

Joint Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) and the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP)

SCOF Background

The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (“SCOF”) oversees and advises 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.

2022-2023 SCOF Specific Charges

1. Address systemic racism and other forms of inequity by assessing and evaluating ways to change University structures, practices, and biases at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels. Examples include eligibility for leadership roles; differential standards for faculty evaluation and compensation based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, department-level voting privileges; biases implicit in quantitative methods for evaluating faculty; and evaluation of effectiveness of campus mental health and wellness programs.

2. Review and comment on workloads, expectations, and differences among school and departmental faculties and identify equity issues that may arise.

3. Review and comment on instructor and course evaluation reports with a focus on their uses in student course selection, improvement of the quality of delivered courses, and hiring, tenure, promotion, and merit-based salary increase decisions.

4. In consultation with SCSEP, review and comment on existing methods for eliciting student feedback to enhance learning experiences. Examples include mid-course or ongoing feedback mechanisms available to the instructor to aid in course re-thinking and re-direction and in the identification of students who may need assistance.

SCSEP Background

The Faculty 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/climate. In general, the committee deals with the matters covered by the following section of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: IV.

2022-2023 SCSEP Specific Charges

1. Address systemic racism and other forms of inequity by assessing and evaluating ways to change University structures, practices, and biases at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels. Examples include eligibility for leadership roles; differential standards for faculty evaluation and compensation based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, department-level voting privileges; biases implicit in quantitative methods for evaluating faculty; and evaluation of effectiveness of campus mental health and wellness programs.

2. In consultation with SCOF, continue to review and comment on existing methods for eliciting student feedback to enhance learning experiences. Examples include mid-course or ongoing feedback mechanisms available to the instructor to aid in course re-thinking and re-direction and in the identification of students who may need assistance.

3. Review and comment on issues related to the care and well-being of international students at Penn.

4. Review the effectiveness of community-building efforts undertaken by the Second Year Experience program to-date.

5. Consider matters related to pandemic recovery and their effects on student well-being and recommend ways in which the University and schools can provide support. Evaluate the efficacy and value-added or

value-diminished by shifting to remote learning and its implications in the short- and long-term.

6. Evaluate the impact of College Houses and Academic Services’ (CHAS) pandemic response and effect on student orientation, advising, and engagement, and identify ways faculty can provide support.

7. Recommend ways in which guidelines and strategies for effective program evaluation for campus wellness programs can be enhanced.

Report

The committees continued to focus efforts on an investigation of teaching evaluations and the way they are used to further Penn’s educational missions for undergraduate students. To educate themselves about the use of course evaluations at Penn, SCOF and SCSEP met jointly twice during the year. Their first joint meeting welcomed Vice Provost for Education (VPE) Karen Detlefsen and executive director of the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) Bruce Lenthall to learn more about Penn’s use of course evaluations and efforts at Penn and nationally to innovate how courses and instructors are evaluated. During the second joint meeting, guests from the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education (SCUE) were welcomed to the meeting to gain a better understanding of student perspectives of course evaluations. SCOF and SCSEP met separately on several other occasions to address *ad hoc* matters and to synthesize discussion from joint meetings. The committees identified several themes.

1. There is heterogeneity in how schools and departments use course evaluations

Course evaluations serve different purposes in different departments and schools, with the main purposes being to (1) inform tenure, promotion, and awards decisions and (2) ensure course quality. Although most schools use course evaluations to inform tenure and promotion decisions, evaluations carry greater weight in some schools (e.g., PSOM) than others. In another school, a suggestion was made that negative evaluations could be used as “a political weapon” but could also be ignored outright. Finally, there was a recognition that course evaluations typically carry greater weight for non-tenure track instructors than for tenure-track faculty and that job security for the former group depends on getting consistently good evaluations from students.

In addition, students and faculty use course evaluations for different purposes. SCUE representatives communicated that they use course evaluations to decide which courses to take in the future and most were unaware that faculty use course evaluations as a tool in tenure and promotion cases and that they carry weight in decisions about teaching awards. With the goal of informing future course selection, students were most concerned that course evaluations accurately reflect the difficulty of the course, and they noted that additional details about class assessments in Penn Course Review would be more informative than difficulty ratings, given individual differences in the kinds of assessments that students find challenging (e.g., some students find exam-based courses more challenging than paper-based courses). SCUE representatives observed that students also use evaluations to comment on whether the instructor is sufficiently sensitive to issues of student wellness and inclusivity. SCUE representatives were skeptical that students would report reliably on academic dishonesty in the classroom.

2. There is heterogeneity in the content of course evaluations

Although most schools (excepting PSOM, Law, and GSE) ask a common set of four to six questions, and a majority of schools also ask a supplementary set of eight questions, there is considerable heterogeneity within and across schools in which questions are included on course evaluations. For example, SAS asks a different supplementary set than most other schools, language and laboratory classes ask different supplementary questions, and there is considerable variety in how graduate courses are evaluated.

(continued on page 2)

(continued from page 1)

3. There is a desire to improve course evaluations to measure new things and to better suit the purpose for which they are used

Various guests and committee members noted that, if the purpose of evaluations is to improve teaching, then both the timing and the content of the end-of-semester course evaluation is not ideally suited to achieving this goal. SCUE representatives noted that end-of-semester course evaluations rarely include questions about some issues that students (and some faculty) deem important (e.g., wellness, inclusivity) and they do not typically allow students to reflect on which instructional activities were more or less effective. End-of-semester course evaluations, which provide an overall rating of the quality of the instructor and the quality of the course, may be better suited to evaluating faculty in tenure and promotion cases. SCUE representatives encouraged the use of mid-semester evaluations as an effective method for improving teaching and were particularly appreciative when faculty shared and discussed the results of mid-semester evaluations with students in class.

There was extensive discussion about how to improve course evaluations and their utility, including designing questions to increase the reliability of students' responses (e.g., querying specific experiences in the classroom *versus* overall impressions of the course). In addition, there are efforts nationwide to broaden methods of course evaluation. These include peer review of course materials and classroom observation as well as self-evaluations, in which instructors present evidence that they have been successful in their teaching and reflect on instructional approaches that are not working. Finally, there was a discussion about the possibility of generating reliable, global scores reflecting instructor or course quality from a larger set of questions about students' experiences with course material and with the instructor.

VPE Detlefsen noted that the Vice Provost's office is particularly concerned with revising evaluations to address two forms of bias: bias from students completing the evaluations and biases in the classroom (e.g., microaggressions¹) that create greater burdens for some students and instructors compared to others. The purpose of this evaluation would be to alert instructors or anyone reviewing the evaluation of the presence of bias in the classroom so as to identify steps to address it. Focus groups on campus will be conducted. Some faculty were concerned that efforts to use course evaluations as a tool to reduce bias in the classroom were potentially in conflict with students' or instructors' perceptions that they could speak freely about sensitive topics involving race, ethnicity, or social class, for example.

4. Faculty are concerned that course evaluations do not accurately reflect course or instructor quality

SCOF and SCSEP members voiced concerns about the validity of end-of-semester evaluations, noting that scores tend to be lower in larger classes and when students do poorly. Faculty wondered whether CTL maintains data that would allow them to determine whether this is the case. Although CTL does not routinely collect school-level evaluation instruments, it does keep track of the overlapping questions over time and would be willing to provide information about this to the committees.

