Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate represents the standing faculty at the University of Pennsylvania. It was established in 1952 to participate in the shared governance of the University, to advise the administration on academic issues and faculty decisions and to provide feedback on a number of related issues. A large portion of its work is done both through a number of standing Senate committees and through the Senate Executive Committee (SEC). The chairs of the Senate committees and their members are given a series of charges each year to guide their work. However, these committees have the freedom and flexibility to consider other appropriate issues that may come to them during the year and set their own agendas consistent with the scope specified for their committee. SEC members meet monthly to converse with senior administrators, faculty, staff and students, to receive updates on matters of concern to their constituency and other members of the Penn community and to provide advice, feedback and oversight on a variety of topics as seen below in the reports from each Senate committee.

The Tri-Chairs (Chair-Elect Claire Finkelstein, Past-Chair Susan Margulies and myself as Chair) meet weekly to discuss concerns of the faculty and other Penn community members. The Tri-Chairs also meet regularly with the President, Provost, Vice Provost for Faculty and other senior administrators of the University. In this way the University administration learns about issues of concern to Penn faculty, SEC and its committees. Similarly, the Tri-Chairs are also informed and consulted about upcoming opportunities and decisions that affect faculty and other members of the University community.

The details, findings, observations and recommendations of each of the Senate committees are given in the individual reports that follow and I encourage you to read them all. Here I briefly provide a sense of some of this year’s themes of the Faculty Senate and note some issues that will continue in the next academic year.

Highlights

Open Learning Initiatives

There has been high faculty and administrative interest in Coursera, SAIL (Structured, Active, In-Class Learning), active learning, flipped classrooms and other similar initiatives to enhance the transmission of knowledge to Penn students and students around the world. Penn is highly visible in the Coursera universe and has concentrated on courses with high-production values and easy accessibility. Edward Rock’s appointment as Director of Open Learning Initiatives indicates the strong interest of the President and Provost in this area and provides a focal point for both teaching and research in innovative teaching methods across the University. The new ARCH auditorium is a great example of some of the accommodations that are needed for these learning experiments. Aspects of Coursera and related experiments were reviewed by several Senate committees. The high interest that Coursera courses have attracted assures that Senate committees will continue to be involved. Of continued interest are ways to assess learning in Coursera courses; faculty time commitment and recognition for work in these educational experiments; and the availability of physical spaces for SAIL classrooms and similar educational experiments.

Student Mental Health and Well-Being

The Faculty Senate met with undergraduate students and representatives from VPU (Vice Provost for University Life) and CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services) to get a more complete picture of the challenges facing students, staff, faculty and administrators at Penn when considering student mental health and well-being. William Alexander, director of CAPS, Max King, associate vice provost for University life, and undergraduate students Abe Sutton, Julie Bittar and Elana Stern provided excellent insights as SEC sought to understand the challenges in this area. The challenges of stigmatization, scheduling of appointments, the increasing needs of incoming students and more were discussed. Some of the Tri-Chairs have been providing continued support to students interested in student mental health challenges and changes. I was very pleased to see CAPS enhance their accessibility to students and also take the initiative to reach out to some schools to enhance the faculty’s ability to assess and refer students to appropriate resources. President Amy Gutmann and Provost Vince Price created the stellar Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare, and I look forward to their report next year on this topic of critical importance to all of us at Penn.

Diversity and Equity

The Progress Report on Minority Equity (Almanac December 10, 2013) and the Progress Report on Penn’s Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence (Almanac February 4, 2014) were published in Almanac during this past academic year. Penn has made progress in the percentage of underrepresented minority faculty and students, and continues this work with considerable energy and commitment. SEC is appreciative of the hard work that has gone into this effort, through specific initiatives to enhance faculty recruiting and faculty retention, to enlarge the faculty pipeline and to enhance faculty diversity and equity. Key faculty hired include Institute of Medicine and Nobel laureate David Baltimore, Eunice Kennedy Shriver, John Mulder, Margaret Wheatley, David Autor and Brenna Hedges. In addition, SEC is appreciative of Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen and Vice President for Institutional Affairs Joann Mitchell, in addition to President Amy Gutmann and Provost Vince Price. All have put tremendous work into these efforts regarding faculty. Dean of Admissions Eric Furda has been leading a similar effort with regard to student diversity.

The diversity search advisors (DSAs) play a key role in their schools and departments. However, there is wide variability in how they are trained for their roles and in their effectiveness. The Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDE), chaired by Lisa Lewis, has made important recommendations as to how to move forward. I recommend that you read their full report.

