Upon leaving an office it is appropriate for one to reflect upon what happened while in office, what was tried, what worked, what did not work, what the main issues are going forward. Any findings or conclusions arrived at by such reflection must of course be provisional, but that is just the reason for making them: so that those who follow will have an explicit record that can be reconsidered, learned from, and improved. As a service, then, to the future, these are my reflections on my term as Chair of the Penn Faculty Senate. These take the form of an intellectual memoir, I would have liked to read similar essays throughout my time of working with the Faculty Senate, and so the form represents my best guess of what will be useful to others who are to come.

How should we characterize what the Penn Faculty Senate is about? The official record is clear. It is specified in the Faculty Handbook (https://catalog.upenn.edu/faculty-handbook/v1/vh.html) that:

> There shall be a Faculty Senate composed of members of the Standing Faculty and the Standing Faculty-Clinician-Educator holding the rank of Professor, Associate Professor, or Assistant Professor. The Senate shall provide opportunity for its members to discuss and express their views upon any matter that they deem to be of general interest to the faculty, and to make recommendations and pass resolutions with respect thereto. It shall have power to make recommendations directly to the President, the Provost, and the Trustees, and to request reports from the University administration.

The officers of the Senate are the Chair, the Past Chair, the Chair-elect, the Secretary, and the Executive Officer. The Chair of the Senate is an ex-officio, non-voting executive officer, calls meetings of the Senate and of the Executive Committee, prepares agendas, and presides at meetings. The Senate Chair also serves simultaneously as the chair of the University Council's Steering Committee.

Put otherwise, the Faculty Senate is a discussion club with consequences and a very broad mandate, because the issue has potentially profound implications for the University in perspectives. As catastrophic as the COVID-19 pandemic is, we see an opportunity to further strengthen the Penn community by navigating these difficult times through exemplary deliberation together. P4’s work will continue during the upcoming year (See: https://provost.upenn.edu/senate/p4).

Finally, and only just recently, the Tri-Chairs have created an ad hoc Senate committee on Planning for Post-Pandemic Penn (“P4”). The committee is charged with attending to all faculty-related matters arising in consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic, whether in the immediate or the longer term. It is chaired by Jennifer Pinto-Martin, the outgoing Past Chair of the Faculty Senate. P4’s main job is to serve as a bi-directional communication hub, linking faculty and University administration discussions pertaining to the pandemic. The Tri-Chairs have been in consultation on this matter with President Gutmann and Provost Pritchett. We welcome working together with the University administration. It is well to have an administration that is deeply rooted to providing opportunities and diversity in perspectives. As catastrophic as the COVID-19 pandemic is, we see an opportunity to further strengthen the Penn community by navigating these difficult times through exemplary deliberation together. P4’s work begins immediately. Expect to hear from it over the summer (See: https://provost.upenn.edu/senate/p4).

Facilitating exemplary deliberation has never been more important than it is now. It is with great confidence and optimism that I welcome Kathleen Hall Jamieson and Bill Braham as Chair and Chair-Elect of the Penn Faculty Senate.
SCESF Report on the Economic Status of the Faculty
Fiscal Year 2019
July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019

I. Introduction
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.

The focus of this report is the current economic status of the faculty, based on salary and benefits data provided to the committee by Provost’s Office, prepared by the Offices of Institutional Research & Analysis and Human Resources. The data as provided to SCESF preserve anonymity of individuals. Benefits data were provided by Human Resources; additional data were extracted from publicly available websites.

Salaries discussed in this report pertain to the aggregated 9-month (academic year) base salary in Fiscal Year 2018 (July 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019) data for the 1,327 members of the tenure-line faculty (763 Professors, 262 Associate Professors, and 302 Assistant Professors). The salaries of deans and faculty on phased retirement are excluded. As in past years, these data also exclude tenure-line faculty from the Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM), except for those in the basic sciences; as well as the roughly 1,000 Clinician Educators in the Standing Faculty from the Perelman School of Medicine, and the Schools of Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, and Nursing.

An academic year base salary is that paid for the normal academic duties of a Standing Faculty member (teaching, research, and service) for a nine-month academic year, irrespective of whether the salary is disbursed over a nine- or twelve-month period, or paid from General Operating Funds and/or from Designated Funds. In the four healthcare schools listed above, which have some or all Standing Faculty on a 12-month or “annualized” base, salaries have been adjusted to be comparable with salaries reported on a 9-month basis.

“Summer money”—additional income paid from various sources for all or parts of up to three summer months, and which varies in function of (a) School and (b) faculty effort—is not included in the academic year base salaries analyzed and reported here, nor are other emoluments.

Section VI details SCESF’s conclusions and recommendations.
All publicly viewable tables provided to the Committee by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty are published on the Almanac website at https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/SCESF_full_report_2020.pdf

II. Challenges to Effective Assessment
The challenge in assessing the state of faculty compensation at Penn begins with the fact that the faculty come from different fields that have different labor markets. We are also spread across different schools with different missions and different requirements for faculty in those schools: someone with the same PhD degree, for example, may be working on quite different topics with different peers and audiences that together constitute different labor markets where wages are not the same. They also may be doing different work and may effectively be in different labor markets at different points in their careers when they hold different ranks.

As a practical matter our task as a Committee is not to assess the overall appropriateness and fairness of compensation. Instead, it is the more limited task of assessing changes in compensation year-to-year.

The challenge with that task starts with the index number problem, in this case, the fact that the composition of faculty changes across fields, schools, and labor markets over time. Average pay at Penn could change because the mix of faculty across fields and labor markets changes even if the pay for each individual faculty member remained unchanged.

Change in average pay is not the only factor worth considering, of course. We are also interested in the distribution of pay and the extent to which increases are spread widely, narrowly, and equally across faculty. Those changes are much more within the control of administrators at the school level. We understand that determining which are appropriate criteria to use to determine the distribution of salary budgets is a challenging decision, and we have no information as to the criteria being used. We can report what the distributions look like, however.

III. Reconciliation of Operating Budget with Data Provided to SCESF
The most important development this year is that we have resolved a long-standing concern of the Committee: to address the apparent disconnect between the compensation data the Committee receives, which is for base salaries, and the overall University budget for faculty compensation, which is more than twice that amount. Our concern has been to understand: where is the rest of it going? Thanks to Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen and Vice President of Budget and Management Analysis Trevor Lewis, we have answered that question. The difference is accounted for by the fact that Standing Faculty Clinician Educators are not included in the data we receive.

Specifically, the University reports that we have 4,793 total faculty of which 2,753 are Standing Faculty. The base salary data that we receive is for 1,327 Standing Faculty. Therefore, there are 1,426 Standing Faculty whose compensation is not included in the measures of base salary that are presented to us. These excluded faculty are virtually all Clinician Educators in the four health schools. The remainder of the total faculty compensation budget includes pay in the form of stipends of various kinds and the pay of post-doctoral researchers and graduate student workers.

SCESF received a briefing from the Office of Budget and Management Analysis on the broader university budget for faculty compensation and the items within it. One of the questions this answered for us was the concern raised in the past as to whether compensation in the form of administrative stipends for faculty taking on administrative work might be widely and unevenly used. The answer appears to be no: the total amount spent on these stipends is minimal.

IV. Caveats
The first caveat to our report, therefore, is that we cannot draw any conclusions about the compensation of Clinician Educators, who are actually the majority of the Standing Faculty at Penn. We understand that their pay varies in part on the delivery of services, but as with other Standing Faculty, they have an academic base salary on which additional pay for delivering clinical care is added. Evaluating their base salary should be no different than evaluating the salary data for the other faculty that we do now. The Committee is concerned that our report ignores the experience of this majority group of our faculty.

The second caveat is that the information we have is only for base salaries. They are important because they are the basis for most employee benefits, and they are also the component of pay to which annual increases are applied.

