

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 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](http://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*

Group/Condition	Average	FYs 2008-2009
Professor	Median	3.7%
	Mean	6.0%
Associate Professor	Median	3.9%
	Mean	6.8%
Assistant Professor	Median	4.0%
	Mean	5.0%
All Three Ranks	Median	3.8%
	Mean	6.0%
US City Average CPI Growth	Mean	-1.2%
Phil. CPI Growth	Mean	-2.0%
Budget Guidelines	Mean	3.5%

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. FYs 2008-2009 CPI growth for the US and for Philadelphia are based on a change in CPI from June 2008 to June 2009.

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/](http://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 6th 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.*

Academic Field	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2008
<b>Full Professor:</b>					
Annenberg	1/34	2/35	2/36	1/38	1/38
Dental Medicine	4/34	6/34	8/35	10/38	11/43
Design	9/52	7/51	3/53	9/53	8/51
Engineering	20/56	14/55	14/56	14/56	14/53
Graduate Education	2/44	3/43	4/45	4/48	4/45
Humanities (A&S)	6/56	5/55	5/56	10/56	8/53
Law	6/36	6/36	7/36	10/41	7/39
Medicine-Basic Science	2/34	3/35	3/37	3/37	5/53
Natural Science (A&S)	11/57	12/56	11/57	15/57	13/54
Nursing	2/23	2/24	2/24	2/26	2/25
Social Policy & Practice	5/22	4/22	6/24	6/25	5/23
Social Science (A&S)	10/56	9/55	9/56	9/57	9/54
Veterinary Medicine	1/14	1/14	1/13	4/17	3/14
Wharton-Business & Management	3/52	2/52	3/53	7/53	5/50
Wharton-Public Policy	3/19	3/19	3/18	--	15/50
Wharton-Statistics	1/35	1/34	1/35	1/34	1/34
<b>Associate Professor:</b>					
Annenberg	--	--	--	--	--
Dental Medicine	1/30	--	--	8/35	14/41
Design	9/50	7/50	1/51	7/53	6/51
Engineering	11/56	9/55	7/55	10/56	9/53
Graduate Education	2/47	2/46	3/46	4/48	5/44
Humanities (A&S)	6/56	8/55	6/56	10/56	6/53
Law	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Medicine-Basic Science	2/31	4/34	2/36	3/37	5/53
Natural Science (A&S)	6/57	11/56	9/57	11/57	11/54
Nursing	7/26	3/26	3/26	5/26	7/24
Social Policy & Practice	--	5/22	5/24	--	3/24
Social Science (A&S)	11/56	11/55	9/56	11/57	11/54
Veterinary Medicine	2/14	2/14	1/13	3/17	8/14
Wharton-Business & Management	1/51	1/52	1/53	2/53	1/50
Wharton-Public Policy	--	--	--	--	--
Wharton-Statistics	--	--	--	--	2/27
<b>Assistant Professor:</b>					
Annenberg	--	--	--	--	--
Dental Medicine	--	--	4/34	11/36	8/42
Design	2/50	4/49	--	5/52	7/49
Engineering	12/56	11/55	6/56	13/56	10/53
Graduate Education	12/43	7/43	6/45	6/47	6/45
Humanities (A&S)	14/56	13/55	14/56	19/56	17/53
Law	3/23	5/28	--	--	--
Medicine-Basic Science	4/33	5/34	9/38	6/37	7/53
Natural Science (A&S)	10/57	7/56	8/57	18/57	15/54
Nursing	5/27	6/27	4/26	5/26	3/24
Social Policy & Practice	--	--	--	--	6/24
Social Science (A&S)	9/56	8/55	15/56	10/57	13/54
Veterinary Medicine	1/14	1/14	1/13	1/17	6/14
Wharton-Business & Management	3/50	7/52	3/53	6/53	10/50
Wharton-Public Policy	--	--	--	--	--
Wharton-Statistics	--	--	--	1/33	1/33

NOTES: -- Median salary data from this particular data source is not complete, and therefore, the more complete average salary data set is used. The AAUDE survey instructions request academic base salaries and this was the metric used for submitting Penn faculty salaries.

