

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

Knowledge is the lifeblood of the University. Its progression may be marked from the crucible of its creation to its dissemination to a larger public, and, finally, to the use to which it is put. But it is no secret that in a time of a great burgeoning of knowledge we also face in the body politic a growing unease about epistemology, the provenance of knowledge, and the course of the Academy. "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness, it was the epoch of belief, it was the epoch of incredulity, it was the season of Light, it was the season of Darkness, it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair, we had everything before us, we had nothing before us, we were all going direct to Heaven, we were all going direct the other way—in short, the period was so far like the present period, that some of its noisiest authorities insisted on its being received, for good or for evil, in the superlative degree of comparison only." So begins Dickens in *A Tale of Two Cities*. And he could well have been talking about the modern day.

Penn's Teach-In of 2018

In response to these troubled times, Penn's Faculty Senate convened an Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Academic Engagement charged with organising a pan-University Teach-In on the *Production, Dissemination, and Use of Knowledge*. The goal was to bring into sharp focus, from a wide range of interdisciplinary perspectives spanning the University, the rigours of knowledge creation in this fluid century, the particular challenges of communicating it in an era of social media and fake news, and the dramatic and exaggerated impacts it can have in a time of instantaneous communication. This was a monumental University-wide effort which culminated in a series of Teach-In events held between March 18 and March 22, at sites all across campus. This faculty-led effort spanned all 12 of Penn's schools in a collective endeavour of the University community: staff, students and faculty throughout the University collaborated to put together more than 30 events on topics that are not merely of academic interest but resonate with societal concerns. All the events were open to the public, and the civic community, schools, local organisations and policy makers were invited to participate in this campus-wide dialogue for our times.

The Faculty Senate had not undertaken anything on this scale in half a century. Indeed, the only previous Teach-In at Penn was organised on March 4, 1969, in a time of social unrest over civil rights and the Vietnam War. Now in the 21st century, the proximate causes of the divide are different, but the signs of division are clear in the increased partisanship and distrust of the Academy evinced in portions of the body politic. In a similar period of disquiet, a half-century after the campus teach-ins during the social unrest of the 1960s, it seemed entirely appropriate that we recreate a community dialogue on knowledge and the role of the Academy to renew the compact between society and the University: the advancement of knowledge in the halls of academe in the service of the improvement of the human condition.

The Teach-In was a year in the making. It launched on Sunday, March 18, with a Penn Museum event titled "How Do We Know? An Afternoon of Learning and Fun in the Penn Museum," sauntered through a splendidly illustrated "Walk Through Time: An Evolution Donut Crawl" down Locust Walk (with credit to the talents of students from the School of Design), and concluded with a student-led event featuring a wide-ranging discussion among students, faculty, and administration on "Purposes of a Penn Education: Student Perspectives" on Thursday, March 22. Sandwiched in between were about 30 events: race, vaccines, gun violence, AI biotechnology, fake news and imagery, lessons from the past, monuments and symbolism, bioethics, sexual harassment, immigration, climate change, data refuge stories, evolution, K-12 education, wellness and health, gender, and leadership were among the topics that were explored in a wide variety of formats, all intended to facilitate a respectful dialogue on topics that can be deeply contentious but take centre stage in the modern day.

The excitement was palpable and the events were richly subscribed to, Mother Nature's whimsy and the incidental snowstorm and University closure notwithstanding. In round numbers, approximately 1,500 people attended the various events, many from the civic community outside Penn. And more than ten times that number followed it online and on social media. The events have been archived on the dedicated Teach-In website, <http://www.upenn.edu/teachin/>.

Quo vadis? For the time being we will bask in the glow of a collective effort when the University came together and invited the community to participate in a dialogue on the Academy and Society. But assuredly, we would like the conversation to continue, and discussions of next steps will carry into the following year.

Highlights of Ongoing Senate Activities

The extraordinary nature of the Teach-In led me to begin with a description of what led to this collective enterprise and provide a full accounting of it, especially as it does not fall within the purview of the standing Senate Committees. Most of the progress made on a multitude of fronts takes place as a result of the work of these committees.

First, I offer a traditional word on structure. The Faculty Senate is comprised of the roughly 2,500 members of the tenure track and Clinician-Educator faculty tracks in the 12 schools at Penn. They are represented by the 58-member Senate Executive Committee (SEC) which is led by its Tri-Chairs composed of the Chair, Past-Chair, and Chair-Elect. The Senate Executive Committee meets monthly, holds discussions with senior administration and other members of the University community, and oversees the activities of the various standing Senate Committees. These include the Senate Committees on: Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP); Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDE); Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF); Faculty and the Administration (SCOA); and Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF). Reports on their activities follow in this *Almanac* supplement. I will provide a précis of some of the highlights of the ongoing activity in these Committees, leaving details for the reports.

Mental and behavioural wellness on campus. These issues continue to be central on campus. A Campus Conversation among community members was followed by the launch of Penn's Campaign for Wellness in November. In the best traditions of shared governance, SCSEP continues to work with the Provost on these issues.

Factors impacting faculty inclusion. There appears to be a lack of clarity among Associate Professors concerning performance standards for promotion to Full Professor. SCFDDE is working with the Vice Provost for Faculty on improving mentorship and monitoring the career progress of Associate Professors.

Diversity and equity. In conjunction with the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity, the Campaign for Community and the Penn Forum of Women Faculty, SCFDDE convened the second "Listening to Diversity" forum. These collaborative efforts are slated to continue.

