Executive Summary of the Economic Status of the Faculty 2008-2009 Report

Introduction

This Executive Summary is meant to cover the most salient portions of the full Economic Status of the Faculty 2008-2009 Report. This report addresses salary increases in 2008-2009, not in 2009-2010, which will be the subject of the report for the next year.

The Summary concludes with the Committee’s Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2008-2009. The complete report can be accessed as www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v56/n33/contents.html

Comparisons with Growth in the Consumer Price Index (CPI)

CPI growth was negative during the year; consequently almost everyone had a real increase. Average academic base salary percentage increases of continuing Penn standing faculty members by rank in comparison with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Penn Budget Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group/Condition</th>
<th>Average FYs 2008-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Median 3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Median 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Median 4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Ranks</td>
<td>Mean 6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US City Average</td>
<td>Mean -1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil. CPI Growth</td>
<td>Mean -2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Guidelines</td>
<td>Mean 3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: Academic base salary increases pertain to all Penn standing faculty members who were faculty at the fall census of both years (or three years for cumulative increases) for which percentage increase are calculated. All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinician Educators from four schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of All Schools.

Comparisons with Peer Universities Using Data from the AAU Data Exchange

The best currently available salary data from other institutions of higher education are provided by the American Association of Universities (AAU) Data Exchange. The AAU is comprised of 60 public and private research universities in the United States and two in Canada. The AAU includes several Ivy League institutions (e.g., Penn, Brown, Harvard, Princeton, Cornell, and Yale), other private universities (e.g., Brandeis, Rice, Emory, Vanderbilt), public flagship universities (e.g., Penn State University and the Universities of Michigan, Virginia, and Maryland), and other public universities (e.g., Michigan State; University of California, Davis; and University of California, Irvine). Please refer to the AAU website for a complete list of member institutions: www.aau.edu/

Salary Comparisons: Penn’s Competitive Standing

The most meaningful comparisons of mean faculty salaries at Penn with those at other universities in the AAU Data Exchange are broken out by academic field and rank. For almost all of the 16 schools/areas, Penn’s mean faculty salaries for all ranks in 2008-2009 are in the upper third of the distribution for AAU institutions. In fact, mean faculty salaries are at least in the top quartile of AAU institutions for all three ranks in all schools/areas except full professors in Engineering and Applied Sciences, where Penn’s salaries ranked 14th out of 53 in fall 2008, and Wharton-Public Policy, where Penn’s salaries ranked 15th out of 50; associate professors of Dental Medicine, where Penn’s salaries ranked 14th out of 41, Nursing, where Penn’s salaries ranked 7th out of 24, and Veterinary Medicine, where Penn’s salaries ranked 8th out of 14, and assistant professors in Dental Medicine, where Penn’s salaries ranked 8th of 42; and Veterinary Medicine, where Penn’s salaries ranked 4th of 14.

A more disturbing pattern emerges when comparing the 2008 salary data with the 2004 data, however. Penn is gaining in some of these school/area rank comparisons, but it is falling behind in many more; and this is particularly so for associate and assistant professors. A summary comparison captures how often Penn is falling behind versus gaining in percentile rank by more than 5%; for full professors Penn has fallen in 2 areas and gained in 1 out of 15 areas; for associate professors, Penn has declined in 4 areas and gained in 1 out of 11 areas; for assistant professors Penn has declined in 6 areas and gained in 2 out of 10 areas.

Rank of mean salary levels for Penn faculty members by academic field in comparison with universities participating in the AAU Data Exchange.
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Penn’s 14 school/areas increased between FY 2005 and FY 2009 for full professors. This is an increase of 22% in mean salary increase, or an increase of 14% in mean salary increase, for all full professors. The percentage of female full professors who continued in rank in FY 2009 was lower than expected. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinic Educators from four schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all Schools. All salaries are converted to a nine-month base.

Mean academic base salaries of Penn faculty members by gender and rank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Not Weighted</th>
<th>Weighted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>$141,545</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$147,815</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$137,000</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$154,627</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$147,875</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$170,077</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>$93,090</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$98,452</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$103,378</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$91,900</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$110,061</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$94,172</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$110,913</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$98,206</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>$82,952</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$87,268</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$73,132</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>$90,513</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$75,136</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$93,547</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$76,421</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011-2012</td>
<td>$95,382</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2012-2013</td>
<td>$90,409</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: Mean academic base salary levels are based on all Penn standing faculty members who continued in rank in FY 2009 from their respective prior years. All salaries are converted to a nine-month base. Excluded were all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, all Clinic Educators from four schools (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice), faculty members who were on unpaid leave of absence, faculty who had chosen phased retirement, and Deans of all Schools. The data are weighted by the number of continuing faculty members at each rank in each school.

