Penn’s faculty, through the Faculty Senate, plays an important role in determining the intellectual direction of the University, working collaboratively with the administration in the process of shared governance. All standing faculty are members of the Senate, although our work is carried out principally through an elected Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and several standing committees. These committees consult regularly with the President and Provost, as well as other senior administrators, deans and faculty colleagues, on a wide range of issues facing the University. We have been fortunate this year to have the thoughtful and enthusiastic participation of many outstanding faculty members, both on SEC and its committees, and the Past Chair, Chair and Chair-Elect of the Senate have had frequent and productive meetings with the President and the Provost, sharing the views of the faculty with the administration.

**Highlights of the 2008-09 Academic Year**

A detailed account of this year’s Senate activities can be found in the monthly reports of SEC actions and the reports of the Senate committees, all published in the Almanac. Much of the discussion, both in SEC and in several committees, focused on the changing nature of higher education and the faculty in the 21st century. Some highlights of this year’s discussions include the following:

• **Diversifying the faculty.** In February SEC held a wide-ranging discussion regarding both the values of and the challenges to improving faculty diversity. The discussion began with a summary of current diversity initiatives by Vincent Price, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs and current Interim Provost. The ensuing conversation highlighted the continuing need to educate departments and schools regarding the importance of recruiting and retaining minority faculty, as well as the ongoing challenge of informing the faculty regarding initiatives undertaken by the Provost’s office to improve diversity. The Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDE) plans a joint effort with the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity, in partnership with Office of the Provost, to develop mechanisms for increasing awareness of diversity initiatives.

• **Recognition for service.** An additional theme that emerged from the SEC diversity discussion was the perception of many faculty members that their service activities were not valued by department chairs and deans. It was suggested that departments and schools recognize and reward service (such as SEC and Senate committee membership, as well as mentoring activities). This topic warrants further discussion at SEC and with the administration, particularly since interest in service to the Faculty Senate is currently very high and should be encouraged.

• **The role of non-standing faculty.** Last year the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) initiated a discussion on the role of non-standing faculty in the 21st century university. That conversation was continued this year with a robust discussion at SEC in which several themes emerged: the differing uses of non-standing faculty among various departments and schools (for example, whether they teach introductory or higher-level courses); the use of full-time versus part-time non-standing faculty; and the rights of non-standing faculty to academic freedom, representation, and job security. SEC and SCOF members recommended additional conversations on this subject, as SCOF continues a census of “who teaches our students.”

• **Seeking Sustainability: The Founder’s Day Symposium.** The Senate hosted a lively Founders Day Symposium on January 16, 2009, designed to showcase Penn’s faculty in honor of Benjamin Franklin’s birthday. Seeking Sustainability: Penn Confronts the Local and Global Challenge was moderated by President Amy Gutmann and included faculty members Gary Bernstein (SAS), Robert Giegengack (SAS), William Braham (Design), Eugenie Birch (Design) and Eric Orts (Wharton). The symposium explored the prospects, realities, challenges, rewards and obligations of universities to exercise leadership by modeling ways to address environmental sustainability as part of the University’s academic mission.

• **Economic status of the faculty.** The Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) worked closely with Vincent Price, Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs, and Stacey Lopez, Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Analysis, to update the Economic Status of the Faculty Report and develop a time-line for future reports that will permit their findings to be used in setting faculty salary guidelines. We gratefully acknowledge Stacey Lopez, Vincent Price, SCESF Chair Laura Perna and other members of the committee for their extraordinary efforts in producing this document.
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Seeking Sustainability: The Founder’s Day Symposium: (left to right) Faculty Senate Chair Sherri Adams at podium, with faculty panelists: Robert Giegengack, professor of earth & environmental science; Gary Bernstein, professor of physics & astronomy; William H. Braham, associate professor of architecture; Eugenie L. Birch, professor of urban studies & business ethics and moderator, President Amy Gutmann.
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• Monitoring the progress of faculty mentoring programs and family-friendly policies. The Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity, played an instrumental role, with the Provost’s Office, in establishing mandatory mentoring programs for junior faculty members in all schools. The committee continues to monitor these programs by gathering data on mentoring best practices to post on the Provost’s Faculty Affairs website and also recommended revision of tenure clock extension language in templates for letters to external reviewers.

• Oversight of educational policy. The Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) had a productive meeting with the new Dean of Undergraduate Admissions Eric Furda to discuss mechanisms for faculty input into the admissions process. The committee also met with Associate Provost for Education Andy Binns, SAS Graduate Dean Ralph Rosen, and representatives of GAPSA (Graduate and Professional Student Assembly) and SASgov to monitor the effects of the uniform system of graduate tuition charges implemented this year.

• Partnership with the Office of the Provost to revise the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators. Every Senate committee reviewed a part of the revised handbook for accuracy. The result will be an accurate and up-to-date document that is easily searchable on-line, a significant improvement over the previous version.

