Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

Since the formation of the Faculty Senate over 60 years ago, the standing faculty at the University of Pennsylvania share governance of all policies affecting faculty. The Faculty Senate Committees are the working groups charged to monitor, investigate and/or make recommendations regarding specific issues of concern to the faculty. The Senate Executive Committee (SEC), with representation from all 12 schools and all faculty ranks, meets monthly to discuss faculty suggestions and substantive policy issues with the administration. In addition SEC approves recommendations from the committees regarding changes to Penn’s policies, and practices. The Tri-Chairs (Past-Chair Camille Charles, Chair-Elect Dwight Jaggard, and myself as Chair) of the Faculty Senate meet regularly with administrative officials, including biweekly consultations with the President and Provost. In these meetings, we discuss issues raised by the faculty or that impact the faculty, collaborate on proposed solutions and partner on their implementation.

Highlights of 2012-2013

This year the standing Committees, SEC and three dedicated ad hoc committees addressed a broad array of important issues. Details are discussed in the Faculty Senate Committee reports included in this issue of Almanac. As Chair of the Faculty Senate, I will highlight those timely topics that integrate across these working groups and with the Tri-Chairs meetings with the administration.

Faculty Diversity. With the University’s Action Plan and the 12 individual school plans for Faculty Diversity in place, the SEC and the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDE) monitored the launch of initiatives, identified opportunities for collaboration across the 12 school-based Faculty Diversity plans. As an example, cross-school coordination of pipeline enhancement programs was recommended by SCFDDE to eliminate administrative redundancy and broaden outreach efforts. Given the Faculty Climate Survey demographic data that show the overwhelming majority of Penn faculty have partners in the workplace, most not at Penn and many not in academia, both SCFDDE and the Senate Committee on the Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) recommend centralization and expansion of dual career hiring processes to enhance hiring and retention of faculty. Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees was particularly supportive of expanding Penn’s collaborations across schools, with other regional Universities, and non-academic search agencies to improve partner job placement. She also supported changes to the Provost’s website to provide easy and open access to feature Penn’s family-friendly policies.

Analyses of the Faculty Climate Survey data by an ad hoc committee (led by Janice Madden, SAS) charged by the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate revealed areas for future attention to support and promote our diverse faculty and a need to enhance communication and within and across faculty groups to improve community climate. Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees plans to introduce an opt-in notification program to enhance faculty access to programmatic announcements about scholarly, educational, intercultural, and work-life balance opportunities. The Climate Survey findings will inform next year’s specific charges for the Faculty Senate standing committees. The Gender Equity Report published this year and the upcoming Minority Equity Report provide important baseline data for future evaluations of Penn’s progress towards diversifying faculty at all ranks and positions of leadership. In their discussions with SEC and the Tri-Chairs, the President and Provost enthusiastically supported initiatives to enrich faculty diversity. To communicate Penn’s progress in expanding and implementing initiatives to enhance faculty diversity, the President and Provost will publish a Faculty Diversity Action Plan next year.

Faculty Compensation. With additional data and analyses provided by Stacey Lopez of Institutional Research and Analysis this year for the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) and SCFDDE, the committees were able to identify nuances in persistent disparities in salaries within rank, with respect to our peers and for women faculty. Next year SCESF and Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA) will continue to study these issues, with expanded comparative information about faculty benefits and potential contributing factors to gender disparity in salaries.

Sabbatical Leave. Using data from the 2011 Faculty Climate Survey and focus group discussions, the ad hoc Sabbatical Committee, jointly charged by the Faculty Senate and Office of the Provost and led by Tom Sollecito (Dental), identified barriers to the use of sabbatical leaves for scholarly refreshment and proposed actions. After review by SCOA, formal resolutions were approved by SEC to provide faculty with annual notice of sabbatical credits, enhanced transparency about processes to request leave, information about which duties faculty are relieved of during leave, and the range of flexible formats for scholarly refreshment (e.g. part-time sabbatical leave while continuing clinical duties). In partnership with Office of the Provost, the Faculty Senate will work with the Deans to implement these resolutions this year.

