Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

Penn’s faculty is central to all aspects of this institution. We teach, we do research, we contribute to our departments and to our Schools. However, the bylaws of the University also give us a substantial role in shaping University-wide policy working collaboratively with the administration and other constituencies in the process of shared governance. All standing faculty are members of the Faculty Senate, although our work is carried out principally through an elected Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and several standing committees. SEC and these committees consult regularly with the President and Provost, as well as other senior administrators, deans and faculty colleagues, on a wide range of issues facing the University. The SEC Committee reports are found in this issue of Almanac. Detailed reports of SEC’s meetings have appeared in Almanac throughout the year. This report summarizes some of SEC’s accomplishments in 2010-2011.

SEC has Three Central Roles

a) Consulting with senior administrators, coming to understand their areas of responsibility, learning about their plans, and then engaging with them about those plans and offering a faculty perspective on relevant issues. This year we met with President Amy Gutmann and Provost Vincent Price, Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty, Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Hollen Lees, Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns, and Vice President for Public Safety Maureen Rush.

b) Review and approval of changes in formal policy that fall under Senate responsibility. This year the School of Dental Medicine proposed a new academic clinician faculty track; it was reviewed by the Senate Committee on the Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) and then referred to SEC. SEC met with Dean Denis Kinane, explored with him how this new track would fit into the organization of the SDM faculty, and then approved the proposal.

c) Initiating exploration of specific issues that are of concern to the SEC membership, or that were referred to SEC for discussion and response by its committees. These issues often became the topics of further consultation with the administration.

Some Highlights of the 2010-2011 Academic Year

1. Perhaps the most important work SEC focused on this year was the effort to move forward with diversifying the faculty. The tri-annual report on Progress on Minority Equity was published in the fall and indicated little progress over the past half decade. SEC dedicated its January meeting to a forum session focused on generating specific ideas for improving this situation. Panel members and SEC members suggested a wide range of possible strategies, and pointed as well to evidence of success in this effort elsewhere. Throughout the rest of the year SEC leadership has maintained a consistent conversation on this issue with the administration. SEC’s efforts to spotlight this issue along with parallel encouragement from other constituent groups on campus complemented and supported a commitment by the administration to develop a formal Diversity Action Plan by the end of this year. SEC is very much looking forward to the development of that plan, and has committed to playing its part in highlighting what it views as a substantial concern for the future of the University.

2. Open Access to research publications. A second substantial effort by SEC has been the discussion and consideration of the issue of Open Access. This spring, the independent Committee on Open Access Publishing led by Senior Vice Provost for Research Fluharty proposed a set of principles encouraging Penn’s research community to provide a high degree of Open Access to research publications. SEC recommended some modifications in that set of principles and hopes to endorse a final document before the end of the academic year.

3. Alternative Sabbatical. SEC received a report from the Senate Committee on Administration recommending consideration of an alternative sabbatical system for faculty whose responsibilities did not permit taking either conventional or compressed sabbaticals. The administration had expressed reluctance to accept the recommendation as offered; SEC expressed a strong view that the issue was important while recognizing that there was a need to better understand some of the underlying issues. The administration and SEC agreed to name a joint ad hoc committee to investigate this issue and make recommendations in the coming year.

4. Faculty Climate Survey. Consistent with recommendations of SEC and its Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDE), the administration developed a faculty climate survey instrument based on one used in other universities. It is meant to examine a range of faculty perceptions of support available for their work at Penn, including mentorship, support for research and teaching, work/life balance, possible inequitable treatment based on personal characteristics and other issues. This survey was piloted with about 160 faculty from several schools. The results of the pilot survey are now available, and SEC has appointed an ad hoc committee to review the results of the pilot study and to advise the Vice Provost for Faculty as to possible changes in the survey before it is broadly implemented in the fall.

