

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

One of my initial objectives this academic year was to organize a meeting of my fellow university faculty senate chairs among our peer institutions. I quickly learned that this was a naïve plan, since few universities have an elected body that represents all of their (what we term) Standing Faculty; some who do also include representatives of their administration as voting members. For other institutions, the faculty senate is the governing body of their union. So I came to respect and embrace the University of Pennsylvania's vision of, and commitment to, shared governance even more than I had previously, having served on our Senate committees and Senate Executive Committee (SEC) for more than a decade. It has been a true honor, not to mention an intellectually and personally satisfying experience, to chair the Senate this year. In this brief report I wish to highlight our accomplishments, document important unfinished business, acknowledge the important contributions of a host of individuals and pass the torch to my successor.

First, I offer a word about structure. The approximately 2,566 members of the tenure track and Clinician-Educator (C-E) track of our 12 schools that comprise the Standing Faculty constitute the Faculty Senate. These individuals elect the 58 members of SEC, which meets monthly to conduct business, such as voting on alterations to the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators (Faculty Handbook)*; hold discussions with senior administrators (including the Provost and the President each term) and consider and approve the reports of the Senate Committees. The Senate is led by its Tri-Chairs, composed of the Chair, the Past Chair (this year Claire Finkelstein of the Law School) and the Chair-Elect (Laura Perna of the Graduate School of Education).

Highlights of Senate Activities

Many of the accomplishments of the Senate this academic year resulted from the work of its committees, whose reports follow in this supplement to this edition of *Almanac*.

Student Mental Health and Wellbeing

Following the leadership of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP), a proposal to establish a cadre of Faculty Ambassadors was approved by SEC and referred to the administration for implementation. As this academic year ends, the first cohort of faculty volunteers is undergoing training so that they can serve as resources for their faculty peers to facilitate discussions around student mental health concerns, in the classrooms and laboratories and on campus generally. We view this as an additional contribution to the on-going efforts of the entire Penn community to both improve the mental health and behavioral climate on campus and identify at an early stage students who are struggling.

Conflict of Interest

The University's several conflict of interest policies, codified in the *Faculty Handbook*, were scrutinized by the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA). No substantive changes were recommended.

Campaign for Community

This initiative, begun with the vision and support of Provost Vincent Price last year, sponsored a series of events that addressed the overarching goal of improving communication among all members of the Penn community around issues that require attention to divergent views and perspectives. The program is co-chaired by the Vice Provost for University Life, the Vice Provost for Education and the Past Chair of the Faculty Senate.

New Academic Support Staff Positions in the School of Arts & Sciences

Over the past few years, various Schools have advanced proposals for alterations to their Associated Faculties and their Academic Support Staffs. These proposals have generally been approved, with occasional modifications, and incorporated in the *Faculty Handbook*. This year, the School of Arts & Sciences (SAS) requested the creation of a Practice Professor track in the Associated Faculty. Additionally, SAS requested both new positions and expansion of others in the Lecturer and Senior Lecturer categories of the Academic Support Staff. The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) carefully reviewed each propos-

al and recommended adoption, which SEC approved. Note was made of the gradual yet persistent increase in the number of non-Standing Faculty who are contributing members of our University professional community.

Unfinished Business

More than half of the individuals at the University of Pennsylvania who teach our students, lead laboratories and conduct research, and care for our patients are not members of the Standing Faculty, and hence they are not members of the Senate and rarely serve on Senate Committees. These members of the Associated Faculty and the Academic Support Staff continue to grow in numbers (reference the work of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission noted above). Additionally, our Emeritus colleagues often eagerly remain engaged in campus activities; however, only members of the Standing Faculty can attain Emeritus status. These various considerations lead to at least two major issues for future examination. *First, what principles and practical issues are governing the evolution of the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania?* This was the subject of our Faculty Symposium this spring, and three university presidents did not have clear answers to these questions for their own institutions, but they agreed that the matter deserves serious study. Because the evolution of the faculty is certainly not novel to Penn, we have the opportunity to begin the development of a strategic vision that will guide our own future and provide assistance for many of our peer universities. *Second, our many colleagues in the Associated Faculty and the Academic Support Staff are not represented by the Senate, and indeed they have no formal representation within the University. Some of the schools at Penn include members of the "non-Standing Faculty" on their own senates, but there is no University-wide forum for their concerns.*

Faculty Compensation

As highlighted in the report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF), when all corrections are made for rank, length of service and so forth, female members of the Standing Faculty continue to be paid somewhat less than their male colleagues. We will continue to work with the administration to rectify this imbalance. The Senate continues to regret that more than half of the Standing Faculty is not represented in the data provided annually to SCESF¹. At a minimum, the Senate needs the opportunity to review the adjusted base salary data for the tenure-track faculty in the clinical departments of the Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM), a cohort of 356 individuals².

Faculty Climate Survey

We look forward to working with the Vice Provost for Faculty in analyzing the full set of data from the questionnaire sent to Standing and Associated Faculty in the fall of this academic year.

