

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate

It has been my great privilege to serve as Chair of the Faculty Senate this past academic year. As a faculty member who studies higher education administration, I have greatly appreciated the opportunity afforded by this position to learn about, and to try to address, important issues facing our University.

The University of Pennsylvania has a strong commitment to shared governance. Established in 1952, the Faculty Senate is a University-wide deliberative body comprised of all members of the standing faculty across the 12 schools. There are approximately 4,600 faculty at the University of Pennsylvania, of whom 2,566 are standing faculty (i.e., tenure track and clinician educators). The 58-member Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meets monthly to discuss current policy issues with senior administrators (including the Provost and the President each term), conduct business (such as voting on alterations to the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*), and consider and approve reports of the Senate Committees. SEC includes representatives from all 12 schools, as well as a non-voting representative from the Penn Association of Senior and Emeritus Faculty. The Senate is led by its Tri-Chairs: Past Chair (Reed Pyeritz, Perelman School of Medicine), Chair-Elect (Santosh Venkatesh, School of Engineering and Applied Science), and Chair.

Much of the work of the Faculty Senate is accomplished by the Senate's committees. The year-end reports of the committees follow. This report summarizes accomplishments and ongoing initiatives, and acknowledges the contributions of individuals who have facilitated the Senate's activities.

Accomplishments

March of Solidarity

Following racist messages sent to Black Penn students on November 16, 2016, the Senate led a march of solidarity for the Penn community. Participants included faculty, staff, and students, as well as President Amy Gutmann, Provost Vincent Price, and other senior administrators. Prior to the march, the Senate Executive Committee passed the following resolution:

On behalf of the Standing Faculty of the University of Pennsylvania, the Faculty Senate Executive Committee endorses the "Statement from Penn President Amy Gutmann About the Presidential Election" and the "Statement from the University of Pennsylvania Regarding Racist Messages Sent to Students." As a faculty, we stand in solidarity with our Black students, faculty, and staff, and all who are feeling targeted, unsafe, and vulnerable. We condemn racism and bigotry on and off our campus, and we are firmly committed to the advancement of equity, inclusiveness, and constructive dialogue on our campus and to ensuring that all persons are treated with dignity and respect. We commit to addressing the bigotry that has been on display in the election cycle and making our campus a safe environment for everyone.

International Faculty and Students

Following the first Executive Order on Immigration, the Faculty Senate organized a gathering on January 30, 2017 in front of College Hall to demonstrate support for those affected. At its February 15 meeting, SEC voted unanimously to endorse the "Message to the Penn Community Regarding Immigration from Amy Gutmann." A majority of SEC members present voted to endorse the "Academics Against Immigration Executive Order" open letter that was signed by more than 31,000 individual US faculty members. At its April 2017 meeting, SEC discussed with Penn Global Executive Director Amy Gadsden and International Student and Scholar Services Director Rudie Altamirano the actions Penn has taken to address the implications of the Executive Orders for the Penn community.

Ad Hoc Committee on Government Engagement

On February 15, 2017, SEC members voted to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on Government Engagement. Chaired by SEC member Neill Epperson (Perelman School of Medicine), the Committee is charged with recommending ways that SEC can advocate for faculty at Penn and nationwide. One emerging initiative is a University-wide teach-in, tentatively planned for Spring 2018. The committee is also considering ways to coordinate with leaders of Faculty Senates at other universities to create a multi-university event. On April 18, the Faculty Senate co-sponsored with

the Annenberg School a panel discussion with two journalists and two Penn faculty: "Do Facts Still Matter? Media, Politics, and Education in a Post-Truth Era." The planned Spring 2018 teach-in is expected to build on this discussion to encourage conversations within and across Penn's 12 schools about how to communicate about facts and ideas with a wide and diverse audience and how to recognize that knowledge may not equally benefit all communities.

Ongoing Initiatives

Faculty Equity and Diversity

The 2017 Inclusion Report summarizing the University's progress on the 2011 Five-Year Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence identifies several issues that require continued attention. While there has been some progress in raising the representation of women and underrepresented minorities among the standing faculty, more work is required. Progress has also been uneven across the 12 schools. Data from the climate survey indicate that women, underrepresented minorities, LGBTQ, and associate rank faculty express lower levels of satisfaction than other faculty. In its 2017 report, the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) identifies gender inequity in salaries, especially at the associate professor rank, and underscores the need to consider gender bias in the predictors of salaries (e.g., rank, time in rank). The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA) has been working with the administration to develop policy that will allow Penn faculty to be reimbursed for childcare expenses associated with travel for research purposes. The Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (SCFDDE) offers several recommendations for improving policies and practices for finding employment for spouses and partners of faculty who are being recruited and/or retained. Continued attention is needed to these issues, as well as to the representation and experiences of LGBTQ Penn faculty.

Diversity and Inclusion

Continued attention is also needed to other aspects of diversity and inclusion. Over the course of the year, the Senate has engaged in several efforts designed to promote knowledge of how to improve diversity and inclusion. On December 2, the Faculty Senate and the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty co-sponsored a Diversity Forum during which diversity search officers and other participants from across campus discussed effective practices for increasing faculty diversity and inclusion. On December 6, the Tri-Chairs convened a luncheon to learn about the experiences of Penn's Presidential Professors. On January 24, the Faculty Senate, along with the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity, Penn Forum for Women Faculty, and the Campaign for Community convened a "Listening to Diversity" forum. During this session, members of the Penn community voiced concerns and shared suggestions for how Penn might bring about productive change. On April 7, the Faculty Senate co-sponsored a seminar on Inclusive Classroom Practices led by the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). A document detailing best practices for inclusive classroom practices is posted on the CTL website. The Tri-Chairs also worked with Associate Vice President for Business Services Chris Bradie to develop a tip sheet on textbook affordability and, at its April meeting, SEC discussed ways to reduce the costs to students of textbooks and supplies. We will continue to work with constituencies across campus to identify effective strategies for improving diversity and inclusion of students and faculty.

Non-Standing Faculty

The Senate Committee on Faculty (SCOF) is charged with reviewing changes proposed by schools about faculty size, appointments, and tracks. While each change on its own often has merit, also important are the aggregate effects of changes in the Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff. At its January meeting, SCOF Chair Amy Sepinwall (Wharton) led a discussion with SEC members about this issue. Continued attention is needed to the principles and practical issues that guide the evolution of faculty at the University of Pennsylvania, as well as the representation of the Associated Faculty and the Academic Support Staff in governance at the university level and within individual schools.

Report of the Chair of the Faculty Senate (continued from page 1)

Student Mental Health and Wellness

Student mental health and wellness continue to be important concerns of the faculty. As noted by the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) in its 2016-2017 report, the University has launched a number of programs designed to improve student behavioral health and wellness. Continued attention is needed to the availability, usage, and short- and long-term outcomes of programs serving particular populations. We also need an evaluation of the Wellness Ambassador Program and more systematic communication between faculty and students about psychological wellness.