5. Other accomplishments:

a) Under the leadership of Past Chair Harvey Rubin SEC organized the Founders’ Day Symposium focused on Human Rights; Contested Practices and Principles; moderated by Dean Michael Fitts of the Law School, it featured presentations by Professors Samuel Freeman, Stephen Glickman, Ann E. Mayer, Sarah Paoletti, and Tukufu Zuberi.

b) Members were appointed to the newly constituted Patent Policy Appeals Board.

c) SEC leadership worked with Vice Provost Lynn Hollen Lees to improve the clarity of the formal letters describing the Faculty Income Allowance Program (FIAP).

d) The Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) established a relationship with the Office of Admissions and met with Dean of Admissions Eric Furda; this will provide a continuing mechanism for faculty involvement in admissions policy.

e) The Senate Committee on Faculty (SCOF) and the four undergraduate Schools collaborated to provide extensive data and moved towards developing a clearer picture concerning who is teaching our students.

f) H. Carton Rogers and the staff at the library addressed with SCSEP concerns raised in SEC about some difficulties with the Blackboard system for course support. They made it clear that they were actively considering ways to improve the system.

g) The Provost’s office and the Office of Institutional Research office provided salary and other data to the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty earlier in the fall than ever before, and allowed that committee to complete its report and address concerns with the administration by the start of the spring semester.

This has been a very good year for participation and for member enthusiasm. From the very first meeting, when SEC members suggested agenda items for the academic year, through to our final meetings discussing open access and directions for diversity action there has been full attendance and high involvement. Members actively engaged with our speakers and with the issues under discussion. Our members have quickly volunteered for many responsibilities including membership in standing committees and in ad hoc committees.

Senate Committee members as well have taken their responsibilities seriously and their chairs have consistently accepted the responsibility for effective leadership. The chairs included Sydney Evans (SCOA), Sheila Murmanaghian (SCSEP), Dan Raff (SCSEP), Reed Pyeritz and Greg Urban (SCOF) and Lois Evans (SCFDDE). These committees cannot function without the extraordinary willingness of the chairs to volunteer their time and their skills. The following reports in this issue of Almanac describe the many accomplishments of those committees.

The Past Chair, Chair and Chair-Elect of the Senate have had frequent and productive meetings with the President and the Provost, sharing the views of the faculty with the administration. We appreciated their willingness to talk straightforwardly about any issue we brought forward.

Finally I want to express my personal gratitude to three people who have played central roles in our work. Harvey Rubin served as Past Chair this year and consistently provided valuable advice about our work and striking insights about the forces at play, based both in his experience in the Senate leadership and in the School of Medicine which houses so many of our faculty; Camille Charles, the Chair-elect, moved quickly and effectively into her role, calling on her experience as an SAS faculty member, as a Center director and with the process of promotion and with maintaining work-life balance. She brings a well-grounded thoughtfulfulness and sense for what are important issues and I look forward to her assuming leadership of the Faculty Senate next year. Most of all we are grateful to Sue White, executive assistant to the Faculty Senate. Sue is just extraordinary: recruiting committee members, managing the committees, keeping the tri-chairs on track, gently reminding us of what we must complete, and maintaining day to day relationships with administrative counterparts. It would all fall apart without her.

—Robert Hornik
Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP)

General Committee Charge
The Committee oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the University’s policies and procedures on the admission and instruction of students, including academic integrity, admissions policies and administration, evaluation of teaching, examinations and grading, academic experiences, educational opportunities (such as study abroad), student records, disciplinary systems, and the campus environment. In general the Committee deals with the matters covered by the following section of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: IV.

Specific Charges
1. Review the issue of cross-school enrollment of students in interdisciplinary programs and in professional programs. Penn prides itself on opportunities for cross-disciplinary education. There is some concern that such opportunities are constrained in practice for some students by limits on access to courses and by cross-school tuition transfer difficulties. Examine whether this is, in practice, a problem, and if so consider recommendations for policy changes.

