

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

The University of Pennsylvania embraces a vision of shared governance in which the faculty is regularly consulted on matters within its purview. The roughly 4,600 members of the faculty are represented by the Faculty Senate, which operates through the rotating membership of its Executive Committee (SEC), its standing committees, and the Faculty Senate leadership, namely the Chair of the Senate, the Chair-Elect and the Past-Chair (the “Tri-Chairs”). SEC is comprised of representatives from each of the University’s 12 schools as well as a handful of at-large representatives, and meets monthly to discuss matters of significance to the faculty, receive briefings from senior administrators and others in the University community, provide feedback on matters of general University import, and vote on changes to the *Faculty Handbook*. The more detailed work of the Faculty Senate takes place in the Senate’s various committees. The Tri-Chairs meet weekly to review the progress of the Senate Committees, address matters raised by the Administration, prepare for upcoming Executive Committee meetings, and to perform other tasks required to advance the work of the Faculty Senate. The Tri-Chairs also meet regularly with the President and Provost, and have formal and informal meetings with the Vice Provost for Faculty and other senior administrators. These meetings provide an opportunity for the Faculty Senate leadership to consult with University administrators about a variety of issues affecting both faculty and the Penn community more generally.

This Report presents the major issues addressed by the Faculty Senate during the 2014-2015 academic year. The year-end reports of each of the Senate committees appear thereafter.

Highlights

Revisions to the Disciplinary Procedures Relating to Sexual Assault on Campus

In keeping with federal guidelines issued by the US Department of Education, Penn embarked on a revision of its rules for handling sexual assaults that occur in the Penn community, when committed by a Penn student. As part of the revision of Penn’s process, the University opened a new office, separate from the Office of Student Conduct (OSC), whose sole function it is to investigate allegations of sexual misconduct and bring such cases to resolution (<http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v61/n20/pdf/012715supplement.pdf>). Although the alteration of University policy on this matter did not require a change to the *Faculty Handbook*, the Tri-Chairs consulted with University leaders regarding this revision. In addition to providing input on the proposed rules, the Tri-Chairs facilitated an exchange of views between faculty from different schools and members of the Administration on this topic. We are deeply appreciative of the Administration’s willingness to consult the Faculty Senate leadership on this matter of great importance to the University community and for their receptivity to receiving many different perspectives on a highly complex, politicized topic. The new rules appear to strike a reasonable balance between the need to encourage victims of sexual assault to report misconduct, on the one hand, and the need to ensure fair treatment for those accused of wrongdoing, on the other.

Revisions to the Patent Policy

Early in the fall, the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA) began reviewing the *Faculty Handbook* rule pertaining to the University’s policy on patents. This coincided with an initiative from Dawn Bonnell, vice provost for research, regarding distributions to faculty under the patent policy as well as a clarification regarding waivers to conflicts of interest for faculty business owners. Among other aims, the University wanted to ensure sufficient permissible flexibility to help foster innovation. Working closely with Vice Provost Bonnell, SCOA revised the *Faculty Handbook* rule on these and several other matters, and the new rule was voted in by SEC on January 21, 2015 (<http://provost.upenn.edu/policies/faculty-handbook/research-policies/iii-e>). This collaborative process brought about an improvement for faculty in the distribution under the patent policy, helped to make the policy more predictable and consistent, and increased faculty involvement in oversight of the implementation of the policy. We are grateful to the Vice Provost for Research for her engagement with the Faculty Senate on this matter, and are pleased with the outcome for the faculty as well as for the University as a whole.

Student Mental Health and Wellbeing

The Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) was charged with considering follow-up action to the recommendations of the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare (<http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v61/n23/pdf/task-force-psychological-health.pdf>). The Committee considered ways the faculty could support the University’s heightened focus on mental health through faculty involvement, and is presenting to SEC a proposal for the creation of a Faculty Ambassador for Mental Health and Welfare. The Faculty Ambassador would serve as a point person for other faculty to provide information about University resources for students suffering from psychological distress, and would disseminate information about how to identify students suffering from mental health pressures at an early stage. SCSEP has been consulting broadly with University administrators to learn more about how faculty can be effective in supporting the University’s efforts to promote student psychological health, and will continue to develop this and other proposals.

Economic Status of the Faculty

In its 2014-2015 Report, the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) identified gender equity in faculty compensation as a critical issue for the University. In the Administration’s responses to the SCESF Report, as well as in President Amy Gutmann’s remarks to the Senate Executive Board, the Administration has signaled that rectifying inequity in pay based on gender is a priority for the President, and the Tri-Chairs understand that steps are already being taken to address this disparity. We look forward to working with the Administration to help identify the broader sources of continuing economic inequality between men and women faculty at Penn, and to assist in all appropriate ways with addressing those sources. The Tri-Chairs are especially appreciative of the commitment of the Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen, whose dedication to eliminating the wage gap that exists on the basis of gender is also evident.