SCOF and SCSEP offer the following findings:

- 1) The impact of teaching evaluations is not equitable; therefore, evaluations can have disproportionate impact on certain instructors based on faculty track.
 - a) Teaching evaluations are inconsequential for some faculty but highly consequential for others (i.e., contingent faculty being considered for reappointment or those being considered for teaching awards).
 - b) In anecdotal cases, contingent faculty have been fired from teaching based on poor teaching evaluations, including some instructors in situations where they were required to teach a prescribed curriculum that they did not design themselves.
 - c) Students use teaching evaluations to guide course selection based on difficulty of workload and instructor ratings.
- 2) Mid-course evaluations, which are used now by some instructors on an *ad hoc* basis, appear to benefit both students and instructors by al-

lowing instructors to "course-correct" their instruction to meet student needs.

- 3) A 2002 report (<https://almanac.upenn.edu/archive/v49/n08/teaching-report.html>) covers many of the concerns raised in the previous two years.

SCOF and SCSEP offer the following recommendations:

- 1) Evaluations should fit the purpose they are meant to serve.
 - a) Consideration should be given to revising evaluation content to reflect the needs of students in course selection and of faculty in promotion and tenure review and for quality improvement of the course.
 - b) Data should be gathered to determine whether contingent faculty are disadvantaged by the evaluation process.
 - c) Questions should be revised to serve the needs of both students and faculty, being mindful of the disparate impact of evaluation feedback on tenure-line faculty *versus* contingent faculty.
 - d) Concerns of diversity and equity should be addressed appropriately through evaluation questions.
 - e) Students should be informed about the ways that faculty use the evaluations that students complete. This could be done as a preamble to the evaluation, as a comment made in class, or on the syllabus.
- 2) Mid-semester evaluations should be encouraged for use more widely and formally.
- 3) University leadership should revisit the contents of the report from 2002 to inform its future efforts.
- 4) The Student Committee on Undergraduate Education should consider producing a future white paper focused on student uses of teaching evaluations.
- 5) Dialogue between student committees and faculty committees on topics of mutual interest should be continued, as committee members found the student perspectives to be enlightening in their own discussions.

SCOF Membership 2022-2023

J. Margo Brooks Carthon (Nursing), *Chair*
 Struan Grant (PSOM/Pediatrics)
 Julia Hartmann (SAS/Mathematics)
 Alexander Reiter (Vet Medicine)
 Emily Steinlight (SAS/English)
 Amy Stornaiuolo (GSE)

Ex Officio to SCOF:

Roger M.A. Allen, SAS/NELC, PASEF non-voting member

SCSEP Membership 2022-2023

Seema Bhatnagar, PSOM/Anesthesiology and Critical Care
 Gerald Campano, GSE
 Ted Chinburg, SAS/Mathematics
 Huda Fakhreddine, SAS/Near East Languages and Civilizations
 Sara Jaffee, SAS/Psychology, *Chair*
 Greg Ridgeway, SAS/Criminology
 Akhilesh Reddy, PSOM/Pharmacology
 Dylan Small (Wharton)

Ex Officio to SCSEP:

Peter Conn, SAS/English, PASEF non-voting member

Ex Officio to SCOF and SCSEP:

William Braham, Weitzman Design, Faculty Senate Past Chair
 Tula Falletti, SAS/Political Science, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
 Vivian Gadsden, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair

¹ <https://www.news.iastate.edu/news/2019/05/15/genderevals>.

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.

2022-2023 Specific Charges for the SCFDDE

1. Address systemic racism and other forms of inequity by assessing and evaluating ways to change University structures, practices, and biases at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels. Examples include eligibility for leadership roles; differential standards for faculty evaluation and compensation based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, department-level voting privileges; biases implicit in quantitative methods for evaluating faculty; and evaluation of effectiveness of campus mental health and wellness programs.
2. Review the current policies related to parental and teaching leave for faculty who choose to grow their families via foster care with the goal of revising the Faculty Handbook as appropriate to address faculty needs.
3. In consultation with SCOF, review and comment on the associated faculty and academic support staff options available in the Faculty Handbook with the goal of making the positions appealing enough to attract a diverse applicant pool and considering the possibility of promotion and professional growth for each of the different positions.
4. Gather and examine data that can help determine trends in gender, race and ethnicity in division, department chair, and deanship leadership at the University over the past five years.
5. Gather and examine data to better understand how each promotion and tenure committee considers service in its promotion guidelines and deliberations and whether there are any ways to prevent overburdening particular faculty groups with service (e.g., women, underrepresented minorities, junior faculty).
6. Review school-level initiatives to foster faculty development and leadership roles for faculty of color and compile a list of learnings and programs that could be replicated across the schools for the University community.
7. Consider the needs of faculty, students, and staff who feel victimized by faculty speech, especially in relation to academic freedom and responsibility.

Report on Charges

Charge 1 was addressed in the context of the other charges.

2. *Review the current policies related to parental and teaching leave for faculty who choose to grow their families via foster care with the goal of revising the Faculty Handbook as appropriate to address faculty needs.*

SCFDDE was unable to reach the Division of Human Resources for formal comment on a proposal to offer foster care benefits to faculty. Based on our own review of the policy, we discovered that foster care is already included in the Faculty Handbook as a reason to request an extension for a faculty probationary period but is not included in the discussion of the faculty parental and teaching leave policy, which only includes expanding a family either through birth or adoption. We recommend revising the Faculty Handbook to add foster care to the list of ways one might grow a family eligible for parental and teaching leave. We also determined that no mention of foster care is included in the Parental Leave policy that applies to both faculty and staff. Considering that this is an issue that impacts both faculty and staff, we recommend that this charge be forwarded to the University Council Committee on Personnel Benefits for further discussion and consideration on how such a policy might be operationalized and applied equitably among faculty and staff. Because the Division of Human Resources is integral to the latter committee's

ongoing work, we are hopeful that the division will be able to make formal comments on any proposals that should arise from it that could also be incorporated into the Faculty Handbook as necessary.

3. *In consultation with SCOF, review and comment on the associated faculty and academic support staff options available in the Faculty Handbook with the goal of making the positions appealing enough to attract a diverse applicant pool and considering the possibility of promotion and professional growth for each of the different positions.*

Our initial inquiries have discovered inconsistencies across schools in terms of professional pathways as well as voting rights privileges for associated faculty and academic support staff. Based on this, SCFDDE hopes to partner with the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty to host two convenings in the upcoming academic year that bring together associate deans and other relevant decision-making officials from across the University. We are proposing that one of these convenings focus on the health schools and the other convening focus on the non-health schools across campus. One agenda item of this convening would be to understand the teaching and scholarship responsibilities for associated faculty and academic support staff whose primary responsibilities are teaching as opposed to research. We also hope to consult with peer institutions regarding how they have implemented these "teaching professorships," which we can use to ground some of this discussion. We also hope to develop a better understanding of how faculty governance works across the different schools with specific attention to voting privileges. We are also hoping that we will have access to the faculty survey to inform further topics that can help to frame these discussions.