2. Follow up on the recommendation that procedures be established for semi-annual SCSEP meetings with the Dean of Admissions in which the Dean and the committee engage in wide-ranging conversation about admissions issues. Consider developing a joint admissions committee with the University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs which has a strong interest in admissions issues. The first such meeting should occur in the 2010-2011 academic year.

3. Continue discussion on the issue of student use of personal laptops and other electronic devices in the classroom. Make recommendations on the appropriate use of such technology in the classroom.

4. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Senate Rules, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the faculty, students and educational programs over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on Students and Educational Policy to undertake in academic year 2011-2012. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

On the urging of the Senate Tri-Chairs, this committee also took up one other charge:
1. Examine concerns raised by faculty members about Blackboard, and in particular the nature of faculty involvement in decisions about Blackboard.

Accomplishments
1. SCSEP meetings with Dean of Admissions Eric Furda
The Committee held two meetings with Dean Furda, jointly with faculty members of the University Council Committee on Academic & Related Affairs. Dean Furda gave the Committee a thorough introduction to the policies and practices of the Admissions Office, and we identified several areas of mutual concern, which we expect will be subjects of ongoing discussion. Among anticipated changes in the composition of incoming classes and the impact of those changes on the faculty; faculty involvement in the recruitment of students with especially strong academic interests; cooperation between the Admissions Office and the faculty in assuring a smooth transition from secondary school to Penn; possible ways in which selective institutions such as Penn influence, or can influence, secondary school curricula. These meetings established a good basis for regular consultation between this Committee and the Admissions Office in the future.

2. Continued discussion on the issue of student use of personal laptops and other electronic devices in the classroom
After a robust discussion within the Committee on student use of laptops in the classroom, we concluded that it would be very difficult to develop a widely applicable general policy on this subject. In our view, this is a matter that should be left to the discretion of individual professors.

3. Cross-school enrollment of students in interdisciplinary programs and in professional programs
SCSEP discussed barriers to cross-registration between schools for graduate students who wish to do interdisciplinary work in consultation with Professors Tom Baker and Sherrill L. Adams. We were able to suggest solutions for some of the particular problems that have arisen in this area, but concluded that those problems are generally quite specific to particular students and programs. Therefore, we did not feel that it would make sense to address this issue in broader terms, at least not at the moment.

4. SCSEP discussion of faculty concerns involving Blackboard
In response to faculty concerns about Blackboard, the Committee met with H. Carton Rogers, vice provost and director of Libraries, Marjorie Hassen, director of Public Services, and Michael Winkler, director of Information Technology & Digital Development. There was a general discussion of the timing and implementation of Blackboard upgrades; possible future successors to Blackboard and the means by which they will be selected; the role of school IT staff in faculty support; and the most effective ways of communicating with faculty, especially about changes to Blackboard. The Committee made suggestions concerning the timing of upgrades, the importance of unbroken availability of Blackboard, and the desirability of communicating with faculty members via their own Blackboard pages.

Recommendations for Next Year’s Committee
Continue the dialogue established this year with the Dean of Admissions, possibly identifying areas for more in-depth discussion.
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Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF)

As part of self-governance by the faculty, collective awareness of the smaller and larger changes to the structure of the faculty is key to designing the future. Accordingly, this year’s Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission focused its attention on the categories of faculty. It studied which categories are involved in teaching our students and to what extent; it examined the creation of new faculty lines; and it looked into the question of whether the faculty as a whole has experienced a decline in the proportion of assistant professors. Much remains to be done in sorting through the myriad issues involved, and on-going monitoring will be essential in the future.

At the same time, it will be important for subsequent committees to take up other key issues affecting the faculty. For example, one of the pressures on the faculty today is the changing pattern of funding for research. How are changes in government and corporate funding of research impacting the faculty? What is the significance for the faculty of the attempts to commercialize research discoveries? How might funding pressures be affecting the restructuring of faculty lines in different schools? The Committee might similarly take up in the future questions regarding the effects on the faculty of shifts in the geo-political and economic organization of the contemporary world, including the demands on faculty to prepare students for citizenship in this world, for future employment opportunities, and for leadership.

