Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

It has been both an honor and a wonderfully engaging experience to serve as Chair of The University of Pennsylvania’s Faculty Senate during the past year. This position reveals the depth and breadth of talent, dedication, and hard work of so many who help to make Penn great, including my faculty colleagues and the senior administration. The model of shared governance at Penn is a powerful mandate. I took this mandate seriously in my role as the Chair and was richly rewarded as a result.

One of my key objectives this academic year was to focus on the issue of campus wellness, a priority for the University. With the hiring of Benoit Dubé as the Chief Wellness Officer, there is a clear commitment to changing the culture on Penn’s campus, including improved access to mental health services and a desire to integrate wellness into the classroom and life outside of the classroom. With support from Provost Wendell Pritchett and the Chief Wellness Officer, we launched a crowdsourcing competition, Your Big Idea Wellness Challenge. We invited faculty, students, and staff to submit ideas to enhance wellness on campus. The contest received over 450 idea submissions, and 14 were selected to present three-minute pitches to a packed audience and a panel of judges. Three ideas were selected for funding and piloting during the next academic year: Weekly Themed Wellness Walks, Nature Rx, and Penn Food Hub. You will soon be able to read about these winners on the Penn Wellness website, www.wellnessatpenn.com.

Below I wish to highlight our accomplishments this year, acknowledging the important contributions of the standing committees, and pass the torch to my successor.

Highlights of Senate Activities

Many of the accomplishments of the Senate this academic year resulted from the work of its committees, whose reports follow in this Almanac supplement. I am grateful to the Chairs of these committees, whose reports appear below: Martha Farah (Grievance Commission); Robert Ghrist (SCOA); Carmen Guerra (SCFDE); Lea Ann Matura (SCOF); Dominic Sisti (SCSEP); and Herbert Smith (SCESF). Their dedication and hard work led to several creative and important recommendations on complex issues facing the University.

Student Mental Health and Wellbeing

The Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) reports that substantial progress has been made in advancing wellness efforts throughout the University, signified in part by the creation of the position of Chief Wellness Officer. SCSEP also identifies several opportunities for improvement across two areas: faculty involvement in enhancing student wellness and the critical review of academic policies and practices that have an impact on student wellness. Further, SCSEP recommends the integration of wellness-based activities, assignments, and other curricular components in courses across the University, a charge to be addressed by this committee next year.

The Role of Non-Standing Faculty

More than half of the individuals at Penn who teach our students and engage in research and clinical care are not members of the standing Faculty. The populations of the Associated Faculty and the Academic Support Staff continue to grow, and these groups are teaching our students with increasing regularity. The evolution of the faculty composition deserves careful thought and a strategic vision that will guide us forward. Some of the schools at Penn include members of the “non-standing” faculty on their own senate, but, save for two seats on the 94-member University Council, there is no University-wide forum for their concerns, so the issue of voice and representation is critical. SCOF launched an initiative to gather data on this important group of faculty and began with a focus group of Lecturers from the four undergraduate schools. This effort will continue, and we hope these data will inform future strategies.

Faculty Compensation

As highlighted in the report of SCESF, the gender gap in faculty base salaries is increasingly due to differences in salaries across Schools. It is important to recognize that these data capture base salary only, and there may be inequities associated with other forms of compensation such as administrative stipends and off-load teaching. The Senate respectfully requests the opportunity to access these other forms of compensation in order to obtain a more complete picture of faculty compensation and potential inequities.

University Response to Sexual Misconduct and Violence

The Tri-Chairs and SEC engaged in numerous discussions throughout the year with central administration regarding Penn’s response to the revised policies on sexual misconduct, issued by the US Department of Education in November 2018. After much consultation with faculty, students, and staff, Penn’s finalized Sexual Misconduct Policy was published in an Almanac supplement on April 30, 2019. Taking feedback into account, the policy represents an umbrella for all issues related to sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, and sexual violence and centralizes oversight of the investigation and resolution of all complaints by a new Associate Vice President of Equity and Title IX Officer.

The Senate Executive Committee (“SEC”)

SEC meets monthly and includes representatives from all schools. This year we heard from key players in the senior administration, including President Amy Gutmann and Provost Pritchett. We also reserved time to think about and discuss issues of importance to the faculty as a whole: issues that cut across school lines, such as sexual misconduct, and the role of the standing faculty in online education at Penn. These discussions were always informative and lively and showcased the incredible engagement of our Faculty.
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Executive Summary of the 2019 SCESF Report on the Economic Status of the Faculty

Introduction
This Executive Summary provides an overview of the 2019 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 2019 Report covers Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, from July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2018. This Executive Summary presents key observations and issues of concern. The full 2019 Report, including all publicly viewable tables provided to the Committee by the Vice Provost’s Office and administrative responses to SCESF’s recommendations, is published on the Almanac website at https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/SCESF_full_report_2019.pdf