• Understanding the changing use of sabbatical leaves. The Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA) has continued to monitor use of sabbatical leaves. Data obtained last year from the Office of the Provost indicated that faculty in some schools and departments were not making use of the opportunities for scholarly leaves. Current efforts entail interviews with faculty who have taken sabbaticals during the past two years, to help understand the current use of scholarly leaves, as well as impediments to taking these leaves.

Moving Forward

Together we have accomplished a great deal this year; yet much remains to be done. The discussion of the nature of Penn’s faculty in the 21st century is one that must continue. I outline below some of the issues that I believe the faculty, in partnership with the administration, must address as we move forward.

• Diversifying the faculty. A thriving and vibrant academy can only exist when its faculty avails itself of all available talent and when the diversity of the faculty reflects the diversity of its students. Although we have made improvements in recent years, the diversity of our faculty does not yet match the diversity of our students. Women comprise 52% of our students, but only 18% of full professors and 13% of department chairs (although we do better with deans and presidents, at 35% and 100%, respectively!). Further, 38% of those accepted for admission to the Class of 2012 are Black, Hispanic, Asian, or Native American, compared with 17% of the standing faculty. The availability of appropriate role models can make the difference in determining whether students see a career in the academy as a viable option. The Office of the Provost has instituted numerous initiatives to improve recruitment and retention of women and minority faculty, which must be vigorously promoted and monitored by the Senate.

• Continued analysis of the changing contours of the faculty. University faculties are aging, since a law banning mandatory retirement went into effect in 1994. In addition, the current economic downturn may further discourage faculty from retiring due to loss of investment income. While we all benefit from the wisdom of our senior faculty, this trend has several potential implications. The abundance of older faculty makes it more difficult to hire young faculty members, which slows diversification of the faculty, as well as the process of bringing fresh ideas into classrooms and laboratories. At the same time, many young doctoral candidates (particularly women) opt out of the academy for careers with better work-life balance. It is important that we understand the impact of these factors, monitor their effects on our faculty, and implement mechanisms to mitigate them.

• The importance of communication. Because Penn is a large decentralized institution, it can be difficult to convey information to those who need it. The Tri-Chairs of the Senate have encouraged the University administration to communicate more frequently with the faculty, and they have done so in a variety of ways. For example, President Gutmann has communicated directly with the faculty, as well as other constituencies, regarding the effects of the economic downturn on the University, and participated in a very thoughtful discussion with SEC on this topic. Interim Provost Vincent Price has updated the Provost’s website to provide easy access to information such as the Gender and Minority Equity Progress Reports and family-friendly policies. However, many initiatives (such as faculty diversity and the parameters of the appointment and promotion process) require an ongoing dialogue between the administration and the faculty. To participate fully in these discussions, the faculty must become more proactive, educating themselves (for example, by reading the Almanac and participating in faculty governance) so they are aware of major University initiatives.

• Faculty-related data. Past Chair’s reports have emphasized the need for improved collection and organization of faculty-related data for the purposes of monitoring and self-study. We are nearing the point where such annual reminders may no longer be necessary. The Faculty Information System, a joint project of the Office of the Provost, Institutional Research, the 12 Schools, and Information Systems & Computing, is being developed to provide a complete and central record of faculty history. It will be important for the Senate to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of this system, since several Senate committees depend on the ready availability of accurate data.

Grateful Acknowledgements

The work of the Faculty Senate is only made possible through the dedicated efforts of many faculty members who believe in the importance of service and have given time and energy to furthering shared governance. I have been privileged to work with all of them this year. I am especially grateful to Past Chair Larry Gladney, whose exceptional wisdom and insight have guided us, and to Chair-Elect Harvey Rubin, whose broad knowledge of the University and activist tendencies bode well for the future of the Senate. Larry Levin has served graciously and effectively as Secretary of SEC. None of our work would have been possible without the extraordinary skills of Sue White, Executive Assistant to the Faculty Senate, who has made my job this year immeasurably easier.

We are fortunate to have enjoyed the dedicated work of many truly excellent Senate committee and commission chairs: Cindy Christian (SCOA), Steve Phipps (SCOF), Lois Evans (SCFDD), Laura Perna (SCSEF), Michael Zuckerman and Kelly Jordan-Sciutto (SCSEP), Alan Rappe (SCAFR), Martin Pring (Publication Policy for Almanac), and Barry Cooperman (Faculty Grievance Commission). They, and the members of their committees, have all done an outstanding job.

We are also deeply grateful to President Amy Gutmann, former Provost Ron Daniels and Interim Provost Vincent Price, for their strong and open partnership with the faculty in leading the University. Throughout our biweekly consultations, coffee chats, meetings with SEC, and involvement with our symposia, they have been true to the best model of shared governance. We have also benefited from numerous consultations with Associate Provost Andy Binns and Vice Provost Steve Fluharty, and have enjoyed working with University Secretary Leslie Kruhly and the Associate Director for University Council and Ceremony Brenda Brand. And finally, I thank my colleagues on the Senate Executive Committee and all the Senate committees for an educational and stimulating year, and I look forward to my role as Past Chair during the upcoming year.