General Committee Charge

The Committee oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the University’s policies and procedures concerning the academic mission, including the structure of the academic staff, the tenure system, faculty appointments and promotions, faculty research, and faculty governance. In general, the Committee deals with the matters covered by the following sections of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: I.E.-F., II.H., II.A.-D.

Specific Charges for 2010-2011 and Work Accomplished

1. Continue the examination of the role of the non-standing faculty in teaching undergraduates by focusing on the Wharton School and the School of Nursing. Taking account of both the information gathered from SAS and from SEAS in the previous year and this new information from Wharton and SON, consider making recommendations concerning (a) roles of non-standing faculty and (b) what information would be needed on an ongoing basis to monitor trends in teaching roles.

The Committee is indebted to the School of Nursing and to the Wharton School for their efforts in providing and synthesizing data on teaching. The School of Nursing’s presentation to the Committee, in particular, helped to clarify the formats that are most useful to the Committee, and both the Nursing and the Wharton data—the last to be received—supply a model for reporting teaching roles for the four schools responsible for educating our undergraduates.

The Wharton data show that a majority of all teaching, as well as the teaching of specifically core classes, is done by the standing faculty. As is to be expected in professional schools where practice, knowledge and skills are key, some of the teaching is carried out by part-time faculty, practice professors, lecturers, and others closely involved in the business world. The data were consistent over the period FY2000 to FY2010. Due to a shortage of nurses during the last decade, as well as to other factors, the number of undergraduate students taught in the School of Nursing increased over the FY2000 to FY2010 period. The level of externally funded research by standing faculty has increased as well. These changes have led to substantial reorganization of teaching roles in the School of Nursing. One change occurred with the introduction of Practice Professors (PhD level, full-time, non-standing faculty) in AY 2005-2006, who have helped to accommodate increased demand by undergraduates for Nursing School classes.

The absolute number of undergraduate School of Nursing students taught by the standing faculty has increased. Overall, the data show that standing faculty members are teaching a reduced proportion of the total credit units earned by undergraduates, but are doing more teaching and also more research.

The Committee noted that longitudinal comparative analysis of teaching in the School of Nursing will become more difficult in the next academic year as there will be a major shift from teaching by single faculty members to team teaching, and teams are likely to include both standing and non-standing faculty.

The Committee did not have time to complete a full comparative analysis of the four undergraduate schools (SAS, SEAS, Nursing, and Wharton) on which we now have teaching data. However, note was made of the fact that the data are not yet in comparable form. Additionally, historical data will be required from SEAS.

We recommend that the form in which the Wharton data were submitted be used as the model for the other schools. Once the data from all four undergraduate teaching schools are in place and in comparable form, the Senate Committee on the Faculty and Academic Mission can better develop recommendations regarding the role of non-standing faculty in the various colleges. SCOF recommends that updates on these time series related to teaching roles be made available on a regular basis.

2. Making use of the previous year’s experience with Law School and SEAS appointment reviews, develop consistent procedures for the SCOF/SEC review of new proposals for faculty tracks; these should reflect discussions with the Provost’s office. These procedures should include the specification of what information would be needed from the proposing school and the Provost’s office to enable full and fair review.

The Committee addressed this charge first in the context of a proposed new faculty track of the School of Dental Medicine, and then reaffirmed and elaborated previous SEC policy about new faculty track reviews.

The Committee learned at its October meeting that the School of Dental Medicine would be submitting a request for a new faculty category—Academic Clinician—comparable to the track by that name in the School of Medicine. Consequently, considerable time had to be devoted to the specifics of that case.

The proposed changes requesting the addition of an Academic Clinician faculty track are intended to bring to the Dental School full-time faculty whose responsibilities will be in patient care and in teaching. This application is seen by the Dean as one piece of his overall efforts to meet the clinical, educational, and research missions of the School of Dental Medicine.