4. *Gather and examine data that can help determine trends in gender, race and ethnicity in division, department chair, and deanship leadership at the University over the past five years.*

Diversity of institutional leadership is not something that the University currently tracks in a publicly accessible way. As a result, SCFDDE currently has only limited data on this topic. We plan to submit a data request to the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty that will help us to get a better sense of what data are currently available with the goals of determining the adequacy of current data collection metrics, identifying any trends related to issues of diversity in leadership and developing recommendations for how to make these data more publicly available. In addition, to establish transparency around this topic, the new faculty diversity dashboard (<https://ira.upenn.edu/penn-numbers/diversity-dashboard>) should contain a filter for viewing the demographic diversity of Penn's leadership.

5. *Gather and examine data to better understand how each promotion and tenure committee considers service in its promotion guidelines and deliberations and whether there are any ways to prevent overburdening particular faculty groups with service (e.g., women, underrepresented minorities, junior faculty).*

There is no repository that houses departmental bylaws and other relevant information related to tenure and promotion guidelines across the different schools. We recommend that the Faculty Senate collect these policies and artifacts. This would allow for cross-school comparisons as well as offer schools models to consider if/when they undertake work to revise their policies. For example, SCFDDE reviewed the Perelman School of Medicine's recent revisions to its Committee on Appointment and Promotion guidelines that more explicitly and systematically include community engagement and service focused on diversity, equity, and inclusion. We see this as a potential model for other schools considering similar revisions. A central repository would be able to effectively highlight this work and the work being undertaken at other schools to provide systematic acknowledgement of service work. This is especially important to consider based on the fact that service work is often most heavily placed on those already underrepresented among the faculty. We see this as part of broader efforts to incorporate contributions related to diversity, equity, and inclusion into tenure and promotion guidelines across the University.

(continued on page 4)

(continued from page 3)

6. *Review school-level initiatives to foster faculty development and leadership roles for faculty of color and compile a list of learnings and programs that could be replicated across the schools for the University community.*

There is currently no central repository for school-level initiatives to foster faculty development and leadership roles and it is, therefore, currently not feasible to determine the participation rates for faculty of color within these programs. We recommend for the University to develop a way for schools to report their school-level initiatives alongside the efforts that they take to ensure a diverse pool of participants in these leadership development opportunities. SCFDDE would welcome the opportunity to review this central repository in order to identify best practices that could be replicated across the schools.

7. *Consider the needs of faculty, students, and staff who feel victimized by faculty speech, especially in relation to academic freedom and responsibility.*

Because this is a charge that extends beyond faculty to include students and staff, we hope to collaborate with the University Council Committee

on Diversity and Equity on this matter during the coming academic year to ensure that all key stakeholders are included in this important conversation.

SCFDDE Membership 2022-2023

Hydar Ali, Dental Medicine
Dani Smith Bassett, SEAS/Bioengineering
Antonella Cianferoni, PSOM/Pediatrics
Nelson Flores, GSE, *Chair*
Carmen Guerra, PSOM/Medicine
Junhyong Kim, SAS/Biology
Meghan Lane-Fall, PSOM/Anesthesiology & Critical Care

Ex officio:

Sherrill Adams, Dental Medicine, PASEF non-voting member
William Braham Weitzman, Design, Faculty Senate Past Chair
Tulia Falleti, SAS/Political Science, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Vivian Gadsden, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair

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

General Committee Charge

The Committee on Faculty and the Administration: The Committee 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.1., I.-K., II.E. III., V., VI. (henceforth referred to as the "Faculty Handbook").

2022-2023 Specific Charges

1. Address systemic racism and other forms of inequity by assessing and evaluating ways to change University structures, practices, and biases at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels. Examples include eligibility for leadership roles; differential standards for faculty evaluation and compensation based on race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, department-level voting privileges; biases implicit in quantitative methods for evaluating faculty; and evaluation of effectiveness of campus mental health and wellness programs.
2. Examine the effects of the U.S. Department of Justice's China Initiative on Penn researchers and the role of University policies and practices in supporting and protecting the faculty.
3. Identify faculty issues of concern regarding intellectual property and ownership of teaching, research, and scholarship, and recommend steps for addressing them.
4. Review University and school policies and best practices regarding online teaching and identify operating principles for their use.
5. In consultation with SCFDDE, Examine the conditions of faculty employment (including personnel benefits) of teaching faculty by school (across all faculty tracks) and their opportunities for career advancement at Penn, and articulate and make recommendations that are guided by principles of equity.
6. Continue to explore existing and alternative models for providing public safety and services to the campus community.

SCOA expended the bulk of its efforts on charges 2 and 6. Charge 1 was addressed in the context of the other charges.

2. Examine the effects of the U.S. Department of Justice's China Initiative on Penn researchers and the role of University policies and practices in supporting and protecting the faculty.

Subcommittee members reviewed existing support materials, policies, and practice at Penn and discussed specific case studies of faculty experience. Subcommittee members made a list of topics to discuss with the Senior Vice Provost for Research. Subcommittee met with Senior Vice Provost for Research and discussed recent and upcoming enhancements to support materials, policies, and practices, providing suggestions and recommendations. Subcommittee members conducted another round of review on enhanced support materials, policies, and practices.

6. Continue to explore existing and alternative models for providing public safety and services to the campus community.

Penn faculty, staff, students, and parents have expressed anxiety about crime within West Philly. The subcommittee asked for information on the impact of increased crime trends in the region (and nationally) on crime statistics for the West Philadelphia area that is the responsibility of DPS.

Professor John MacDonald, Professor of Criminology and Sociology and member of the DPS Advisory Board, presented these data for January 1, 2016, to August 8, 2020 (see Table). They clearly show that except for theft, crimes of all categories are substantially and importantly fewer within the zone patrolled by Penn Police (from 30th Street to 43rd St. and from Market St. to Baltimore Avenue, inclusive of the Health Systems Complex). We hypothesized theft may be higher because there is simply more to steal in this relatively affluent area, and that it may be easier to accomplish within the Penn Patrol Zone.

Table 1: Penn Patrol Zone Crimes, 2016-2020

Penn Patrol Zone Remains Considerably Safer Today (Jan 1, 2016-Aug 8, 2020)

Area	Murder	Shooting	Gun Robbery	Robbery	Gun Assault	Agg Assault	Assault	Burglary Com	Burglary Res	Theft from MV	Theft
Inside Patrol Zone	1	4	43	127	23	167	760	64	145	265	3024
UCD Outside	12	38	253	332	84	260	1181	119	517	917	2636
18 District Outside	65	287	331	491	482	1179	4116	165	887	1258	2163

Table 1-provided by Professor John MacDonald

Professor MacDonald reported: "There are clearly still considerably fewer crimes that involve violence inside the Penn Patrol Zone relative to the adjacent UCD area and the rest of the 18th District (west of 52nd)". These results may be partially attributable to effective Penn policing, but they may also be attributed to differences in land use, seasonality of land use, number of police verses the Zone's population, and other differences in the Penn patrolled areas verses those in comparative areas. Whatever the reasons, The Penn Patrol Zone is much safer than almost any other area of the city including Center City.

While there are serious crimes within the Penn patrolled area, there are many fewer than outside its area. This suggests that perceptions of the dangers exceed the actuality. The Committee discussed possible reasons for this, including UPennAlert text and email communications followed by all clear messages after a location has been deemed safe, as well as the way crimes are now reported on TV and social media. For example, people who live in low crime areas of the country may perceive crime at Penn as much greater than those who live in other urban areas. The Committee wonders if all the texts are legally required (for example, "Gun shots heard at Walnut and 40th"), or if only some are. It suggests there may be other ways to calm people's anxiety that could be explored. Perhaps this a topic that can be examined fruitfully by a sub-committee of the DPS Advisory Board.

