

(continued from page 4)

plication of University resources (viz. filming). Other, related, questions include:

3A) What happens to course content when a faculty member is no longer employed at Penn? OLI has indicated flexibility and good-faith, but no standards exist.

3B) To what extent does faculty creation of materials for online courses count as work-for-hire? In cases where it does, are the appropriate work-for-hire policies (e.g., mutual agreement of such before work commences) followed?

3C) What is the protocol for the case where faculty are assigned creation or administration of online courses as part of standard teaching duties.

3D) What is the protocol for institutional repurposing of faculty work products (e.g., videos and other online content) for other courses or purposes?

4) These observations – an increase in demand for online courses coupled with a decrease in supply incentive and unclear IP protocols – point to an equilibrium where faculty are largely-to-wholly disengaged from the process of providing education to an increasing population of learners in our community and beyond. Such an outcome would limit faculty fulfillment of the Penn Compact tenets of inclusion and innovation and would be furthermore deleterious for all parties, especially learners.

5) Commensurate with its research from the previous year, SCOA observed apparent disparities across schools in terms of involvement of Standing Faculty with respect to contracting processes and principles and remuneration. Online learning compensation for Standing Faculty members should be compared against residential coursework compensation across schools.

6) SCOA noted concerns about quality check mechanisms in place for online coursework, describing a “fragile system” and anecdotal accounts of inconsistent reviews. SCOA members noted interest in data regarding the number of online courses developed over the past two years in SEAS and SAS, the portion of which were developed primarily by Standing Faculty, and the number of part-time lecturer contracts that have been added as a function of online programs.

Recommendations:

1) As additional avenues for online learning are implemented, Penn should achieve transparency with Standing Faculty regarding revenues, costs, and time expectations for creating and managing coursework content.

2) The *Faculty Handbook*, the above-referenced “standard” OLI agreement, and any school-based agreements with Standing Faculty should

clearly and consistently detail intellectual property ownership parameters with respect to the faculty member and the University.

Other Business: Faculty Parental Policy

SCOA considered amendments to *Faculty Handbook* section II.E.4, the Faculty Parental Policy, which were proposed by Vice Provost for Faculty Anita Allen. SCOA concluded that the previous policy was written in such a manner as to invite abuse and that a change in the statement of the policy is in order. It was noted in particular that any such policy clarification will of needs be general, with specific interpretation left to the schools. For example, in PSOM, it is nearly impossible to disaggregate teaching from other activities (e.g., clinicals), making an over-specific policy unworkable. SCOA recommends a careful, compact statement interpretable by individual schools. SCOA defers further discussion to the Senate Executive Committee, which will review the proposed policy amendment prior to its finalization.

Proposed Charges for SCOA in 2019-2020:

1. Collect data on online courses developed and taught by Standing Faculty and by Associated Faculty and Academic Support Staff and incentives offered.

2. Assess the quality and structure of the Bachelor of Applied Arts and Sciences (BAAS) and Master of Computer and Information Technology (MCIT) programs.

3. Conduct interviews with stakeholders involved in strategic planning of online learning at Penn.

4. Assess the utilization of dependent tuition benefits and employer-provided retirement contributions by Standing Faculty members.

SCOA Membership 2018-2019

Robert Ghrist, SAS/Mathematics & SEAS/ESE, Chair

Ryan Baker, GSE

Joel Bennett, PSOM/Medicine

Ken Drobotz, Vet School

Al Filreis, SAS/English

Kevin Platt, SAS/Russian & East European Studies

Talid Sinno, SEAS/CBE & MEAM

Ex-officio members:

Marshall Meyer, Wharton, PASEF non-voting member

Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing School, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect

Santosh Venkatesh, SEAS/ESE, Faculty Senate Chair

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.

2018-2019 Specific Charges for the SCFDDE

- Review the Postdoctoral Fellowship for Academic Diversity Program with respect to the number of Fellows who have been hired by Penn into Standing Faculty and/or research positions.
- Identify best practices for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs) across schools.

- Review the climate of mid-career faculty across schools.
- Continue to support a once yearly “Listening to Diversity” event to allow the University-wide community an opportunity to express and listen to concerns related to diversity and inclusion as raised by the real-time internal and external environmental factors and changes.

- 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 nine times (Aug. 30, Sept. 6, Oct. 4, Oct. 26, Dec. 6, Jan. 10, Feb. 7, Mar. 7, Apr. 4). Invited guests included Anita Allen, Vice Provost for Faculty (VPF); Lisa Bellini, Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM) Vice Dean for Academic Affairs; Dawn Bonnell, Vice Provost for Research; Matt Hartley, Graduate School of Education (GSE) Associate Dean for Academic Affairs; Eve Higginbotham, PSOM Vice Dean for Diversity and Inclusion; Joann Mitchell, Senior Vice President for Institutional Affairs & Chief Diversity Officer; Karen Redrobe, Director of the Wolf Humanities Center and the Elliot and Roslyn Jaffe Professor of Cinema and Modern Media; and Wendy White, University General Counsel.