In its review of the request, the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission looked first at the current complement of faculty in the School of Dental Medicine. It then formulated a set of questions, and invited Dean Denis Kinane of the School of Dental Medicine to respond to them. During his response to the Committee, the Dean also furnished information regarding the projected effect of the proposed line on the current distribution of faculty positions.

In regard to the Committee’s question regarding why the School proposed a cap on the number of Academic Clinicians of 25% of the standing faculty, the Committee was informed that this cap would bring the School into line with procedures in the School of Medicine.

After discussion, the Committee approved the request, forwarding a report to the Senate Executive Committee, including the proposed changes to the Faculty Handbook.

In regard to the specific charge to the Committee to develop consistent procedures for the review of requests for new lines, the Committee located in the archives the 1998 report in which it endorsed a set of guidelines. That section from Almanac reads as follows:

(continued on page 10)
Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF)

(continued from page 9)

a) Before it will respond to requests for new categories of faculty or for increases in the number of personnel within these categories, SEC will require systematic information on the current distribution within the Schools of the types, numbers, and responsibilities of instructional and research personnel, including standing faculty, non-standing faculty, clinician-educators, and other relevant categories.
b) SEC reiterates the Standing Faculty’s right to know who is teaching our students, by category of instructional personnel, so that the Standing Faculty can carry out its responsibility for the educational mission of the University, and SEC requests the central administration to provide for its availability.
c) SEC endorses a move toward making classifications of instructional and research personnel more coherent across the Schools, unless a School can justify the need for differences.

The Committee reaffirmed these guidelines, with the suggestion that the words “and historical distribution” be inserted in point (a) after the words “the current distribution.”

Additionally, the Committee developed a set of questions for the School of Dental Medicine that it believes would be useful in reviewing future requests from Schools for changes in faculty tracks. The questions are as follows: (1) Why is the proposed track change needed at this time? Assuming a strategic plan for the School is motivating the request, what are the principal elements at issue? (2) What is the cap for the new line as a percentage of the Standing Faculty? How was the cap set? How will the cap be monitored and enforced? (3) What will be the effect of the new track on part-time faculty? Were the part-time faculty consulted? (4) If the vote of the faculty of the school submitting the request was not unanimous, what were the concerns of those who dissented?

3. Examine the reasons for and the impact of the declining number of assistant professors in the Standing Faculty. Make recommendations for mitigating the impact of this decrease in young faculty members on the energy and vigor of the University.

We examined data provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs on tenured and tenure-track faculty in all 12 schools from fiscal year 2000 to the present. Several trends are evident:

• The size of the tenured and tenure-track faculty across the University increased from 1463 in FY2000 to 1626 in FY2010, that is, an overall increase of 11%. Only two schools experienced significant declines (Dental Medicine and Veterinary Medicine).

• Over the same period of time, the number of assistant professors in the University decreased from 394 to 381, that is, a decrease of about 3%. Ammon, Arts & Sciences, Law, and Nursing all saw significant increases rather than decreases during this period.

• The overall decline is largely attributable to the School of Medicine, which saw a decline in the number of assistant professors over this period from 183 to 134.

With one exception, the percentage of the tenured and tenure-track faculty comprised of assistant professors varied relatively little over the decade. The exception is the School of Medicine, which we examined in some detail. In FY2000, assistant professors comprised 39.2% of the tenured and tenure-track faculty; by FY2010, this fraction fell to 25%. The tenured faculty grew, in part, by new appointments of senior faculty and conversions (from Clinician Educator and Research tracks) to tenure. The data have been forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee.

We recommend that the current and the incoming Deans of the School of Medicine be made aware of the data on the declining fraction of the Standing Faculty comprised of non-tenured assistant professors.

Apart from the School of Medicine, and taking account of financial factors, we see no trend towards a decline in the number of assistant professors.