Tobacco Divestment

SEC took up the issue of divestment from tobacco companies by the University by hosting a discussion involving informative and clear presentations by faculty members Michael Weisberg and William Bratton, with contributions by others. Following a Q&A and vigorous discussion, SEC members voted unanimously to support the divestment proposal. The results of this vote were transmitted to the University Council, which subsequently voted on the proposal. The results of these votes are now being considered by the Trustees, who have the final responsibility for the decision.

Grievance Procedures

An Ad Hoc Faculty Grievance Committee, created by the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs, and chaired by Theodore Ruger, examined our present procedures for the Faculty Grievance Commission and proposed a revised set of guidelines approved by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility, the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration and SEC at the end of this past academic year. These changes clarify the language governing the procedures, provide guidance on the interaction between the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility and the Faculty Grievance Commission and their respective roles, assures parity between faculty and the administration on access to recordings of any hearings and reduces ambiguities in the present policies and procedures. In addition, the new language vastly improves the method by which the pool of hearing panel members is chosen. This was an enormous and important two-year effort involving numerous consultations with faculty and senior administrators. These revisions will become part of the Faculty Handbook for the next academic year.

Economic Status of the Faculty

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) did an excellent job of taking a fresh look at compensation within Penn, (continued on page 2)
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compensation compared to other universities and concerns regarding eq-

uity in compensation across the University. After a number of internal dis-
cussions and gathering of information, the report was recently brought to
SEC where SCESF Chair Erika Holzbaur and Vice Provost for Faculty
Anita Allen provided very thoughtful perspectives on this issue. This in-
spired a spirited discussion on salary equity across the institution, equity
with respect to gender and other issues that was incredibly enlightening
and engaged a number of SEC members. Do take a look at the executive
summary or the full report.

Faculty Track Changes in Schools

This year a number of proposals for track changes across several
schools were approved by the Faculty Senate Committee on Faculty and
the Academic Mission and by SEC. The impetus for these changes came
from several sources. First, many schools are facing changing needs in
teaching, research and, in the health schools, clinical care. They often in-
cluded considerations of present and anticipated changes in teaching load,
research funding and reimbursement. Second, several schools needed to
be brought into compliance with the Faculty Handbook (e.g., modifying
the caps on a given track). Finally, there was a need to clarify the roles and
responsibilities of the faculty tracks to reduce ambiguities when it came
to duties and assessment.

There was a complex and major realignment in the four health schools
to more clearly define the roles and expectations of the Standing Faculty
(i.e., Tenure Track and Clinician-Educator) and to expand the caps on
several of the tracks. This was done by a coordinated effort among the
University’s four health schools. It represents a major accomplishment in
clarifying and strengthening faculty roles in those schools and in bringing
these tracks into conformity with the Faculty Handbook. More important-
ly, it equips the health schools to face the constantly changing landscape
of funding and regulation.

Track changes by increasing caps on certain non-standing faculty were
also approved for the School of Engineering and Applied Science and the
School of Design.

Unfinished Business

Academic Integrity

There are few items that strike as close to the heart of academe as aca-
demic integrity. Several Senate and University Council committees and oth-
er groups on campus have looked extensively at this during the past three
years and there are some excellent ideas on how to enhance the system. One
example is the use of non-reportable sanctions. I am hopeful that concrete
recommendations can be implemented during the next academic year.

A preliminary analysis of the 2011 faculty climate survey data re-
vealed that responses varied by faculty rank, school, gender and race/eth-
nicity. Deeper analyses are necessary to see if the differences in the expe-
rience of women or under-represented minority faculty are due to an over-
representation of junior faculty ranks in those groups, or rather are truly
differences by race, ethnicity or gender. Additional analyses will also pro-
vide deeper insight into effectiveness of programs/policies and highlight
areas in need for intervention, after examining relationships among dis-
tinct aspects of academic culture, relationships between satisfaction and
outcome measures and between satisfaction and utilization of Penn’s fam-
ily-friendly and mentoring programs.

I encourage the optimal use of this information in the coming academ-
ic year to enhance the environment for all faculty at Penn. I think the re-
sults are an incredibly valuable resource for us all.
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ident for business services. In addition, John Swartley, associate vice pro-
provost for research and Susan Sproat, executive director for benefits, were
helpful in providing understanding of their work and its direct relation to
Penn faculty.

President Amy Gutmann and Provost Vince Price have been accessible
and collegial and have always provided additional insight into the chal-
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Dwight L. Jaggard
Report of the 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 in section IV of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators.

2013-2014 Specific Charges

1. Get an update from Vice Provost Andy Binns on the status of the School of Arts & Sciences Committee on Undergraduate Education proposed changes for the improvement of current academic integrity procedures, policies and practices.

2. Work with the Library to finalize the Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy FAQ list and help to disseminate this information to faculty and students.