Report on Charges

1. Review the Postdoctoral Fellowship for Academic Diversity Program with respect to the number of Fellows who have been hired by Penn into Standing Faculty and/or research positions.

SCFDDE inquired with Dr. Dawn Bonnell, Vice Provost for Research, about the functioning of the Postdoctoral Fellowship for Academic Diversity Program. The committee also invited Dr. Karen Redrobe, the Director of the Wolf Humanities Center and the Elliot and Roslyn Jaffe Professor of Cinema and Modern Media, to learn more about its postdoctoral fellowship program and generally about postdoctoral fellowship opportunities in the humanities at Penn.

(continued on page 6)

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

(continued from page 5)

Dr. Bonnell provided background on the Program: Since its 2010 inception, a total of 57 postdocs have gone through the program. Roughly 50% of postdocs remain working in academia; the others work in industry. The program funds half the salary and expenses for the postdoc, and the host school provides the other half. Each school decides and prioritizes which candidates they wish to accept. Some schools (particularly SAS and PSOM) will hire more postdocs than the Office of the Vice Provost for Research (OVPR) has the budget to support, in which case the school pays 100% of the expenses. Though candidates apply directly to OVPR, they are required to have identified a school-based mentor and project prior to submitting an application. Postdocs receive a one-year commitment with an option for up to two additional years.

Dr. Bonnell informed the Committee that of the 57 postdocs, only two participants have remained at Penn (one in Nursing and the other in African American Studies). She noted that the program is not designed to lead to a faculty or research position here, and that there were challenges to hiring postdocs internally (e.g., it is discouraged to hire postdocs in some fields since the alum would likely be competing for grant dollars directly against their mentor at the institution). Only in special cases would talented postdocs have been encouraged to shift to other research areas as a means to retain them.

The Committee also heard from Dr. Redrobe about the postdoc program of the Wolf Humanities Center, a Mellon-endowed program that provides five one-year fellowships. Dr. Redrobe pointed out several institutional challenges that have to be addressed in order to create and foster diversity in postdoc programs. For instance, application forms received by review committees provide no demographic data on applicants except for gender, leaving the committee to do “guesswork” as to race, ethnicity, and socioeconomic background. Dr. Redrobe has called for a more rigorous process for collecting such demographic data and implementing best practices for transparency in review processes. And, starting next year, the Wolf Humanities Center application form will begin to gather demographic data on applicants in a legal manner.

Dr. Redrobe noted the importance of implementing changes in the process of how centers and schools choose their leaders to ensure that diversity is kept in mind throughout these processes. SAS centers are all asked to have bylaws with parameters for leadership and postdoc selection processes and for advisory boards. Promoting diversity in all those areas (more than simply identifying a “token” person of color who “bats” for diversity while everyone else “bats” for their field of research) would improve diversity for future entering cohorts. Dr. Redrobe encouraged Penn as a whole to consider ways in which diversity can be made a mandate for all committees.

There appears to be no comprehensive list of postdoc programs at Penn. SCFDDE recommends the creation of a centralized information/website about all postdocs at Penn. This can help to capture information about the range of postdoctoral programs at Penn and also provide a sense of the most promising candidates in different fields. Furthermore, it can create a hub to help enhance a sense of community among postdocs and their supporters. Such community building could include bringing postdocs together for social purposes, career counseling, and other activities.

Recommendations:

- The Provost postdoctoral fellowships should be re-focused so as to further the diversification of the faculty at Penn. One possibility is to treat the postdoctoral application process explicitly as part of an application for a tenure track, with the department taking on the postdoctoral fellow committing itself to allocating a tenure track line to the selected candidate on the fellowship’s completion. Some departments, however, may not want to make this kind of commitment up front. Another option is that the postdocs might be allocated as an additional recruitment incentive to attract diverse candidates who have already been made a tenure-track offer by a department in a school at Penn. Other universities (Princeton, Michigan, UC Berkeley, and Chicago) have been utilizing postdoctoral fellowships in this way.

