

(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*