Key Observations and Concerns
a. A 3% annual increase for faculty continuing in rank remains the University target. Penn continues to specify 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, in part because Schools and other units whose budgets do not permit such average increases are not required to maintain the target.
b. Base salaries of Assistant Professors are highly competitive; those of Professors and Associate Professors are less so. When salaries at Penn are compared to those at comparable research institutions, salaries of Assistant Professors remain near the top, whereas those for Professors and Associate Professors have settled into a middle range that stamps Penn as a notch below the top institutions.
c. The gender gap in faculty base salaries is increasingly a gap due to differences in salaries across Schools. Statistical analysis shows that base salaries within Schools are, on average, essentially the same for male and female Associate Professors and Assistant Professors, and that the difference among Professors is small and fading. But even as women at Penn attain a distribution by rank that is increasingly similar to that of their male colleagues, the continuing concentration of women in Schools and fields with lower average salaries augurs a continuation of a gender disparity in salaries across the University as a whole.
d. 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.
e. 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. These may differ across faculty and they may differ among Schools. 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.
f. Data omit segments of the Standing Faculty. Data provided to SCESF cover 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.

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 assessing gender and other equity issues related to compensation.
b. Provide data for all Standing Faculty. The absence of these data is of continuing concern to SCESF, since the committee is charged with representing the interests of all Standing Faculty at Penn.
c. Maintain an eminent faculty via competitive salaries. Salaries of Professors and Associate Professors in several fields and Schools lag the comparative standing targeted by the administration.
d. Consider the structural source of continuing gender equality in salaries. Average salaries are lower in the Schools in which female faculty are comparatively numerous.
e. Increase the retirement benefit matching contribution to 10%. Such an increase would bring Penn into alignment with competing institutions and better prepare faculty for retirement.

SCESF Membership 2018-2019
Peter Cappelli, Wharton/Management
Blanca Himes, PSOM/Biostatistics, Epidemiology, & Informatics
Sarah Kagan, Nursing
Iouri Manovskii, SAS/Economics
Pamela Sankar, PSOM/Medical Ethics & Health Policy
Herbert Smith, Chair, SAS/Sociology

Ex Officio:
Jennifer Pinto-Martín, Nursing, Faculty Senate Chair
Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/Electrical & Systems Engineering, Faculty Senate Past Chair
Steven Kimbrough, Wharton/Operations, Information & Decisions, 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 & Analysis, and Human Resources. The Committee also notes that this year’s full report directly benefited from presentation and analysis described in reports from previous years and, where appropriate, some previous text is included.

The full report of the 2019 SCESF, including numerous Tables and the Responses from the Administration, can be found online at https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/SCESF_full_report_2019.pdf

Report of the Faculty Senate Grievance Commission
The Faculty Senate Grievance Commission of the University of Pennsylvania is an independent committee consisting of three faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This Commission is available to members of the Penn faculty and academic support staff 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 2018-2019, the Commission was composed of James Palmer (PSOM/Otorhinolaryngology, Past Chair), and Martha Farah (SAS/Psychology, Chair), and Connie Ulrich (Nursing, Chair-Elect).

During this year the Commission was approached by three faculty members concerning a variety of issues. One case involved a long-standing but unresolved problem with laboratory facilities. After discussions with the Commission chair concerning the requirements and procedures for a formal grievance, the professor opted to pursue other courses of action. A second case, involving procedures for reappointment as an assistant professor, was resolved within the faculty member’s school. The third case, regarding compensation, grants management, and intellectual property, remains under discussion between the faculty member and the Commission chair.

—Martha Farah (Grievance Commission Chair, 2018-2019)
Building a culture of wellness begins even before SCSEP recommends developing communication strategies, 21, 30-40. This is a course on happiness. Given the challenges we recognize that students may experience stress and anxiety. We encourage faculty to provide a supportive environment where students can feel comfortable discussing their experiences with wellness. SCSEP recommends that an essay question be developed for The Pursuit of Happiness course:

**“Create life balance”**

Faculty-student interaction in the classroom: SCSEP recommends all faculty include verbiage in their syllabus related to wellness. CAPS provides an example:

> Your wellness is important to me! College can be tough. If you are feeling distressed, please know that Penn provides many resources for care and support. Counseling and Psychological Services (215-898-7021) and the HELP line (215-898-HELP) offer trained 24-hour services to all members of the Penn community. You can also talk to me. Though I cannot provide therapy to you, I’m happy to be available for support, consultation, and guidance.

Another example is offered by Professor James Pawelski in his syllabus for The Pursuit of Happiness course:

> **Important Note:** This is a course on happiness. Given the challenges of college life, we understand that you may well be experiencing levels of unhappiness beyond what this course can address. If you are feeling distressed, please know that Penn provides many resources for care and support. Counseling and Psychological Services (215-898-7021) and the HELP line (215-898-HELP) offer trained 24-hour services to all members of the Penn community. You can also talk to me. Though I cannot provide therapy to you, I’m happy to be available for support, consultation, and guidance.