Online learning initiatives. A bewildering range of new online courses, certificates and full degree programmes are making their way into the online ethos. Several of Penn's schools are active in this space. The situation is very volatile, and SCOF and SCOA are monitoring these new programmes with a view to understanding the impact of these new modalities on residential programmes, and issues related to intellectual property, contracts, and incentives.

Associated faculty and academic support staff. There are a variety of ranks in these faculty tracks across the 12 schools of the University. In ongoing work, SCOF is working with the office of the Vice Provost for Faculty to quantify the makeup of the various tracks and their teaching responsibilities, and to identify best practices for representative governance.

Faculty salaries and benefits. SCESF provides an annual analysis of the economic status of the Standing Faculty at Penn, excluding tenure-line faculty from the Perelman School of Medicine (except for those in basic sciences). The analyses provided this year tackled comparisons of base salary at Penn with those at peer institutions, a consideration anew of the gender disparity in faculty salaries at Penn, and faculty benefits. Going forward, SCESF hopes to expand the analysis to incorporate data for total compensation into its analysis of the gender gap and to expand the analysis of salary to all Standing Faculty at Penn.

Acknowledgements

As has been mentioned by others, a long list of acknowledgements excites more attention by its omissions than by its inclusions. I will be brief and not attempt to list everyone who has enriched my life over the past year and to whom I am indebted. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I thank President Amy Gutmann and Provost Wendell Pritchett for our regular meetings and consultations and for the assistance provided by their offices. I very much appreciate their openness and candour, and their willingness to listen to faculty perspectives. Penn's long history of shared governance continues to thrive because of the commitment of administration to these institutions. And I must add a particular and heartfelt appreciation for their encouragement and support of the Teach-In. A campus-wide enterprise on the scale that we had envisaged would not have been feasible without the support, nay enthusiasm, of senior administration.

(continued on page 3)

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

Background

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

2017-2018 Specific Charges

1. Engage with the Offices of the Vice Provost for University Life and Vice Provost for Education on the development of a repository of mental health and wellness resources at Penn and review how information on available resources is communicated to students and faculty.
2. Explore the nature and prevalence of substance abuse on campus and related educational programming and explore the possibility of developing a University Recovery Center and housing.
3. Explore the nature and prevalence of sexual violence on campus and related institutional policies, practices and resources.
4. Assess the impact of the Faculty Wellness Ambassador program.
5. Support the planning and execution of "Knowledge Teach-In" events.

Report & Recommendations

Since September 2015, SCSEP has studied the problem of mental and behavioral wellness on campus. We have met with administrators, clinicians and leaders from mental health treatment, peer and advocacy groups. These included national organizations such as ActiveMinds, local groups like PennReflect, service providers under the supervision of VPUL and VPE and members of the Mental Health Task Force. The committee found all of these stakeholders to be fully dedicated to serving individuals with mental illness and improving wellness across the University. SCSEP's fact-finding process also revealed that there are scant outcomes data about the many activities and programs across campus. This is in contrast to other universities where mental health programming has been systematically studied and, in some cases, the results published. Moreover, our findings indicate that, because of fragmented communication, there exist programmatic redundancies and missed opportunities.

The following recommendations reflect these and other findings.

Organizational Restructure: Our overall findings led us to recommend in an interim report (dated March 22, 2018) to the Provost that Penn should have a single designated leader, who possesses strong managerial capabilities and who has expertise in the field of mental-health care. This person should then execute program evaluations, determine appropriate new structures, information flow and personnel to be set up at Penn. As of the writing of this report, this recommendation is being implemented.

Communications: Students needs to be educated on which resource should be called on for a psychiatric problem of their own or for a peer. Faculty, staff and administrators likewise need to be educated on who to contact when they see a student or a colleague in crisis or experiencing distress and what the signs for the problem might be. To improve access for students experiencing a mental- health issue, all online resources should include a simple set of questions to direct users to relevant resources or emergency contact information.

Social Media: There is now a body of evidence that excessive social media use is correlated with mental-health issues. We recommend a University-wide educational initiative (which might include a University-wide course) on the impact of social media on individual health, personal identity, the nature of knowledge and truth and the community.

Development of Wellness Courses and Curricular Content: The SCSEP recommends the development of both stand-alone courses on wellness and courses that integrate topics related to mental health and wellness. The SCSEP recommends the development of a portfolio of University-wide courses that focus on wellness and may include courses that challenge students to develop, implement and evaluate wellness programs at Penn. Community outreach and service-learning courses with a focus on mental health and wellness should be offered. Additionally, a set of discipline-specific courses that include wellness components should be designed and offered. SCSEP recommends a mechanism—perhaps emanating from the Provost's office—for supporting course development and realigning teaching incentives for the cadre of faculty who volunteer to advance this goal.

Inventory of Existing Wellness Courses: SCSEP recommends identifying courses that are potentially supportive of student well-being—e.g. community-engagement ("academically based community service") courses—and measure the efficacy of these academic activities for supporting and improving student well-being. Create a page on the Wellness website where testimonial evidence from student engagement is provided.

Recovery Center & Recovery Housing: SCSEP recommends the new AVP for Wellness study the needs for both a campus recovery center and housing opportunities for students in recovery and develop a set of recommendations for enhancing support of students who are in recovery.

Clubs and Wellness: Student membership in organizations and clubs is highly competitive, often leading to distress and disappointment. In addition to adhering to all anti-hazing regulations, SCSEP recommends all University clubs systematically examine how and if their missions and requirements for acceptance and membership reflect the fundamental values of the University as a community of mutual respect.