The SCESF Report also identifies the widening gap between faculty salaries and the salaries of senior administrators on campus. The sharp rate of increase in the salaries of professional campus administrators reflects a nation-wide trend. The SCESF report notes the disparity in order to highlight the relatively stagnant nature of faculty salaries over the past five years, which is based on the annually announced pool of 3% as reported in the *Almanac* (<http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v61/n32/pdf/esf-long.pdf>). SCESF recommends that in view of recent improvements in the economy, as well as sizable growth in Penn’s financial profile in particular, faculty should be the beneficiaries of several “catch up” years devoted to accelerating the rate of increase. This would place Penn in a more competitive position relative to its peers and facilitate the recruitment and retention of the country’s best faculty.

Diversity and Equity

Enhancing the diversity of the faculty and economic equity in the treatment of women and underrepresented minority faculty was a central focus for the Faculty Senate leadership and for several committees of the Faculty Senate, including the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (SCFDDE) and the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF). SCFDDE and SCESF identified the gender gap in Penn salaries as a major area of concern. In addition, SCFDDE was focused on increasing the representation of women and underrepresented minorities on campus, as identified in the goals of the Action Plan for Faculty Diversity. The Committee also focused on minorities that were not the focus of the Action Plan, such as LGBT faculty. The Committee discussed the results of the Faculty Climate Survey, as well as worked to identify climate issues that were not addressed by the surveys already conducted, such as the experience of LGBT faculty on campus.

Faculty Notification of Benefits and Safety Alerts

Over the course of the past several years, the Tri-Chairs have identified a lack of knowledge among the faculty of the full extent of the benefits the University provides for Penn employees. We also discovered that staff are often better informed about their benefits than faculty. Working with Vice President of Human Resources Jack Heuer and with Vice Provost Anita Allen, we were able to put in place a newsletter from Human Resources

(continued on page 2)

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate (continued from page 1)

es specifically addressing faculty benefits, comparable to the one staff receive. The newsletter, entitled *My HR*, is produced roughly once a month, and contains information of particular utility and interest to faculty.

A second issue of notification relates to faculty receipt of safety information on nights and weekends. The practice had been to notify faculty only during the work week, within business hours, of public safety conditions that arise on campus and the surrounding area. Working with Maureen Rush, vice president for public safety, we supported a change in the notification practices to send faculty evening and weekend alerts. Faculty are permitted to “opt out” in the event they preferred not to receive such notifications. The fact that very few faculty have chosen to opt out of the notifications indicates that faculty appreciate receiving the additional notifications.

Campaign for Community

In March, Provost Vincent Price, in partnership with the Faculty Senate, announced the launch of a joint initiative entitled the *Campaign for Community* (<http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v61/n29/campaign-community.html>). The goal of the Campaign is to challenge ourselves to examine the nature of our community and to consider the differences that sometimes splinter that community. It is intended to promote understanding among individuals with different points of view and to allow us to gain diverse perspectives on controversial topics. It is an honor to participate in this visionary project in conjunction with the Office of the Provost, and I look forward to seeing the project unfold in the months and years ahead.

Arts and Culture at Penn

The Senate Executive Committee is dedicated to supporting both performing and visual arts at Penn, and to promoting the integration of the arts into the academic curriculum. In particular, the Senate is interested in exploring ways that arts and culture can be brought into traditionally non-arts based academic pedagogy. Strategies for accomplishing this goal include object-based learning, coursework centered on museum exhibitions or performing arts events, and familiarizing students and faculty with Penn’s cultural spaces. Karen Beckman, Elliot and Roslyn Jaffe Professor of Cinema and Modern Media, in her presentation to the Senate Executive Committee, identified a variety of ways that faculty at Penn outside the arts can help promote Art and Culture at Penn. These include developing resources to support arts-based course development, promoting cooperative ventures among Penn’s cultural centers or between cultural centers and the schools, promoting a better understanding of arts-based practice as a scholarly activity, and designating a regular slot for presentation of Art and Culture-related issues at Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meetings. The Faculty Senate is broadly supportive of these goals, and looks forward to working with the leaders of Penn’s cultural centers to assist in their realization.

Unfinished Business

Diversity and Equity

The Faculty Senate appreciates the President’s commitment to eliminating the gender gap in faculty salaries, and will look forward to learning more from the Administration in the 2015-2016 academic year about the results of its efforts. The Senate also anticipates the final report of the Action Plan for Faculty Diversity, which has been announced as forthcoming during the upcoming year. The Senate will also continue to focus on climate issues for underrepresented minority faculty and women, as well as to consider expanding the focus on climate to LGBT faculty.

Faculty Compensation

In its ongoing effort to monitor the adequacy of faculty salaries at Penn, especially the adequacy of Penn faculty compensation relative to faculty at peer institutions, the Senate will continue to try to assemble and assess comparative data clarifying the economic status of Penn faculty relative to other institutions. To this end, the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) will consider incorporating information about faculty benefits into its annual economic report, as the economic position of faculty cannot be accurately assessed without understanding the value of faculty benefits. In addition, SCESF, along with the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (SCFDDE), will continue to monitor the gender gap in faculty salaries, and to consider the possible causes of inequity in the economic standing of women faculty.