Using the federal CIP (Classification of Instructional Programs) codes for 2000, departments at comparable universities were mapped to Penn Schools.

\*\* Between fall 2007 and fall 2008, several modifications were made to CIP Code classifications for medical sciences. In fall 2009, at the schools' request, Wharton-Public Policy began being compared to Economics rather than Policy programs.

Calculations of rank only include those universities that have relevant departments. Therefore, the number of universities among which Penn is ranked varies by field. Rank is suppressed for all cells which contain fewer than five Penn faculty members.

Comparisons with Peer Universities Using AAUP Survey Data

Presented below is a comparison of the mean salaries of all full professors at Penn with those at a small select group of research universities based on data obtained by the Penn administration, collected annually by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and published in *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

The data in this table show that over the period, mean salaries for full professors at Penn became more competitive with four of the institutions in the comparison set but became less competitive with 14 of them, by far the greater part of the panel. This reinforces the comparative concerns already raised for assistant and associate professors above. Again, we give a more detailed analysis in the longer version of our report.

# SENATE 2009-2010

Full professor salary comparisons: Percentage differences in mean academic base salary levels of Penn full professors in comparison with salary levels of full professors at a sample of comparable research universities

University	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Harvard	+13.8%	+12.5%	+13.4%	+11.7%	+13.7%
Stanford	+3.6%	+4.2%	+0.7%	+6.0%	+7.4%
Princeton	+5.4%	+4.6%	+4.6%	+5.2%	+6.4%
Chicago	+3.5%	+3.5%	+3.8%	+4.4%	+6.0%
Columbia	-2.1%	N/A	N/A	-0.4%	+3.4%
Yale	+1.5%	+0.9%	+0.7%	+1.1%	+3.1%
NYU	-3.7%	-3.9%	-4.5%	-0.5%	+0.8%
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	<b>\$143.4K</b>	<b>\$149.9K</b>	<b>\$156.5K</b>	<b>\$163.3K</b>	<b>\$169.4K</b>
Northwestern	-5.0%	-6.1%	-5.9%	-6.3%	-4.5%
Duke	-8.4%	-9.0%	-9.3%	-7.0%	-4.8%
MIT	-5.9%	-6.4%	-6.8%	-7.7%	-5.4%
UCLA	-14%	-14.3%	-14.9%	N/A	-14.7%
UC Berkeley	-15.1%	-15.8%	-16.1%	N/A	-15.3%
N.C. (Chapel Hill)	-21.4%	-23.1%	-19%	-17.9%	-15.8%
Michigan	-16.2%	-16.2%	-16.7%	-19.1%	-16.1%
Carnegie-Mellon	-17.4%	-17.4%	-18.8%	-23.5%	-19.4%
Virginia	-17.6%	-17.9%	-18.2%	-23.1%	-21.3%
Texas (Austin)	-23.4%	-22.8%	-22.6%	-29.6%	-21.9%
MN (Twin Cities)	-26.5%	-26.4%	-25.5%	-34.6%	-24.8%

NOTES: Penn academic base mean salaries are based on standing faculty members at the rank of professor. Excluded are all members of the Faculty of Medicine except basic scientists, and all standing faculty members who are appointed as Clinician Educators from four other schools that have such positions (Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy & Practice). Data Source: AAUP Salary Surveys.

### Variability in Average Salary Levels by Rank

The table below shows mean and median faculty salaries by rank for all schools combined for each of four years: 2004-05 through 2008-2009. In FY 2009, mean salaries were 78% higher for full professors than for assistant professors and 16% higher for associate professors than for assistant professors. After weighting the data to reflect differences in the distribution of faculty across schools by rank, mean salaries of full professors were 85% higher than for assistant professors and mean salaries of associate professors were 25% higher than assistant professors. The longer version of our report gives a more extensive discussion.

