mentoring activities; incidence of discriminatory behaviors; concerns regarding prospects for continued employment; intellectual property, and other matters. As of this writing, we are finalizing the addition of additional questions relating to charge 4 (above) to this poll. We have requested approval for administration of the poll to both standing faculty and adjunct faculty and expect to initiate data collection in the early summer.

Proposed Charges for SCOA in 2021-2022

1. Analyze and assess data derived from polling efforts in 2020-2021 relating to the effectiveness of university support for online teaching during the pandemic.
2. Review and comment on any changes at DPS as a result of the Report on Public Safety and Outreach Initiative released in April 2021.

SCOA Membership 2020-2021

Ryan Baker, Education
Joel Bennett, PSOM/Medicine
Peter Kuriloff, Education
Errol Lord, SAS/Philosophy
Vera Krymskaya, PSOM/Medicine, *Chair*
Steven Messé, PSOM/Neurology
Kevin M. F. Platt, SAS/Russian & East European Studies
Erica Reineke, Veterinary Medicine
Ex-officio members:
William Braham, Weitzman Design, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg, Faculty Senate Chair
Marshall Meyer, Wharton, PASEF non-voting member

Report of the Senate Committee on Faculty and the Academic Mission (SCOF)

General Committee Charge

The committee oversees and advises the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) on matters relating to the University's policies and procedures concerning the academic mission, including the structure of the academic staff, the tenure system, faculty appointments and promotions, faculty research, and faculty governance. In general, the committee deals with the matters covered by the following sections of the University's Handbook for Faculty and Academic Administrators: I.E.-F., I.H.2., II.A.-D.

2020-2021 Specific 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 as they apply to the committee's general charge.
2. Facilitate the changes identified in the previous charge.
3. Review and comment on the level and quality of departmental, school and University support for faculty to ensure that the best possible online education can be delivered during the COVID pandemic.
4. Develop best practices for decision making across schools, including for hiring and promotion, with emphasis on inclusivity across ranks and tracks.
5. Identify voting practices across departments and schools to determine who votes on what issues and why.
6. Review voting practices to ensure that those practices cannot be used to discriminate against junior faculty.
7. Monitor the extent to which departments and schools are articulating standards of engaged scholarship.
8. Recommend ways in which broader impacts of engaged scholarship are recognized and rewarded in the promotion and compensation process. Collect best practices for setting up guidelines for evaluating faculty activities.

Recommendation Highlights

1. Schools should develop professional growth opportunities for non-standing faculty.
   a. Faculty in these tracks do not feel appreciated and integrated in department life and do not have a voice in important decisions related to their activities.
   b. Expansion of voting rights to non-standing faculty would not alone address their challenges.
   c. Deans, department chairs, and senior faculty may have too much influence on how non-standing faculty would vote, given their vulnerable positions as at-will employees of the schools.
2. Use faculty satisfaction survey results to inform actions.
   a. School-level results satisfaction surveys should be shared with all faculty during school-wide faculty meetings, and top priorities for improvement should be articulated by school leadership.
   b. The pandemic may exacerbate the lack of sense of belonging for faculty.

3. Clearly enunciate voting practices.
   a. Ensure uniform application of voting practices within each area (department, school, etc.).
   b. Ensure that conscious decisions approved by faculty are made on occasions when multiple options are possible.
   c. Set explicit guidelines for faculty inclusion on search committees.
   d. The Office of the Provost should provide training for new department chairs on decision-making processes and offer refresher sessions every three years. Content should be informed by best practices in decision-making.

Activity Highlights

The committee discussed the need to have meaningful representation and inclusion in decision making for faculty across all tracks. A special concern has been the non-standing faculty tracks (i.e., the associated faculty and academic support staff). Faculty in these tracks are integral to the University's teaching and research missions and should have ways to meaningfully participate in decision-making and to advocate for their interests.

While analyzing data available to SCOF on issues raised by non-standing faculty in recent years, we identified several areas of dissatisfaction for that group compared to standing faculty. However, a disturbingly large portion of standing faculty also report dissatisfaction regarding their ability to participate in decision-making, to fit well in informal faculty networks, and to receive recognition commensurate with their achievements.

We surveyed department chairs to understand variations in decision-making practices. Some departments do not vote anonymously, which may serve to influence faculty to vote against their preferences. Department chairs have authority to make a wide range of decisions without consultation with faculty. Most chairs report that they consult with faculty when making decisions, but who is included in the consultations is not well defined. We recommend that training be provided for all incoming chairs on best practices in decision-making to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Identifying issues of central faculty concern surrounding the role and disposition of academic support staff and associated faculty

Discussion of issues related to academic support staff and associated faculty have been part of SCOF activity each year in the past decade. SCOF reviews each school's requests to hire in faculty tracks it was not previously approved to hire within, to raise caps on sizes in these tracks relative to standing faculty, and to change the rules for these tracks, usually to enhance the possibility of retaining faculty in these tracks. Though SCOF has not reviewed any specific proposals, the committee is anecdotally aware of some interest in requesting changes in voting privileges for faculty in some of these tracks.