V. Review of Data Provided to SCESF
Turning to what we can say: we can assess the change in base salaries for faculty over this past year, beginning with how the change compares to the situation in the broader economy and labor market. The first question is how our increases have kept up with the cost of living, or what we can buy with it. The Consumer Price Index is the Federal Government’s measure of changes in inflation, and it is calculated in different ways based on the starting and stopping months, the location, what items are in it (e.g., food and energy costs are sometimes excluded because their prices are more volatile), and so forth. The Bureau of Labor Statistics overall Consumer Price Index for Philadelphia-Camden-Wilmington region increased in 2018-2019 by 2.1 percent. The University reports that the mean increase in faculty base salary over the same period is 4.4 percent, which represents a noticeable gain in real living standards of 2.3 percent. As a comparison, the average increase across the US in real (hourly) wages was 3.2 percent.

1 SCESF’s charge is to “gather and organize data on salaries and benefits and represents the faculty in the determination of University policy on salary issues.”
2 www.upenn.edu/almanac
3 https://apps.finance.upenn.edu:44305/secure/budgetbooks/PDFs/FY20-
University-Operating-Budget.pdf
4 https://home.wwp.upenn.edu/about/facts; retrieved December 17, 2019
5 https://www.bls.gov/regions/mid-atlantic/news-release/consumerpriceindex_
philadelphia.htm
6 See Table 1. For full complement of publicly viewable data tables, visit the online version of this report at https://almanac.upenn.edu/uploads/media/
The average real wage increase (annual) for the life, physical, and social scientists occupational category, the single occupation that appears to map most closely to our overall faculty, was 0.8 percent in the US over the same period (a 2.4 percent “nominal” wage increase against 1.6 percent cost of living increase).

The most relevant comparisons, of course, are with the pay for other faculty elsewhere. The University provides us with two sets of comparisons. The first is based on data from roughly 57 other Universities who participate in the Association of American Universities Data Exchange, roughly half of which are State Universities. These data, reported in Table 4, show that Penn does quite well as compared to other Universities but that how well we do varies widely by School and Department: four of our Departments are ranked #1 out of 57 for Full Professor salaries (what appears to be base salaries) for the 16 other Universities reporting that data. On others, such as natural sciences, we do considerably worse, 13th on the list. We appear on balance to compare better on Full Professor comparisons than for Assistant Professors.

Against the Ivy Plus (including MIT, Stanford, and Chicago) Universities, we are roughly in the middle for Full Professor base salaries but near the top for Assistant Professors. Geography and perhaps cost of living differences appear to drive the relative positions, with rural schools paying less and those in more expensive urban areas paying more. For Assistant Professors, Penn comes out at the top when differences in cost of living are adjusted.

Arguably the most revealing information comes from the tables that reveal information about the distribution of salaries and the increases in them. Table 9 shows the difference between mean and median salary levels. The mean salaries are higher than the median because the distribution of salaries across faculty is skewed to the right: salaries above the median are further above it than the salaries below the median are from it. A few very high salaries could also produce this result. In Table 10, we see information on salary levels for the bottom and top quartile of the distribution and then for the interquartile range between those as compared to the median salary.

Tables 6, 7, and 8 present the quartile results by rank for 2018-2019 salary increases. Here we see that several schools—Annenberg School for Communication, Perelman School of Medicine, and School of Social Policy & Practice—gave all faculty at the Full Professor level the same increases. The Wharton School and the School of Engineering and Applied Science had the widest variance in salary increases. Why there are such differences across Schools is an interesting question. It would appear to be either because School administrators have different views about how increases should be determined or because there are larger differences in performance across faculty or other attributes in some schools than in others. We suspect the former is more important. The distribution of salary increases is more similar across schools at the Assistant Professor level. The variation in the level of salaries (Table 10) is greater than the variation in the increases in salaries, however, perhaps because the former represents years of annual increases.

Table 2 presents in detail on one important aspect of the distribution question, and that is: how many faculty got salary increases that did not keep up with inflation? In other words, how many saw their real salary decline? The answer is roughly eight percent, but here the results vary considerably across schools: from one-third in the School of Dental Medicine to “none” in the Law School, School of Nursing, and School of Social Policy & Practice. What accounts for this difference is not obvious. Because we do not have the data on average increases by school, we cannot tell to what extent the variation is accounted for by lower overall salary budgets versus administrative decisions.

Table 12 indicates some considerable progress in narrowing gender pay differences over time. The overall difference between male and female average base salary is due in part to the fact that men and women are not equally distributed across schools and fields. Women have historically been disproportionately represented in departments and schools that have lower salaries. The overall salary gap narrows considerably when the mean and median measures are adjusted to take out those differences: male Full Professors and Assistant Professors then earn only 0.09 percent more than their female colleagues, respectively, while female Associate Professors earn 1.4 percent more than their male colleagues. The University also shared with SCESF a regression analysis that controls for a wider range of attributes. The analysis finds a small gap (0.04 to 0.08 percent depending on the model) between the pay of men and women that is reported as not statistically significant. The data have not been updated in the model since 2015, however. Faculty with expertise in estimating these models have offered and continue to offer their help to the University in estimating these models.

VI. Issues of Concern and Recommendations from SCESF

In accordance with Faculty Senate policy, we present the following issues of concern and our recommendations to address these issues. We note the general point that in the absence of information to address questions about pay, those questions do not go away. Often we construct answers to them that are wrong and can be damaging. As an example, in the absence of information about the extent and amount of faculty stipends, members of this committee over the years have often assumed that the stipends were considerably more important—and more unequal—than the information we received this year suggests that they actually are. Receiving information typically resolves problems like these.

A. Expanding Economic Data Beyond Base Salary

Issue of Concern: As in previous years, we note that while faculty salaries are the preponderant form of faculty compensation, faculty compensation also comes from sources such as summer salaries, administrative stipends, performance bonuses, pay for additional teaching, and support from grants and contracts. Having some sense of what total compensation looks like would be enormously important in assessing the state of faculty compensation.

SCESF Recommendation: SCESF requests that data from the Provost’s Office be expanded next year to include total compensation for faculty. We note that the University responded to this request in 2019 by saying that addressing this request had to wait until Penn’s payroll system was updated. That happened in this year. Our understanding is that the updating is now complete.

Response: The University acknowledges that the SCESF would like to expand its work to include additional information. The University requests that, in advance of its 2020 report, the Senate work toward a common understanding with the Office of the Provost regarding the data to be made available. In response to requests by the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs in FY18 and FY19 for “total compensation” data, the Office of the Provost began to explore the feasibility of providing the Faculty Senate with the additional data being requested. Following consultation with the Division of Human Resources and the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, the Provost’s Office notified the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs that further exploration of its request must await the completion of the University’s human capital management project. That project was launched in July 2019, but has not yet been fully implemented.

B. Assessing the Economic Status of the Entire Faculty

Issue of Concern: SCESF is charged with gathering and organizing data on academic salaries and benefits for the faculty and to represent the faculty in the determination of University policy on salary issues. This year, SCESF was provided academic base salary data for 1,327 Standing Faculty. We appreciate the University’s help in understanding the fact that the total Standing Faculty compensation budget includes amounts for Clinician Educators, who comprise 1.02% out of the 2,753 Standing Faculty, a significant portion of Penn’s overall Standing Faculty. Further, we do not have any information on the compensation of an additional 402 members of the (non-Clinician Educator) Standing Faculty. Together, these two groups total 1,426 Standing Faculty members, a majority group for which the Committee does not have compensation data. We believe that the Committee should represent the interests of the entire Standing Faculty. We suggest that the University work with the Committee next...
year to figure out how to represent the interests of this majority group.

SCESF Recommendation: To provide a more complete analysis of faculty salary and benefits, SCESF requests that data from the Provost’s Office be expanded next year to include the academic base salary for all Standing Faculty, subject to the standard exclusion of deans and faculty members in phased retirement. SCESF again requests the PSOM Standing Faculty data to analyze along with data from every other School at Penn.

Response:
As noted above, SCESF would like to expand the scope of what traditionally has been its work. The SCESF should continue its work to reach an understanding with the Provost concerning the data to be made available for this report.