Mean academic base salary levels of Penn standing faculty members who continued in rank by rank

Rank	Academic Year	Average	Amount	Not Weighted	Weighted	
Full Professor	2004-2005	Mean	\$141,545	1.71	1.79	
		Median	\$130,050	1.82	1.77	
	2005-2006	Mean	\$147,815	1.69	1.82	
		Median	\$137,000	1.87	1.81	
	2006-2007	Mean	\$154,627	1.71	1.82	
		Median	\$143,000	1.90	1.83	
	2007-2008	Mean	\$160,803	1.72	1.85	
		Median	\$147,875	1.94	1.84	
	2008-2009	Mean	\$170,077	1.78	1.85	
		Median	\$156,077	1.95	1.85	
	Associate Professor	2004-2005	Mean	\$93,090	1.12	1.22
			Median	\$83,650	1.17	1.22
2005-2006		Mean	\$98,542	1.13	1.25	
		Median	\$87,500	1.20	1.26	
2006-2007		Mean	\$103,378	1.14	1.25	
		Median	\$91,900	1.22	1.26	
2007-2008		Mean	\$106,061	1.13	1.26	
		Median	\$94,172	1.23	1.26	
2008-2009		Mean	\$110,913	1.16	1.25	
		Median	\$98,206	1.23	1.23	
Assistant Professor		2004-2005	Mean	\$82,922	1.00	1.00
			Median	\$71,400	1.00	1.00
	2005-2006	Mean	\$87,268	1.00	1.00	
		Median	\$73,132	1.00	1.00	
	2006-2007	Mean	\$90,513	1.00	1.00	
		Median	\$75,136	1.00	1.00	
	2007-2008	Mean	\$93,547	1.00	1.00	
		Median	\$76,421	1.00	1.00	
	2008-2009	Mean	\$95,382	1.00	1.00	
		Median	\$80,030	1.00	1.00	

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 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. 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

Penn's 14 school/areas increased between FY 2005 and FY 2009 for full professors. This is evidence of ongoing rapidly increasing disparity of faculty salaries across Penn's 14 schools/areas at the full and associate professor ranks. (The Inter-Quartile Range changes for assistant professors are less consistent.) Schools/areas offering higher median salaries apparently also offer higher annual percentage increases. That is, the increases in the IQR are not just proportional to the increase in salary levels from one year to the next, but the disparities among schools/areas in median salaries are growing in dollars and percentages. (See full report for tables.)

These data indicate that, in general, differences in median faculty salaries between lower paying schools/areas and higher paying schools/areas have been, and continue to be, slowly increasing both in dollar amount and in percentage difference. As noted in prior SCESF reports, variability among schools/areas is no doubt a product, to a considerable extent, of market forces in the hiring of faculty members and in the relative wealth of schools (i.e., financial ability to support faculty salaries). The relative wealth of schools available for supporting faculty salaries is, in major part, a function of how much income a school is able to earn and the level of non-faculty expenditures it regards as essential.

### Variability by Gender

In response to recommendations in previous reports, this report includes two tables describing gender differences in faculty salaries.

First Quartile (Q1), Median (Md.), and Third Quartile (Q3) Percentage Salary Increases of Faculty who Continued in Rank by Gender and Rank: 2008-09

Rank	Gender	Q1	Md.	Q3
Full Professor	Men	3.0%	3.5%	4.8%
	Women	3.2%	3.9%	5.5%
Associate Professor	Men	3.2%	3.6%	4.9%
	Women	3.5%	3.7%	4.5%
Assistant Professor	Men	3.5%	4.0%	6.0%
	Women	3.5%	3.6%	4.7%

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. All salaries are converted to a nine-month base.

Mean academic base salary levels of Penn faculty members by gender and rank

Acad. Yr.	Avg.	Unweighted			Weighted		
		Women	Men	% Diff.	Women	Men	% Diff.
<b>Full Professor</b>							
2004-	Mean	132,002	143,533	8.7%	133,999	143,534	7.1%
2005	Median	121,800	131,300	7.8%	131,044	139,834	6.7%
2005-	Mean	139,706	149,558	7.1%	140,778	149,256	6.0%
2006	Median	126,935	138,450	9.1%	137,379	146,120	6.4%
2006-	Mean	147,006	156,267	6.3%	145,892	155,924	6.9%
2007	Median	132,800	144,350	8.7%	142,866	151,937	6.3%
2007-	Mean	150,286	163,176	8.6%	151,196	163,176	7.9%
2008	Median	137,013	149,623	9.2%	148,819	159,494	7.2%
2008-	Mean	160,576	172,192	7.2%	161,153	172,192	6.9%
2009	Median	143,983	157,625	9.5%	155,980	167,437	7.3%
<b>Associate Professor</b>							
2004-	Mean	87,707	95,943	9.4%	94,129	95,421	1.4%
2005	Median	78,307	88,056	12.4%	94,140	93,594	-0.6%
2005-	Mean	92,807	101,484	9.3%	92,395	100,972	9.3%
2006	Median	82,750	93,500	13.0%	92,849	99,583	7.3%
2006-	Mean	94,765	107,547	13.5%	95,196	107,045	12.4%
2007	Median	87,263	95,000	8.9%	97,470	103,697	6.4%
2007-	Mean	96,729	110,812	14.6%	106,225	110,812	4.3%
2008	Median	89,972	98,170	9.1%	110,306	107,276	-2.7%
2008-	Mean	104,061	114,076	9.6%	110,244	114,076	3.5%
2009	Median	93,636	101,900	8.8%	110,470	107,352	-2.8%
<b>Assistant Professor</b>							
2004-	Mean	77,677	85,672	10.3%	85,579	85,672	0.1%
2005	Median	65,300	74,807	14.6%	82,754	84,704	2.4%
2005-	Mean	80,757	91,374	13.1%	90,681	91,374	0.8%
2006	Median	68,190	78,500	15.1%	87,917	89,163	1.4%
2006-	Mean	83,738	95,015	13.5%	93,783	95,015	1.3%
2007	Median	70,950	84,000	18.4%	90,765	92,079	1.4%
2007-	Mean	88,223	97,907	11.0%	97,840	97,907	0.1%
2008	Median	72,641	82,900	14.1%	95,495	94,331	-1.2%
2008-	Mean	89,046	100,012	12.3%	99,900	100,012	0.1%
2009	Median	76,400	84,615	10.8%	97,667	96,777	-0.9%

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 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. Female faculty members are weighted using male weights. Male weights are calculated as a ratio of male faculty in each school/area to the total number of male faculty at Penn. Percent difference is calculated as the difference between male and female salaries divided by the female salary. Negative percent differences occur when the female salary exceeds the male salary.

## SCESF Recommendations and Questions for the Administration for 2008-2009

### 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 data 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 and attain 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 also have more developed faculties in some fields of study. We seek, through strategic investments in faculty recruiting and compensation, to consolidate our competitive strengths and to address our competitive shortcomings.*

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

Inequity 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 (Phil.). This issue did not arise in the year studied in the present report; but past history suggests that this fact came as a surprise to all concerned. In 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.

*The Provost's Office agrees to explore this request with the Office of Institutional Research and Analysis.*

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 inequity 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.

*(continued on page 4)*

## 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 Institutional 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 SCESF requested that the Provost continue 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 Table is grouped by Penn faculty rank, 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.*

### Senate Committee on Economic Status of the Faculty Membership 2009-2010

Daniel Raff (Wharton School), *Chair*  
William Dailey (School of Arts & Sciences)  
Sarah Kagan (School of Nursing)  
Ann O'Sullivan (School of Nursing)  
David Pope (School of Engineering & Applied Science)  
Tim Rebbeck (School of Medicine)  
Robert Hornik (Annenberg School for Communication), *ex-officio*  
Harvey Rubin (School of Medicine), *ex-officio*  
Sherrill Adams (School of Dental Medicine), *ex-officio*

---

## Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR)

### Annual Report for 2009-2010 to the University Faculty

1. 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 academic freedom and responsibility 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 together with the Provost's Office, SCAFR confirmed that all Schools had constituted their Committees on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (CAFRs), and distributed to them a general procedural guide for such School committees.

3. SCAFR 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. SCAFR took up once again and for the final time the case of a faculty member that had been the subject of several rulings by SCAFR over many years. SCAFR had previously determined, in 2008, that given the lapse of time, incomplete records, and differing memories, SCAFR 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 SCAFR in December 2009, reporting no further action either by himself, the relevant School, or the University, and asked for SCAFR's further assistance. Upon further inquiry and investigation of what had transpired in the intervening period since its determination in 2008, SCAFR 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), SCAFR 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 SCAFR 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. SCAFR met with and discussed a petition by a faculty member about possible inappropriate assignment of duties. Afterwards the CAFR of his own School issued a finding consistent with the concern expressed by the faculty member. In view of the action by the CAFR of the faculty member's School, the assignment of duties was rescinded by the Chair of his Department. SCAFR found this response to be sufficient, and informed the faculty member to keep SCAFR apprised of any further developments.

7. The Chair of SCAFR 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 SCAFR's final meeting in May, and will be further addressed over the summer and in the next academic year.

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

—Samuel Freeman, SCAFR 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.

4. Monitor affordable childcare service provision.

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*

o Assure that items on mentorship are included in the fall University climate survey

o Continue work on the mentoring metrics blueprint, in dialogue with the new Provost

o Request from the Provost a report on the adequacy of the annual deans' reports on mentoring; review and make recommendations based on findings

o Confirm that orientation and training for new and ongoing department

(continued on page 6)

(continued from page 5)

- chairs includes mentoring; make recommendations as appropriate
- *Harmonize the understanding between the Office of the Provost and the various schools concerning the trajectory of faculty promotion, with special attention to extensions*
- *Monitor and support the evolution of the Women's Faculty Forum*
- *Continue to support accessible child care*
  - Review dissemination and uptake of the new policy on backup child care
- *Promote strategies to eradicate sexual harassment and enhance diversity*
  - Follow up on SCFDDE recommendations regarding sexual harassment, especially the identification of non-reporting resources for faculty
  - Confirm that orientation and training for new and ongoing department chairs include sexual harassment
  - Continue to meet with and collaborate with the Council Committee on

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-Sciutto (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 of Communication), *ex officio*

## 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 in young faculty members on the University
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 suppose 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 category 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 neatly addressed this original charge to SCOF. 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, and these faculty members have no other responsibilities. 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.

2. *Examine the extent and the reasons for the declining number of assistant professors in the standing faculty.*

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 extension of Faculty Income Allowance Program to standing faculty members over the age of 70.

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.*

The Committee discussed with the Provost the issue of conversion of faculty members on the Research Track to tenure-probationary or tenured positions in the standing faculty. The conclusions were that these instances are rare and that the *Faculty Handbook* language adequately addresses the process.

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 role of the emeritus faculty was discussed. The development of the Penn Association of Senior and Emeritus Faculty (PASEF) has had a strikingly positive impact, and the Committee recommended that SEC monitor the impact of PASEF periodically, perhaps with a survey of its members. The chair of PASEF is welcome to bring any issues relevant to the mission of SCOF directly to the Committee.

### 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, SCOF recommended approval of this request to SEC.

- Dean Eduardo Glandt of SEAS requested several changes in the language of the *Faculty Handbook*. The main issue was to increase the cap

(continued on page 7)

(continued from page 6)

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 undergraduates 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.

## SCOF Membership 2009-2010

Reed Pyeritz (School of Medicine), *Chair*  
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.
- 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:
5. Resume and complete consideration of some intellectual property issues that arose in the Committee in 2008-2009
  6. 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
  7. Clarify a contradiction between the *PennBook* and the *Faculty Handbook* on academic integrity violations
  8. 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 report for 2007-2008, had recommended a full assessment of the impact of the Tuition Reform after its third year of operation, in AY 2012.

#### 2. Post-Doctoral Positions in the Humanities and Social Sciences

The Committee agreed that there was no need to take up this issue. In the current economic climate, there was no prospect of a significant initiative in humanities and social science post-docs this year.

#### 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 suffi-

cient 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 meet 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—once a 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-

(continued on page 8)

(continued from page 7)

posite appeals to declared University policy.

In consultation with Vice Provost for Education Andrew Binns and Director of the Office of Student Conduct Susan Herron, the Committee approved a modest rewording of the language in the *Faculty Handbook*, Section IV.C., Charter of the University Student Disciplinary System (Imposing Sanctions on a Student). In this revision, the relevant sentence would be modified to read: "if the student has been found not to be responsible for an academic integrity violation, the instructor must re-evaluate and should assign a grade (which may differ from the grade originally assigned) based on the student's academic performance in the course." The Committee recommended to the Office of the Provost and the Office of Student Conduct that they adopt this revision and incorporate it in the *Faculty Handbook*. Both offices have approved the revision.

#### 8. Laptops in the classroom

Responding to an eloquent complaint from a colleague about increasingly adverse educational consequences of increasing student use of laptops and other electronic devices in the classroom, the committee discussed the issue extensively but concluded that it could not proceed further without more information. The Committee asked Faculty Senate Chair Harvey Rubin to get feedback from the Senate Executive Committee to gauge the extent of faculty concern about this issue.

#### Recommendations for Next Year's Committee

- The Committee envisions no need for any active monitoring of the

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 SEC 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.

#### SCSEP Membership 2009-2010

Michael Zuckerman (School of Arts and Sciences), *Chair*

Christine Bradway (School of Nursing)

Daniel Lee (School of Engineering and Applied Science)

Catriona MacLeod (School of Arts and Sciences)

Philippe Met (School of Arts and Sciences)

Kathleen Montone (School of Medicine)

Harvey Rubin (School of Medicine), *ex officio*

Robert Hornik (Annenberg School for Communication), *ex officio*

## 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:

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 neither be staffed nor 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-

standing, but some that might bear closer investigation in regard to the degree of involvement by full-time faculty members.

*SCOA recommends that each school maintain a list of its Master's and certificate degree programs; define review criteria and constitute a review committee for those programs; and each school should conduct a full review of all such programs every five years.*

#### 2. Practices Across Schools on Sabbaticals and Other Leaves.

On the basis of administration data on leave utilization and informal surveys of faculty members in various schools conducted by SCOA members in previous years as well as this year, the committee concluded that there is reason for concern that many faculty members are unaware of pertinent leave policies; some, particularly those doing clinical work and lab research, find it difficult to utilize leaves as currently structured; and in some instances faculty members have continued to do clinical work, research, and teach while being recorded as on leave. The Committee developed a template for alternate, more flexible forms of leave that the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs discussed with the President and Provost.

*SCOA recommends that efforts to establish such alternate forms of leave be pursued.*

#### 3. Form and Monitor a SCOA Subcommittee on Research.

The Subcommittee was formed, with SCOA member Professor Sydney Evans serving as SCOA's representative on it, and it began consideration of its charges, including identification of particular problems.

*SCOA recommends that the Subcommittee on Research continue its work on how the University research infrastructure supports humanities and social science scholarship and how information technology needs of researchers are being met, along with related concerns that the Subcommittee may identify.*

#### 4. Monitor Cases of Temporary Exclusion.

The Committee did not receive any reports of temporary exclusions, nor did it hear concerns suggesting the need to develop further policies at this time. Its work was primarily devoted to the matters raised in the first three charges.

#### SCOA Membership 2009-2010

Rogers M. Smith (School of Arts and Sciences), *Chair*

Regina Austin (School of Law)

Sydney M. Evans (School of Medicine)

Sohrab Rabii (School of Engineering & Applied Science)

Bernard Shapiro (School of Veterinary Medicine)

Barry Silverman (School of Engineering)

Harvey Rubin (School of Medicine), *ex officio*

Robert Hornik (Annenberg School for Communication), *ex officio*