Conflict of Interest

Having addressed necessary revisions to the patent policy at Penn, the

Senate plans to address the related issue of Penn’s conflict of interest policy. The *Faculty Handbook* rule on Conflicts of Interest has not been revised for many years, and it is presently out of keeping with the Conflict of Interest rule used by Penn’s Administration. In view of the need for clear rules and notice to faculty of their rights and duties, the Faculty Senate will consider attempting to clarify the University’s policies and practices with regard to Conflict of Interest.

Acknowledgements:

This year has been both an extraordinary learning experience for me as Chair, as well as a personal pleasure, largely due to the integrity, wisdom, charm, and good humor of the individuals with whom I have had the privilege to work. I am grateful on behalf of the Faculty Senate, as well as personally, for the regular consultations with President Gutmann and Provost Price. President Gutmann’s creative leadership of the University was constantly unfolding before our eyes, and we appreciated her willingness to engage the Tri-Chairs in such discussions. The Provost was always receptive to faculty concerns and was generous in his willingness to give contrary points of view a fair hearing, as well as to include Faculty Senate leaders in many ongoing initiatives. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to the Vice Provost for Faculty, Anita Allen, for the considerable time and energy she devoted to working with the Faculty Senate and for her thoughtful approach to matters affecting the faculty. Vice Provost for Research, Dawn Bonnell, Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns, and Vice Provost for University Life, Valarie Swain-Cade McCoullum, have all engaged in joint projects with the Faculty Senate this year, in addition to their routine consultation, and we look forward to on-going collaboration with them on these and other matters. We are grateful as well for the regular consultation with Vice Provost for Global Affairs, Zeke Immanuel.

A special thanks to Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli, whose wisdom and good sense, as well as openness to discussion, could be counted on throughout. I have relied heavily on the sound advice and common sense of General Counsel Wendy White. I also wish to express my gratitude to Leslie Kruhly, vice president and university secretary, for working so effectively with the Tri-Chairs with regard to University Council. Vice President for Human Resources Jack Heuer was generous with his time, efforts and energy, and collaboration with him was a pleasure. The effectiveness of Vice President for Public Safety Maureen Rush, in the face of extraordinary challenges, provides an outstanding example of leadership, and I am grateful for her advice and collaboration. In short, this year’s consultation and collaboration between the Faculty Senate and the various university administrative offices has been a rich and fruitful one, and supplies a model of effective shared governance.

Equally important to the accomplishments of the Faculty Senate this year was the leadership of our excellent Committee Chairs, whose reports you will read below. It has been a great pleasure to work with them, and I look forward to seeing the fruits of their labors as their initiatives and recommendations unfold in the future.

It has been a special privilege to work closely with Past-Chair Dwight Jaggard and Chair-Elect Reed Pyeritz during this past year. We have spent many hours together working on Senate business, sharing ideas, and reflecting on issues affecting academic life, as well as laughing together and enjoying one another’s company. I relied greatly on the incisive minds, common sense, and wisdom of both individuals. The memories from this year, as well as the lessons learned, will stay with me far into the future. Vicki Hewitt from the Office of the Faculty Senate and Andreana Thomas were energetic, clear thinking and reliable assistants. I cannot imagine how the Tri-Chairs would have functioned without them.

I would like to extend a special welcome to Laura Perna as the new Chair-Elect, whose expertise in higher education is an exciting addition to the Faculty Senate leadership. We thank the Senate Nominating Committee for having the wisdom to select her. It has been an honor to serve as Chair of the Faculty Senate this year, and I look forward to serving as Past-Chair in the next academic year.



Claire O. Finkelstein
Faculty Senate Chair, 2014-2015

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*.

2014-2015 Specific Charges

1. Discuss Penn's efforts to support student mental health, consulting with Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) representatives and the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare.

2. Review status of proposed changes to the Penn Charter on rules regarding sanctions for un-reportable student offenses.

3. Discuss with representatives from Penn Abroad and International Internship Program how Penn is supporting students who want to participate in summer study abroad programs.

4. Continue discussions with Eric Furda, dean of admissions, about strategies likely to yield applications from students from underrepresented groups.

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 2015-2016. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Accomplishments

1. Discuss Penn's efforts to support student mental health, consulting with Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) representatives and the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare.

The Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare, led by Rebecca Bushnell, professor of English, and Anthony Rostain, professor of psychiatry and pediatrics issued its final report in February, 2015. Report of the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare (*Almanac Supplement*, February 17, 2015).

SCSEP was pleased to receive the Task Force Report and that the University is providing additional resources to CAPS. The committee is also pleased to learn that CAPS offers training for department chairs and faculty leaders. The committee suggested this training be open to all interested faculty, but it is not known whether the resources necessary to accomplish this were available.

The Committee also discussed whether future task forces would be more effective if they covered a broader scope of related issues, since mental health issues are also connected to alcohol abuse and sexual assault. To some members, it seemed inefficient to have separate task forces addressing these interconnected issues.

There are still many outstanding challenges including the ones discussed in the Task Force report. Some of these challenges include:

- Communicating the importance of mental health and wellbeing to student success to the University Community;
- Disseminating information about available resources and supports for student mental health and wellness;
- Educating and training faculty, staff, students, parents, and families about fostering mental health and responding to students who need help;
- Optimizing the resources devoted to CAPS to meet the needs of students.