Academic base salary data for the majority of the Standing Faculty has been made available to the SCESF for many years. Based on fall 2019 data, there were 1,022 Standing Faculty on the CE track and 1,729 on the tenure track. A majority of CE faculty are based in the Perelman School of Medicine where their compensation packages typically include three components: (1) a published minimum base salary for a faculty member’s academic rank; (2) a base salary supplement, also called an “adjusted base salary,” that is the result of highly individual arrangements to respond to specific needs; and (3) clinical income tied to patient care-related responsibilities and performance. Rigorous processes in the departments and PSOM promote internal equity and national competitiveness with respect to components (2) and (3).

SCESF Recommendation:
It is SCESF’s recommendation that the Provost provide academic base salary data for Standing Faculty in the current year.

VII. Tables
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_2020.pdf.
Committee Findings and Questions

1. SPAI (founded October 2016) provides resources to students, staff, and faculty to support arts initiatives across a spectrum from securing funding to attend live theater to creating visual or digital media installations. SCSEP asked how the program evaluates the impact of the arts resources on students. We requested that SPAI report its findings to SCSEP, which are to be shared with students interested in pursuing arts initiatives.

2. The Your Big Idea Wellness campus competition was held in spring 2019 and led to the implementation of a number of campus initiatives that promote individual wellness: (a) Campus Walks, (b) Nature Rx as possible kind of treatment for emotional wellbeing, (c) expansion of the Penn Garden to Penn Park as a means of addressing food insecurity issues amongst Penn students and staff, and (d) Campus Conversations where faculty discuss overcoming adversities. We recommend that the Provost’s office ensure these programs are better known on campus, and SCSEP is interested in how they are evaluated for impact and effectiveness.

3. Student anxiety is a growing campus health challenge. Sources of anxiety include the sense that there is growing uncertainty in student lives. Examples of uncertainty include the COVID-19 pandemic; climate change (see the interim report from the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Institutional Response to Climate Change, “CIRC,” in this supplement); growing wealth disparities; increased reliance on social media resulting in diminished face-to-face engagement and interpersonal skills. We know anecdotally that CAPS has observed a significant increase in anxiety among students and has developed strategies for addressing anxiety on the individual level. We need to know whether these findings are now evidence-based, and we would like to see explicit guidelines on how to address anxiety addressed as a public health concern on our campus and as a means to improving student sense of wellbeing.

4. Penn Global programs have benefitted significantly from generous donor support, meaning that students from all income groups can study abroad, short term, in the summer, or during a regular semester. The LPS Summer Abroad program is an ongoing if smaller program. The mental health challenges of student travel are significant and perhaps not as easily interrogated (as compared to physical health) prior to departure on a study abroad experience. While there have been significant changes to evaluating a student’s capacity to travel, we would like to see explicit guidelines for addressing mental health (and other) emergencies when Penn students are abroad. If a student has to return home unexpectedly, what happens to their educational program? Who decides, as in the case of a global pandemic like COVID-19, when and how a student should return to campus? We urge the University to ensure that all study abroad programs that are faculty-led programs include provisions for a staff member to travel with the faculty person to handle logistics.

5. CAPS has expanded and diversified its staff knowledge and capacity to address the breadth of Penn student challenges, but there is still a perception that CAPS cannot meet student needs. Could resources be allocated to generate a digital public health messaging program that could include the testimonials of students who have been supported by CAPS while retaining their privacy?

The remaining recommendations speak to the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on students.

The College Houses have clearly been at the forefront in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic; we are grateful to, and impressed by, the astute and generous manner in which the University, Vice Provost for Education Beth Winkelstein, CHAS Faculty Director Lisa Lewis, CHAS writ large, and the hard-working staff within the Offices of the Vice Provost for University Life, Student Intervention Services, Student Health Services, and Penn First Plus drew on and expanded the emergency procedures already in place at Penn to get students off campus and back home (or somewhere safe) to complete their semester through remote learning (including the provision of small stipends for food and internet connectivity in some cases). Students were allowed to petition to remain on campus, and some have, with expanded meal plans, individual rooms with private bathrooms, and social distancing plans implemented.

6. We use this moment of complete disruption and the move to remote learning to consider how it will be possible to help students return to campus following the distress related to the rapid departure from campus and the quick implementation of a new way of socializing through social distancing. What will be the challenges to creating a sense of safety, of building community, to removing fear and anxiety, and constituting a supportive learning environment?

7. The University had emergency procedures in place, but in the face of COVID-19 had to implement a series of new and costly initiatives. SCSEP would welcome an internal report on how these procedures were transformed in the unprecedented context of a global pandemic.

8. SCSEP calls upon student leadership organizations, including the Undergraduate Assembly and the Student Committee on Undergraduate Education to gather and report data on the successes and challenges of the COVID-19 response from the University.

Recommendations for 2020-2021 SCSEP

1. Collaborate with the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Post-Pandemic Planning at Penn (P4), which was established in April 2020, on matters related to pandemic response and recovery and their effects on student wellbeing.

2. Consider any policy and procedural changes to emergency preparedness and other mechanisms implemented to support student wellness throughout the pandemic response.

3. Evaluate the efficacy and value added by shifting to remote learning. What will be the long-term impact on Penn of such a radical shift in medium of knowledge transmission?

4. Evaluate the impact of CHAS’s pandemic response and identify ways that the Faculty Senate can provide support.

5. Examine the wider set of programs that could address and support student wellbeing (including but not limited to SPAI, faith-based initiatives, and community engagement).

Members of the 2019-2020 SCSEP Committee

Sunday Akintoye, Dental Medicine
David Amponsah, SAS/Africaenas Studies
Sara Jaffee, SAS/Psychology
Ty Muhly, PSOM/Anesthesiology & Critical Care
Carol Muller, SAS/Music, Chair
Marilyn Schapira, PSOM/Medicine
Mindy Schuster, PSOM/Medicine
Krystal Strong, GSE
Alan Strudler, Wharton
Ex Officio:
Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Steven Kimbrough, Wharton, Faculty Senate Chair
Anita Summers, Wharton, PASEF non-voting member
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-life balance 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.

2019-2020 Specific Charges for the SCFDDE

• Identify how Schools, departments and centers are delivering unconscious bias training programs to their faculties; propose supplemental methods.

• Identify ways to improve community building among postdocs at Penn and recruitment from peer diversity postdoc programs as a means of enhancing diversity and inclusion on campus.

• Identify new and ongoing opportunities at the University and School levels for faculty professional development.

Report on Charges

1. Identify how Schools, departments and centers are delivering latent bias training programs to their faculties; propose supplemental methods

SCFDDE received a briefing from Ms. Lubna Mian, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty, who provides latent bias training to all faculty search committees and to centers and departments that request it. Ms. Mian provides four workshops per year: two each for all faculty and two for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs). The training is focused on University policies through presentation of and participant interaction with case studies. The training has been mandated for all faculty searches since the 2015 launch of the Inclusion Report. More information can be received about the training by contacting The Office of Faculty Affairs at provost-fac@upenn.edu

Recommendations:

• Consider amending the program title to “Latent Bias Awareness Training” or a similar title to enhance the accuracy of the training’s purpose. The trainings cover latent bias research and anti-discrimination policies and practices. SCFDDE, however, recognizes that the training sessions offered by the Office of the Provost, through the Perelman School of Medicine’s (PSOM’s) Office of Inclusion and Diversity and outside vendors may have different titles depending upon the provider, but the scope of content is similar.

• Given the variability in how Schools and departments conduct Latent Bias Awareness Training, SCFDDE recommends that the University develop a program to increase the number of individuals (including DSAs) who are qualified to train faculty search committees. This program would provide the training and resources as well as guidelines for how to identify and address latent bias when it occurs during the committee process.

• There remain questions about how often Latent Bias Awareness Trainings are needed and how much time search committees need to devote to them. The committee acknowledges the memo sent on April 30, 2020, from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty (OVPF) to deans and department chairs with clarification on the training offerings available, duration and frequency of trainings needed, and delivery methods for latent bias and non-discrimination training. We encourage OVPF to make the contents of the memo available publicly.

2. Identify ways to improve community building among postdocs at Penn and recruitment from peer diversity postdoc programs, as a means of enhancing diversity and inclusion on campus.