3. Continue discussing with Eric Furda, dean of admissions, the strategies that are likely to yield applications from academically gifted students from underrepresented groups, including those with disadvantaged backgrounds. Monitor progress to expand Penn’s reach in local Philadelphia high schools as well as nationally in targeted community colleges.

4a. Continue discussing with Vice Provost Andy Binns the online course evaluation system, and consider whether slated improvements address faculty concerns. Continue to advocate for the inclusion of new polling features in the online course evaluation system.

4b. Discuss the course evaluation process for online courses in consultation with Professor Edward Rock, director of Open Course Initiatives and Andy Binns, vice provost for education.

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, 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 2014-2015. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Accomplishments:

1. Get updates on proposed changes for the improvement of current academic integrity procedures, policies and practices.

Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns reported that his office has been following up on suggestions made by the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE) to improve academic integrity procedures, policies and practices. The Office of Student Conduct (OSC) is now fully staffed, which has resulted in fewer student complaints.

The SCUE report determined that academic integrity issues at Penn are handled in an inconsistent manner. This is because each faculty member can choose to deal with the situation in a number of ways, either with the assistance of OSC or on their own. Vice Provost Binns believes some of the inconsistency is due to reluctance of faculty to report students because the minimum sanction for an academic integrity violation is a reportable offense.

One suggestion from the SCUE report was to develop a first report system, where faculty members could report an academic integrity incident without sanctioning the student. The first report system would have an accumulating database, which would automatically trigger a response if multiple reports were made about the same student. Vice Provost Binns discussed potential problems with such a system: namely, no school of Penn’s size has implemented such a system.

Director of OSC Michele Goldfarb has suggested rewriting the Charter of the University of Pennsylvania Student Disciplinary System to allow OSC to impose sanctions on students that are not reportable on their records. Provost Vincent Price supports this option and the undergraduate deans are considering it. Vice Provost Binns suggested beginning the process of drafting changes to the Charter this summer, with the process of approving these changes to begin in the fall.

Vice Provost Binns urged faculty to include information about academic integrity in their class syllabi and to discuss it in the first class, including how cheating will be defined in the class and what the consequences of cheating will be. There is suggested language available on both the OSC and the Center for Teaching & Learning websites.

SCSEP Recommendations

The SCSEP supports a gradual overhaul of the Penn Student Disciplinary System, with the goal of creating coherent policies that inform the actions of all faculty and students. The SCSEP supports changes to the Penn Charter that would allow OSC to impose sanctions on students that are not reportable on their records. The SCSEP also supports the development of an online first report system that could first be tested by faculty in one of the undergraduate schools.

2. Develop FAQ List for Faculty and Students on Intellectual Property and Copyright Policies.

Following up on meetings from the previous year, the SCSEP met with Associate General Counsel Robert Terrell, Scholarly Communication Librarian Shawn Martin and Associate Librarian, Collection Development & Management, Martha Brogan. A FAQ list was generated that provides guidance on intellectual property and copyright policies that are often confusing to faculty and students. Updated content with link to FAQ was posted at the Library website in March 2014: http://guides.library.upenn.edu/copyright

Practices for open access journal publishing vary by discipline, but are moving towards open access, in part due to the requirement from Coursera and other open learning initiatives to employ open access materials. The Libraries believe the impetus for the move to open access must come from the faculty creators of scholarship, and that it is in the best interests of the faculty to retain copyrights of their work. Penn has instituted a Scholarly Commons Repository, which collects the scholarly output of researchers at Penn in a freely-accessible archive.

To help faculty and students to resolve challenging issues, a Copyright Clinic is held on Tuesdays at 3 p.m. in Room 125 at the Weigle Information Commons in the Van Pelt-Dietrich Library.

SCSEP Recommendations

The SCSEP encourages Penn faculty to spend time reviewing the Penn library website, as these are important and complicated issues that impact many aspects of teaching and scholarly work. Faculty should explore their options for publishing scholarly work in open access formats and reach out to Penn Library staff if they run into obstacles. Finally, to help educate students about copyright information contained in the FAQ and updated library website, the relevant link should be included in Penn’s graduate student handbook: http://guides.library.upenn.edu/copyright

3. SCSEP Meeting with Dean of Admissions, Eric Furda

SCSEP learned how Penn Admissions works with many different partner organizations to reach talented URM (underrepresented minority) students. These organizations reach students at all stages in the pipeline, and the majority of them are based on socioeconomic criteria rather than strictly on race. About half of the URM students enrolled come from one of these partner organizations. The other half is identified by student searches. Penn is doing well enrolling URM students, but this is a very competitive space, with many peer institutions offering merit scholarships in addition to need-based financial aid. URM students are still underrepresented in the Early Decision pool, which is only 6% URM applicants compared to 8-12% URM applicants in the general admissions pool.

