

## 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.

### 2019-2020 Specific Charges for the SCFDDE

- Identify how Schools, departments and centers are delivering unconscious bias training programs to their faculties; propose supplemental methods.
- Identify ways to improve community building among postdocs at Penn and recruitment from peer diversity postdoc programs as a means of enhancing diversity and inclusion on campus.
- Identify new and ongoing opportunities at the University and School levels for faculty professional development.

### Report on Charges

#### 1. Identify how Schools, departments and centers are delivering latent bias training programs to their faculties; propose supplemental methods

SCFDDE received a briefing from Ms. Lubna Mian, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty, who provides latent bias training to all faculty search committees and to centers and departments that request it. Ms. Mian provides four workshops per year: two each for all faculty and two for Diversity Search Advisors (DSAs). The training is focused on University policies through presentation of and participant interaction with case studies. The training has been mandated for all faculty searches since the 2015 launch of the Inclusion Report. More information can be received about the training by contacting The Office of Faculty Affairs at [provost-fac@upenn.edu](mailto:provost-fac@upenn.edu)

#### Recommendations:

- Consider amending the program title to “Latent Bias Awareness Training” or a similar title to enhance the accuracy of the training’s purpose. The trainings cover latent bias research and anti-discrimination policies and practices. SCFDDE, however, recognizes that the training sessions offered by the Office of the Provost, through the Perelman School of Medicine’s (PSOM’s) Office of Inclusion and Diversity and outside vendors may have different titles depending upon the provider, but the scope of content is similar.

- Given the variability in how Schools and departments conduct Latent Bias Awareness Training, SCFDDE recommends that the University develop a train-the-trainer program in order to increase the number of individuals (including DSAs) who are qualified to train faculty search committees. This program would provide the training and resources as well as guidelines for how to identify and address latent bias when it occurs during the committee process.

- There remain questions about how often Latent Bias Awareness Trainings are needed and how much time search committees need to devote to them. The committee acknowledges the memo sent on April 30, 2020, from the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty (OVPF) to deans and department chairs with clarification on the training offerings available, duration and frequency of trainings needed, and delivery methods for latent bias and non-discrimination training. We encourage OVPF to make the contents of the memo available publicly.

#### 2. Identify ways to improve community building among postdocs at Penn and recruitment from peer diversity postdoc programs, as a means of enhancing diversity and inclusion on campus.

SCFDDE continued to examine postdoctoral programs at Penn. Last year, the committee reviewed the Postdoctoral Fellowships for Academic Diversity program and turned this year to a broader examination of postdoc programs across the University and their contributions to diversity and equity at Penn. In Schools, such as Wharton, that do not have a School-wide postdoctoral program, responsibility for enhancing diversity within postdoctoral programs is left to the departments. This risks resulting in uneven outcomes. By comparison, the Weitzman School of Design treats the School’s postdoctoral program as a vehicle to accomplish equity, access, and inclusion across the School at all levels, including creating

a pool of potential applicants for Standing Faculty positions.

SCFDDE members examined how many Schools operate diversity committees and how departments usually go about accessing University-wide resources to accomplish equity, access, and inclusion. The Biomedical Postdoctoral Programs continue to be very active in attracting and training postdocs. The committee also reviewed the most recent postdoctoral census data available from fall 2017 and fall 2018. More than half of the 1,335 postdocs (790) are housed in PSOM, with 108 across the Dental, Nursing, and Veterinary Schools. A further 220 are in SAS and 195 in SEAS. Forty-five are African American, 179 are Asian, and 478 are white, 38 are Hispanic/Latin(o/a), and 1 is Native-American/Alaskan Native. A total of 565 are international citizens for whom no racial categorization is available from the data. The Provost’s Center awards 16 postdocs, which does not include the Diversity postdocs for which the Provost pays partial funding (see <https://research.upenn.edu/postdocs-and-students/ovpr-fellowship-recipient/>).

Committee members suggested that if campus postdoctoral programs have made diversity commitments, they are not reflected in the racial demographics of the program. SCFDDE members expressed interest in comparing the placement rate of diversity postdocs into tenure-track positions (at Penn or otherwise) compared to general postdocs. Interest was also expressed in understanding the impact that the Provost’s fund has had on the diversity makeup of the postdoc programs at Penn and also in learning about how the Provost’s Office informs Schools about the availability of this fund.

#### Recommendations:

- The Provost postdoctoral fellowships should be re-focused so as to further the diversity of the faculty at Penn. One possibility is to treat the postdoctoral application process explicitly as part of an application for a tenure track position, with the department taking on the postdoctoral fellow committing itself to allocating a tenure-track line to the selected candidate upon the fellowship’s completion. 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.

- Penn should centralize information about and for postdocs across all disciplines so as to share information about available post-doc positions and available candidates. 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.

- SCFDDE should consider issues related to reported categorization of post-doc demographic data.

#### 3. Identify new and ongoing opportunities at the University and School levels for faculty professional development

Last year 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.

Mid-career faculty in PSOM cited multiple challenges based upon results of a survey administered by PSOM leadership. Typically faculty members have less direct motivation to earn promotion beyond Associate, with associated reduction in 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. The vast majority of faculty that have remained at the 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

(continued on page 7)

(continued from page 6)

the similar 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.