University Response to Sexual Harassment and Violence

We continue to be concerned that Penn's definition of "sexual harassment," while perhaps conforming to that expected by the US Department of Justice and the Office of Civil Rights, is so broad as to risk infringing open expression. This is an issue far from unique to Penn, and we look forward to working with the administration and our peer institutions to rectify this imbalance.

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the Tri-Chairs and SEC, I want to thank Provost Vincent Price and President Amy Gutmann for our regular conversations and consultations. We were able to raise for discussion any number of issues and were certain to engage in a frank and open dialogue. While we did not always agree, I assure my Faculty colleagues and the University community that our views were fairly heard.

In preparing for my role as Chair, I met with all of the deans of all of the

¹ See page 6 at <http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v62/n24/pdf/esf-long.pdf>. There are a total of 2,566 Standing Faculty, and data from approximately 1,241 are included in the annual information provided to SCESF. Data from the 974 C-E track faculty from any of the schools have never been received nor reviewed. Therefore data were not received for approximately 351 members of the tenure-track faculty (22%) and 52% of the entire Standing Faculty.

² Datum provided by the PSOM Office of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development on May 4, 2016

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

schools, all the vice provosts, and other senior administrators. Their views and counsel were invaluable as the Tri-Chairs set the agenda for SEC and the Senate committees. Throughout the year, SEC, the Senate committees and/or the Tri-Chairs had the opportunity and privilege to hold discussions with Marianne Achenbach, executive director, PSOM Office of Research Support Services; William Alexander, director of Counseling & Psychological Services; Anita Allen, vice provost for faculty; Peter Ammon, chief investment officer; Dawn Bonnell, vice provost for research; Grace Calhoun, director of athletics and recreation; Dennis DeTurck, dean of the College of Arts & Sciences; Craig Carnaroli, executive vice president; Ezekiel Emanuel, vice provost for global initiatives; Steve Fluharty, dean of the School of Arts & Sciences; Eric Furda, dean of admissions; Deborah Harley, sexual violence investigative officer; Jack Heuer, vice president of human resources; Max King, associate vice provost for health and academic services; Lynn Hollen Lees, University ombudsman; Bruce Lenthall, director of the Center for Teaching and Learning; Marcia Martínez-Helfman, associate ombudsman; Joann Mitchell, vice president for institutional affairs; Tom Murphy, vice president for information technology; Maureen Rush, vice president for public safety; Reed Shuldiner, chair of the University Council Committee on Personnel Benefits; Susan Sproat, executive director for benefits; Valarie Swain-Cade McCoullum, vice provost for University life; John Swartley, associate vice provost for research; Wendy White, general counsel; Beth Winkelstein, vice provost for education; and Stanton Wortham, faculty director of the Online Learning Initiative. Leslie Kruhly, University vice president and secretary, again facilitated the Senate's interactions with the University Council in a most effective manner and with consummate good humor. The willingness of these senior administrators to work with the Faculty Senate at all levels is a great example of Penn's commitment to shared governance.

I am also grateful to the Chairs of our Senate committees this year, whose reports appear below: Regina Austin (SCFDDE); Shyam Balganes (SCAFR); Susan Margulies and Andrea Troxel (SCESF); Brendan O'Leary (Committee on Committees); Martin Pring (*Almanac*); Parvati Ramchandani (Grievance Commission); Harvey Rubin (Nominating Committee); Mindy Schuster (SCOF); Polk Wagner (SCOA); and Michael Weisberg (SCSEP). Their work has resulted in a number of creative and important recommendations that the University can carry forward in pursuit of its mission.

I have been fortunate to work closely with Past Chair Claire Finkelstein, whose institutional knowledge and insight has been invaluable to our work, and Chair-Elect Laura Perna, whose wisdom and discretion will carry the Senate forward during the coming year.

James "Patrick" Walsh came to Penn at the start of the academic year to assume the dual roles of graduate student and Executive Assistant to the Senate. It is beyond fair to say that the Senate Committees, SEC and the Tri-Chairs owe him tremendous thanks for organizing our activities, keeping us on target and (generally) within deadlines and facilitating our accomplishments.

I look forward to serving as Past Chair for the coming academic year.



—Reed E. Pyeritz
William Smilow Professor of Medicine
Faculty Senate Chair, 2015-2016



Faculty Senate Symposium, April 6, 2016, "The Role of Faculty: A Conversation with University Presidents"

From left to right: University of Pennsylvania Senate Chair Reed Pyeritz, University of Virginia President Teresa A. Sullivan, Rutgers–Newark Chancellor Nancy Cantor, Illinois Institute of Technology Former President John L. Anderson.

Report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP)

General Committee Charge

The Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) oversees and advises the Senate 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*.

2015-2016 Specific Charges

1. Assist the Office of the Provost with the implementation of the Mental Health and Wellness Ambassador Pilot Program.

2. Continue to review the University's response to the recommendations of the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare (*Almanac* February 17, 2015).

3. Review University programs that advise undergraduate students and that encourage the faculty mentorship of undergraduate students.