Recommendations to 2018-2019 SCSEP

1. Assist and provide faculty consultation to the Associate Vice Provost for Wellness.
2. Provide oversight and recommendations regarding the progress of the wellness initiatives, specifically advancing the integration of wellness across all University curricula.
3. Hold an open meeting for students to provide input and continue to seek student input on existing programs, CAPS and new wellness initiatives whenever possible.
4. Evaluate approaches and strategies for pass/fail grade system in first semester of freshman year.

2017-2018 SCSEP Members

Dominic Sisti, PSOM/Medical Ethics & Health Policy, *Chair*
Sunday Akintoye, Dental School
José Bauermeister, Nursing
Laura Desimone, GSE
Sharon Irving, Nursing
Carol Muller, SAS/Music
Karen Redrobe, SAS/History of Art
Ralph Rosen, SAS/Classical Studies
Jorge Santiago-Aviles, SEAS/ESE

Ex Officio:

Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Anita Summers, Wharton, PASEF non-voting member
Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair

Executive Summary of the SCESF Report on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Introduction

This Executive Summary provides an overview of the 2018 Report of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF). The Report relies on 1) a series of tables that summarize faculty base compensation provided by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and 2) benefits information collected by SCESF from other institutions. The 2018 Report covers Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, from July 1, 2016 through June 30, 2017. This Executive Summary presents key observations and issues of concern. The full 2018 Report, including all publicly viewable tables provided to the Committee by the Vice Provost's office, is published on the *Almanac* website at https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/medial/SCESF_full_report_FY2017.pdf

Key Observations and Concerns

a. *Our report is limited to base salary, an incomplete measure of compensation.* The report uses base salary as a measure of compensation, but faculty at Penn earn additional compensation for a variety of activities, including supplemental teaching, summer research and department administrative tasks. The magnitude and distribution of these additional sources of compensation are unknown to the Committee, and thus, our report is limited in its ability to fully characterize compensation differences across schools and on the basis of demographic categories, such as gender.

b. *Data omit segments of the Standing Faculty. Data provided to SCESF covers all members of the tenure-line faculty in most schools of the University.* As in past years, however, these data exclude tenure-line faculty from the Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM), except those in basic science departments. Also excluded are roughly 1,000 Standing Faculty-Clinician-Educators from the schools of Medicine, Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine and Nursing. Because SCESF's mission is to report on the economic status of all Standing Faculty at Penn, we note that our report is incomplete.

c. *Base salaries of Full and Associate Professors continue to lose ground compared to those at peer institutions.* In recent years, Penn has targeted a 3% annual increase in base salary for faculty continuing in rank. Data provided by the Vice Provost's Office confirm a median increase of 3% across schools and ranks, albeit with considerable variation. Consistent with previous SCESF reports, when salaries at Penn are compared to those at comparable research institutions, base salaries of full and associate professors are losing ground relative to peers, whereas base salaries of assistant professors remain near the top of the field.

d. *Gender gap in faculty base salaries persists.* After statistically adjusting for differences in field, rank and time in rank, a gap of approximately 1.5% in base salary persists between male and female Penn faculty at all ranks. A gap of this size has been observed by SCESF for several years.

e. *Penn provides excellent benefits for dependent education, but retirement contributions lag.* Compared to peer institutions, Penn offers excellent benefits for dependent education that benefit a select group of faculty each year. The current 9% limit on contributions to retirement accounts, however, is lower than the 10% norm at peer institutions.

Recommendations

SCESF offers the following recommendations to the Office of the Vice Provost.

a. *Provide data summarizing total compensation.* Base salary permits SCESF to compare salaries at Penn to those at other universities. Base salary does not, however, provide an adequate foundation for assuring gender equity in compensation. SCESF looks forward to continued discussion with the Vice Provost for Faculty about the best ways to address this important issue.

b. *Provide data for all Standing Faculty.* The pursuit of these data has been an ongoing concern of SCESF, as the Committee seeks to represent the interests of all Standing Faculty at Penn.

c. *Correct the downward relative trend in salaries of associate and full professors.* SCESF believes that Penn will benefit from correcting this trend by relieving some faculty of the need to seek outside offers in order to demonstrate their market value to Penn, and by not losing some of its faculty members to other institutions.

d. *Reduce the gender gap in base salary.* SCESF appreciates that the Office of the Vice Provost shares this objective and looks forward to continued progress.

e. *Increase the limit on benefits matching contributions to 10%.* Such an increase would bring Penn into alignment with competing institutions and better prepare faculty for retirement.

2017-2018 SCESF Members

Robert Stine, Wharton/Statistics, *Chair*
Kenneth Burdett, SAS/Economics
Robert Ghrist, SAS/Mathematics
Blanca Himes, PSOM/Biostatistics, Epidemiology, & Informatics
Sarah Kagan, Nursing
Iouri Manovskii, SAS/Economics

Ex Officio:

Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair
Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Past Chair
Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

The Committee gratefully acknowledges the essential and invaluable assistance of J. Patrick Walsh of the Office of the Faculty Senate and the additional information provided in response to SCESF requests by the offices of the Provost, Institutional Research and Analysis and Human Resources. The Committee also notes that this year's report directly benefited from presentation and analysis described in reports from previous years and, where appropriate, some previous text is included here.

The full report of the 2018 SCESF including numerous Tables and the Responses from the Administration can be found online at

https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/medial/SCESF_full_report_FY2017.pdf

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

(continued from page 1)

The work of the Senate largely takes place within the various Senate Committees. They have done yeoman's work this year and generated insights and recommendations on difficult issues. The chairs of these Committees have provided exceptional leadership and it has been my great privilege to work with them: Neill Epperson (Ad Hoc Senate Committee on Academic Engagement), Dominic Sisti (SCSEP), Carmen Guerra (SCFDDE), Thomas Sollecito (SCOF), Pamela Sankar (SCOA), Robert Stine (SCESF), Vivian Gadsden (Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility), and Martin Pring (Senate Committee on Publication Policy for *Almanac*). A large number of University administrators and faculty materially assisted these committees by providing information and expert advice. To each of them I extend my thanks.

