

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.

2020-2021 Specific Charges for the SCFDDE

SCFDDE recognizes that inclusion does not occur without recognition of existing biases and need for equity on all fronts.

Dismantling Systemic Racism:

1. Assess and evaluate ways to change University structures, practices, and biases (at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels) that perpetuate systemic racism.
2. Facilitate the changes identified in the previous charge.

Promoting Inclusion:

3. Review the application of the University pandemic-related policy on tenure clock extensions to ensure equity and fairness.
4. Review each school's Diversity Action Plan and identify "best practices" to improve each school's plan as well as the University's plan as embodied in its 2019 Faculty Inclusion Report (and in the process explore GSE's internal climate survey as a model for incorporating broad, internal feedback).
5. Review the implementation of Interfolio with respect to its effect on diverse faculty recruitment and retention.

Report on Charges

1. *Assess and evaluate ways to change University structures, practices, and biases (at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels) that perpetuate systemic racism.*

2. *Facilitate the changes identified in the previous charge.*

Systemic racism is no longer the overt objectionable action that is easily identified and thus easily addressed. It now comes in the form of the subvert racial bias that is at times unconsciously implemented, or worse, held in place because of customary practices and long-held traditions. With Penn being among the oldest universities in the country, this institution will inevitably perpetuate aspects of institutional racism that continue to linger in the larger American educational system. In order to address institutional racism and racial bias, we must come to terms with its existence and then embrace institutional and pedagogical approaches that minimize or eradicate its effect.

The first step in engaging in such an ambitious endeavor is the systematic collection of baseline data as well as the development of mechanisms to ensure the continual collection of data to monitor changes across time. Ideally, the University would survey the entire Penn community on an annual basis to gauge individuals' experiences with racism, discrimination, and racial bias. Penn should report these findings and educate faculty, students, and staff on the efforts they are taking to address reported concerns.

The second step in dismantling structural racism is to take action that responds to the data that has been collected. In reviews of Diversity Action Plans, our committee has learned about the many initiatives currently being taken by schools across the University to diversify leadership, faculty and students in response to the data that they have collected. We also learned from colleagues on our committee from PSOM about work that they have undertaken in response to the killing of George Floyd to create several anti-racism committees in various departments focused on structural, policy, and cultural changes. (For example, a January 2021 PSOM publication detailed the roles that medical schools play in propagating the misrepresentation of race in medical curricula and offers approaches for medical educators to modify their courses and curricula to be anti-racist <https://www.nejm.org/doi/pdf/10.1056/NEJMms2025768>).

Yet, this important work being undertaken by the schools is often disconnected from one another and could more effectively be connected

to dismantle structural racism across the entire University. For example, while most schools report providing faculty with latent bias training in relation to faculty searches, it is unclear what these trainings entail and we suspect that it looks extremely different across the schools. More consistent University-wide guidelines would be helpful in ensuring that all schools have a robust and comprehensive approach to latent bias training. One possibility in doing this is through the development of a University-wide train-the-trainer model, which would ensure consistency across schools and allow for the development of consistent policies around issues such as how often faculty should receive latent bias training and the role this training should play in faculty searches and other policy areas.

In the spirit of examining ways of creating more consistent University-wide models for dismantling structural racism, we reviewed the websites of several of our peer institutions and found that many of them comprised University-wide anti-racism committees as well as committed institutional funds for projects that address systemic racism across their campus ([Addressing Systemic Racism Fund | The Office of the Provost | Brown University](#)). We propose that Penn adopt a similar model. Such a University-wide committee could have among its charges the development of transparent University-wide policies focused on diversity, equity and inclusion. Considering the fact that so many of the schools already have Diversity and Equity offices or committees, this seems like a great place to recruit participants for such a University-wide committee. While our committee's charge is a focus on faculty, we envision that such a University-wide committee could broaden its charge to include a specific focus on the interrelationship between leadership, faculty, staff and students. This committee could, for example, monitor trends on the annual University-wide surveys that we are recommending be implemented and identify areas in need of policy changes.

Recommendations:

- The University should administer an annual survey designed to collect data related to issues of diversity, equity and inclusion across the campus as a way of identifying trends and to develop a plan for policy change as appropriate.
- The University should develop a train-the-trainer program that would increase the number of individuals who are qualified to conduct latent bias trainings. The program should provide the resources needed to deliver training sessions and clearer guidelines for how to recognize and address latent biases that occur during the faculty search process. It would also provide consistent University-wide guidelines on issues such as how much time faculty search committees need to devote to such trainings.
- The University should develop a University-wide anti-racist committee that brings together individuals from the different schools focused on issues of diversity, equity and inclusion to develop University-wide policies focused on dismantling structural racism.
- Review the application of the University pandemic-related policy on tenure clock extensions to ensure equity and fairness.

3. *Review the application of the University pandemic-related policy on tenure clock extensions to ensure equity and fairness.*

COVID-19 has impacted the work and careers of many faculty. Based on results from [a survey delivered to faculty in October 2020](#), it appears that all domains of a typical faculty career have been impacted. In the teaching domain, there has been a general increase in time required for course preparation and delivery. In the domain of advising and mentoring, there has been an increase in time spent advising students experiencing pandemic-related challenges. In the domain of service, there has been an increase in time spent in engagement in efforts to make pandemic-related changes to curriculum, advising, lab access, and more, as well as engagement in pandemic-related initiatives for the department, University, professional association, and other organizations. These changes, which required more time spent on non-research activities, have coincided with less access to resources to conduct research due to restrictions on access to research sites, labs, facilities, studios, and other venues; restrictions on professional travel and field research; loss of access to research subjects; need to restart or pivot research; and

(continued on page 4)

(continued from page 3)

cancellation of seminars, presentations, and opportunities to collaborate. These challenges have caused a significant slowing of publication and grant funding processes. At the same time, faculty were burdened with uncharacteristic responsibilities such as caregiving and homeschooling responsibilities and health issues (for self or family).