SCFDDE continued to examine postdoctoral programs at Penn. Last year, the committee reviewed the Postdoctoral Fellowships for Academic Diversity program and turned this year to a broader examination of postdoc programs across the University and their contributions to diversity and equity at Penn. In Schools such as Wharton, that do not have a School-wide postdoctoral program, responsibility for enhancing diversity within postdoctoral programs is left to the departments. This risks resulting in uneven outcomes. By comparison, the Weitzman School of Design treats the School’s postdoctoral program as a vehicle to accomplish equity, access, and inclusion across the School at all levels, including creating a pool of potential applicants for Standing Faculty positions.

SCFDDE members examined how many Schools operate diversity committees and how departments usually go about accessing University-wide resources to accomplish equity, access, and inclusion. The Biomedical Postdoctoral Programs continue to be very active in attracting and training postdocs. The committee also reviewed the most recent postdoctoral census data available from fall 2017 and fall 2018. More than half of the 1,335 postdocs (790) are housed in PSOM, with 108 across the Dental, Nursing, and Veterinary Schools. A further 220 are in SAS and 195 in SEAS. Forty-five are African American, 179 are Asian, and 478 are white, 38 are Hispanic/Latin(o/a), and 1 is Native-American/Alaskan Native. A total of 565 are international citizens for whom no racial categorization is available from the data. The Provost’s Center awards 16 postdocs, which does not include the Diversity postdocs for which the Provost pays partial funding (see https://research.upenn.edu/postdocs-and-students/over-fellowship-recipients/).

Committee members suggested that if campus postdoctoral programs have made diversity commitments, they are not reflected in the racial demographics of the program. SCFDDE members expressed interest in comparing the placement rate of diversity postdocs into tenure-track positions (at Penn or otherwise) compared to general postdocs. Interest was also expressed in understanding the impact that the Provost’s fund has had on the diversity makeup of the postdoc programs at Penn and also in learning about how the Provost’s Office informs Schools about the availability of this fund.

Recommendations:

• The Provost postdoctoral fellowships should be re-focused so as to further the diversity of the faculty at Penn. One possibility is to treat the postdoctoral application process explicitly as part of an application for a tenure-track position, with the department taking on the postdoctoral fellow committing itself to allocating a tenure-track line to the selected candidate upon the fellowship’s completion. 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.

• Penn should centralize information about and for postdocs across all disciplines so as to share information about available postdoc positions and available candidates. 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.

• SCFDDE should consider issues related to reported categorization of post-doc demographic data.

3. Identify new and ongoing opportunities at the University and School levels for faculty professional development

Last year 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.

Mid-career faculty in PSOM cited multiple challenges based upon results of a survey administered by PSOM leadership. Typically faculty members have less direct motivation to earn promotion beyond Associate, with associated reduction in 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. The vast majority of faculty that have remained at the Associate Professor level 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 (continued on page 7)
the similar 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.

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; and 2) GSE deliberately seeks 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 will be. The GSE dean has inquired directly with these professional faculty to better understand their experiences at GSE. This effort has led to changes within the School, including changing the informal collective position name from "non-Standing Faculty" to "professional faculty," as noted above. There is ongoing work to review voting privileges of professional faculty for certain issues, contract renewal terms, annual review processes, and development of a sabbatical program for them. The School plans to conduct a more formal assessment in 2020 via another climate survey.

Committee member Carmen Guerra presented on work that she has undertaken as part of her capstone project for the PSOM Executive Leadership for Academic Medicine program. In this presentation she differentiated between mentorship, which is defined as helping mentees to "...acquire the essential competencies needed for success..." and sponsorship, which is defined as "public support by a powerful, influential person for the advancement and promotion of an individual for whom he or she sees untapped or unappreciated potential." Dr. Guerra described research that suggests women are over-mentored and under-sponsored relative to male peers. She described ways that she had sought to support PSOM senior faculty in being more reflective about the ways that they engage in mentorship versus sponsorship in the hopes of remedying gender inequities in this area. She also provided survey findings that suggested that consciousness-raising about these issues can significantly improve senior faculty interactions with more junior faculty.

Recommendations:
• The Associate Professor faculty would benefit from undergoing a formal review process by the department—or School-level promotion and tenure committees with feedback specifically addressing the path for further academic promotion.
• Mentorship could be a way mid-career faculty can be motivated to advance their career and improve their overall career satisfaction.
• Department Chairs should consistently monitor the progress of all Associate Professors towards promotion to full Professor.
• SCFDD should explore GSE's climate survey as a model for incorporating feedback from faculty, staff, and students.
• SCFDD should further explore distinctions between mentorship and sponsorship and the ways in which these distinctions map onto University-wide equity issues.

4. Other matters falling under SCFDDDE’s general charge

In connection with this charge, SCFDDDE gathered, and began the process of reviewing, each of the twelve Schools’ Diversity Action Plans (DAPs). In all, ten such plans have been filed with the Faculty Senate (two others have not been revised since 2015). The plans vary widely in their scope and level of detail, across numerous dimensions. SCFDDDE believes it would be helpful to identify best practices in the DAPs and then to encourage each School to revise its plan accordingly. A useful first step would involve a systematic assessment of each DAP, along the following lines: Who is covered—staff? students? faculty? Which protected classes are identified? Has the School collected data—historical? current? ongoing? What organizational mechanisms have been put in place to administer or effectuate the plan? What particular strategies does the plan identify for increasing and/or solidifying diversity? When was the plan developed? What criteria and metrics have been identified for assessing progress? Has the School undertaken a climate survey? What resources have been devoted to implementation? How is the plan publicized? discussed? promoted?

Recommendation: SCFDDDE should systematically review each School’s Diversity Action Plan along the dimensions indicated, and then identify “best practices” that might guide revision of each School’s Plan.

Review of Sabbatical Leave Policies Across Schools

Anecdotes offered by multiple SCFDDDE members suggested that sabbatical leave policies and practices may differ in their implementation across Schools. SCFDDDE inquired with the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty, which informed us that the Faculty Handbook sets forth the sole policy on scholarly leaves that applies uniformly to all Schools. During a scholarly leave with pay, salary is covered by the University. However, some Schools provide sabbaticals which are paid by the School, not by the University. The School is then allowed to grant a School-funded sabbatical to faculty members at its own discretion. As an example, a Professor of Practice, who—as a member of the Associated Faculty—is not eligible for a University-funded leave, may seek a School-funded sabbatical at the School’s exclusive discretion. The information received was deemed satisfactory by SCFDDDE and was not pursued further.

Members of the 2019-2020 SCFDDDE Committee

Hydar Ali, Dental Medicine; Antonella Cianferoni, PSOM/Pediatrics; Nelson Flores, GSE; Jorge Gd Avez, PSOM/Anesthesiology & Critical Care, Chair; Carmen Guerra, PSOM/Medicine; Sharon Hayes, Weitzman Design; Amy Sepinwall, Wharton; Dagmawi Woubshet, SAS/English; Ex officio: Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect; John Keene, Weitzman, Design; PASEF non-voting member; Steven Kimbrough, Wharton, Faculty Senate Chair

Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA)

During 2019-2020, SCOA was charged with assessing the status of online learning at Penn, especially with respect to the two new fully online degree programs being offered. Because limited information has been available on these nascent programs, assessing them proved challenging. At the same time, the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (“SCOF”) was charged with assessing Penn’s online degrees and programs. After providing a full briefing of its work to SCOF, SCOA suspended its work until Fall 2020.

Report of the Faculty Senate Grievance Commission

The Faculty Senate Grievance Commission of the University of Pennsylvania is an independent committee consisting of three faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This commission is available to members of the Penn faculty and academic support who allege they have been subject to action that is contrary to the University procedures, policies, and/or regulations, that is discriminatory, or that is arbitrary. During Academic Year 2019-2020, the commission was composed of Martha Farah (SAS/Psychology, Past Chair), Connie Ulrich (Nursing, Chair), and Mitchell Berman (Law, Chair-Elect).