4. Identify current caps on non-tenure track faculty tracks and examine how this is monitored in the schools.

The Committee has not been able to take up this task, given its other work this year. In our review of the School of Dental Medicine, our inquiry regarding the reasons for a cap on the number of Academic Clinicians (no more than 25% of the standing faculty) revealed that the number was chosen to bring the school into line with the School of Medicine. This reasoning is in accordance with the longstanding interest of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission of making classifications of instructional and research personnel more coherent across the Schools.

At the same time, a broader inquiry into the enforcement of caps on non-tenured faculty lines in the various Schools, into the motivations for those caps, and into the procedures for monitoring them remains to be undertaken.

5. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Senate Rules, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on the Faculty to undertake in academic year 2011-2012. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

The committee wishes to make the following recommendations for the 2011-12 academic year. The Committee should:

a) Complete its evaluation of the role of non-tenured faculty in undergraduate teaching by encouraging the four undergraduate schools to shape their data into a common format, with the Wharton report as a model.
b) Identify current caps on non-tenure track faculty tracks and examine how this is monitored in the schools.
c) Using the preceding material, as well as other data gathered by the committee, discuss and make recommendations regarding the proper role of the non-tenured faculty in undergraduate education at Penn.
d) Discuss and make recommendations about how to assess the changing patterns of funding for research and its effects on the faculty, formulating a set of specific questions and beginning to answer them as time permits.
Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDE)

General Committee Charge
The Committee (i) identifies and promotes best practices for faculty development, mentoring and work environment to facilitate faculty success at all career levels; (ii) evaluates and advocates processes for faculty recruitment, promotion, and retention that promote diversity, equity, and work/life balance for the faculty; (iii) monitors the status of faculty development, mentoring, diversity and equity; and (iv) issues periodic reports on the activities and findings of the committee and makes recommendations for implementation.

Specific Charges
The Committee reviewed and accepted the specific charges for this AY referred to it by the Senate Executive Committee. These were to:
1. Continue efforts in area of sexual harassment.
2. Promote continued development of faculty mentoring.
3. Examine issues concerning tenure clock extensions.
4. Monitor and support evolution of Women’s Faculty Forum.
5. Continue to support accessible child care.
6. Continue joint efforts on minority recruitment and faculty diversity with University Council Diversity and Equity Subcommittee.
7. Discuss ways to assure training for search committees on bias in hiring.

The Senate Executive Committee, at its September 15 meeting, “strongly supported the SCFDDE’s discussion on ways to promote training for all faculty search committees on bias in hiring and their continuing discussion on the sexual harassment policy” (Almanac, September 21, 2010). Thus, the Committee focused much of its attention on these two charges.

Report of Activities
The Committee met nine times between September 27 and April 22. One meeting included the HR Director of Quality of Worklife Programs; one convened a panel comprising the General Counsel, the Ombudsman, and the Vice President for Institutional Affairs (VPFA); one meeting was held jointly with the University Council Committee on Diversity & Equity and the Subcommittee on Faculty Recruitment & Retention; and one with Vice Provost for Faculty and the VPFA. The Committee continued to collaborate with the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity through ex officio appointment of its Chair Nancy Tkacs and exchange of minutes.

With Respect to its Charges Regarding
1. Sexual harassment, the Committee:
   a) Reviewed and discussed effectiveness of the University’s current policy on sexual harassment.
   b) Compared Penn’s policy with the published policies of our peer schools and explored issues associated with changing Penn’s policy from the perspective of the various constituencies.
   c) Convened a panel comprising the General Counsel, the Ombudsman, and the Vice President for Institutional Affairs to discuss issues and solutions regarding a confidential resource for faculty in the case of sexual harassment concerns.

2. Mentorship, the Committee:
   a) Monitored use of its mentoring best practices website which averaged 36 hits per month vs. 27 per month in the previous year.
   b) Monitored the University’s inclusion of the Committee’s recommended mentoring items in the pilot version of the Climate Survey and gave feedback.