Admissions believes that it has identified a broad range of scores that indicate whether an admitted student will feel academically comfortable at Penn, especially in cases where the high school curriculum is lacking. In general, applicants need to self-report an A or A- high school average, with combined SATs of around 2100 to be considered competitive. Wharton has pinpointed a baseline math SAT score that students need to be successful in its program.
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Relationships with community colleges (as a potential source of low-income, high-achieving students with proven ability to complete college work) have not been expanded in recent years. One reason is that Penn does not have plans to complete articulation agreements with such colleges, which would automatically guarantee the transfer of college credits.

Recruiting of international students has been limited by lack of funds for financial aid and increasing competition from peer institutions. Penn only provides need-blind admissions to students from Mexico and Canada. In other parts of the world, admissions decisions are made with input from Student Financial Services and guided by efforts to get a wide range of international representation. The Penn Compact 2020’s focus on international student aid will likely provide additional funding for more students to attend from the most disadvantaged areas of the world.

Dean Furda also addressed Penn’s branding issue, which grows in significance as the number of high school graduates in the Northeast continues to decline. He noted three priorities in working with Steve MacCarty, Vice President of University Communications: Penn’s overall reputation; Penn’s no-loan policy and the availability of financial aid; and what Penn graduates are doing. Penn’s current students are effectively being employed as ambassadors for the undergraduate program. Penn’s number of applicants has increased by 6% each year over the past few years, but some peer schools are rising at a faster rate. The 2014 admissions numbers showed a favorable uptick, with applications increasing to 35,788 (a 14.4% increase from 2013) and the acceptance rate decreasing to 9.9% (from 12.1% in 2013).

SCSEP Recommendation

The SCSEP notes that many of Penn’s peer institutions have fared better in recent years in increasing student diversity, but that Penn’s 2014 admissions statistics signal a great improvement. Penn should continue implementing strategies to increase the total number of applications. New resources will likely need to be deployed to increase the pool of applications from qualified under-represented minorities and first-generation college students, and to improve student recruitment in this very competitive arena. Penn has a very dynamic urban campus and broad course offerings that should appeal to a diverse student body, but many high school students outside of the mid-Atlantic region are still not familiar with Penn as an Ivy League university.

4a. Get updates on the online course evaluation system, and consider whether slated improvements address faculty concerns.

The Committee met with Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns to learn about the status of the online course evaluation system. In general, there appears to have been no change (or improvement) in the online course evaluation system in the past year.

Vice Provost Binns noted that Penn’s contract with the online course evaluation vendor expires in 2016, and his office is just starting to solicit feedback from the deans and faculty on how the system is working for them. Since Penn has partnered with Canvas, one suggestion is to find a way to integrate the two systems. In response to an earlier concern about the length of time for the course evaluations, the standard has become to open the evaluations on the last week of classes and close them at the end of finals. Vice Provost Binns noted that the response rates on course evaluations have been excellent, with more than 80% of students responding.

SCSEP Feedback

SCSEP has ongoing concerns about the lack of control that faculty have over when students evaluate the course and lack of ability to add or modify questions that are posed to students. In particular, the course evaluation system has identified student cheating in some courses. Faculty should be given flexibility, for example, to pose additional questions within the course evaluation system that will help to identify patterns of cheating. Along these lines, it is a positive development that the Center for Teaching & Learning now offers a midterm course evaluation process called Course Feedback for Instructors (CFI), which is customizable and confidential.

4b. Discuss the course evaluation process for online courses.

SCSEP met with Professor Edward Rock, director of Open Course Initiatives, Dr. Jacqueline Candido, director of LPS Online Learning & Digital Engagement and Kristine Rabberman, director of Academic Affairs, SAS Division of Professional and Liberal Education. SCSEP learned from Dr. Rock that each School has its own process for approving a Coursera course proposal, but the process must culminate in the Dean signing off on the proposal. The proposal then goes to the Faculty Advisory Committee, which can either recommend, decline or ask for revision and resubmission. The Faculty Advisory Committee’s recommendations then go to the Provost and Professor Rock for final approval. The number of new course proposals has stabilized at roughly 10-20 per year.

Some Coursera courses are now being used for outreach purposes to help prepare high school students for college-level work. Courses such as Precalculus (under development) may also help to bridge a skills gap for on-campus college students with weaker high school preparation.

Penn’s LPS (and previously CGS) has offered online courses since 2000, most during the summer session. These courses are evaluated much like normal course offerings and are generally as well received as standard lecture courses. Unlike Coursera courses, LPS courses are open to a limited number of paying students, and faculty have much more freedom with distribution of course materials. Online courses are also frequently offered in many of the professional graduate programs.