Focus groups convened by the Faculty Senate (pre-pandemic) and studies at other universities have documented that faculty in these tracks

do not feel appreciated and integrated in department life and do not have a voice in important decisions related to their activities.

Given that across the University these tracks are growing in size and that faculty in these tracks are integral to the education and research missions of the University, we urge schools to develop and make openly accessible clear paths for professional growth for non-standing faculty. Each school should write explicit bylaws outlining the rights and responsibilities for all faculty, including the non-standing faculty. The Office of the Provost should keep these bylaws on file and accessible to members of the faculty.

Based on our survey of department chairs, SCOF members did not believe the expansion of voting rights to non-standing faculty would alone address their challenges. SCOF members voiced specific concerns that deans, department chairs, and senior faculty may have too much influence on how non-standing faculty would vote, given their vulnerable positions as at-will employees of the schools. In studies at other universities, teaching faculty often co-teach with tenure-track faculty. Questions remain as to the power dynamics in these co-teaching settings.

SCOF also reviewed results from the most recent faculty satisfaction survey completed in 2015. That survey included questions related to inclusion in decision-making and sense of belonging in, and recognition by, the department. The survey was administered to faculty in all Penn schools, to both standing and non-standing faculty. Results are dominated by the Perelman School of Medicine (PSOM), given its faculty size.

SCOF studied the responses for the following three statements:

a. I have a voice in the decision making that affects the direction of my department

b. I feel excluded from an informal network in my department

c. I have to work harder than some of my colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar

Responses to the above three statements were indicated based on a 5-point scale (Strongly disagree, Disagree, Neither disagree or agree, Agree, Strongly agree), with larger value indicating higher satisfaction.

For statement (a), there is a large and significant difference between standing faculty (mean 3.63) and non-standing faculty (mean 3.15). Of the standing faculty, 62% said they agree or strongly agree with statement (a), compared to just 43% for the non-standing faculty. On questions (b) and (c), non-standing faculty again indicated lower satisfaction, but the absolute difference was smaller.

Respondents' top five reasons to consider leaving Penn were the same for standing faculty and non-standing faculty except for one. Standing faculty considered leaving Penn to have more time to do research while non-standing faculty were interested in improving prospects for tenure. This finding suggests that providing paths for promotion and career growth should be a top priority for schools that employ full-time non-standing faculty.

SCOF members were struck by the large percentage of standing faculty who expressed low satisfaction on the above statements. For (a), 19.5% of faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed they have a voice in decision-making. For (b), 18% did not feel included in the informal network. For (c), 28% felt they have to work harder to get equal recognition.

The feeling of not being included in the informal network of the department is likely to worsen because of pandemic-enforced isolation, when established connections are likely to continue and strengthen outside of online faculty meetings but developing new connections would be harder. Deans and department chairs must develop explicit strategies for mitigating these problems.

Gender and racial differences in inclusion, decision-making and recognition

A concern was raised during a Senate Executive Committee (SEC) meeting that the gender and racial composition of non-standing faculty is different than that of standing faculty. If this is true, problems in this track would have a disproportionate impact on women and minorities.

The 2015 faculty satisfaction survey shows that there are more women in the non-standing faculty tracks (42%) compared to standing faculty (32%).

In terms of race, there were slightly fewer white faculty in non-standing faculty tracks (74%) compared to standing faculty (77%).

In group comparisons for standing faculty across gender, race, and sexual orientation status, only Asian faculty as a group expressed lower satisfaction on their ability to contribute to decision-making (mean 3.43 versus 3.66, with non-Hispanic white faculty as the comparison group). The mean for Hispanic faculty is 3.77, greater than that for the non-Hispanic white group. The mean for non-Hispanic Black faculty is 3.59.

Feeling included in decision-making varies by rank, with mean satisfaction of 3.79 for full professors, 3.53 for associate professors, and 3.43 for assistant professors.

Black, Hispanic, and Asian faculty reported feeling less included in informal networks and having to work harder to gain recognition.

Inclusion in decision-making is most problematic for Asian faculty and for junior faculty.

SCOF urges the Provost, deans, and department chairs to use results from faculty satisfaction surveys to identify concerns and develop and publish actionable plans to address these concerns. We are particularly concerned that the ongoing pandemic may exacerbate the lack of sense of belonging for faculty. Schools should develop specific plans for improving their voting and decision-making practices. School-level results satisfaction surveys should be shared with all faculty during school-wide faculty meetings, and top priorities for improvement should be articulated by school leadership.

Problematic voting and decision-making practices

SCOF members reported anecdotally different practices for decision-making in their schools and departments. To get a better sense of the range of practices, SCOF requested that department chairs in all schools (approximately 100) complete a questionnaire. A total of 74 responses were received.

The results confirmed that there is remarkable variation across departmental practices. SCOF urges each school and department to outline their practices in their respective faculty handbooks to ensure that they are uniformly applied and that a conscious decision approved by faculty is made where multiple options are possible.