The Clery Center describes requirements of the Clery Act in this document (https://www.clerycenter.org/assets/docs/NCSAM19_TW-vs-EN.pdf) and the [University's Annual Security and Fire Safety Report](#) (aka the Clery Report; pages 9 & 10) offers the following information on the use of the UPennAlert system:

When the Division of Public Safety becomes aware of criminal incidents that in the judgment of DPS and the University's senior leadership constitute a serious or continuing threat to the campus community, DPS issues a timely warning to notify the community. Depending on the particular circumstances, a timely warning may be disseminated by using one or a combination of the following: email distribution; various campus publications; the Public Safety and University website; crime alerts; flyers posted at various locations on campus; social media; and/or activation of the UPennAlert system, which employs personal electronic devices, Penn Siren Outdoor System (Penn SOS) and/or digital displays to advise the community of the situation. Timely warnings are considered on a case-by-case basis. Any timely warning issued shall not contain the names or other identifying information of any complainant, such as their residence

The UPennAlert is only activated for significant emergencies or dangerous situations involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of students or employees occurring on campus that are confirmed by law enforcement personnel and with the approval of the University's senior leadership. The UPennAlert is not activated if in the professional judgment of the responsible authorities such a notification would compromise efforts to resolve the emergency. When a UPennAlert is sent, the proper message is selected from several pre-scripted messages and sent to the appropriate audience. A UPennAlert can only be sent by one of several

(continued on page 6)

FACULTY SENATE 2022-2023

(continued from page 5)

initiators who are trained by the Division of Public Safety. Furthermore, the UPennAlert is tested annually to ensure all faculty, staff and students are familiar with emergency alerts and what their individual roles are during an actual situation.

2. SCOA wanted to know how promised efforts to make the DPS more transparent have progressed. Professor MacDonald suggested the expanded DPS website (<https://www.publicsafety.upenn.edu/about/uppd/university-of-pennsylvania-police-department-uppd-information-and-statistics/>) has improved transparency, as has the expanded DPS Advisory Board.
3. SCOA wanted to understand if the DPS's accountability has improved. Professor MacDonald again suggested that the expansion of the DPS Advisory Board (<https://www.publicsafety.upenn.edu/safety-security-partners/groups-and-organizations/dps-advisory-board/>) to include more members of community organizations, more student, and other Penn representatives may be improving this. He reported members do not hesitate to ask questions at the meetings. He says they appear to have "skin in the game," and it seems to be working very well.
4. The Public Safety Review and Outreach Initiative report authored by Drs. Dorothy Roberts and Chaz Howard suggested students and community members, especially Black students, and Black community members, feel "over-policed." However, their report did not provide data (qualitative or quantitative) for these claims. Professor MacDonald reported there are now very good survey methods with which to do targeted community surveying, and that Penn could benefit by arranging to conduct these, perhaps annually or bi-annually. Such work could help identify areas to work on and to discern whether some groups of people feel over-policed as well as to identify what could improve DPS-community relations around this issue and overall. Senior Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli suggested in his follow-up progress report (9-21-2021) that a survey would be conducted. DPS informs the committee that a survey is

currently in development

5. The Public Safety Outreach Initiative report suggested innovations are needed in the way Penn handles calls involving mental health issues. Student Health and Counseling (SHAC) is primarily responsible for "wellness checks". According to the VP for Public Safety, Penn's Help Line is administered by PennComm (Penn Emergency Communications Center) for persons in need of immediate assistance for themselves or a friend. Most calls are passed on to Student Health and Counseling and, if needed, to a private, on-demand counseling session. In cases of imminent self-harm, now that SHAC provides 24/7 counseling, In cases of imminent self-harm during the day, Penn Police work with on-site SHAC counselors and Student Intervention Services (SIS) personnel to provide immediate response and support for the student. During other hours, Penn Police have followed a process for several years where they connect on the phone to an on-demand counselor with whom they jointly decide how to proceed in each case. During spring 2023, DPS working in conjunction with Wellness and University Life, embarked on a co-responder mental health pilot program, in which a social worker and officer are dispatched jointly to the scene. Here, we suggest it would be useful for SCOA to follow-up next year, to learn how this pilot worked. It may also be useful to explore best practices emerging across the country.

SCOA Membership 2022-2023

Ryan Baker, Education, *Chair*
Chenoa Flippen, SAS/Sociology
Randall Mason, Design
Steven Messé, PSOM/Neurology
Erika Reineke, Veterinary Medicine
Shu Yang, SEAS/Electrical and Systems and Engineering

Ex-officio members:

William Braham, Weitzman Design, Faculty Senate Past Chair
Tulia Falletti, SAS/Political Science, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Vivian Gadsden, Education, Faculty Senate Chair
Peter Kuriloff, Education, PASEF non-voting member

Report of the Faculty Grievance Commission, 2022-2023

The Faculty Senate Grievance Commission (hereafter the 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 staff who allege they have been subject to actions contrary to the University procedures, policies, or regulations; that are discriminatory; or that are arbitrary or capricious (see <https://provost.upenn.edu/senate/faculty-grievance-commission>). During Academic Year 2022-23, Santosh Venkatesh (Engineering, Past Chair), Sarah Kagan (Nursing, Chair), and John Paul MacDuffie (Wharton, Chair-Elect) served on the commission.

The commission received six queries from faculty and academic support staff from schools across the university. This number of queries is somewhat higher than in previous years but not grossly out of line with the trend over the past eight years. Five of the six queries resulted in formal grievances being filed with the commission. One grievance involved denial of tenure. The other four complained of maltreatment of the faculty member by the dean of the school in which they are appointed. The commission, led by the chair, explored each grievance, which included communication with all parties involved and review of pertinent documents. The commission discussed each grievance and the information gleaned in exploring it, assessing it against the criteria under which it operates (viz. actions contrary to the University procedures, policies, or regulations; that are discriminatory; or that are arbitrary or capricious), and achieved consensus amongst its three members. The chair then responded to the faculty member filing the grievance. None of the grievances filed resulted in a hearing. Finally, the commission continues to monitor and communicate as necessary regarding a grievance filed in 2021 that remains open and is yet unresolved.

—Sarah Kagan (Grievance Commission Chair, 2022-2023)

(continued on page 7)

FACULTY SENATE 2022-2023

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF)

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) is charged by the “Rules of the Faculty Senate” to:

- Gather and organize data on faculty salaries and benefits;
- Issue an annual report on the economic status of the faculty; and
- Represent the faculty in the determination of University policy on salary issues.

SCESF did not produce a report during the 2022-2023 academic year. In keeping with practices of previous years, SCESF offers below the publicly viewable tables provided to the committee by the Provost’s Office and prepared by the Office of Institutional Research & Analysis.

Table 1
Average academic base salary percentage increases of continuing Penn standing faculty members by rank in comparison with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Penn Budget Guidelines

Group/Condition/Metric		FY 2021-2022
Professor	Mean	4.5%
	Median	3.0%
Associate Professor	Mean	5.1%
	Median	3.0%
Assistant Professor	Mean	4.2%
	Median	3.3%
All Three Ranks	Mean	4.6%
	Median	3.0%
U.S. City Average CPI Growth	Mean	9.1%
Phil. CPI Growth	Mean	8.8%
Budget Guidelines	Mean	3.0%

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

CPI reported for FY 2021-22 for the US and Philadelphia are based on growth for the period between June 2021 to June 2022.

