual chapters. Currently, the IFC is proposing a judicial board, to handle minor infringements of the Recognition Policy. Since similar mechanisms have been successful on other campuses, the committee recommends that the proposal warrants consideration.

   C) Encouraging adult involvement (alumni, faculty, administration, etc.) with the day-to-day activities of the Greek system by examining specific ways that this involvement could be most beneficial to each chapter. While many chapters currently have graduate student advisors, alumni advisors, and chapter counselors, there is much variability from chapter to chapter in the form and level of adult involvement. Noteworthy in this regard is that “strong” chapters appreciate and benefit from their current programs of adult involvement.

   Minimum standards regarding the form and level of adult involvement should be established.

3) Both Greek and non-Greek students identify fraternal organizations as a principal sponsor of parties and social activities at the University and acknowledge the need for more diversity in social options. Students perceive the need for a structural facility where social activities could be held for all University students (residential and non-residential).

   This facility would serve the University community in numerous ways, providing: a) designated meeting rooms for the city-wide Black Greek organizations that have limited University resources available to them; b) meeting rooms for smaller University-recognized organizations that currently have no designated place to meet; c) an “informal” forum for faculty-student interaction; d) social and educational opportunities for all residential and non-residential students.

   The committee strongly recommends that the University administration give thoughtful consideration to the construction of a student-union complex.

Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy
Roger M. A. Allen
Elijah Anderson
Laura L. Hayman (Chair)
Alice Kelley
John W. Roberts
Peter Vaughan
Jacob M. Abel (ex-officio), Senate Chair
Anthony R. Tomazinis (ex-officio), Senate Chair-elect
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May on Campus
May on Campus
Making the Honor Code Work

The Undergraduate Assembly received in its fall 1984 poll a number of complaints about cheating at Penn. Soon after that, some students came to a UA Steering meeting to discuss the same problem. As a result, a committee of UA and non-UA members was formed to look into the University's Honor Code. "Code of Academic Integrity," Almanac, May 4, 1982, which outlines Penn's policy on academic integrity. The committee would like both the students and faculty better informed about the University's policy on cheating, and to suggest some improvements in the system as a whole.

At Penn, reported cases of cheating can be handled in any one of three ways. First, the professor may handle it alone. There were 27 such cases reported during the 1983-84 academic year. Second, a case may be handled by the professor and the Judicial Inquiry Office; this is known as the informal way to handle a case. Third, a case may go to the Honor Board. This happens when a student denies his or her guilt, when a case is considered extremely serious by the professor, or when a professor feels that the Honor Board is necessary to discourage a student from cheating again. Sixteen cases either were handled informally or went to the Honor Board during the 1983-84 academic year. Seven of them were cases of plagiarism. Four others were either copying another student's exam paper or bringing notes into an exam. Four additional cases involved forgery of a grade-change slip or a drop/add slip. The sixteenth case concerned the unauthorized possession of an exam. Out of these 16 cases, 12 were handled informally, three went to the Honor Board, and one was dismissed. Other problems that have been reported include the buying of papers, and the collaborative writing of computer programs.

These statistics add up to only 43 cases reported to the Judicial Inquiry Office for the 1983-84 academic year, and none of these cases resulted in expulsion.

Generally speaking, four problems exist in the current honor system: (1) not enough students fear the consequences of cheating; (2) not enough students know that an Honor Code exists at Penn; (3) not enough faculty and students abide by the Code; and (4) not all of the cases of cheating are reported.

Both the students and faculty can be held responsible for the low number of reports to the Judicial Inquiry Office. We would recommend that a faculty member report all cases of cheating to the J.I.O., even if he or she wants to handle the case himself or herself. This will help insure more accurate statistics in the J.I.O.'s records.

The Provost and the Deans of each of the undergraduate schools should have the responsibility to emphasize to each department the importance of the Honor Code. One suggestion is that every professor should mention the University's policy on cheating during his or her introductory lecture and/or at each exam.

Some people feel that the Code should be changed so that the responsibility may also be placed on the students to turn in fellow students. It may be emphasized that one person's cheating hurts not only that one person but hurts also those in his or her class. Although this goal may seem rather difficult to achieve, Penn's honor system has the potential to reach this status if the proper changes are made.

All undergraduates should be familiar with the Code and the possible repercussions for violating it before they arrive at the University. A letter from the Provost sent during the summer would receive a great deal of attention. If this letter included both the Code and an explanation of the students' moral obligation not to cheat, then these students would be made more aware than the present student body. This, at the very least, is a start.

Another idea is a letter that contains the Code and a written statement which the students would sign. This statement would represent an agreement between the University and the said student that he or she understands the Code and accepts the moral obligation not to cheat. One possibility is for the signed statement to be a part of the application so that students could not apply without signing it. Another option is to send it before or after the student decides to matriculate at the University. In any case, the suggestion is that a student not be able to matriculate without signing it.