4. Examine University support for initiating and maintaining dual degree programs at Penn.

5. Review the establishment and maintenance of online degree programs at Penn.

Report and Recommendations

Mental Health and Wellness Ambassador Pilot Program

Last academic year, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) recommended that a student-focused Mental Health and Wellness Ambassador Program be piloted. This program was to provide special training for a core group of faculty members in schools and departments so that they could serve as a resource for their colleagues as questions about student mental health (best practices, campus resources, how to handle crises) arose in their academic units.

As of the writing of this report, names of faculty members to be included in the program's pilot have now been solicited, but no definitive announcement of the program's dates, planned training or content have been issued. We hope that members of SCSEP and the SEC, both of which include members with substantial experience in dealing with mental health issues and those who initially conceived of the program, will be consulted as the training is developed, so that they can contribute their expertise.

We recommend that next year's SCSEP continue to assist with and review the implementation and expansion of the Mental Health and Wellness Ambassador program.

University's Response to the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare

The majority of SCSEP's efforts this academic year have gone toward reviewing the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare's recommendations, especially in light of the continuing tragic student deaths by suicide. While there have been some genuine points of progress, the Committee has found that a number of important recommendations remain unimplemented, and that a number of related evidence-based recommendations generated by this Committee and other groups on campus have failed to gain traction. This is a summary of our findings and recommendations.

Penn's most significant positive achievement is the reduction of non-urgent CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services) appointment waiting time. Although it is unclear to us what the average waiting time actually is—we have heard estimates ranging from no waiting time at all (from one senior administrator) to several weeks (from students)—it is clear that there has been substantial reduction from the pre-Task Force

norm. The most common statistic is that there is now a 3-5 day waiting time for non-urgent appointments at CAPS. We commend VPUL and CAPS on this improvement. However, we urge CAPS to continue moving along this trajectory of improvement. The literature suggests, and our experience as educators confirms, that students rarely seek mental health services at the earliest stages of distress and that easy access to services at an early date is extremely important in preventing more significant problems at later dates.

We also applaud CAPS for expanding the "I CARE" training (including the new "essentials" version). In the coming year, we believe that this training should be expanded to accommodate all interested faculty and staff.

One of the simplest recommendations of the Task Force was that a short document be prepared and distributed to all faculty, which outlines mental health warning signs and gives specific advice about what to do or who to call when a student is suspected to be, or demonstrates that he or she is, in distress. Such a document was not distributed to the faculty until the end of spring semester 2016. Moreover, there is no clear faculty landing point on the CAPS webpage that provides this information. We strongly urge CAPS and VPUL to distribute a document with basic information about mental health to all instructors every semester (this is especially important because graduate students and lecturers change each semester). This information should be distributed both in hard-copy and electronic formats. We recommend that the CAPS website be revised immediately so that there is a clear landing point for instructors and that the information given is clear and consistent.

We have learned that CAPS is working on a virtual tour of its facilities. While we think that showing students CAPS facilities is an important part of helping them feel comfortable with using CAPS services, we suspect that this will not be an effective approach. Ideally, students should walk through the doors of CAPS and have the opportunity to meet a CAPS counselor in person. Thus we recommend that a visit to CAPS and Student Health Service (SHS), including meeting a counselor, should be part of the New Student Orientation (NSO) campus tour.

Alternatively, substantial attempts could be made for all new students to meet a CAPS counselor in another location, either in their College House, during NSO, in the classroom or by direct invitation to drop in for a visit. Short of this, a digital presentation of CAPS might better be framed as an upbeat and humorous source of information, something like HUP's recent video about infection control or Southwest Airlines' safety videos, rather than a virtual tour of facilities.

Given that there are many faculty members at Penn who are not only extremely knowledgeable about mental health, but also about effective presentation of health information, we strongly recommend consultation with these individuals. SCSEP would be happy to facilitate that communication.

The Task Force recommended the creation of a 24-hour hotline, which has been implemented as (215) 898-HELP (4357). This line is answered by police dispatchers, whom, we are told, have been specially trained for mental health emergencies. We recommend that the 2016-2017 SCSEP review the training these dispatchers receive, as we have heard reports that many calls to this number end up with Penn Police at students' doors and hence students are reluctant to call this number.

Another theme of the Task Force recommendations is that easy access to mental health services requires multiple entry paths. Based on our inquiry of best practices at peer institutions, and discussions with experts on the faculty, we strongly recommend that a text messaging-based access point be created. This might take the form of SMS access to (215) 898-HELP, but other options should be explored as well.

(continued on page 4)

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

We know that students use text messaging as a primary means of communication; therefore, a text-based crisis intervention service should be considered seriously by CAPS and VPUL. For example, Crisis Text Line (CTL) is used by other universities as an entry point into crisis intervention. A free service, CTL staff trains counselors to answer text messages from students in crisis. In partnership with host universities, this service provides campus-specific text numbers and a cadre of trained counselors. Additionally, research on user data (that is fully anonymized) could help uncover additional needs at the University.