Table 2
Percentage of continuing standing faculty awarded salary increase
percentages that exceeded the percentage growth in the consumer
price index (CPI) for Philadelphia

Schools and Disciplinary Areas	Percentage FY 2021 to 2022
Annenberg	11.8%
Dental Medicine	8.7%
Engineering & Applied Science	1.7%
Graduate Education	9.1%
Humanities (A&S)	10.9%
Law	4.7%
Natural Science (A&S)	7.7%
Nursing	8.1%
Perelman-Basic Science	5.1%
Social Policy & Practice	11.1%
Social Science (A&S)	9.5%
Veterinary Medicine	4.0%
Weitzman	20.5%
Wharton	4.6%
All Schools/Areas	7.2%
U.S. City Average CPI Growth	9.1%
Phil. CPI Growth	8.8%
Budget Guidelines	3.0%

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

CPI reported for FY 2021-22 for the US and Philadelphia are based on growth for the period between June 2021 to June 2022.

Table 3
Percentage of continuing full professors awarded salary
increase percentages that exceeded the percentage growth in the
consumer price index (CPI) for Philadelphia

Schools and Disciplinary Areas	Percentage FY 2021 to 2022
Annenberg	10.0%
Dental Medicine	11.8%
Engineering & Applied Science	2.6%
Graduate Education	6.3%
Humanities (A&S)	8.5%
Law	2.5%
Natural Science (A&S)	10.5%
Nursing	16.7%
Perelman-Basic Science	3.4%
Social Policy & Practice	10.0%
Social Science (A&S)	11.9%
Veterinary Medicine	0.0%
Weitzman	7.7%
Wharton	6.7%
All Schools/Areas	7.2%
U.S. City Average CPI Growth	9.1%
Phil. CPI Growth	8.8%
Budget Guidelines	3.0%

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

CPI reported for FY 2021-22 for the US and Philadelphia are based on growth for the period between June 2021 to June 2022.

FACULTY SENATE 2022-2023

Table 4

Rank of mean salaries of Penn faculty by academic fields as compared to universities participating in the American Association of Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) survey.

Academic Field	Fall 2011	Fall 2012	Fall 2013	Fall 2014	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019	Fall 2020	Fall 2021
Full Professor											
Annenberg	1/41	1/39	1/43	1/43	1/43	1/42	1/41	1/44	1/43	1/43	1/44
Dental Medicine	10/45	9/43	9/44	11/44	10/46	11/45	15/46	17/49	1/44	13/48	12/48
Engineering & Applied Science	13/55	14/54	13/58	14/59	17/59	16/56	11/56	16/62	1/45	8/60	10/62
Graduate Education	6/47	7/45	4/45	6/45	6/47	6/45	6/47	11/48	1/46	12/46	11/45
Humanities (A&S)	7/56	11/55	11/58	10/59	11/60	10/57	9/57	9/62	1/47	10/60	10/62
Law	7/39	8/38	7/39	8/38	6/41	6/40	4/38	6/43	1/48	6/44	7/44
Natural Science (A&S)	12/56	11/55	14/58	15/59	18/60	14/57	13/57	17/62	1/49	13/60	14/62
Nursing	1/19	1/19	1/21	3/23	1/24	2/24	2/30	2/31	1/50	4/30	5/28
Perelman - Basic Science	6/56	8/55	7/58	8/59	9/60	6/57	6/57	10/62	1/51	6/60	9/62
Social Policy & Practice	6/25	6/23	6/26	4/27	3/27	3/26	1/25	1/27	1/52	2/28	2/28
Social Science (A&S)	8/56	9/55	9/57	9/58	7/59	9/57	8/57	7/61	1/53	9/60	8/62
Veterinary Medicine	3/14	4/13	2/13	3/13	4/13	5/14	4/16	3/16	1/54	4/15	3/14
Weitzman	10/53	11/52	10/55	11/56	11/57	10/54	10/52	11/57	1/55	13/58	13/59
Wharton-Business & Management	5/53	2/52	3/55	2/56	1/56	1/53	1/53	2/58	1/56	2/56	2/57
Wharton-Public Policy	13/54	12/53	5/55	9/56	10/57	9/55	9/55	-	1/57	8/58	8/59
Wharton-Statistics	1/34	2/34	2/36	2/34	1/34	1/32	1/31	2/36	1/58	2/37	4/35
Associate Professor											
Annenberg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/59	1/42	1/42
Dental Medicine	13/43	9/41	-	6/44	-	-	-	-	1/60	3/49	4/49
Engineering & Applied Science	11/54	11/53	10/56	11/57	10/57	7/54	7/55	11/61	1/62	13/60	14/61
Graduate Education	8/45	9/44	9/44	6/45	6/47	6/44	6/46	14/48	1/63	11/49	12/48
Humanities (A&S)	11/55	13/54	12/57	10/58	9/59	10/56	8/56	8/61	1/64	11/60	10/61
Law	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1/65	n/a	-
Natural Science (A&S)	15/56	17/55	17/58	15/58	17/59	18/56	15/56	20/61	1/66	19/60	22/61
Nursing	5/19	3/19	2/21	7/24	7/25	4/25	5/31	6/31	7/31	6/30	6/27
Perelman - Basic Science	4/55	4/54	3/57	4/58	5/59	5/56	6/56	11/61	8/62	8/60	9/61
Social Policy & Practice	-	-	-	-	-	6/26	4/25	6/28	6/28	7/28	3/27
Social Science (A&S)	8/56	14/55	10/56	7/57	8/58	10/56	8/56	12/60	13/62	9/60	13/61
Veterinary Medicine	6/14	6/13	7/13	7/13	4/13	4/14	6/15	6/15	6/14	7/14	5/13
Weitzman	1/51	3/51	3/52	3/54	4/56	6/53	6/53	9/57	10/58	9/56	6/57
Wharton-Business & Management	2/51	2/51	3/54	3/56	3/56	1/53	1/53	2/58	3/58	5/56	6/57
Wharton-Public Policy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2/56	4/58	2/56	1/56
Wharton-Statistics	2/27	2/30	-	-	-	-	1/27	-	-	-	-
Assistant Professor											
Annenberg	-	-	3/41	3/42	-	2/40	-	-	-	-	-
Dental Medicine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	27/48
Engineering & Applied Science	7/54	8/54	8/58	10/59	6/59	7/56	8/56	8/61	9/62	14/60	13/61
Graduate Education	-	15/43	12/44	13/44	11/46	13/44	10/45	12/47	14/49	13/46	15/46
Humanities (A&S)	14/56	17/55	14/58	13/59	9/59	9/56	8/56	12/61	13/62	9/60	8/60
Law	6/27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2/29	-
Natural Science (A&S)	15/56	22/55	16/58	18/59	20/60	18/57	12/57	17/62	16/63	17/60	13/62
Nursing	3/19	2/19	3/21	5/24	5/25	4/25	8/31	8/31	6/31	7/30	5/28
Perelman - Basic Science	6/56	9/55	9/58	10/59	15/60	5/57	6/57	9/61	9/63	10/60	11/61
Social Policy & Practice	-	5/24	5/26	5/27	6/27	8/26	3/25	-	-	-	-
Social Science (A&S)	7/56	8/55	7/57	8/58	11/59	14/57	13/57	17/61	14/63	13/60	12/62
Veterinary Medicine	5/14	5/12	5/13	5/13	5/13	4/14	8/16	8/15	6/16	7/15	3/14
Weitzman	6/51	4/50	5/54	7/55	7/56	5/52	5/52	6/56	8/58	8/56	10/56
Wharton-Business & Management	4/52	4/51	5/54	7/55	4/56	4/53	5/53	4/58	5/58	4/56	6/57
Wharton-Public Policy	1/54	1/53	1/52	1/55	1/56	1/55	1/55	1/59	1/61	1/58	1/59
Wharton-Statistics	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2/37	1/37	1/36

Using the federal CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) codes, departments at comparable universities were mapped to Penn schools.