3. Implementation of the tenure clock extension policy, the Committee: reviewed and concurred with the new template letter requesting external review and revised language in the University Faculty Handbook.

4. The Penn Forum for Women Faculty, the Committee:
   Heard occasional reports from the Vice President of the Council

5. Child care & other family friendly programs, the committee:
   a) Met with the HR Director of Quality of Worklife Programs to monitor dissemination and faculty use of newly adopted programs on backup child care.
   b) Recommended additional ways to disseminate availability of programs.

6. Diversity in faculty recruitment & retention, the committee:
   a) Reviewed and recommended changes to the University’s draft Minority Equity Report, many of which were subsequently incorporated in its published version.
   b) Met with the Vice Provost for Faculty and the Vice President for Institutional Affairs and recommended strategies for the University’s new Diversity Plan.
   c) Continued joint efforts with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the University Council Committee on Diversity & Equity-Subcommittee on Faculty Recruitment & Retention to advocate for broader and more effective outreach efforts to recruit minority faculty.

7. Bias in hiring, the Committee:
   Recommended updating the Bias in Hiring PowerPoint presentation on the Provost’s website, which was subsequently done.

Based on its work this year, the SCFDDE wishes to put forward the following motion and recommendation for consideration by the SEC:
Motion 1: That the language describing the Office of the Ombudsman as a resource to faculty in regard to sexual harassment be updated to reflect current practice that is similar to that of our peer universities and that a set of written procedures be developed to provide for consistency in the work of the Office.

Recommendation: We are looking forward to the presentation of the Diversity Action Plan this summer. SCFDDE recommends that SEC review this plan and consider the promise of the specific components in the plan to achieve noteworthy improvement in Penn’s faculty diversity. SCFDDE, which has considered these issues in depth over the past several years, would be open to including this task in its charge for the 2011-2012 year.

Among the components SCFDDE believes important to include in such a plan, given its extended conversations about this issue, are 1) the assurance of high quality bias-in-hiring training being made available to, and preferably mandatory for, all search committees, and 2) requiring schools to develop an individualized diversity plan with measurable incremental outcomes for which it will be held accountable by the Provost.

Recommended SCFDDE Activities for AY2011-2012
- Monitor proposed changes in the sexual harassment policy and description of resources available to faculty.
- Evaluate the findings regarding mentoring from the Faculty Climate Survey and update the website descriptions of mentoring best practices.
- Continue to monitor and support the evolution of the Women’s Faculty Forum.
- Continue to support accessible child care & other family-friendly policies.
- Monitor development and implementation of the University’s diversity plan; promote training for all search committees on bias in hiring.
- Continue to monitor the effectiveness of the tenure clock extension policy by gender.

Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity & Equity Membership 2010-2011
Lois Evans, School of Nursing, Chair
Clifford Deutschman, School of Medicine/Anesthesiology
Olena Jacenko, School of Veterinary Medicine
Kelly Jordan-Schuto, School of Dental Medicine
Mitch Marcus, School Engineering & Applied Science
Susan Margulies, School of Engineering & Applied Science
Ex Officio Members:
Robert Hornik, Annenberg School for Communication, Senate Chair
Camille Z. Charles, School of Arts & Sciences/Sociology, Senate Chair-Elect
Nancy Tkacs, School of Nursing, Council Committee on Diversity and Equity Chair
Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on the Faculty and the Administration (SCOA)

General Committee Charge
SCOA oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the faculty’s interface with the University’s administration, including policies and procedures relating to the University’s structure, the conditions of faculty employment.