We applaud the Office of Admissions for tagging information related to mental health and passing it along to the relevant parties when students are admitted. We encourage VPUL and CAPS to work with the Office of Admissions to enhance this program. We recognize that some students may be hesitant to disclose mental health condition prior to admission. We therefore recommend that each student accepted to the University be provided with an option to opt-in to some kind of CAPS related support program upon admission. We also recommend that next year's SCSEP review the readmission and support processes for students who have been on medical leave.

SHS now gives every student a brief depression screen during every visit. We believe that this is a step in the right direction towards taking a wellness approach to mental health. We strongly urge CAPS and SHS to use a comprehensive instrument that has been validated for young adult mental health in their screening efforts. Moreover, we recommend that the feasibility of requiring mental health screenings of this type for all students be studied. Mental health screening should be considered in parity with other preventative measures such as vaccinations, which are required to be up-to-date before students can register for classes each semester. Faculty experts should be consulted on both matters, and SCSEP would be pleased to help facilitate this consultation.

Finally, it has become clear to this Committee that seriously addressing the campus' mental health crises will require community-wide cultural change, including a change of social norms and language. From the faculty perspective, this will no doubt involve subtle and not-so-subtle changes in the way faculty talk to students, both one-on-one and in class. Such community changes are difficult but not impossible. When we have raised these issues with CAPS and VPUL, we have been told Penn's partnership with the Jed Foundation is in part intended to address them. While this is no doubt valuable, we once again point out that Penn faculty includes some of the world's top experts in the allied fields of behavioral health care—including but not limited to psychiatry, psychology, educational counseling, nursing, social work and medical ethics—who can spearhead these efforts.

In some areas of student life, there is an environment of toxic competitiveness and stress that places students who may already be at-risk for mental health conditions at higher risk. It is critical that the entire Penn community begin to address this issue, develop strategies for students to recognize and strive toward healthy levels of achievement. This does not mean lowering Penn's standards of excellence, but, rather, developing realistic and healthy models for achievement and wellness.

Cross-disciplinary Education and Dual Degree Programs

SCSEP believes that cross-disciplinary education is essential and increasingly important. At Penn, cross-disciplinary education will often involve cross-school instruction, which is extremely difficult to accomplish. During the course of the academic year, we have spoken to a number of faculty members and several members of the administration about the challenges of initiating and maintaining interdisciplinary, cross-school teaching and degree programs. While there are plenty of cases of success-

ful programs and cross-school initiatives, all of these seem to require substantial negotiation at the administrative level in an ad hoc fashion.

Although there have been successes, we have also repeatedly been told that the Responsibility Center Management (RCM) model, different tenure/promotion standards across the schools and different ways that faculty teaching effort is counted are working against the goal of interdisciplinary instruction. A good example in recent years was the Cross Currents program. This program generated a number of very interesting courses which, from the accounts we have heard, were successful and well-received, but many of these were only taught once because there was not administrative support for their continuation.

SCSEP strongly recommends that the Provost's Office conduct a study of the ways that RCM and accounting of teaching effort impact cross-disciplinary instruction and degree programs. We believe that there could be many potential changes to these systems that would be beneficial for all. Colleagues in departments such as Wharton's OIDD (operations, information and decisions department) and Management could be profitably consulted with about the ways RCM could be made to accommodate such changes.

Outstanding Issues

SCSEP did not review online degree programs this year, pending the findings from the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF). We recommend that SCSEP consider online degree programs next year in consultation with SCOF.

SCSEP did not review University programs that advise undergraduate students and that encourage the faculty mentorship of undergraduate students. We recommend that next year's committee pursue this issue.

Recommendations to 2016-2017 SCSEP

1. Continue to assist with and review the implementation and expansion of the Ambassador program.
2. Continue to review the implementation of Mental Health Task Force recommendations, facilitating contact between faculty experts, VPUL and CAPS.
3. Provide feedback to CAPS as it develops material and a website update for instructors.
4. Review the training that police dispatchers receive to staff the (215) 898-HELP hotline.
5. Invite experts to discuss productive ways of changing social norms and language in the classroom.
6. Study the feasibility of creating a standing mental health oversight board.
7. Work with the Provost's office to study ways that RCM can be reformed to allow for more regular cross-school instruction.
8. Review online degree programs in consultation with SCOF.

SCSEP Membership 2015-2016

Michael Weisberg, School of Arts & Sciences/Philosophy, *Chair*
Paulo Arratia, School of Engineering & Applied Science/MEAM & CBE

Rita Barnard, School of Arts & Sciences/English

Laura Desimone, GSE

Sharon Irving, School of Nursing

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

Dominic Sisti, PSOM/Medical Ethics

Ex officio members:

Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Reed Pyeritz, PSOM/Medicine & Genetics, Faculty Senate Chair

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. and II.A.-D.

2015-2016 Specific Charges

1. To consider any matters affecting faculty size, appointments and tracks brought to the Committee by individual schools.

The Committee received proposals for four faculty track changes from the School of Arts & Sciences Dean, Steven Fluharty, which were approved by the Provost. The principles behind these track change proposals were not to diminish the role of the Standing Faculty but to meet curricular obligations to students. Each of these proposals was discussed separately. SCOF invited several representatives to report to the Committee on these matters. Dean Fluharty also briefed the Committee and answered questions about each of the proposals.