Trends in Variability Over Time

The variability (i.e., the Inter-Quartile Range, IQR) of median salaries for
1. Accuracy and Timeliness of Information

We begin with a remark. As indicated in prior reports and in conversations with the Provost’s Office, the SCESF has in the past had concerns about the accuracy of data and information in the tables produced by the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis (IR&A). The Office has been responsive (and, indeed, some historical issues have been revised in ways that make them inconsistent with, but more reliable than, previously published data).

The Office of Institutional Research has worked effectively to insure the accuracy of faculty salary data. The Provost’s Office is committed to the provision of accurate data in a timely fashion, and we will continue to work with SCESF and IR&A to ensure timely consultation, as well as comparability and reliability of information.

2. Salary Competitiveness

To provide high-quality instruction, research, and service, the University must maintain at least faculty salaries at levels that are highly competitive with salaries provided by peer universities, while simultaneously sustaining other components of university operations.

SCESF Recommendations

a) Mean salaries at Penn have fallen behind the comparison groups in the AAU Data Exchange (AAUDE) in a number of areas (e.g., compare first and last columns in Table 4). The SCESF recommends that priority be placed on increasing mean salaries to competitive levels for the faculty groups that have fallen behind.

Comparisons over time using AAUDE data are problematic because of changing numbers of participating schools and shifting composition of the disciplinary categories. Several peer institutions did not submit data in 2004. Nevertheless, the Provost agrees to explore reasons for the competitive standing of Penn’s salaries in particular fields identified by the Committee, and to work with the school deans to take corrective actions that may be justified and financially feasible.

b) We note that there is room for improvement for faculty in many of the rank by school/area comparisons (Table 4). Moreover, the gaps in mean salaries between Full Professors at Penn and Full Professors at Stanford, Princeton, Chicago, and Yale increased between 2004-05 and 2007-08 (Table 5), other potentially competitive universities in fact overtook Penn, and most of the universities below Penn gained on Penn. The question arises whether the University can keep and attract the highest-quality faculty members unless faculty salaries are in the top group.

The President and Provost remain committed to further enhancing Penn's ability to offer highly competitive faculty salaries, while recognizing that some of our peers enjoy greater financial resources than Penn, and may overtake Penn, and most of the universities below Penn gained on Penn. The question arises whether the University can keep and attract the highest-quality faculty members unless faculty salaries are in the top group.

The Provost’s Office agrees to explore reasons for the competitive standing of Penn’s salaries in particular fields identified by the Committee, and to work with the school deans to take corrective actions that may be justified and financially feasible.

c) Even though priority should be placed on regaining Penn’s competitive level in the academic fields identified above, the SCESF recommends that equal priority be given to recognizing and rewarding with salary increases distinguished performance of faculty members who choose not to seek, or use, attractive offers of external appointment to negotiate salary increases. This is in part an issue of equity, in part an issue of morale, and in part an issue of not creating problems for the University in the future. The SCESF recognizes that these are decisions taken at the Dean and Department Chair levels but observes that decision-makers at those levels are often keenly aware of budget constraint issues. The Committee feels that explicit guidance from the Provost would be very helpful in this matter.

The process of yearly evaluation of faculty is designed to reward distinguished performance and University guidelines for salary increases are explicit on this point, as outlined in the response to 3a.

3. Salary Equity

Inequality among individual faculty salaries by rank within departments (and schools that are organized as single departments) must be identified and eliminated.

SCESF Recommendations

a) The SCESF continues to recommend that the Provost and Deans give further consideration to decreasing instances in which faculty members who have performed at least at a satisfactory level are awarded salary increases that are below the annual growth in the CPI (Phils.). This issue did not arise in the year studied in the present report; but past history suggests that this fact came as a surprise only because of making this recommendation, we realize that the feasibility of awarding increases to faculty members with satisfactory performance at least as great as growth in the CPI depends on the difference between funds available for salary increases and the CPI growth percentage — with the larger the positive difference, the greater the feasibility of providing salary increases of at least the CPI growth percentage. The pool of funds available for faculty salary increases is awarded according to merit, not as a cost-of-living adjustment. During years of financial stringency when the salary pool is relatively small, it is difficult to recognize promotions, as well as outstanding productivity, teaching, and service, while giving all faculty increases above the CPI. We are delighted that during this past year the growth in all faculty salaries outpaced changes in the cost of living.

b) Tables 2 and 3 give information about the percentage of faculty members receiving increases less than the rise in the cost of living, but they give data only for a single academic year. The real cost to the faculty member of a series of increases each of which is only slightly below the CPI growth percentages could be significant. In general, it would be useful to supplement Tables 2 and 3 with information cumulating increases and changes in the cost of living over a longer time interval. The Committee does not currently see such data and therefore cannot currently comment on whether or not this is a problem and, if it is, what the extent of the problem might be. The Committee would like to see such data in the future. The Committee would first like to discuss with the Provost what an appropriate measurement frame might be.

c) In previous reports, the SCESF observed considerable variability in median faculty salaries across Penn’s 14 schools/areas. The Committee understands that both school/area finances and external conditions will inevitably influence such figures. Information about the extent of this variability and its course over time is nonetheless of ongoing interest. The Committee would like to receive and analyze this data again in the future.

