SENATE
From the Senate Office

Actions Taken by the Senate Executive Committee
Wednesday, April 5, 1995

1. Academic Planning and Budget. Past Chair Gerald Porter reported that the committee met twice since the last SEC meeting. One meeting was reserved for a report on the 1995-96 budget, the other had presentations on the 5-year plan of the School of Veterinary Medicine. Capital Council has not met since the beginning of the year. Mail votes are conducted.

2. Interim Suspension of Faculty. SEC received and reviewed a SCAFR proposed revision of the Policy on Interim Suspension of Faculty Members. The policy as amended and approved appears below.

3. Department Closings. SEC received and reviewed a Senate Committee on the Faculty amended version of the Statement on Department Closings (*Almanac* May 3, 1994). SEC rejected the amendment that read "Members of the faculty must be affiliated with a department or with a school in the event the relevant school does not have departments." SEC agreed to reconsider inserting similar language under Section II.E.8 of the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*. The approved statement appears below.

4. Proposed Just Cause Revision
a. SEC received and reviewed a petition which protested the March 1 SEC action "to seek a faculty- wide vote, with simple majority required, for approval of the proposed revision of just cause procedures." SEC agreed that it had the authority to send out a mail ballot under Section 9(a) of the Faculty Senate Rules and reaffirmed its decision to send the SEC approved revision of the just cause procedure for a faculty vote following discussion at the April 19, 1995 Faculty Senate meeting. SEC agreed that the issue of "a simple majority required for approval" will be a separate item on the agenda of the April 19 Senate meeting.

b. SEC received and reviewed a petition to include an alternative revision of the just cause procedure on the agenda of the April 19, 1995 Senate meeting. In accordance with the Faculty Senate Rules Section II(c), the item will be placed on the agenda. SEC agreed that the alternative proposal (a) will be discussed separately from the SEC approved proposal; (b) will follow discussion of the SEC approved proposal; and (c) will be given agenda time equal to that of the SEC approved proposal.

5. Consensual Sexual Relations. SEC received and reviewed a petition objecting to the action taken by the Senate Executive Committee on March 1, 1995 approving the Proposed Policy on Consensual Sexual Relations between faculty and students" and recommending that the proposal "should be widely discussed and debated before any action on its adoption." Noting that the proposed policy was published for comment in *Almanac* on February 7, 1995 with no response, SEC approved a motion to "republish the proposed policy and the Report of the Subcommittee on Consensual Sexual Relations (*Almanac* February 7, 1995), together with the comments of members of the community who oppose or support the proposed policy." Those wishing to contribute to the requested discussion and debate should submit their comments to *Almanac* no later than April 20. The report, proposed policy, and comments will be published in *Almanac* on April 25. The Chair of the Faculty Senate will encourage *The Daily Penn-sylvanian* to receive and publish comments from students and faculty during the comment period. Thereafter, the proposed policy will be submitted to the faculty for approval or disapproval by mail ballot.

Attachment: Revision of the Policy Concerning Interim Suspension of Faculty Members

April 5, 1995

The proposal that follows was unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility in November 1994, following discussions with Provost Stanley Chodorow. These recommendations amend a proposal previously approved by the Senate Executive Committee and published in *Almanac* January 12, 1994.

After receiving additional comments from the Provost, SCAFR discussed this proposal again on February 8, 1995. At that time, the committee decided that it would be helpful to add the cross- reference to the policy on Temporary Exclusion of a Faculty Member due to impaired capacity.

This proposal is intended to replace the existing paragraph II.E.104.d of the University policy concerning Suspension or Termination of Faculty for Just Cause (p. 48, *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*, revised 1991). If the new Policy Governing Sanctions taken Against Members of the Faculty is adopted, this proposal would replace the section on Interim Suspension (p. 27, Mendelson/Burbank draft, December 8, 1994).

II.E.10.4.d. A faculty member shall not be suspended—*i.e.*, required to discontinue all or a substantial portion of his or her University activities—during the above mentioned proceedings unless continuation of those activities would present a serious risk of harm to self or other individuals before the proceedings can be completed. Any such suspension shall be with salary. A dean's decision to suspend a faculty member shall be accompanied by a concise statement of the factual assumptions upon which it rests and the grounds for concluding that the faculty member's continuance presents the serious risk described above. Except in an emergency, a decision to suspend should be made only after consultation with the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility of the faculty concerned. Prior to such consultation, that committee should, whenever time permits, afford the faculty member an opportunity to be heard, to present written (or, at the committee's option, oral) statements of witnesses, and to give reasons why the interim suspension should not be ordered. In an emergency, that is, where the risk of harm is sufficiently imminent to preclude consultation with the committee, the dean may suspend the faculty member without such consultation. Even in such circumstances, the dean should make an effort to consult the committee's chair in advance and should consult the full committee as soon as possible thereafter. Any interim suspension should be preceded, accompanied, or (in an emergency) followed as expeditiously as possible by the initiation of just cause proceedings in accordance with paragraph 10.4.e. (For procedures governing the Temporary Exclusion of a Faculty Member due to impaired capacity rather than sanctionable misconduct, see Section II.E.14.)

Attachment: Senate Committee on the Faculty Statement on Department Closings

April 5, 1995

Universities exist for the creation and dissemination of knowledge. The decision to discontinue a department should therefore be based upon academic considerations as determined by the faculty as a whole or appropriate committees thereof. Accordingly, there should be early, careful, and meaningful faculty involvement in decisions relating to the reduction of instructional and research programs. Such involvement should precede not only the ultimate decision to close the department but also decisions made during the pendency of the closure issue that will have a strong bearing on its outcome (e.g., the suspension of student admissions into a program or department).

There are a number of general procedures that should be followed when a department closing is contemplated.

1. Consultation

Most, if not all, schools, and the University as a whole, have faculty committees charged with the responsibility of reviewing planning and budgetary decisions. Such committees should be involved in decisions to limit the resources of departments or close them. However, such reviews are not substitutes for early and frequent consultation with the faculty of the affected departments themselves or with the faculty as a whole. The dean should take seriously the advice received in such consultations and, in most circumstances, should act in accordance with the advice.