Senate Executive Assistant J. Patrick Walsh provided seamless support to each of the Senate Committees. He has my heartfelt thanks for handling varied demands with equanimity and efficiency, especially during the hurly-burly of the production of the Teach-In. Without him we would have

founded at the first shoal.

I have had the very great good fortune to work closely with Past Chair Laura Perna and Chair-Elect Jennifer Pinto-Martin over the last year. Their wisdom and sagacity, coupled with the most even of temperaments, kept the ship afloat. It has been my signal privilege and pleasure to have served with them.

Let me close by extending a warm welcome to the incoming Chair-Elect Steve Kimbrough and by saying that I am very much looking forward to helping Jennifer Pinto-Martin over the coming year as I transition to Past Chair.

Santosh S. Venkatesh

—Santosh S. Venkatesh,
Professor, Electrical and Systems Engineering (ESE),
School of Engineering and Applied Science
Faculty Senate Chair, 2017-2018

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

General Committee Charge

The Committee oversees and advises the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) 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.

Specific Charges and Steps Taken to Address Them

1. *Continue to review the impact of online learning initiatives, particularly emerging online certificate and degree programs, on residential learning at Penn.*

The Online Learning Initiative (OLI) has been charged with presenting a strategic plan for online learning to the Provost and the Vice Provost of Education. SCOF was offered an opportunity to provide OLI leadership, including Peter Decherney, Faculty Director of OLI, and Rebecca Stein, Executive Director of OLI, with feedback as it developed its plan.

The introduction of massive open online courses (MOOCs) in 2012 brought new opportunities to the online teaching environment. Penn was an early partner with Coursera and has developed new content on that platform since 2012. All 12 of Penn's schools have held at least one MOOC. A list of MOOCs can be found on OLI's website.

Beyond stand-alone MOOCs, SCOF is aware of the following online learning opportunities that exist at Penn: a "Robotics MicroMasters®" non-credit certificate from SEAS; a "Computer Science Essentials for Software Development" non-credit certificate program from SEAS; a number of certificate and specialization programs from Wharton Online; and other opportunities such as for-credit classes through LPS. Penn currently has two full online degrees, an online Doctorate in Clinical Social Work from the School of Social Policy and Practice and a Masters in Health Care Innovation from the Perelman School of Medicine.

OLI's current role is to support schools' faculty and staff in their thinking about the business infrastructure and staffing needs for online learning initiatives within their schools and to coordinate community-building across schools that have similar objectives. As of Fall 2017, OLI does not currently have the capacity to assist schools with instructional design needs, however, OLI leadership noted that OLI does provide instructional design support for MOOCs and provides assistance to schools that create for-credit online courses. OLI is developing a toolkit for use by those instructional design online officers that includes guidance and support for policies, budgets, timelines, platforms, marketing, contracts, quality assurance, faculty support, student orientation and program assessment. Visit the OLI website: onlinelearning.upenn.edu, for more information.

During its discussions, SCOF members suggested that OLI consider an approach similar to one taken by the Penn Center for Innovation (PCI), in which PCI embeds a PCI staff member in a school for a short period to support related developmental initiatives. Questions also arose regarding (1) whether any research has been done on the effectiveness of online learning at Penn or elsewhere and (2) faculty involvement in online learning (with respect to tenure and promotion, compensation, etc.).

In short, SCOF provides the following suggestions as Penn clarifies the institutional vision in becoming a leader in the world of online learning:

- Identify online learning outcomes and metrics for measurement;
- Identify the methods being used to evaluate effectiveness with respect to various online learning programs;
- Provide models that assess the impact of online learning on residential learning;
- Provide data on faculty load, capacity and ownership: clarify the role/outcome of faculty efforts in online teaching initiatives; and
- Provide central support to schools for instructional design in online learning initiatives.

SCOF recommends that this charge be carried over to the 2018-2019 academic year.

2. *Identify best practices for giving representation to Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty within departments, schools and the University.*

In order to identify the best practices for giving representation to Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty within departments, schools and the University, SCOF engaged in meaningful discussions regarding the actual role of Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff at Penn. SCOF assembled a chart that illustrated the various Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff titles in each school along with the caps in size for each category (if listed); unfortunately, this information was dated as sourced exclusively from the current *Faculty Handbook*. Furthermore, it was noted that no information on the size of "Lecturer" groups is available. After thoughtful deliberation, SCOF is drafting a memo to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty on the makeup of these various groups so that the quantifiable information can be compared to similar data gathered in 2011. Moreover, since data collection in the past did not fully capture the qualitative work done by each track in each school, SCOF is interested in better understanding who is being taught by the Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff and what actual activity is being performed by each faculty type to help determine how they contribute to the academic mission in each of the schools.

It was further determined that this level of granularity would possibly need to be collected from each individual school in order to better understand the background from which schools make requests for changes in their faculty makeups while identifying best practices for Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff representative governance. Stanford's ongoing Provost's Committee on Lecturers provides an example of how Penn could examine its Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff roles.

SCOF members also agreed that it should identify tools that can aid in tracking faculty numbers and roles in order to avoid delays in future questions requiring data review.

SCOF recommends that this charge be carried over to the 2018-2019 academic year and recommends that it continue to reference the Appendix of SCOF's 2016-2017 report as it continues its work.