The proposals were:

A. *To create in the SAS Associated Faculty a "Practice Professor" track, which already exists in other schools.*

The Committee discussed the need for teachers who are distinguished in their fields and have unique, real-life skills. A Practice Professor track within SAS would be of benefit, similar to the tracks already in place in the Schools of Design, Engineering, Nursing and Wharton. The Committee voted unanimously to approve it.

B. *To create the new positions "Lecturer in Critical Writing" and "Senior Lecturer in Critical Writing" in the Academic Support Staff.*

All undergraduate students are required to take a Critical Writing course. These courses are taught by non-Standing Faculty. The newly created track intends to find faculty members who are skilled at meeting the specific educational needs of the students. People in this track currently retain the position of full-time "Lecturer A" for up to three years which can be extended to six years by the permission of the Provost's Staff Conference. The more seasoned and effective teachers would then become Lecturers in Critical Writing, as decided by a committee assembled by the dean, with an initial three-year appointment, followed by a review at the end of the second year and the ability to continue in the role for up to eight years (and subsequent five-year terms) pending approval of the Provost's Staff Conference. The total number of lecturers cannot exceed 15% of the Standing Faculty in SAS. The Committee spoke with Al Filreis, who runs the Critical Writing program, for clarification. He supported the proposal as a way to decrease turnover amongst the non-Standing Faculty, meet educational needs and provide stability to the program. The Committee also heard from Senior Lecturers in the Critical Writing program who also supported the proposal.

C. *To raise the cap on the number of "Lecturers in Foreign Languages" from 6% to 15% of the Standing Faculty and the number of "Senior Lecturers in Foreign Languages" from 3% to 8% of the Standing Faculty.*

Since regular full-time lecturers can only serve three years, the Lecturer in Foreign Language (LFL) was developed to increase the continuity of foreign language teaching. In the current system, it was noted that an Instructor first becomes a "Lecturer A" and the best become LFLs. The Senior LFL position was created to recognize outstanding performance and enhance continuity in the position. It was noted that SAS is already over its limit of 30 LFLs. In 2015 there were 40 Lecturer A positions, 38 LFLs and eight Senior LFLs. SCOF invited Linda Chance, associate chair and associate professor of Japanese language & literature, who coordi-

nates LFLs in the department, as well as Reyes Caballo-Márquez, LFL and coordinator of Spanish intermediate, to join their discussions. It was acknowledged that there is an unmet need for teaching foreign language to freshman undergraduates. Several areas of concern were raised among the group: The Standing Faculty in the Romance languages is overwhelmingly male and the LFLs are more often female. Compensation and work level for LFLs should be reviewed over time. LFLs were not often invited to faculty meetings, and they may have offices at remote geographic locations from the rest of the department, thereby diminishing the potential for interpersonal interactions and eroding job satisfaction.

D. *To raise the cap on the number of "Senior Lecturers" in the Academic Support Staff from 3% to 8% of the Standing Faculty.*

E. *Summary of Track Change Proposals and Committee Recommendations*

The Committee voted unanimously to approve each of these proposals and present them to the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) for ratification. Several concerns were raised that will require future review and discussion:

- Courses at the 200-level and above should be taught exclusively by Standing Faculty.

- Concern was raised that non-Standing Faculty do not have an adequate voice in regards to the nature and terms of their employment. Efforts to increase inclusion and interaction with other members of the faculty and to avoid a "two-tiered" system should be investigated.

- The Committee recommends that gender composition and compensation in the tracks be reviewed regularly.

- The Faculty Senate should regularly review the composition of the teaching faculty and consider how these and future proposals may affect education of undergraduates.

2. To continue to evaluate innovations in classroom-based instruction (e.g., "flipped" classrooms).

The Committee invited Beth Winkelstein, vice provost for education, and discussed Structured Active In-class Learning (SAIL, or flipped classroom) initiatives at Penn. Math, physics and bioengineering sophomore courses incorporating active learning are in their fourth year at Penn. The Center for Teaching and Learning continues to assist in reviewing the progress of these initiatives and engage in controlled studies of learning methods. There are currently 26 courses identified as active learning courses. There are \$5,000 course development grants for faculty to help develop new courses around active learning. Investment in classrooms that are best suited for active learning is ongoing.

3. To review open learning initiatives and Penn's contractual arrangements with faculty.

The Committee invited Stanton Wortham, faculty director of the Online Learning Initiative (OLI), to a SCOF meeting. He reviewed OLI's progress: there are 83 courses currently on Coursera and edX. Several charge a fee and result in a certification. Financial aid is available. Most of the specializations have been launched through Wharton, and they have generated substantial revenue for the school. Wharton has no plans to offer online degree programs. At Penn, a doctorate in clinical social work is offered online, but it is completely synchronous with in-person learning, complete with class lectures that are live-streamed online. A second online-only degree is proposed in collaboration among PSOM, Law and Wharton in health policy behavioral economics. Profit from these courses is shared by the involved faculty. Seed money is available to Penn faculty for development of a massive open online course (MOOC). The Provost remains committed to growing and developing faculty engagement in MOOCs.