Faculty Administrative Burdens. SEC and SCOA worked closely with Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty and Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli to reduce faculty burdens associated with the administration of research. Improvements in information technology, animal research, human subjects research and travel reimbursement procedures were planned or implemented this year.

Aligning Policy and Practice. The Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators is now online and fully searchable, providing easy access to up-to-date policies that affect faculty. An ad hoc committee jointly formed by the Office of the Provost and the Faculty Senate and composed of faculty representatives from the Faculty Senate leadership, the Faculty Grievance Commission, the Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility (SCAFR), the Office of the Provost and chaired by Ted
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Ruger (Law) has been charged to revise the *Handbook* Faculty Grievance procedures to update processes, enhance transparency, describe mediation roles and improve consistency between policy and practice.

In another effort to align *Handbook* policy with practice, an ad hoc committee formed by the four health schools is considering revisions to the Standing Faculty—Clinician-Educator track, and discussed underlying principles with SEC and the SCOF this year. Next year, after track changes are drafted and approved by the Standing Faculty of each health school, SCOF will review the proposed changes to the *Handbook*, and make recommendations to SEC to consider.

**Graduate, Undergraduate and Online Education.** This year, the rapid expansion of Penn’s online educational initiatives (including Coursera) stimulated vigorous discussion in SCOA, SEC and the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) about faculty oversight in course approval, issues related to intellectual property and copyright, conflicts of interest and commitment, academic integrity, metrics for evaluating course quality and the economic and pedagogical impact of online educational materials. In partnership between the Provost and the Faculty Senate, these discussions will continue in the upcoming year to integrate new opportunities with existing or revised policies and practices.

Another area of cross-committee focus this year was to understand the role of standing faculty in undergraduate teaching and our masters programs (SCOF and SCOA, respectively). Next year, committees will discuss the economic and philosophical aspects of the changing balance of standing and non-standing faculty in our educational mission.

In March, SEC opened their monthly meeting to the entire University community to discuss the economic and educational challenges facing research-intensive universities and implications for the future. The presentations by Ron Ehrenberg (Cornell) about the economic landscape and Andrew Delbanco (Columbia) about what/how students learn are posted for viewing on the Faculty Senate website (www.upenn.edu/faculty_senate/announcements.html) and these issues will be addressed in the upcoming year in the Faculty Senate standing committees and in discussions between the Tri-Chairs and the administration.
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*Susan Margulies*

George H. Stephenson Term Chair in Bioengineering and Professor of Bioengineering, School of Engineering and Applied Science

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

The 2012-2013 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty published the Economic Status of the Faculty, 2011-2012 Report in the February 26, 2013 *Almanac*; an executive summary as well as the full report are available online at [www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v59/n23/ESF.html](http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v59/n23/ESF.html)

**Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility**

The annual reports of the 2012-2013 and 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 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 in section IV of the University’s Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators.

2012-2013 Specific Charges

1. 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.

2. Develop a FAQ list for faculty and students on Intellectual Property, Copyright Policies, and new Conflict of Interest 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.

3. Discuss the goals, administrative structure and faculty involvement for Coursera with Provost Price. Monitor faculty participation in Coursera and use of the platform in Penn’s courses.

4. Meet with Lauren Steinfeld, from the Office of Audit, Compliance, and Privacy to review the Guidelines for the Use of Social Media at Penn.

5. Continue to monitor the online course evaluation system and consider whether slated improvements address faculty concerns.

6. Continue to get updates on courseware options in consultation with relevant administrators from Penn’s library.

7. The University Council on Academic and Related Affairs is continuing discussions on Best Practices for Academic Integrity with Vice Provost for Education, Andy Binns. Consider engaging with the University Council on Academic and Related Affairs in this discussion.

8. 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 2013-14. 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. The Admissions office has noted an increase in the number of applications in Engineering, as well as in Physics and Math. Conversely, applications from students expressing interest in Economics, Political Science and the Arts have been decreasing. Recent changes in the Penn website and improvements in promotional materials were intended to attract a more intellectually curious student. However, Dean Furda believes there is more work to be done to make Penn most appealing to the “life of the mind” student.