SCSEP Feedback

Many Penn faculty, across several Schools, have gained significant experience in creating and administering online courses in the past 15 years. Penn can leverage this experience for new initiatives, including teaching innovations in the form of “flipped” classrooms, educational opportunities for busy professionals and increasing outreach to underserved students, locally, nationally and internationally, through Coursera as well as Penn-specific online platforms.

5. Consider Charges for the Coming Year.

At its April meeting, the Committee reviewed the status of its charges and identified areas for continued work in the coming academic year. These topics are summarized below:

- Continue discussing with Dean Furda, the strategies that are likely to yield applications from academically gifted students from under-represented groups, including those with disadvantaged backgrounds.
- Meet with Vice Provost Binns, and Director of OSC Michele Goldfarb, to review proposed changes to the Penn Charter that would allow OSC to impose sanctions on students that are not reportable on their records. Get updates on status of first report system.
- Get updates from Professor Ed Rock, director of Open Course Initiatives, about local academic outreach efforts employing Coursera materials. Other groups at Penn involved in providing academic enrichment opportunities for local Philadelphia students should be included in this conversation.
- Discuss with CAPS representatives and other Penn administrators how Penn is trying to support student mental health and general wellbeing. In particular, how is Penn working to create supportive environments for undergraduate and graduate students who come to Penn from very different cultural, political and socioeconomic backgrounds?
- Discuss with representatives from Penn Abroad and International Internship Program how Penn is supporting students who want to participate in summer study abroad programs.
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Paulo Arratia, School of Engineering & Applied Science/ Mechanical & Applied Mechanics
Emily Blumberg, Perelman School of Medicine/Emergency Medicine
Ivan Dmochowski, School of Arts & Sciences/Chemistry, Chair
Sharon Irving, School of Nursing
Emma Meagher, Perelman School of Medicine/ Experimental Therapeutics
Carol Muller, School of Arts & Sciences/Music
Jorge Santiago-Aviles, School of Engineering & Applied Science/ Electrical & Systems Engineering
Ex Officio Members:
Dwight Jaggard, School of Engineering & Applied Science/ Electrical & Systems Engineering, Senate Chair
Claire Finkelstein, Law School, Senate Chair-Elect
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., H.2., II.A.-D.

2013-2014 Specific Charges

1. Review and discuss Penn’s course credits and AP credits for open learning in consultation with Professor Edward Rock, director of Open Course Initiatives.

In view of the rapidly changing landscape in online education, as well as in burgeoning alternative educational modalities, the Committee felt that it would be useful to get an overview of how these initiatives are being shaped at Penn. Accordingly, the Committee consulted with Professors Edward Rock (director of Open Course Initiatives, School of Law), Andrew Binns (vice provost for education, School of Arts & Sciences) and Rebecca Maynard (Graduate School of Education).

On the narrow question of Penn’s course credits and AP credits for open learning, it became apparent to the Committee that the current XCAT online system is adequate for current and projected purposes. The system handles transfer credit, study abroad and advanced placement with jurisdiction over course approvals at the departmental level. Penn does not currently give course credit for Coursera courses (or other online open courses), but any request for course credit, whether the material was acquired through a traditional or through an open learning forum, can be handled within XCAT—as implemented currently, a request for course approval is generally routed through the system to a faculty member in the appropriate department teaching material closest to the subject matter of the requested course.

On the broad issue of the evolution in open learning it was clear to the Committee that the Open Learning Initiatives at Penn and elsewhere are very much in flux with rapid changes in the use of digital platforms like Coursera, on-going experiments in the use of digital content in Structured Active In-class Learning Classrooms (such as flipped classrooms) and the acquisition and analysis of data on the efficacy of these new pedagogical vehicles. The Committee feels that it is important to keep a finger on the pulse of these developments with a view to identifying best practices and cohesive approaches that make the most of the new technologies.

2. Continue to work with the vice deans of the schools as they carry forward the process of consultation with their faculties on guidelines for the role of non-standing faculty in teaching of undergraduates. After a discussion of preliminary data, the Committee has asked the Provost’s Office to evaluate whether it is possible to extract data on freshman courses with non-standing faculty instructors across the schools.

3. Carry forward the implementation of the regular collection of data on the role of non-standing faculty in teaching of undergraduates by working with the Provost for Faculty to approve specific language for an additional guideline, requiring data on non-standing faculty, to be added to the Guidelines for Requests for Faculty Track Changes.

The Committee heard from Professor Anita Allen (vice provost for faculty, School of Law) on the on-going data collection pertaining to the role of non-standing faculty in teaching of undergraduates. After a discussion of preliminary data, the Committee has asked the Provost’s Office to evaluate whether it is possible to extract data on freshman courses with non-standing faculty instructors across the schools.

