Committee on Committees
Report on the Functioning of Council Committees
during Academic Year 2010-11

Mechanism of Evaluation
Each faculty member on the Committee on Committees was assigned to review a Council committee. Each review consisted of in-person, phone, and/or email interviews typically with the committee chair, administrative liaison, and staff support person, using the questions below. In some cases other members of the committee were asked for responses to these questions as well. Other University constituencies were asked to provide information on committee performance via their members who serve on the committees. All committee members then reported their findings to the Committee on Committees in March for discussion. This report provides an overview of the general findings, as well as specific comments on the functioning of each committee. However, Steering is advised to look at the individual committee reports to gain a complete view of how the committees are performing.

Questions Posed to Each Committee Chair
1. Was the committee’s specific charge for this year clear and appropriate?
2. What changes, if any, do you think need to be made in the committee’s general charge?
3. What issues were addressed this year and were they resolved?
4. How many times did the full committee meet? If subcommittees were created, how many were created, how often did they meet, and what was their purpose?
5. Based on the charges for this year, and the discussion to date, what do you see as issues emerging for consideration next year?
6. Which members would you recommend to serve on the committee next year? Is there anyone on the current committee who is the logical successor as chair, either now or in the future?
7. Is the membership of the committee well suited to the committee’s charge? (expertise, representation of interests, etc.)
8. What was the role of the administration’s liaison in your committee?
9. Whom has the committee consulted or met with during the past year?
10. What problems did the committee encounter, e.g., access to necessary resources?
11. How did the new structure work involving opportunities for oversight, opportunities to work with your administrative liaison to resolve specific issues, and opportunities to generate larger recommendations?
12. What recommendations would you make going forward?
13. Is there any question that should have been asked that was not included?

Overall Comments
This is the first year that University Council committees operated under a new system, intended to increase their capacity for getting things accomplished on their own (in conjunction with their administrative liaison), while putting forward fewer, but more substantial recommendations to the University Council at the end of each year. These changes reflect concerns expressed by Committee members that their recommendations were not adequately responded to and those expressed by administrators that some recommendations did not always reflect full knowledge of what was already happening. Thus, under this system, committees have two major roles:

1. Broad review in its area(s) of interest—monitoring to see whether there are any issues requiring deeper exploration—it is possible that sometimes no recommendations come out of this process, but the University is well served by having a representative body keeping track of what is happening.
2. Deeper consideration of a small number of (1-3) issues. These issues may remain from the previous year’s agendas as reflected in the current charges, or they may result from information uncovered in the monitoring work described above. Such examinations might be undertaken by the committee as a whole, or by subcommittees, and will likely involve multiple meetings and conversations with people around the University engaged with the issue. From this type of examination, two outcomes are possible:

   a) Direct work with the administrators responsible in the focus area to clarify issues and to encourage them to consider policy modifications if appropriate, however, will likely be resolved this way.

   b) Formal proposal of a very small number of well developed and carefully considered recommendations to be forwarded to Council Steering and possibly to Council itself. These may be drawn from policy recommendations that were reviewed at Steering level, but which the committee continues to want to put forward. They may reflect larger scale proposals that require decisions that cannot be made at the level of the area administrators.

This new system offers greater agency to the committees and their members, which should also increase their sense of purpose and the rewards they derive from getting more immediate results from their efforts. Moreover, Council and the Administration consider only those items that require their attention and can do so more efficiently. Overall, this new process should make committee work more productive and rewarding, as well as streamlining the process by which major recommendations are responded to and how those responses are communicated back to the relevant committees.

Because this is the first year under this new operating system, a major issue for consideration across committees is the degree to which the new process provides opportunities for completing their work and reduces the frustrations associated with serving on UC committees to this point.

• In general, and as is detailed below in the reports from each committee, this new system seems to be working quite well. Variation is evident; however, in particular, the Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA) continues to express some frustration with the breadth of their general charge. Alternatively, the Committee on Facilities has made a great deal of progress this year, resolving several issues on their own, in addition to preparing two recommendations to bring to Council.

• Based on recommendations from previous years, the Faculty Senate Tri-Chairs met with the President and the Provost to specifically review each of the committee recommendations from the 2009-2010 academic year, and the feedback they received was communicated directly to the committee membership at the beginning of the 2010-2011 academic year. This took place at the initial meeting of each committee this year, when the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the University also explained the new system for committee work as well as the rationale behind the changes; this, too, was found to be quite helpful. Nonetheless, there was still one instance in which serious miscommunication occurred and committee members were not informed about the result of one of their recommendations. This suggests that there are still areas where reporting may need to be more formalized.