The specific short- and long-term implications of the pandemic have likely affected faculty members differently. Indeed, negative implications for traditional measures of faculty productivity may be greater, on average, for women faculty and faculty of color, given gender differences in caregiving responsibilities, disproportionately negative health- and economic-related effects of the pandemic on Black and Brown people and communities, and greater expectations for women faculty and faculty of color to engage in mentoring and institutional service. Early data show that journal submissions during the early months of the pandemic were lower for women than for men.

While full implications of the pandemic for faculty will play out over the next several years, given the cumulative and longitudinal nature of faculty research, grant, and publication processes, the University has implemented some measures to assure a fair process that takes into account the extraordinary challenges faced by faculties in the last year.

In September 2020, the University extended the probationary period by one year for all faculty who are assistant professors and associate professors without tenure in the tenure, clinician-educator, and research tracks whose reviews have not already begun, who are not in their mandatory or terminal years, and who have not already received an extension related to COVID-19. This automatic extension is designed to offer maximum flexibility. It does not require the faculty to opt in, yet it can also be waived. In addition, all faculty members may include pandemic impact statements in their annual performance and activity reports and in their dossiers for appointment, tenure, and promotion. External reviewers will be informed that the University added a pandemic impact statement to its review process in spring 2021 and will be asked to consider the short- and long-term implications of the pandemic on working conditions, productivity, and career trajectory when making their evaluations if the dossier includes a pandemic impact statement. Reviewers will also be asked to focus on the quality of scholarly contributions more than the quantity. The University also developed a [Guide for Supporting Penn Faculty](#) that is designed to promote diversity and inclusion for faculty in the pandemic. The guide is meant as an aide to inform how we assess productivity during and following the pandemic-era.

While junior faculty have been clearly impacted by the pandemic, associate professors may have been vulnerable as a result of the pandemic, too, as they are a group who are typically young enough to still be meeting childcare demands and are more committed to other projects and initiatives by virtue of their career progress. The Provost's Faculty Development Session: Life Beyond Promotion to Associate Professor was a first step to address this issue.

On resources for mental health and well-being, Penn has an Employee Assistance Program for faculty and staff, many programs of which can be accessed virtually.

Based on the results of the faculty survey delivered in October, prominent issues described by faculty included mental health and wellness and caregiving. The University has since established a special COVID-19 Childcare Grant offering up to \$2,000 per faculty, staff, and post-doctoral researchers whose salaries are less than \$100,000 to reimburse expenses for childcare between September 1, 2020 and May 31, 2021. A new platform, Caregiver Connections, is designed to help people in the Penn community find others in their own neighborhood to address caregiving needs.

4. Review each school's Diversity Action Plan and identify "best practices" to improve each school's plan as well as the University's plan as embodied in its 2019 Faculty Inclusion Report (and in the process

explore GSE's internal climate survey as a model for incorporating broad, internal feedback).

In connection with this charge, SCFDDE created an organizational chart that sought to answer the questions raised in the 2020 report. Some cross-cutting themes that emerged were an increased reliance on diversity search advisors (DSAs) in identifying and challenging biases in faculty searches, the formations of committees focused on issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) across schools, and the appointment of deans or other school leaders charged with further promoting each school's mission related to DEI. Some DEI leaders had independent budget authority, while many others did not. Some school plans included measurable goals along with clear deliverables to hold themselves accountable for meeting these goals. Yet, this was the exception rather than the rule, with most reports offering few details on how the schools intend to hold themselves accountable for enacting their visions. In addition, very few schools had reporting requirements for DEI activities of individual departments. Lastly, there were not consistent stakeholders included in all schools, ranging from schools that only included standing faculty to schools that included their entire communities including standing and non-standing faculty, students and staff.

Recommendations:

- The University should develop more specific guidelines as to what elements should be included in each school's Diversity Action Plan, including a budget plan for the proposed actions. At minimum, this University-wide guidance should lay out which populations should be covered by the plan, a requirement for the inclusion of baseline data, reporting requirements, and measurable goals and deliverables for how the school will work to enact DEI. GSE's internal climate survey is one model to follow for incorporating baseline data into the plans.
- Review the implementation of Interfolio with respect to its effect on diverse faculty recruitment and retention.

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

Members of our committee met with staff from the Office of the Vice Provost of Faculty to discuss Interfolio. We learned that Interfolio contains some tools that Penn is not currently using that might be helpful in enhancing diversity recruitment efforts. We hope to continue to explore these options in the upcoming academic year.

Recommendations:

- The Faculty Senate should make a formal request for additional information from the Office of the Vice Provost of Faculty with the goal being to eventually encourage schools to make use of these tools as effectively as possible.

SCFDDE Membership 2020-2021

Hydar Ali, Dental Medicine
Antonella Cianferoni, PSOM/Pediatrics
Nelson Flores, GSE, *Co-Chair*
Jorge Gálvez, PSOM/Anesthesiology & Critical Care, *Co-Chair*
Daniel Gillion, SAS/Political Science
Carmen Guerra, PSOM/Medicine
Junhyong Kim, SAS/Biology
Meghan Lane-Fall, PSOM/Anesthesiology & Critical Care
Ken Lum, Weitzman Design
Amy Sepinwall, Wharton

Ex officio:

William Braham, Weitzman, Design, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg, Faculty Senate Chair
Jorge Santiago-Aviles, SEAS/ESE, PASEF non-voting member