Given that department closings typically follow a protracted period during which the department in question receives limited resources, school administrations have ample time to explain the implications of such actions for the future. If a department is deprived of resources because its performance is found wanting or its viability is otherwise questioned, administrators need to make the reasons clear and to avoid the temptation to attribute the decision to "hard times" or "scarcity of resources."

Resources are always scarce, and schools allocate them according to what they perceive as their best interests. Departments should be informed that they are at risk, and given the reasons.

2. Departmental Review

All schools should have regular review of departments.

Departmental reviews should be used to provide the department with timely notice of its shortcomings and the need for improvement and to provide the school decision-makers with information essential to a sound evaluation of the department. Such reviews also provide formal and informal opportunities to alert the department to the school's plans. Departmental reviews should not be triggered by specific proposals for closing or making other adverse changes to a department. However, when a closing is being considered, the lack of a timely external review should prompt a more intense internal evaluation of the department.

3. Informing the Department of the Decision to Close

Faculty members of a department facing closure must be informed well before the formal recommendation of a closure is publicly announced. At that time, they must be given information regarding their future at the University and the procedures the school has initiated to find a new University affiliation for them.

When informing the department of its decision, the school should provide a detailed and frank explanation. If the school's administrators are confident they are acting on the basis of sound information, they should have little reason to withhold the reasons for these actions. If they are not confident, they should recognize the need for further deliberation before taking action.

4. Academic Freedom

Department closure is typically predicated upon academic grounds such as the lack of fit with the mission of the school, which would not justify similar action against an individual tenured faculty member. A proposed closing alone does not give rise to an academic freedom violation. However, even if all the appropriate review and consultation procedures have been followed, the closure, or threatened closure, of a department may present delicate and difficult questions of academic freedom.

There may also be a danger that a small, and therefore vulnerable, group of faculty members may be relocated, marginalized, or have their academic freedom impaired as a result of the dean's personal hostility, or distaste for their political or philosophical views. Both administrators and faculties must be on guard against this.

In cases where academic freedom issues appear to be raised, the dean should seek the advice of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFR) of the school or the Faculty Senate at a sufficiently early stage for that advice to be factored into the decision. Aggrieved faculty members always have the right to complain of the dean's action to the appropriate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

5. Transfers of Faculty

The procedure for transferring faculty can be found in Section II.E.8 of the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: A Selection of Policies and Procedures of the University of Pennsylvania.*

SENATE
From the Chair

TO: Members of the Faculty Senate
FROM: Barbara J. Lowery, Chair
DATE: April 7, 1995
SUBJECT: Agenda for the Annual Meeting of the Faculty Senate
           Wednesday, April 19, 1995
           3:00 to 5:15 p.m. in Alumni Hall, Towne Building

l. Approval of the minutes of the April 20, 1994 plenary meeting (enclosed with mailing)
2. Report of the Chair. Time allocated: 10 minutes.
3. Report of the President. Time allocated: 5 minutes.
4. Report of the Provost. Time allocated: 5 minutes.
5. Report of the Committee on Administration—E. Ann Matter, Chair.
   Time allocated: 10 minutes. *[See page S-5 of this Supplement.]*
6. Report of the Committee on Students and Educational Policy—James Laing, Chair.
   Time allocated: 10 minutes. *[See pages S-6 through S-8 of this Supplement.]*
7. Report of the Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty —Gerald J. Porter, Acting Chair.
   Time allocated: 5 minutes report; 15 minutes discussion. *[See page S-4 of this Supplement.]*
8. Revision of the procedure for Suspension or Termination of Faculty for Just Cause
   a. *Discussion Only.* Senate Executive Committee approved revision *[See pageS-1 of this Supplement, attachment to SEC Actions Taken April 5].* Time allocated: 30 minutes.
   b. *For Discussion and Action.* SEC recommendation on mail ballot decision criterion "that a simple majority be required for approval" of the SEC-approved revision of the just cause procedure. Time allocated: 15 minutes.
   c. *For Discussion and Action.* Alternative revision of the just cause procedure *[below]*. Time allocated: 30 minutes.
9. Adjournment by 5:15 p.m.

Attachment: Agenda Item—Alternative Proposal on Just Cause

Text of the Petition Received:
Under Rules of the Faculty Senate, Section 11, paragraph (c):
    "The agenda shall include any subject requested in writing by five or more members of the Senate prior to circulation of the agenda..."
We the undersigned request full discussion and vote on a resolution, to be moved and seconded at the meeting, to send, with accompanying text and information, for mail vote of approval or disapproval by the entire Senate the attached outline of the present "just cause procedure" (*Handbook*, pp.47-51) [or such revisions of the summary as may be agreed before the meeting], along with SIX proposed amendments, contained therein in italics, designed (a) to correct defects recently encountered, while (b) preserving the present system of School autonomy over faculty discipline and all present individual rights to hearings, and appeals both by School Faculties

and by the Trustees,—which amended procedure, if approved by majority vote of the Senate, is to be substituted for Section V of the SEC proposal of March 1,1995, and integrated with the rest of the proposed Sanctions process by SEC, to replace its entire "just cause" proposals, before submission of any proposal to the Trustees for amendment of the relevant Standing Resolutions and Statutes of the University.

(signed)

Anthony Tomazinis, Professor of City Planning
James F. Ross, Professor of Philosophy and Law
Malcolm Campbell, Interim Dean, GSFA
Michael Cohen, Professor of Physics
Paul Guyer, Florence R.C. Murray Professor
    of Humanities
Alan Charles Kors, Professor of History

Summary (by J.F. Ross) of Present "Suspension or termination for just cause" procedure (Handbook, pp. 47-51), with proposed amendments, to replace Section V of SEC proposal (3-1-95).

1. This section is directed at suspension or termination for just cause, e.g., behavior making one unfit for an academic community. *Amendment #1 : to restrict definition of "just cause" to the words of the Statute Art. 9, Sec.14, without illustrations.*

2. Prosecution by Dean or President or elected Group for Complaint, begins with Dean's or President's informal investigation, consultation with several senior colleagues in the School, and perhaps attempt at informal adjustment (e.g. "retirement," planned resignation, restitution, supervised research, etc.) *Amendment #2: a "target" letter will notify respondent at outset of the inquiry.*

3. If informal settlement not reached, Dean/ President formally complains to the School CAFR (12 Schools with faculties ranging from about 600 in Medical School, 490 in SAS to less than 20 in several). *Amendment #3: once*

prosecution is begun, no one but the President can "sign off" to discontinue it and that cannot bind a Faculty's Group for Complaint.