Faculty Compensation

The Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF) has continued its important work of reporting academic base salaries and benefits of Penn faculty. The Senate continues to regret that more than half of the standing faculty is not represented in the data provided annually to SCESF. The Senate will continue to request that data provided by the Provost's Office be expanded to include the academic base salary for all standing faculty, including tenure-track faculty in the clinical departments of the Perelman School of Medicine.

Communication with Faculty

Effectively communicating information about Senate activities is also an ongoing challenge. The 36 "constituency members" of SEC provide one channel of communication between SEC and Standing Faculty constituents. We encourage faculty who are interested in becoming involved with the Senate to contact the Office of the Faculty Senate. Please also follow the Senate's Facebook page.

Acknowledgements

The University's commitment to shared governance is clear. On behalf of the Faculty Senate, I want to express my sincere appreciation to President Gutmann and Provost Price for the time and energy that they devote to our regular conversations and consultations. We are grateful for their willingness to discuss issues that are important to the Senate and administration. We appreciate their openness and receptivity to our views and perspectives, and we thank them for including the Senate in emerging and ongoing initiatives. We also appreciate the efforts that they have made to keep us apprised of issues pertaining to the departure of Provost Price and the selection of a new Provost. Per the guidelines set forth in the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*, the Faculty Senate identified six standing faculty to serve on the advisory committee for the search. The Senate wishes Provost Price well, as he transitions to his new role as President of Duke University. We tremendously appreciate the many contributions he has made to Penn over the years, including his service with the Faculty Senate (including Chair) as well as Provost.

We are also grateful to the Vice Provosts for their time and engagement. Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen, was especially helpful, meeting regularly with the Tri-Chairs and Senate Committees to discuss issues pertaining to faculty diversity, salaries, and climate. Vice Provost for Education Beth Winkelstein, Vice Provost for University Life Valarie Swain-Cade McCoullum, Vice Provost for Research Dawn Bonnell and Vice Provost for Global Affairs Zeke Emanuel also thoughtfully engaged with the Senate on various issues. University Vice President and Secretary Leslie Kruhly effectively facilitated the Senate's interactions with the University Council and its committees. We are also grateful to Assistant Vice President for Community Relations Glenn Bryan for leading SEC members on an insightful bus tour around West Philadelphia, highlighting work Penn is doing with our local community.

Following the example of my predecessor, Reed Pyeritz, I met individually with the deans of all 12 schools, the Vice Provosts, and other senior administrators during the summer of 2016 to prepare for my role as Chair. Their views and counsel informed the agendas that the Tri-Chairs set for SEC and the Senate committees. In addition to the topics discussed above, this past year the Tri-Chairs, Senate Committees, and/or SEC held discussions about Penn's work in West Philadelphia, information security at Penn, the academic calendar, graduate student unionization, sexual violence, political advocacy, online instruction, food insecurity and textbook

costs, first generation and low income students, career services available to students, active shooter training, cross-school collaboration, and the role of social media for communication.

We very much appreciate the time that many other individuals made to talk with us, including: Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli, Senior Vice President and General Counsel Wendy White, Vice President for Public Safety Maureen Rush, Executive Director of Faculty Affairs Lubna Mian, Vice President for Government Affairs Jeffrey Cooper, Director of Media Relations Ron Ozio, Associate Director for News Amanda Mott, Manager of Internal Communications Heather Davis, Senior Manager of New Media Communications Matt Griffin, Associate Professor of Biology and Penn faculty athletics representative Paul Schmidt, Executive Director of the Office of Government Affairs and Community Relations Dawn Maglicco Deitch, Dean of Undergraduate Admissions Eric Furda, Information Security Officer Joshua Beeman, Provost Administrative Affairs (PAA) Chief of Academic Finance and Planning Trevor Lewis, PAA Director of Administrative Affairs Julie Shuttleworth, Director of Counseling and Psychological Services William Alexander, Director of Student Intervention Services Sharon Smith, Sexual Violence Investigative Officer Deborah Harley, Director of Student Sexual Violence Prevention and Education Jessica Mertz, Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning Bruce Lenthall, Vice President for Business Services Marie Witt, Associate Vice President for Business Services Michelle Brown-Nevers, Associate Vice Provost for Equity and Access Will Gipson, Director of Special Services in the Division of Public Safety Patricia Brennan, Graduate Education and Initiatives Executive Director Anita Mastroieni, Associate Vice President for Business Services Chris Bradie, Penn Global Executive Director Amy Gadsden, International Student and Scholar Services Director Rudie Altamirano, Director of Career Services Pat Rose and Vice Provost and Director of Libraries Carton Rogers.

The accomplishments of the Senate depend on the effectiveness of its committees. This year's committee chairs provided exceptional leadership: for SCFDDE, Regina Austin (Law); for SCAFR, Vivian Gadsden (GSE); for SCESF, Susan Margulies (SEAS/Bioengineering) and Robert Stine (Wharton); for the Senate's Committee on Committees, Brendan O'Leary (SAS/Political Science); for the Senate Committee on the Publication Policy for *Almanac*, Martin Pring (PSOM/Physiology); for the Faculty Grievance Commission, Mitch Marcus (SEAS/CIS); for the Senate Nominating Committee, Susan Margulies (SEAS/Bioengineering); for SCOF, Amy Sepinwall (Wharton); for SCOA, Pamela Sankar (PSOM/Biomedical Ethics); and for SCSEP, Dominic Sisti (PSOM/Biomedical Ethics). As indicated in the individual committee reports that follow below and in prior issues of *Almanac*, the committees have generated useful insights and recommendations on many important issues. We are grateful for the engagement of each member of every committee.

I am particularly grateful to have had the opportunity to work with Past Chair Reed Pyeritz and Chair-Elect Santosh Venkatesh. Their insights, perspectives, and wisdom have been invaluable, and I have not only enjoyed the many hours we have spent together but also learned a great deal from our many conversations. I have also benefited from the exceptional assistance of J. Patrick Walsh, executive assistant to the Senate. Patrick has provided the essential support that is required to organize and conduct productive meetings and activities, and make possible our accomplishments.

I conclude by extending a warm welcome to Jennifer Pinto-Martin (Nursing), the next Chair-Elect. I look forward to working with Jennifer (as Chair-Elect), Santosh (as Chair), and other colleagues in my capacity as Past Chair in the coming academic year.



Laura W. Perna,
James S. Riepe Professor
Graduate School of Education
Faculty Senate Chair, 2016-2017

Report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP)

General Committee Charge

The Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) oversees and advises the Senate 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 matters covered in Section IV of the University's *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*.

2016-2017 Specific Charges

1. Review the ways in which Penn communicates the availability of the mental health services it provides to students and faculty.
2. Continue to review the implementation and expansion of the Faculty Wellness Ambassador program.
3. Consider whether and how teaching evaluations can be used to assess classroom climate.
4. In collaboration with the Campaign for Community and any other appropriate organizations, convene an event that invites all members of the Penn community to engage in an active discussion on ways in which a welcoming environment can be created for all students on campus, especially first-generation students and those from low-income households.