3. *Initiate a review of teaching by Standing Faculty, Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty with respect to freshmen and sophomore courses.*

This topic was tabled for the year as discussions clarified the need for more elementary knowledge regarding the composition and responsibilities of all faculty.

4. *Identify mechanisms for better communication and collaboration between school-based faculty governing bodies and the University Faculty Senate.*

This topic was tabled for the year and recommends that the charge be carried over to the 2018-2019 academic year.

5. *Consider any matters affecting faculty size, appointments and tracks brought to the committee by individual schools.*

Professor Matthew Hartley, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the Graduate School of Education (GSE), summarized a proposal to extend the term for Senior Lecturers in GSE from three years to five years. At GSE, Senior Lecturers play an important role in the instructional capacity of its programs. Senior Lecturers come to GSE after having served in other GSE roles or as experienced professionals in other industries. A Senior Lecturer must serve as a Lecturer for at least five years prior to promotion to Senior Lecturer. GSE has never exceeded its maximum allowance of 10 Senior Lecturers on the Academic Support Staff at a given time. The proposed extension would bring GSE in line with Senior Lecturer terms in other professional schools. There are renewal limits for Lecturers at which point

(continued on page 5)

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

(continued from page 4)

they are promoted to Senior Lecturer or released. Academic Support Staff at GSE have never before transitioned into Standing Faculty roles. Lecturers and adjunct faculty serve essentially the same roles at GSE, though Lecturers tend to work full time.

On a call to question, the proposal was approved unanimously and forwarded to the Senate Executive Committee for final review, which also unanimously approved the proposal. The proposal was forwarded to the Office of the Provost along with the endorsement of the Faculty Senate.

6. Support the planning and execution of “Knowledge Teach-In” events.

SCOF advised and supported the efforts of the Faculty Senate in convening a series of “Teach-In” events at various campus sites March 18-22, 2018. Approximately three dozen events were planned that involved contributions from students, faculty and staff, across all three schools and multiple centers. It encouraged the use of the Teach-In website as a repository for materials and video generated by Teach-In events. SCOF members and Faculty Senate leadership also engaged representatives from the Penn Libraries and Online Learning on strategies for memorializing Teach-In content on online learning platforms and other archives.

Proposed Charges for SCOF in 2018-2019

1. Continue to review the impact of online learning initiatives, particularly emerging online certificate and degree programs, on residential learning at Penn.

2. Continue to work toward identifying best practices for giving representation to Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty within de-

partments, schools and the University.

3. Continue a review of teaching by Standing Faculty, Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty with respect to freshmen and sophomore courses.

4. Identify mechanisms for better communication and collaboration between school-based faculty governing bodies and the University Faculty Senate.

5. Consider any matters affecting faculty size, appointments and tracks brought to the committee by individual schools

2017-2018 SCOF Members

Thomas P. Sollecito, Dental School, *Chair*
Yianni Augoustides, PSOM/Anesthesiology
William Beltran, Vet School
Eric Feldman, Law School
Lea Ann Matura, Nursing School
Susan Sauvé Meyer, SAS/Philosophy
Mindy Schuster, PSOM/Infectious Diseases
Bruce Shenker, Dental School
Lyle Ungar, SEAS/CIS

Ex Officio Members:

Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing School, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Gino Segre, SAS/Physics, PASEF non-voting member
Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair

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 Academic Year 2017-2018, the commission was composed of Mitchell Marcus (SEAS/Computer and Information Science, Past Chair) James Palmer (PSOM/Otorhinolaryngology, Chair) and Martha Farah (SAS/Psychology, Chair-Elect).

During the year, the commission was approached by seven members of the faculty, five of whom had been denied tenure, and the other two had difficulties with administrative agreements. In all cases, the individual had several initial discussions with the Chair of the Commission about the grievance process, the circumstances of the case, discussions about clarifying the issues that might be grounds for a grievance and discussions about the procedures for submitting a formal grievance letter. In two tenure cases, the faculty member decided not to pursue a formal grievance after discussion. In three tenure cases, the faculty member has submitted a formal grievance which is undergoing evaluation. In the final two cases, the faculty members filed a formal grievance, and resolution was reached with appropriate administration entities.

—James Palmer (Grievance Commission Chair, 2017-2018)

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

General Committee Charge

The 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 (e.g., the Patent Policy) 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.I., I.-K., I.E. III., V., VI.

Specific Charges and Steps Taken to Address Them

1. *Systematically review existing and new modalities for online education at Penn, with particular focus on issues related to intellectual property, contracts and incentives for faculty to develop such courses.*

SCOA continued its review of issues related to faculty involvement in online learning courses including compensation and intellectual property (IP) rights. To better understand these issues, SCOA invited Peter Decherney, faculty director, and Rebecca Stein, executive director, from Penn’s Online Learning Initiative (OLI) to discuss these issues with Committee members. Individual SCOA members also reported to the Committee on separate discussions they held with directors of two online learning programs and with staff from the University’s Office of the General Counsel who have helped to develop contracts for online learning courses. These conversations suggest that substantial agreement exists about IP conditions that pertain to online learning courses. However, they also highlighted that, as a result of the de-centralized management of online learning at Penn, there is no comprehensive account of practices across schools, making any conclusion about how schools handle these issues provisional at best.

To address this gap, SCOA designed and piloted a survey distributed to staff involved in online learning at Penn’s 12 schools. We received answers from nine schools, two of which informed SCOA that they offered no online courses during the periods surveyed. Three did not respond in time for publication. A revised survey will be administered next year with clearer and more detailed questions. Considering the preliminary nature of these results, we report them in summary form rather than specific to each school.