4. CAFR [or Hearing Board, see amendment #5] holds threshold, non-evidential hearing to decide whether charges as made and facts as alleged, if true, would amount to just cause for termination or suspension. Dean has to outline the case. *Note:* in effect, CAFR asks "if what the Dean is saying turns out, by clear and convincing evidence, to be true, would that amount to just cause to terminate or suspend?" If CAFR thinks not, the case stops right there, unless Dean/prosecution appeals to School faculty and they find the charges, if true, would amount to "just cause"; if they do, formal hearing (see #5) is held. Otherwise, case for major sanction, stops.

5. If CAFR decides "yes, this would amount to just cause" (i.e., to indict), then a formal evidentiary hearing, procedurally supervised by SCAFR is arranged, with challenges for bias, formal recording, assistance of counsel, presentation by both sides (details skipped for now) and formal report to the school's Faculty. *Amendment #5: to allow Faculty respondents in Schools with less than 100 members to notify SCAFR to select a University-wide Hearing Board to substitute for the School's CAFR to hear the case and report to the School's Faculty.*

6. Any procedural question or disputed interpretation of procedure is decided by SCAFR and SCAFR alone.

7. *Amendment #6 (to par. "k", p. 50): the only outcomes of a formal Hearing can be "guilty" with a recommended termination or suspension, or "not guilty" with no major sanction recommended. If a "not guilty" outcome is not appealed to the whole Faculty by the Dean/prosecution, the President may impose a minor sanction, based on review of the Hearing record, subject to respondent's appeal through the grievance process.*

8. Both prosecutor and respondent have the right to appeal for trial de novo by the school's entire faculty (PP.i, p.50), regardless of the outcome of the Hearing. *Note:* no such appeal to one's Faculty or to the Trustees, has ever been taken; miscreants tend to "move on and out" rather than face all their colleagues.

9. The Faculty Member may instead appeal to the Trustees directly from CAFR recommendation, (unless the prosecution appeals to the Faculty), and the Faculty Member can also appeal to Trustees from the decision of the faculty (p.50) with a personal hearing before the Trustees guaranteed (p.51. par. "m").

10. On such an appeal, the Trustees decide whether there are defects of procedure or evidence or law, not SCAFR (though SCAFR can advise), and Trustees can remand for more hearing, can discontinue the case, or substitute a lesser penalty than the one recommended, but not an increased penalty.

11. On remand by Trustees CAFR *(or Hearing Board, Amendment #5)* holds further evidentiary hearing or corrects procedure or both and reports to the Faculty. Both parties can again appeal to the whole faculty for trial of the case (or the Faculty Member can again appeal directly to Trustees and receive a personal hearing, if prosecution has not appealed to the whole Faculty). And both can appeal again to Trustees after a whole-faculty hearing.

12. Salary continues for one year on termination, except when School's CAFR finds offense to be egregious and Trustees agree to cut off salary on termination date.

Note: Note with six simple amendments, (and technical tightening of time-scales—not included here), the present procedures can be fixed to avoid any repeat of the plagiarist's escape, WHILE PRESERVING ALL THE PRESENT very extensive appeals RIGHTS OF THE FACULTY AND THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE SCHOOL FACULTIES.

This is done, without destroying the autonomy of the 12 Schools and without centralizing judgmental power in the President, or infecting the Senate Chairs with any judicial functions at all—and without removing the extensive appeals rights of the entire University faculty.

— James F. Ross, Professor
of Philosophy and Law

On Community Service Responsibility of Faculty

A Report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty
March 30, 1995

The Commission on Strengthening the Community reported that, in addition to establishing the intellectual standards of the University, the faculty plays a crucial role in "transmitting values and setting a civil tone at the University." In this context, the Commission made a series of recommendations concerning faculty roles and responsibilities as they relate to community service both within and external to the University. Two of these recommendations, B1 and B2, are of relevance to the community service issue.

In B1, it was recommended that an *ad hoc* faculty committee appointed by the Provost address: (1) the defining of University values, including the standards of faculty responsibility and (2) the manner in which the faculty's traditional teaching and research responsibilities are related to constructive engagement in the life of the University community and the wider community of which the University is a part. The Commission further suggested that the *ad hoc* committee revise and amplify the Faculty Responsibility Section in the *Faculty Handbook.*

In B2, the Commission recommended that the Provost and Deans encourage faculty to become more active in campus activities that build respect and cooperation in the community. They went on to suggest that faculty performance related to such community service be considered in all salary and promotion decisions and that an effective and equitable evaluation system be developed by the *ad hoc* committee.

With respect to B1, the Senate Committee on the Faculty recognizes that the continued existence of the University is dependent upon a good relationship with its surrounding community. It also believes that the urban community, with its attendant social, health care, safety, legal, and education problems, for example, provides a unique opportunity for University faculty to study and to assist the community. Such research-based extramural activities should receive consideration in decisions about promotion and salary. In addition, if a faculty member is specifically requested by an administrator to perform community service, appropriate released time should be granted. Community service should be voluntary, however. A faculty member who is not involved in such service should not be penalized.

With respect to B2, the Senate Committee on the Faculty reaffirms that the primary roles or responsibilities of the Standing Faculty at this University are research, teaching, and service. The statement related to Faculty Service (p.41, *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*) is clear as written and does not require revision. Specifically, the *Handbook* states:

"Another aspect of faculty activity is service to the department, the school, and the University.

"The Faculty is involved in all decisions affecting courses, curricula, degrees, appointments, and promotions, and in many others affecting the physical plant and the multifarious aspects of University life and activities. Thus service as administrators and committee members is an important concomitant of faculty status.