During this year the Commission was approached by one faculty member concerning reappointment issues. This case is currently under discussion between the faculty member, the other relevant parties, and the Commission Chair-Elect.

—Connie Ulrich, Grievance Commission Chair, 2019-2020
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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 Commit-
tee (SEC) on matters relating to the University's policies and procedures
considering the academic mission, including the structure of the academic
staff, the tenure system, faculty appointments and promotions, faculty re-
search, 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.

2019-2020 Specific Changes and
Steps Taken to Address Them

1. Identify the issues of central faculty concern surrounding the role
and disposition of Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty.

Last year, the committee commissioned a focus group with lecturers
across the Schools. The top concern identified by the focus group was
job stability. Other salient issues were broadly related to participation and
inclusion: fair treatment, respect, and participation in department deci-
making. The latter class of concerns are relevant to our third charge
this year and make for an important discussion issue next year, across all
tracks and ranks.

This year, the committee planned to carry out two additional focus
groups with specialized lecturers: Lecturers in Foreign Languages (LFLs)
and Lecturers in Critical Writing. At a Fall 2019 University Council meet-
ing, the representative for Lecturers expressed concerns related to fair
treatment, respect, and participation, similar to the issues identified during
SCOF’s focus group last year. (See https://radix.www.upenn.edu/sec-
etary/secure/UC-Materials-20191204.pdf#page=7, PennKey authenti-
cation required.)

The planned focused groups, planned for March, were cancelled be-
cause of the campus closure. Given the uncertainty for the Fall semester,
the focus groups may not be able to take place soon but should be conduct-
ed whenever that becomes practical.

More broadly, Schools should develop standard exit surveys to be ad-
ministered to departing lecturers and senior lecturers, which can offer a
more complete picture of problems that may exist within these tracks. Schools
should use exit surveys collect information related to the length of service for Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff. In the long
term, doing so will help School leadership to identify people who have
made careers out of their roles, despite the underlying doubts among those
outside of the track that doing so is possible. Overall, Schools should de-
velop career advancement plans for lecturers and senior lecturers when-
ever possible. The health Schools (i.e., Dental, Veterinary, Nursing, and
PSOM) can offer examples of how they have approached this task, given
the large number of Associated Faculty in these Schools.

2. Collaborate with the Senate Committee on Faculty and the
Administration (SCOA) to identify the issues of central faculty con-
cern related to online learning at Penn.

SCOF conducted a brief survey with the deans of all 12 Penn Schools
and invited two guests to discuss with SCOF incentives for developing on-
line courses and promoting effective of online teaching.

Only two of the eight Schools that responded to our questionnaire re-
ported having clear guidelines, incentives, and support for faculty who
wish to develop online courses. For Schools that have moved to develop
online courses, the central identified objectives were to enhance their rev-
ue and prestige by reaching a wider student population. SCOF members
were surprised to learn that improving on-campus learning via the content
developed for online teaching did not appear to be a guiding objective.

SCOF requested a list of online courses from each School. Five Schools
provided the requested information (i.e., Design, Law, PSOM, SP2, and
Vet). From these, SP2 and PSOM are the Schools with considerable online
presence at this time. Should SCOF continue their analysis of online learn-
ing, identifying best practices through dialogues with the online program
directors at these Schools may be the most informative in terms of fig-
urating what works and what does not.

There was considerable variation among Schools in who teaches on-
line, with some having only Standing Faculty develop and teach these
courses and others having all (introductory) courses taught by Associated
Faculty and Academic Support Staff.

SCOF welcomed two members of SCOA to learn from their investiga-
tions. Ryan Baker, Associate Professor of Teaching, Learning, and Lead-
ership in the Graduate School of Education, shared with SCOF his find-
ings about the effectiveness of online programs: do students learn equally
well in person and online? SCOF learned that such studies of teaching ef-
ficacy are difficult to carry out, little evidence on whether online in-
struction is superior or inferior to in-class instruction yet exists. Some
universities heavily invest in data analytics to track student progress and
provide support whenever students require it. To SCOF’s knowledge,
Penn does not yet engage in such initiatives, neither for on-campus nor
for online instruction. Leaders of the online learning at Wharton are in-
terested in developing these analytics for their online courses, however.
SCOF believes that small interventions, such as having staff who regu-
larly reach out to students to check on their progress can make big dif-
fences in outcomes. Anecdotally, professors who have developed on-
line courses shared with SCOF that the preparation and experience gained
from the development process has directly resulted in improvement to their
in-person teaching quality. Given the lack of analytics, this finding is
impossible to confirm beyond the anecdote.

Robert Ghrist, SCOA Chair and the Andrea Mitchell University Pro-
fessor of Mathematics and Systems Engineering, and also joined us to
talk SCOA’s recent findings with respect to online learning. (SCOA’s
2018-19 report discusses these findings in depth: https://provost.upenn.
etu/sites/default/files/users/user131/SCOA%20Report%202018-19.pdf)
SCOF believes that properly incentivizing faculty is important for the de-
velopment of high-quality content. Further, student evaluations in the con-
text of online learning are more challenging to interpret because of the
lack of standards for comparison and the unclear expectations for student
outcomes.

SCOF recommends to Schools the engaging in online learning pro-
grams: (1) Develop and adhere to guidelines for payment, support, and
intellectual property related to online courses; (2) Given the known effec-
tiveness of blended classrooms, provide information and opportunities for
instructors who may wish to develop and record short modules for their
on-campus instruction; (3) Consider mechanisms that would provide the
necessary time and support for faculty to update and improve their cur-
rently taught classes; and (4) Set up analytics to track teaching effective-
ness and student learning.

3. Review voting privileges of the Practice Faculty (pursuant to Facult-
y Handbook Section II.B.3.7.), giving special consideration as to whether
active Practice Faculty should be permitted to vote on matters related to
the appointment or promotion of other Practice Faculty.

The Faculty Handbook explicitly prohibits Practice Faculty from vot-
ing on appointments and promotions. However, SCOF questions the jus-
tification for this prohibition. In many cases, faculty within the track have
the best understanding of the expected contributions to School activities
that should be made by their peers in the track, so it makes sense that they
should be invited to provide input and to vote on track-related appoint-
ment and promotion matters.

Anecdotally, SCOF finds that some School and departmental practices
already veer from the policy. We also point out that in 2016, the School of
Engineering and Applied Sciences changed their definitions for Practice
Professors in an attempt to create a longer term career option for people
who would otherwise be hired into the Lecturer track. This change cre-
ates possible misunderstandings for cross-School discussions of the Prac-
tice Professor track and should be kept in mind as Schools consider future
plans for growth and changes of the track.

SCOF members discussed more broadly the mechanisms for faculty
decision-making processes within Schools and departments. Its concern
was that allowing voting in principle does not guarantee meaningful par-
ticipation in decision-making. SCOF distributed a survey to deans inquir-
ing about hiring and promotion processes.

In a number of responding Schools, the hiring committee makes hiring
decisions exclusively as opposed to the faculty as a whole, so a sim-
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ple recommendation to allow Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff to participate in decisions would not be meaningful if the protocol for assembling the hiring committee is not re-examined. Moreover, some Schools have relatively few faculty on non-tenure tracks, so it would be burdensome to those few who would always be always called upon to participate on hiring committees.

Several Schools also reported that voting on hiring and promotion decisions is not anonymous. This approach makes it very difficult for junior faculty and non-tenure-track faculty to express their opinions without fear of negative consequences. SCOF expresses serious concern about the practice of non-anonymous voting. Range voting may be an especially beneficial alternative for hiring decisions. (See https://www.rangevoting.org/WarrenSmithPages/homepage/rangevote.pdf.)

SCOF offers the following recommendations: (1) Deans together with the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty (OVPF) should revisit the Handbook’s policy, especially as it pertains to prohibition of voting by Practice Professors on hiring and promotion decisions for other Practice Professors; (2) Deans together with OVPF should consider whether non-Standing Faculty should participate in the hiring and promotion of non-Standing Faculty with equal or lower rank; (3) SCOF should connect with the faculty governing bodies in Schools to discuss how those bodies might collect and share best practices for hiring and promotion across all Schools.