In its effort to create a diverse student body, Penn Admissions considers socioeconomic factors, first-generation college status, parent employment, zip code and other factors. Penn is part of the Questbridge program, which is a national outreach effort that identifies high-achieving students from a lower socioeconomic background. Penn is shifting attention to the Southeast as that population of college-age students is increasing, whereas the college-bound population in the Northeast has started to decrease. Dean Furda noted that in the past four years Penn has increased the number of Hispanic students, but that to achieve national representation of Hispanic students at Penn would require matriculation of 120 additional students per class.

SCSEP Recommendations

The Committee recommends greater dialog between Admissions and Penn faculty on issues regarding admitted student academic profiles, as a changing composition of the student body can have a large impact on individual departments.

The SCSEP notes that many of Penn’s peer institutions have fared much better in recent years in increasing student diversity. The SCSEP believes that Penn must learn from successful strategies at peer institutions and then adopt policies to increase the pool of applications from qualified under-represented minorities and first-generation college students, and to improve student recruitment in this very competitive arena. Penn has a very dynamic urban campus and broad course offerings that should appeal to a diverse student body, but many high school students outside of the mid-Atlantic region are still not familiar with Penn as an Ivy League university.

2. Develop a FAQ List for Faculty and Students on Intellectual Property, Copyright Policies and New Conflict of Interest Policies

The Committee met on two occasions with the Associate General Counsel Robert Terrell, Scholarly Communication Librarian Shawn Martin, and Associate Librarian—Collection Development & Management Martha Brogan. In consultation with the SCSEP, a draft FAQ list was generated that provides helpful guidance on intellectual property and copyright policies that are often confusing to faculty and students. The SCSEP is working with Shawn Martin to finalize the FAQ list, and this list will be posted at the Library website in the next few months. This one-page list will help to guide users to a large number of online resources provided by the Penn Library.

SCSEP Recommendation

The SCSEP encourages Penn faculty to spend time reviewing the FAQ list when it becomes available online, as these are important and complicated issues that impact many aspects of teaching and scholarly work.

3. Discuss the goals, administrative structure, and faculty involvement for Coursera with Provost Price

The SCSEP met with Professor Ed Rock, Director of Open Course Initiatives. He hopes that faculty using Coursera will use technology or other non-traditional methods to disseminate knowledge. He also suggested that Coursera may be a catalyst to improve teaching at Penn, for example,
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in the creation of “flipped” classroom experiences.

Professor Rock explained that the first call for Coursera proposals, which appeared in October, 2012. Each proposal must be reviewed and signed by the Department Chair and Dean. To produce each Coursera course costs Penn roughly $50,000, which will be shared by the school and Provost. A Coursera Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) has been established, which will serve two functions:

- Act as a consultative body for Ed Rock and the Provost to consider issues and programs related to online learning.
- Review and select all proposals for new courses, within the Provost’s budget.

Professor Rock opined that it is too early to establish metrics for Coursera course “success.” He noted that one type of success was evident in courses attracting tens of thousands of enrollees, and the high level of student engagement.

SCSEP Recommendations

The SCSEP has concerns that the Coursera course selection process will bypass the curriculum committees established in the different Schools. Professor Rock stated that the Coursera FAC will act as a curriculum committee, but it will be important to make sure that courses have sufficient intellectual merit and are not redundant with other Coursera offerings from Penn. There may be issues as Coursera grows, about course redundancy with Coursera offerings from other schools.

There are growing pressures for Penn faculty to make lectures available to students online and to adopt teaching methods that promote student activity in the classroom. SCSEP believes that it will be important to track course reviews for faculty who are flipping their courses, with a goal of identifying best practices. Are student learning outcomes improved for all subjects and for both small and large courses?

The committee notes that due to the time and resources required to produce and run Coursera courses, it will be more realistic for the majority of Penn faculty to use the Canvas platform to disseminate interactive educational materials to Penn students.