"All three activities, teaching, research, and service, are of major importance, and all may be considered in determining salary levels and eligibility for promotion. Since some members may be called upon for extraordinary effort in one or more of these areas, such effort is consistent with adjustment in the others. Thus exceptionally heavy administrative duties are often balanced by a reduction in teaching load. Taken in their entirety, faculty activities usually involve a total commitment of one's professional time and effort."

In conclusion, if faculty service activities in the wider community are to be considered in promotion and salary decisions, they must be research-based or specifically requested of the faculty member by the administration. Faculty service within the University should be encouraged and recognized in accordance with existing policy. If, as is widely perceived, existing policy is not being followed the provost in consultation with the dean should insure that it is.

Stephen B. Burbank (law)
Jean Crockett (emeritus finance)
Janet A. Deatrick (nursing)
Peter J. Hand (animal biology/vet), chair
Morris Mendelson (emeritus finance)
Sheila H. Murnaghan (classical studies)
Janet Rothenberg Pack (public policy & management)
Ex Officio: Barbara J. Lowery (nursing), Faculty Senate Chair
    William L. Kissick (medicine), Faculty Senate Chair-elect
Staff: Carolyn P. Burdon (executive assistant, Faculty Senate)

Report of the 1994-95 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

April 10, 1995

In this report, we analyze the economic status of the faculty against four criteria: (A) Salaries at similar institutions; (B) The consumer price index; (C) An ideal of equity within the faculty, within departments, within schools and across schools; and (D) Salaries of senior administrative staff. Based upon this analysis, we conclude that

- we are doing satisfactorily against other institutions,
- the majority of faculty members are falling behind the Consumer Price Index,
- there are very substantial differences among faculty across the University, and
- there may be too wide a discrepancy between faculty salaries and those of senior administrators.

Our analysis was conducted without full access to all data. Furthermore, some of the data that we were shown is confidential and can not be used in this report. There is much that is unknown about the salary structure within the University. In addition to careful attention to the issues raised in this report we recommend a careful examination of the current salary compensation system throughout the University.

We begin with the comparisons against important criteria.

Compared with similar institutions: The annual AAUP salary survey results for the period 1989-1993 show that:

1. Compared with the other Ivy League universities, Stanford, MIT and UC Berkeley over the five-year period, Penn ranked sixth or seventh in full professor salaries, third in associate professor salaries, and first to fourth in assistant professor salaries.

2. Penn's relative position has remained fairly constant over these years.

3. The salaries of full professors at Penn are not as competitive as those of associate and assistant professors.

Compared with an absolute standard: The AAUP data indicate that the average salary of full professors at Penn increased 20% over the past five years, approximately the same rate as the Consumer Price Index. Since over 60% of full professors get less than the average increase we conclude that the salaries of over 60% of full professors have fallen behind the CPI during these five years.

Comparisons within the University: The primary purpose of a price system is to allocate resources to their best uses. Salary differences exist between individuals, departments and schools for a variety of reasons. The contributions made by some faculty are valued more highly than those made by others and as a consequence those faculty may receive higher salaries; some faculty work in areas where there is greater external demand; to retain such faculty, Penn must pay higher salaries. Time in grade may also affect salary levels, although in a complex way.

Sometimes, however, inequities result since salary increments may depend on factors other than individual performance. An example of such a factor is the financial condition of the faculty member's school. The following comparisons indicate the inequity that exists.

- In 1994-95, the best paying school in the University (excluding Medicine) compensated its full professors, on average, more than 50% higher than the lowest paying school.
- In 1994-95, one school offered its full professors an average increase of less than 3% while another offered an average of almost 8%.

We have also seen data that suggests large differences within schools as to both rates of pay and rates of increases in pay. Surely similar differences exist within some departments.

Compared with nonacademic salaries: Another important comparison by which faculty salary equity can be gauged is with other University salaries. We have compared some senior administrators with full professors and the next tier of administrators with associate professors. Form 990, the University's 1992 Income Tax Report, which is publicly available, contains data on the salaries of 15 senior Penn administrators. Excluding the President, the Provost, the executive vice president and the two top administrators of the medical center, the average salary of the remaining nonacademic administrators (most with the title of vice president) was $138,561. An average 1992 raise of 6% would make the 1993 average $146,874. The average full professor's salary in 1993-1994 was $88,100. Adjusted to a 12-month salary this would be equivalent to $117,400 — 20% less than senior nonacademic administrators. Administrative salaries at the next lower level are also likely to be out of line with faculty salaries.

We believe, for example, that in the current year there are many non-academic administrators—deputies, associates, directors—who earn in excess of $100,000 per year. The average associate professor salary in 1993-94 ($62,200) adjusted to a 12-month salary is $82,933. It might be argued that this discrepancy exists at other universities and that it is market driven. However, it may be the case that Penn is providing very generous salaries to its administrators—salaries that limit the funds available for faculty increases. Here again, a careful examination is required.

Conclusions

1. The salaries of full professors are not as competitive as those of associate and assistant professors.

2. The salaries of a majority of faculty members have not kept pace with the consumer price index.

3. There are major differences in salaries across schools and in their average salary increases.

4. Based on the limited data available to us, there is reason for concern about the differences between non-academic administrators salaries and faculty salaries.

The discrepancies that we have seen within the University do not, of themselves, provide evidence of inequity. To the extent that they represent differences in merit or response to market forces many will not object. However, a portion of these inequalities cannot be adequately explained either in terms of market forces or differences in merit. For example, the "responsibility center" budgeting process is a significant variable that produces variations in faculty compensation. There may also be straightforward inequities reflecting short term decisions to reward one faculty member and not another. Over time, a small initial difference can compound to a significant difference.

We believe that these concerns should be addressed as decisions are being made about faculty salaries in the next academic year. We also believe that it is time to do a thorough examination of compensation policy. Among the issues to be considered are the following:

1. What are the variations across schools, across departments, within departments, and between faculty and administrators, and in comparison to costs of living.

2. What evidence is there for various explanations of the differences in compensation, including merit differences, time in position, wealth of the relevant responsibility center, market forces reflecting the average compensation in an area, market forces producing unusual compensation for individuals within an area, etc.