Still another idea would be to ask each student to sign a statement saying that he or she will not cheat and will report others who do so. Once again, such a statement might either come with the application, arrive after the student gets a bid to attend the University, or be signed every time an exam is given.

Even if written codes are unrealistic at Penn, students should be aware that there is an Honor Code. That is where much of the problem lies. Students should know about the Code and the potential punishment for violation of the Code before they arrive at Penn. Further, an ad might be taken out in The Daily Pennsylvanian at the beginning of every semester to print the Code and include a letter from the Provost and/or the UA on the moral obligation that students have not to cheat.

All of the suggestions listed should be looked into as if we were building a new University — because in one sense, we are. The responsibility is on the students, faculty, and administration to work together on this issue to build the character of the student population as a whole to the point where no one would ever think of cheating, and if someone indeed did cheat, then he or she would turn himself or herself in.

---

Excerpts from Houston Hall Board Resolution on Irvine

Abstract

We, the Houston Hall Board, oppose the plan to convert Irvine Auditorium into a 1000-seat music facility. While a music center on campus may be a necessity, the costs to student life associated with placing such a facility in Irvine are too great.

The University needs both a new music performance facility and the flexibility inherent in Irvine as it currently exists. The Office of Student Life report makes abundantly clear the impossibility of relocating many of the functions currently performed by Irvine. Suitable alternatives do not presently exist on campus. The Houston Hall Board therefore recommends that the University begin a search for other sites for a music hall, and perform the necessary maintenance and overhaul of Irvine.

The Houston Hall Board

representing Graduates and Professional Students Association (GAPS); Graduate Student Activities Council (GSAC); Penn Commuters; Penn Union Council (PUC); Performing Arts Council (PAC); Student Activities Council (SAC); Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE); Undergraduate Assembly (UA); and United Minorities Council (UMC)

Correction: In the Irvine report (Almanac April 2, pgs. 4-7), the potential seating capacity of the multipurpose area in the proposed athletic complex was incorrectly stated as 12,000. The number should have been 1200. In the same article it was also implied that the major problem with using Meyerson Hall for PUC Movies was Meyerson's lack of 35mm projection equipment. The more basic problem, which was not stated, is that Meyerson has no 16mm equipment, so an additional rental fee would be incurred at each showing.
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### Out of the Frying Pan

The November 5 resignation of Dean Joel Conarroe ... in the midst of the School of Arts and Sciences' month-long celebration of its tenth anniversary.

*Lama* November 13, 1984, p. 1

The Dean himself eloquently explained this precipitous exit.

Having administered one thing or another for the last twenty years, I have in the last few months become increasingly impatient to return to those things that initially drew me to an academic career, that is, teaching and research. I have decided ... to spend the next period of my life composing not memos and reports but lectures and scholarly essays. I would prefer to spend my time in close daily contact with poetry, with footnote, with students. I suppose I could encapsulate my decision by saying I am more interested in Byron than in budgets.

*Letter resignation*, ibid., p. 3.

Then, just five months later:

School of Arts and Sciences Dean Joel Conarroe has been named president of the Guggenheim Foundation.

"My primary responsibility will be to maintain the high standards associated with the foundation and to work with various selection committees, which is this year will also be responsible for the endowment and funding of the foundation."

*The Daily Pennsylvanian*, April 12, 1985, p. 1

I wonder whether Lord Byron can supply the answer to this riddle.

Forgive me; there is something at your heart
More than the mere discharge of public duties,
Which long use and a talent like to yours Have rendered light, nay, a necessity;
To keep your mind from stagnating.

Marino Faliero, Doge of Venice
*Act II, Scene I."

—*Martin Pring*
Associate Professor of Physiology/ Med.

Dean Conarroe, with an assist from the Bard, responds.

But with the word the time will bring on
Summer, when briers shall have leaves as well as thorns,
And be as sweet as sharp. We must away: Our wager is prepared, and time revives us.
All's well that ends well: still the fine's the crown,
What's the course, the end is the renown.

### Tuition Benefits

Over the past two years, many faculty worked long and hard to raise University awareness concerning the disastrous effects on many of the proposed changes in Penn's traditional tuition benefit for dependent children. Now, with changes in the federal tax laws to begin on July 1 of this year, graduate tuition benefits for all faculty and staff children and spouses will be taxed as additional income — in this case, income which never will be received.

What this means is that if a spouse wishes to take a course, or a child wants to work toward a graduate or professional degree in any field, that benefit will be taxed at the faculty member's prevailing rate, not the child's (often marginal) tax rate. In many cases, the effect will be that of reducing the 100% or 75% faculty benefit by as much as half. This increase in salary (one can envision the increase being greater than the actual salary) would bring about a detrimental effect of making children ineligible for student loans. How many faculty will be able to send their children (not to mention spouses) to Penn's expensive graduate schools under these conditions? — especially after having struggled to meet fees, housing and other expenses during four or more undergraduate years? Clearly, it was not Congress' intention to tax one party (parents) for financial benefits accruing to another.