Calculations of rank only include those universities that have relevant departments. Therefore, the number of universities among which Penn is ranked varies by field.

Rank is suppressed for all cells that contain fewer than five Penn faculty members.

Table 5
Percentage differences in mean academic base salary of professors at selected research universities for Academic Years 2017-2018 through 2021-2022

Full Professors - Mean Academic Base Salaries: Percentage Differences*

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Columbia	15.6%	16.1%	13.1%	18.6%	16.9%
Stanford	13.3%	14.5%	10.4%	9.8%	9.3%
Princeton	9.5%	10.9%	7.5%	8.8%	8.0%
Harvard	13.1%	9.3%	7.0%	7.6%	6.7%
Chicago	7.8%	8.2%	3.7%	6.0%	5.6%
MIT	2.5%	3.8%	1.3%	1.1%	3.8%
Penn	\$217.3	\$223.60	\$237.30	\$236.80	\$246.30
Yale	-1.4%	3.3%	2.1%	-1.1%	-1.1%
Dartmouth	-9.5%	-7.1%	-8.9%	-14.3%	-4.8%
Duke	-3.5%	-4.2%	-6.7%	-6.8%	-9.1%
Brown	-15.4%	-16.1%	-18.9%	-18.9%	-19.7%
Cornell	-17.8%	-17.9%	-20.7%	-21.4%	-21.4%

Notes: Penn compensation levels are based on standing faculty members at the rank of professor. Excluded are all members of the Perelman School of Medicine except basic scientists, and all standing faculty members who are appointed as clinician-educators. Data Source: AAUP Salary Surveys.

*Universities are listed from highest to lowest percentage difference for full professors as of 2021-2022. For each year reported, the difference between the Penn mean salary and the mean salary for a comparison university was computed as a percentage of the Penn salary.

Associate Professors - Mean Academic Base Salaries: Percentage Differences*

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Columbia	15.1%	19.3%	20.6%	25.9%	30.2%
Stanford	12.6%	13.7%	15.2%	14.5%	14.5%
MIT	6.4%	9.0%	11.7%	8.7%	12.9%
Harvard	8.3%	0.5%	3.6%	4.7%	8.9%
Princeton	2.6%	2.8%	5.8%	3.2%	5.5%
Penn	\$140.1	\$143.9	\$145.6	\$146.70	\$149.60
Yale	-3.6%	-6.6%	0.1%	-1.2%	-0.6%
Dartmouth	-8.4%	-5.6%	-5.9%	-8.1%	-1.3%
Duke	-0.9%	-1.7%	-0.5%	-2.2%	-2.6%
Chicago	-10.1%	-8.1%	-6.4%	-3.7%	-2.9%
Cornell	-10.1%	-9.8%	-8.5%	-10.4%	-9.4%
Brown	-14.3%	-13.6%	-13.0%	-14.3%	-13.1%

Assistant Professors - Mean Academic Base Salaries: Percentage Differences*

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Columbia	-3.1%	-1.8%	-0.6%	8.8%	5.2%
Harvard	8.0%	1.5%	1.5%	-0.4%	1.2%
MIT	-4.5%	-0.4%	1.7%	-1.8%	0.3%
Penn	\$130.3	\$132.6	\$136.5	\$140.30	\$147.90
Stanford	1.0%	3.3%	1.7%	-3.1%	-5.1%
Chicago	-6.8%	-3.1%	-0.9%	-7.1%	-10.7%
Princeton	-11.6%	-10.7%	-10.3%	-11.5%	-11.9%
Yale	-15.9%	-11.1%	-11.9%	-14.6%	-14.7%
Duke	-12.4%	-8.1%	-9.5%	-12.0%	-14.8%
Cornell	-10.5%	-10.3%	-10.7%	-14.2%	-17.2%
Dartmouth	-20.3%	-21.0%	-17.0%	-19.0%	-17.9%
Brown	-25.2%	-24.8%	-25.2%	-27.5%	-27.3%

FACULTY SENATE 2022-2023

Table 5 - Adjusted
Percentage differences in mean adjusted academic base salary of professors at selected research universities for
Academic Years 2017-2018 through 2021-2022

Full Professors - Mean Adjusted Academic Base Salaries: Percentage Differences*

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Chicago	6.6%	4.6%	1.9%	3.6%	3.1%
Penn	\$201.20	\$204.30	\$222.60	\$244.50	\$254.30
Duke	6.7%	6.6%	1.4%	-3.5%	-5.8%
Yale	-3.2%	3.1%	0.2%	-6.3%	-6.3%
Princeton	-6.4%	-7.0%	-12.4%	-9.9%	-10.5%
Dartmouth	-8.5%	-2.6%	-4.3%	-25.0%	-16.6%
Columbia	-16.2%	-19.9%	-22.0%	-19.8%	-21.0%
Brown	-19.4%	-20.0%	-23.5%	-20.7%	-21.4%
Cornell	-13.1%	-14.2%	-17.9%	-24.2%	-24.3%
Harvard	-1.0%	-4.8%	-6.5%	-24.3%	-24.9%
MIT	-10.2%	-9.5%	-11.5%	-28.8%	-26.9%
Stanford	-33.1%	-31.3%	-35.1%	-41.4%	-41.6%

Notes: Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists) and all clinician-educators. Data source: AAUP Salary Surveys.

*Universities are listed from highest to lowest percentage difference for full professors as of 2020-2021. For each year reported, the difference between the Penn mean salary and the mean salary for a comparison university was computed as a percentage of the Penn salary.

Salary figures adjusted Mercer Cost of Living Indices.