3. What are the values implicit in the current salary system, and do those serve the institution and its members well? For example, it is clear that individual compensation reflects an individual's ability to attract outside offers, which most often reflects success in research. This reduces funds available to compensate others who are particularly successful in other academic areas, such as classroom teaching, and can be an incentive to spend more time on research and less time teaching. Also, within departments, in the effort to compete for new faculty, offers have been made that are significantly above the average salary for continuing faculty. Few equity adjustments have been received by continuing faculty to preserve their position in what is, in effect, a new salary structure. The effort to build for the future may involve a transfer of resources from veteran faculty to new faculty with adverse consequences for faculty morale. In both of these cases, and others, there are fundamental value considerations at issue.

There is a need to compare the costs and benefits of each policy for the institution and for the individuals involved without prejudging the outcome. The result of a careful study may suggest the need to initiate a systematic, long-term process of remediation including a possible redesign of the budgeting system.

Charles E. Dwyer (education)
Jamshed Ghandhi (finance)
Laura L. Hayman (nursing)
Robert C. Hornik (communication)
William L. Kissick (medicine)
Samuel Z. Klausner (sociology)
Barbara L. Lowery (nursing)
Gerald J. Porter (mathematics), Acting Chair

Report of the 1994-95 Senate Committee on Administration

April 5, 1995

The committee was charged with four tasks for the year:

1. to follow up on the recommendations of the 1993-94 Senate Committee on Administration regarding changes in responsibility centered budgeting, especially with regard to allocating additional funding to the provost's office for educational programs, and with redesigning central services for tighter control;
2. to continue the line of inquiry first articulated by the February 14, 1991 (*Almanac* March 19, 1991) Senate Committee on Administration ("the Pollack Report") into the large increase in the size of the administrative budgeting in respect to academic budgets;
3. to focus on changes in administration that are proposed by the new president and provost; and
4. to develop some procedures for the removal of a dean before the end of his or her term of office.

The first three charges have been incorporated into the major restructuring efforts now underway as a result of the Coopers & Lybrand study of the University (*Almanac Supplement* January 17, 1995). To assure the inclusion of the faculty in this restructuring, the committee talked twice with Provost Stanley Chodorow and once with President Judith Rodin and Acting Executive Vice President Jack Freeman. The provost and the president assured us that faculty would be members of each of the task forces to be established to carry out restructuring in different areas of the University. Our concern was the selection of faculty participants for the task forces. Our position was and continues to be that the faculty should be selected by the appropriate Faculty Senate committees, not by the administration.

A subsequent meeting with Jack Freeman raised concerns that faculty would be a part of the restructuring process at the first level. Dr. Freeman's position seems to be that faculty will be limited to a consultative role, at a second tier from the task force activity. This is conceptually very different from the role envisioned by the committee and outlined by the president and the provost. We fear that such a plan would not sufficiently employ faculty expertise about the University, nor would it make the faculty (who were the instigators of this administrative restructuring) true partners in the process. We recommend that this issue be resolved through substantial further consultation between the administration and representatives of the Faculty Senate. This issue remains under discussion.

The committee also spoke with President Rodin about the number of appointments to her office, and were satisfied that, with respect to the numbers of staff (we do not know about costs) the changes seem appropriate. We were not asked and have not talked to the provost about changes in that office. We recommend that the 1995-96 Senate Committee on Administration continue to monitor staff additions and restructuring in the offices of the president and provost in the context of cost containment and re-engineering throughout the University.

The fourth issue, the drafting of a procedure for the removal of a dean, was carried out successfully. After several drafts and two presentations to the Senate Executive Committee, a final version was accepted by SEC at the March 1, 1995 meeting (see below). This will be added to the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators* in Section I.E.2. The text of the procedure for the removal of a dean is:

For Insertion in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators I.E.2

On page 8: Change heading "Consultation for Deans, Associate Deans, and Vice Deans" to "Appointment of Deans, Associate Deans, and Vice Deans" and begin paragraph with preamble:

The Statutes of the Corporation (9.4) state that a Dean shall be appointed or removed by the Trustees, upon recommendation by the President and the Provost, and according to policies and procedures promulgated by the President and the Provost.

On page 9, before heading "Appointments of Acting Administrators" add a new heading: "Removal of a Dean"

The procedure for the removal of a Dean prior to the expiration of his or her term may be initiated by the President and the Provost. It may also be initiated by a faculty vote of no confidence taken at a meeting in accordance with the bylaws of the school. The vote of no confidence must be confirmed by a majority of the standing faculty in a subsequent mail ballot. In either case, the Provost shall appoint, in consultation with the

Senate Committee on Consultation, an Advisory Committee of at least five faculty members, a majority of whom shall be from outside of the school. The Committee shall be charged by the Provost and the President to gather information relevant to the issues specified in the charge, including interviews with the faculty and Dean. The Committee shall forward its recommendations, with supporting documents, to the Provost, the President, and the Dean, within four weeks of its appointment. The Committee shall report its recommendations to the faculty of the school.

> *Leonard J. Bello (microbiology/veterinary)*
> *David Brownlee (history of art)*
> *E. Ann Matter (religious studies), chair*
> *Arnold J. Rosoff (legal studies)*
> *Cynthia Scalzi (nursing)*
> *Henry Teune (political science)*
> *Ex Officio: Barbara J. Lowery (nursing), Faculty Senate Chair*
> *   William J. Kissick (medicine), Faculty Senate Chair-elect*
> *Staff: Carolyn P. Burdon (executive assistant, Faculty Senate)*

Report of Senate Committee on Publication Policy for Almanac

March 28, 1995

This normally somewhat dormant committee had a busy year and met a number of times to consider a proposal from the administration to 1) initiate a new daily electronic news service under *Almanac,* 2) merge *Almanac* and *The Compass* for a trial period, and 3) absorb the content of certain current small stand-alone newsletters (e.g. *The Bottom Line, Benefits News*, *Penn News Digest*) into the merged publication. Included among those meetings were discussions with senior administrators, the Editor of *Almanac* and the then Manager of *The Compass.*

Towards the end of these discussions the committee saw some mockups of a merged publication. They were reassured by these that the functions and positive features of both parent publications could be preserved, and that improved indexing and the appearance of different material under clearly recognizable logos would mitigate the inevitable dilution of the material of each publication by that of the other.