• The appointment of a formal administrative liaison to each committee—in addition to the individuals already staffing them—is highly valued by the committees. In each case, the liaison is appropriate for the broad purview of the committee, though this is more obvious for committees such as Facilities and Personnel Benefits, than it is for a committee like CARA, where there is significant breadth. Liaisons have been a major source of information, and for connecting the committee with others on campus with relevant information. In several instances, committees have been able to move their agenda items forward and to resolve them without requiring formal recommendations to Council.

A final general concern seems to persist from last year: the inconsistent attendance of student representatives at some committee meetings. This seems to be the result of course schedules conflicting with times that are preferable for faculty and staff to meet.
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• The committee again recommended that GAPSA and the UA consider structural approaches to resolving this concern to ensure that student representatives can participate effectively on the committees. Specifically, the committee recommended that, at the beginning of each semester alternate student representatives be named to serve as permanent replacements if the primary representative cannot attend scheduled meetings on a regular basis and therefore needs to be replaced.

Committee on Academic & Related Affairs (CARA)

General Comments: The committee met eight times and functioned well. The committee took on a large number of charges, and was thus only able to address each charge superficially. Generally, each meeting took on one topic for an hour, with little opportunity for follow-up. In the specific charge to CARA, Steering recommended that they focus on one or two of their charges, and merely do overviews of broader areas; ultimately, however, the committee ended up taking an alternative approach and monitored/reviewed each of them. CARA’s role and way of working needs modification, as they simply do not spend enough time on any single issue to be able to prepare informed recommendations.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that the University Council Steering Committee limit this committee’s specific charge to one topic for the committee to focus on. The Committee on Committees also recommends that the committee be offered the opportunity to select one additional charge to focus on, should a topic arise during the year. This scenario did occur this year, when the committee was asked to review the Library’s strategic plan with H. Carton Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries. Finally, now that CARA has completed the monitoring function for each of the areas under its purview, the Committee on Committee suggests that this specific charge rotate each year to cover the broad areas listed in the committee’s general charge.

Committee on Campus & Community Life

General Comments: This committee has will have met five times by the end of the academic year. The committee did not get their finalized membership list until after the first meeting and this caused some confusion for the members who missed that first meeting. Student membership was not finalized until after the first meeting, which resulted in that constituency being confused and out of the loop; several faculty members on the committee encountered scheduling conflicts. Many meetings were re-scheduled or cancelled which caused confusion and made it difficult to follow progress on the committee charges. The committee did take on a large number of charges and similarly to the UC Academic and Related Affairs Committee were thus only able to address each charge superficially.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that the University Council Steering Committee limit this committee’s specific charge to one topic for the committee to focus on. The Committee on Committees also recommends that the committee be offered the opportunity to select one additional charge to focus on, should a topic arise during the year.

Committee on Diversity and Equity

General Comments: In general, this committee functioned well. They also formed subcommittees to focus on the following issues: a University-level diversity website, the climate survey, and the recruitment of a more diverse faculty. Chair Nancy Tkacs explained that this was her first year as Chair and it took her some time to understand the monitoring, liaison, and formal recommendation system initiated this year. The chair noted that this committee’s discussions are emotionally charged and require extensive discussion due to their complexity. This committee has 10 “invited guests” who attend and take an active role in most meetings. In general the invited guests’ input is felt to be beneficial and at times critical to the committee, but it is unclear what role the “invited guests” should play in committees in general, and how their presence influences the input of voting members of the committee. This is of particular concern given the number of committee members (16) relative to the number of invited guests (10). The University Council Committee on Committees noted that the “invited guests” are referred to in the Bylaws with the following language: “Committee chairs, in consultation with their committee, may invite guests to attend committee meetings.” Nonetheless, the Committee on Committees recommends the following procedure for “invited guests”:

• The first meeting of any University Council committee only includes the members of the University Council Committee, the staff, and liaison.
• The Committee Chair, in consultation with the committee may invite one or more guests to attend a committee meeting to provide input for a topic when their input is deemed beneficial for that topic.
• Invited Guests should not be on the committee distribution list.
• There should be an appropriate balance of committee members and invited guests; it was suggested that the number of invited guests at any meeting should not outnumber any single constituency group on the committee.