In view of the Task Force findings as well as the need to improve the psychological health and welfare of all members of the University com-

munity, the Committee proposes the creation of the Faculty Mental Health and Welfare Pilot Program: Faculty Wellness Ambassador Initiative. This program aims to improve:

- Communication of the importance of student mental health and wellbeing,
- Dissemination of information on the available resources,
- Education and training of faculty and staff. In short, this Wellness Ambassador Program consists of training selected faculty members in each of Penn's academic departments (and/or Schools) on issues related to student's mental health and wellbeing.

Selected faculty (and possibly staff) will receive training from the Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) staff in order to become aware of the main issues related to student's psychological wellbeing and the main resources available at Penn. It is important to note that the selected faculty ambassador is neither a mental health counselor nor a substitute for one. Rather, the Wellness Ambassador will serve as a timely resource for faculty members seeking advice on mental health issues as well as available resources and programs available at Penn. The faculty ambassador is also expected to increase awareness in their respective departments and schools of the challenges confronting students that can affect their psychological health and wellbeing. The Committee believes that this would be an efficient model for training faculty. The department chair would nominate a candidate, who would then undertake training and educate other faculty members on these issues. This position would rotate over time (2 to 3 years) so many faculty members would end up receiving the training.

2. Review status of proposed changes to the Penn Charter on rules regarding sanctions for un-reportable student offenses & (ii) summer study abroad programs.

In view of the difficulty getting faculty members to report student conduct issues, the rules on reported offenses have recently been changed. Under the new rule, if a student is found responsible of a student conduct violation at a level that only requires a letter of reprimand, there is not a permanent record kept on file. Faculty members need to be made aware of this student conduct rule change.

The Committee believes that the initial issue regarding changes to the Penn Charter on rules regarding sanctions for un-reportable student offenses is resolved. The main change is that if a student is found responsible of a student conduct violation at a level that only requires a letter of reprimand a permanent record is not kept on file, but the Office of Student Conduct may keep a record of the transgression. This measure should encourage more faculty members to report minor violations. However, it is not clear that faculty members across the University are aware of this student conduct change. SCSEP strongly encourages the Julie Nettleton, director of the Office of Student Conduct, to proactively reach out to faculty members across the University to make them aware of this procedural change. SCSEP also encourages the Office of Student Conduct to reach out to departments and schools across the University to educate them on the resources available and procedures concerning student academic integrity, old and new.

3. Study Abroad

SCSEP remains concerned about the summer study abroad program, particularly with regards to financial aid available to students. It is clear that there are some financial strains associated with the program and SCSEP will work closely with representatives of Penn Global and Student Financial Services in the coming academic year to learn more about the main issues affecting the program.

4. Diversity

The University of Pennsylvania started an action plan for faculty diversity and excellence to encourage the recruitment and benefit the retention of minority faculty, and SCSEP wanted to learn about resources for

(continued on page 4)

Report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) *(continued from page 3)*

underrepresented faculty/post-doc students.

The Committee is pleased to learn that the University is taking concrete steps in diversifying its pre- and post-doctoral programs. This can have a positive effect into the “pipeline problem,” which is often cited as the main problem in hiring more URM faculty members. However, SCSEP feels that these programs will have to be significantly enhanced or scaled-up to accept a greater number of applicants in order to have any significant impact. For example, the pre-doctoral program accepts only three students per year, which is a very small percentage of our graduate student population. Perhaps a partnership can be arranged between the Office of the Provost, and individual schools to provide more fellowships for URM graduate & professional students.

SCSEP has a few suggestions on how to better advertise the URM pre-doctoral program. Some of the suggestions include (i) making a formal announcement about the program to all schools and departments and (ii) allowing schools to suggest candidates to the Office of the Provost (candidates might be better matched with a mentor). Finally, SCSEP will continue to deliberate on mechanisms to increase diversity in the graduate and professional student and faculty populations.

Continue discussion with Eric Furda, Dean of Admissions, involving strategies likely to yield applications from students from underrepresented groups.

Eric Furda, dean of admissions, expressed to the committee that Penn is becoming increasingly more socio-economically diverse since adopting President Amy Gutmann’s initiative to offer all grant and no loan financial aid packages to students with financial need. Compared to our peers, Penn is at the vanguard of enrolling students from lower socio-economic backgrounds, although our number of Pell Grant recipients as a percentage of class size can be misleading since we are the largest institution to have an all-grant no-loan policy. SCSEP is pleased to learn that Penn is faring better in attracting and admitting URM students than in previous years. Yet, the percentage of enrolled URM students at Penn is still relatively low compared to peer institutions. The SCSEP recommends “active or targeted recruiting strategies,” which can produce better yields. Penn could focus in regions of the country with high percentages of URM high-school students such as Puerto Rico, Florida, California, southwestern states (Native Americans), and Hawaii, as well as urban areas. Also, many URM and first-generation students are not aware of Penn’s no-loan

policy. Since financial burden is often the limiting factor for such students to attend college, it is important to better advertise and educate the public on Penn’s the no-loan policy.