The committee recommended that the Senate Executive Committee approve the proposal, which they subsequently did, with the following conditions:

1. It is agreed and clearly stated that the Editor of *Almanac* reports editorially to the Almanac Advisory Board for the publication in its entirety.
2. The Manager of *The Compass* should report to the Editor of *Almanac.*
3. The traditional content, style and function of Almanac material must be retained in full.
4. In cases of contention for space it is assured that the Editor of *Almanac* will accord priority to material For the Record and to discussion and opinions concerning University issues.
5. The trial merger must be a genuine experiment and be readily reversible in the event that it is unsuccessful. In particular budgets for the forthcoming fiscal year should not assume any of the (relatively modest) savings expected from the merger.
6. The space taken by Job Opportunities should be compressed to the extent possible without loss of information content.
7. A fully effective distribution mechanism must be provided.

The trial period was originally set to begin in March, but has been postponed to permit adequate preparation in the face of some personnel changes. The committee intends to evaluate its success in the fall after sufficient experience with it has been gained.

> *Jacqueline M. Fawcett (nursing)*
> *Phoebe S. Leboy (biochemistry/dental)*
> *Ann E. Mayer (legal studies)*
> *Martin Pring (physiology/medicine), Chair*
> *Paul F. Watson (history of art)*
> *Ex Officio: Barbara J. Lowery (nursing), Faculty Senate Chair*
> *   William L. Kissick (medicine), Faculty Senate Chair-elect*

A Proposal for Enhancing Advising at Penn

Report of the 1994-95 Faculty Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy

April 5, 1995

Preamble

Good advising is essential to success in most students' education. Currently, students can seek advice from a variety of sources, including professional advisors in school offices, peer advisors (both official and unofficial), and faculty. The mix of these resources varies across schools. Although much of this advising is excellent, there is considerable room for improvement. Current and former students, when questioned about their experience at Penn, frequently voice considerable dissatisfaction with the advising system. The amount of professional advising presently available is insufficient for giving personal and in-depth assistance to every student who could benefit from it. Peer advising varies widely in quality. Faculty mentoring, which can add much value to students' educational experiences, is not working to its full potential. This report offers recommendations that focus on strengthening the advising system in several ways that, in our judgment, would increase and enhance the mentoring by faculty. Although our deliberations leading to this report focused primarily on the advising of undergraduates, we believe that many of these proposals apply also to the mentoring of graduate students.

Introduction

A distinctive feature of the University of Pennsylvania is the appreciable extent to which its students engage in diverse combinations of academic programs. Penn undergraduates are especially prone to such "hyphenating": at least 1,420 of the 9,917 undergraduates whose primary affiliation is in one of the four undergraduate schools seek multiple degrees, majors, or concentrations. (See the Appendix for details.) The rich variety of multiple options at Penn offers students considerable freedom to custom-design programs suited to their career aspirations and tastes. Yet this same diversity generates a maze of substantive options, prerequisites, program requirements and bureaucratic obstacles of a complexity that can be daunting to students, faculty, and even the best-informed professional advisors.

Difficulties in coping with this complexity engender serious dysfunctions. For professional advisors, much of their valuable contact time with students is wasted on bureaucratic details. For faculty, teaching, research and other responsibilities leave too little time for keeping well-informed about program opportunities and requirements across the University. As a consequence, many faculty seldom advise students. For students, the maze of programs, requirements, and scheduling difficulties lead to confusion, much wasting of time in gathering information, and dissatisfaction with the advising system. When students learn that faculty often cannot answer their questions about formal requirements, they frequently do not seek the more valuable mentoring that faculty can provide in helping them to think about personal goals, intellectual adventuring in the selection of courses, involvement in research, and other ways of enhancing the value of their educational experience at Penn. These difficulties also contribute to inordinate delays in selecting a program portfolio leading to a degree, the overuse of previously well-traveled paths (sometimes attributed to herd mentality) while potentially attractive alternatives lie undiscovered (thus oversubscription of some courses and low enrollment, hence infrequent offering, of others), and an undergraduate experience in too many large courses.

Objectives

This document prescribes some steps that, in our judgment, should be taken to enhance students' interactions with professional advisors and faculty mentors and to help students take fuller advantage of Penn's distinctive educational opportunities, in part by

- establishing a closer relationship between each student and a faculty advisor that is intended to continue throughout the student's educational experience, and
- making better use of modern information technology to provide user-friendly, computer assistance for use by students, faculty and staff advisors, departments and schools in advising, monitoring, and educational planning.

We emphasize that our proposals on the use of information technology are intended to enhance, not to supplant, human contact between students and advisors. Instead, we seek to take care of many administrative matters in another way, so that advisors and students can devote their time together to more important matters.

Proposals

Toward these objectives, we offer the following propositions for consideration by a broader group of stakeholders that includes students, residential and school faculty, advising staff, and information system specialists.[1]

1. A faculty advisor should be assigned to each student prior to matriculation, and should be expected to continue serving as that student's advisor throughout the student's educational experience at Penn, unless the student requests a change of advisor.

Remarks. Each department in the University should be responsible for selecting a set of the faculty to serve as advisors. Deans and department chairs should ensure that faculty assigned this important role (a) are well- informed about their responsibilities as advisors, (b) are given ample support by professional advising staff in more routine activities such as course scheduling, (c) are granted relief from other duties if the advising responsibilities are extensive, and (d) are rewarded appropriately for their performance as mentors. The assignment of each student to an advisor should be coordinated with the residential plan, and the advisor should be knowledgeable about the student's likely field of interest, if that field is known. The role of the faculty advisor is expected to evolve as the student progresses, with issues of transition being paramount in the first year, decisions about major or concentration becoming central in the second year, and career decisions growing in importance in subsequent years. The advisor should be alert to any indication that an advisee might be encountering personal or academic problems that can arise at any time in the educational experience, and should be ready to assist the student in dealing with these issues, or to arrange for the student to consult someone who can. The information system advocated below can be useful in monitoring a student's progress, proactively signaling early warning of any indication that a student might be getting into academic or personal trouble, and providing decision support in helping the student and professional advisor to deal with administrative details so that more of the time the faculty advisor spends with the student can be devoted to mentoring.