Report & Recommendations

Over the course of the 2016-2017 academic year the SCSEP held eight regular meetings, one telephonic meeting, and an open forum. The committee primarily focused on issues related to behavioral health and wellness and the campus environment which represents both a continuation and extension of the previous year's SCSEP work. The committee also examined a proposal to change the academic calendar; this proposal was tabled. This report summarizes the Committee's recommendations across these two broad areas. The Committee did not address Charge #3 and recommends it be included in the charges for next year.

Initiative Inventory & Evaluation

Since the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare promulgated its February 2015 Report, the University has launched a number of programs designed to improve student behavioral health and wellness. In part because the concepts of "psychological wellness" or "behavioral wellness" are particularly vague, the scope of these activities has been broad. Some of these activities are aimed at providing urgent support to students in psychiatric crisis or distress, such as efforts to expand Clinical and Psychological Services (CAPS) clinical operations and services and the addition of new rapid crisis response systems. Other initiatives aim to improve student wellness and the campus environment, such as the availability of wellness activities, i.e. massages and snack breaks, during exam weeks. The SCSEP recognizes the value of wellness activities across this broad spectrum of need. However, it is important to distinguish between and strategically prioritize, wellness activities and initiatives.

The SCSEP recommends that the Office of the Provost, with support from the SCSEP and appropriate faculty experts, conduct an inventory of all University initiatives that support student psychological wellness. SCSEP further recommends items in the inventory be categorized according either to specific student populations or to the level of the psychological, behavioral, or clinical risk they aim to address. SCSEP recommends the University publish this inventory and encourage school deans, department chairs, and other relevant administrative leaders to broadly and regularly communicate the availability of these resources to their constituents. Metrics of successful outcomes of these programs should be identified to facilitate the initiation of longitudinal studies by Vice Provost for University Life (VPUL) to measure the impact of each of the programs on the desired, but measurable outcomes. These metrics and evidence-based outcomes should be made publicly available in pre-determined increments.

SCSEP Mission and Charges

The SCSEP recommends that the Faculty Senate include student wellness as a standing charge for the SCSEP, amending its name to the Senate Committee on Student Wellness and Education Policy. The SCSEP would

therefore be charged with oversight and development of behavioral health and wellness programming at the University each year, including periodic review of metrics defined by the administration. In committing the SCSEP to this task, the Senate would send a clear message that the Faculty is dedicated to improving the psychological well-being of the student body.

Promoting Wellness Communication

SCSEP uncovered a number of communication gaps between students and faculty. Faculty and instructional staff should receive clear, regular communications providing instructions for addressing psychological distress among students. Direct communication between faculty and students concerning psychological wellness should be encouraged in the classroom. SCSEP recommends the University—to the greatest extent possible and with respect to and consent from students and families—maintain supportive contact with students who are on leave due to mental health conditions.

SCSEP recommends that all faculty and instructional staff include a statement on their syllabi that conveys the University policy on accommodations. This statement should be universal in nature such that no confusion across schools can be construed. The CAPS phone number should be printed on all student, faculty and staff PennCards. Faculty should receive CAPS information in email and hardcopy at the start of each semester. A banner on Canvas should be added that directs students to relevant wellness resources. In addition, communication across faculty governance structures—particularly SCSEP and the University Council—should be enhanced to synergize effort and activity on identifying and accomplishing common charges related to student wellness.

Finally, we urge University leadership to convey the importance of student wellness and available resources in Convocation and other important addresses to the entire University community.

Improvement & Oversight of Wellness Ambassador Program

In 2015, the Senate Executive Committee recommended that a Mental Health and Wellness Ambassador Program be piloted. This program was to provide special training for a core group of faculty members in schools and departments so that they could serve as a resource for their colleagues as questions about student mental health (best practices, campus resources, crises management) arose in their academic units.

The Wellness Ambassador Program has been launched and continues to expand across the University. Initially, Ambassadors were situated within the four undergraduate schools. There are now Wellness Ambassadors in those schools and in some of the graduate schools. This is a very positive development, as faculty members become more engaged in student behavioral health and find colleagues willing and able to assist them when encountering students in distress or crisis. There is at the moment no systematic evaluation regime in place for the Program, and individual Ambassadors have anecdotally expressed confusion about their roles and responsibilities. It will be critical to define these roles and identify metrics for success of this program and conduct ongoing evaluation.

The Faculty Senate and the SCSEP should provide support to the administrative leadership in recruiting Ambassadors, communicating to all faculty-campus wide the names of Ambassadors, and evaluating the impact of the Program. Faculty ambassadors should establish direct lines of communication with faculty and student leaders of mental health and wellness groups. The names of Ambassadors should be published on the corresponding faculty affairs website in each school, and a unified set of procedures should be in place for use across all schools. SCSEP stresses the importance these Ambassadors play as resources for students in need. It is important that the role of the Wellness Ambassador does not become overly burdensome on the part of the faculty member or serve as a substitute for interface with other mental health providers.

Fostering Behavioral Health Integration

Penn Behavioral Health is home to the nation's top clinical psychiatrists, psychologists, and other behavioral health providers and services. Yet, these resources are often out of reach to students, faculty, and staff. The SCSEP encourages Penn Behavioral Health and the Office of the VPUL, along with other key stakeholders within Penn Medicine and Penn Nursing, to design a

(continued on page 4)

Report of the Senate Committee on Students and Educational Policy (SCSEP) (continued from page 3)

pathway for students, faculty, and staff to gain affordable and timely access to clinicians and services of Penn Behavioral Health.

Support of Student Groups

Student groups (peer groups) often represent the front line of mental health intervention on campus. There are now over two dozen University-sanctioned groups committed to psychological or behavioral wellness. Some of these groups function independently and others are chapters of larger national organizations. The University provides financial support to these groups so that they can convene, develop programs, and offer opportunities to members and the student body. It is unclear how well integrated these groups are with the wellness and behavioral health infrastructure or their knowledge of each other.

The SCSEP recommends that student groups should receive increased financial support and training opportunities such as mental health first aid training, following the completion of an initial inventory of existing University-sanctioned groups in order to determine the extent to which their missions overlap so as to minimize duplication of effort and use of resources. Student leaders should be closely aligned with Faculty Wellness Ambassadors and extant university resources.

Counteracting Toxic Competitiveness

In its 2015 report, the Task Force on Student Psychological Health and Welfare correctly stated, "Like its peer institutions, Penn has a highly competitive academic and extracurricular culture that some students perceive to demand perfection. Such perceptions may lead to pressures to succeed both academically and socially that may be unrealistic and lead to feelings of being overwhelmed. Some experience depression or other forms of distress often evidenced by changes in behavior."