Survey Question	Summary of responses
How many contracts did your school issue to faculty to develop online learning courses in 2016-2017?	Based on the 7 schools that issued ≥ 1 contract, the number of contracts issued varied from 2 to 40, and the median issued was 6.
How many contracts did your school issue to faculty to develop online learning courses for 2017-2018?	Based on the 5 schools that issued ≥ 1 contract, the number of contracts issued varied from 3 to 30, and the median 10.
Was compensation calculated the same for all contracts or differently for some contracts?	Most schools reported that they calculate compensation differently across contracts. Bases for differences included faculty rank, standing and status, and course type (e.g., credit or non-credit).
Is compensation paid as part of regular salary or in addition to regular salary?	All schools paid faculty in addition to salary. Some also paid as part of regular salary.
Approximately how much are faculty paid to develop a semester-equivalent course.	Across schools, faculty receive an amount ranging between \$2,500 and \$25,000 to develop an online course. Within schools, payment varies based on faculty rank or standing, course type, and required effort.
Do faculty receive additional compensation if an online course runs again, and if so how much?	Almost all schools pay additional compensation if a course runs again. Across schools compensation varied. In 2016-2017, from \$1,500 to \$15,000; in 2017-2018, from \$1,500 to \$5,000. Within schools the amount paid varied primarily by course type (e.g., MOOC versus for-credit). Two schools specified that in the event a course receives net revenue, faculty receive additional payment calculated as a percent of the net revenue.
What conditions do contracts from your school contain with regard to intellectual property (IP)?	Most schools report following guidelines set by OLI, described as giving all rights to the University for actual video or audio recordings created for the course while the faculty member retains rights to the material’s intellectual content. Some schools reference other policies and one school reported that it does not address IP. Two schools highlighted provisions concerning material presented by guest lecturers and exemption for recorded material of their own creation that faculty incorporate.
Does your school approve online courses using the same process as residential courses?	Most schools report using a different process to approve online courses. None provided detail.

SCOA highlights four findings.

1) Concern that IP policies related to online learning activities varied across schools motivated this SCOA charge. Thus, the finding that most schools report adhering to OLI’s policy should mitigate SCOA’s concern.

2) The disparity in payments across reporting schools (the highest paid and the lowest differ by a factor of ten) calls for scrutiny, especially in light of concerns discussed in (3) below.

3) Policies at two schools allowing faculty to receive additional payment calculated as a percent of the net revenue of a course, in the event the course receives net revenue, raised concerns. Specifically SCOA members considered the implications of introducing an idea that faculty are paid based on the number of students they enroll; whether, for example, this might create a conflict of interest for faculty and whether creating a system with differential incentives might have unanticipated consequences on the University’s academic mission.

4) Reasons for approving online courses by a different process than residential courses should be identified, and implications of potentially allowing for the development of two sets of standards and goals should be examined.

2. Review the provisions for faculty engagement with the various innovation hubs at Penn.

SCOA reviewed available material about several of Penn’s innovation hubs and met with Dawn Bonnell, Vice Provost of Research (VPR), who oversees several of these efforts. SCOA also inquired to the Tri-chairs about the scope of this charge, in particular whether it was meant to apply broadly to any activity at Penn that might be considered innovative or only to those recognized as part of the President’s innovation program, such as the Pennovation Center and the Penn Center for Innovation (PCI). SCOA received clarification that the charge addresses only the latter.

Recommendation: SCOA recommends that this charge be carried over to the 2018-2019 academic year and that it be revised to clarify the intended goals of the charge.

3. Review the availability of childcare services on campus and any related policies.

Regarding the charge to review childcare services on campus and related policies, SCOA first reviewed charges concerning day care services of other University committees, including University Council Committee on Personnel Benefits (CPB) and Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) and exchanged emails about those charges with SCESF Chair Robert Stine. Noting overlap of committee charges to examine childcare services, SCOA membership voted to continue to focus its attention on policies regarding using grant funds to reimburse childcare expenses associated with research-related travel. See Charge #4.

4. Continue to review existing and emerging policies regarding use of grant funds to reimburse childcare expenses associated with travel for the funded project.

Through exchanges with the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs and with the office of Anita Allen, Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF), SCOA continued to monitor efforts to create a fund to reimburse expenses incurred by faculty for dependent care expenses associated with faculty travel for scholarly activities. SCOA reviewed the proposed language for the policy and asked for clarification about to which groups of dependents it applied (only young children or also other dependents who might need supervised care) and whether and how the policy had been disseminated to faculty. SCOA learned that the VPF is working with the Penn Forum for Women to establish a Provost-based fund to support the program and that these efforts could result in a forthcoming new program. At the time of publication, SCOA was unaware of a resolution about to whom the policy will apply (both whether it applies only to faculty or to post-doctoral fellows as well and whether care only for young children is reimbursable or also expenses for other dependents).

Recommendation: SCOA should continue to review progress on the establishment of this fund, in particular policies governing who may use it and for what purposes and plans for its dissemination to eligible Penn employees.

5. Support the planning and execution of Knowledge Teach-In events.

SCOA advised and supported the efforts of the Faculty Senate in convening a series of “Teach-In” events at various campus sites from March 18-22, 2018. A summary of the Teach-In can be found in other reports contained within this supplement.

(continued on page 7)

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration

(continued from page 6)

Other Business

FIAP/Terminal Sabbatical

SCOA was asked to review the terms governing terminal sabbaticals and Faculty Income Allowance Plan (FIAP) payments in response to concerns about variation in practices across schools. SCOA members spoke with staff at SAS, PSOM and SEAS as well as with staff in central administration about their handling of requests for terminal sabbaticals and about the procedures for calculating FIAP payments.