---

[1] We are grateful to a number of people for providing information and comments that helped us develop these propositions, including Jeanne Curtis, Al Filreis, Steve Kimbrough, Ronald Sanders, John Smolen, Daniel Shapiro and others associated with the Data Warehouse and Project Cornerstone. But they should not be held accountable for the proposals offered in this report.

2. Each course, academic program, department and school should make effective use of electronic communications—electronic mail, home pages, bulletin boards, list servers, and the like—to facilitate communication with students. Undergraduate coordinators and program advisors should monitor these communications and ensure that questions are answered promptly. Information concerning faculty members' interests in teaching and research, course descriptions and schedules, program requirements, orientation sessions, career planning seminars, research opportunities, and so on should be advertised via these means.

Remarks. We applaud the success of the English department in this regard and are encouraged by trends elsewhere on campus to make better use of these methods to foster closer relationships with students. We urge that this transition be accelerated. The decision support system advocated later in this report would make significant contributions to this effort. In this regard, for example, we are pleased to hear that each student's e-mail address will soon be recorded in the Student Record System and downloaded into the relational database (described below) that is being developed in the Data Warehouse component of Project Cornerstone. With this addition, the system we propose below can be used readily to combine students' e-mail addresses with class lists and other information, thus simplifying the task of creating list servers. As the electronic University grows in importance, it becomes increasingly imperative that all intended users have ready access to the appropriate hardware and software.

3. Efforts should be made to ensure that all students are able to use these systems throughout their educational experience. At the earliest opportunity, each new student should be given an e-mail address, access to the network, and hands-on training in the use of this technology. The ResNet should be completed as soon as possible, and better and more rapid access to PennNet should be provided for off-campus users.

Remarks. In this regard, we are pleased by the recently announced plans to increase and improve the pool of modems (*Almanac* March 14, 1995, p. 11) to facilitate access to PennNet and the Internet from off-campus. We are encouraged also to hear that plans are being made to update the network to provide high speed, wide bandwidth communications.

In the remaining propositions, we propose the development of a system for providing computer assistance to students, faculty and staff advisors, departments and schools in planning, advising, and monitoring our students' educational progress. Before outlining features of the system we have in mind, it is useful to provide some background.

Penn's Student Record System (SRS), operated and maintained by the Office of Student Information and Systems, is the University's primary repository of authoritative and secure information on course scheduling, registration, program requirements, student records, and degree auditing. SRS is designed for data input, record keeping, and processing transactions.

(One of us, an SAS advisor in the College office, has also been using the system to record advising notes in students' files.) Although SRS seems to support these activities well, it has a number of limitations for the purposes we have in mind. In particular, SRS is older technology. Retrieving information from the system is somewhat laborious, and the user interface is not very friendly. It is a flat-file system, not a relational database. Thus, authorized users can access a particular student's records, much as one might retrieve a folder from a filing cabinet, but cannot retrieve summary information about, say, which mathematics courses were taken by current third-year students majoring in English who live on campus. Thus it is not sufficiently flexible to deal with queries that were not anticipated when the system was programmed.

To begin addressing these limitations of SRS for purposes other than those for which it was intended, Project Cornerstone is developing, in the Data Warehouse project, a read-only relational database that, for purposes of this report, we shall call the Decision Support Environment (DSE). Information from SRS is downloaded nightly into the DSE. At the present, DSE does not retrieve certain information central to our concerns from the Degree Audit portion of SRS, but could do so with little additional effort. Because it is programmed (in Oracle) as a relational database, DSE appears to provide an important first step towards the system we propose.

The following propositions advocate the development of a new decision support system, which we refer to as SAM (Support for Advising and Monitoring), to provide a user-friendly interface with DSE. These propositions characterize broadly, as an ideal, the performance characteristics that the system should exhibit if it is to make significant contributions to

the enhancement of advising at Penn. On the other hand, we emphasize that this report does not (a) present a well-defined preliminary design of this system, (b) assign priorities to these performance features, or (c) provide any estimate of costs. Even with the remarkable rate of advances in information technologies, the costs continue to be appreciable, especially for the development of more specialized software. It may not be practical, at least initially, to implement every feature advocated below. We propose that a task force consisting of students, faculty, professional advisors, information specialists and appropriate representatives of the administration should be formed to develop a preliminary design of this system, prioritize the performance characteristics, and estimate the costs associated with these features. As cost estimates are obtained, the desirability of each feature should be evaluated and the design should be modified as necessary to develop a cost-effective system that satisfies budgetary constraints. Fortunately, the staff of the Data Warehouse Project is off to an excellent start, and should play a central role in this process.

4. A user-friendly application that interfaces with the Decision Support Environment should be developed for the use of students, faculty and staff advisors, departments and schools that provides accurate and timely answers to requests about information which the user is authorized to receive pertinent to planning, advising, and monitoring educational progress.

5. This system should provide a user-friendly interface that can be used with little training by a variety of nontechnical users, including advisors, using desktop tools, and should be accessible over PennNet.

Remarks. Effective use of the system will require, at the minimum, that each advisor and student have access to appropriate hardware and software.

6. The system should provide adequate safeguards so that the ability to read or write any particular information is restricted to users who are authorized to do so.

Remarks. It is straightforward to enforce such authorizations for each user who employs a password known only to that person. Note that we include the possibility here that information can be entered by the user into the system. We understand that it is desirable to maintain DSE as a read-only system, because much of its power and flexibility results from the fact it does not incur the overhead associated with transaction processing. Thus, SAM should include a separate relational database, also written in Oracle, that can accept appropriate input from users who are authorized to do so. By developing this portion of SAM in the same database environment, we understand that it would be quite feasible to design the system so that it provides access to data from both databases in a way that appears seamless to the user.

7. A determination of what information can be entered or retrieved by various types of users of SAM should be made after due deliberation by a committee composed of students, faculty, program coordinators, and relevant staff.

Remarks. We think that all faculty advisors should be able and encouraged to enter notes concerning their advisees, and that teaching faculty should be authorized to enter notes concerning students enrolled in their course. The proposed committee will need to address complicated issues related to the confidentiality of student files.