(continued on page 6)

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

Recommended Charges for the 2016-2017 Academic Year

The Committee recommends the following charges be given to SCOF in the coming academic year:

1. To review the results of the current and future track changes with regard to numbers, courses taught, gender composition and student evaluations.
2. To continue discussions about ways to improve retention, job satisfaction and inclusiveness among the non-Standing Faculty.
3. To continue to review active learning initiatives and to receive updates on the ongoing research at Penn that tracks students who are randomized to traditional versus active learning classroom.
4. To continue to review open learning initiatives and new courses and degrees, faculty initiatives, faculty satisfaction and details of faculty contractual arrangements.
5. To review the results of the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey in collaboration with other Senate Committees as appropriate.

SCOF Membership 2015-2016

Mindy Schuster, PSOM/Infectious Diseases, *Chair*
Lea Ann Matura, School of Nursing
Justin McDaniel, School of Arts & Sciences/Religious Studies
Amy Sepinwall, Wharton School
Tom Sollecito, School of Dental Medicine
Lyle Ungar, School of Engineering & Applied Science/CIS
Ex officio members:
Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Reed Pyeritz, PSOM/Medicine & Genetics, Faculty Senate Chair

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

The 2015-2016 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty
published the Economic Status of the Faculty Report
in *Almanac* February 23, 2016;

An Executive Summary: <http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v62/n24/pdf/022316-supplement-execsummary.pdf>
as well as the Full Report: <http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v62/n24/pdf/esf-long.pdf>
are both available online.

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 procedures, policies and/or regulations, that is discriminatory or that is arbitrary. During the Academic Year 2015-2016, the Commission was composed of Steven Sondheimer (Medicine, Past Chair), Parvati Ramchandani, (Medicine, Chair) and Mitch Marcus (Computer & Information Science, Chair-Elect).

During the year, the Commission reviewed a grievance by a faculty member regarding denial of tenure. A letter of inquiry about the matter was sent to the Past Chair in April 2015 but the formal grievance was filed with the current Chair only in September 2015.

The Commission pursued additional information from the grievant's department and met with multiple faculty leaders in the grievant's department on separate occasions as well as University leadership and representatives from the Vice Provost's office. The Commission as a whole reviewed the case in detail, each member reaching an independent conclusion about the merits. Multiple meetings of the entire Commission were held, where all aspects of the case were carefully considered, with thoughtful consideration of the impact of the Commission's deliberations on the faculty member. Additional discussion was held with representatives from the Ombudsman's Office as well. After these multiple meetings, the Commission reached a consensus that the case did not have enough merit to warrant forwarding to a hearing.

—Parvati Ramchandani, Grievance Commission Chair, 2015-2016

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 make recommendations for implementation.

2015-2016 Specific Charges

1. Finalize proposal for the Faculty Advocate position, in consultation with the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs, and work towards the implementation of this position.
2. Review the Faculty Climate Survey process.
3. Assess the Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence and review any final report from the Office of the Provost.
4. Review Penn's efforts to recruit and retain women and underrepresented minorities to the Penn Faculty.
5. Review the Provost's Program for Postdoctoral Fellowships for Academic Diversity.

Report of Activities

The Committee met a total of eight times (10/6/15, 10/20/15, 11/3/15, 12/1/15, 1/19/16, 2/2/16, 3/15/16 and 4/5/16). Invited guests included Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen, Ombudsman Lynn Lees, Associate Ombudsman Marcia Martínez-Helfman, members of the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity (UC-CDE), Chair and Professor Ezekiel Dixon-Roman (SP2), Professor Herman Beavers (English and Africana studies), Professor Chenoa Flippen (sociology), graduate PhD student Justine Seick (Nursing), junior undergraduate student Juana Granados (urban studies) and freshman undergraduate student Hannah Sweeney (political science).

Report on Charges

Finalize Proposal for a Faculty Advocate Position

Over the course of the year, the Committee refined its proposal for the appointment of a Faculty Advocate as it continued to hold discussions with Ombudsman Lynn Lees and Associate Ombudsman Marcia Martínez-Helfman about the role of the Office of the Ombudsman. The proposal for a Faculty Advocate was primarily a response to the fact that the Office of the Ombudsman had been designated an "agent of notice" and therefore could not have maintained confidentiality in cases in which a faculty member sought supportive resources in connection with violation of policies against sexual violence and sexual harassment. As a result, there was no office staffed by Standing Faculty to which faculty could report such behavior in confidence. In February, the Committee learned of a change in policy; the Office of the Ombudsman will be a confidential resource for the reporting of sexual violence and harassment by faculty, subject to the proviso that the Office may share information with University administrators "as [is] appropriate to keep members of the University community safe."

The Office of the Ombudsman shared with the Committee a handout that is given to prospective recipients of its services that clearly addresses the Office's stance with regard to confidentiality, neutrality and independence in general. It was agreed that the Office of the Ombudsman will post such information on its website so that prospective users of its services will have it available to them before they visit.