Specific Charges
At the initial meeting of SCOA for the 2010-2011, the committee considered the official charges provided by Professor Robert Hornik, Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:

1. Collect data on the governance and oversight of the school-based Master’s programs. Consider whether current faculty oversight is adequate or whether additional oversight processes should be recommended.
2. Continue to review practices across schools related to sabbatical and other leaves. Review and make recommendations for any needed policy changes related to sabbatical requirements and use in order to ensure fairness across schools.
3. Form and monitor the work of a SCOA Subcommittee on Research charged with examining how the University research infrastructure supports humanities and social science scholarship, and how information technology needs of the researchers are being met.
4. Monitor any cases in which the power of temporary exclusion is exercised under recently adopted provisions in order to assess their adequacy. Consider whether there is a need to develop policies around temporary exclusion (e.g., for illness reasons) that do not fall under current policy.

Accomplishments
1. Data on Governance and Oversight of the School-Based Master’s Programs.
   - This charge was a continuation of work by the 2009-2010 SCOA Committee. That group had determined that individual schools oversee most Master’s programs, as well as a variety of terminal degree certificate programs but that there was concern regarding their consistent oversight by appropriate faculty. In 2009-2010, a database was compiled on school-based Master’s and certificate programs at Penn. The 2010-2011 SCOA developed a simple questionnaire inquiring about the amount and type of oversight provided by standing faculty, non-standing faculty or others to be sent to the directors of the identified programs. The specific goal was to identify the presence and extent of any oversight problems. This questionnaire was discussed with Dr. Andy Binns, Vice Provost for Education. His recommendation was that SCOA meet with the Deans and/or appropriate Vice Deans of each School to ascertain the status of these programs in their schools.
   - SCOA recommends that the discussion regarding oversight of Master’s and Professional programs in the individual Schools within the University be continued next year by interviewing the Deans and/or appropriate Vice Deans of each School.
   - In 2009-2010, the SCOA Committee determined that there was reason for concern that many faculty members find it difficult to utilize sabbatical leaves as currently structured. In some instances faculty members have continued to do clinical work, research, and teach while being recorded as on leave. This problem was found to be particularly prevalent in the medical related schools. To address this issue, a preliminary draft of an alternate sabbatical program was written. The 2010-2011 committee further developed and clarified this proposal and Dr. Hornik discussed it with several groups and individuals within the Penn community. SCOA findings were brought to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and they unanimously agreed that serious concerns have been raised and ought to be followed up. While the administration was unwilling to accept the preliminary proposal to supplement current sabbatical opportunities, it did agree to name a joint committee to consider this issue in greater depth.
   - While this issue remains to be resolved, 2010-2011 SCOA’s work instigated serious consultation with the President, Provost, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, and the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). SCOA recommends that there be continued development of an Alternative Sabbatical Program for Penn faculty. This continued exploration should be carried out either within SCOA or in a newly formed joint administration-faculty committee.
3. Form and Monitor a SCOA Subcommittee on Research.
   - The Subcommittee was formed in 2009-2010. Dr. Harvey Rubin assumed the Chairmanship of this subcommittee with SCOA member Professor Sydney Evans serving as SCOA’s representative on it.
   - This subcommittee was formed to review support and infrastructure necessary for applications to the major funding agencies and support for business administrators to learn appropriate grant procedures. Suggestions included improving IRB training at all levels and re-evaluation of the grant submission process so that it will work more efficiently. The Committee discussed ways that the University could be more supportive to large grant submission and move toward Open Access at Penn. In addition, a conversation with the Director of Penn Praxis, Harris Steinberg was held. Penn Praxis is a “401C3” to help faculty in the School of Design match their interests and provide real world opportunities to place students with clients on design challenges.
   - Specific recommendations were not made by the SCOA Subcommittee on Research.
4. Monitor Cases of Temporary Exclusion.
   - This charge related to a prior recommendation that the revised policy relating to temporary exclusion be reviewed. However, given that there have been no cases of such exclusion, there was no basis for review.
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Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
The 2010-2011 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty published its annual report in the February 22, 2011 Almanac; an executive summary as well as the full report are available online at www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v57/n23/contents.html.

Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
The annual report of the 2010-2011 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility will be published in a future issue.