Likewise faculty members should be encouraged to include a brief introductory discussion about themselves and to describe to students their own strategies for maintaining life balance. Self-disclosure, when appropriate, of one’s own lived experiences with mental illness offers a moment for connection between students and professors, as an invitation to students to communicate about their own challenges, and possibly as another avenue for student support should they need it.

Faculty-student interaction in college housing: The impact of faculty-student interaction on student wellness is significant, especially with regard to faculty who live in student housing. College houses each customize their own surveys, though it is possible that College Housing and Academic Services (CHAS) might be able to provide a summary of findings from a recent set of surveys. SCSEP members expressed interest in reviewing survey instruments in order to recommend improvements for how wellness-related questions are addressed. They also proposed the creation of a rubric of strategies for assisting students with self-care for use by college houses.

**Exam scheduling:** We recognize that students may experience stress around mid-term exam periods. In consideration of students who typically take two or more courses within a particular department concurrently, efforts should be made within departments to stagger mid-term exam days.

**Major choice and career trajectory:** SCSEP members fully recognize that the ultimate aim of many Penn students is to launch successful careers in their fields of choice. However, this aim sometimes supersedes the broader University goal of providing students with a well-rounded education. Student interest in liberal arts education has declined, despite recent trends indicating employers value individuals with both technical skills and knowledge in the arts and humanities. SCSEP reviewed research on the linkage between college majors, earnings, and job satisfaction. Most of the current research in this area has focused on the linkage of majors to lifetime income. Stanford economist Caroline Hoxby examined the records of 230,000 students and alumni.1 She found that the highest earnings are in engineering, mathematics, and IT; the lowest are in childhood education, theology, social work, and the arts. John Robst, research associate professor at the University of South Florida, using a national database, concluded that (1) students majoring in the liberal arts have a higher probability of changing occupations, but the ability to change is much easier, and there are no negative effects on income; and (2) for those who majored in a specific skill but then did not work in that specific area, the negative effects on income were substantial.2 SCSEP encourages the initiation of a study involving Penn students and alumni aimed at understanding the relationship between majors with lifetime job satisfaction, limited to Penn graduates. The Mellon Foundation appears very interested in the issue of a perceived decline in liberal arts education and could be a potential funder for such a study.

**Clubs:** SCSEP recommends that the student club entry system continue to be reformed. Certain aspects of club entry and the “auditions” process amount to hazing. SCSEP noted the need for wellness programming to address problems related to a culture of “toxic competitiveness” amongst students. SCSEP endorses the Undergraduate Assembly’s and the Student Activities Council’s resolution outlining seven guidelines that student clubs should follow when recruiting students. https://sacfund.net/policies/club-recruitment-policies

**“Less is More”:** SCSEP recommends developing communication strategies to students that emphasize deep engagement in a few select activities while discouraging over-commitment to many. We recognize the energy and passion students bring to Penn but wish to instill in students a sense of self-awareness and recognition of reasonable limits to prevent over-commitment, which may lead to stress, distress, and physical and mental health issues.

**Wellness courses:** SCSEP recommends the integration of wellness-based activities, assignments, and other curricular components in courses across the University. We encourage the development of a roster of courses that are designated as having a wellness component that might eventually become components to a minor or concentration. Courses might include those that provide students an opportunity to write about the role of arts in their wellness and a deeper understanding of the biological bases of stress, depression, and other behavioral health challenges. SCSEP recommends:

1 Article in press
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mends the consideration of accrediting physical education courses. (Mis)use of stimulant medications by Penn students: Students who have mental health conditions may divert their medications to other students who do not. Common examples include the diversion of methylphenidate (Ritalin) and Adderall. SCSEP recommends a multi-media, multi-platform communication initiative that aims to teach students that these medications are not cognitive enhancers, that there are significant risks in the misuse of these medications, and that “sharing” medications with peers is dangerous.

**Recommendations to 2019-2020 SCSEP**

1. Examine the effects of social media use on Penn student wellness.
2. Study the effect of student choice of majors and activities on wellness by identifying case studies that illustrate the relationship between balanced student schedules and successful career trajectories.
3. Review the student experience survey instruments used by College Houses and Academic Services and recommend improvements for how wellness-related questions are addressed.

---

**Report of the Senate Committee on the 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., I.G.-H.1., I.-K., II.E. III., V., VI. (henceforth referred to as the Faculty Handbook).

**Specific Charges and Steps Taken to Address Them**

SCOA’s specific charges were to:

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. Assess the utilization of dependent tuition benefits and employer-provided retirement contributions by Standing Faculty members;
3. Examine the scope of programming and resources available to faculty members within the portfolio of the Chief Wellness Officer; and
4. Continue to review the distribution of University Research Foundation awards by research area.

SCOA expended the bulk of its efforts on point #1. Points #2 and #4 were not considered in depth, and point #3 was addressed directly by the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy.

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.