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 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 2014-2015. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

It is the view of the Committee that two of the charges should carry over to the academic year 2014-2015.

a. The rapidly changing landscape in Open Learning and the emergence of new instructional methodologies exploiting digital content in Structured Active In-class Learning Classrooms have the potential to be hugely transformative and reshape the core mission of the faculty. SCOF should continue to monitor these developments.

b. SCOF should continue to work with the Vice Provost for Faculty on the regular collection and analysis of data on the role of non-standing faculty in teaching undergraduates. One possible outcome of a review is the crafting of explicit language for a guideline on the role of non-standing faculty in undergraduate teaching, with particular reference to freshman teaching.
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Nancy Hanrahan, School of Nursing
Ron Harty, School of Veterinary Medicine
Aidy Segnwall, Wharton School
Mindy Schuster, Perelman School of Medicine/Infectious Diseases
Tom Sollecito, School of Dental Medicine
Santosh S. Venkatesh, School of Engineering and Applied Science/Electrical and Systems Engineering
Jeff Winkler, School of Arts & Sciences/Chemistry
Dwight Jaguard, School of Engineering and Applied Science/Electrical & Systems Engineering, Faculty Senate Chair
Claire Finkelstein, Law School, Faculty Senate Chair-elect
Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDEE)

General Committee Charge
The Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (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 that makes recommendations for implementation.

2013-2014 Specific Charges
1. Continue to monitor the development and implementation of the University’s Diversity Action Plan and School plans. Review and discuss the draft Diversity Action Plan Progress Report and the draft Minority Equity Report with the Vice Provost for Faculty.
2. Update language on confidentiality for the Office of the Ombudsman that is in line with peer institutions and uphold ability of the Office to maintain confidentiality. Continue discussing with Joann Mitchell, vice president for institutional affairs and Marcia Martinez-Helfman, associate ombudsman findings from peer institutions survey. Discuss making the Ombudsman’s Office an even more effective resource for faculty.
3. When available, evaluate the findings from the Faculty Climate Survey. Develop a list of priorities and follow-up with the Vice Provost for Faculty to discuss recommendations for changes in policies around identified concerns.
4. Present and discuss cross-school collaboration recommendations outlined in the 2012-2013 Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity Annual Report with the Vice Provost for Faculty.
5. Get an update on Penn’s childcare offerings in consultation with Marilyn Kraut, Director of Penn’s Quality of Worklife Programs.
6. 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 2014-2015. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Report of Activities
The Committee met a total of seven times (10/30, 11/13, 12/11, 1/28/16, 3/20 and 4/2). Invited guests included Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen; Diversity Search Advisors Karen Beckman (SAS), Bill Bratton (Law), Jim Guevara (PSOM), Peter Petrakis (SAS) and C.J. Taylor (SEAS), and Karen Grasse (Associate Director for Faculty Affairs, Perelman School of Medicine); Wendy White (Senior Vice President & General Counsel for Institutional Affairs and/or University Council).

Accomplishments Specific to Charge
The Committee agreed to focus on the first four charges.

Recommendations for 2014-2015
1. Increasing the visibility of the initiatives that fund faculty diversity. The Committee acknowledges that the University offers a variety of initiatives that fund faculty diversity but these initiatives are not well publicized throughout the University. The Committee recommends that these initiatives be better publicized.
   a. Include the information to the University’s diversity website so that it is centrally located.
   b. Diversity Search Advisors should be the conduit of information to their schools and departments.
2. Improving the process for diverse faculty recruitment and retention
   The Committee reviewed the Progress Report on Minority Equity and noted that there has been incremental progress in increasing faculty diversity at Penn. Expecting more successful results at this early stage is unrealistic given the early stages of the Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence. In particular, the Committee appreciates that the Progress Report highlighted under-represented minorities in leadership positions. The Committee recommends, however, that the University find additional methods to improve the recruitment and retention process for diverse faculty.
   a. Currently, DSAs complete and sign off that the search committee has followed the requirements for ensuring diversity after the candidate is hired. A better approach may be to have the review process completed before an offer can be made.
3. Training and education concerning the role of the Diversity Search Advisor (DSA).
   The Committee recognizes the importance of the Diversity Search Advisor (DSA) role and encourages the University to examine the current process and structure for training and education of individuals appointed as DSAs.
   a. Improve training and networking for DSAs. Ways that the training and networking could be strengthened and supported include a longer training period (possibly a semester-long seminar), circulating a scholarly bibliography on diversity issues and/or an informal reading or working group.
   b. Educating all faculty about the role of the DSA. Currently faculty are educated about the role of DSAs only if they are on a search committee. It is important for faculty to be educated about diversity initiatives whether they are on a search committee or not. A venue for this education could be at departmental meetings.
   c. Improve access to resources from the central administration to reinforce the institution’s commitment to diversity.
   d. Compensation for DSA activities. Compensation could be course release time or financial.
4. Clarifying the role of the Ombudsman for faculty, staff and students. The role of the Ombudsman is an important resource for Penn faculty, students and staff but ambiguity around role and function of the Ombudsman remains for the Penn Community. In addition, language surrounding confidentiality ad mandatory reporting remains unclear.
   a. The Ombudsman speaking to students at New Student Orientation and/or University Council.
   b. The Ombudsman addressing faculty through a visit to each school/department.
5. Written communication to faculty, staff and students from the Ombudsman.
   In addition, the Committee recommends that discussions continue with the Senior Vice President and General Counsel as well as inviting a faculty member from the Law School whom has expertise in issues of confidentiality and mandatory reporting.
6. Evaluate the findings from the Faculty Climate Survey.
   When available, evaluate the findings from the Faculty Climate Survey. Develop a list of priorities and follow-up with the Vice Provost for Faculty to discuss recommendations for changes in policies around identified concerns.
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The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration “oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the University’s interface with the University’s administration, including policies and procedures relating to the University’s structure, the conditions of faculty employment (such as personnel benefits) and information. In general the Committee deals with the matters covered by the following sections of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: I.A., D., G.-H.1, I.-K., II.E., III., V., VI.