The proposal for the appointment of a Faculty Advocate was also a response to Committee's perception that the Office of the Ombudsman "has moved away from the role of serving as a strong advocate of fairness." As originally described by the first person to hold the position of Ombudsman, upon receiving complaints, it was the role of the Ombudsman to attempt "to secure, where called for, either a satisfactory explanation or expeditious and impartial redress." In addition, "the Ombudsman [was to] recommend to the appropriate administrator(s) steps that will prevent a recurrence, and [was to] follow up to see whether the steps have indeed been taken." Indeed, according to the *Faculty Handbook*, the Ombudsman is "[t]o recommend changes in the policies and procedures of the University. . . to assure that, first, members of the University are treated fairly and with respect, and, second, that the principles on which decisions are based are sound." The Committee envisioned that the Faculty Advocate would foster fairness

by functioning like an advisor, mentor or supporter at the University level.

The Office of the Ombudsman maintains that it advocates for fairness, although perhaps not as aggressively and publicly as some might prefer, by promoting mediation and dialogue with regard to individual disputes. Moreover, it negotiates with administrators, not at the behest of any single individual, to affect changes in procedures and policies that generate grievances on a recurring basis, but this can take time. Users of the Office's services are encouraged to return if their complaints are not sufficiently addressed. It appears then that the Office may act on information supplied by complainants but does not follow up with them if their complaints result in changes in procedures and policy. The Committee is concerned that a practice that does not provide feedback to complainants may not be sufficiently fair, respectful and transparent.

Recommendations:

- a. The Committee should hold its proposal for the appointment by the Faculty Senate of a Faculty Advocate in abeyance pending further discussions with the Office of the Ombudsman.
- b. The Committee should review the information that is disclosed to potential users of the services of the Office of the Ombudsman to assure that it clearly and fully explains the role of the Office of the Ombudsman.

Review Climate Survey Process

Early in the year, the Committee met with Vice Provost Allen about the distribution of the results of the 2011 Faculty Climate Survey. We noted that we had not received the results for underrepresented minorities until we asked for them and then only received hard copies hand delivered to us. We were told that a new survey would be undertaken before the end of the calendar year and that the results would be distributed more promptly and with greater thoroughness.

At a subsequent meeting with the chairs of several Senate committees, Vice Provost Allen and Stacey Lopez, associate vice president for institutional research and analysis, discussed the data needed by the committees from both the 2011 and 2015 surveys. The data is expected to be disseminated during summer 2016.

Recommendations:

- a. The Committee should evaluate the findings of the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey, particularly as they relate to women, minorities, underrepresented minorities and LGBTQA faculty, and identify areas of concern.
- b. The Administration should develop a comprehensive list of recommendations for changes in policies that address concerns identified by the Survey data and consider the need and viability of following up the survey with one-on-one, in-depth interviews and focus groups.

Review the five-year Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence 2011-2016

This is the final-year of the five year plan. The results will be finalized in November 2016 and a report issued in February 2017. Vice Provost Allen shared some of the preliminary data compiled as of November 2015. The Committee was interested in details regarding sources of financial support (particularly new sources of funding) and the relationship between expenditures and specific activities and gains in diversity.

The Committee investigated interim reporting of diversity data by conducting an informal survey at the school level. We sought to identify the extent to which schools provided information about their diversity efforts on their websites and/or otherwise shared information about progress in faculty hiring and other diversity initiatives with faculty and students. We found that most schools addressed the issue of diversity online but that the extent of the disclosures varied widely in topics covered and detail.

Recommendations:

- a. The Committee should review and evaluate the Final Report of the five-year Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence.
- b. The Administration should promote mechanisms that increase transparency and reporting of school-level initiatives, expenditures and gains regarding diversity on an on-going basis.
- c. The Administration should consider sponsoring a University-wide symposium for the entire Penn community to showcase successful and innovative diversity programming at Penn, in order to stimulate a wider range of schools to create similar programs.

(continued on page 8)

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

d. The Administration should monitor the development and implementation of the University's plans for increasing diversity at the department and program level.

Review Penn's Efforts to Recruit and Retain Diverse Faculty

SCFDDE met with representatives from the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity. Included in the session were two students who self-identify as first-generation and/or low-income college students. This year, UC-CDE has focused on the experiences of first-generation and low-income students. SCFDDE saw the joint meeting as an opportunity to consider what the faculty can do to promote diversity, rather than what is being done to increase its diversity. The joint committees engaged in a probing dialogue about class-based bias in the classroom, the impact of lapses in faculty advising for first-generation and low-income students, and the importance of mentoring and role modeling by faculty who were themselves first-generation and low-income students.

Recommendation:

The Committee should maintain communication between the SCFDDE and UC-CDE and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.