The SCSEP recommends that faculty and instructors remain conscientious about the level of course work and expectations for each student. Faculty should be prepared to accommodate individual requests for deadlines if a student appears to be in distress. Students should be educated about the health and well-being ramifications of taking on too many responsibilities and should be encouraged to set reasonable limits on their academic coursework and extracurricular activities and on the importance of periodic self-evaluation with respect to these concerns.

Social Media Use

The SCSEP recommends that programming be developed and provided to students concerning the impact of social media on psychological wellness. An emerging body of evidence suggests that social media use is correlated with mental illnesses such as depression and distressing situations arising from feelings of envy, cyberbullying, and sexting. A seminar series that includes interactive discussions and formal didactics on the impact of social media on mental health and wellness should be launched.

I CARE

The I CARE program has trained over 1,800 faculty, staff, and students at Penn. The SCSEP recommends that leaders at CAPS consider ways to incentivize participation in I CARE. As one hypothetical example, CAPS, in conjunction with relevant department chairs and deans, might consider developing a comprehensive I CARE course in which students could enroll and earn 0.5 course units. Upon completion of proper training, faculty members would also receive credit toward their teaching loads when they instruct student-focused I CARE courses.

In addition, SCSEP recommends that CAPS coordinate and integrate I CARE offerings within the College House and Academic Services, offering the program across the residential system for publicity and ease of participation.

University Recovery Center

The University currently lacks a robust infrastructure to support students who are recovering from addiction and substance use disorders. The

ideal infrastructure consists both of accessible support services and a physical environment for continued recovery, such as substance-free housing options and meeting spaces for recovery group meetings. The Association of Recovery in Higher Education offers resources and background on university recovery communities and programs at peer institutions as well as guidance for developing such programs. The SCSEP, VPUL, CAPS, Residential Services, and student leaders should convene an exploratory group with the aim of developing a plan for substance-free spaces and housing.

Revising the University Academic Calendar

The Senate Executive Committee (SEC) established an Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Academic Calendar, which was chaired by SEC member Ron Donagi (SAS/Mathematics). The proposal generated from that Ad Hoc Committee was presented to SEC, which referred it to the SCSEP for further deliberation. The SCSEP invited Dr. Donagi and faculty colleagues from Wharton and Nursing who had cited concerns about the effect of the proposed calendar on academic life within those schools. The SCSEP also met with representatives from the Office of the Vice Provost for Education to discuss challenges related to implementing the proposed calendar should it be adopted. The School of Nursing cited concerns that the proposed calendar would not meet with Nursing accreditation standards and would also jeopardize relationships with clinical sites at which their students receive real-world experience. Other schools were receptive to the proposal or to generally exploring options to optimize the current University Academic Calendar. After due diligence was conducted and the SCSEP deliberated, it decided to table the proposal. The SCSEP recommends, however, that the Senate Tri-Chairs continue discussions with the Provost and the Deans to explore ways to optimize the current system. It invites input from members of the Penn community on this matter by writing the Senate Office.

Outstanding Charges

Because of time constraints and the complexities of other issues it reviewed, the SCSEP did not consider whether and how teaching evaluations can be used to assess classroom climate. It recommends this charge be continued to the 2017-18 academic year.

Recommendations to the 2017-2018 SCSEP

1. Continue to assist with the implementation and evaluation of the Faculty Wellness Ambassadors Program.
2. Consider the feasibility of the development of a Senate standing committee on Student Wellness, or consider requesting to the Faculty Senate that its name and general charge be amended to include student wellness (as described above).
3. Support and assist the University in exploring the development of a University Recovery Center and housing.
4. Consider whether and how teaching evaluations can be used to assess classroom climate.
5. Elevate the discussion of academic calendar revisions and monitor progress on proposals.

SCSEP Membership

Paulo Arratia, SEAS / MEAM & CBE
Laura Desimone, GSE
Sharon Irving, Nursing
Carol Muller, SAS/Music
Karen Redrobe, SAS/History of Art
Ralph Rosen, SAS/Classical Studies
Jorge Santiago-Aviles, SEAS/ESE
Dominic Sisti, PSOM/Medical Ethics & Health Policy, *Chair Ex Officio*:
Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair
Anita Summers, Wharton, PASEF non-voting member
Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty

The 2016-2017 Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty published the Economic Status of the Faculty Report in *Almanac* February 28, 2017: see The Executive Summary: <http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v63/n25/pdf/022817-supplement.pdf>
The Full Report: <http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v63/n25/pdf/est-long.pdf>

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF)

General Committee Charge

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

2016-2017 Specific Charges & Steps Taken

1. Identify mechanisms for better communication and collaboration between school-based faculty governing bodies and the University Faculty Senate.

In addressing this Charge, SCOF focused its efforts on identifying ways of enhancing communication between Standing and non-Standing Faculty ("NSF") and proposing a mechanism for NSF to communicate with one another across schools (*see Appendix A online*). There remains work to be done in enhancing communication and collaboration between school-based governing bodies and the University Faculty Senate (*see Proposed Charge #1, below*)

2. Initiate a review of teaching by Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty in the undergraduate schools with respect to numbers of courses and students taught, and student evaluations.

In 2010-2012, SCOF undertook a study entitled "Who's Teaching Our Students?" Each school submitted data reflecting the breakdown in among Standing Faculty and the various categories of NSF. These data are now at least five years old. SCOF recommends that each school be asked for updated data (*see Proposed Charge #2, below*).

At the time of the original data collection, there was no standard set of instructions dictating what specific data should be collected and how it should be analyzed and formatted. SCOF determined that Wharton's submission was the clearest and most comprehensive, and it recommends that Wharton's submission be used as the model for all future such data collection. SCOF has retained on file a copy of the 2011 Wharton submission for ease of reference.

3. Convene an event that invites the faculty to engage in an active discussion on the role and future of faculty at Penn [and]

4. Consider the ongoing development of online delivery of educational programming (including but not limited to MOOCs) and its implications to global engagement.

SCOF spent a considerable amount of time discussing the various issues that online education raises, and it decided to address some of these at an event held in April 2017 that was open to the entire university. The event, "Online Learning Initiatives at Penn: Where Are We Going?", involved a panel discussion featuring Kostas Daniilidis, professor of computer science and director of online education for SEAS; Peter Decherney, professor of English and cinema studies, current chair and member since 2012 of the Provost's Faculty Advisory Committee on Online Learning, and chair of the SAS Faculty Advisory Committee on Online Learning; Don Huesman, managing director of Wharton Online Learning; and Anne Trumbore, senior director of Wharton Online Learning. The panelists described the current online offerings and plans for the future. Among the key issues addressed was the way in which online courses would interact with traditional modes of content delivery; the burdens and benefits to faculty of developing and producing online courses; the objectives of the various initiatives, and how the university aims to evaluate whether they are met; and what the future holds for OLI at Penn.

The session was recorded, and SCOF plans to make a bookmarked version of the event available online to the university community at large.

Given how rapidly online learning initiatives are developing and changing the landscape of education for our students and those outside the university who access our online offerings, SCOF recommends that next year's committee continue to monitor online learning (*see Proposed Charge #3, below*).