5. Consider Charges for Next Year

During the course of all our meetings, the Committee identified areas for continued work in the coming academic year. These topics are as follows:

- Continue conversation with Anita Allen, vice provost for faculty, on how to enhance and increase the number of URM students in our pre-doctoral and post-doctoral programs. It would also be of value to discuss strategies for recruiting and retaining URM faculty members.
- Meet with Zeke Emanuel, vice provost for global initiatives; Amy Gadson, executive director of Penn Global; and a representative from Student Financial Services for a more in-depth discussion on the financial issues regarding the Penn Summer Abroad and Study Abroad programs.
- Continue to get updates from Dean Furda on strategies to attract academically gifted students from under-represented minority groups. It would be important to understand and get to know the resources available to such students once at Penn so that they can thrive and be academically successful.
- Continue to discuss issues related to mental health and psychological well being with Dr. William Alexander and the CAPS staff.

SCSEP Committee Members 2014-2015

Paulo Arratia, School of Engineering & Applied Science/MEAM,
Chair

Anthea Butler, School of Arts & Sciences/Religious Studies

Laura Desimone, Graduate School of Education

Mauro Guillen, Wharton/Management

Sharon Irving, School of Nursing

Jorge Santiago-Aviles, School of Engineering & Applied Science/ESE

Jane Willenbring, School of Arts & Sciences/Earth and Environmental
Science

Ex Officio:

Claire Finkelstein, Law School, *Faculty Senate Chair*

Reed Pyeritz, Perelman School of Medicine/Medicine and Genetics,
Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

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

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.

2014-2015 Specific Charges

1. Consider the implication of faculty leaves on the timing of tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions.

The University of Pennsylvania gives all tenure track faculty the option of an extension of the tenure clock under certain circumstances. This policy has been in place for some time but it may be fair to say that it is not well understood among the general faculty and indeed there may be an undercurrent of unease inhibiting its use. The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission was charged with considering the implication of such tenure clock extensions on tenure, promotion, and reappointment decisions.

The Committee was briefed by Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen on the tenure clock extension policy of the University. The policy governing tenure clock extensions is spelt out in the *Faculty Handbook*. To summarize, such extensions are intended to be value neutral. The relevant section of the *Handbook* instructs deans seeking external evaluations of candidates who have availed of a tenure clock extension to inform external reviewers that such an extension was taken and that the evaluation of the candidate's productivity should be made without factoring in the extra time granted by the extension. The Provost's Office provides a letter template for all schools to use in order to ensure uniformity across the University in such cases where a tenure clock extension was taken.

The Committee found that the policy is spelt out clearly in the *Faculty Handbook*. To ensure conformity with the directives, the Committee suggested reminding deans and department chairs about the tenure clock extension policy in the annual letters asking for the list of tenure-eligible faculty. The Vice Provost for Faculty's office is currently in the process of upgrading workshops offered to new chairs and the Committee suggested that information about the policy be included in these workshops.

2. Continue discussion of Open Learning Initiatives and the emergence of new instructional methodologies.

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 continue the process begun in the previous academic year of gathering information on 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 Nora Lewis (vice dean of professional and liberal education, School of Arts & Sciences).

Director of Open Learning Initiatives Ed Rock described the current state of open learning at Penn. Penn has partnered with Coursera to provide Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). Since the spring of 2012, Penn has completed 38 courses, some of which have run multiple times. There have been close to three million students enrolled in these courses. The Provost's Office issues a Call for Proposals once a year. The Call for Proposals issued in October 2014 expanded the scope to include the development of other digital content for use in on-campus courses in traditional classes as well as in experiments with new instructional methodologies to improve the quality of education by incorporating Structured Active In-class Learning (SAIL). In addition to Coursera, Penn recently decided to join the edX consortium founded by Harvard and MIT, which offers MOOCs on an open source platform.

Professor Rock identified two priorities for Open Learning Initiatives at this time: to find ways to generate income in order to defray the costs of the program, and to encourage faculty members to use digital resources in on-campus classes. In response to international demand for business education in particular, the Wharton School has launched a Business Foundations Specialization with Coursera consisting of four classes and a Capstone project. This has been developed as a pre-Master of Business Administration program, and so will not compete directly with the traditional Wharton MBA program.

Vice Provost for Education Binns weighed in on the possibility of offering selected online degree-granting programs at Penn. This is an area where some of our peer institutions have been very active. In response to Committee concerns about ensuring that the quality of potential programs was up to Penn standards and the effects of such programs on faculty hiring, Dr. Binns affirmed that, just as for any new academic program, a school wishing to initiate an online degree program would have to weigh its costs and benefits in consultation with faculty: any such new program must be voted on by the standing faculty of the school, and then approved by the Provost's Office and the Board of Trustees.

The Committee also heard from Vice Dean of Professional and Liberal Education Nora Lewis on the current mixture of online and regular course offerings from the College of Arts and Sciences. While Penn does not currently have a fully online program, there are at this time a couple of hybrid programs in place; no online undergraduate programs are being envisaged. Ms. Lewis also outlined for the Committee some of the thorny state regulatory thickets that have to be navigated.

