

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

General Committee Charge

The Committee oversees and advises the Executive Committee on matters relating to the faculty's interface with the University's administration, including policies and procedures relating to the University's structure, the conditions of faculty employment (such as personnel benefits), and information. In general the Committee deals with the matters covered by the following sections of the University's *Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators*: I.A.-D., G.-H.1., I.-K., II.E., III., V., VI.

2011-2012 Specific Charges

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

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

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

4. Review current policies regarding Intellectual Property (Patents) in light of the 2011 Supreme Court decision: *Stanford v. Roche Molecular Systems*.

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

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

Accomplishments

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

The SCOA committee this year spent almost all of its effort on this charge. This charge was a continuation of work by the 2009-2010 & 2010-2011 SCOA committees. Those groups had determined that individual schools oversee most Masters programs, as well as a variety of terminal degree certificate programs but that there was concern regarding their consistent oversight by appropriate faculty. In 2009-2010, a database was compiled that identified all of the school-based Masters and certificate programs at Penn. This year the Committee surveyed all schools to add information to the database on the size of their Masters programs. The committee was particularly pleased with the 100% participation of all the schools. There was discussion in the Committee about whether to next send out a questionnaire to Masters programs to better understand the degree of faculty governance and oversight. However this questionnaire was

discussed with Dr. Andy Binns, vice provost for education, and his recommendation was, instead, that the next step would be for SCOA to interview a selection of Deans and/or appropriate Vice Deans to ascertain the status of these programs in their schools. As such, after better understanding the size and scope of the Masters programs, the committee began the interview process with a program that had spent time and resources to create a strong governance process over its Masters programs. This interview was very useful in understanding faculty governance processes across admissions, program curriculum, and teaching.

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Review urrent Policies Regarding Intellectual Property (Patents) in Light of the 2011 Supreme Court decision: *Stanford v. Roche Molecular Systems*

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

5. Monitor Cases of Temporary Exclusion

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

SCOA Committee Members, 2011-2012

- Sigal Barsade, Wharton School, *Chair*
- Brenda Casper, School of Arts & Sciences/Biology
- Ken Drobatz, School of Veterinary Medicine
- David Eckmann, Perelman School of Medicine/ Anesthesia
- Insup Lee, School of Engineering and Applied Science
- Laura Perna, Graduate School of Education
- Robert Vitalis, School of Arts & Sciences/Political Science
- Ex Officio Members:*
- Camille Z. Charles, School of Arts & Sciences/Sociology, *Senate Chair*
- Susan Margulies, School of Engineering and Applied Science/Bioengineering, *Senate Chair-Elect*