In order to properly assess both the current state of affairs and to become better oriented with the relevant procedures and protocols, SCOA invited the following guests from Penn’s Online Learning Initiative (OLI): Peter Decherney, faculty director; and Rebecca Stein, executive director. In addition, SCOA also invited Polk Wagner, professor of law, to orient SCOA on relevant IP issues. SCOA is grateful to its invited guests for their candid conversations and helpful information.

SCOA highlights the following findings:

1) Penn remains a leader in online education, and the demand for online course generation is rapidly increasing. This is evidenced by the recent creation of the Master of Computer and Information Technology (MCIT) in SEAS and the incipient Bachelor’s of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) in SAS/LPS, both of which are degree-granting programs. Both these and other programs to come will require large numbers of high-quality courses to be built quickly and to Penn’s standards of excellence. This is a very positive development, and Penn should continue to exercise leadership in this domain.

2) Since Penn’s entrance into the online course market, incentives for standing Faculty to engage in course development and maintenance have declined in several respects, as follows:

2A) Creation of an impactful online course is now more difficult than it was 5-7 years ago (competition has greatly increased, and with it, the amount of work required to build a quality product in a winner-take-all market), whereas novelty and publicity for doing so have declined. There is little social or professional reward for faculty investing time in course creation, and less for course maintenance.

2B) From the initial round of contracts for faculty-created massive open online courses (MOOCs) to the current, “standard” OLI “Open Online Course Development Agreement,” a shared faculty pool for profits has been initiated. However, to date, no such pool has been created and no accounting of costs and revenues has been provided. In addition, schools or centers hosting the most successful revenue-generating courses (e.g., Wharton) have renegotiated separate terms with Courseera and have isolated their revenue streams away from participation in any potential shared pool. This does not encourage faculty buy-in.

3) In addition, issues surrounding intellectual property (IP) when Standing Faculty create course content has been and remains unclear on a few points. The Faculty Handbook (Section I.I.B. Policy Relating to Copyrights and Commitment of Effort for Faculty) is clear that “creators of intellectual property own the copyright to works resulting from their research, teaching and writing.” While the use of University resources for filming of videos would appear to fall under the proviso that “Exceptions to this policy arise when the faculty create works that make substantial use of the services of University non-faculty employees or University resources”, the standard OLI Agreement states in Section 4.3 that:

*Copyright Policy Does Not Apply. You agree that the University’s “Policy Relating to Copyrights and Commitment of Effort for Faculty”, and any amendments or replacements in the future, (“Copyright Policy”) does not and will not apply to you in connection with the Course and this Agreement. You hereby waive application of the Copyright Policy to the Course and this Agreement.*

This obscures rather than clarifies the situation, since the Faculty Handbook would appear to already account for exceptions based on ap-
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lication of University resources (viz. filming). Other, related, questions include:

3A) What happens to course content when a faculty member is no longer employed at Penn? OLI has indicated flexibility and good-faith, but no standards exist.

3B) To what extent does faculty creation of materials for online courses count as work-for-hire? In cases where it does, are the appropriate work-for-hire policies (e.g., mutual agreement of such before work commenced) followed?

3C) What is the protocol for the case where faculty are assigned creation or administration of online courses as part of standard teaching duties.

3D) What is the protocol for institutional repurposing of faculty work products (e.g., videos and other online content) for other courses or purposes?

4) These observations – an increase in demand for online courses coupled with a decrease in supply incentive and unclear IP protocols – point to an equilibrium where faculty are largely-to-wholly disengaged from the process of providing education to an increasing population of learners in our community and beyond. Such an outcome would limit faculty fulfillment of the Penn Compact tenets of inclusion and innovation and would be furthermore deleterious for all parties, especially learners.

5) Commensurate with its research from the previous year, SCOA observed apparent disparities across schools in terms of involvement of Standing Faculty with respect to contracting processes and principles and remuneration. Online learning compensation for Standing Faculty members should be compared against residential coursework compensation across schools.

6) SCOA noted concerns about quality check mechanisms in place for online coursework, describing a “fragile system” and anecdotal accounts of inconsistent reviews. SCOA members noted interest in data regarding the number of online courses developed over the past two years in SEAS and SAS, the portion of which were developed primarily by Standing Faculty, and the number of part-time lecturer contracts that have been added as a function of online programs.

Recommendations:

1) As additional avenues for online learning are implemented, Penn should achieve transparency with Standing Faculty regarding revenues, costs, and time expectations for creating and managing coursework content.

2) The Faculty Handbook, the above-referenced “standard” OLI agreement, and any school-based agreements with Standing Faculty should clearly and consistently detail intellectual property ownership parameters with respect to the faculty member and the University.

Other Business: Faculty Parental Policy

SCOA considered amendments to Faculty Handbook section II.E.4, the Faculty Parental Policy, which were proposed by Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen. SCOA concluded that the previous policy was written in such a manner as to invite abuse and that a change in the statement of the policy is in order. It was noted in particular that any such policy clarification will of needs be general, with specific interpretation left to the schools. For example, in PSOM, it is nearly impossible to disaggregate teaching from other activities (e.g., clinicals), making on over-specific policy unworkable. SCOA recommends a careful, compact statement interpretable by individual schools. SCOA defers further discussion to the Senate Executive Committee, which will review the proposed policy amendment prior to its finalization.