These presentations highlighted issues very much in flux. It was clear to the Committee that there is very rapid change and innovation in online course offerings as well as in the adaptations of digital resources in on-campus classes. There is a need to monitor progress in these areas, identify best practices and targets of opportunity, and keep an eye on regulatory issues and burdens.

1. Continue consultation with school leadership regarding faculty tracks.

The consultative process that began in 2012 between the Committee, the Provost's Office, and the various schools on guidelines for appointments, promotions, and caps on numbers in the various faculty tracks was carried forward and the Committee received two significant faculty track change proposals for review.

- The Committee received a faculty track change proposal from the School of Nursing proposing to combine the existing 20% cap on Senior Lecturers and the 20% cap on Advanced Senior Lecturers so that the total number of Senior Lecturers and Advanced Senior Lecturers will not exceed 40%, with no restriction on the number in either category. The goal of this proposal was to provide the School with greater flexibility in the promotion and recruitment of lecturers.

- The Committee received a collaborative proposal from the School of Veterinary Medicine (SVM), the Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM), and the School of Dental Medicine (SDM) proposing changes to the Academic Clinician (AC) faculty track. The major goal of the proposal was to establish the AC track in the Vet School by creating a career path for existing staff vets and furthering the Vet School's clinical education and training mission. The AC track already exists in the Perelman School of Medicine and the School of Dental Medicine. The intent of the proposal was not to reduce the size of the standing faculty in any school but to align the AC track with the changes that were implemented in the Clinical Educator (CE) track in 2013-2014 and to enhance clinical instruction and services. The changes proposed new caps limiting the sizes of AC faculty as a percentage of standing faculty: Dental, 40%; PSOM, 70%; and Vet, 40%.

(continued on page 6)

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) *(continued from page 5)*

After deliberation the Committee voted to approve each of these proposals and present them to the Senate Executive Committee for ratification.

2. *Continue to work on the regular collection and analysis of data on the status of non-standing faculty in undergraduate education.*

The Committee has asked the Provost's Office to keep it apprised of the on-going data collection pertaining to the role of non-standing faculty in teaching of undergraduates. No new data were examined over the course of the academic year and this remains an ongoing issue to be carried over to the next academic cycle.

3. *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 2015-2016. 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 2015-2016.

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.

c. SCOF should begin an examination of the processes governing mandatory reviews and early tenure cases (as also early reviews of other cases where an up-or-down decision is mandated) with a view to making these processes transparent and consistent.

SCOF Membership 2014–2015

Nancy Hanrahan, School of Nursing

Ron Harty, School of Veterinary Medicine

Justin McDaniel, School of Arts & Sciences/Religious Studies

Amy Sepinwall, Wharton/Legal Studies & Business Ethics

Mindy Schuster, Perelman School of Medicine/Infectious Diseases

Tom Sollecito, School of Dental Medicine

Santosh S. Venkatesh, School of Engineering & Applied Science/

Electrical & Systems Engineering, *Chair*

Ex Officio Members:

Claire Finkelstein, Law School, *Faculty Senate Chair*

Reed Pyeritz, Perelman School of Medicine/Medicine and Genetics,
Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

The 2014-2015 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
published the Economic Status of the Faculty Report
in *Almanac* April 28, 2015;
an executive summary as well as the full report
are available online at
www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v61/n32/pdf/042815-supplement-execsummary.pdf

Report of the Faculty Senate Grievance Commission

The Faculty Senate Grievance Commission of the University of Pennsylvania is an independent committee 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 who allege they have been subject to action that is contrary to the University's procedures, policies and/or regulations, that is discriminatory or that is arbitrary. During Academic Year 2014-2015, the commission was composed of Martha A. Q. Curley (Nursing, Past Chair), Steven Sondheimer (Medicine, Chair), and Parvati Ramchandani (Medicine, Chair-Elect).

During the year, the commission was approached by two members

of the faculty: both had been denied promotion.

The first individual filed a formal grievance and spoke with the Chair. The commission pursued additional information from the grievant's department. The commission as a whole reviewed the case in detail, each member reaching an independent conclusion about the merits. The Chair consulted the commission for a consensus after reaching a decision about whether the case should result in a hearing panel. The case was not forwarded to a hearing.

The second case remains outstanding for further consideration in the upcoming year.

—Steven J. Sondheimer, *Grievance Commission Chair, 2014-2015*

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (SCFDDE)

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.

2014-2015 Specific Charges

1. Review Penn's efforts to recruit and retain women and underrepresented minorities to the Penn faculty.
2. Clarify the role of the Office of the Ombudsman for faculty, staff, and students.
3. When available, evaluate the findings from the Faculty Climate Survey.
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 Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity to undertake in academic year 2015-2016. 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 nine times (10/15, 11/5, 12/11, 2/10, 3/3, 3/18, 3/27, 3/31, and 4/14). Invited guests included Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen, Ombudsman Lynn Lees, and Associate Ombudsman Marcia Martinez-Helfman, Director of the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Center (LGBTC) Bob Schoenberg, Professor Robert Carpick (SEAS/MEAM & MSE), and Professor André Dombrowski (SAS/History of Art) from the working group on LGBT faculty diversity.