The administration apparently lobbied against this change in Washington (although on different terms) but to no avail. Consequently, we have no alternative but to reconsider the nature of the benefit itself. Given the importance of the benefit to the children and spouses of so many faculty and staff, so overwhelmingly reinforced in last year's faculty vote, the University clearly has an obligation to do what is in its power to do to insurc continuance of this benefit in undiminished form. More generally, it is in everyone's best interests to provide needed support for those who have taken on the financial burdens of raising the families populating our classes.

Fortunately, discussions of the University Benefits committee make clear that there is a relatively simple no-cost solution to the problem. That solution would be to arrange support from graduate scholarship funds giving precedence to faculty dependent children and spouses, as is the case with other preferred groups of individuals. Since additional costs incurred for scholarships would be directly offset by "benefit" savings, making scholarship available on a preferential basis would pose no additional costs to the University. Even if Congress eventually decides to tax all scholarships, those scholarships would at least be taxed at the children's marginal rate.

Clearly, these changes could easily be instituted by the University and would be in everyone's best interests. The faculty staff benefit would effectively be preserved at absolutely no cost to the University.

Not to make some such change, moreover, would raise a number of vexing issues. If tuition paid to dependents is to show up as salary to the faculty member, the serious question arises as to the University's current commitments to retirement, insurance and other benefits which are tied directly to faculty salary.

As a member of the University Council Benefits committee, and given the July 1, 1985 deadline. I feel an obligation to bring this urgent issue to the attention of the administration and faculty, in the hope that the aforementioned suggestion will be instituted prior to July 1.

—*Joseph M. Scandura*
Associate Professor of Education

### Cuts In Education Funds

Congress will take up the FY 1986 First Budget Resolution later this month and may already have done so by the time this is published. We can anticipate an intense debate over proposed cuts in non-defense discretionary programs, including education. It is vitally important that all of us involved in higher education, administrators, faculty, and students, continue to work to ensure that they oppose the proposed cuts in education funds that were part of the agreement negotiated by Senate Budget Committee Republicans and the White House on April 4. The known proposed reduction in student assistance is $40 million; the probably it will turn out to be higher when the full details of the negotiated agreement are unveiled on the Senate floor.

The reductions are to be accomplished by changing the current law to provide for the establishment of a $1000 cost of attendance cap. It is estimated that a family...
International Simon Bolivar Prize

Alice Paul Session: May 8

The Women's Faculty Club presents its Alice Paul Awards to undergraduate, graduate and professional school graduating students Wednesday, May 8, at 4 p.m. in the Ben Franklin Room of Houston Hall. Recipients discuss Penn and their experiences here, in a traditional spring meeting open to women faculty, administrators and interested others. In addition to presenting the Alice Paul Awards, the Club will honor three women students for special service to Women's Studies.

Stolen Tapes: PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) announced last week that it had recovered seven video cassettes. The Department of Agriculture copies of the 60 hours of videotape stolen in the 1984 break-in by the Animal Liberation Front and excreted by PETA to produce a 24-minute video, "Unnecessary Fuss." At the end of the video, "necessary Fus," the video is shown to be unfinished. The University will comment on PETA's recovered videotape, Provost Thomas Ehrlich said in a press conference last October, but will review the whole 60 hours if all are returned.

Review of Head Injury Research Project

The University is setting up an inside-outside committee to review research in the Head Injury Laboratory of the School of Medicine. Vice Provost for Research Barry Cooperman announced Thursday.

The committee will be made up of Penn faculty members—including nonmedical faculty—and "prominent individuals who are not affiliated with the University," Dr. Cooperman said. Chairing it will be Dr. Truman G. Schnabel, an internist who is C. Mahlon Kline Professor of Medicine and former president of the American College of Physicians.

The lab has passed four reviews since a May 1984 break-in focused national attention on its use of primates in research, Dr. Cooperman said. The Society of Neurosciences reviewed it in June 1984; the University of Glasgow (which has researchers affiliated with the project) in January 1985; the NIH (for scientific merit) and the Medical School's Animals Care Committee (for compliance with standards) in February 1985. The lab also was the subject of a two-hour dialogue in January, sponsored by Dr. Cooperman's office at the request of the Law School faculty (Almanac February 12). In the discussion, Dr. Thomas Gennarelli reported that the research shows a 12- to 24-hour "window" after diffuse axonal injury (injury caused by acceleration of the head) in which nerve fibers "are damaged but not transected, do become transected . . . if we can understand that mechanism and develop strategies to prevent it there's a possibility now of a specific treatment for brain damage."