The Provost’s Office reviews salary increases submitted by the deans and chairs and will continue to examine the rationale for giving low increases to individual faculty members. Differences in school budgets will continue to shape the percentage of faculty whose salary increases are at the high end of the suggested range.

d) The SCESF also requests support from the Provost to meet with Deans of particular schools to further understand processes for determining salary increases and communicating salary increases to faculty, as well as the forces that contribute to low percentage increases for faculty in the school. (We have received such offers of support in the past. Our experience in the fall of 2009 was limited but also fruitless.) The Committee is especially interested in understanding forces that contribute to differences across schools over time in the percentage of faculty who receive salary increases at or above the rate of inflation.

The Provost’s Office agrees to work with SCESF to explain the processes that shape the levels of salary increases at the School level and account for differences over time. Competitiveness of salaries in the top ranks and retention are central factors driving increases at or above the rate of inflation.

4. Gender Equity

Data in Table 12 show that average salaries are lower for women than for men faculty, especially for Full Professors, even after weighting the data to reflect differences in the gender distribution of faculty by school and area. This pattern for Full Professors has been unchanging since FY 2005. The suggestion of gender inequality in faculty salaries is troubling. For assistant professors there is close equality, while for associate professors median salaries are similar, but men have an advantage in mean salaries.

SCESF Recommendation

The SCESF recommends that the Provost’s Office place priority on identifying the causes of observed gender differences in salaries and addressing any inequities that are not attributable to legitimate forces.

The Provost’s Office is committed to the principle of gender equity in salaries. We note however that the 2009 Gender Equity Report found relatively few significant differences by gender when years of experience, department, and school are considered. This issue will require further study.

5. Completeness of Data

Previous SCESF reports requested that Tables 6, 7, and 8, which provide percentage salary increases by rank, school, and quartile, be adapted to show a two- or three-year average for cases in which the number of faculty is 10 or fewer (as quartiles would be based on two people). This recommendation has not yet been implemented. The SCESF also requests that future reports show not only percentage salary increases by rank and school, but also actual average salary levels by rank and school.
SCESF Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2008-2009

(continued from page 3)

SCESF Recommendation
Implement the procedure for providing information for small cells in Tables 6, 7 and 8 by averaging data over two or three years for the 2008-09 report. Provide an additional table to the SCESF for the 2008-09 report that summarizes average salary levels by rank and school.

The Office of Research and Analysis does not provide data on cells with fewer than ten cases in order to protect the privacy of individual faculty members. Averaging the data for a two or three year period would not solve this problem.

6. Faculty Benefits
As faculty benefits at Penn compared with peer institutions have not been examined since the 1998-99 report, the SCESF requests that the Provost’s Office provide this information for next year in accordance with what was done in 1998-99. Furthermore, going forward, we believe that, as recommended in prior reports, benefits should be looked at roughly every five years. Although the Provost indicated in previous SCESF reports that this was a timely request, we believe that this process has not yet been initiated.

SCESF Recommendation
Undertake the report on faculty benefits in the next SCESF report. The request for a report on faculty benefits every five years is a reasonable one, and the Provost agrees to work with the Vice President for Human Resources to undertake such a study next academic year and every five years thereafter.

7. Competitiveness of Salaries in Senior Ranks
The SCESF has previously expressed concern about the relative spread in salaries at the Full Professor level. A low spread may correspond to a problem in attracting faculty at the upper end of the scale. In previous reports, the Provost indicated that the Provost continues monitoring this situation and advise the Committee as to what efforts are being made to allow Penn’s “top end” to stay competitive.

SCESF Recommendation
As in previous reports, we emphasize that ongoing monitoring of the competitiveness of “top end” salaries is important and should be continued. In its yearly review of proposed salaries, the Provost’s Office will continue to monitor increases in compensation for full professors, keeping in mind the desirability of maintaining competitive salaries in senior ranks. In times of financial stringency, however, the University has to recognize many competing needs, such as staff salaries and student financial aid, when determining the amount of the faculty salary pool.

8. Further Information for Analysis
The SCESF would like some more information.

a) Table 1 gives mean and median academic base salary percentage increases of continuing Penn faculty members by rank and compares these to the Budget Guidelines (a mean), US City average CPI growth, and Philadelphia CPI growth. The mean figures in Table 1 are consistently significantly larger than the medians. To some extent this phenomenon represents genuine inequality in what the table is designed to measure. But to an extent we cannot judge from the data as presented, it is also an artifact of promotion raises, i.e. category transitions for individuals, since the population characterized for the table is all members of the Standing Faculty in the autumn of the years in question and not just those continuing in rank. The Committee would like to see what happens to the median-mean gaps if the sample is standing faculty members who were on the faculty and in the rank in question in the years in question.