4. Meet with Lauren Steinfeld, from the Office of Audit, Compliance, and Privacy to review the Guidelines for the Use of Social Media at Penn

The SCSEP met with Lauren Steinfeld in October, 2012. She highlighted a new document, Guidelines for the Use of Social Media at Penn, which addresses issues that may arise regarding the responsible use of social media in the context of Penn’s teaching, research, service and administrative functions. The SCSEP endorsed this document.

5. Continue to Monitor the Online Course Evaluation System

The Committee met with Vice Provost for Education Andy Binns, to learn about the status of the online course evaluation system. Student response rates are much higher for the online course evaluations and students have reported that they feel less time encumbered. There is a working group that meets with Rob Nelson, Director of Education, to address technical and academic issues with the online course evaluation system. The University courseware will be moving from Blackboard to Canvas, which has put planned changes to the online course evaluation system on hold.

SCSEP Feedback

There appears to have been little change (or improvement) in the online course evaluation system in the past year. SCSEP has ongoing concerns about the lack of control that faculty have over when students evaluate the course, and the types of questions that are posed to students.

SCSEP members also noted that questions for the online evaluation system vary across schools. There is currently little faculty consultation concerning the question selection for each school’s online course evaluation system. Vice Provost Andy Binns stated that he will ask Rob Nelson to strongly encourage the working group to consult with faculty.

The course evaluation system has identified student cheating in some courses. It will be important for faculty to be able to pose additional questions within the course evaluation system that will help to identify patterns of cheating.

6. Get Updates on Courseware Options from Penn Library Administrators

This issue was tabled due to the impending decision for Penn to go with Canvas.

7. Consideration of Penn’s Procedures for Treating Academic Dishonesty

Vice Provost Andy Binns updated SCSEP on recent developments concerning Academic Integrity. The Office of Student Conduct is now fully staffed and has a new staff member who is an experienced mediator.

Binns explained that the Committee on Undergraduate Education (CUE) in the School of Arts & Sciences drafted a report on Academic Integrity recommending that the Charter of the University of Pennsylvania Student Disciplinary System be revised to reflect the greater flexibility and leniency in the current disciplinary system. Also recommended in the CUE report were changes to the current academic disciplinary system, to facilitate reporting of student disciplinary issues and detect repeat offenders.

SCSEP Recommendations

The Office of Student Conduct should continue its outreach efforts to inform students and faculty of the services it provides.

SCSEP endorses CUE’s recommended changes to the Penn Charter. SCSEP also supports the creation of new online resources to lower faculty barriers to reporting incidents of student academic misconduct, and new software to identify student repeat offenders.

8. Consider Charges for the Coming Year

SCSEP identified areas for continued work in the coming academic year:

- Continue discussing with Dean of Admissions the strategies that are likely to yield applications from academically gifted students from underrepresented groups, including those with disadvantaged backgrounds. Is progress being made to expand Penn’s reach in local Philadelphia high schools as well as nationally in targeted community colleges?
- Work with the Library to finalize the Intellectual Property and Copyright Policy FAQ list, and help to disseminate this information to faculty and students.
- Continue to monitor the online course evaluation system, and consider whether scaled improvements address faculty concerns. Continue to advocate for the inclusion of new polling features in the online course evaluation system.
- Meet with the Coursera Faculty Advisory Committee to learn about its involvement in overseeing Coursera. Meet also with Professor Ed Rock, Director of Open Course Software, to consider the academic outcomes from Coursera, and the impact that faculty involvement in Coursera is having on Penn’s on-campus students. The SCSEP is interested to meet with Penn faculty who are experimenting with flipped classrooms.
- Continue discussing with Penn faculty and Provost Andy Binns on Coursera options in consultation with relevant administrators from Penn’s library.
- Consider faculty concerns within the professional schools that there is more training that should be provided to prepare students for the competitive job market.

SCSEP Membership 2012-2013

Emily Blumberg, Perelman School of Medicine/Emergency Medicine
Christine Brady, School of Nursing/Behavioral & Health Science
Ivan Dmochowski, Chair, School of Arts & Sciences/Chemistry
Ellis Golub, School of Dental Medicine/Biochemistry
Jorge Santiago-Aviles, School of Engineering and Applied Science/Electrical & Systems Engineering
Michael Weisberg, School of Arts & Sciences/Philosophy

Ex Officio Members:
Susan Margules, School of Engineering/Bioengineering, Senate Chair
Dwight Jaggaard, School of Engineering/Electrical & Systems Engineering, Senate Chair-Elect
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., H.2.A.-D.

2012-2013 Specific Charges

1. Finalize the specification of the data that should be regularly collected to permit characterization of the role of non-standing faculty in undergraduate teaching. Once all of the data have been obtained, a mechanism for the systemization of the regular accumulation of this data should be determined and implemented.

After deliberating the issue, the committee reiterated that the regular collection of data on the role of non-standing faculty in undergraduate teaching is important for providing a clearer picture of the evolution of the faculty’s core mission. The committee recommends that this data should be collected when faculty track changes are proposed. An additional guideline, soliciting the undergraduate course units taught by standing faculty vs. non-standing faculty, should be added to the Guidelines for Requests for Faculty Track Changes, with the Wharton report to SCOF from 2011 being provided as a model for the format of data presentation. The specific language for the additional guideline should be worked out in consultation with the Vice Provost for Faculty.

2. Consider and recommend essential elements of a dual career hiring/retention resources website to serve needs of Department Chairs, current faculty, recruits and administrators.

The committee conducted extensive review and discussion of the issue of dual career hiring and retention. In fewer than a third of these cases, faculty or staff positions at Penn are sought. In such cases, if the recruit and the accompanying partner would occupy separate schools, the Provost’s office and the recruiting school subvene the accompanying partner’s salary during a five-year window.

In other cases, the work of trying to place an accompanying partner falls to the ingenuity of the recruiting school. In order to gain a better understanding of what is currently being done along these lines, we interviewed:

- Vicki Mulhern, Executive Director of Faculty Affairs and Professional Development, School of Medicine
- Ann Perch, Director of Faculty Administration at Wharton
- Roxanne Gilmer, Assistant to the Chair, Management Department at Wharton
- Pat Rose, Director of Career Services

From these interviews, and further conversation with Lynn Lees, Vice Provost for Faculty, the committee judged that many people currently at the university are already working diligently to find employment for accompanying partners. The committee recommends a greater role for the Office of the Provost in coordinating this work.

On the basis of these considerations, the committee recommends:

- That the Office of the Provost develop and maintain a website to be the central resource for dual career hiring. The main audience for the website should be hiring committees and secondarily recruits and accompanying partners themselves.
- The further development of the Higher Education Recruitment Consortium (HERC) database of job listings in institutions in Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Maryland.

- That the Office of the Provost designate a preferred third party vendor, such as Career Concepts, or other provider, who can assist schools in placement of Accompanying Partners interested in non- academic employment.
- That the Office of the Provost steer recruiting schools to Pat Rose at Penn’s Career Services, whose services are currently used by recruiting schools in some cases, and who expressed a willingness to expand her program’s role in this area.

3. Review and get an update on the Perelman School of Medicine strategic planning process with Dean J. Larry Jameson as it pertains to potential changes in the PSOM faculty track descriptions and caps. Discuss the rules for assignment to and promotion within each track, as well as the rules and practices for switching between tracks. Clarify the timeline for proposed PSOM actions. Similar information ought to be collected from the other health schools.

At the close of the year, the committee and SEC heard a presentation from Lisa Bellini, Vice Dean for Faculty Affairs, School of Medicine, updating us on the ongoing conversation about clarifying the description of the Clinician Educator track. The conversation has evolved into a larger one among the four health schools, including medicine, veterinary medicine, dental medicine and nursing. The Vice Deans of these schools were appointed to a committee by Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees to work up a set of principles to guide the revision of language in the faculty handbook describing the track. The individual schools will vote on these principles before the close of AY12-13.

4. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Senate Rules, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty 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 2013-14. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

a) SCOF should carry forward the implementation of the regular collection of data on the role of non-standing faculty in teaching of undergraduates by working with the Vice Provost of Faculty to approve specific language for an additional guideline, requesting data on non-standing faculty, to be added to the Guidelines for Requests for Faculty Track Changes.

b) Penn’s initiatives in Open Learning should remain a topic for SCOF. The potential of these developments to reshape the core mission of the faculty is both large and not yet fully understood.

c) SCOF should continue to work with the health school’s vice deans as they carry forward the process of consultation with their faculties on guidelines for the rules for assignment to, promotion within and caps on the numbers within each of their faculty tracks. The committee will be in a position to receive formal proposals after consultation with the faculty within each school and in consultation with the Provost’s office.

SCOF Membership 2012-2013

Harold Feldman, Perelman School of Medicine/Epidemiology
Ron Harty, School of Veterinary Medicine/Pathology
Amy Sepinwall, Wharton School/Legal Studies & Business Ethics
Peter Struck, School of Arts & Sciences/Classical Studies, Chair
Mindy Schuster, Perelman School of Medicine/Infectious Diseases
Barbara M. Wall, School of Nursing/Family & Community Health
Jeff Winkler, School of Arts & Sciences/Chemistry
Santosh S. Venkatesh, School of Engineering & Applied Science/Electrical & Systems Engineering

Ex Officio Members:
Susan Margulies, School of Engineering/Bioengineering, Senate Chair
Dwight Jagard, School of Engineering/Electrical & Systems Engineering, Senate Chair-Elect
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.

2012-2013 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. 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 Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees to discuss recommendations.

2. Monitor the continued 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's plan. Look at plans for common needs where collaboration might be recommended.

3. Discuss the Gender Equity Report in consultation with Vice Provost Lynn Lees and offer recommendations as needed.

4. Continue to follow up with Ombudsman 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.

5. Continue to monitor child care, in particular the proposed night-time child care program for communication and usage.

6. Monitor and get updates on the activities of the Women’s Faculty Forum.

7. 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 SCFDDE to undertake in academic year 2013-2014. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Report of Activities

The Committee met a total of seven times (once jointly with the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity 4/22) (10/17, 11/27, 12/10, 2/7, 3/12, 4/4). Invited guests included Joann Mitchell, Wendy White, Marcia Martinez-Helfman, Lynn Lees, Lubna Mian and John Jackson.

Accomplishments Specific to Charge

1. Faculty Climate Survey.
   a. Climate data not yet available. This issue will be a priority for next year.

   a. After meeting with John Jackson, Senior Advisor to the Provost for Diversity, about common themes in the plans, SCFDDE reviewed the diversity plans for each school and prepared recommendations for cross-school collaborations and centralized support (see box on page 7).

   b. SCFDDE recommends that the Diversity Plans on Schools’ public websites should include diversity definitions specific to the school. Currently some definitions are very narrow and may exclude gender and sexual diversity. Other definitions were very broad and reflected inclusivity rather than diversity and preclude the development and evaluation of meaningful metrics and strategic initiatives.

   c. Met with the University Council Committee on Diversity to review their survey of the Diversity Search Advisor program and suggestions for next year.

   d. SCFDDE meetings with Diversity Officers from each school is deferred till next academic year, when every school should have a School Diversity Plan representative in place.

   a. At the request of SCFDDE and Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF), this year’s report contains new regressions and tables.

   b. SCFDDE reviewed the report, suggested changes, and met with Vice Provost for Faculty Lynn Lees to discuss implications.

4. Ombudsman Office.
   a. The Committee met with Joann Mitchell, Wendy White and Marcia Martinez-Helfman to discuss policies and practice regarding confidentiality and reporting. New language was proposed to provide clarity, and alternative structures were discussed that would align the University with other peer institutions in terms of confidentiality and mandatory reporting.

   b. Joanne Mitchell and Marcia Martinez-Helfman are surveying peer institutions for best practices. A report to SCFDDE will be ready next year.

   c. Finalizing this language should be a priority for SCFDDE next year.

5. Child Care.
   a. Night-time child care program discontinued due to low enrollments and high cost.

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

(continued on page 7)
Recommendations for 2013-2014:

a. Evaluate the Findings from the Faculty Climate Survey. Develop a list of priorities and follow-up with the Provost’s Office to discuss recommendations for changes in policies around identified concerns.

b. Continue to monitor development and implementation of the University’s Diversity Action Plan and School plans. Ask the appropriate diversity officer/coordinator from each school for a 1 to 2 page summary of progress to date. Schedule meetings with School Diversity Officers to discuss progress.

c. Discuss cross-school collaboration recommendations with Vice Provost for Faculty.

d. Update language on confidentiality for the Office of the Ombudsman that is in line with peer institutions and upholds ability of the Office to maintain confidentiality. Address findings from peer institution survey and incorporate into language.

e. Follow and support the Women’s Faculty Forum.

SCFDDE Members 2012-2013

Sherri Adams, School of Dental Medicine/Biochemistry
Julie Fairman, Chair, School of Nursing/Behavioral Health Science
Olena Jacenko, School of Veterinary Medicine/Animal Biology
Priti Lal, Perelman School of Medicine/Pathology & Lab Medicine
Heather Love, School of Arts & Sciences/English
Mitch Marcus, School of Engineering & Applied Science/Computer and Information Science
Salimah Meghani, School of Nursing/Family & Community Health
Ignacio Tapia, Perelman School of Medicine/Pediatrics
Ex Officio Members:
Susan Margulies, School of Engineering/Bioengineering,
Senate Chair
Dwight Jaggard, School of Engineering/Electrical & Systems Engineering, Senate Chair-Elect

SCFDDE Recommendations for Cross-School Collaborations and Coordination to Enhance Faculty Diversity

I. Enable Networking among Diversity Officers:

• Encourage each school to identify Diversity Deans, Directors, Officers, and Search Advisors and bring them together as a group for cross-school conversations, support, initiative and training.
• Identify and merge best practices from diversity programs already in operation across schools.
• Develop a website with “best practices” and a discussion board for diversity search advisors and officers to share ideas and generate collaborative strategies.
• Recognize that diversity issues and measurement surrounding ethnic and gender identity may be difficult to measure. Review online faculty application and remove any bias in demographic questions. Encourage diversity officers to share different types of measures, metrics and benchmarks that are successfully used across schools and programs.

II. Promote Cross-School Collaboration on STEM Pipeline Initiatives:

• Health schools, SAS and SEAS should develop a coordinated effort to increase the STEM pipeline for middle school and high school students in the region, and career outreach through undergraduate to graduate programs.
• Create a centralized mechanism to coordinate the pipeline/recruitment efforts among the health schools/SAS/SEAS, and thereby engage faculty, students and staff in a common initiative while minimizing administrative redundancy.

III. Highlight Penn Benefits in School-Specific Diversity Plans:

• Publicize Penn faculty benefits that may be important to LGBQTQ prospective and current faculty, such as the adoption benefit, health benefits for domestic partners, or coverage for sex reassignment surgery. Ensure all diversity search advisors and officers are aware of these faculty benefits.
• Provide links to Penn’s dual career hiring programs and family friendly policies in all recruitment efforts.

IV. Facilitate University-Wide Initiatives to Support Faculty Diversity and Development:

• Introduce incentive programs to encourage collaboration on diversity programs across schools.
• Create a campus-wide climate of inclusiveness for the community through social events and cultural awareness events, lunches and other social activity to encourage cross-school group discussions and activities for under-represented groups across campus to nurture cross-school communities.
• Build on already existing initiatives and create new University-sponsored and cross-school sponsored speaker series related to diversity and inclusion.
• Expand mentoring support. Develop a cross-school/University training program and online resources for faculty mentors. Introduce mid-career mentoring and professional development programs.
• Provide centralized coordination for and expansion of dual career recruitment and retentions.
General Committee Charge

The Committee on Faculty and the Administration: 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.1., I.-K., II.E. III., V., VI.;

2012-13 Specific Charges

1. Continue discussions on the oversight of Masters and Professional Programs in the individual schools within the University. 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 knowledge of best practices. After several such interviews, a more broad survey might then be conducted to determine where the university stands with regard to faculty oversight of Masters Programs. After this review, develop a set of recommendations and suggestions for Masters’ programs faculty oversight.