- Consider shortening Provost postdoctoral fellowship periods. The current fellowship is allocated for a three-year period, making it one of the more generous fellowships of its kind. It may be that a three-year period is optimal for some schools and departments around the University (perhaps in Medicine, for instance, and the natural sciences) but in many areas a three-year commitment may be less necessary. In most fields a three-year period is more than is needed to provide young scholars with time to carry out their postdoctoral research, and conversely, for departments to have the time to evaluate young scholars (if that is the fellowship’s purpose). A three-year fellowship is also a considerable investment of resources on the part of the university. In fields where the norm for fellowships is two or even one years, shortening the fellowship period would free up resources for a greater number of fellowships to be allocated across the university and in the School of Arts and Sciences in particular.

- Create a location for centralized information about postdocs and for postdocs across all disciplines at Penn so as to share information about both candidates for the post-docs and existing post-docs at Penn. An overall theme cited by SCFDDE members was the need for an enhanced community of postdocs and their supporters. Such community building could include bringing postdocs together for social purposes, career counseling, and other activities.

2. Identify best practices for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs) across schools.

To learn about the best practices for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs), SCFDDE invited Dr. Eve Higginbotham, Vice Dean for Inclusion and Diversity (OID) at PSOM, and Ms. Corrinne Fahl, OID Program Coordinator. PSOM has the most experience with the DSA program as it currently has 45 DSAs embedded in over 200 annual faculty searches at PSOM.

With the adoption of *Interfolio* in July 2019, some of the current DSA responsibilities and best practices may change. However, until now, DSA Best Practices have included:

DSAs should meet with the department chair and/or division chief annually to define the open faculty position(s), align the responsibilities and goals of each position with the appropriate faculty track, and provide guidance on composition of the search committee chair and members. The shared goal should be to make search committees as diverse as possible. SCFDDE acknowledged that the limited number of female and underrepresented minority Standing Faculty at PSOM results in increased frequency of requests for their participation on search committees.

Until now, DSAs have reviewed and approved position descriptions prior to posting. This will continue with the introduction of *Interfolio*.

The DSA attends the first search committee meeting as an ex-officio member, helps to familiarize the committee with University and School policies and resources, provides unconscious bias training, encourages use of and provides a list of structured interview and applicant evaluation questions, and ensures the committee takes steps to expand the applicant pool. DSAs should continue to serve ex-officio to the search committee to ensure that best practices are followed and that all candidates are given fair consideration. DSAs should attend the final decision meeting before offers are extended to assure the process is compliant. In addition, the DSA should review and approve the “Affirmative Action Appointment” form (the format of the form will change with *Interfolio*) and liaise with university officials as necessary to ensure process compliance.

PSOM has created a repository of DSA tools, which is available at <https://www.med.upenn.edu/fapd/docurepollist/category/diversity-search-advisor/>

Some of these tools including a full list of the roles and responsibilities of, and checklists and best practices for, DSAs. There are also links to additional resources including the Implicit Association Test and an Association of American Medical Colleges video that reviews the science of unconscious bias. (Note: PSOM is planning for improved faculty search resources for July 2019 with the introduction of *Interfolio*).

(continued on page 7)

(continued from page 6)

Recommendations:

- Given the quantity and complexity of the faculty searches that occur annually at the University of Pennsylvania, SCFDDE calls for transforming the DSA positions to be more than service positions, since DSA efforts are critical to Penn's mission and since the role requires a significant investment of both time and skill by the DSA.

- In addition, there are promising strategies at PSOM that should be more widely piloted by other schools and departments, including creating a database of diverse candidates currently at peer and minority serving institutions to share with search committees, and having the DSA conduct unconscious bias training workshops aimed at search committees and senior members of the administration. Ms. Fahl has agreed to train any interested administrators in these strategies.

- Finally, while SCFDDE suggests that the focus of the DSA program should continue on recruiting of diverse faculty, investment of similar levels in retention of existing faculty might result in even greater return-on-investment to Penn. One potential way to build on the success of the DSA program is to consider creating a departmental diversity advisor who could be trained by the Vice Provost for Faculty to be a resource on matters related to diversity and inclusion for his/her department.

3. Review the climate of mid-career faculty across schools.

SCFDDE obtained information from several schools regarding the climate of mid-career faculty concerning their successful progression toward the rank of (full) Professor. The committee invited presenters from PSOM and GSE to learn about mid-career faculty challenges across the schools.

The committee heard presentations from Lisa Bellini, PSOM Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, regarding a mid-career survey conducted at PSOM in 2018. Dr. Bellini stressed the importance of mentorship over the past decade, where new faculty have been expected to have a formal mentor named in the offer letter.

Dr. Bellini described challenges that mid-career faculty may face, including less direct motivation to earn further promotion, and could benefit from mentorship to increase their joy, satisfaction, and engagement with their work. Pressures on mid-career faculty include acute work overload. On average, PSOM faculty members work 60 hours per week while facing increases in non-work related responsibilities such as raising a family. There has been a cultural shift toward working families in the last two decades, with 75% of current faculty having a full-time working partner. SCFDDE members noted that administrative burdens of faculty members have also increased in recent decades, which raised questions about the sustainability of University expectations for faculty advancement (up-or-out tenure system) and balance with other administrative responsibilities.