5. Consider any matters affecting faculty size, appointments, and tracks brought to the committee by individual schools.

SCOF reviewed and ultimately approved the following proposed changes to the faculty composition and conditions of employment:

a. A proposal from GSE to eliminate the 10-year employment limit for positions of Practice Professor and Associate Practice Professor;

b. The creation of a Practice Professor Track and a Senior Lecturer Track in SP2;

c. The creation of a Practice Professor Track at the Annenberg School for Communication; and

d. The introduction of an Assistant Professor of Practice rank, and a change in the understanding of the Practice Professor role, in SEAS.

Since reviewing proposals for track changes is a core SCOF function, SCOF recommends that next year's committee undertake this important work (*see Proposed Charge #4, below*).

Other SCOF Work

In addition to addressing the 2016-2017 charges, SCOF undertook several other initiatives:

1. In the fall, SCOF reviewed a portion of aggregated results from the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey. The data suggested some interesting findings, but SCOF thought the task of distilling insights from aggregated results information too ambitious, given SCOF's other work. The committee ultimately concluded that it would defer work on the data to other Senate committees. SCOF understands that the Provost's Office is considering adoption of policies on the basis of the results, at which point SCOF could engage with these products directly (*see Proposed Charge #5, below*).

2. Prompted by proposals to enlarge the number of NSF in various schools, but also by work done by prior years' committees, SCOF spent a considerable amount of time discussing concerns about the status of NSF. These discussions were central to planning an event SCOF organized, at which SEC members were invited to discuss the role of NSF across the University and any associated concerns. That discussion took place at a January 2017 SEC meeting. The thoughts articulated by the members of SEC gave rise to further SCOF discussions, in light of which SCOF has developed four policy recommendations re-garding NSF (*see Appendix A*) as well as identifying possible further work for next year's SCOF (*see Proposed Charge #6, below*).

Proposed Charges for SCOF in 2017-2018:

1. Identify mechanisms for better communication and collaboration between school-based faculty governing bodies and the University Faculty Senate.

2. Initiate a review of teaching by Academic Support Staff and Associated Faculty in the undergraduate schools with respect to numbers of courses and students taught, and student evaluations.

3. Continue to monitor online learning initiatives with an eye to safeguarding the University's academic mission.

4. Consider any matters affecting faculty size, appointments, and tracks brought to the committee by individual schools.

5. Review the Provost's Inclusion Report (released in Spring 2017), which is in part based on results from the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey.

6. Attend to issues concerning the status of non-Standing Faculty (NSF). In particular:

a. Identify best practices for giving voice to non-Standing Faculty (NSF) within the departments/schools in which they serve, on matters directly relevant to them (*see Appendix A, item number II*);

b. Invite schools with Lecturer and/or Practice Professor Tracks to revise the appropriate subsections of the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators* (II.B.3 and II.B.4); describing the criteria for advancement within each of these tracks (*see Appendix A, item number III*); and

c. Develop and seek implementation of a mechanism for including NSF in a non-voting capacity on SEC (*see Appendix A, item number IV*).

SCOF Membership

Yianni Augoustides, PSOM/Anesthesiology

Eric Feldman, Law

Lea Ann Matura, Nursing

Susan Suavé Meyer, SAS/Philosophy

Mindy Schuster, PSOM/Infectious Diseases

Amy Sepinwall, Wharton, *Chair*

Tom Sollecito, Dental School

Lyle Ungar, SEAS/CIS

Ex Officio:

Laura Perna GSE, Faculty Senate Chair

Gino Segre, SAS/Physics, PASEF non-voting member

Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Report of the Senate Committee on the Faculty and the Administration (SCOA)

2016-2017 Specific Charges

Our specific charges this year were to:

1. Review (annually) the implementation of the Faculty Handbook Conflict of Interest policies in consultation with the Office of the Provost, including ways that individual schools define, apply, and enforce the policies.

SCOA focused its annual review on possible variation of policies across Penn's 12 schools. SCOA found that most schools rely entirely on the University policies. Among those that augment University policy with school-specific guidelines, there were some ambiguities about which policy had precedence. Efforts currently underway to integrate all schools into a centralized computerized reporting system for reporting extramural research might address some of these issues.

Recommendation: Retain this established charge for 2017-2018 or consider adding it to SCOA's general charge.

2. Review policies regarding use of grant funds to reimburse childcare expenses associated with travel for purposes of the funded project.

SCOA discussed the issue of whether and how Penn faculty could be reimbursed for childcare expenses associated with travel for research purposes, in particular for attending conferences. A few schools at Penn, including Annenberg and Wharton, sometimes provide reimbursement for these expenses, but the University policy does not include childcare costs as covered expenses. A recent NIH policy clarification has highlighted this inconsistency. NIH established that grant funds can be used toward travel expenses for dependent children only if reimbursement of those expenses is permitted by the University's reimbursement policy generally for travel expenses. Thus, as long as Penn's policy disallows the expense, Penn faculty with NIH funding cannot use NIH funds for this purpose.

SCOA's preliminary investigation revealed that many other universities do reimburse these expenses, including Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Brown, Cornell, University of Michigan, and Stanford. Discussion with Vice Provost for Faculty, Anita Allen, established that her office is working on developing a Penn policy to allow reimbursements for childcare expenses associated with travel related to attending conferences. Outstanding questions include: to whom such a policy would apply, whether the funds can be used to reimburse only childcare or child and adult care, whether it should be managed by the University or by the schools, and what should be the annual maximum payment for such expenses. Vice Provost for Faculty Allen emphasized that several Penn offices are involved in developing the policy and that she hoped that a new one would be available within six months.

Recommendation: SCOA should retain this charge for 2017-2018.

3. Continue to review the scope and effectiveness of the University Research Foundation's funding process.

SCOA began its review of the scope and effectiveness of the University Research Foundation (URF) funding process by examining the program's restructuring announced in September 2016 by Vice Provost for Research Dawn Bonnell. This restructuring added a new group of funding opportunities designed to support investment in emerging research areas—the program's announcement cited Precision Medicine as an example—while maintaining support for the URF's original objectives, which include funding junior faculty and supporting projects in disciplines where external funding is difficult. Noting that the new initiative to fund emerging research seemed designed to support disciplines that already had access to robust external funding (such as medicine and engineering), SCOA asked how URF would distribute funds between its "new" and "old" priorities.

SCOA reviewed online sources, heard from committee members who have served as reviewers for URF proposals, and posed questions to the Vice Provost. SCOA learned that the new program will be supported by additional

funds and so will not at this time entail reduced support for the original URF priorities. Also of note: the first Research Opportunity Development Grant to be awarded under the new program went to a proposal from SAS entitled *Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf: Cities and Maritime Networks 2500-2000 BCE* and received an award that totaled \$180,000. SCOA also inquired into the source of URF funds and whether they could (or should) be increased. SCOA learned that some of the funding currently comes from an endowment and that a significant fundraising effort would be necessary to increase future funding award amounts and numbers significantly.