8. The system should contain and link information that includes:

— course catalog information concerning each course and instructor; well-specified, machine-implementable rules defining the requirements of each major, concentration, and minor program (with appropriate provision for waivers or exceptions to be granted);

— the academic record of each current student to date, annotated as appropriate by the student's advisor; each student's current academic plan, indicating the requirements that have been satisfied in the student's program towards graduation and the student's tentative schedule of courses, as approved by the student's advisor; both the short-term and long-range plans of each program for scheduling course offerings; historical data on job placements and graduate school admissions, by major or concentration.

Remarks. Links among these data are included to facilitate course planning by students, advisors, and departments or programs. Course schedules planned by students can be used in estimating staffing needs

for courses, and planned course offerings by departments can feedback to students and advisors for their use in estimating whether various educational plans are feasible.

9. The system should support "what if" questions. For an important example, the student and advisor should be able to explore in this manner what academic plans would enable the student to pursue various alternative programs, given the student's academic progress to date.

Remarks. For this purpose the linking of the requirements in various programs, planned course offerings, and the student's academic record is essential. Each student should have read-only access to his or her unofficial transcript, should be permitted to explore options unassisted, but should be able to enter changes in the educational plan only with his or her advisor's authorization. Override authority to waive or substitute alternatives in place of program requirements should be entered by an authorized person, and should become part of the student's record, thus protecting the student and advisor from any subsequent disclaimer.

10. The system should take a proactive role in sending a timely alert to the advisor of any student who is getting into academic difficulties, wherever they occur across the University.

Remarks. Ideally, this should operate as an early warning system, and should operate during the semester as well as after final grades are submitted. This would require at the minimum that instructors make some type of mid-term report signaling for each student in the class whether or not that student appeared to be having trouble. The system should be proactive by, say, sending to the advisor of any student in difficulty an e-mail message (without violating confidentiality) alerting the advisor to "Ask SAM for new information about your advisees."

11. Ensure that there is no financial disincentive or barrier to using the system.

Remark. Currently, the charges made by the Office of Information for accessing the Student Record System create a disincentive to using that system. This should be avoided so that SAM is open to every authorized user. One method of doing this is to charge a flat fee per student enrolled in the university as a general cost of education, rather than applying a fee per access to the system. Also, both advisors and students need access to appropriate hardware and software for using the system.

12. Whether via SAM or some other means, each advisor should have access to the photograph of each assigned advisee. The several ways outlined below for doing this have the additional advantage of making it possible to provide the instructor of each course with the photograph of every student enrolled in that class.

Remarks. This would provide considerable assistance to advisors and instructors in learning promptly the names of their students, thus nurturing a more friendly environment. This might be accomplished in various ways, as suggested by the following examples. (a) By one approach, using older technology, each student could be issued class cards containing the student's photograph and other pertinent information that can be collected in each of the student's courses. This approach has been used quite successfully in the Wharton School's MBA program. (b) Alternatively, this information might be supplied by the Registrar when the class pre-enrollment lists are distributed, and updated as necessary when a student adds the course. Presumably this would require that the information be available electronically. One way to accomplish this is to convert photographs taken for Penn identification cards to machine-readable form so that they can be entered into the Student Records System. (c) A third approach, also requiring that photographs be available electronically, would be to create for each student, advisor, and course a home page. Then pointers could be inserted that linked the home pages of advisee and advisor, and also the home pages of the course or instructor and every student enrolled in the course.

Conclusion

This report offers twelve propositions for enhancing the advising, monitoring, and mentoring of Penn undergraduates. The first proposes that a faculty advisor should be assigned to each student at entry, and should be expected to continue advising, monitoring, and mentoring this student's progress throughout the student's program at Penn. The remaining eleven propositions identify ways in which information technology should be used to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the advising system, so that the faculty advisor and student can devote their time together on important matters, rather than on administrative details. Yet even with the help of an ideal decision support system that performs as we have prescribed, effective mentoring will continue to be a challenging task. The advisor's good will, personal commitment, intellectual taste, deep concern for education, and availability to students are essential to successful mentoring. If we are to improve the mentoring for Penn undergraduates, then serious efforts must be undertaken to recruit, inform, support, and reward excellent advisors from the faculty, and to relieve them of other duties that might distract them from this crucially important role in the undergraduate experience.

Alice Kelley (English)
Peter J. Kuriloff (education)
James D. Laing (Wharton), Chair
Warren Seider (chemical engineering)
Lorraine Tulman (nursing)
Ex Officio: *Barbara J. Lowery (nursing), Faculty Senate Chair*
William L. Kissick (medicine), Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Staff: *Carolyn P. Burdon (executive assistant, Faculty Senate)*

Appendix

We thank Ronald Sanders, University Registrar, for providing the following information on Penn undergraduate students, by school or division and category, based on the Fall 1994 census (tape created 10/21/94).

	A	B	C	D	E	F
COL	6,119	129	5,600	175	340	4
EAS	1,449	50	1,073	366	10	0
NUR	453	3	392	61	0	0
WH	1,896	444	1,432	89	363	12
Sub-Total	**9,917**	**626**	**8,497**	**691**	**713**	**16**
CGS	1,483	2	1,476	4	3	0
EVE	458	2	410	0	48	0
Total	**11,858**	**630**	**10,383**	**695**	**764**	**16**

Key

Column A: number of students whose primary affiliation is this school or division.

Column B: number of students whose secondary affiliation is this school or division.

Columns C, D, E and F display the distribution of those students with a primary affiliation in this school or division (Col. A) across programs, as follows (i.e., A = C+D+E+F):

Column C: number of students in this school or division with only one major or concentration.

Column D: number of students from this school or division enrolled in one of the other schools or divisions as a secondary affiliation.

Column E: number of students affiliated only with this school or division seeking two majors or concentrations.

Column F: number of students affiliated only with this school or division with three majors or concentrations.

Note: the students in Column D could have more than one major or concentration in either of their two schools or divisions; to avoid double-counting, they are omitted from Columns C, E and F.

Thus, D+E+F provides a lower bound on the number of undergraduates pursuing multiple degrees, majors, or concentrations.