For 2013-2014, the Committee was primarily charged with making recommendations for the review and oversight of master’s degree programs and with reviewing faculty ownership, intellectual property and labor issues relating to the University Conflict of Interest Policy and its application to on-line teaching. The committee also assisted in reviewing the revised Faculty Grievance Procedures and in monitoring the efforts of the Vice Provost of Research to reduce the regulatory burden on faculty.

Oversight of Master’s Programs

The number of master’s programs varies considerably both from school to school and within schools over time. SCOA examined materials on the number of MA programs, the criteria for their establishment and maintenance and any extant procedures for oversight. We confirmed that these continue to vary widely.

SCOA recommends that all Schools with master’s degree programs have procedures for oversight in place. These should occur at regular, published intervals and be conducted according to published criteria.

Noting the disparity in procedures and quality of oversight among the schools, SCOA also encourages the development of criteria for best practices in the conduct and oversight of master’s degree programs. In pursuit of this, we appended the system of review developed by the School of Engineering & Applied Sciences, which is exemplary. [Appendix B]

Master’s degree programs differ significantly. Best practices should therefore be formulated by each school and department according to their pedagogical and disciplinary goals. There are, however, core principles that should guide all master’s programs.

SCOA encourages schools and departments to develop and publish their own criteria for best practices in their MA programs. These should include:

1) specific admissions criteria
2) faculty oversight of curriculum
3) career mentoring
4) periodic program review

Massive Open Online Courses and University Policy on Conflict of Interest and Labor

SCOA’s primary task for this year was an examination of issues concerning conflict of interest, intellectual property rights and labor practices that arose in connection with massive open online courses (MOOCs). The statement issued by Provost Price and Professor Rock of the Law faculty and published For Comment in Almanac May 7, 2013 raised a number of concerns among the faculty. Over the course of the last two years, SCOA and the Tri-Chairs have discussed these issues among themselves, with their colleagues, and with faculty members of the Law faculty. We are especially grateful for Professor Christopher Yoo’s counsel.

MOOCs present a special case with regard to provisions governing intellectual property and conflict of interest. MOOCs in particular, and online forms of teaching more generally, are undergoing rapid change, pedagogically and in law.1 At present, the construction of a MOOC at the University of Pennsylvania is done under a work for hire contract with Coursera and the University of Pennsylvania, rather than by the provisions of the Faculty Handbook. Coursera contracts are negotiated individually and vary in their provisions. Faculty should therefore consult with their colleagues to determine customary arrangements and appropriate rates of remuneration. Faculty should also be conscious of the disparity between Coursera contracts and provisions governing intellectual property rights in the Faculty Handbook.2 The faculty member contracting with Coursera is paid for “services performed and all of the rights you grant under this Agreement.”3 “The audio and video recordings of lectures included in the course are owned by the University” and the University has “the legal right to distribute” the course.4 The faculty member retains “the copyright interest in the New Course Content” created or authored for the course. Faculty have expressed concerns that Coursera could edit, modify or combine lectures and course materials with other elements in ways that would be inaccurate, misleading or objectionable to the faculty author. We advise adding provisions to the Coursera contract addressing this concern for reputational and academic accuracy. In addition, SCOA has significant concerns relating to the relicensing of online courses. We recommend the addition of language to the Coursera contract to the effect that “The University agrees that it will defer to the faculty member’s reasonable objections to any proposed relicensing of online courses.”