Recommendation: SCOA should conduct a periodic review of the number and dollar amount of grants awarded by URF in both old and new categories.

4. Review Penn's standard contracts for Massive Open Online Courses and consider ways in which the University could enhance its support for faculty who are interested in launching new MOOCs.

SCOA initiated a review of several issues related to faculty involvement in online learning courses including intellectual property rights that arise in connection with Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and other forms of online courses.

SCOA reviewed contract templates, heard from committee members concerning online master's programs at PSOM and SEAS, and met with Peter Decherney, Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Open Learning Initiatives, who provided an overview and update on the state of online learning initiatives at the University.

SCOA's preliminary investigation suggests that online learning is evolving rapidly at Penn and is taking a variety of forms of which MOOCs are one. A decision this year by the Provost to shift oversight of online courses from the University level to the schools complicates the task of reviewing policies governing these activities. Staffing turnover across the current academic year within Penn's Online Learning Initiative also contributes to the challenge of collecting current information. SCOA commends the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) for convening the April 4 symposium "Online Learning at Penn: Where Are We Going?" and intends to fully review the information gleaned from that session for its future deliberations. The recently-named Faculty Director of the Online Learning Initiative, Rebecca Stein, has expressed a commitment to engage with the Senate on these issues in Fall 2017.

The expansion of online courses suggests growing interest among Penn faculty in developing online versions of their courses. The website for Penn's Online Learning Initiative lists over 100 online courses across all schools. Absent centralized oversight of these activities, review of the variety of arrangements governing faculty participation and intellectual property still remains a priority. Informing faculty of the opportunities and challenges posed by this dynamic situation is important.

Recommendation: SCOA recommends that this charge remain active for 2017-2018 and its scope be expanded to encompass all courses with online components.

SCOA Membership

Xinyin Chen, GSE
 Ken Drobotz, Veterinary Medicine
 Katherine Margo, PSOM/Family Medicine
 Irina Marinov, SAS/Earth and Environmental Science
 Pamela Sankar, PSOM/Biomedical Ethics, *Chair*
 Talid Sinno, SEAS/CBE & MEAM
Ex officio:
 Marshall Meyer, Wharton, PASEF non-voting member
 Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair
 Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Report of the Faculty Senate Grievance Commission

The Faculty Senate Grievance Commission of the University of Pennsylvania is an independent committee consisting of three faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. This commission is available to members of the Penn faculty and academic support who allege they have been subject to action that is contrary to the University procedures, policies, and/or regulations, that is discriminatory, or that is arbitrary. During Academic Year 2016-2017, the commission was composed of Parvati Ramchandani (PSOM/Medicine, Past Chair), Mitchell Marcus (SEAS/Computer and Information Science, Chair), and James Palmer (PSOM/Otorhinolaryngology, Chair-Elect).

During the year, the commission was approached by three members of the faculty, two of whom had been denied tenure, and one of whom, a part-time clinical faculty member, had been terminated after a professionalism hearing.

In all cases, the individual had several initial discussions with the Chair of the Commission about the grievance process, the circumstances of the case, discussions about clarifying the issues that might be grounds for a grievance, and discussions about the procedures for submitting a formal grievance letter. In one tenure case, the faculty member decided not to pursue a formal grievance. In the second tenure case, the faculty member has submitted a formal grievance which will remain outstanding for further consideration in the upcoming year. In the final case, the faculty member filed a formal grievance. The Commission is pursuing additional information from the grievant's school and has not yet reached a determination of whether the case should result in a hearing panel.

Mitchell Marcus, Grievance Commission Chair, 2016-2017

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

General Committee Charge

The Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (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 that make recommendations for implementation.

2016-2017 Specific Charges

1. Review the information that is disclosed to potential users of the services of the Office of the Ombudsman to assure that it clearly and fully explains the role of the Office of the Ombudsman.
2. Evaluate the findings of the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey, particularly as they relate to women, minorities, underrepresented minorities, and LGBTQ faculty, and identify areas of concern.
3. Review and evaluate the Final Report of the five-year Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence.
4. Review policies and practices for finding employment for the spouses and partners of faculty who are being recruited and/or retained.
5. Convene an event to engage Penn faculty in an active discussion on how faculty diversity can be further enhanced at Penn.
6. Maintain communication between the SCFDDE and the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.

Report of Activities

The Committee met a total of eight times (09/22, 10/13, 11/17, 12/08, 01/19, 02/23, 03/23 and 04/13). Invited guests included Vice Provost for the Faculty (VPF) Anita Allen and Bob Stine, Co-Chair of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF).

Report on Charges

1. Information Provided by the Office of the Ombuds

The Office of the Ombudsman shared with the SCFDDE a handout that is given to prospective recipients of its services that clearly addresses the Office's stance with regard to confidentiality, neutrality, and independence. It was agreed that the Office would post such information on its website so that prospective users of its services would have it available to them before they visited the Office. The Office has done so. See <http://www.upenn.edu/ombudsman/principles.html>

SCFDDE also considered the title of the Office and concluded that it should be gender-neutral. It asked the Tri-Chairs to raise the matter with the Administration. Vice President for Institutional Affairs Joann Mitchell undertook to consult with various interested constituencies about changing the title. It was the consensus of those consulted that the title should be changed to the "Office of the Ombuds."

2. Findings of the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey

On March 21, 2017, the President and Provost published their Faculty Inclusion Report, which recaps the results from the five-year Action Plan for Faculty Diversity and Excellence. The results of the 2015 Climate Survey are summarized in parts I.A.7 and 8 of the Faculty Inclusion Report.

SCFDDE examined the findings of the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey, particularly those comparing females to males in the aggregate, females to males within each rank, minorities to whites, and underrepresented minorities to whites within each rank. The Committee recognized that without data on salaries, teaching loads and actual reasons for departure it is difficult to draw definitive conclusions about the survey data.

SCFDDE invited Professor Bob Stine, Co-Chair of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty (SCESF), to share SCESF's analysis of both the climate data and additional salary data it reviewed¹. SCESF found that there is a wage gap between men and women faculty that starts at the assistant professor rank and persists as faculty advance through the ranks. These wage gaps are reflected in the climate survey

¹ According to its report (see next footnote), SCESF reviewed data on Standing Faculty salaries with the exception of "data on salaries of nearly 1,000 clinician educators ... from Medicine, Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Nursing, and Social Policy and Practice [...] ... 240 tenure-line PSOM faculty in clinical departments, 86 tenure-line PSOM faculty based at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, [and] ... 35 PSOM tenure-line faculty based at the Veterans Administration."

data, which indicates that only half of women faculty are satisfied with their salaries compared to two-thirds of men. Further statistical analysis of the data revealed a statistically significant gap of 5.5% separating the salaries of male and female associate professors. SCESF's Executive Summary states that "in the 2015 climate survey, associate professors as a group are collectively less satisfied with their experience at Penn than other faculty. About 40% of associate professors are women. SCESF recommends that prompt attention be paid to the gender gap at the associate professor level. SCESF reiterates its concerns as follows: Given the significant impact of rank and time in rank on salaries, SCESF recommends attention, oversight and mentoring to ensure that women associate professors are being promoted to full professor in a timely manner."²

The Faculty Inclusion Report indicates that women and minorities expressed lower levels of satisfaction than the majority. The 2015 Faculty Survey contains information that would be useful in program development by organizations representing the interests of female faculty such as the Penn Forum for Women Faculty and LGBTQ faculty such as the LGBTQ Working Group. If the terms for distribution of the survey results stated in the survey instrument bar sharing any data from a climate survey with such organizations, SCFDDE should begin talks with the Vice Provost for the Faculty and the Office of Institutional Research & Analysis to redraft the terms in anticipation of the next survey.