SCOA determined that practices were consistent across schools; however, the fact that some schools offer 9-month contracts to faculty and others offer 12-month contracts created some confusion. This was clarified by noting that FIAP calculations are based on “average academic base salary” for each school, regardless over what time period it is paid. FIAP does not take into account any supplemental salary that faculty on 9-month or 12-month contracts might arrange. Thus, reliance on “average academic base salary” is what creates consistency across schools in calculating FIAP payments.

Based on these inquiries SCOA membership notes, however, that understanding of the terminal sabbatical and FIAP payments policies among faculty and staff is uneven and suggests that more attention be paid to publicizing and explaining these policies.

University Research Foundation

SCOA continued its review of the scope and effectiveness of the University Research Foundation’s (URF) funding process that it began in 2016-2017. The review was prompted by the question of whether the URF would maintain a commitment to its original objectives, which include funding junior faculty and supporting projects in disciplines where external funding is difficult, in light of changes to the program to increase support for emerging research areas likely to be in the running for external support (e.g., precision medicine). A review of the distribution of funding decisions during 2016-2017 suggested that SCOA’s concern was misplaced. A

review of 2017-2018 funding decisions suggests the same, at least insofar as the proportion of grants awarded in research areas less likely to get external funding exceeded the proportion awarded to faculty in areas that are commonly awarded external funding, such as in engineering and health-related schools (i.e., Dental, Medicine, Nursing, Veterinary). Questions remain concerning the value, as opposed to the number, of grants awarded to faculty across various disciplines. SCOA should continue its review of the scope and effectiveness of the URF funding process during future years.

Proposed Charges for SCOA in 2018-2019

1. Systematically review existing and new modalities for online education at Penn, with particular focus on issues related to approval process, intellectual property, contracts, and incentives for faculty to develop and maintain such courses.

2. Continue to review existing and emerging policies regarding use of grant funds to reimburse childcare expenses associated with travel for the funded project.

3. Continue to monitor the processes used for assessing faculty conflicts of interest.

4. Continue to review the distribution of University Research Foundation awards by research area.

2017-2018 SCOA Membership

Pamela Sankar, PSOM, *Chair*

Joel Bennett, PSOM/Medicine

Ken Drobotz, Vet School

Al Filreis, SAS/English

Katherine Margo, PSOM/Family Medicine

Talid Sinno, SEAS/CBE & MEAM

Peter Struck, SAS/Classical Studies

Ex-officio members:

Marshall Meyer, Wharton, PASEF non-voting member

Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing School, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair

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.

2017-2018 Specific Charges for the SCFDDE

1. Continue investigating the factors impacting faculty inclusion, with particular attention to issues of promotion and satisfaction in the associate professor rank and recruitment, retention, promotion and climate for women and minorities.

2. Follow up on the December 2016 Diversity Forum and continue to identify opportunities for cross-school collaboration to advance diversity and inclusion goals.

3. Review the operation of the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity.

4. Maintain communication between the SCFDDE and the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.

5. Support the planning and execution of Knowledge Teach-In events.

Report of Activities

The Committee met a total of six times (September 20, November 3, January 26, February 2, March 2, and April 6). Invited guests included Anita Allen, Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF); Sam Starks, Executive Director, Office of Affirmative Action (OAA); Joann Mitchell, Senior Vice President for Institutional Affairs & Chief Diversity Officer; and Ezekiel Dixon-Román, Chair of the University Council on Diversity and Equity.

Report on Charges

1. *Continue investigating the factors impacting faculty inclusion, with particular attention to issues of promotion and satisfaction in the associate professor rank and recruitment, retention, promotion and climate for women and minorities.*

The Committee obtained information from several schools on the status of Associate Professors with tenure and the policies and initiatives concerning their successful progression towards the rank of (full) Professor¹.

Its review of the information revealed two issues to which the University administration should give consideration. First, the committee observed a perceived lack of clarity among Associate Professors concerning the performance standards for promotion to Professor. Wide variation across schools in terms of performance expectations were detected. The Committee observed that the number of Associate Professors who do not get promoted to Professor is larger in some schools than in others. There continues to be a number of faculty who reach retirement without being promoted to Professor. Second, there exists a perception among recently-promoted Associate Professors that the new administrative burdens they have to shoulder is quite taxing on their ability to continue doing research with a view to being promoted to Professor. Most importantly, women and members of underrepresented minority groups report fielding many requests to serve on committees, run programs and engage in other types of administration work.

Recommendations:

a. The Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty should put in place a uniform system for gathering information about the career progress of Associate Professors, and about successful policies implemented at the

¹ The Law School does not promote faculty to the Associate rank; instead, faculty are promoted to Professor at the time they receive tenure.

(continued on page 8)

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

(continued from page 7)

School level that might be adopted by other schools as best practices.

b. Schools should be encouraged to establish systems to monitor the career progress of Associate Professors, the administrative demands placed on them and the mentorship systems needed to ensure their career success.

c. The Committee recommends that the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty considers the possibility of establishing a “soft clock” for Associate Professors whereby progress towards promotion to Professor is tracked and evaluated by the academic departments at some fixed intervals of time. For example, departments could internally evaluate Associate Professors every five years, counting from the year of promotion to tenure. This soft clock would help ensure that enough attention is given to the career progress of Associate Professors and that policies and procedures are reexamined if there is evidence of any counterproductive actions or trends that might interfere with their career progression.