—Sherrell Adams
Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR)

1. SCAFR met approximately monthly from September 2008 to April 2009. SCAFR’s annual agenda arises from its mission, mandated by the Trustees in the Statutes of the University, both to investigate and report on matters of its own choosing and to deal with cases or queries brought to SCAFR’s attention by members of the University faculty, who elect it and whom it serves.

2. With the help of Susan White, of the Faculty Senate Office, and of Associate Provost for Faculty Affairs Vincent Price, SCAFR confirmed that all Schools had constituted their Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFRs).

3. SCAFR met with the chairs (or delegates of the chairs) of the School CAFRs, emphasizing the need for all faculty members to be aware of their rights and responsibilities, and of the existence and function of School CAFRs. SCAFR underscores the importance of holding this meeting early in each academic year, to increase communication between SCAFR and the CAFRs.

4. This year, SCAFR became aware that in some cases the CAFRs have been asked to take on duties beyond their mandate to safeguard academic freedom and responsibility. Accordingly, SCAFR corresponded with the CAFR chairs, requesting them to determine whether they are being asked to take on such duties, and to seek to discontinue them. All the CAFR chairs responded, certifying that they currently are not undertaking such duties.

5. SCAFR and the University administration concur on the importance of protecting the academic freedom of associated faculty and academic support staff. Associate Provost Vincent Price wrote to SCAFR on December 10, 2008, agreeing “that the associated faculty (Handbook II.B.3) and those of academic support staff (II.B.4) who have teaching or research responsibilities, are within the scope of the assurance of academic freedom, [Statutes of the Trustees, Article 11, (Handbook II.A)], and have recourse to their school’s committee on academic freedom and responsibility (CAFR), and, where appointed outside a school, to the Senate Committee (SCAFR) when questions of academic freedom or academic responsibility arise.”

Later in the academic year, in response to a statement from the University Ombudsman, SCAFR forwarded a copy of the above to the Ombudsman, to insure consistent understanding across the University concerning this issue. SCAFR encourages every faculty member to notify any associated faculty and academic support staff who have teaching or research responsibilities that they possess rights to recourse to their school’s CAFR and to SCAFR, in cases concerning academic freedom and responsibility.

This academic year’s SCAFR suggests that next year’s SCAFR seek ways to advertise the existence and role of SCAFR and the CAFRs. In particular, it is important to ensure that the associated faculty and staff with education and research duties are aware of their access to SCAFR and the CAFRs. This year’s SCAFR suggests that it may be beneficial to request that each dean send notification to his/her school’s complete teaching and research staff lists at the start of each academic year.

6. SCAFR advised a School CAFR concerning a possible case involving dismissal of an instructor.

7. SCAFR and the leaders of the Faculty Senate discussed the role of confidentiality in the functioning of SCAFR. After considering the issue, SCAFR voted to reiterate that its deliberations and proceedings are confidential. Because the 2008-2009 SCAFR members held a range of views on this topic, revisiting this issue in the next year may be beneficial.

8. Following an agreement from last academic year, the Associate Provost sought the opinion of SCAFR concerning a draft revision of the Faculty Handbook. SCAFR requested some revisions to correct and clarify certain policies.

9. This year’s SCAFR inherited an agenda item from last year, concerning the prior agreements between the SOM and the Faculty Senate about a cap on the percentage of SOM faculty who are Clinician Educators. SCAFR expressed its concern to the Provost, and it received assurances that the matter would be given full consideration in 2008-2009. However, the departure of the provost necessitated tabling this issue until the 2009-2010 academic year.

10. SCAFR received outstanding and collegial cooperation from Provost Ron Daniels and from Associate Provost/Interim Provost Vincent Price throughout this academic year, and it was encouraged by the responsiveness of the Provost and Associate Provost to matters of academic freedom and responsibility.

—Andrew M. Rappe, SCAFR Chair, 2008-2009
Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP)

Charges for 2008-2009
This academic year the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy was asked to: 1) Examine the impact of the Graduate Tuition Reform with particular emphasis on graduate students in the School of Arts and Sciences (SAS). To gain insight into this process, the committee met with 1) Ralph Rosen, SAS Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Tracey Turner, the SAS Graduate Studies Budget Director each semester, 2) the chair of GAPSA, Andrew Rennekamp, and 2 SAS representatives, Caroline Bishop, President of the School of Arts and Sciences Student Government (SASgov) and Rafael Walker Vice President of SASgov, and 3) Associate Provost Andy Binns to follow up on the impact of the Tuition Reform. During this year, the impact of the Graduate Tuition Reform has been minimized by a one-year “hold harmless” policy. However, based on our conversations with the representatives from GAPSA and SASgov, several concerns persist and are outlined below:

1) Of immediate concern, the SASgov representatives mentioned that students in years 2-5 are at risk for the greatest impact for the following reasons. To help expedite degree completion in 5 years, first year SAS graduate students were given summer funding. If students graduate in 5 years, these students avoid the cost increase of year 6. However, there is concern that students in years 2-5 will not have this added time benefit, but will still be accountable to the new tuition costs under the Graduate Tuition Reform. Thus, there is concern that students currently in years 2-5 will not complete their degree in the 5-year time frame and incur the increased tuition rates.

