General Committee Charge

The Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (i) identifies and promotes best practices for faculty development, mentoring, and work-life balance 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

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 training program 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/ovpf fellowships-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 postdoc 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 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 postdoc 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.
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the similar Academic Clinician track within the Associated Faculty. Last-
ly, 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 mov-
ing forward; and 2) GSE deliberately seeks ways for newly tenured Asso-
ciate 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 suc-
cessful careers as school administrators or policy-makers. Some profes-
sional 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 tra-
jectory will be. The GSE dean has inquired directly with these profession-
al faculty to better understand their experiences at GSE. This effort has
led to changes within the School, including changing the informal collect-
ive position name from “non-Standing Faculty” to “professional facul-
ty,” as noted above. There is ongoing work to review voting privileges of
professional faculty for certain issues, contract renewal terms, annual re-
view processes, and development of a sabbatical program for them. The
School plans to conduct a more formal assessment in 2020 via another cli-
mate survey.

Committee member Carmen Guerra presented on work that she has
undertaken as part of her capstone project for the PSOM Executive Lead-
ership for Academic Medicine program. In this presentation she differen-
tiated between mentorship, which is defined as helping mentees to “…ac-
brue 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 men-
torship versus sponsorship in the hopes of remedying gender inequities in
this area. She also provided survey findings that suggested that conscious-
ness-raising about these issues can significantly improve senior faculty in-
teractions 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 fur-
ther 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 incor-
porating feedback from faculty, staff, and students.
• SCFDDE should further explore distinctions between mentorship and
sponsorship and the ways in which these distinctions map onto Uni-
versity-wide equity issues.

4. Other matters falling under SCFDDE’s general charge

In connection with this charge, SCFDDE gathered, and began the pro-
cess 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 be-
lieves 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 class-
es are identified? Has the School collected data—historical? current? on-
going? What organizational mechanisms have been put in place to ad-
minister 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? dis-
cussed? 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 sabb-
atical 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 sabbati-
cal 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 sat-
sfactory by SCFDDE and was not pursued further.

Members of the 2019-2020 SCFDDE Committee
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Antonella Cianferoni, PSOM/Pediatrics
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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 de-
gree 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 academ-
ic support who allege they have been subject to action that is contrary
to the University procedures, policies, and/or regulations, that is dis-
criminatory, 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
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