The contractual arrangements between the University, faculty and Coursera MOOCs are governed under a regime distinct from that which governs intellectual property and conflict of interest issues for the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania. The contractual status of the faculty is governed, in the absence of explicit contracts, by the Faculty Handbook, which remains the authoritative source for the rights and obligations of the faculty, and by customary practice in the academy. These are not superseded by the interpretations offered in the May 7, 2013 Almanac. The faculty retain the intellectual property rights secured in the Faculty Handbook and in the Research Investigators’ Handbook, cited below. The faculty also retain the ordinary and customary rights that prevail in academic practice. These include the right to participate in academic activities outside the University including conferences and lectures for a period not to exceed 1 in 7 days during the school year and freely in the summer where their customary obligations permit this, and to conduct reading courses, among other practices. The faculty willingly acknowledge their duty to the University as their primary obligation and do not seek to compete with the University. The faculty affirm the conflict of interest provisions of the Faculty Handbook, which codifies the requirements and expectations of the University and has been accepted as authoritative by faculty and administration.

Faculty Grievance Procedures

SCOA reviewed the proposed revisions to the Faculty Grievance procedures and raised certain concerns which we forwarded to the Tri-Chairs to be passed along to the Ad hoc committee tasked with drafting the revision. The most important of these concerned securing rights of the faculty in the case of a grievance. In particular, SCOA believed that the grievant should have the same access to recordings of the proceedings as the Provost (given explicitly in Section IVb). To make the process more equitable and ensure confidentiality, the committee recommended that the recording be accessible to both parties on an equal basis.

Report from Vice Provost for Research Dawn Bonnell

Dawn Bonnell continued the tradition of clear, concise and substantive reports the committee saw under her predecessor Steve Fluharty, now Dean of SAS. We as a committee appreciated the work Vice Provost Bonnell continued the tradition of clear, concise and substantive reports the committee saw under her predecessor Steve Fluharty, now Dean of SAS. We as a committee appreciated the work Vice Provost Bonnell


2 5 Ibid, note 2 above.

3 Online Course Agreement, 2012-06-21 Online Course Agreement—Coursera v5, p.2.3.1

4 Ibid, "Draft Summary of Terms" attached to Online Course Agreement.

5 Ibid, note 2 above.
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nell is doing to reduce the regulatory burden on faculty. We encourage this
effort in the years to come, and suggest that SCOA continue oversight of
this process. The Penn Center for Innovation appears to be an excellent
vehicle for enhancing our connections to industry and for supporting cre-
ative work at Penn that may have commercial value. With the anticipated
challenge of decreasing federal funds, this appears to be an excellent place
to focus some of efforts of this office of research. We look forward to the
opening of the Penn Center for Innovation and share Vice Provost Bon-
nell’s hopes for its success.

Recommended charges to SCOA 2014-2015

1. We recommend that our successors on this committee retain a
watching brief on issues of conflict of interest and intellectual proper-
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Faculty Senate Grievance Commission

Annual Report

April 2014

The Faculty Senate Grievance Commission of the University of Pennsylvania is an independent com-
mittee consisting of three faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This
Commission is available to members of the Penn faculty and academic support staff who allege they have
been subject to action that is contrary to University procedures, policies and/or regulations, that is dis-

During the Academic Year 2013-2014, the commission was composed of Robert Hollebeek (Physics
and Astronomy, Past Chair), Martha A.Q. Curley (Nursing, Chair) and Rogers Smith (Political Science,
Chair Elect). During the year, the Commission was approached by two members of the faculty, both had
been denied either promotion or a continued appointment.

In each case, the individuals had several initial discussions with the immediate past chair and the cur-
rent chair of the commission about the grievance process, the circumstances of the case, discussions about
clarifying the issues that might be grounds for a grievance and discussions about the procedures for sub-
mitting a formal grievance letter. In both cases the Commission chair pursued additional information from
the potential grievant’s department or dean.

In both cases, the commission as a whole reviewed the case in detail, each member reaching an inde-
pendent conclusion about the merits. In both cases, the chair consulted the commission for a consensus af-
ter reaching a decision about whether the cases should result in a hearing panel. Neither case was forward-
ed to a hearing. No cases remain outstanding for consideration in the coming year.

During the year, the Commission collectively reviewed the proposed changes to the faculty grievance
procedure (section II.E.12 of the Faculty Handbook) and provided comments on the prehearing proce-
dures.

—Martha A.Q. Curley, Grievance Commission Chair, 2013-2014

Senate Committee on
the Economic Status of the Faculty

The 2013-2014 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty, 2012-2013
Report in the May 6, 2014 Almanac; an executive summary as well
as the full report are available online at www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v60/n33/esf.html

Senate Committee on
Academic Freedom and Responsibility

The annual reports of the 2013-2014, 2012-2013 and the 2011-
2012 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility
will be published in a future issue.