Associate Professors - Mean Adjusted Academic Base Salaries: Percentage Differences*

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Duke	9.6%	9.4%	8.1%	1.3%	0.9%
Penn	\$129.70	\$131.50	\$136.60	\$151.50	\$154.40
Chicago	-11.1%	-11.1%	-8.1%	-6.0%	-5.1%
Yale	-5.4%	-6.7%	-1.8%	-6.4%	-5.8%
Columbia	-16.6%	-17.6%	-16.8%	-14.9%	-12.0%
Princeton	-12.3%	-13.8%	-13.7%	-14.5%	-12.6%
Cornell	-4.9%	-5.7%	-5.3%	-13.7%	-12.6%
Dartmouth	-7.2%	-1.1%	-1.2%	-19.6%	-13.6%
Brown	-18.4%	-17.6%	-17.9%	-16.2%	-14.9%
MIT	-6.9%	-5.0%	-2.3%	-23.5%	-20.5%
Harvard	-5.2%	-12.5%	-9.5%	-26.3%	-23.3%
Stanford	-33.5%	-31.9%	-32.3%	-38.9%	-38.8%

Assistant Professors - Mean Adjusted Academic Base Salaries: Percentage Differences*

	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Penn	\$120.60	\$121.20	\$128.00	\$144.80	\$152.70
Duke	-3.2%	2.2%	-1.6%	-8.9%	-11.8%
Chicago	-7.9%	-6.4%	-2.6%	-9.2%	-12.8%
Yale	-17.4%	-11.2%	-13.4%	-19.1%	-19.3%
Cornell	-5.4%	-6.3%	-7.5%	-17.3%	-20.2%
Princeton	-24.4%	-25.2%	-26.8%	-26.6%	-27.0%
Dartmouth	-19.3%	-17.3%	-12.8%	-29.1%	-28.2%
Harvard	-5.5%	-11.6%	-11.3%	-29.9%	-28.7%
Columbia	-29.8%	-32.3%	-31.4%	-26.4%	-28.9%
Brown	-28.8%	-28.4%	-29.4%	-29.0%	-28.9%
MIT	-16.3%	-13.2%	-11.1%	-30.9%	-29.4%
Stanford	-40.4%	-38.0%	-40.2%	-48.2%	-49.3%

Table 6
Full Professors: Median academic base salary percentage increases of faculty continuing in rank who were Penn full professors for FY2022, along with the first and third quartile salary increases

School/Area	First Quartile (Q1), Median (Md.), and Third Quartile (Q3) Percentage Salary Increases, FY 2021-2022		
	(Q1)	(Md.)	(Q3)
All Schools	2.9%	3.0%	4.0%
Annenberg	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Dental Medicine	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Engineering & Applied Science	2.9%	2.9%	3.0%
Graduate Education	3.0%	3.0%	5.0%
Humanities (A&S)	2.8%	2.8%	3.1%
Law	3.0%	3.5%	3.5%
Natural Science (A&S)	2.8%	2.8%	3.2%
Nursing	3.0%	3.0%	4.1%
Perelman-Basic Science	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Social Policy & Practice	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Social Science (A&S)	2.8%	3.0%	3.5%
Veterinary Medicine	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Weitzman	3.0%	3.0%	3.5%
Wharton	3.7%	4.4%	5.1%
Budget Guidelines		3.0%	

Notes: The Budget Guideline is provided for comparison purposes. As per Penn policy, it is a guideline for the salary increment pool for all standing faculty members in each school, but not specifically for each rank.

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the Faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

Salary increases include increases from all sources (e.g. merit, market, retention).

The median (Md.) percentage salary increase is the mid-point of all increases within each school and rank.

The difference between the third (Q3) and first quartile (Q1) provides a measure of variability in the percentage increases for each school and rank.

Median percentage increases are reported only if the number of faculty members in a given school and rank is five or more, quartile percentage increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is nine or more.

Table 7

Associate Professors: Median academic base salary percentage increases of faculty continuing in rank who were Penn Associate Professors for FY2022, along with the first and third quartile salary increases

School/Area	First Quartile (Q1), Median (Md.), and Third Quartile (Q3) Percentage Salary Increases, FY 2021-2022		
	Q1	Md.	Q3
All Schools	2.8%	3.0%	3.5%
Annenberg			
Dental Medicine			
Engineering & Applied Science	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%
Graduate Education	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Humanities (A&S)	2.8%	2.8%	3.0%
Law			
Natural Science (A&S)	2.7%	2.8%	3.0%
Nursing	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%
Perelman-Basic Science	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Social Policy & Practice		3.0%	
Social Science (A&S)	2.8%	2.8%	3.2%
Veterinary Medicine	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Weitzman	3.0%	3.1%	7.5%
Wharton	3.3%	4.5%	5.4%
Budget Guidelines		3.0%	

Notes: The Budget Guideline is provided for comparison purposes. As per Penn policy, it is a guideline for the salary increment pool for all standing faculty members in each school, but not specifically for each rank.

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

Salary increases include increases from all sources (e.g. merit, market, retention).

The median (Md.) percentage salary increase is the mid-point of all increases within each school and rank.

The difference between the third (Q3) and first quartile (Q1) provides a measure of variability in the percentage increases for each school and rank.

Median percentage increases are reported only if the number of faculty members in a given school and rank is five or more, quartile percentage increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is nine or more.

Table 8

Assistant Professors: Median academic base salary percentage increases of faculty continuing in rank who were Penn Assistant Professors for FY2022, along with the first and third quartile salary increases

School/Area	First Quartile (Q1), Median (Md.), and Third Quartile (Q3) Percentage Salary Increases, FY 2021-2022		
	Q1	Md.	Q3
All Schools	3.0%	3.3%	4.6%
Annenberg			
Dental Medicine			
Engineering & Applied Science	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
Graduate Education		3.0%	
Humanities (A&S)	2.8%	3.0%	3.7%
Law			
Natural Science (A&S)	2.8%	3.0%	3.2%
Nursing	3.0%	3.0%	3.1%
Perelman-Basic Science	3.0%	3.0%	4.0%
Social Policy & Practice			
Social Science (A&S)	2.8%	2.9%	3.3%
Veterinary Medicine	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Weitzman		3.0%	
Wharton	4.0%	5.2%	5.6%
Budget Guidelines +		3.0%	

Notes: The Budget Guideline is provided for comparison purposes. As per Penn policy, it is a guideline for the salary increment pool for all standing faculty members in each School, but not specifically for each rank.

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

Salary increases include increases from all sources (e.g. merit, market, retention).

The median (Md.) percentage salary increase is the mid-point of all increases within each school and rank.

The difference between the third (Q3) and first quartile (Q1) provides a measure of variability in the percentage increases for each school and rank.

Median percentage increases are reported only if the number of faculty members in a given school and rank is five or more, quartile percentage increases are reported only if the number of faculty members is nine or more.

FACULTY SENATE 2022-2023

Table 9
Mean academic base salary of Penn standing faculty members who continued in rank by rank

Rank/Academic Year/Metric			Amount	Not Weighted	Weighted
Professor	2017-2018	Mean	\$221,028	1.74	1.85
		Median	\$200,460	1.92	1.85
	2018-2019	Mean	\$227,354	1.72	1.87
		Median	\$205,320	1.86	1.87
	2019-2020	Mean	\$234,776	1.76	1.89
		Median	\$211,391	1.93	1.88
	2020-2021	Mean	\$237,743	1.79	1.90
		Median	\$215,740	1.95	1.89
	2021-2022	Mean	\$245,255	1.72	1.87
		Median	\$218,367	1.86	1.86
Associate Professor	2017-2018	Mean	\$137,758	1.09	1.24
		Median	\$119,710	1.15	1.25
	2018-2019	Mean	\$141,883	1.07	1.25
		Median	\$124,309	1.13	1.24
	2019-2020	Mean	\$144,264	1.08	1.25
		Median	\$126,834	1.16	1.23
	2020-2021	Mean	\$144,238	1.08	1.23
		Median	\$126,408	1.14	1.21
	2021-2022	Mean	\$149,288	1.05	1.22
		Median	\$131,684	1.12	1.21
Assistant Professor	2017-2018	Mean	\$126,802	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$104,498	1.00	1.00
	2018-2019	Mean	\$132,272	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$110,123	1.00	1.00
	2019-2020	Mean	\$133,232	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$109,366	1.00	1.00
	2020-2021	Mean	\$133,132	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$110,864	1.00	1.00
	2021-2022	Mean	\$142,903	1.00	1.00
		Median	\$117,619	1.00	1.00

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

The data are weighted by the number of continuing faculty members at each rank in each school.