2) A second, but equally important concern, exists regarding the effects of the Graduate Tuition Reform on external funding. Under the current plan, students who apply for external funding for years 4 and 5 do not benefit from receiving the award as the new higher tuition rate uses up too much of the funds. In the past, students who received these awards could defer use of their “Ben Franklin Money” to year 6. As receiving these awards has several desirable benefits for students in addition to providing funding for their studies, a plan to rectify the financial ‘disincentive’ to applying for these awards needs be drafted and implemented.

3) A final proposal that was discussed with all parties was the possibility of creating and utilizing Post-doctoral Fellowships to enhance training and increase scholarly preparedness for the job market for our SAS graduate programs. Associate Provost Andy Binns stated that a program to create post-doctoral fellowships for disciplines in the Arts and Sciences has been a topic of discussion within our administration and between administrations at our peer institutions. These programs are currently on hold as all parties deal with the flagging economy; however, there is interest to pursue such a program for the future.

Intellectual Property Rights
The committee met with Robert Terrell, Office of General Counsel, to discuss the intellectual property rights of faculty with regard to lecture material. Mr. Terrell explained that faculty members retain intellectual property rights to their lecture material and students cannot sell the material directly. Some schools, like the School of Dental Medicine have orientation courses to inform their students on Intellectual Property; however, it is not practical for all schools to use this approach. Mr. Terrell suggested that faculty include a statement regarding intellectual property on their syllabi and agreed to draft language for several intellectual property policy templates that faculty could use on their syllabi. Despite several follow-up e-mails, Mr. Terrell has not provided these templates as of this date. However, the committee feels these Intellectual Property Policy Statements would be useful to faculty and hope that Mr. Terrell will provide them in the future for distribution to the faculty.

Impact of Graduate Tuition Reform
The committee focused primarily on Charge 1, investigating the impact of the Graduate Tuition Reform on graduate students in the School of Arts and Sciences (SAS). To gain insight into this process, the committee met with 1) Ralph Rosen, SAS Associate Dean for Graduate Studies and Tracey Turner, the SAS Graduate Studies Budget Director each semester, 2) the chair of GAPSA, Andrew Rennekamp, and 2 SAS representatives, Caroline Bishop, President of the School of Arts and Sciences Student Government (SASgov) and Rafael Walker Vice President of SASgov, and 3) Associate Provost Andy Binns to follow up on the impact of the Tuition Reform. During this year, the impact of the Graduate Tuition Reform has been minimized by a one-year “hold harmless” policy. However, based on our conversations with the representatives from GAPSA and SASgov, several concerns persist and are outlined below:

1) Of immediate concern, the SASgov representatives mentioned that students in years 2-5 are at risk for the greatest impact for the following reasons. To help expedite degree completion in 5 years, first year SAS graduate students were given summer funding. If students graduate in 5 years, these students avoid the cost increase of year 6. However, there is concern that students in years 2-5 will not have this added time benefit, but will still be accountable to the new tuition costs under the Graduate Tuition Reform. Thus, there is concern that students currently in years 2-5 will not complete their degree in the 5-year time frame and incur the increased tuition rates.

2) A second, but equally important concern, exists regarding the effects of the Graduate Tuition Reform on external funding. Under the current plan, students who apply for external funding for years 4 and 5 do not benefit from receiving the award as the new higher tuition rate uses up too much of the funds. In the past, students who received these awards could defer use of their “Ben Franklin Money” to year 6. As receiving these awards has several desirable benefits for students in addition to providing funding for their studies, a plan to rectify the financial ‘disincentive’ to applying for these awards needs be drafted and implemented.

3) A final proposal that was discussed with all parties was the possibility of creating and utilizing Post-doctoral Fellowships to enhance training and increase scholarly preparedness for the job market for our SAS graduate programs. Associate Provost Andy Binns stated that a program to create post-doctoral fellowships for disciplines in the Arts and Sciences has been a topic of discussion within our administration and between administrations at our peer institutions. These programs are currently on hold as all parties deal with the flagging economy; however, there is interest to pursue such a program for the future.

Admissions
The committee met with Eric Furda, Dean of Admissions, who was interested in finding avenues for faculty content and voice in the Admission process. He would also like to engage faculty in helping promote and advocate for Penn in recruiting students to Penn. To help Dean Furda approach and engage faculty on this important University mission, the committee had the following suggestions: 1) work with the Tri-Chairs to identify faculty that the Office of Admissions can feature, 2) contact the following groups to help formulate a list of faculty to contact such as the Biomedical Graduate Studies Group, Graduate Group Chairs, and Undergraduate Chairs, 3) invite Undergraduate Chairs to build a roster of faculty to help the Office of Admissions with recruitment either as featured faculty or in “showing students what Penn has to offer” (These faculty need not be limited to those in the undergraduate schools), and 4) obtain input from faculty who have won teaching awards. The possibility of forming a committee or utilizing an existing committee to provide input into the admissions process was also discussed.

Recommendations for Next Year’s Committee
The committee recommends that SCSEP continues to monitor the impact of the Graduate Tuition Reform particularly with regard to the impact on SAS students in years 2-5. Also, measures to permit SAS students to benefit from external awards and/or fellowships in the 4th and 5th years need to be constructed.

The committee recommends following up on the possibility of creating post-doctoral positions in the Arts and Sciences with peer institutions to provide fresh recipients of doctoral degrees with additional time to establish their scholarly activities in preparation for faculty positions.

The committee recommends following up with Mr. Terrell to see if he could provide the promised templates for Intellectual Property Policy for distribution to faculty for inclusion in their syllabi.

The committee recommends returning to the investigation of Interdisciplinary Graduate Education particularly with regard to students in Professional Degree programs.

2008-2009 Committee Members
Michael Zuckerman, School of Arts and Sciences, Chair-Fall 2008
Kelly Jordan-Schiutto, School of Dental Medicine, Chair-Spring 2009
Lance Donaldson-Evans, School of Arts and Sciences
Marybeth Gasman, Graduate School of Education
Daniel Lee, School of Engineering and Applied Science
Kathleen Montone, School of Medicine
Sherrri Adams, School of Dental Medicine, ex officio
Harvey Rubin, School of Medicine, ex officio
Charges for 2008-2009

The Senate Executive Committee gave the Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission these charges for its work during academic year 2008-2009:

1. Vigorously push forward the study of non-standing faculty that the Committee has begun, and pass the work on to future years’ Committees, to maintain the continuity and momentum of this important work.

2. Study and make recommendations on the role of emeritus faculty at Penn, including the rights and privileges extended to them by their Departments and Schools, with a view to ensuring that they are able to enrich Penn by their continued activity, and to benefit from their continuing contact with the communities of which they have been valued members.

3. Examine the reasons for and the impact of the declining number of assistant professors in the standing faculty in the School of Medicine, and determine whether this decline has also affected other schools. Make recommendations for mitigating the impact of this decrease in young faculty members on the energy and vigor of the University.

4. Examine the conversion of faculty from the research track to tenure track or tenure, to determine the impact of some individuals having more time to tenure.

5. Review and discuss the Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Rules of the Faculty Senate, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on Faculty to undertake in academic year 2009-2010.

Study of non-standing faculty

Most of the Committee’s time during the year was devoted to our continuing examination of the role of non-standing faculty at Penn.

In the last three or four decades, a broad range of institutions across American academia have employed increasing numbers of faculty who are not tenured or on the tenure track. This trend is drawing increasing attention across higher education, in legislatures and in state and federal agencies that deal with colleges and universities, in the press, and among the general public. The trend potentially represents a profound change in American higher education.

Our study was begun in the spring term of 2008, because we felt that as a nationally and globally eminent university, Penn should know as precisely as possible how many non-standing faculty members we have and what roles they play here, and that it should ensure that their employment brings the greatest possible benefits to their students and colleagues, to these faculty members themselves, and to the University as a whole.

At Penn, as at other institutions, non-standing faculty play important roles in both teaching and research; in each area, questions arise involving the appropriate responsibilities for such faculty, about their relations with their colleagues on the standing faculty, and about their work conditions, rights under the guarantees of academic freedom, etc.

Because the issue is so large and multifaceted, the Committee decided to focus initially on two aspects: gathering data about the present role of non-standing faculty in undergraduate teaching, and on a more abstract, philosophical discussion about the role of non-standing faculty at Penn.

As the School of Arts and Sciences teaches by far the most undergraduates at Penn, we decided to begin by gathering data on teaching in SAS. With the help of Stacey Lopez, Penn’s Assistant Vice President for Institutional Research and Analysis, and with the cooperation of Associate Provost Vincent Price, and of Dean Rebecca Bushnell and the SAS staff, we requested and have received an informative body of data from that School. We are continuing our study of this data.

We have asked the Deans of other Schools that teach large numbers of undergraduates for similar data.

We continue to believe that this study is central to understanding Penn’s recent history and to planning its future; it is therefore the focus of our most important recommendations for the Committee’s work in coming years.

Millennium Discussion of the Role of Non-standing Faculty

In connection with our study, the Committee worked with SEC and the Office of the Provost to sponsor a Millennium Discussion on Faculty in the 21st Century, held at SEC’s meeting on November 12, 2008. This discussion was part of the Millennium Study of the University that the Committee recommended in its Annual Report of last year. The Committee developed a set of talking points for the discussion, which was moderated by Associate Provost Vincent Price and Committee Chair Steve Phipps.

The discussion was wide-ranging and animated, and SEC members made many helpful and insightful comments, both in the discussion and in later e-mails.

Revision of the Faculty Handbook; Recommendation for future revision

During the spring term, the Committee was asked to review and correct parts of sections I and II of the Faculty Handbook, which deal with University and faculty structure and governance. The discussions about these revisions highlighted for the Committee that the Handbook is the Faculty’s closest approximation to a Constitution. Together with the University Charter and the Statutes of the Trustees, it is perhaps the central document in University governance. The documents that will comprise the new version of the Handbook are drawn from a variety of sources, including the previous editions of the Handbook, the Statutes, and documents issued by the Offices of the Provost and of the President. These components were widely dispersed—more like the British than the American constitution—and it is only recently that they have been collected into a single comprehensive document, thanks to hard work by Linda Koons and others in the Office of the Provost.

This in turn suggested to the Committee that it would be good for the Faculty, in consultation with the Office of the Provost, to do a more thorough review of the Handbook, perhaps even to rewrite it as a single, coherent document. This would also be an appropriate time to raise outstanding issues of University governance that should be addressed in a constitutional document.

Renewed recommendation of a general study of Penn as an eminent University in the 21st century (“The Millennium Study”)

Last year, moved in part by our study of non-standing faculty, the Committee recommended that SEC sponsor a wide-ranging study and discussion devoted to this question: What should be the nature of a great University in the new millennium?

In making this recommendation, we cited among other things the expansion of knowledge and the increasing specialization of scholarship, the explosion in the technology for publication and dissemination of its results, and in the technology of teaching, and in the pressures—in part resulting from these trends—to divorce teaching from research, and to place the former in the hands of professional teachers who are not expected to dedicate major efforts to scholarship and research. Our society’s expectations of higher education also appear to be changing—increasingly, the college diploma appears to be regarded as a credential for employment, and perhaps less as purely a sign of education in the deep sense.

The discussion held under SEC’s auspices last November 12 was an excellent contribution to the Millennium Study, but the study should not end there. We again call on SEC to foster this study, and offer the Committee’s help in advancing it.

Recommendations for next year’s committee (2009-2010)

We recommend that next year’s committee consider these matters as it plans its work:

1. Continue to advance the Committee’s study of non-standing faculty, and pass the work on to future years’ Committees, to maintain the continuity and momentum of this important work.
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2. Study and make recommendations on the role of emeritus faculty at Penn, including the rights and privileges extended to them by their Department and Schools, with a view to ensuring that they are able to enrich Penn by their continued activity, and to benefit from their continuing contact with the communities of which they have been valued members.

3. Examine the reasons for and the impact of the declining number of assistant professors in the standing faculty in the School of Medicine, and determine whether this decline has affected other schools. Make recommendations for mitigating the impact of this decrease in young faculty members on the energy and vigor of the University.

4. Examine the conversion of faculty from the research track to tenure track or tenure, to determine the impact of some individuals having more time to tenure.

5. Review and discuss the Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Rules of the Faculty Senate, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on Faculty to undertake in academic year 2010-2011.

2008-2009 Committee Members

Stephen Phipps, School of Arts and Sciences, Chair
Grace Kao, School of Arts and Sciences
Ian Lustick, School of Arts and Sciences
Reed Pyrritz, School of Medicine
Diana Slaughter-Defoe, Graduate School of Education
Beth Winkelstein, School of Engineering and Applied Science
Sherri Adams, School of Dental Medicine, ex officio
Harvey Rubin, School of Medicine, ex officio

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

General Committee Charge

The Committee (i) identifies and promotes best practices for faculty development, mentoring and work environment to facilitate faculty success at all career levels; (ii) evaluates and advocates processes for faculty recruitment, promotion, and retention that promote diversity equity, and work-life balance for the faculty; (iii) monitors the status of faculty development, mentoring, diversity and equity; and (iv) issues periodic reports on the activities and findings of the committee and makes recommendations for implementation.

Specific Charges

The Committee reviewed and accepted the draft specific charges referred to it by the Senate Executive Committee. These were to:

1. Follow up faculty recruitment pipeline & retention issues.

2. Provide input regarding mentorship into planned/ongoing University projects.

3. Support the wide dissemination of mentoring best practices & opportunities.


5. Monitor implementation of sexual harassment and bias in recruitment training recommendations.

Report of Activities

The Committee collaborated with the University Council on Diversity and Equity including one joint meeting between SCFDDE and the Council’s Subcommittee on the Faculty, shared SCFDDE minutes with the Council Committee, and meeting of the chairs with the SEC Tri-Chairs. Further, the committee met twice with Associate Provost Vincent Price, with representatives of two University offices, and with faculty from the School of Medicine and the Wharton School. By the end of the spring semester, the Committee will have met a total of 9 times to conduct its business.

With respect to its charges:

1. Regarding faculty recruitment & retention, the Committee:
   a. Reviewed and gave input to both the Minority Equity and Gender Equity Reports
   b. Recommended a revision of the templates for letters to external reviewers to the Office of the Provost which resulted in the addition of new tenure clock extension language
   c. Discussed development of a website to facilitate diversity in recruitment

2. Regarding mentorship, the Committee:
   a. Reviewed the proposed exit interview and recommended insertion of mentoring items
   b. Consulted SOM and Wharton regarding their recent climate surveys, reviewed other surveys and recommendations of consultant Dr. Croughan in preparation to recommend mentorship items for inclusion in upcoming university climate survey in development
   c. Recommended that the Provost require deans to report on mentoring outcomes at each end of year
   d. Developed brief descriptions of ‘best practices’ per school at Penn for posting on the mentoring website Office of the Provost

3. Regarding child care, the Committee:
   a. Met with representatives from Facilities and Real Estate Services to learn more about the status of planning for child care on campus
   b. Sent a memorandum to the Provost in support of continued efforts to obtain high quality child care for faculty.

4. Regarding the sexual harassment and bias in recruitment training charge, the Committee:
   a. Recommended strongly to the Associate Provost that trainings on sexual harassment and bias in recruitment training be continued across the campus.

Recommended Activities for FY2009-2010

• Oversee and assure that mentorship is included in the University climate survey
• Recommend to the Schools that mentorship be included on the template CV, either as part of service or in a separate category
• Continue work on the mentoring metrics blueprint in dialogue with the new Provost
• Monitor the annual reporting on mentorship by the deans to the Provost
• Refine the materials on Mentoring Best Practices for the Provost’s website
• Follow up on the recommendation for new faculty orientation
• Ensure that orientation and training for new and ongoing department chairs includes mentoring
• Follow and support the evolution of the Women’s Faculty Forum
• Continue to support accessible child care
• Request annually from the Provost a report on sexual harassment
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Lois Evans, School of Nursing, Chair
Clifford Deutschman, School of Medicine
Helen Davies, School of Medicine
Olena Jacenko, School of Veterinary Medicine
Susan Margulies, School of Engineering & Applied Science
Erle Robertson, School of Medicine
Sherri Adams, School of Dental Medicine, ex officio
Harvey Rubin, School of Medicine, ex officio
The General Charge of the Committee on Faculty and the Administration:

SCOA oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the faculty’s interface with the University’s administration, including policies and procedures relating to the University’s structure, and the conditions of faculty employment.

Specific Charges to SCOA for 2008-2009:

1. Discuss the oversight of, and faculty involvement in, the Master’s Programs at the University.
2. Continue to work with the administration to review data across schools (to the best of our ability), to review practices across schools related to sabbatical and other leaves, and to review and make recommendations for any needed policy changes related to sabbatical requirements and use in order to ensure equivalency across schools.
3. Keep a close watch on any cases in which the power of temporary exclusion is exercised under the new provision in order to assess its adequacy. SCOA has recommended that the new policy be reviewed in three years time, and thus any cases arising under this provision over the course of the next two years will be subject to scrutiny.
4. Review and discuss this committee’s general charge, as provided in the Senate Rules, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty and Administration over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on Administration to undertake in academic year 2009-2010. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.
1. Discuss the oversight of, and faculty involvement in, the Master’s Programs at the University.

The Master’s Programs at the University belong to each school, and do not fall under the supervision of the Provost’s Office. These programs are financial opportunities for individual schools that independently develop and oversee the programs. Both doctoral and undergraduate students can take courses within the Master’s Programs, which is a concern of the Associate Provost for Education. After deliberation, this committee thought that the Senate Committee on Students and the Educational Policy (SCSEP) would be an appropriate committee to review this issue, or perhaps that SCOA and SCSEP should form a joint subcommittee to address the issues of quality and oversight of the Master’s Programs at Penn. Our recommendation for the upcoming year is to develop a joint approach to this issue.

2. Examine the standard sabbatical policy and its usage, especially by research faculty, in the schools doing health-related research.

Last year, SCOA began to address variations in the use of the sabbatical policy across schools. We found that qualified faculty in the health sciences schools and the school of engineering were underutilizing their earned sabbaticals. Additionally, the committee became aware of new concerns regarding the usage of the sabbatical policy: faculty are asked to use sabbatical time without the appropriate reduction in teaching or research activities. The committee is aware of the “compressed leave” instituted for the school of medicine, which may be used by faculty at other schools on an ad hoc basis. Based on concerns brought to the attention of the committee, committee members decided to conduct an informal survey of faculty who have recently taken sabbatical. A questionnaire was developed, and a (partial) list of faculty recently on sabbatical was generated. SCOA members have begun to contact faculty, and we will meet early this month to review the pilot survey, which we will amend as necessary. If data indicate that faculty are retaining teaching and research demands during sabbaticals, the Provost’s Office will monitor these infractions. Additionally, the committee feels that the sabbatical policy should be reviewed, as changing demands in the 21st century might require flexibility in the policy to ensure that faculty sabbaticals are used as they are intended. Finally, we recommend that during the upcoming year, SCOA should continue to gather data on sabbatical use by faculty members across schools.

3. Faculty Handbook Review

SCOA was asked to review sections of the Faculty Handbook that pertained to policies addressing faculty and administration issues. Members of the committee reviewed all sections provided, and made recommendations for changes. It is noted that the volume of research oversight contained in the handbook has become onerous and impractical for its intended purpose.

4. Temporary Exclusion Provision

The committee did not receive any reports that the temporary exclusion provision, drafted last year, was used this year.

5. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Senate Rules, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty and Administration over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on Administration to undertake in academic year 2009-2010. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

SCOA did not formally identify any items to be reviewed by its successor committee. However, the committee feels that additional work related to the sabbatical policy is needed in order to ensure equivalency across schools. In addition, SCOA members recommended that an ad hoc committee be established with members of SCOA and SCSEP to evaluate oversight of the Master’s Programs at the University.
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SENATE 2009-2010

Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC): 2009-2010

Chair: Harvey Rubin (SOM/Infectious Diseases)
Chair-Elect: Robert C. Hornik (Annenberg)
Past Chair: Sherrill Adams (Dental Med.)
Secretary: Gary Molander (SAS/Chemistry)
Secretary-Elect: Kelly Jordan-Sciutto (Dental Med.)
Past Secretary: Therese Richmond (Nursing)

At-Large Representatives
Karim McGowan (SOM/Path. and Lab Med.)
Lydie Moudielen (SAS/Rom. Lang.)
Dwight Jaguard (SEAS)
Lynne Lees (SAS/History)
Peter Cappelli (Wharton)
Emma Dillon (SAS/Music)
Janet Deatrick (Nursing)
Amy Pratt (SOM/Neurology)
Matthew Hartley (GSE)
David Eckmann (SOM/Anesthesiology)
Michael Topp (SAS/Chemistry)
Katherine Schultz (GSE)

Assistant Professor Representatives
Talia Fullett (SAS/Political Science)
Sigal Ben Porath (GSE)

PASEF Representative
Sohrab Rabii (SEAS)

Constituency Representatives
(Constituency Numbers in Parentheses)

TBA (Annenberg, #1)
Julia Rudolph (SAS/History, #2)
Deborah Thomas (SAS/Anthropology, #3)
Jonathan Block (SAS/Math, #4)
Mechthild Pohlschroder (SAS/Biology, #5)
Jeffrey Winkler (SAS/Chemistry, #6)
Gerald Prince (SAS/Languages, #7)
Steve Matthews (SAS/Economics, #8)
Michael Garner (SAS/English, #9)
Charles Yang (SAS/Philosophy, #10)
Jamal Elias (SAS/East Asian Lang. and Civil. #11)
Robert Hollebeek (SAS/Physics, #12)
Robert Vitalis (SAS/Political Sci., #13)
Robert Kurzban (SAS/Psychology, #14)
Janice Madden (SAS/Sociology, #15)
Ellis Golub (Dental Med., #16)
Shaun Harper (GSE, #17)
John C. Schotland (SEAS, #18)
Jonathan Smith (SEAS, #19)
Anuradha Mathur (Design, #20)
Tom Baker (Law, #21)
Nina Prak (SOM/Path. & Lab Med., #22)
Kieran Slevin (SOM/Anesthesiology, #23)
Daniel Langleben (SOM/Psychiatry, #24)
Brian M. Salzberg (SOM/Neurosci. & Physio. #25)
Martin Keane (SOM/Cardiology, #26)
Michael McGarvey (SOM/Genetics, #27)
Phyllis Dennery (SOM/Pediatrics, #28)
Evan Siegelman (SOM/Radiology, #29)
Jennifer Pinto-Martin (Nursing, #30)
Femida Handy (Social Policy, #31)
Bernard Shapiro (Vet. Med., #32)
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University Council Meetings 2009-2010
(Bodek Lounge, Houston Hall)
All Senate Executive Committee members, excluding At-Large members, are also members of the University Council.

October 30, 4–6 p.m.
November 6, 4–6 p.m.
December 4, 4–6 p.m.
February 5, 4–6 p.m.
March 5, 4–6 p.m.
April 2, 4–6 p.m.