Accomplishments Specific to Charge

The Committee agreed to focus on all the charges given, but focused primarily on charges (2) and (3). Focus on charge (1) would have been redundant given that the central specific charge of the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity this year was to examine the University's efforts relating to staff diversity and around the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and graduate students.

Report on Charges

Review of the Faculty Climate Survey

The Committee reviewed the results of the Faculty Climate Survey, looking particularly at how women, minority, under-represented minority, and Lesbian Gay Bisexual and Transgendered (LGBT) faculty experienced Penn's faculty climate. This survey was conducted in 2011-2012, but the majority of the results of the survey were made accessible to the Committee only this past year. While we were asked to treat the results of the survey as confidential, the perception of Penn's climate by faculty respondents in these groups is overall consistent with the few questions noted within the Progress Report on Penn's Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence (*Almanac Supplement* February 4, 2014). For example, while 26% of all faculty respondents agreed to some extent with the statement, "I need to work harder than my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar," the percentages for women, minority, underrepresented minority, and LGBT faculty were 40%, 39%, 48%, and 51% respectively (Progress Report, footnote 9). We agree with the Progress Report that these findings are "a fruitful departure point for improving the experience of all faculty at Penn." In this spirit, we recommend that the University now extend its efforts beyond recruitment and retention of women and underrepresented minorities, and begin to address the fact that these groups feel undervalued on campus. We also note that although LGBT faculty are inconsistently included as a group within various mechanisms to address diversity, the survey presents strong evidence that LGBT faculty, like groups consistently included in efforts to support diversity, experience Penn as undervaluing them as scholars.

Recommendations

- a. Progress in this area should be monitored and publicly reported. Faculty Climate Surveys should be conducted at regular intervals, with formal reporting on changes in climate.
- b. Both one-on-one in-depth interviews and focus groups should be conducted within these faculty populations focusing both on causes and possible solutions.
- c. Funding should be provided for pilot programs that offer leadership training and networking opportunities to women and LGBT and underrepresented minority faculty.
- d. Mechanisms should be found to transition exceptional post-doctoral students who are women or members of underrepresented groups into faculty positions at Penn.
- e. LGBT faculty should be explicitly included within all school Diversity Action Plans and in all programs meant to encourage diversity. In particular,
 - i. The administration and school deans should dispel current confusion as to whether LGBT faculty are eligible for Presidential term professorships and the Penn Fellows program. Post-doctoral fellowships explicitly created to foster faculty diversity should be extended to include LGBT applicants.
 - ii. An LGBT faculty support group should be created for faculty across the University.

Clarifying the Role of the Office of the Ombudsman

The Office of the Ombudsman (henceforth, the Ombuds) is an important resource for students, staff, and faculty, but there has been continuing confusion as to the role of the Ombuds and regarding confidentiality, in particular as to whether the Ombuds is an office legally bound by mandatory reporting of sexual harassment cases, and thus not able to offer confidentiality in such cases.

Both sources of confusion have now been resolved. First, the Office of the Ombuds informs clients that it will make every effort to keep their concerns confidential with the exceptions of disclosures of imminent harm or where there is a legal obligation of the University to respond. However, following new federal guidance on requirements for universities in cases of sexual harassment, it has now been established that the Ombuds is legally required to report all cases of sexual harassment, as it now informs all clients. There are a range of offices within the University that can legally maintain confidentiality in such cases, but we note here that none of the individuals who serve in these offices are members of the standing faculty.

Second, the Ombuds is now committed to a dual but limited role of advising and of mediating disputes as a neutral party that is limited to "exploring options for informal resolution of conflicts." The Office sees its role as providing mediation and de-escalation of disputes, as well as providing information and referrals to other resources on campus.

Unfortunately, it appears that this leaves behind part of the original purpose of the Ombuds, as expressed in the first explanation of that office published in the *Almanac* (Volume 18, No. 3, September 14, 1971) by Penn's first Ombuds, Joel Conarroe: "the Ombudsman attempts to secure, where called for, either a satisfactory explanation or expeditious and impartial redress" and "recommends to the appropriate administrator(s) steps that will prevent a recurrence, and follows up to see whether the steps have indeed been taken."

While we applaud this clarity, we are struck that there is now no faculty member in any kind of official role to whom another faculty member can go and expect confidentiality if confronted by behavior that may constitute sexual harassment. We are also struck that the Ombuds office has moved away from the role of serving as a strong advocate of fairness, if not any particular individual, and thus that faculty members in particular are lacking access to such an advocate.

Recommendations

- a. The position of Faculty Advocate should be created through the Faculty Senate, who could indeed work for, in Dr. Conarroe's language, "satisfactory explanation or expeditious and impartial redress," and who could maintain confidentiality in regard to faculty concerns unless legally required to divulge information.
- b. The Tri-Chairs should immediately work toward the creation of such a

(continued on page 8)

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (SCFDDE) *(continued from page 7)*

position, and this Committee, working with the Tri-Chairs, should be charged with developing guidelines for this position.