2. Discuss the Ad Hoc Sabbatical Committee Report and review the committee’s recommendations with Vice Provost Lynn Lees. Review the Ad Hoc Sabbatical Committee and the Ad Hoc Faculty Climate Review Committee’s assessment of sabbatical data from the Faculty Climate Survey.

3. Discuss the progress of Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty’s committees that are charged to review: conflict of interest, human subject research, animal research, effort reporting, financial reporting, select agents and toxins, export controls, IT systems and training. In particular, identify opportunities to reduce the faculty administrative burden while maintaining regulatory compliance and ways to improve processing time for grant submission.

4. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge, as provided in the Senate Rules, and identify what you believe to be the most pressing issues facing the Faculty and Administration over the next few years. In light of your discussions, recommend to the Senate Executive Committee two or three high-priority charges for the Committee on Administration to undertake in academic year 2013-14. In explaining these charges, outline any appropriate actions you suppose the Senate might conceivably take after its review.

Accomplishments

Discussion and review of masters and professional programs across the University. SCOA’s review of the University’s Masters and Professional Programs has been ongoing for a few years. This year we heard from Norm LeVes, SAS Vice Dean for Professional and Liberal Education, and David Bieber, Executive Director College on LPS masters programs. Our plan for next year is to construct guidelines for what we view as best practices regarding: admissions criteria, faculty oversight of curriculum, periodic review of the program, and career mentoring.

Recommendations based on review of Faculty Senate’s Ad Hoc Sabbatical Committee. Upon review of the ad hoc committee’s report on sabbatical leave policies across all the Schools, SCOA made three recommendations.

1. Faculty should be informed annually of their accrued sabbatical leave credits, preferably in their annual salary letter.

2. Descriptions of different sabbatical leave options, including part-time sabbatical leaves when applicable, should be readily available. For clinical faculty, the specific duties from which the faculty member would normally be relieved should be clearly defined.

3. Procedures for requesting a sabbatical, including how far in advance the faculty member must notify their department, should also be clear.

The Senate Executive Committee adopted all three recommendations by resolution, the first in December and the others in April. The Provost presented the first recommendation to the Deans, who agreed to report earned sabbatical leave credits to their faculty annually, although not necessarily in a salary letter. SCOA hopes the University will work toward implementing a Web-based sabbatical leave accounting system, where each faculty member may check his/her own accrued leave credits.

Discussion of progress made by Senior Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty’s committees reviewing policies and reporting systems related to research and extramural research funding. Some SCOA members heard Dr. Fluharty’s report to SEC in fall 2012, and he updated SCOA in April. He noted the need to reduce faculty time spent on administrative tasks related to research and extramural funding, and he updated us on the activities of the following working groups: Financial Conflict of Interest Policy, which completed a revised policy but is still meeting, the Animal Welfare Committee, which has made strong recommendations for reorganizing the Office of Animal Welfare, the Human Subject Committee, and the Research Administration Committee. A working group was recently formed to examine research-related IT issues. A committee on use of select agents is yet to be formed. SCOA made no recommendations regarding Dr. Fluharty’s report.

Review of draft document applying the University’s Conflict of Interest Policy for Faculty Members to Online Teaching. This document came to SCOA late in the year and generated a great deal of discussion within our committee, both about the University’s Conflict of Interest Policy as applied to online teaching and about the policy itself, more broadly applied. The document is scheduled for publication in the Almanac soon, and SCOA recommended that publication should be accompanied by requests for faculty comments. The Senate Tri-Chairs will convey this recommendation to the President and Provost.

Recommended charges to SCOA for 2013-2014. SCOA identified two items for the Committee’s attention next academic year.

1. Wrap up consideration of masters and professional degree programs across the University by constructing recommendations for what SCOA views as best practices regarding: Admissions criteria, faculty oversight of curriculum, periodic program review and career mentoring.

2. Revisit the University Conflict of Interest Policy and its application to online teaching, paying particular attention to feedback received from the faculty.
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