Table 10
Variability of academic base salary for faculty who continued in rank:
first, second and third quartile median salary by rank and year

Rank/Academic Year	Q1	Median	Q3	IQR	IQR-to-Median Ratio	# of Areas
Professor						
2017-2018	\$160,557	\$200,460	\$268,324	\$107,767	0.54	14
2018-2019	\$165,139	\$205,320	\$273,202	\$108,063	0.53	14
2019-2020	\$170,360	\$211,391	\$283,242	\$112,882	0.53	14
2020-2021	\$171,000	\$215,740	\$291,186	\$120,186	0.56	14
2021-2022	\$175,668	\$218,367	\$297,190	\$121,523	0.56	14
Associate Professor						
2017-2018	\$108,932	\$119,710	\$140,858	\$31,926	0.27	13
2018-2019	\$111,554	\$124,309	\$145,655	\$34,101	0.27	13
2019-2020	\$114,378	\$126,834	\$149,867	\$35,489	0.28	13
2020-2021	\$112,664	\$126,408	\$148,650	\$35,986	0.29	13
2021-2022	\$117,193	\$131,684	\$153,635	\$36,442	0.28	13
Assistant Professor						
2017-2018	\$92,739	\$104,498	\$162,500	\$69,761	0.67	13
2018-2019	\$95,383	\$110,123	\$170,500	\$75,118	0.68	13
2019-2020	\$97,695	\$109,366	\$170,000	\$72,305	0.66	14
2020-2021	\$97,660	\$110,864	\$166,000	\$68,340	0.62	15
2021-2022	\$102,752	\$117,619	\$177,250	\$74,498	0.63	14

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

Table 11
Percentage Salary Increase Distribution of Faculty Who Continued in Rank by Sex and Rank

Rank/Sex		First Quartile (Q1), Median (Md.), and Third Quartile (Q3) Percentage Salary Increases, FY 2021-2022		
		Q1	Md.	Q3
Professor	Men	2.9%	3.0%	3.8%
	Women	2.9%	3.0%	4.0%
Associate Professor	Men	2.8%	3.0%	3.3%
	Women	2.8%	3.0%	3.7%
Assistant Professor	Men	3.0%	3.7%	5.1%
	Women	3.0%	3.1%	4.4%

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

FACULTY SENATE 2022-2023

Table 12

Mean academic base salary of Penn standing faculty members who continued in rank by rank and sex.

Rank/Academic Year /Metric		Unweighted			Weighted by School/Discipline			Men - Women	
		Women	Men	% Diff.	Women	Men	% Diff.	Unweighted	Weighted
Professor									
2017-2018	Mean	\$209,332	\$224,612	7.3%	\$219,887	\$224,612	2.1%	\$15,280	\$4,725
	Median	\$191,455	\$202,303	5.7%	\$214,914	\$218,668	1.7%		
2018-2019	Mean	\$215,827	\$231,146	7.1%	\$227,665	\$231,146	1.5%	\$15,319	\$3,481
	Median	\$197,760	\$207,566	5.0%	\$224,511	\$226,504	0.9%		
2019-2020	Mean	\$223,194	\$238,722	7.0%	\$237,028	\$238,722	0.7%	\$15,528	\$1,694
	Median	\$205,308	\$214,505	4.5%	\$235,083	\$233,411	-0.7%		
2020-2021	Mean	\$224,811	\$242,464	7.9%	\$239,490	\$242,464	1.2%	\$17,653	\$2,974
	Median	\$205,986	\$218,275	6.0%	\$232,129	\$237,769	2.4%		
2021-2022	Mean	\$231,901	\$250,708	8.1%	\$247,735	\$250,708	1.2%	\$18,807	\$2,973
	Median	\$211,680	\$222,215	5.0%	\$241,502	\$244,945	1.4%		
Associate Professor									
2017-2018	Mean	\$132,170	\$141,178	6.8%	\$141,845	\$141,178	-0.5%	\$9,008	-\$667
	Median	\$117,815	\$124,877	6.0%	\$141,123	\$139,411	-1.2%		
2018-2019	Mean	\$136,518	\$145,392	6.5%	\$147,284	\$145,392	-1.3%	\$8,874	-\$1,892
	Median	\$122,250	\$127,062	3.9%	\$145,707	\$143,502	-1.5%		
2019-2020	Mean	\$134,632	\$149,871	11.3%	\$144,834	\$149,871	3.5%	\$15,239	\$5,037
	Median	\$124,795	\$130,139	4.3%	\$141,486	\$144,844	2.4%		
2020-2021	Mean	\$137,327	\$148,394	8.1%	\$147,733	\$148,394	0.4%	\$11,067	\$661
	Median	\$124,036	\$128,902	3.9%	\$142,294	\$143,322	0.7%		
2021-2022	Mean	\$144,832	\$152,124	5.0%	\$153,156	\$152,124	-0.7%	\$7,292	-\$1,032
	Median	\$129,027	\$133,566	3.5%	\$148,644	\$146,924	-1.2%		
Assistant Professor									
2017-2018	Mean	\$117,892	\$134,178	13.8%	\$134,366	\$134,178	-0.1%	\$16,286	-\$188
	Median	\$100,131	\$112,231	12.1%	\$129,538	\$130,074	0.4%		
2018-2019	Mean	\$122,891	\$140,914	14.7%	\$138,599	\$140,914	1.7%	\$18,023	\$2,315
	Median	\$103,186	\$115,951	12.4%	\$135,424	\$136,582	0.9%		
2019-2020	Mean	\$126,504	\$139,702	10.4%	\$138,366	\$139,702	1.0%	\$13,198	\$1,336
	Median	\$103,629	\$116,190	12.1%	\$135,354	\$135,234	-0.1%		
2020-2021	Mean	\$126,384	\$140,039	10.8%	\$136,791	\$140,039	2.4%	\$13,655	\$3,248
	Median	\$103,655	\$116,473	12.4%	\$133,037	\$135,463	1.8%		
2021-2022	Mean	\$136,611	\$148,923	9.0%	\$143,709	\$148,923	3.6%	\$12,312	\$5,214
	Median	\$108,454	\$121,838	12.3%	\$140,021	\$146,608	4.7%		

Notes: All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members with an appointment at the time of the fall census for both years. Faculty members on paid leave or unpaid leave are reported at their full salaries.

Excluded are all members of the faculty of PSOM (except basic scientists); all clinician-educators in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice; faculty members on phased retirement plans; and the 12 deans.

Salaries for female faculty members are weighted using male weights. Male weights are calculated as a ratio of male faculty in each school/area to the total number of male faculty at Penn. Percent difference is calculated as the difference between male and female salaries divided by the female salary. Negative percent differences indicate that salaries of female faculty exceed those of male faculty.