Recommendations for 2015-2016

1. Revise description of the position of Faculty Advocate, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs and work towards the implementation of this position.

2. Investigate institutionalizing a recurring Faculty Climate Survey and possible mechanisms to institutionalize formal reporting.

3. Review implementation of the School Action Plans for Faculty Diversity, and review the effectiveness of Diversity Search Advisors.

4. Review Penn's efforts to recruit and retain women and underrepresented minorities to the Penn Faculty. Meet early in the year with the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity to coordinate review of diversity across staff and graduate students.

SCFDDE Membership 2014-2015

Regina Austin, Law School
Mauro Calcagno, School of Arts & Sciences/Music
Carmen Guerra, Perelman School of Medicine/General Internal Medicine
Lisa Lewis, School of Nursing/Family and Community Health
Mitch Marcus, School of Engineering & Applied Science/Computer & Information Science, *Chair*
Ignacio Tapia, Perelman School of Medicine/Pediatrics
Tobias Wolff, Law School
Ex officio:
Claire Finkelstein, Law School, *Faculty Senate Chair*
Reed Pyeritz, Perelman School of Medicine/Medicine and Genetics, *Faculty Senate Chair-Elect*

Report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty and the Administration (SCOA)

The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration “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 (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 2014-2015, the Committee was primarily charged with

1. Reviewing Penn’s faculty copyright and patent policies including Coursera contracts and standard patent agreements between faculty members and the administration.

2. Considering *Faculty Handbook* changes to clarify Penn’s Conflict of Interest policy.

3. Clarifying the rights and responsibilities of faculty regarding development and fundraising for centers and institutes.

Our activities this year centered primarily on reviewing and discussing the University’s Patent and Tangible Research Property Policies and Procedures, the implementation of that policy by the Penn Center for Innovation, and the relationship between that Policy and the University’s conflict of interest policies.

Changes to the Patent and Tangible Research Property Policies and Procedures

In 2014, the SCOA met with the Vice Provost for Research to discuss a series of proposed changes to the Patent and Tangible Research Property Policies and Procedures, which is part of the *Faculty Handbook*. After reviewing and discussing the VPR’s suggested changes, the SCOA offered additional amendments to the policy based on our discussions. These amendments were agreed to by the SEC, the VPR, and the Office of General Counsel, and were later approved by the University Trustees.

In general these changes made the Patent Policy more faculty-friendly along a number of dimensions, including altering the distribution formula, clarifying the availability of waivers under aspects of the policy, and enhancing the role of the Faculty-led Patent Policy Appeals Board to help resolve any disputes that might arise under the policy.

The Implementation of the Patent and Tangible Research Property Policies and Procedures

In Spring 2015, the SCOA met with the VPR and the Director of the Penn Center for Innovation (PCI) to discuss how the Patent Policy has been implemented. Based on our conversations, the SCOA agreed that future SCOA charges should include further consideration of whether and how the Faculty Senate should exercise some regular monitoring or oversight of the way the Patent Policy is implemented.

Considering the University’s Conflict of Interest Policies

Throughout the year, the SCOA considered the ways that policies on conflicts of interest affect the implementation of other University policies—most particularly policies related to patents and consulting. After discussion with the VPR, the SCOA determined that there were in fact at least two separate conflict of interest policies that directly impact faculty activities; the terms and provenance of these policies seem to conflict in important ways. The SCOA determined that a major initiative of the 2015-2016 SCOA should be to review and potentially harmonize these policies.

Best Practices in Research Support by Business Affairs Offices

In Spring 2015 the SCOA met with the Associate Vice President for Research concerning the ways that department and school-based Business Affairs offices support faculty research efforts (especially with respect to the grant application process). Based on that conversation, the SCOA recommends more investigation into this issue in 2015-2016.

Possible SCOA Charges for 2015-2016

The SCOA recommends the following charges to be considered for 2015-2016:

1. Review the implementation of the Patent Policy by the PCI and consider recommendations to establish Faculty Senate-based oversight or monitoring of the implementation of the Policy.

2. Review the University’s conflict of interest policies, and consider how to simplify, harmonize, and combine the various policies.

3. Gather more information on the ways that Business Affairs offices support research efforts, and consider ways that the SCOA can assist in enhancing the quality of such support for faculty.

SCOA Membership 2014-20145

Sigal Ben-Porath, Graduate School of Education
Ken Drobatz, School of Veterinary Medicine
Jonathan Korostoff, School of Dental Medicine
Irina Marinov, School of Arts & Sciences/Earth and Environmental Science
Brian Salzberg, Perelman School of Medicine/Neuroscience
Talid Sinno, School of Engineering & Applied Science/ Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering (CBE) Mechanical Engineering & Applied Mechanics
R. Polk Wagner, Law School, *Chair*
Ex Officio Members:
Claire Finkelstein, Law School, *Faculty Senate Chair*
Reed Pyeritz, Perelman School of Medicine/Medicine and Genetics, *Faculty Senate Chair-Elect*