The results of the climate survey have been shared with the schools. The Vice Dean of Academic Affairs for PSOM circulated to the full-time faculty a PowerPoint presentation that summarized the findings of the 2015 survey, provided comparison with results from the 2011 survey, and added action items. Schools and departments should be encouraged to share the results with their faculty.

Recommendations:

a. The Administration should consider methods for wider dissemination of the results of the 2015 Faculty Climate Survey and develop a comprehensive list of responses to statistically significant levels of dissatisfaction expressed by women, underrepresented minorities, LGBTQ and associate rank faculty.

b. SCFDDE should investigate the climate issues impacting female associate professors and develop recommendations that address the circumstances that may be impeding their promotion to full professor.

3. Review the 5-Year Action Plan for Diversity and Excellence 2011-2016

Although successful recruitment of minorities and women has resulted in an increase in the percentages of minorities, underrepresented minorities, and women on the faculty, departures were a significant factor in limiting the gains from new additions. The Administration should establish a method to track and account for faculty departures and the reasons for them, perhaps by conducting standardized exit interviews.

Recommendations:

a. The Administration should monitor the development and implementation of the University's plans for increasing diversity at the departmental and program levels. Attention should be paid to department-level differences in progress toward University and school diversity goals.

b. SCFDDE recommends that every department chair annually report to the VPF on faculty who are leaving the department and their reason(s) for doing so. SCFDDE recommends that thorough exit interviews of all departing faculty be performed by the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty.

c. SCFDDE recommends that the University encourage schools that have large faculties and that have not made substantial gains in the hiring of women, minorities, and underrepresented minorities to appoint an associate or vice dean for inclusion and diversity.

d. The Administration should promote web-based mechanisms that increase transparency and reporting of school-level initiatives, expenditures, and gains regarding diversity on an annual basis. We recommend that each school's annual faculty diversity report be made publicly available.

e. SCFDDE should investigate the extent to which the goals of faculty inclusion, particularly for women and minorities, are reflected in clear internal promotion paths and the allocation of leadership positions and service obligations, as well as in the provision of resources devoted to midcareer advancement, recognition, and parental leave.

² The SCESF report can be viewed at <http://www.upenn.edu/almanac/volumes/v63/n25/pdf/est-long.pdf>

(continued on page 8)

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDE) *(continued from page 7)*

4. Partner and Spousal Hiring

Policies and practices for finding employment for the spouses and partners of faculty who are being recruited and/or retained are of importance due to their potential impact on the quality and diversity of the faculty. However, they are also fraught with complexity as where the hiring of a spouse/partner has the potential of removing an opportunity for another candidate to be recruited to the accommodating department. This is especially important for smaller departments that have infrequent faculty openings. The Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF) evaluated spousal hiring policies in 2012-2013. Its review noted significant variability in practices across the University, and it made a number of recommendations, including the development of a website to serve as a resource for recruiting schools and candidates and the appointment of an internal “conciierge” to facilitate access to available resources.

SCFDDE is now charged with evaluating spousal hiring policies and most importantly, assessing how spousal/partner hiring practices might contribute to diversity. Our key questions are:

- Is the available support for spousal/partner hiring adequate and effective?
- Is the support made available on an equitable basis?
- Are spousal/partner hiring practices contributing to the University’s diversity goals?

To pursue these questions, SCFDDE reviewed the 2009 University Policy on Faculty Recruitment and Dual Careers along with subsequent updates, determined which of the SCOF recommendations have been implemented, followed up with each school to assess variability (or consistency) with spousal hiring practices, and interviewed current faculty who have experienced the spousal/partner hiring program as a part of their initial recruitment or retention. We also sought to obtain information from the Provost’s Office regarding the number of spousal/partner hires in the last five years, as well as the number of faculty candidates who did not accept positions due to difficulty accommodating spouses/partners.

Our review highlighted ongoing variability in implementation of practices related to spousal/partner hiring across the University along with a general lack of transparency regarding procedures and available resources. In interviews with eight schools, we learned that many follow the guidance provided by the Provost’s Guidelines and Procedures for Faculty Appointments, Promotions, and Terminations referenced above. Inquiries for a position for a spouse/partner are initiated by the dean’s office of the school hiring or attempting to retain the primary faculty member. If the partner/spouse seeks a position in a different school, the dean’s office of the primary school will then reach out to the dean’s office of the secondary school. As per policy, the Provost’s office is also alerted of the potential dual career hire. If a successful appointment is made across two schools, salary for the spouse/partner for the first five years is divided evenly among the primary and secondary schools and the Provost’s office. Dual appointments within the same school may go through faculty committees and human resources.

Actual implementation appears to be related to the size of each school and available resources. For small schools that do not have many faculty openings, it may be particularly challenging to find an open position or to ensure a good fit. Most schools do not have dedicated staff to assist with the search process and there do not appear to be many available resources to assist with searches outside of the University. Therefore, in many instances, requests for partner/spousal hiring are managed on a case-by-case basis. Most schools cite successful dual career hires but no more than six per school in the past five years, while other schools reported none in the same period.

Recommendations:

- a. The University should improve communication about dual career hiring policies and procedures as well as available resources.
- b. SCFDDE supports the creation of a University-wide website through which information can be uniformly communicated and easily accessed from individual school websites by potential candidates and current faculty.
- c. The University should consider hiring dedicated staff to facilitate dual-career hiring to help ensure consistent implementation of the policy and procedures. For schools that do not have resources for dedicated staff, SCFDDE agrees with the previous recommendation to expand Career Services resources to help fulfill this role.
- d. The University should improve resources for the identification of opportunities for spouses/partners outside of the University.
- e. SCFDDE 2017-2018 should:
 - i. Consider alternative positions within the University to accommodate academic spouses/partners. This may include adjunct professorships which are not paid positions but through which individuals may pursue research funding.
 - ii. Identify best practices related to spousal/partner hiring used by other

universities with successful programs.

- iii. Continue its evaluation of the impact of dual hiring practices on faculty diversity recruitment and retention goals.

5. The Inaugural Diversity and Inclusion Luncheon

In its 2015-2016 recommendations, SCFDDE urged the Administration to consider sponsoring a University-wide symposium to showcase successful and innovative diversity programming at Penn, in order to stimulate a wider range of schools to create similar programs.