Dr. Bellini noted that the vast majority of faculty that have remained at associate professor level currently are in the Clinician-Educator track. These faculty members tend not to be as active in research and joined the university before the existence of the Academic Clinician track within the Associated Faculty. Lastly, the PSOM survey showed no significant differences when evaluating under-represented minority status, though differences were illustrated for women across the board.

The committee also heard from Matt Hartley, GSE Professor of Education and Associate Dean for Academic Affairs. GSE recently conducted its own climate survey for faculty, staff, and students as well as a set of focus groups.

Mid-career faculty at GSE receive support in two ways: 1) As part of the tenure process, faculty are asked to discuss their research agenda moving forward; 2) GSE is intentional about finding ways for newly tenured associate professors to take on leadership roles. GSE has non-standing, or professional faculty tracks that include Professors of Practice, Senior Lecturers, and Lecturers. Many of these faculty come to Penn after successful careers as school administrators or policy-makers. Some professional faculty may be at earlier points in their careers, however, and once they are promoted to Senior Lecturer, it is not clear what their career trajectory may be at this point. The GSE Dean has met with the professional faculty to better understand their experiences at GSE. This work has led to changes, including changing the informal collective position name from "non-standing faculty" to "professional faculty. There is ongoing work to review voting privileges for certain issues, contract renewal terms, annual review processes, and development of a sabbatical program. The school

plans to conduct a more formal assessment in 2020 via another climate survey.

Recommendations:

- The associate professor faculty would benefit from undergoing a formal review process by COAP and their respective department with feedback specifically addressing the path for further academic promotion.

- Department Chairs throughout the university are urged to continue monitoring the progress of associate professors towards promotion to full professor.

- Explore GSE's climate survey as a model for incorporating feedback from faculty, staff, and students.

4 and 5. (4) Continue to support a once yearly "Listening to Diversity" event to allow the University-wide community an opportunity to express and listen to concerns related to diversity and inclusion as raised by the real-time internal and external environmental factors and changes; and (5) Maintain communication between the SCFDDE and the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity and collaborate when possible on issues of mutual concern.

The University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity (UC-CDE) addresses issues related to equity of gender, race, class, religion, political affiliation, and other matters for all members of the Penn community. During spring 2017, 2018, and 2019, UC-CDE, SCFDDE, and the Penn Forum for Women Faculty (PFWF) jointly conducted public listening forums and learned that equity challenges are complex and require in-depth research so that the committees can be responsive to a variety of needs.

The 2019 "Listening to Diversity Forum" was well attended by faculty and staff across all of Penn. A theme that emerged from Forum speaker statements is the large discrepancy in solving diversity and equity problems across various departments and schools at Penn. Specifically, some diversity and inclusion issues that are resolved in transparent manner within some departments and schools go unresolved in others.

Recommendations.

- Continue collaboration efforts between SCFDDE, UC-CDE, and PFWF on matters of mutual concern.

- Consider the feasibility of expanding the frequency of the Forum in future years.

- Encourage leaders of departments and centers to complete training programs on diversity and equity issues (e.g., unconscious bias training, noted above) and to offer similar training to faculty and staff within centers.

Overall Recommendations for SCFDDE for 2019-2020

1. Identify ways to improve community building amongst postdocs at Penn and their supporters, as a means of enhancing diversity and inclusion efforts on campus.

2. Review the implementation of Interfolio with respect to its effect on diverse faculty recruitment and retention.

3. Identify best practices for implementing unconscious bias training programs across schools, departments, and centers.

4. Assist and provide faculty consultation to the incoming Associate Vice President for Equity and Title IX Officer.

5. Provide consultation to the Vice Provost for Faculty regarding efforts to provide opportunities for faculty professional development.

6. Advise the Vice Provost for Faculty on adapting questions for the next faculty climate survey regarding advancement and progress of mid-career faculty.

SCFDDE Membership 2018-2019

Nelson Flores, GSE
Jorge Gálvez, PSOM/Anesthesiology & Critical Care
Carmen Guerra, PSOM/Medicine, *Chair*
Mauro Guillén, Wharton
Michael Jones-Correa, SAS/Political Science
Irina Marinov, SAS/Earth and Environmental Science
Kate Nathanson, PSOM/Medicine
Dagmawi Woubshet, SAS/English

Ex officio members:

John Keene, Design, PASEF non-voting member
Steven Kimbrough, Wharton, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Nursing, Faculty Senate Chair