The Committee requests that in future years it be given for examination, and possible publication, two companion Tables to the current Table 1. One of these would cover only the faculty ongoing in rank, as suggested above. The other would give the figures for faculty making rank transitions (by transition).

b) Table 3 gives the percentage of continuing Penn Full Professors awarded percentage increases exceeding the percentage growth in the Philadelphia CPI. The rationale for disaggregating the figures of Table 2 but publishing only the disaggregands for the Full Professors may lie in the idea that essentially all other members of the Standing Faculty are progressing towards Full Professor status and that any who are not, Associate Professors especially, should somehow expect their pay to lag. There are facts in the background here that are not obvious and that the Committee would like to explore.

The Committee would like, at least for the purposes of its own background, to be supplied with the tenure-in-rank distribution of the Standing Faculty’s Associate Professors as part of the preparation of next year’s report. The Committee would also like to see the correlation between years-in-rank and the difference between salary and median salary for individual Associate Professors.

c) Table 4 gives the rank of mean salaries by School (and occasionally sub-School category) relative to comparable units in the AAUDE survey. The Office of Research and Analysis, i.e. the Full Professors in each of the many groups, then the Associate Professors in each group, then the Assistant Professors. Five columns of annual figures present a history for each row’s relative pay. The layout of the Table encourages the reader to compare how well given rank faculty are paid (relative to other universities) across Schools (etc.). Changes in position in this Table may to some extent represent redistribution across ranks within Schools. They may, however, to some extent represent policies or resource constraints within individual Schools. It seems to the Committee very likely the case that whatever causes there are lie within Schools.

The Committee thinks it might promote discussion of these causes, and more generally greater transparency in the resource allocation process, by reorganizing Table 4. Instead of grouping the lines by rank, they could be grouped by administrative units: first the Annenberg Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors, then the Dental Medicine Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors, then all the ranks for the Design School, and so forth and would like to discuss with the Provost his views on the pros and cons of doing this going forward.

The Committee is also concerned that the shifts in comparison set sizes over time in the individual lines of Table 4 may obscure larger patterns. The Committee is contemplating creating an additional table giving explicitly percentiles, deciles, or some other such aggregation as another way of making the trends in this table more transparent.

d) Table 5 presents percentage differences in mean academic base salary levels for Full Professors at a sample of major research universities over a five-year history. Each column is calculated relative to the Penn absolute figure that year. Trends in these figures are not as easy to pick out as they might be.

The Committee would like to explore possible forms for a supplementary Table, to be routinely published going forward, highlighting changes in these positions over time.

e) Tables 6, 7, and 8 give first, second, and third quartile increase percentages for Full Professors continuing in rank, Associate Professors continuing in rank, and Assistant Professors continuing in rank, by School and sub-school unit. These figures would be much more meaningful compared to something.

The Committee requests that going forward, a column be routinely added to each of these three Tables giving the inter-quartile range for each row as a percentage of the median. The Committee would also like to publish the means for these Tables (purposes of convenient comparison to the guidelines).

f) As noted in previous reports, Tables 6, 7, and 8 also do not report quartiles for schools/areas by rank when the number of faculty is 10 or fewer (as quartiles would be based on two people). While the Committee agrees wholeheartedly with this protection of information about individuals, it would still like to see and be able to monitor over time some measure of dispersion for these schools by rank.

The Committee repeats its recommendation from previous reports that, going forward, the Committee be provided a two or three year average of those quartiles for those schools/areas in which we otherwise would not be able to report a first or third quartile.

The Provost’s Office agrees to explore these requests with the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis, while keeping in mind the need for long term stability in the tables to ensure comparability from year to year.
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Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR)

Annual Report for 2009-2010 to the University Faculty

1. SCAF R’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 academic freedom and responsibility of its own choosing and to deal with cases or queries brought to SCAF R’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 together with the Provost’s Office, SCAF R confirmed that all Schools had constituted their Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAF Rs), and distributed to them a general procedural guide for such School committees.

SCAF R met on five occasions from September 2009 until May 2010 to discuss three specific petitions by members of the faculty alleging violations of their academic freedom.

4. SCAF R took up once again and for the final time the case of a faculty member that had been the subject of several rulings by SCAF R over many years. SCAF R had previously determined, in 2008, that given the lapse of time, incomplete records, and differing memories, SCAF R had done what it could to bring the University and the faculty member into negotiations, failing which each party would seek what legal recourse it deemed appropriate. The faculty member came back to SCAF R in December 2009, reporting no further action either by himself, the relevant School, or the University, and asked for SCAF R’s further assistance. Upon further inquiry and investigation of what had transpired in the intervening period since its determination in 2008, SCAF R declined to take any further action, and recommended that the faculty member make efforts to engage in negotiations with the appropriate parties representing the University that were initially proposed by the Provost’s Office in 2008.

5. In connection with the aforementioned case (no. 4), SCAF R extended an invitation to the Provost, requesting a meeting to discuss the complexities involved in this longstanding case. The Provost and Vice Provost for Faculty declined to meet with and discuss the case with SCAF R or its Chair for reason that they believed that the matter had been reasonably addressed in 2008, and they saw no grounds for readdressing the case, nor for an additional meeting about it.

6. SCAF R met with and discussed a petition by a faculty member about possible inappropriate assignment of duties. Afterwards the CAF R of his own School issued a finding consistent with the concern expressed by the faculty member. In view of the action by the CAF R of the faculty member’s School, the assignment of duties was rescinded by the Chair of his Department. SCAF R found this response to be sufficient, and informed the faculty member to keep SCAF R apprised of any further developments.

7. The Chair of SCAF R met late in the spring semester with the University Ombudsman, a Chair of a Department, and a faculty member who is not a member of the standing faculty, to hear the faculty member’s allegations regarding violations of academic freedom. The complaint is to be discussed by the Committee as a whole at SCAF R’s final meeting in May, and will be further addressed over the summer and in the next academic year.

SCAF R received truly invaluable service from Susan White, Secretary of the Faculty Senate Office, whose intelligence, thoroughness, competence, and diligence were indispensable to SCAF R’s work.

—Samuel Freeman, SCAF R Chair, 2009-2010

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 for this AY referred to it by the Senate Executive Committee. These were to:

1. Continue joint efforts on minority recruitment and faculty diversity with University Council Diversity and Equity Subcommittee on the Faculty and Vice Provost for Faculty.

2. Monitor implementation of mentorship programs throughout the University.

3. Monitor implementation of the Forum for Women Faculty.


5. Request update from Provost concerning sexual harassment workshops.

6. The Committee affirmed that while progress in mentoring would be tracked, the major emphasis would be placed on diversity, harassment, and childcare.

Report of Activities:
The Committee will have met a total of nine times by the end of the Academic Year. One meeting included the Provost, one the immediate past Ombudsman and Associate Ombudsman, and one the Vice President for Institutional Affairs; two meetings were held jointly with the University Council on Diversity and Equity Subcommittee on the Faculty (including one with the newly appointed Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees). Further collaboration between SCFDDE and the Council’s Subcommittee on the Faculty was achieved through ex officio appointment of the Chair John Jackson to the SCFDDE, exchange of minutes, and participation of the two chairs in the interview process for a new University Affirmative Action Officer.

With respect to its charges:

1. Diversity in faculty recruitment & retention, the Committee:
   
a. Explored with the Vice Provost for Faculty the need for each school to develop a strategic plan for diversity and to report annually on progress to the Provost.
   
b. Recommended and secured the web posting of the Vice Provost’s training program on Unconscious Bias in Hiring for Search Committees; explored recommendation of making this part of Knowledge Link and a requirement for each Search Committee member.
   
c. Explored the use of a Balanced Scorecard strategy for achieving diversity goals.

d. Continued to urge the development of a website to facilitate diversity in recruitment & retention of a diverse faculty.

2. Regarding mentorship, the Committee:
   
a. Reviewed the University’s Climate Survey (in development) and recommended additional items on mentoring for inclusion.
   
b. Confirmed currency and accuracy and posted Mentoring Best Practices for each school on the Mentoring Website (Vice Provost for Faculty Home Page); access was monitored, achieving an average of ~27 hits per month.

3. Regarding the Forum for Women Faculty, the Committee:
   
a. Heard regular reports from the Vice President of the Council.
   
b. Recommended inclusion of newly retired women in the annual reception.
   
c. Informed the SEC of the newly established Award for Recognition of significant contributions to advancing the role of women in higher education and research at Penn.

4. Regarding child care, the Committee:
   
a. Reviewed, gave feedback on and tracked the roll out of the new policy on backup child care.
   
b. Explored alternative methods for effective dissemination.

5. Regarding the sexual harassment and bias in recruitment training charge, the Committee:
   
a. Reviewed the Sexual Harassment Policy.
   
b. Met with the Past Ombudsman and Associate Ombudsman and with the Vice President for Institutional Affairs to explore implementation and effectiveness of Penn’s policy on harassment.
   
c. Requested reconciliation between all sexual harassment documents.
   
d. Recommended dissemination of the exemplar GSE EEO & Harassment Policy document across the schools.
   
e. Identified that faculty are not reporting incidents, and that no resource currently exists for faculty to use that is a ‘non-reporting’ entity; requested that an informal survey of Penn’s peer schools be conducted to identify practices re: providing a non-reporting resource for faculty and their policy dissemination practices.
   
f. Recommended strongly that trainings on sexual harassment and bias in recruitment be continued across the campus.

Recommended Activities for AY 2010-2011:

- Promote continuing development of faculty mentoring
  
or Assure that items on mentorship are included in the full University climate survey
  
or Continue work on the mentoring metrics blueprint, in dialogue with the new Provost
  
or Request from the Provost a report on the adequacy of the annual deans’ reports on mentoring; review and make recommendations based on findings
  
or Confirm that orientation and training for new and ongoing department...
Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF)

General Committee Charge:
The Committee oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the University’s policies and procedures concerning the academic mission, including the structure of the academic staff, the tenure system, faculty appointments and promotions, faculty research, and faculty governance. In general, the Committee deals with the matters covered by the following sections of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: I.E.-F., H.2., II.A.-D.

Specific Charges:
1. Continue to advance the Committee’s study of non-standing faculty, and make recommendations if appropriate.
2. Examine the extent and the reasons for the declining number of assistant professors in the standing faculty. Make recommendations for mitigating the impact of this decrease.
3. 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 and consider whether policy recommendations are advisable.
4. 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.
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 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 the Faculty to undertake in academic year 2010-11. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you propose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Accomplishments:
1. Continue to advance the Committee’s study of non-standing faculty.
   The Committee focused its analysis of the role of the non-standing faculty (NSF) on the four undergraduate schools and requested data on the types of NSF, the number of courses and CUs taught by NSF, the role of NSF in departmental governance and how NSF faculty are evaluated. The categorization of NSF includes diverse individuals, including (in the School of Medicine) faculty members in the Academic Clinician and the Clinical tracks, and spread throughout the University, practice professors, adjunct faculty, lecturers and senior lecturers (who are members of the academic support staff), and teaching assistants, who are graduate students. The Faculty Handbook both defines these positions and establishes limits in each school of each type of NSF (either as an absolute number or as a percentage of the standing faculty).
   We met with Dean Rebecca Bushnell and reviewed the data from the School of Arts and Sciences. As we were preparing to address the other schools, we received a request from the Provost, through the Tri-Chairs, to analyze two independent requests for changes in the Faculty Handbook regarding NSF and to make recommendations to SEC (see below). One of these requests was from Dean Eduardo Glandt of the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, and the extensive discussions of the data from SEAS that we had with Dean Glandt and vice Dean Kumar addressed this original charge to SOCF. The Committee did not receive data from the School of Nursing or the Wharton School, so as noted below, we recommend that this charge be carried forward.
   A number of conclusions were drawn from the analysis of the data on teaching provided by SAS and SEAS. First, participation by NSF in teaching undergraduate students (and graduate students) varies widely among departments. In part, this reflects variations in the requirements for teaching placed on standing faculty by their departments. Second, some courses (such as foreign languages, theater arts and creative writing) are deemed to be taught best by NSF because of what they bring into the courses. Third, the number of course units (CUs) taught by full-time standing faculty has gradually increased over time, in large part due to a concerted effort to reduce the number of part-time NSF. Fourth, the teaching performance of NSF is evaluated on a regular basis. Fifth, in most instances NSF are not involved in departmental governance activities.
   On reflection over the months of our deliberations, the Committee strongly recommends that SEC initiate a discussion of both the philosophy of and plans for the use of NSF in the educational missions of the University. Many factors are involved, or ignored, at the present time, including expectations of the standing faculty, pressures to conduct research, financial limitations among the Schools, assessing performance of NSF (which often exceeds that of the standing faculty), employment security of and benefits for NSF, and the expectations of the entire University community.
   4. 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.
   The Committee did not have time to address the apparent decline in the percentage of the standing faculty that is assistant professors, except in broad terms. Clearly the recent economic recession has reduced the retirement portfolios of senior faculty members and made retirement less likely. The impact has been fewer tenure-track slots available for new recruits. We recommend returning to this issue next year and assessing data in each school over the past decade, with particular attention to the impact of the temporary expansion of Faculty Income Allowance Program to standing faculty members over the age of 70.
   5. Additional Charges:
   Dean Michael Fitz of the School of Law requested a change in the language of the Faculty Handbook to increase the number of Senior Lecturer positions from one to two. After considerable discussion and deliberation, SOCF recommended approval of this request to SEC.

Diversity to pursue solutions to achieve faculty diversity, including a university level diversity web site development, school level diversity strategic plans with annual reports to the Provost, use of balanced scorecard as a tool to help achieve a culture that embraces diversity.
   Promote training for all search committees on bias in hiring

SCFDDE Membership 2009-2010
Lois Evans (School of Nursing), Chair
Clifford Deutschman (School of Medicine)
Helen Davies (School of Medicine)
Olena Jacenko (School of Veterinary Medicine)
Kelly Jordan-Scutto (School of Dental Medicine)
Susan Margulies (School of Engineering & Applied Science)
John Jackson (Annenberg School of Communication), ex officio
Harvey Rubin (School of Medicine), ex officio
Robert Hornik (Annenberg School for Communication), ex officio
on Senior and Principal Lecturers from 5% to 15%. This reflected reducing part-time NSF and moving existing Lectures to the more senior title. There was also a request to establish an Associate Professor of Practice position. After considerable discussion and deliberation, SCOF recommended approval of these requests to SEC.

6. In terms of charges for next academic year, the Committee recommends the following:
   - Continue the examination of the role of the NSF in teaching under-graduates by focusing on the Wharton School and the School of Nursing.
   - Engage SEC and the Administration in an examination of the philosophy of the evolution of the faculty at the University of Pennsylvania.
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Reed Pyeritz (School of Medicine, ex officio)
Ian Lustick (School of Arts & Sciences)
Stephen Phipps (School of Arts & Sciences)
Diana Slaughter-Defoe (Graduate School of Education)
Beth Winkelstein (School of Engineering & Applied Science)
Jeff Winkler (School of Arts & Sciences)
Harvey Rubin (School of Medicine, ex officio)
Robert Hornik (Annenberg School for Communication, ex officio)

Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP)

General Committee Charge:
The Committee oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the University’s policies and procedures on the admission and instruction of students, including academic integrity, admissions policies and administration, evaluation of teaching, examinations and grading, academic experiences, educational opportunities (such as study abroad), student records, disciplinary systems, and the campus environment. In general, the Committee deals with the matters covered by the following section of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: IV.

Specific Charges:
On the recommendation of the 2008-2009 Committee and the Faculty Senate, this committee was asked to:
1. Continue to monitor and report on the impact of the Graduate Tuition Reform
2. Evaluate the feasibility of creating post-doctoral positions in the Humanities and Social Sciences
3. Consider the impact on interdisciplinary and professional education of tuition flow issues and make appropriate recommendations based on findings
4. Form a subcommittee with the Director of Admissions to update the Admissions Policy for the Undergraduate Schools and develop recommendations concerning a continuing faculty advisory role in admissions.
5. On the urging of the Senate Tri-Chairs, this committee also took up four other charges, three at the outset of the year and one more that came up this spring:
   - Resume and complete consideration of some intellectual property issues that arose in the Committee in 2008-2009
   - Look at an issue in a Dental School program that required students to take courses outside the Dental School from which they were shut out by other schools
   - Clarify a contradiction between the PennBook and the Faculty Handbook on academic integrity violations
   - Consider a faculty complaint about student use of laptops and other electronic devices in the classroom

Accomplishments:
1. Graduate Tuition Reform
   The Committee agreed that this issue could be considered dormant, at least for this year. A series of negotiations during the summer with the SAS Associate Dean for Graduate Studies, Ralph Rosen, alleviated the last remaining qualms of the 2008-2009 committee, reassuring the 2009-2010 committee that graduate students would not be disadvantaged in any foreseeable way in the administration of the new tuition rules. So the Committee agreed to watch and wait, in the knowledge that SCSEP, in its final recommendation to define the relation as one of collaboration rather than oversight.

2. Post-Doctoral Positions in the Humanities and Social Sciences
   The Committee agreed that there was no need to take up this issue.

3. Tuition Flow and Interdisciplinary Education
   The Committee considered this charge and could see no need to address it. So far as we could see, no pressing difficulties in interdisciplinary graduate or professional education turn on problems of tuition flow.

4. Subcommittee to work with the Dean of Admissions
   The Committee agreed to monitor the subcommittee throughout the year and delegated SCSEP Chair Michael Zuckerman to sit ex officio on the subcommittee. The subcommittee will, we trust, present its own report on its work to the Faculty Senate. For the purposes of this report, it is sufficient to say that the subcommittee’s principal recommendation was that a Senate committee meet regularly with the Dean of Admissions to provide faculty oversight of the admissions process. The subcommittee initially envisioned such a meeting once a semester but in the end opted for more latitude. The final recommendation provided for meeting “periodically.”

This Committee agreed that SCSEP is the appropriate Senate committee to work with the Dean of Admissions but modified the subcommittee’s recommendation to define the relation as one of collaboration rather than oversight. This Committee also agreed to restore a degree of specified regularity—one year—to these meetings with the Dean of Admissions. Thus the committee resolved that “The Faculty Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) will, in a consultative format with the Dean of Admissions, once a year review undergraduate admissions policies for all students, including transfers, and make recommendations when appropriate.” In addition, the Committee will review outcomes of these policies and make recommendations when appropriate.” The Committee agreed that the calling of these meetings should be included in the SCSEP charge for future years.