Committee on Facilities

General Comments: This committee is working well and is very pleased with the monitoring, liaison, and formal recommendation system initiated this year. Some members noted that the new structure made the meetings more informational rather than discussion-oriented but the chair is working on addressing this. The chair hopes to put forward two resolutions for consideration.

Committee on Personnel Benefits

General Comments: This committee functions very well and meets once a month. The issues are complex and some members struggle with understanding the complexity of discussions, and the use of acronyms specific to the personnel benefits world are a challenge for new members to learn quickly. The University Committee on Committees noted that the University Council Personnel Benefits committee Liaison is extremely helpful explaining the complex terminology and new acronyms. It is expected that the Committee will forward two recommendations to Council.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that the Committee on Personnel Benefits organize a new member orientation, and/or develop background materials to familiarize new members with the issues and vocabulary relevant to their charge.

Committee on Committees 2010-2011
Chair: Camille Charles (SAS); Faculty: Shaun Harper (GSE), Robert Hollebeek (SAS), Bob Hornik (Annenberg), Michael McGarvey (Med), Harvey Rubin (Med); GAPSA: Glenn Stieffenhofer (Housing Services); WPPSA: Loretta Hauber (Weingarten Learning Resources Center); UA: Justin Moore (SAS); GAPSA: Henry Friedman (Wharton); Staff: Susan White (Faculty Senate) and Lynne Sniffen (Office of the Secretary).
Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

2010-11 Specific Charges and Related Meetings

1. Meet jointly (or as a subcommittee) with the Senate Committee on Students and the Educational Policy (SCSEP) to address admissions issues.
   • A subcommittee of CARA faculty met jointly with SCSEP and Eric Furda, dean, Admissions, October 25, December 20.
   While the committee may wish to do a broad review of more than one of the following areas, it will want to choose only one as a focus area for this year:

2. Undertake an overview review of athletics, including adequacy of the balance of facilities for intercollegiate, intramural and recreational use; any issues concerning the tension between intercollegiate athletics and formal educational pursuits; any issues around Title IX and recent legal decisions; and the fee structure for membership at Penn’s fitness facilities.
   • Mike Diorka, associate director, Recreation and Athletics–January 24

3. Undertake a review of Library services, including issues related to the balance among funds allocated to purchase of books, journals, newspapers, and (other) electronic resources in the context of changing patterns of user demands.
   • H. Carton Rogers, vice provost & director, Libraries–December 13

4. Examine the role of the Office of Student Conduct and the resolution of cases concerning potential violations of academic conduct rules.
   • Susan Herron, director, Office of Student Conduct–February 14

5. Review plans and initiatives for increasing opportunities for undergraduate research.
   • Harriet Joseph, director, Center for Undergraduate Research and Fellowships and Wallace Genser, associate director, CURF–November 8

CURF—Recommendations

1. We recommend a systematic improvement in tracking and recognizing undergraduates who are involved in research activities. CURF plays an important role in stimulating undergraduate interest in research. Yet, few statistics are apparently retained about the outcomes of student searches. For example, the PURM program stimulated nearly 500 applicants in 2010 for 45 slots, but whether the 450+ unsuccessful applicants found alternative positions on campus does not appear to have been recorded. This statistic, which covers a fraction of the undergraduates apparently involved in research, seems to reflect that there is no central tracking of either the numbers or the type of research activity in which students are engaged. Much information of this type must already be available from many academic departments, such as through course registration or payroll accounting, or from the Student Employment Office. Also, it seems that pollin students and faculty directly could be productive, in particular providing a means to count those, such as research-active volunteers, who may otherwise be missed. Finally the question arose as to whether student participation in research activity, a likely highlight of their experience at Penn, could be more effectively documented as part of the Official Record.

2. Several different responsibility centers in this Committee’s purview emphasized the importance of academic integrity training (i.e., CURF, Library, OSC). Although such training is Federally-mandated for many researchers and consequently for many graduate and undergraduate students involved in research, actual statistics on the existence of an academic integrity “problem” on the Penn campus are hard to come by. We recommend that the Committee address this issue in the coming year, both to avoid the redundancy due to overlapping areas of responsibility and to ensure that all students, faculty and staff are appropriately covered.

Library—Recommendations

1. We recommend supporting Open Access publishing to a greater degree to help counter the problem of costly subscriptions to “bundled journals.”