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

SCOF expects to receive one proposal of this nature during Summer 2020 and will consider it during the next academic year. Schools are reminded that proposals should be accompanied with data about the current state of the School and an outline of a strategic plan for development that justifies the proposed change.

Proposed charges for SCOF in 2020-2021:
1. Consider recommendations about how broader impacts connecting scholarship with society can be integrated and rewarded in promotion criteria. More broadly, collect best practices for setting up guidelines for evaluating faculty activities.
2. Given the absence of teaching analytics, investigate how teaching effectiveness and contributions are measured in different Schools to ensure the quality of programs and to identify differences in criteria across faculty tracks.
3. Develop best practices for decision making across Schools, including for hiring and promotion, with emphasis on inclusivity across ranks and tracks.
4. Establish connection with the faculty councils across Schools to coordinate the identification of pertinent pan-University issues and to collect reliable information.

SCOF Membership 2019-2020
William Beltran, Vet School
Eric Feldman, Law School
Lea Ann Matura, Nursing School
Ani Nenkova, SEAS/CIS, Chair
Susan Sauvé Meyer, SAS/Philosophy
Bruce Shenker, Dental School
Julia Ticona, Annenberg School
Lyle Ungar, SEAS/CIS
Ex Officio Members:
Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Steven Kimbrough, Wharton, Faculty Senate Chair
Roger Allen, SAS/NELC, PASEF Representative

Reports continue on next page
Interim Report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Scholarly Communication

Background
The Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee on Scholarly Communication was established in September 2019. Three broad goals were identified:

1. Explore how the Penn community defines “scholarly communication,” review the environment, and identify critical issues in these areas.
2. Identify broader trends in scholarly communications and issues that are emerging (e.g.: the impact of publishers on scholarship, partnership agreements, achieving “open access,” and copyright retention).
3. Make recommendations to the University and the Library on its future contracts with companies that publish scholarly journals.

Historical Information
A Committee on Open Access Publishing was appointed by the Provost and Senior Vice Provost for Research in December 2009 to examine the status of open access publishing practices and to make recommendations for establishing procedures to promote open access that better serve the Penn community and the general public. In May 2010 the Committee presented its recommendations to the Provost, the Senior Vice Provost for Research and the Council of Deans. Between September 2010 and April 2011 these recommendations were discussed with the faculty of the Schools across the University. In May 2011, the recommendations in the form of a Statement of Principles were endorsed by the Faculty Senate.

- Faculty Open-Access Statement of Principles for Scholarly Articles (September 13, 2011)
- SEC Discussion on Open Access Statement (April 2011)
- SEC Endorsement of Open Access Statement (May 2011)

Charge
The Faculty Senate’s Ad Hoc Committee on Scholarly Communication will convene for the 2019-2020 and 2020-2021 academic years with a focus on deliberating on current issues in the publisher ecosystem and the dissemination of scholarly research. Specifically, the committee will evaluate how publishers are influencing, and at times inhibiting, the production of and access to information resources and explore opportunities to form unique partnerships and transformative agreements. The Committee will also address overarching issues (e.g., publisher influence, partnerships and publisher agreements, open access/scholarship, copyright and retention of author’s rights, privacy, new and experimental models for publishing, the production and dissemination of information), broadly disseminating a common understanding of the scholarly resource landscape and developments within it.

The Ad Hoc Committee’s work will be prioritized by the group to keep interests aligned with the priorities of the Senate. The Committee may review some of the current topics and engender greater collective awareness of the issues involved. The Committee may delve into practices of the faculty in their various roles in scholarly production (e.g., as authors, editors, reviewers) and consider how, as a University, we can support greater dispersal of information resources developed and managed at Penn.

The Committee shall have power to present reports and recommendations on any matter relating to scholarly communications to the Senate. The Committee shall be governed in its responsibilities and procedures by rules established by the Faculty Senate. The Committee’s work will be reviewed on a yearly basis by the Senate Executive Committee.

Interim Report
The Committee began meeting early in the academic year and is still in an information-gathering phase of its work. The plan from the Committee’s inception has been to produce a first formal report in Spring 2021, and the Committee still expects to do so.

As an interim report to the April 15, 2020, meeting of the Senate Executive Committee (SEC), Daniel Raff (Associate Professor of Management and Committee Chair) organized a brief oral introduction to the problems the Committee is studying and to the ways in which libraries are responding. The Committee committed from the start to work closely with Penn Libraries professional staff with expertise on relevant matters. The relationship is proceeding productively: the Committee’s work program this year has been entirely confined to journal publishing, and this is a domain in which the Libraries’ staff expertise is broad and deep. In the SEC presentation, Professor Raff spoke first to provide some brief economic context, after which Brigitte Weinsteiger (Associate Vice Provost for Collections and Scholarly Communication) and Jon Shaw (Associate Vice Provost for Libraries and Deputy University Librarian) spoke at greater length on the issues as these present to the Libraries and to the Association of Research Libraries consortium, of which Penn is a member.

Professor Raff began with some scene-setting. The most important framing facts are simple. Journals began being produced by learned societies but have increasingly become accessible only through commercial publishers. The prime motivation of the leading commercial publishers is profit rather than the diffusion of knowledge, and they act in a strategically sophisticated way. Digital modes of access to content, the aggressive acquisition and proliferation of titles, and opportunities these offer for bundling and general revenue extraction have only strengthened the publishers’ bargaining position when negotiating contracts with university libraries and university library systems. Penn relies to an important extent on publication activity in evaluating faculty performance, particularly for tenure and promotion decisions. This induces a demand from the Standing Faculty for access to learned journals over and above what its members might require in the natural course of their own research. These needs are of our own negotiating situation more, rather than less, difficult.

Ms. Weinsteiger then articulated four major issues present in the current scholarly communications system. The first issue concerns the unsustainable costs required to support the current model of scholarly publishing, particularly regarding the terms sought by the for-profit commercial publishers. The issue is not just the crude one of funding but also the ramifications of resource displacement in order to pay the journal publishers’ fees, the real value of one journal versus another, the true costs involved in producing a journal, and the extent to which those true costs are in alignment with what Penn is asked to pay. Ms. Weinsteiger noted, to give a sense of proportion, that the Libraries’ subscriptions from the five largest commercial publishers of journals (i.e., Elsevier, Sage, Springer Nature, Taylor & Francis, and Wiley) alone currently consume 30% of the Library’s entire annual acquisition budget.

The second and third major issues facing scholarly communications concerns limitations on access to Penn scholarship. Because of the high cost of access to paywalled scholarly periodicals, there are limitations to the audience that can afford to read Penn scholarship. Worse, the problem exceeds less well-resourced institutions and independent individuals in the United States and the industrialized world: many institutions and individuals in the Global South have no practical means of accessing such journals and their faculty are therefore badly constrained in their ability to stay informed about scholarly discussion in their disciplines.

The final issue concerns inequity in the ability to publish. This issue has emerged as an unintended consequence of many attempts to address the other issues. Publishing models for Open Access publishing that operate on a pay-to-publish basis, such as article processing charges (APCs) that authors pay to publish an article Open Access and transformative agreements that develop this approach on a much larger scale, are increasingly prevalent. The high costs associated with these funding models are simply unattainable for many authors (particularly—though far from exclusively—in the Global South), thus precluding them from active participation in scholarly discussion within their disciplines.

As the University considers the many approaches it could take to influence any of these issues, it should consider two variables: speed and cost. How quickly does Penn wish to influence any of these issues, and how much are we willing or not willing to pay to influence them? It is imperative that we identify the appropriate balance to strike between these variables as we chart our path forward.

Mr. Shaw then surveyed the ways in which other libraries and universities across the country are addressing these issues. He focused in particular on the ways in which peer academic libraries are shifting their activities to influence the scholarly landscape. He shared a Toolkit developed by the Association of College and Research Libraries (http://acrli.libguides.com/scholcomm/toolkit/) which offers examples that expand upon efforts:

- Building libraries’ collections to strategically support scholarship and positively respond to economic challenges of traditional scholarly publishing;
- Assisting faculty with optimizing the impact of their research;
- Utilizing the right of fair use, and advocating others to do the same, in order to promote preservation, access, use and discovery of materials in
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research and instruction;
• Educating authors on their intellectual property rights and assisting with the interpretation and amendment of publication contracts;
• Facilitating compliance with funder public access mandates;
• Developing and managing institutional repositories for the purpose of collecting, showcasing and augmenting discovery of institutional research output; and
• Advocating for open access to scholarship when appropriate.

It was in his view critical to understand how peer libraries are engaging with faculty, shifting from functioning solely as a repository of physical objects like books and bound journal volumes and as an access point for journal backfiles and other databases to working directly with the faculty, formally and collaboratively (the “together rather than independently” approach), both regarding the use of library materials and influencing and advancing scholarly communications more broadly over the whole of the research-through-publication lifecycle via library-mediated workflow management systems.

The forces and configurations implicated in the outbreak of the Committee’s charge are complex and dynamic. The Committee this year has begun to explore them and the ways Penn might best respond. We will continue to do so for at least the coming year. We will submit a more extensive report a year hence for SEC discussion and for possible consideration of recommendations SEC might wish to make. We will advise in that report whether we think there is further work for the Committee as such to pursue and, if so, what that work might be. Our goal in the coming year or in some longer term is to assist SEC in developing a plan or at least a basic position from which scholarly communications issues can be addressed as they arise. Arise they surely will.

Members of the 2019-2020
Ad Hoc Committee on Scholarly Communication

Jerry Jacobs (Professor of Sociology)
Kathleen Hall Jamieson (Faculty Senate Chair-Elect and Elizabeth Ware Packard Professor of Communication)
Lewis Kaplan (Professor of Surgery at the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania and the Veterans Administration Medical Center)
Steven Kimbrough (Faculty Senate Chair and Professor of Operations, Information and Decisions)
Eileen Lake (Professor of Nursing)
Rebecka Peebles (Assistant Professor of Pediatrics at the Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia)
Kathy Peiss (Roy F. and Jeannette P. Nichols Professor of American History)
Daniel Raff (Associate Professor of Management), Chair
Beth Simmons (Andrea Mitchell University Professor of Law and Political Science)
Kathy Peiss (Roy F. and Jeannette P. Nichols Professor of American History)

Non-voting members:
Mary Francis (Director of the University of Pennsylvania Press)
Aishwarya Pawar (GAPSPA representative, Cell and Molecular Biology Ph.D. candidate)
Jon Shaw (Associate Vet Provost and Deputy University Librarian)
Brigitte Weinsteiger (Associate University Librarian for Collections)

Report of the Senate Ad Hoc Committee on the Institutional Response to the Climate Emergency (CIRCE)

Committee Charge
CIRCE was established in December 2019 for the purpose of facilitating discussion of all aspects of global warming and climate change as they pertain to faculty at the University of Pennsylvania. Specifically, CIRCE will consider the following categories of faculty interest as they pertain to the climate emergency at Penn:
• Education, including classroom instruction as well as extra-curricular educational activities
• Research, including as well scholarship, practical expertise, and artistic expression
• Operations of the University, including decarbonization, energy efficiency, and sustainability
• Flourishing of community, both within Penn, and between Penn and its regional and international stakeholders

Sub-Committee Organization
It was recognized in its formulation that the charges to CIRCE could not be completed successfully by a single committee. As a result, three subcommittees were formed, specifically: Operations, Research & Education, and Community & Policy. Different types of work were pursued by each subcommittee, so the report is divided into sections for each of them.

Operations
The Operations subcommittee developed four recommendations.

1. Updated Climate and Sustainability Action Plan (CSAP)
We recommend that the administration prepare and publish an updated Carbon and Sustainability Action Plan to reflect the effects of the Solar Power Purchase Agreement (Solar PPA) and the Air Travel offsets announced by the President and to clarify the strategies, challenges, and achievements in each of the seven sections of plan. Recommendations for five of the sections are addressed in this section, while the other two are addressed by the work of the Community & Engagement and the Research & Education subcommittees.

The updated plan should explain exactly how the main campus will achieve carbon neutrality by 2042, making clear the pathway to the “100 x 42” goal mentioned in the report. It should show all the categories of campus emissions and the effect of each initiative over time. The data used to prepare the plan should be made available to the Penn community as part of the plan, including all consumption data and the carbon emissions factors for different categories of admissions. The data will provide incentives for improvement among the schools and can help students and faculty in propose projects to reduce emissions.

Many of the recommendations address the awareness and visibility of the carbon reduction initiatives. Despite the significant ambitions of the plan, there is uneven awareness of its goals or achievements, even among those interested in the topic. There is also a great deal of untapped potential for individual action across the campus. The current plan is largely implemented from the top down through the formal administrative mechanisms available to the teams in facilities and purchasing, and the committee recommends that for the next phase of planning that the campus community be more engaged in reduction efforts.

Utilities and Operations
The updated plan should explain the sources of campus utilities, and the role played by the new Solar PPA for electricity and the purchase of summer steam for chilling. All energy use, emissions, and offsets should be fully reported.

The university should consider a solar installation within the main campus, to make the achievement of the new Solar PPA more visible.

Physical Environment
Energy use and emissions should be reported for each campus building or facility, with major renovation and efficiency initiatives listed. This will both inform the campus about efficiency achievements and provide information for new initiatives to reduce emissions.

The plan should explain the energy and carbon performance standards for all new buildings and all renovations, benchmarking them against national standards.

The University should join the “2030 District Challenge” promoted by Green Building United, reporting energy use for all its campus buildings. The CSAP 3 goals already exceed the goals of that challenge, and Penn’s participation would help provide momentum and leadership to the plan.

Waste Minimization and Recycling Goals
The updated plan should explain the carbon emissions associated with each form of waste, especially the tradeoffs between landfill and waste to energy.

Waste and recycling types and quantities should be reported for each campus building. The University should evaluate mechanisms for reporting waste and recycling quantities for all administrative units as part of the Green Office program.

The changing market for recycled materials has complicated single stream recycling and highlights the importance of the ongoing waste re-
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dution methods. The University should consider establishing a parallel goal of net-zero waste by 2042, following the lead of US Army bases.

**Purchasing and Air travel**

The updated plan should explain the carbon emissions associated with air travel and campus fleet vehicles, including fuel types and itemized by school or unit.

CIRCE is very supportive of the initiative to purchase carbon offsets for campus air travel, which will establish Penn’s leadership among its peer schools. The criteria for carbon offsets should be clearly articulated and the administrative mechanisms for their review and purchase should continue to include faculty involvement.

As the program for offsetting air travel continues in subsequent years it will be important to consider the level at which the offsets are purchased—School, department, individual, etc—in order to provide well balanced incentives for the reduction of unnecessary air travel. For example, it will be important to protect the travel of junior faculty as they establish their reputations. It will also be necessary to provide guidance and support for remote or virtual forms of meeting.

The updated report should describe plans for replacing the campus fleet with electric or low carbon vehicles.

**Transportation**

The updated report should explain the amounts of emissions and emission intensity associated with each form of transportation.

The University has implemented multiple initiatives to reduce commuter transportation, increasing mass transit ridership and bicycle use, but the number of car commuters remains relatively constant. The revised report should explain the challenges to further reductions in car commuters.

2. **Extend CSAP to the hospital, students, real estate holdings**

CAP 1.0 declared that the plan would be extended to all of the University’s facilities, so CIRCE recommends that action plans be developed for the hospital system and for the non-campus real estate holdings of the university.

Mechanisms should be considered for extending the carbon footprint to include student housing and travel, which is beyond the direct management of the University. This could be a student organized initiative. This could include a survey or auditing off campus housing and a landlord ranking for carbon intensity.