5. Intellectual Property Rights
   In 2008-2009, the Committee met with Robert Terrell, of the Office of General Counsel, to discuss the intellectual property rights of faculty with regard to their lecture material. Mr. Terrell explained that faculty members retain intellectual property rights to their lecture material and that students cannot sell the material directly. He suggested that faculty who are concerned to make such rights explicit to their students could include a statement regarding intellectual property on their syllabi, and he agreed to draft language for several intellectual property policy templates that faculty could use on their syllabi. But to the end of 2008-2009 he had not done so.

The Committee met again with Mr. Terrell this past year. Reiterating his caution that copyright issues are too broad for one-size-fits-all statements, he presented three formulations that faculty so inclined could put on their syllabi and websites to put students on notice about their expectations and to establish copyright ground rules in their classroom. The Committee approved the most and the least restrictive of the three templates that Mr. Terrell offered. The Committee then passed those two on to the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee for their approval and for publication in Almanac so as to put these options before as many faculty as possible. The Provost and the Senate Executive Committee did approve, and the two templates were published in Almanac on March 30, 2010.

6. Dental School Students Excluded from Required Courses
   In light of the very small number of students involved, the Committee considered this an issue more appropriately left to the schools involved, unless we found that similar problems existed elsewhere in the University. We inquired of the Deputy Dean of Education in the School of Engineering and Applied Science, Vijay Kumar, since SEAS seemed the school most likely to encounter such a problem. Dr. Kumar reported that he did not consider this a problem of consequence in SEAS, so the Committee judged this an issue not properly within its jurisdiction.

7. Academic Integrity
   On the urging of the University’s Ombudsman, Joan Goodman, the committee took up a discrepancy between the provisions of the Faculty Handbook and the PennBook for the assignment of grades in courses in which faculty believe students guilty of academic integrity violations and students are subsequently held not to be responsible for such violations. The differences were arcane. They turned on matters of what faculty had to do and what they were advised to do at what stage of the grading process in those cases of vindication of students after academic integrity proceedings. But the differences did beg resolution, to prevent equal but op-
Graduate Tuition Reform next year. But full review of the Reform that the 2008-2009 committee recommended for the following year (AY 2012) still seems like a good idea.

* The Committee detects no push for a major expansion of post-doctoral positions in the humanities and social sciences on the near horizon. But SCSEP should consider such an initiative very carefully if and when it ever materializes.

* The Committee recommends that procedures be established for an annual meeting with the Dean of Admissions in which the Dean and the committee engage in wide-ranging conversation about admissions issues. The first such meeting should occur next year.

* The Committee recommends that the issue of student use of laptops and other electronic devices in the classroom be revisited if SC finds sufficient faculty interest in the matter. Such revisitation might include drafting of a statement on the appropriate use of such technology in the classroom in the material that students receive during freshman orientation.
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**Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA)**

**General Committee Charge:**

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:**

1. At the initial meeting of SCOA for the AY 2009-2010, the committee considered the official charges provided by Professor Harvey Rubin, Chair of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee:
   1. Collect data on the governance and oversight of the school-based Master’s programs. Consider whether current faculty oversight is adequate or whether additional oversight processes should be recommended.
   2. Continue to review practices across schools related to sabbatical and other leaves. Review and make recommendations for any needed policy changes related to sabbatical requirements and use in order to ensure fairness across schools.
   3. Form and monitor the work of a SCOA Subcommittee on Research charged with examining how the University research infrastructure supports humanities and social science scholarship, and how information technology needs of the researchers are being met.
   4. Monitor any cases in which the power of temporary exclusion is exercised under recently adopted provisions in order to assess their adequacy. Consider whether there is a need to develop policies around temporary exclusion (e.g., for illness reasons) that do not fall under current policy.

**Accomplishments:**

1. Data on Governance and Oversight of the School-Based Master’s Programs.

There are two types of Master’s programs at Penn. A small number are overseen by Andy Binns, Vice Provost for Education. The schools themselves oversee most Master’s programs, as well as a variety of terminal degree certificate programs. Committee members reported concerns that some of the latter may either be staffed or overseen by full-time faculty to any significant degree, and that there is no systematic information available on these programs. The Committee met with Andy Binns, who indicated his office is seeking to insure that all programs have a review clause and that reviews occur as prescribed in the programs under his office’s supervision. He also favored development of norms and rules for Master’s and certificate programs and expressed concern that the data the central administration has on such programs may not be comprehensive.

The Committee then asked the Graduate Assistant to the Faculty Senate, Janelle Haynes, to survey Penn websites to compile a database on school-based Master’s and certificate programs. The results showed that there are indeed a great number and variety of these programs, many clearly out