Proposed Charges for SCOA in 2019-2020:

1. Collect data on online courses developed and taught by Standing Faculty and by Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff and incentives offered.

2. Assess the quality and structure of the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) and Master of Computer and Information Technology (MCIT) programs.

3. Conduct interviews with stakeholders involved in strategic planning of online learning at Penn.

4. Assess the utilization of dependent tuition benefits and employer-provided retirement contributions by Standing Faculty members.

SCOA Membership 2018-2019

Robert Ghrist, SAS/ Mathematics & SEAS/ESE, Chair
Ryan Baker, GSAS
Joel Bennett, PSOM/Medicine
Ken Drobatz, Vet School
Al Filreis, SAS/English
Kevin Platt, SAS/Russian & East European Studies
Talid Sinno, SEAS/CBE & MEAM

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 (SCFDE)

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 in mentoring, diversity, and equity; and (iv) issues periodic reports on the activities and findings of the committee that make recommendations for implementation.

2018-2019 Specific Charges for the SCFDE

• 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.
• Identify best practices for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs) across schools.
• Review the climate of mid-career faculty across schools.
• 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.
• Maintain communication between the SCFDE and the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.

Report of Activities

The Committee met a total of nine times (Aug. 30, Sept. 6, Oct. 4, Oct. 26, Dec. 6, Jan. 10, Feb. 7, Mar. 7, Apr. 4). Invited guests included Anita Allen, Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF); Lisa Bellini, Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM) Vice Dean for Academic Affairs; Dawn Bonnell, Vice Provost for Research; Matt Hartley, Graduate School of Education (GSE) Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; Eve Higginbotham, PSOM Vice Dean for Diversity and Inclusion; Joann Mitchell, Senior Vice President for Institutional Affairs & Chief Diversity Officer; Karen Redrobe, Director of the Wolf Humanities Center and the Elliot and Roslyn Jaffe Professor of Cinema and Modern Media; and Wendy White, University General Counsel.

Report on Charges

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.

SCFDE inquired with Dr. Dawn Bonnell, Vice Provost for Research, about the functioning of the Postdoctoral Fellowship for Academic Diversity Program. The committee also invited Dr. Karen Redrobe, the Director of the Wolf Humanities Center and the Elliot and Roslyn Jaffe Professor of Cinema and Modern Media, to learn more about its postdoctoral fellowship program and generally about postdoctoral fellowship opportunities in the humanities at Penn.

(continued on page 6)
Dr. Bonnell provided background on the Program: Since its 2010 inception, a total of 57 postdocs have gone through the program. Roughly 50% of postdocs remain working in academia; the others work in industry. The program funds half the salary and expenses for the postdoc, and the host school provides the other half. Each school decides and prioritizes which candidates they wish to accept. Some schools (particularly SAS and PSOM) will hire more postdocs than the Office of the Vice Provost for Research (OVPR) has the budget to support, in which case the school pays 100% of the expenses. Though candidates apply directly to OVPR, they are required to have identified a school-based mentor and project prior to submitting an application. Postdocs receive a one-year commitment with an option for up to two additional years.

Dr. Bonnell informed the Committee that of the 57 postdocs, only two participants have remained at Penn (one in Nursing and the other in African American Studies). She noted that the program is not designed to lead to a faculty or research position here, and that there were challenges to hiring postdocs internally (e.g., it is discouraged to hire postdocs in some fields since the alum would likely be competing for grant dollars directly against their mentor at the institution). Only in special cases would talented postdocs have been encouraged to shift to other research areas as a means to retain them.

The Committee also heard from Dr. Redrobe about the postdoc program of the Wolf Humanities Center, a Mellon-endowed program that provides five one-year fellowships. Dr. Redrobe pointed out several institutional challenges that have to be addressed in order to create and foster diversity in postdoc programs. For instance, application forms received by review committees provide no demographic data on applicants except for gender, leaving the committee to do “guesswork” as to race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background. Dr. Redrobe has called for a more rigorous process for collecting such demographic data and implementing best practices for transparency in review processes. And, starting next year, the Wolf Humanities Center application form will begin to gather demographic data on applicants in a legal manner.

Dr. Redrobe noted the importance of implementing changes in the process of how centers and schools choose their leaders to ensure that diversity is kept in mind throughout these processes. SAS centers are all asked to have bylaws with parameters for leadership and postdoc selection processes and for advisory boards. Promoting diversity in all those areas (more than simply identifying a “token” person of color who “bats” for diversity while everyone else “bats” for their field of research) would improve diversity for future entering cohorts. Dr. Redrobe encouraged Penn as a whole to consider ways in which diversity can be made a mandate for all committees.