The Office of the Vice Provost and the Faculty Senate held a Diversity and Inclusion Luncheon on December 2, 2016, in the Living Room Lounge of the Inn at Penn. The planning committee for the event consisted of Laura Perna (GSE and Senate Chair), Sophia Lee (Law), Lisa Lewis (Nursing), Carmen Guerra (PSOM/Medicine), and Lubna Mian (Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty). The event was attended by over 50 faculty and diversity and inclusion leaders from across the campus. The agenda included a welcome and opening remarks by Dr. Anita Allen, followed by a panel session with Drs. Eve Higginbotham (PSOM), Amy Hillier (Design), and Stephanie Abbuhl (PSOM) that was moderated by Dr. Carmen Guerra. The event concluded with comments and questions from the attendees which raised many ideas for creating a more inclusive environment at Penn. For example, there seemed to be a general sense that greater interventions at the departmental level were warranted, particularly to improve the unbalanced culture within schools/colleges that results from some departments having a more inclusive culture than others. Post-event evaluations were also obtained. The consensus there was that the event aided in reducing “the silo effect,” produced constructive candid conversation, and should be repeated.

The Office of the Vice Provost and the Faculty Senate, along with the members of the planning committee, will use the feedback to determine whether to hold annual diversity and inclusion forums and what topics should be covered.

6. Liaison with UC-CDE on LGBTQ Faculty Climate

Regina Austin, Chair of SCFDDE, is a member of the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity (UC-CDE) and a liaison between the two committees. She served on a UC-CDE subcommittee examining LGBTQ student, faculty, and staff climate at Penn. The LGBTQ population on campus looks to the LGBT Center for support. The Center, which falls under the purview of the Office of the Vice Provost for University Life, exists primarily for the benefit of students, but extends its services to staff through LGBTQ Employees at Penn (LEAP) and faculty who participate in the LGBTQ Faculty Diversity Working Group.

Among the offices that are available to consider complaints and grievances from the LGBTQ population on campus is the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs. Its director is also the Title IX administrator. There are indications that the current US Presidential Administration is contemplating changes in federal policy regarding Affirmative Action and Title IX that would impact the faculty’s rights and obligations with regard to diversity and equity.

Recommendations:

The Committee should maintain communication between the SCFDDE and UC-CDE.

The Committee should consider how changes in federal policy toward affirmative action and Title IX will impact the policies, procedures, and practices of the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity.

Overall Recommendations for SCFDDE for 2017-2018:

1. Continue the review of policies and practices regarding the hiring of spouses and partners of faculty being recruited and/or retained, as described above.
2. Investigate factors impacting the climate and goals of faculty inclusion, including the promotion process, for associate professors, with particular attention to women and minorities and propose corrective measures.
3. Consider the operation of the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity in advance of changes in federal policy, particularly Title IX policy.

SCFDDE Membership 2016-2017

Regina Austin, Law, *Chair*
 Rita Barnard, SAS/English
 Kristen Feemster, PSOM/Pediatrics
 Carmen Guerra, PSOM/General Internal Medicine
 Mauro Guillén, Wharton/Management
 Mitch Marcus, SEAS/CIS
 Gwendolyn DuBois Shaw, SAS/History of Art
Ex officio:
 John Keene, Design, PASEF non-voting member
 Laura Perna, GSE, Faculty Senate Chair
 Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF)

Appendix A

Four policy recommendations relating to non-Standing Faculty (NSF)

I. Recommendation that each school produce an inventory of the breakdown in instruction between Standing and non-Standing Faculty:

In 2010-2012, SCOF undertook a study entitled *Who's Teaching Our Students?* Each school submitted data reflecting the breakdown in among Standing Faculty and the various categories of NSF. These data are now at least five years old. SCOF recommends that each school be asked for updated data. At the time of the original data collection, there was no standard set of instructions dictating what specific data should be collected and how it should be analyzed and formatted. SCOF determined that Wharton's submission was the most clear and comprehensive, and it recommends that Wharton's submission be used as the model for all future such data collection. We agree. SCOF has retained on file a copy of the 2011 Wharton submission for ease of reference.

II. Recommendation that each department include NSF at meetings discussing issues of concern to both Standing and non-Standing Faculty

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the Senate Sub-Committee for the Faculty and Academic Mission continued its examination of the place of NSF across the university. To that end, SCOF ran a focused discussion at a SEC meeting where it sought to consult members of SEC to gain insight into the concerns that arise for them and at their schools. At the discussion, it was suggested that NSF members be included in department meetings where issues of concern to both Standing and non-Standing Faculty members were to be discussed. Because there is much variability in the nature and roles of NSF in different departments and schools, SCOF believes that more work should be done to identify sensible ways of including NSF. To that end, SCOF recommends that next year's committee *identify best practices for involving NSF in matters of concern to them.*

III. Recommendation that each School revise the relevant provisions in the Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators describing criteria for advancement in NSF tracks

Currently, Sections II.B.3 and II.B.4 of the *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators* describe the Practice Professor and Lecturer tracks respectively, including the possibility for promotion within each track. As it stands, however, these sections provide very little concrete guidance as to the criteria for advancement. Greater clarity would allow candidates for promotion to know what their school expects of them and personnel committees to know how to evaluate NSF promotion cases. SCOF therefore recommends *that each school revise the relevant subsections of the Faculty Handbook to provide these additional details.*

IV. Recommendation that SEC amend its structure to add a non-voting seat for a NSF member

During the 2016-2017 academic year, the Senate Sub-Committee for the Faculty and Academic Mission continued its examination of the place of NSF across the university. One concern voiced in discussion with the Senate Executive Committee, and raised independently in SCOF meetings, regarded representation and voice for the NSF on matters concerning faculty governance. To begin addressing this concern, SCOF recommends that SEC amend its governing structure to include one NSF as a non-voting member of SEC. While it would be beyond SCOF's purview to recommend a selection process for the NSF representative, SCOF nonetheless offers the following suggestion:

- a. Each department chair should
 - i. assemble a list of names and email addresses of the department's NSF; and
 - ii. send an email to those NSF (i) containing the assembled names and email addresses and (ii) inviting nominations, including self-nominations, for a school-wide NSF committee. In the event that more than one person is nominated, the Chair can follow up the nomination process with a ballot so that the department's NSF can select their nominee.
- b. Each departmental nominee would then serve on a school-wide committee of NSF whose purpose would be to:
 - i. together with the other schools, develop a process for selecting one NSF member from across the university for a non-voting position on SEC; and
 - ii. function as a base for pursuing issues of concern to the NSF. (Each of these school-wide units could determine for itself how it wishes to operate.)

The process SCOF suggests is meant to serve as a starting point for identifying a NSF member representative to SEC. The NSF might well choose an alternative selection procedure.

SCOF recommends that the NSF representative to SEC be elected to a 1-year renewable term.