(A) Anonymous voting

Of all responding departments, 59% report using anonymous voting for important decisions such as hiring and promotion. Several report that results remain anonymous among other faculty but all voting information is available to the department chair. We are concerned about the large number of departments where voting is not anonymous. This practice puts a strain on junior faculty, who may not feel comfortable to vote their true preferences. Even for senior faculty members, these practices may stifle opinions and deliberation in decision-making.

With respect to hiring and promotion decisions, many departments do not record reasons for opposing a decision, some doing so in order to preserve anonymity. SCOF recommends that reasons for which faculty vote in opposition to the majority decision should be collected, anonymously and by a departmental non-faculty administrator, and provided to higher-level university committees, who will approve the decision. Reasons should be collected by an administrator and shared directly with the school-wide committees.

(B) Search committee practices

There is considerable variation in the factors that determine the composition of search committees. The most common factors indicated were: maximizing inclusion in decision-making; area fit with hiring priorities; ensuring representation of various constituencies; continuity with prior searches; and seniority.

In 58% of responding departments, search committee members record their independent opinions before the chair or advocate makes a case for or against a decision. Conversely, 20% of departments do not have such a practice. The remaining 22% use other approaches to decision-making.

Only two responding departments indicated that they use specially appointed "devil's advocates" whose role is to challenge search committee choices.

SCOF recommends that departments should set explicit guidelines for inclusion on search committees and record the frequency of faculty par-

ticipation in this type of decision-making. When choosing candidates to invite for interviews, committee members should identify the factors that would influence those decisions, record them, and evaluate all candidates using the same rubric. At least three independent opinions should be recorded for each candidate before committee discussion, in order to avoid undue influence of an individual's framing (positive or negative) to affect the collective decision.

Similarly, faculty feedback should be collected. Departments should record the percentage of faculty who do not have sufficient information to form an opinion before an open discussion, when opinion will be largely shaped by the presenter.

(C) Department chair responsibilities and training

Many department chairs have the authority to make decisions without faculty consultation. In 84% of responding departments, appointments to search committees are made by the department chair. In some departments, chairs can independently hire lecturers, make decisions about curriculum and teaching assignments, and decide who should be invited to department seminars.

The Office of the Provost should provide training for new department chairs on decision-making processes and offer refresher sessions every three years. Content should be informed by best practices in decision-making.

Use and Usefulness of Student Evaluations

SCOF discussed how teaching evaluations are used in different schools and departments. Anecdotally, in some departments, evaluations are used for promotion but have no consequences for senior faculty. In addition to the variation in evaluation metrics by size and type of course (required versus not), evaluations tend to vary by the degree to which the topic allows "teaching to the test." Also anecdotally, some schools use teaching evaluations to inform decisions about curriculum.

SCOF members expressed concern about the lack of consistent studies of learning outcomes. For example, students of foreign languages were formerly evaluated first according to their progress as measured by carefully constructed tests administered uniformly across all course sections (the so-called "proficiency-requirement"), and only then assigned traditional grades. The implementation of that system in the 1980s required the establishment of a separate category of instructor, the "Lecturer in Foreign Languages." While that specific category of instructor still exists in SAS, the student evaluation system that made the category necessary was expensive and was eventually abandoned.

SCOF members agree that teaching support, including assignment of both teaching assistants and of lecturers who "co-teach" courses, should be fairly distributed.

SAS representatives to SCOF reported the most constructive uses of teaching evaluations. Low-rated evaluations are used to inform the provision of resources and guidance for junior faculty regarding class preparation and student expectations. Evaluations are not used in punitive ways (e.g., to delay or prevent promotions).

SCOF intends to continue its assessment of course evaluations in the next academic year.

Respectfully submitted,

Ani Nenkova, associate professor of computer and information science, on behalf of the SCOF Membership 2020-2021

SCOF Membership 2020-2021

Ariana Chao, Nursing
Eric Clemons, Wharton
Chenoa Flippen, SAS/Sociology
Ani Nenkova, SEAS/CIS, *chair*
Rebecka Peebles, PSOM/Pediatrics
Alexander Reiter, Veterinary Medicine
Bruce Shenker, Dental Medicine
Julia Ticona, Annenberg

Ex Officio Members:
Roger Allen, SAS/Near Eastern Languages & Civilizations, PASEF Representative
William Braham, Weitzman Design, Faculty Senate Chair-Elect
Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Annenberg, Senate Chair

Report of the Faculty Senate Grievance Commission 2021

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 2020-2021, the commission was composed of Connie Ulrich (Nursing, Past Chair), Mitchell Berman (Law, Chair), and Santosh Venkatesh (Engineering, Chair-Elect).

At the time of last year's report, the Commission was reviewing one matter concerning non-reappointment of an untenured faculty member. That matter continued through the summer and, with the Commission's active involvement, was eventually resolved by mutually acceptable agreement among the faculty grievant, their department, and the central administration. In addition, this spring three faculty members from diverse schools and departments separately approached the Commission with preliminary inquiries regarding the Commission's jurisdiction and the nature of the grievance process. In each case, the Chair provided the information requested. In one of the cases, the Chair also spoke with the faculty member at length by phone. As of this writing, none of the three faculty members has pursued the issue further with the Commission.

—Mitchell Berman (Grievance Commission Chair, 2020-2021)