There appears to be no comprehensive list of postdoc programs at Penn. SCFDDE recommends the creation of a centralized information/website about all postdocs at Penn. This can help to capture information about the range of postdoctoral programs at Penn and also provide a sense of the most promising candidates in different fields. Furthermore, it can create a hub to help enhance a sense of community among postdocs and their supporters. Such community building could include bringing postdocs together for social purposes, career counseling, and other activities.

Recommendations:

1. The Provost postdoctoral fellowships should be re-focused so as to further the diversification of the faculty at Penn. One possibility is to treat the postdoctoral application process explicitly as part of an application for a tenure track, with the department taking on the postdoctoral fellow committing itself to allocating a tenure track line to the selected candidate on the fellowship’s completion. Some departments, however, may not want to make this kind of commitment up front. Another option is that the postdocs might be allocated as an additional recruitment incentive to attract diverse candidates who have already been made a tenure-track offer by a department in a school at Penn. Other universities (Princeton, Michigan, UC Berkeley, and Chicago) have been utilizing postdoctoral fellowships in this way.

2. Consider shortening Provost postdoctoral fellowship periods. The current fellowship is allocated for a three-year period, making it one of the more generous fellowships of its kind. It may be that a three-year period is optimal for some schools and departments around the University (perhaps in Medicine, for instance, and the natural sciences) but in many areas a three-year commitment may be less necessary. In most fields a three-year period is more than is needed to provide young scholars with time to carry out their postdoctoral research, and conversely, for departments to have the time to evaluate young scholars (if that is the fellowship’s purpose). A three-year fellowship is also a considerable investment of resources on the part of the university. In fields where the norm for fellowships is two or even one years, shortening the fellowship period would free up resources for a greater number of fellowships to be allocated across the university and in the School of Arts and Sciences in particular.

3. Create a location for centralized information about postdocs and for postdocs across all disciplines at Penn so as to share information about both candidates for the post-docs and existing post-docs at Penn. An overall theme cited by SCFDDE members was the need for an enhanced community of postdocs and their supporters. Such community building could include bringing postdocs together for social purposes, career counseling, and other activities.

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

To learn about the best practices for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs), SCFDDE invited Dr. Eve Higginbotham, Vice Dean for Inclusion and Diversity (OID) at PSOM, and Ms. Corinne Fahl, OID Program Coordinator. PSOM has the most experience with the DSA program as it currently has 45 DSAs embedded in over 200 annual faculty searches at PSOM.

With the adoption of Interfolio in July 2019, some of the current DSA responsibilities and best practices may change. However, until now, DSA Best Practices have included:

- DSAs should meet with the department chair and/or division chief annually to define the open faculty position(s), align the responsibilities and goals of each position with the appropriate faculty track, and provide guidance on composition of the search committee chair and members. The shared goal should be to make search committees as diverse as possible. SCFDDE acknowledged that the limited number of female and underrepresented minority Standing Faculty at PSOM results in increased frequency of requests for their participation on search committees.

- Until now, DSAs have reviewed and approved position descriptions prior to posting. This will continue with the introduction of Interfolio.

The DSA attends the first search committee meeting as an ex-officio member, helps to familiarize the committee with University and School policies and resources, provides unconscious bias training, encourages use of and provides a list of structured interview and applicant evaluation questions, and ensures the committee takes steps to expand the applicant pool. DSAs should continue to serve ex-officio to the search committee to ensure that best practices are followed and that all candidates are given fair consideration. DSAs should attend the final decision meeting before offers are extended to assure the process is compliant. In addition, the DSA should review and approve the “Affirmative Action Appointment” form (the format of the form will change with Interfolio) and liaise with university officials as necessary to ensure process compliance.

PSOM has created a repository of DSA tools, which is available at https://www.med.upenn.edu/fapd/docurepo/list/category/diversity-search-advisor/

Some of these tools including a full list of the roles and responsibilities of, and checklists and best practices for, DSAs. There are also links to additional resources including the Implicit Association Test and an Association of American Medical Colleges video that reviews the science of unconscious bias. (Note: PSOM is planning for improved faculty search resources for July 2019 with the introduction of Interfolio).
Non-standing faculty” to “professional faculty. There is ongoing work to understand their experiences at GSE. This work has led to professional faculty tracks that include Professors of Practice, Senior Lecturers, and Lecturers. These faculty members are critical to Penn’s mission and since the role requires a significant investment of both time and skill by the DSA, full-time commitment is required.

In addition, there are promising strategies at PSOM that should be more widely piloted by other schools and departments, including creating a database of diverse candidates currently at peer and minority serving institutions to share with search committees, and having the DSA conduct unconscious bias training workshops aimed at search committees and senior members of the administration. Ms. Fahl has agreed to train any interested administrators in these strategies.