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; and 2) GSE deliberately seeks 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 will be. The GSE dean has inquired directly with these professional faculty to better understand their experiences at GSE. This effort has led to changes within the School, including changing the informal collective position name from “non-Standing Faculty” to “professional faculty,” as noted above. There is ongoing work to review voting privileges of professional faculty for certain issues, contract renewal terms, annual review processes, and development of a sabbatical program for them. The School plans to conduct a more formal assessment in 2020 via another climate survey.

Committee member Carmen Guerra presented on work that she has undertaken as part of her capstone project for the PSOM Executive Leadership for Academic Medicine program. In this presentation she differentiated between mentorship, which is defined as helping mentees to “. . . acquire the essential competencies needed for success. . .” and sponsorship, which is defined as “public support by a powerful, influential person for the advancement and promotion of an individual for whom he or she sees untapped or unappreciated potential.” Dr. Guerra described research that suggests women are over-mentored and under-sponsored relative to male peers. She described ways that she had sought to support PSOM senior faculty in being more reflective about the ways that they engage in mentorship versus sponsorship in the hopes of remedying gender inequities in this area. She also provided survey findings that suggested that consciousness-raising about these issues can significantly improve senior faculty interactions with more junior faculty.

#### *Recommendations:*

- The Associate Professor faculty would benefit from undergoing a formal review process by the department—or School-level promotion and tenure committees with feedback specifically addressing the path for further academic promotion.
- Mentorship could be a way mid-career faculty can be motivated to advance their career and improve their overall career satisfaction.
- Department Chairs should consistently monitor the progress of all Associate Professors towards promotion to full Professor.
- SCFDDE should explore GSE’s climate survey as a model for incorporating feedback from faculty, staff, and students.
- SCFDDE should further explore distinctions between mentorship and sponsorship and the ways in which these distinctions map onto University-wide equity issues.

#### *4. Other matters falling under SCFDDE’s general charge Review of School-based Diversity Action Plans.*

In connection with this charge, SCFDDE gathered, and began the process of reviewing, each of the twelve Schools’ Diversity Action Plans (DAPs). In all, ten such plans have been filed with the Faculty Senate (two others have not been revised since 2015). The plans vary widely in their scope and level of detail, across numerous dimensions. SCFDDE believes it would be helpful to identify best practices in the DAPs and then to encourage each School to revise its plan accordingly. A useful first step would involve a systematic assessment of each DAP, along the following lines: Who is covered—staff? students? faculty? Which protected classes are identified? Has the School collected data—historical? current? ongoing? What organizational mechanisms have been put in place to administer or effectuate the plan? What particular strategies does the plan identify for increasing and/or solidifying diversity? When was the plan developed? What criteria and metrics have been identified for assessing progress? Has the School undertaken a climate survey? What resources have been devoted to implementation? How is the plan publicized? discussed? promoted?

*Recommendation:* SCFDDE should systematically review each School’s Diversity Action Plan along the dimensions indicated, and then identify “best practices” that might guide revision of each School’s Plan.

#### *Review of Sabbatical Leave Policies Across Schools*

Anecdotes offered by multiple SCFDDE members suggested that sabbatical leave policies and practices may differ in their implementation across Schools. SCFDDE inquired with the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty, which informed us that the *Faculty Handbook* sets forth the sole policy on scholarly leaves that applies uniformly to all Schools. During a scholarly leave with pay, salary is covered by the University. However, some Schools provide sabbaticals which are paid by the School, not by the University. The School is then allowed to grant a School-funded sabbatical to faculty members at its own discretion. As an example, a Professor of Practice, who—as a member of the Associated Faculty—is not eligible for a University-funded leave, may seek a School-funded sabbatical at the School’s exclusive discretion. The information received was deemed satisfactory by SCFDDE and was not pursued further.

#### **Members of the 2019-2020 SCFDDE Committee**

Hydar Ali, Dental Medicine  
Antonella Cianferoni, PSOM/Pediatrics  
Nelson Flores, GSE  
Jorge Gálvez, PSOM/Anesthesiology & Critical Care, *Chair*  
Carmen Guerra, PSOM/Medicine  
Sharon Hayes, Weitzman Design  
Amy Sepinwall, Wharton  
Dagmawi Woubshet, SAS/English  
*Ex officio:*  
Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect  
John Keene, Weitzman, Design, PASEF non-voting member  
Steven Kimbrough, Wharton, Faculty Senate Chair

### **Senate Committee on Faculty and the Administration (SCOA)**

During 2019-2020, SCOA was charged with assessing the status of online learning at Penn, especially with respect to the two new fully online degree programs being offered. Because limited information has been available on these nascent programs, assessing them proved challenging. At the same time, the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (“SCOF”) was charged with assessing Penn’s online degrees and programs. After providing a full briefing of its work to SCOF, SCOA suspended its work until Fall 2020.

### **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 2019-2020, the commission was composed of Martha Farah (SAS/Psychology, Past

Chair), Connie Ulrich (Nursing, Chair), and Mitchell Berman (Law, Chair-Elect).

During this year the Commission was approached by one faculty member concerning reappointment issues. This case is currently under discussion between the faculty member, the other relevant parties, and the Commission Chair-Elect.

—Connie Ulrich, *Grievance Commission Chair, 2019-2020*