3. **Carbon Offsets**

Even when all the initiatives in the action plan have been realized the campus will still produce some carbon emissions, so programs for carbon offsetting and/or capture will need to be developed. At present, ideas for offsets are being considered by numerous entities across campus, and while this exploration and innovation should be supported, there should also be a central group or committee tasked with reviewing and approving any offset. The subcommittee agreed that offsets should be as local as possible, visible, verifiable, and additional (meaning that they add new carbon reduction activities).

The University might also consider partnering with an NGO to develop local or Penn specific offsets. A number of offset proposals have been advanced for consideration.

**Local Carbon Offsets: West Philadelphia weatherize and solarize**

CIRCE is investigating the carbon offset potential of weatherizing and solarizing low-income houses in the West Philadelphia neighborhoods adjacent to the university. This would reduce or eliminate utility bills for the residents and allow the University to retain the carbon credits. This is an inexpensive form of carbon offset, but has many additional benefits. A number of groups and agencies in the city are engaged in related forms of work and the committee has met with them to discuss potential collaborations.

**Faculty and Staff energy audit and solarize campaign**

Following a model developed at Duke, CIRCE is investigating the potential of a campaign to provide energy reduction audits and solar installation evaluation to faculty and staff. An initial analysis suggests that the amount of carbon associated with faculty and staff housing rivals the emissions of the main campus, so this could be a significant initiative.

**Tree planting and wetland restoration**

One of the most cost effective ways to directly capture carbon is through tree planting and even more so through wetland restoration. CIRCE is investigating the potential of local programs.

4. **Enhanced Student Eco-Rep: Faculty supervised auditing program**

CIRCE is investigating the organization of student teams to audit energy use in campus buildings, identifying efficiency improvements for review and implementation by FRES. This initiative might also be extended to non-campus buildings and could form the basis of an ABCS course.
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**Research and Education**

The world needs an effective “response to the urgent threat of climate change on the basis of the best available scientific knowledge” (The Paris Agreement). Such a response is crucially dependent on the knowledge of physical scientists, but also the knowledge of social scientists, humanists, designers, ethicists, policy experts, and science communicators. An effective response will require an unusually high degree of multi-disciplinary collaboration and innovative protocols for translating among disciplines.

We propose that Penn’s efforts in climate change research and education heed the Paris Agreement’s call for an urgent response to an urgent threat in the creative, multidisciplinary way it requires. To give focus to these efforts, and to avoid disciplinary silos, we propose to be guided by the primary international bodies focused on climate change: The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). These bodies are authoritative sources on the science and consensus about all aspects of climate change. They set an international agenda for climate change research, organizing what is known, but also scooping gaps in our collective knowledge. We propose to align our university-wide effort with these bodies by guiding our efforts on what they indicate is critically important to know, but that is not yet well known or well understood.

When we consulted with colleagues in the IPCC and UNFCCC about their largest knowledge gaps, they surprised us with their answers. For example, we expected to hear about limitations in modeling technology. Instead, they emphasized needing tools to deal with conflicts in multi-lateral negotiations. They requested tools to address the inability of most people in the world to imagine the future that is coming and how it could be changed. And they also emphasized the crucial need for place-based knowledge in climate adaptation studies: how the interaction between the climate system, the population, and land use changes, and policy will interact. If we can come to understand these knowledge gaps and help to fill them, Penn’s campus-wide work on climate change will have a substantial and immediate impact. These initial, exploratory discussions are far from complete and need to be pursued in detail. What does seem clear is that the UN climate change bodies are rich sources for identifying impactful, multidisciplinary research problems suited to Penn’s unique expertise.

1. **Research**

Beyond the physical science of the climate system, the international priorities in climate research are new strategies of mitigation, pathways for adaptation and resilience, and, as a last resort, dealing with massive movement of people. All of these areas require physical scientists, engineers, biologists, social scientists, ethicists, policy experts, designers, and gifted communicators to work together to develop smart strategies. We propose that Penn’s research response to the climate emergency follow these patterns. Working from public documents and with our partners at IPCC and UNFCCC, we believe that the highest international climate priorities can be identified, and resources should be directed towards multidisciplinary teams that want to work on those issues.

More specifically, we recommend that support be given to multi-disciplinary faculty teams that can identify pressing, unaddressed problems of high priority to the international climate community. For example, in consultation with colleagues at the UNFCCC and IPCC, and in our internal deliberations, we have identified these questions as the kind of research we are well-positioned to address.

(continued on page 13)
(continued from page 12)

What is the best path to global decarbonization? How can we reach net zero mid-century, and negative emissions at the end of the century? [energy engineering, energy policy, market analysis, risk and behavioral analysis, sociology, communications]

Where exactly are the climate danger hot spots and how will this effect local communities and biodiversity? [climate modelling, land use planning, ecology, public policy]

How do the Sustainable Development Goals tradeoff with Aggressive Mitigation, and what principles should guide thinking about these tradeoffs? [ethics and political philosophy, risk and behavioral analysis, energy policy]

How will climate change affect agriculture, forestry, and fisheries management, and how can changes in these practices lead to more resilient communities and mitigation? [ecological and population modelling, land use planning, public policy, agricultural policy]

What are complete set of risks of climate change for infrastructure, human and non-human health, biodiversity, food, migration, and so forth? [Risk analysis, scenario planning, public health, demographics]

How can the international community and national governments help prepare local communities to be resilient against climate change, and also learn from their local expertise? [political science, anthropology, community health]

Although these are simply examples of the kinds of multi-disciplinary collaborations we advocate, each of these ideas has been identified in IPCC reports or by parties to the UNFCCC negotiations as an area of pressing concern. They are all extremely complex questions, but they are the kinds of questions Penn is well-positioned to address.

2. Education

Penn undergraduates and graduate students should have substantial exposure to the principles of climate change and the multi-disciplinary effort required to combat it and mitigate its worst effects. We are thus very encouraged that students and faculty are requesting more substantive and sustained climate education including new courses, new programs, maybe even new minors or majors or requirements to complement existing programs such as Environmental Studies and Environmental Humanities. The members of CIRCE are enthusiastic about these ideas, as well as proposals to strengthen existing programs to enhance their climate change content. Each idea deserves careful study, and CIRCE anticipates continuing discussions around these plans in the next academic year.

We note with concern that the number of climate change related courses remains relatively small, and this will hamper the more ambitious plans being discussed. Penn needs a series of substantial, multidisciplinary course on climate change at each level of study: gateway, core training, capstone, and seminars. Such offerings should include substantial study of the physical basis of climate change, decarbonization, adaptation and resilience, policy and ethics, and impacts including migration.

Our collective offerings thus far leave major curricular gaps, and also no central mechanism for flagging or advertising them across campus. It is our strong recommendation that administration address this lack of courses, and study the issue carefully. Resources may be required to help create and sustain requisite courses, as well as the climate courses needed to fully address the climate emergency fall outside the typical teaching demands of departments.
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Community and Policy

The major focus of the subcommittee on community and policy in spring semester 2020 was to raise awareness of the climate emergency, motivate climate mitigation on a significant scale, and open and enhance channels of communication between students, faculty, staff, and administration. The major accomplishments of the subcommittee were the drafting of faculty resolution and the preparation of manual to support the actions in the resolution.

Resolution on the Individual and Institutional Responses of Faculty in the University of Pennsylvania to the Global Climate Emergency

The Resolution depicts the context of the climate emergency and formulates a series of actions that faculty pledge to take with regard to their professional and personal carbon footprint, including calling on the Board of Trustees, the President, and the Provost to improve the institutional response to the climate emergency.

Manual for a Low-Carbon Faculty.

The Manual for a Low Carbon Faculty offers information and advice to faculty on shifting to renewable energy at home, air travel alternatives and offsets, and making it possible for faculty to divest retirement accounts of fossil fuel assets and to invest in green funds.

The Resolution and Manual will be released quietly over the summer and will enjoy a formal rollout in September in connection with Penn Climate Week (September 21-27). The subcommittee is coordinating with PPSA and WPPSA to adapt the Resolution and Manual for possible adoption by University staff. Before the campus closed, the subcommittee met with leadership of the Undergraduate Assembly and graduate student representatives about facilitating a conversation with the University Administration about the climate emergency.
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