Finally, while SCFDDE suggests that the focus of the DSA program should continue on recruiting of diverse faculty, investment of similar levels in retention of existing faculty might result in even greater returns on-investment to Penn. One potential way to build on the success of the DSA program is to consider creating a departmental diversity advisor who could be trained by the Vice Provost for Faculty to be a resource on matters related to diversity and inclusion for his/her department.

Review the climate of mid-career faculty across schools.
SCFDDE obtained information from several schools regarding the climate of mid-career faculty concerning their successful progression toward the rank of (full) Professor. The committee invited presenters from PSOM and GSE to learn about mid-career faculty challenges across the schools. The committee heard presentations from Lisa Bellini, PSOM Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, regarding a mid-career survey conducted at PSOM in 2018. Dr. Bellini stressed the importance of mentorship over the past decade, where new faculty have been expected to have a formal mentor named in the offer letter.

Dr. Bellini described challenges that mid-career faculty may face, including less direct motivation to earn further promotion, and could benefit from mentorship to increase their joy, satisfaction, and engagement with their work. Pressures on mid-career faculty include acute work overload. On average, PSOM faculty members work 60 hours per week while facing increases in non-work related responsibilities such as raising a family. There has been a cultural shift toward working families in the last two decades, with 75% of current faculty having a full-time working partner. SCFDDE members noted that administrative burdens of faculty members have also increased in recent decades, which raised questions about the sustainability of University expectations for faculty advancement (up-or-out tenure system) and balance with other administrative responsibilities.

Dr. Bellini noted that the vast majority of faculty that have remained at associated professor rank currently are in the Clinician-Educator track. These faculty members tend not to be as active in research and joined the university before the existence of the Academic Clinician track within the Associated Faculty. Lastly, the PSOM survey showed no significant differences when evaluating under-represented minority status, though differences were illustrated for women across the board.

The committee also heard from Matt Hartley, GSE Professor of Education and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. GSE recently conducted its own climate survey for faculty, staff, and students as well as a set of focus groups.

Mid-career faculty at GSE receive support in two ways: 1) As part of the tenure process, faculty are asked to discuss their research agenda moving forward; 2) GSE is intentional about finding ways for newly tenured associate professors to take on leadership roles. GSE has non-standing, or professional faculty tracks that include Professors of Practice, Senior Lecturers, and Lecturers. Many of these faculty come to Penn after successful careers as school administrators or policy-makers. Some professional faculty may be at earlier points in their careers, however, and once they are promoted to Senior Lecturer, it is not clear what their career trajectory may be at this point. The GSE Dean has met with the professional faculty to better understand their experiences at GSE. This work has led to changes, including changing the informal collective position name from “non-standing faculty” to “professional faculty. There is ongoing work to review voting privileges for certain issues, contract renewal terms, annual review processes, and development of a sabbatical program. The school plans to conduct a more formal assessment in 2020 via another climate survey.

Recommendations:
- The associate professor faculty would benefit from undergoing a formal review process by COAP and their respective department with feedback specifically addressing the path for further academic promotion.
- Department Chairs throughout the university are urged to continue monitoring the progress of associate professors towards promotion to full professor.
- Explore GSE’s climate survey as a model for incorporating feedback from faculty, staff, and students.

4 and 5. (4) 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; and (5) Maintain communication between the SCFDDE and the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.

The University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity (UC-DCE) addresses issues related to equity of gender, race, class, religion, political affiliation, and other matters for all members of the Penn community. During spring 2017, 2018, and 2019, UC-DCE, 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 committees can be responsive to a variety of needs.

The 2019 “Listening to Diversity Forum” was well attended by faculty and staff across all of Penn. A theme that emerged from Forum speaker statements is the large discrepancy in solving diversity and equity problems across various departments and schools at Penn. Specifically, some diversity and inclusion issues that are resolved in transparent manner within some departments and schools go unresolved in others.

Recommendations:
- Continue collaboration efforts between SCFDDE, UC-CDE, and PFWF on matters of mutual concern.
- Consider the feasibility of expanding the frequency of the Forum in future years.
- Encourage leaders of departments and centers to complete training programs on diversity and equity issues (e.g., unconscious bias training, noted above) and to offer similar training to faculty and staff within centers.

Overall Recommendations for SCFDDE for 2019-2020
1. Identify ways to improve community building amongst postdocs at Penn and their supporters, as a means of enhancing diversity and inclusion efforts on campus.
2. Review the implementation of Interfolio with respect to its effect on diverse faculty recruitment and retention.
3. Identify best practices for implementing unconscious bias training programs across schools, departments, and centers.
4. Assist and provide faculty consultation to the incoming Associate Vice President for Equity and Title IX Officer.
5. Provide consultation to the Vice Provost for Faculty regarding efforts to provide opportunities for faculty professional development.
6. Advise the Vice Provost for Faculty on adapting questions for the next faculty climate survey regarding advancement and progress of mid-career faculty.
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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., I. I. H.2., I.A.-D.