Review Impact of Postdoctoral Fellowships on Diversity Hiring

The Committee discussed with Vice Provost Allen 2015 data regarding the status of the diverse postdoc cohorts entering Penn between AY2009 and AY2013. The data show that few of the diverse postdocs who remained at Penn became members of the Standing Faculty. They were statistically more likely to join the Academic Support Staff. The data did not focus specifically on the Postdoctoral Fellowships for Academic Diversity.

Recommendation:

The Administration should determine how postdoctoral fellowships might be structured to most effectively contribute to the diversity of the Standing Faculty.

Recommendations for 2016-2017

1. The Committee should review the information that is disclosed to potential users of the services of the Office of the Ombudsman to assure that it clearly and fully explains the role of the Office of the Ombudsman.

2. The Committee should evaluate the findings of the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey, particularly as they relate to women, minorities, underrepresented minorities and LGBTQA faculty, and identify areas of concern.

3. The Committee should review and evaluate the Final Report of the five year Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence.

4. The Committee should maintain communication between the SCFDDE and UC-CDE and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.

5. The Committee should examine the relationship between the Faculty Senate and the non-Standing Faculty (including the Emeritus Faculty, Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff) and how these groups might participate in an inclusive model of shared governance within the University.

SCFDDE Membership 2015-2016

Regina Austin, Law School, *Chair*

Rita Barnard, School of Arts & Sciences/English

Kristen Feemster, PSOM/Pediatrics

Carmen Guerra, PSOM/General Internal Medicine

Lisa Lewis, School of Nursing/Family & Community Health

Mitch Marcus, School of Engineering & Applied Science/Computer & Information Science

Ex officio members:

Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Reed Pyeritz, PSOM/Medicine & Genetics, Faculty Senate Chair

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

2015-2016 Specific Charges

Our specific charges this year were to:

1. *Review Faculty Handbook conflict of interest (COI) policy in consultation with the Office of the Provost.*

SCOA reviewed the COI policies in the *Faculty Handbook*—there are two, one that generally applies to faculty members, and one that is specific to research conflicts of interest. SCOA met with Vice Provost for Research (VPR) Dawn Bonnell on multiple occasions and recommended changes to the *Handbook* that would cross-reference the COI policies for clarity. SCOA did not recommend any substantive changes to the COI policies, though SCOA did recommend that the Faculty Senate be consulted for faculty membership for the Conflict of Interest Standing Committee (CISC), which is charged with reviewing matters that arise under the *Handbook's* Conflict of Interest Policy Related to Research. As of spring 2016, the VPR offers the Faculty Senate an annual opportunity to recommend members of the Standing Faculty for consideration of membership on the CISC.

SCOA recommends that annual review of the implementation of the *Faculty Handbook* Conflict of Interest Policies be charged to future SCOA teams.

2. *Review the implementation of recent changes to the Patent Policy and the faculty responses thereto.*

SCOA met with VPR Bonnell and Penn Center for Innovation (PCI) Director John Swartley to review the implementation of the Patent Policy, especially in light of the changes recommended by SCOA in 2014-2015. Our review indicated that the policy was working appropriately without major problems to-date and that no additional changes were needed at this time.

SCOA recommends that future annual reviews be charged to SCOA teams, and that PCI provide SCOA with specific data concerning the operation of the patent policy as part of that review.

3. *Review University efforts to assist faculty in obtaining external research funding.*

SCOA met with several administrators on the question of how and whether support for grant application and administration varies across University units. SCOA's preliminary investigation revealed a wide vari-

ance in the quality and level of front-line grant support, though specific data was hard to come by. SCOA met with Marianne Achenbach, executive director of the Perelman School of Medicine Office of Research Support Services, whose grant support services may serve as a model for cross-school standardization. SCOA believes that this issue needs substantial further study and possibly a targeted survey or other data collection effort. An effort to develop and distribute "best practices" or "minimal standards of support" documentation should be undertaken to help guide University administrators in allocating resources for grant support.

SCOA recommends that this charge remain for future consideration during 2016-2017.

4. *Review the scope and effectiveness of the University Research Foundation's funding process.*

SCOA did not examine this issue during 2015-2016. SCOA recommends that this charge remain for future consideration during 2016-2017.

Additional Proposed Charges for 2016-2017

1. Evaluate the University's "mass email" policies and recommend whether the Faculty Senate should have the ability to communicate to the Standing Faculty through "mass email" distributions.

2. Review Penn's standard contracts for Massive Open Online Courses and evaluate faculty satisfaction with these contracts. SCOA should include contracts from individual Penn schools (e.g., Wharton) in its review.

3. Review the way in which development and fundraising offices—both University-wide and in individual schools—work with faculty members to help identify potential funding sources.

SCOA Membership 2015-2016

R. Polk Wagner, Law School, *Chair*

Ken Drobatz, School of Veterinary Medicine

Irina Marinov, School of Arts & Sciences/Earth & Environmental Science

Pamela Sankar, PSOM/Biomedical Ethics

Talid Sinno, School of Engineering & Applied Science/CBE & MEAM

Santosh Venkatesh, School of Engineering & Applied Science/ESE

Ex officio members:

Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Reed Pyeritz, PSOM/Medicine & Genetics, Faculty Senate Chair