2. *Follow up on the December 2016 Diversity Forum and continue to identify opportunities for cross-school collaboration to advance diversity and inclusion goals.*

The Office of VPF Allen is currently planning a Diversity Summit in collaboration with Ruth Zambrana, professor of women’s studies at the University of Maryland, who is leading research with funding from a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation grant that will lead to the creation of a guidebook for best practices on faculty inclusion. Deans, Provosts and Presidents from 20 peer institutions will be invited to Penn to discuss best practices on faculty diversity and inclusion. Leadership from Penn, including Anita Allen, Joann Mitchell, Sam Starks, Nursing Dean Antonia Villarruel, PSOM Vice Dean Eve Higginbotham, Dean John Jackson and Professors Lisa Lewis, Stephanie Abbhul and Carmen Guerra among others are helping to plan the event to be held at the Inn at Penn on September 20-21, 2018 (starting at 4 p.m. on the first day). A draft agenda will be available soon, and President Gutmann has been invited to provide an opening address. Professor Guerra recommends that SCFDDE convene a Penn-exclusive event during the week following (perhaps as a luncheon) to discuss the lessons-learned and how they can be applied to work of the various schools.

Recommendation: Consider forming an implementation team with representatives from all the schools as well as SCFDDE and the University Council to help identify and implement best practices learned at the summit to advance Penn’s diversity and inclusion goals.

3. *Review the operation of the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity.*

The committee met with Mr. Starks and learned that OAA’s major responsibilities include obligations to uphold Penn’s nondiscrimination statement that Penn is a welcoming and inclusive community. Until Mr. Starks began in the role in 2010, OAA was viewed as a compliance office for affirmative action, but its scope has broadened to investigate complaints of harassment and discrimination against protected classes (women, minorities, persons with disabilities and veterans). Mr. Starks’s role has since broadened to include working with the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity as its administrative liaison and with the Office of Faculty Affairs in coordinating the generation and maintenance of school-based Faculty Diversity Action Plans. Penn’s decentralization gives cause for OAA to serve as a single unifying entity for distributing information and best practices across centers. OAA works with schools and centers to provide guidance on equal opportunity issues, recruiting faculty and staff and working with staff and labor relations as needed.

OAA hosted a “listening tour” in spring 2017 that served as a safe space for Penn members to voice concerns about equity on campus. This year, the “Listening to Diversity” event was held on March 14. At this most recent event, several excellent suggestions were raised by the audience. The full recommendations will be communicated by Ezekiel Dixon-Román, associate professor in the School of Social Policy and Practice (SP2) and Mr. Starks. However, two example recommendations that were voiced at the event were increasing awareness about how bias impacts grading and evaluation (e.g. Horn and Halo Effects) and how to manage this bias as well as expanding DSA training to help search committees identify and recruit LGBT faculty.

Recommendations:

a. Continue to support a once yearly “Listening to Diversity” event to allow the University-wide community an opportunity to express and listen to concerns related to diversity and inclusion as raised by the real-time internal and external environmental factors and changes.

b. Consider expanding the training of DSAs to include how to better identify and recruit LGBT faculty.

c. Consider sponsoring a workshop to raise awareness about how bias impacts grading and evaluation (e.g. Horn and Halo Effects) and how to manage this bias.

4. *Maintain communication between the SCFDDE and the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.*

The committee met with Dr. Dixon-Román, who has served as Chair of the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity (UC-CDE) for the past five years. The committee addresses issues related to equity of gender, race, class, religion, political affiliation and other matters for all members of the Penn community. Currently, it is examining equity issues for LGBT faculty, staff and students and for international faculty, staff and students. During spring 2017 and again in spring 2018, UC-CDE, SCFDDE, and the Penn Forum for Women Faculty (PFWF) jointly conducted public listening forums and learned that equity challenges are complex and require in-depth research so that the committee can be responsive to a variety of needs.

Recommendation: Continue collaboration efforts between SCFDDE, UC-CDE on matters of mutual concern.

5. *Support the planning and execution of Knowledge Teach-In events.*

The committee advised and supported the efforts of the Faculty Senate in convening a series of “Teach-In” events at various campus sites from March 18-22, 2018. Approximately three dozen events were planned that involved contributions from students, faculty and staff, across all three schools and multiple centers. The effort exemplified the *Penn Compact 2020*’s goals of Inclusion, Innovation, and Impact by crossing disciplinary boundaries to engage the Philadelphia public in bridging Penn’s academic mission and the popular conception of it. More than 1,000 people visited campus, including dozens of members of the public, to take part in debates, discussions and interactive activities designed to be part of a deepening, ongoing conversation on how Penn in particular and universities in general might best fulfill their crucial intellectual and societal missions.

Recommendation: Schools and centers that are interested in engaging the public in its academic work should consider using the “Teach-In” to model future, targeted workshops, either on campus or outside it.

Overall Recommendations for SCFDDE for 2018-2019

1. Review the Postdoctoral Fellowship for Academic Diversity Program with respect to the number of Fellows who have been hired by Penn into Standing Faculty and/or research positions.

2. Identify best practices for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs) across schools.

3. Examine the composition of Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff with respect to diversity and equity goals.

2017-2018 SCFDDE Members

Carmen Guerra, PSOM/Medicine, *Chair*
 Kristen Feemster, PSOM/Pediatrics
 Mauro Guillén, Wharton
 Michael Jones-Correa, SAS/Political Science
 Irina Marinov, SAS/Earth and Environmental Science
 Kate Nathanson, PSOM/Medicine

Ex officio:

John Keene, Design, PASEF non-voting member
 Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
 Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair