Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

The Faculty Senate was established in 1952 as the representative voice for full-time teaching faculty at the University of Pennsylvania. The University of Pennsylvania embraces a vision of shared governance in which the faculty is regularly consulted on how academic issues and faculty decisions heavily influence policies that are under the purview of faculty responsibility. Much of the work of the Faculty Senate is done through an elected Senate Executive Committee (SEC) and a set of standing committees. On behalf of the faculty, members of SEC and the various committees engage in substantive investigation and consideration of matters of import with the University administration. In addition to the work of these committees, the Tri-Chairs (Chair-Elect, Chair, and Past-Chair) meet regularly with the President and the Provost. These meetings provide opportunities for the administration to learn about and respond to issues raised by SEC and/or its committees, as well as the many faculty constituencies across the University. Summaries of SEC meetings appear in Almanac monthly, and detailed reports from each Senate committee appear elsewhere in this issue. What follows is a summary of some of SEC’s accomplishments for the 2011-2012 academic year.

The Faculty Senate Executive Committee serves three major functions:

a) Consultation with senior administrators, with an eye toward understanding their areas of responsibility and staying informed about their plans in an effort to better engage with them, ensuring that faculty perspectives and concerns are brought to bear on relevant issues. This year we met with President Amy Gutmann and Provost Vincent Price. Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty, Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees, Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns, Vice Provost for Global Initiatives Ezekiel Emanuel, and Executive Vice President Craig Camaroli.

b) Review and approval of changes in formal policy that fall under Senate responsibility. This year the Graduate School of Education (GSE) proposed an increase in their allotment of Senior Lecturers, and the Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM) proposed a new part-time faculty track. Both proposals were reviewed by the Senate Committee on the Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) and then referred to SEC. SEC met with Stanton Wortham, Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the Graduate School of Education, to examine how these changes impact the organization of their school and its programs, and then approved the proposal. The PSOM proposal will be reviewed and voted on by SEC during their next meeting on May 9, 2012; Vice Dean for Faculty and Resident Affairs, Lisa Bellini will represent the Medical School for this discussion.

c) Initiating consideration and exploration of issues that are of concern to the SEC membership, or that are referred to SEC for discussion and response by its committees. These issues often become the topics of further consultation with the administration.

I am extremely pleased to report that the SEC and its committees had a very productive year, engaging in a wide variety of activities, including:

1. Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence. At the end of last academic year, the administration released its Diversity Action Plan. This plan is the culmination of last year’s work by SEC and its membership and other constituent groups on campus, which was supported by the administration. This year, SEC and the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDE) monitored the initial implementation of the Plan, and remains committed to being actively involved in addressing what it views as a serious concern for the future of the University.

2. Faculty Climate Survey. The ad hoc committee appointed by SEC last year continued to work with Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees to revise and implement the Faculty Climate Survey across the University this year. This committee will continue its work this summer, reviewing results and advising Vice Provost Lees on analyses of particular interest to SEC and its committees. This year’s ad hoc committee includes representatives of relevant Senate committees, including SCFDE and SCOF.

3. Masters and Certificate Programs. The Senate Committee on the Faculty and Administration (SCOA) undertook an examination of Masters and Certificate programs across the University, gathering information from all 12 schools on their programs and enrollments. This committee also considered how best to assess the level of faculty involvement in the oversight of these programs, meeting with Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns and Vijay Kumar, Deputy Dean for Education in the School of Engineering. This work sets the stage for continued exploration of this important issue next year.

4. Faculty Track Changes. In addition to the review of proposals from the Graduate School of Education and the Perelman School of Medicine mentioned previously, the Senate Committee on the Faculty and Academic Mission (SCOF) reviewed and revised their guidelines for requests from schools for faculty track changes. These guidelines are shared with the Office of the Provost as a guide for information needed from schools requesting faculty track changes. These guidelines were implemented this year, greatly expediting the committee’s process for review and presentation to SEC.

In addition to these accomplishments:

a) The Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) continued to build on their relationship with Eric Furda, Dean of Admissions, in an effort to focus on Penn’s strategies for recruiting students from underrepresented minorities and low-income families. This year, SCSEP worked in conjunction with the University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA) to pursue this issue. SCSEP also met with Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns to discuss the work being done by his Faculty Council on Access and Academic Support to assure post-matriculation success for undergraduates.

b) The Senate Committee on Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDE) worked with Vice Provost Lynn Lees on a memo distributed to Deans and Department Chairs on January 10, 2012 clarifying issues on the application of Penn’s policy on Extension of the Probationary Periods that Apply to Granting of Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor. The committee also monitored updates to the language in the University’s Sexual Harassment policy, in collaboration with Vice President for Institutional Affairs Joann Mitchell and reviewed and discussed the status of childcare at Penn and the use of the Parents in a Pinch program with Marcie Witt, Vice President for Business Services and Marilyn Kraut, director of Quality Worklife Programs for the Division of Human Resources. This committee also met with the Ombudsman and the Associate Ombudsman to discuss usage of the office and the maintenance of continuity. These accomplishments are in addition to their monitoring schools’ progress on their diversity action plans in conjunction with the University Council Diversity and Equity Committee, including an update from John Jackson, Senior Advisor for Diversity, and recommendations of topics of interest for the ad hoc Faculty Climate Survey Review Committee.

c) The Faculty Senate Executive Committee engaged in important conversation with Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty regarding the research-related administrative burdens facing faculty across the University. Senior Vice Provost Fluharty has formed several working groups that include faculty recommendations from SEC to consider these issues, including but not limited to Conflict of Interest.

d) The Provost’s Office and the Office of Institutional Research provided salary and other relevant data to the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) early in the fall semester, once again allowing this committee to complete its report (Almanac: February 28, 2012) and address concerns with the administration early in the spring semester.

We saw another year with very good participation and member enthusiasm. We continued last year’s practice of soliciting the membership for agenda items at the beginning of the academic year, in addition to making the format more conversational. These suggestions paved the way for our consideration of research- and travel-related administrative burdens on faculty, the roll-out implementation of the University’s Diversity Action Plan, and fostered helpful changes in the format of the SEC meetings. Our members remained actively engaged in these conversations throughout the year and often volunteered their service on standing and ad hoc committees, as well as for Senior Vice Provost Fluharty’s working groups and committees and assisted with the Middle States Accreditation.

The Senate committees have been extremely productive this year, accomplishing a great deal. This is due in large part to the admirable commitment that the members bring to their service to the faculty and the University, as well as the effective and responsible leadership of those who volunteered their time and skills to chair these committees. The reports of
these committees are included in this issue of Almanac and describe the many accomplishments not included in this report. I would like to take the opportunity to thank both the membership of the various committees, as well as their chairs: Sigal Barsade (SCOA), Sheila Murnaghan and Ivan Dmochowski (SCSEP), Sarah Kagan (SCESF), Jeffrey Winker (SCOF), Kelly Jordan-Sciutto and Peter Struck (SCFDFE).

The Tri-Chairs of the Faculty Senate engage in frequent and worthwhile meetings with President Amy Gutmann and Provost Vincent Price. In these consultations, we share the perspectives of the faculty with the administration. These conversations have been engaging and productive, and we appreciate their straightforwardness in discussing any issues we brought to them for consideration.

Finally, I would be remiss if I did not express my deep and enduring gratitude to my partners in this endeavor. I could not have agreed to take on this important responsibility without the support of my staff in the Center for Africana Studies. Gale Garrison, Carol Davis, Michelle Houston, and Deb Broadnax hold down a sizable and growing fort, taking care of the Center, the students who are attached to the Center, and of me. I am on time and up to speed in no small measure because of this wonderful group of women. I also want to thank my faculty colleagues in the Center for their support, and for making themselves available at a moment’s notice.

During my year as Chair-Elect, Robert Hornik was an exceptional model in leadership. This year, as Past-Chair, Bob continued to offer his thoughtful advice and valuable insights in a wide variety of circumstances. Chair-Elect Susan Margulies has been a quick-study, bringing terrific and much-appreciated enthusiasm and commitment to her role, as well as a wealth of knowledge of issues important to the Senate; I am very much looking forward to her leadership in the coming year. The three of us could not accomplish anything without the undying commitment of Sue White, Executive Assistant to the Faculty Senate. There really are not words to express my amazement at her institutional memory and her capacity for recruiting committee members and then managing those committees, making sure that the tri-chairs stay on task and respond appropriately to all that is brought to us for consideration, remembering to remind us when we forget while at the same time staying on top of her own to-do list, and elegantly navigating and maintaining relationships with administrative counterparts. We would be lost without her, and we are truly grateful that she is our partner.

—Camille Z. Charles

Edmund J. and Louise W. Kahn Term Professor in the Social Sciences
Professor of Sociology and Education, School of Arts & Sciences
Director, Center for Africana Studies

Report of the 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 Section IV of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators.

2011-2012 Specific Charges

1. Continue the dialogue established with the Dean of Admissions, identifying areas for more in-depth discussion.
2. Become familiar with the Faculty Council on Access and Academic Support and its work to assure post-matriculation success.
3. Revisit the Intellectual Property and Copyright policies regarding curricular course materials, videotaping lectures, and posting course materials. Discuss the best way to make this information easily accessible to faculty and students.
4. Review faculty feedback from the online course evaluation system launch.
5. Consider the adequacy and effectiveness of Penn’s procedures for locating and responding to academic dishonesty. Consider the relevance of the incidence of reported cheating from the online course evaluation system as data.
6. Monitor trials of possible successors to Blackboard with appropriate support staff from the Penn Libraries.

A recent “Dear Colleague” letter from the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Education made it imperative that Penn revise its Charter for the Student Disciplinary System to be in compliance with both the letter and spirit of the Title IX law. On the urging of the Senate Tri-Chairs and Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns, this Committee took up one additional charge:

7. Examine changes to the Charter of the University of Pennsylvania Student Disciplinary System, which were made by the Provost’s Office with the assistance of the General Counsel.
8. Finally, 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, students and educational programs 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 Students and Educational Policy to undertake in academic year 2012-13. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Accomplishments

1. SCSEP Meeting with Dean of Admissions Eric Furda

The Committee held one meeting with Dean Furda, who reviewed the policies and practices of the Admissions Office. This meeting continued the regular consultation between this Committee and the Admissions Office that has transpired in recent years.

The Committee identified several areas of mutual concern, which we expect will be subjects of ongoing discussion: changes in the composition of incoming classes and the impact of those changes on the faculty; methods for identifying students with strong intellectual interests, as a counterbalance to Penn’s pre-professional culture; faculty involvement in the recruitment of students with especially strong academic interests; the ways in which selective institutions such as Penn influence, or can influence, secondary school curricula; admissions strategies for casting a wide net to ensure that applications are received from a diverse population of students. The Committee learned about Penn’s recent transfer applications from students at Miami Dade College, arguably the largest and most diverse college in the nation.

2. Familiarization with Faculty Council on Access and Academic Support (FCAAS)

The Committee met with Vice Provost for Education, Andy Binns, to discuss the work of the FCAAS. The FCAAS is performing in-depth sta-
tistical analysis of student outcomes at Penn, particularly by reviewing the performance of under-represented minorities relative to the larger student body. A recent focus has been student outcomes in “on-ramp” courses, which most of Penn’s undergraduates take in their first year. Additional topics under investigation are the 4- and 6-year graduation rates, GPA, post-graduate education and career choices. Current SCSEP Chair Ivan Dmochowski, now serves on the FCAAS, which will facilitate dialogue between these two bodies in the future.

3. Clarification of Penn’s Intellectual Property and Copyright Policies

The SCSEP learned that faculty and student questions regarding the dissemination of course materials are common, and to gain greater understanding of these issues, the SCSEP has met with the General Counsel’s Office in recent years. With an eye to disseminating the most important information to as many faculty and students as possible, Ivan Dmochowski met with Associate General Counsel Robert Terrell, to consider the creation of a FAQ list. An outline of topics to be covered in the FAQ will be circulated to the SCSEP, which will oversee the completion of this project in 2012-2013.

4. Review of Faculty Feedback from New Online Course Evaluation System

The SCSEP reviewed the “Dear Colleague” letter and the resulting revised Charter (Almanac April 10, 2012). Andy Binns gave a special 30-minute presentation on this topic. The Committee formulated a brief list of recommendations, which included providing special training to faculty who might serve on hearing panels for the Office of Student Conduct. In particular, the new “Preponderance of Evidence” standard (only 51% certainty required in reaching a verdict) poses new challenges for faculty members who serve on the hearing panel.

Additional issues were raised in this meeting with Andy Binns, including whether legal representation should be allowed at OSC hearings. The Committee learned that exclusion of legal representation from Penn’s academic hearing process mirrors that at many other academic institutions, and is not inconsistent with the intent of the “Dear Colleague” letter.

8. Consider Charges for the Coming Year

At its April meeting, the Committee reviewed the status of its charges and identified areas for continued work in the coming academic year. These topics are summarized below.

Recommendations for Next Year’s Committee

- Continue the dialogue that has been established with the Dean of Admissions. The SCSEP should consider with the Dean the admissions strategies that are likely to yield applications from academically gifted students with disadvantaged backgrounds. As examples, the SCSEP should get progress reports on efforts to expand Penn’s reach in local Philadelphia high schools as well as in targeted community colleges, in Florida and elsewhere.
- Develop a FAQ list for faculty and students on Intellectual Property and Copyright Policies of relevance to the academic mission. Robert Terrell, Associate General Counsel, has agreed to guide this effort. The SCSEP should decide how to make this information widely available.
- Continue to monitor the online course evaluation system, and consider whether slated improvements address faculty concerns.
- Continue to get updates on courseware options in consultation with relevant administrators from Penn’s library.

SCSEP Membership, 2011-2012

Ivan Dmochowski, School of Arts & Sciences/Chemistry, Chair
Christine Bradway, School of Nursing/Behavioral and Health Sciences
Ellis Golub, School of Dental Medicine
Shaun Harper, Graduate School of Education
John Jackson, Annenberg School for Communication and School of Arts & Sciences/Anthropology
Catriona MacLeod, School of Arts & Sciences/Germanic Languages and Literatures
Sheila Muraghan, School of Arts & Sciences/Classical Studies

Ex Officio Members:
Camille Z. Charles, School of Arts & Sciences/Sociology, Senate Chair
Susan Margulies, School of Engineering and Applied Science/Bioengineering, Senate Chair-Elect
Report of the 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: LE.-F., H.2., ILA.-D.

Specific Charges for 2011-2012 and Work Accomplished

1. Complete its evaluation of the role of non-standing faculty in undergraduate teaching by encouraging the four undergraduate schools to shape their data into a common format, using the Wharton report as a model. Complete the full comparative analysis by focusing on getting time-series historical data from SEAS and reformatting the SAS data to conform to the Wharton model. Upon completion of this analysis, review all data from the four undergraduate schools and develop recommendations if appropriate.

2. Make recommendations concerning how to get reports from the four undergraduate schools on an ongoing basis to monitor trends in teaching roles in consultation with the Office of the Provost. Confidentiality agreements for use of the data should be established and communicated to Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs Lynn Lees.

3. Review the confidentiality agreements that were made with the four deans of the undergraduate schools and that it was agreed that the data would be shared in broad terms with SEC. SCOF deferred discussion on how to get reports on an ongoing basis until the data from SEAS is received.

4. Review the 1997-1998 SCOF Report in which it endorsed a set of guidelines specifying what information would be needed when a school proposes changes for faculty tracks. Consider what changes, if any, might be appropriate in the needed information. Consult with the Provost’s Office to finalize this list. This specified information from the school would allow the Provost’s Office to enable full and fair review from SCOF/SEC.

SCOF reviewed the draft Guidelines for requests from schools for faculty track changes that were drafted in 1997-1998 and revised in 2011. The final Guidelines were sent to the Office of the Provost on October 25. These guidelines were implemented this year in time for the proposals from the GSE and the Perelman School of Medicine and it greatly expedited the Committee’s process for review (vide infra). The Guidelines are attached as an addendum to this report (see next page).

5. Examine past, current, and planned organization of major full and part-time faculty tracks in the Perelman School of Medicine including proportions of faculty in each track, rules for assignment to and promotion within each track, as well as and the rules and practices for switching between tracks. Similar information ought to be collected from the other health schools. SCOF notes that the new Dean of the Perelman School of Medicine, J. Larry Jameson, has engaged the PSOM faculty in strategic planning which may address some of the concerns in this charge. As a result, we recommend that this charge be deferred until the completion of the PSOM study.

Additional Charges

• Dean Andrew Porter of the Graduate School of Education requested a change in the language of the Faculty Handbook to increase the Senior Lecturers within the school from four to eight, with the Senior Lecturers at any time not to exceed twenty percent of the standing faculty. SCOF reviewed and evaluated this request. The Committee met twice to discuss this proposal and requested additional information from the GSE. After reviewing the information, SCOF agreed that the proposal is adequate and justified. The suggested revision was forwarded to SEC for a vote on March 21, 2012.

• Dean J. Larry Jameson of the Perelman School of Medicine requested a change in the language of the Faculty Handbook to amend the School’s Academic Clinician track to permit part-time employment. The Committee met twice to discuss this proposal and, after considerable discussion and deliberation, we agreed that the proposal is adequate and justified. The suggested revision was forwarded to SEC for a vote on May 9, 2012.

• We explored the question of the role of health benefits (and the lack thereof) on retirement decisions. We met with Leny Bader, director of Benefits, Sue Sproat, executive director of Human Resources; and Jack Heuer, vice president of the Division of Human Resources to discuss the impact of the extra cost of health benefits on faculty considering retirement. The data that they presented suggested strongly that post-retirement health care costs are not a barrier to retirement, and that quality of life issues were much more prominent in the decision-making process.

• 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 2012-2013. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Recommendations for the 2012-2013 Academic Year

• Finalizing the specification of the data that should be regularly collected to permit characterization of the role of non-standing faculty remains an important charge of SCOF in the coming year. Once the SEAS data have been obtained, a mechanism for the systemization of the regular accumulation of this data will be implemented.

• Examine past, current, and planned composition of all major full- and part-time faculty tracks in the Perelman School of Medicine, the rules for assignment to and promotion within each track, as well as and the rules and practices for switching between tracks. Similar information ought to be collected from the other health schools. SCOF notes that the new Dean of the Perelman School of Medicine, J. Larry Jameson, has engaged the PSOM faculty in strategic planning which may address some of the concerns in this charge. As a result, we recommend that this charge be deferred until the completion of the PSOM study.

• Provost Price has just announced a new initiative in which Penn, along with Princeton, Stanford, and the University of Michigan, will participate in Coursera, an open-access web platform for online classes, led by university faculty members, that draw on their areas of expertise and existing courses. SCOF was not consulted on this program, and it is incumbent on us to examine the effect of the faculty on this program, and vice versa.

SCOF Membership 2011-2012

Jeffrey Winkler, School of Arts & Sciences/Chemistry, Chair
Amy Sepinwall, Wharton School
Harold Feldman, School of Medicine/Epidemiology
Max Mintz, School of Engineering and Applied Science
Reed Pyeritz, School of Medicine/Genetics
Greg Urban, School of Arts & Sciences/Anthropology
Barbra M. Wall, School of Nursing
Ex Officio Members:
Camille Z. Charles, School of Arts & Sciences/Sociology, Senate Chair
Susan Margules, School of Engineering and Applied Science/Bioengineering, Senate Chair-Elect
Addendum: 
Guidelines for requests from schools for faculty track changes

The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) wishes to provide guidelines for proposed requests for faculty track changes in order to expedite the review process. The Committee agreed to require that, before it can advise on new requests for track changes, it should be provided sufficient information about the current distribution of the teaching roles in that school, including the most recent available information about the numbers of enrollments taught by personnel in various statuses, and the projected changes in those enrollments associated with the new appointments.

The questions and chart provided below comprise the guidelines for information that the Committee requires.

1. Why is the proposed faculty track change needed at this time? Assuming a strategic plan for the School is motivating the request, what are the principal elements at issue?
2. What is the cap for the new line as a percentage of the Standing Faculty? How was the cap set? How will the cap be monitored and enforced?
3. What will be the effect of the new faculty track be on part-time faculty? Were the part-time faculty consulted?
4. Please include in your proposal the outcome of the faculty vote. If the vote of the faculty of the School submitting the request was not unanimous, what were the concerns of those who dissented?
5. Will the new faculty track affect the teaching of undergraduate and graduate students and if so explain how this will change.
6. Explain how the roles of the new faculty track will differ from current faculty tracks. How will the criteria for promotion differ?

In the chart below please provide specific numbers of current and projected number of faculty and other teaching staff for all faculty track categories (including part-time and full-time status), and please correct the categories if they are incorrect or inapplicable. Please fill in current data and (to give some sense of your future expectations) for expected numbers and distribution for five years from now.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th># in current year</th>
<th># in five years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Full-time standing faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Tenure track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Clinician Educator track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Full-time academic support/associated faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Academic Clinicians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Research faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Lecturers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Instructors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Adjunct faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Practice Professor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Part-time academic support/associated faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Active emeritus faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Adjunct faculty (with professor as part of title)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Clinical faculty (with professor as part of title)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Part-time academic support/associated faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Clinical Associate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report of the 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.

2011-2012 Specific Charges

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

1. Monitor proposed changes in the Office of the Ombudsman, the Sexual Harassment Policy and the description of resources available to faculty for discussing and reporting workplace climate concerns. Follow up on the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on May 15, 2011: That the language describing the Office of the Ombudsman as a resource to faculty in regard to sexual harassment be updated to reflect current practice that is similar to that of our peer universities and that a set of written procedures be developed to provide for consistency in the work of the Office.

2. Evaluate the findings from the Faculty Climate Survey. Consider implications of results for issues under the broad charge of this Committee. Follow up with the Provost’s Office to discuss recommendations for changes in policies around identified concerns.

3. Continue to monitor and support the evolution of the Women’s Faculty Forum.

4. Continue to support accessible childcare & other family friendly policies. Investigate childcare access policies and capacity for faculty at Penn, relative to peer institutions.

5. Monitor development and implementation of the University’s Diversity Action Plan.

6. Continue to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the Faculty Handbook Policy II.E.3. Policy on Extension of the Probationary Periods that Apply to Granting of Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor, and in particular examine how this policy is utilized by gender. Clarify the policy regarding the option and timing for revoking extension of the tenure clock. Consider whether there are implications of this ‘extension’ policy as it relates to the third year review (i.e., reappointment), including whether delay of that review is required if an extension of the probationary period has been requested, and also how the results of a review happening before a decision has been made to extend the probationary period affects whether the extension can be requested.

7. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, recommend two or three high-priority charges.

Report of Activities
(10/20, 11/29, 1/24, 2/28, 3/13, 3/19, 4/24)

The Committee will have met a total of seven times by the end of the Academic Year. One meeting included the Vice President for the Division of Business Services and the Director of Penn’s Quality of Worklife Programs, one meeting included the Ombudsman and Associate Ombudsman as well as the Vice President for Institutional Affairs and one meeting was a joint meeting with the University Council on Diversity and Equity.

With respect to its charges

1. Monitor proposed changes in the Office of the Ombudsman, the Sexual Harassment Policy and the description of resources available to faculty for discussing and reporting workplace climate concerns. Follow up on the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on May 15, 2011: That the language describing the Office of the Ombudsman as a resource to faculty in regard to sexual harassment be updated to reflect current practice that is similar to that of our peer universities and that a set of written procedures be developed to provide for consistency in the work of the Office.

   a. Joann Mitchell, vice president for Institutional Affairs, was contacted and confirmed that the Sexual Harassment Policy was updated and continues to be monitored on individual school websites.

   b. Joann Mitchell came to discuss the proposed update to the Policy on Sexual Violence.

   c. Ombudsman Thadious Davis and Associate Ombudsman Marcia Martinez-Helfman discussed the role of the Office of the Ombudsman, resources for faculty/staff changeover, usage numbers, membership as an affiliate of the International Ombudsman Association, and the implications of the Ombudsman as a reporting office for cases of sexual harassment.

2. Evaluate the findings from the Faculty Climate Survey. Consider implications of results for issues under the broad charge of this Committee. Follow up with the Provost’s Office to discuss recommendations for changes in policies around identified concerns.

   a. Identified Faculty Climate Survey questions that will be informative to the charges of SCFDDE and requested data from the subcommittee analyzing the Faculty Climate Survey.

3. Continue to monitor and support the evolution of the Women’s Faculty Forum.

   a. Heard reports on the Women’s Faculty Forum activities at each meeting from Dr. Sherri Adams, President, Penn Forum for Women Faculty.

   b. Metro with Marie Witt, vice president for the Division of Business Services, and Marilyn Kraut, director of Penn’s Quality of Worklife Pro-
grams, with discussion points outlined below.

b. Penn currently has 156 slots at the Penn Childrens Center with an additional 50 guaranteed slots at 2 other facilities: The Caring Center and The Parent Infant Center.

c. Marilyn Kraut noted that Penn has an online and telephone program, Worklife Resources, which helps people identify day care centers in their area: https://new.mylifevalues.com/login.aspx

d. Parents in a Pinch usage has continued to increase for childcare.

e. Use of Parents in a Pinch for elder care has not been used.

f. Night childcare from 4-8 p.m. is being explored.

5. Monitor development and implementation of the University’s Diversity Action Plan.

b. Received updates on the progress of Diversity Action Plans from the Chair of the Senate Executive Committee and Diversity leaders from two schools.

c. Met jointly with the University Council Diversity and Equity Committee for a conversation with John Jackson, Senior Advisor to the Provost for Diversity.

6. Continue to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the Faculty Handbook Policy I.E.3. Policy on Extension of the Probationary Periods that Apply to Granting of Tenure or Promotion to Associate Professor, and in particular examine how this policy is utilized by gender. Clarify the policy regarding the option and timing for revoking extension of the tenure clock.

a. Concerns regarding the implementation of the Policy on Extension of the Probationary Period were discussed by the committee and with Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees.

b. A memo of explanation was sent to department chairs clarifying the intent of the policy by Vice Provost Lynn Lees.

7. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, recommend two or three high-priority charges.

a. Future charges are listed below.

**Recommended Activities for AY 2012-2013**

- Evaluate the findings from the Faculty Climate Survey. Considering the implications of results for issues under the broad charge of this committee and develop a list of priorities. Follow up with the Provost’s office to discuss recommendations for changes in policies around identified concerns.

- Monitor development and implementation of the University’s Diversity Action Plan. Ask the appropriate diversity coordinator from each school for a 1 to 2 page summary of their school plan. Look at plans for common needs where collaboration might be recommended.

- Continue to follow up with the Ombudsman’s Office on the resolution passed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on May 15, 2011: That the language describing the Office of the Ombudsman as a resource to faculty in regard to sexual harassment be updated to reflect current practice that is similar to that of our peer universities and that a set of written procedures be developed to provide for consistency in the work of the Office. In particular, discuss how to reconcile the role of the Ombudsman Office as a mandatory reporting center and the ability of the Ombudsman to maintain confidentiality. Continue to monitor child care, in particular the proposed night-time child care program for communication and usage.

- Follow and support the evolution of the Women’s Faculty Forum

**SCFDDE Committee Members, 2011-2012**

Kelly L. Jordan-Sciutto, School of Dental Medicine, Co-Chair
Peter Struck, School of Arts and Science/Classical Studies, Co-Chair
Sherri Adams, School of Dental Medicine
Julie Fairman, School of Nursing
Olena Jacenko, School of Veterinary Medicine
Randy Mason, School of Design
Salimah Meghani, School of Nursing

*Ex Officio Members:*
Camille Z. Charles, School of Arts & Sciences/Sociology, Senate Chair
Susan Margulies, School of Engineering and Applied Science/Bioengineering, Senate Chair-Elect

---

**Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty**

The 2011-2012 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty published its annual report in the February 28, 2012 _Almanac_; an executive summary as well as the full report are available online at [www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v58/n24/ef.html](http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v58/n24/ef.html)

**Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility**

The annual report of the 2011-2012 Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility will be published in a future issue.
General Committee Charge

The Committee 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, the conditions of faculty employment (such as personnel benefits), and information. In general the Committee deals with the matters covered by the following sections of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: I.A.-D., G.-H.I., I.-K., I.E., III., V., VI.

2011-2012 Specific Charges

1. Continue the discussion regarding faculty oversight of Master’s and Professional programs in the individual schools within the University. It may be appropriate to obtain information about school processes by interviewing the Dean and/or appropriate Vice Dean of each school. On the basis of these discussions consider whether to recommend some or all of the following with regard to faculty oversight: that each school maintain a list of its Masters and Certificate degree programs; that all programs have defined review criteria and have constituted a review committee including standing faculty for those programs; and that each school should conduct a full review all such programs on a fixed cycle.

2. Maintain oversight of review support and infrastructure necessary for applications to the major funding agencies—federal, state, local, and foundations. Discuss regulatory burdens on faculty to support research grants. Consider methods to reduce burden on faculty time, like the interface developed by the University for the ARRA reporting.

3. Discuss suggestions for revisions to the Faculty Grievance Procedure in collaboration with the current Grievance Commission, and the Vice Provost for Faculty. Determine if an ad hoc committee is needed to review the procedures in more depth.


5. Follow up on the recommendation that the Temporary Exclusion Policy be reviewed three years after implementing this new provision in order to assess its adequacy. Since the policy has not been implemented in the past five years; discuss whether it can be evaluated now, or whether the evaluation should be postponed.

6. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Senate Rules, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty and Administration over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on Administration to undertake in academic year 2012-2013. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Accomplishments

1. Data on Governance and Oversight of the School-Based Masters Programs

The SCOA committee this year spent almost all of its effort on this charge. This charge was a continuation of work by the 2009-2010 & 2010-2011 SCOA committees. Those groups had determined that individual schools oversee most Masters programs, as well as a variety of terminal degree certificate programs but that there was concern regarding their consistent oversight by appropriate faculty. In 2009-2010, a database was compiled that identified all of the school-based Masters and certificate programs at Penn. This year the Committee surveyed all schools to add information to the database on the size of their Masters programs. The committee was particularly pleased with the 100% participation of all the schools. There was discussion in the Committee about whether to next send out a questionnaire to Masters programs to better understand the degree of faculty governance and oversight. However this questionnaire was discussed with Dr. Andy Binns, vice provost for education, and his recommendation was, instead, that the next step would be for SCOA to interview a selection of Deans and/or appropriate Vice Deans to ascertain the status of these programs in their schools. As such, after better understanding the size and scope of the Masters programs, the committee began the interview process with a program that had spent time and resources to create a strong governance process over its Masters programs. This interview was very useful in understanding faculty governance processes across admissions, program curriculum, and teaching.

SCOA recommends that the discussion regarding oversight of Masters and Professional programs in the individual schools within the University be the primary charge of the Committee and be continued next year. The next steps should include interviewing a sample of Deans and/or appropriate Vice Deans of the schools to both determine the presence or extent of any oversight problems as well as to build a knowledge of best practices. After several such interviews, we recommend that a more broad survey then be conducted to determine where the University stands with regard to faculty oversight of Masters programs. The ultimate goal would be to offer a set of recommendations and suggestions for Masters programs faculty oversight.

2. Maintain Oversight of Review Support and Infrastructure Necessary for Applications to the Major Funding Agencies

The Committee noted that Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty is putting together several committees to examine these issues. The committee suggested that they should monitor the progress of that committee, however that committee did not reach a stage in which monitoring was possible.

SCOA recommends that at an appropriate time, they should get an update on the progress of Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty’s committees.

3. Discuss Suggestions for Revisions to the Faculty Grievance Procedure in Collaboration with the Current Grievance Commission, and the Vice Provost for Faculty

The Committee noted that there is a Grievance Commission comprised of three faculty members and that the Commission has expressed an interest in having a Senate committee review their rules. However, the Grievance Commission did not contact SCOA during this academic year.


This charge was removed from the Committee, although SCOA members noted that any implications from this case on Penn should be discussed with Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty.

5. Monitor Cases of Temporary Exclusion

This charge related to a prior recommendation that the revised policy relating to temporary exclusion be reviewed. However, given that there have been no cases of such exclusion, there was no basis for review.