2018-2019 Specific Charges and Steps Taken to Address Them

1. Review the composition of and teaching by Standing Faculty, Academic Support Staff, and Associated Faculty.

Much discussion centered on the various faculty roles enumerated in the Faculty Handbook and how these positions and roles were similar and/or different across the University. The roles of the Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff varied widely across the Schools. There are differing opportunities for faculty in the Schools. For example, at least one School occasionally hires Lecturers who have an expectation that in a certain number of years a role on the Tenure Track would be provided to the faculty member. SCOF observed differing perceptions on the roles of Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff, with inter-School perceptions varying greatly. Some Schools appear to utilize the roles as career positions that full-time, permanent, or tenure-equivalent. However, that practice was criticized for its lack of true job security: they can be terminated at-will with limited notice. Oftentimes persons appear to be recruited into certain positions with verbal implications that they can remain in the positions for extended periods given strong performance. It is also not clear if Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff have a voice in Departmental or School matters that pertain to their roles.

In order to understand the responsibilities of the various tracks among Schools, we requested data on the various tracks, job descriptions, and criteria for appointment/promotion and review from the Schools that utilize these tracks. Preliminary review of the data indicates variation in roles and expectations across the Schools.

Data for Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff provided at the request of SCOF by Institutional Research and Assessment (IR&A) (2018) indicate the size of the Associated Faculty has increased over the past decade, mainly because of the introduction of the Academic Clinician (AC) track in Dental, Vet and PSOM. Overall, there appears to be a decrease in full-time Lecturers since 2008 and a notable increase in part-time Lecturers in some Schools. SCOF recommends further data collection and analysis related to who is doing the teaching in the various Schools (Standing Faculty vs. Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff).

Recommendations:
- SCOF should attempt to gather data on the number of undergraduate courses taught by Standing Faculty, Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff and how this has changed over time.
- SCOF should consider further:
  - How is representation for various tracks defined?
  - If a faculty member is not a good fit within a track, is it possible to transition to a more suitable faculty track?
  - What representation should the Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff have at the University level?
  - What reasonable standards and expectations can be promoted that are flexible enough to apply to Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff across all tracks while still maintaining rigor in the tracks?

2. Continue to work toward identifying best practices for giving representation to Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty within departments, Schools and the University.

Interest was also expressed in understanding whether Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff feel that their perspectives and interests are well represented as part of the shared governance processes in Schools. There was a great deal of discussion regarding how or if Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff members have a voice in their perspective Schools/departments. Concerns about Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff wellbeing, including available fringe benefits and job satisfaction, were voiced, as were concerns about the complexities of various tracks and variance in titles and roles across Penn’s Schools. Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff tracks allow Deans flexibility to expand and contract teaching and programming on short notice, since Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff are at-will employees. Committee members agreed the need to understand the amount and nature of undergraduate instruction being done by Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff.

SCOF discussed identifying vulnerable groups and following them over time to understand what they are doing. This would allow, for example, Schools to recognize whether Academic Clinicians are holding responsibilities set forth for Academic Clinicians or whether they are overlapping responsibilities with Clinician Educators. Track definitions and parameters should be monitored to ensure that responsibilities are consistent with requirements and expectations. Academic faculty should also have an appropriate “voice” in their departments so that they are able to perform their roles well.

We discussed various ways to yield information from Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff regarding their role, voice, etc. SCOF members discussed the potential distribution of a survey to Academic faculty members inquiring about their wellbeing and their roles and responsibilities. SCOF members agreed that focus groups should be conducted by an independent facilitator. SCOF members in the undergraduate Schools were asked to help identify a full-time Lecturer and a Senior Lecturer to participate in the initial focus group.

This focus group was convened in March 2019. Nine full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers participated in the focus group from Nursing, SEAS and SAS. Some of the positive findings include: Work satisfaction and competence; Relations (they like the people they work with); and Compensation (pay was not a top issue). Areas of concern: 1) Job stability, benefits stability, fair treatment as employees; 2) Career paths; 3) Research opportunity and support; 4) Respect, status; 5) Participating—having a voice in program/department oversight and decisions; 6) Recognition of presence and value; 7) Quality of education; and 8) Embedded cultural norms and structural discrimination.

Recommendation:
- Convene additional focus groups and continue to review results. Develop a plan for next steps based on results.

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

Since the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA) was charged to review aspects of faculty remuneration as they relate to online education, SCOF elected to allow SCOA to complete its work before pursuing this charge. SCOF received routine updates regarding SCOA’s work. SCOF did question the extent to which faculty are asked to participate in online learning. Should this work be considered within a usual teaching load or in addition to a usual teaching load? Should online teaching initiatives considered in the promotion/tenure review process? SCOF recommends pursuing answers to these questions.

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

SCOF did not receive any proposals this year.

Proposed Charges for SCOF in 2019-2020

1. Continue to work toward identifying best practices for giving representation to Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty within departments, Schools, and the University.

2. Continue to review the composition of and teaching by Standing Faculty, Academic Support Staff, and Associated Faculty.

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