2. We recommend a review of the relationship between the Library budget and projected academic and other growth areas (e.g., new professorships, research centers, organizations, departments and other programs). Each expansion and new initiative potentially places additional strains on the Library budget.

3. Regarding the use of course-support software, it appears that Blackboard is adequate. For those who wish to use it as a simple repository of information, it seems effective, but there is a consensus that the yearly updates cause an unnecessary irritation to the average user. We understand that there are several alternatives to Blackboard under consideration, including an upgraded version of Blackboard itself and some open source options. No matter how the support program evolves, it would be appreciated if more effective training were available so that users could obtain the maximum advantage from the program (e.g., on-line grading, interactivity). We certainly recommend a review of this system, taking into account projected user needs.

Athletics and Recreation—Recommendations

1. The Athletics and Recreation administration is concerned that women’s teams commonly lose players beyond their second year. We recommend that the underlying causes be examined, in order to encourage increased participation among juniors and seniors. Considering the various constraints on the Athletics budget, it seems appropriate also to review the relative participation in the different programs.

2. We also recommend that Recreation and Athletics make every effort to adjust the fee structure and facility availability to encourage the involvement of personnel other than undergraduates, most of whom are on campus twelve months of the year.

3. The Committee supports the recommendation from Recreation and Athletics to extend Penn Transit service to Penn Park, particularly after normal business hours. However, the Committee also recommends that this request be combined with a review of the overall effectiveness of Penn Transit in servicing Center City after hours, which is of particular concern to Graduate and Professional Students.

Office of Student Conduct—Recommendations

We recommend a review of academic integrity training practices across the campus, with a view to developing a more uniform system. We recommend particular attention to TA training programs, including the Summer Orientation Program for International TA’s, currently administered by the Office of International Programs, considering that Teaching Assistants are responsible for demonstrating good practices to undergraduates. Close coordination with the OSC and Federal guidelines would seem appropriate.

General Recommendations for CARA Committee 2011-2012

The Committee suggests for next year that the two recommendations that emerged from CURF form the basis of the Committee agenda: (1) Documentation of undergraduate research activity, and (2) Assessment of academic integrity issues. The second item was also expressed as a concern in discussions with both the Library and OSC.

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs 2010-2011

Chair: Michael Topp (SAS); Faculty: Kathleen Bozes-Battaglia (Dental), Nancy Hanrahan (Nursing), Paula Henthorn (Vet), Leszek Kubin (Vet), Jon Merz (Med), Paul Shaman (Wharton), John Vohs (SEAS); Graduate Students: Michael Kelly-Sell (Med), Maria Murray (SEAS); Undergraduate Students: Charles Gray (Wharton), Daniel Urgelles (SAS); PPSA: Laura Foltman (GSE), Jon Shaw (Libraries); WPPSA: Suzanne Oh (GSE), Peter Rockett (SEAS); Administrative Liaisons: Karen Lawrence (Provost’s Office), Leo Charney (Provost’s Office); Staff: Ralph Dispigno (Provost’s Office).
Committee on Diversity and Equity

General Committee Charge

The Committee on Diversity and Equity aids Penn in fostering and taking full advantage of its diversity as well as in strengthening ties across all boundaries to enrich and enliven the campus community. The Committee shall advise the offices of the president, provost, and the executive vice presidents on ways to develop and maintain a supportive atmosphere on campus for the inclusion and appreciation of diversity among all members of the University community. The Committee will review and provide advice regarding the University’s equal opportunity and affirmative action programs and policies. The areas in which the Committee shall report to the Council include diversity within the educational and work settings, integration of staff and faculty into the larger campus community, and ways to foster a campus environment that is inclusive and supportive of difference. The Committee also will advise the administration on specific diversity issues that may arise on campus.

2010-2011 Specific Charges

1. Help to finalize the architecture for a forthcoming Diversity website.
2. Continue joint efforts with the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity.
3. Meet with newly named Affirmative Action Officer. Discuss University plans in relevant areas.
4. Continue to consider ways of adding a qualitative component to University efforts at assessing campus climate, including consultation with Penn faculty who might help to design it.
5. Continue to monitor the implementation of gender-nonspecific campus policies, including the possibility of installing more private showers in recreational bathrooms and providing broader housing options for incoming undergraduates who identify as transgender.
6. Collect data on current diversity initiatives within all 12 Schools.
7. Review and discuss the committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given highest priority for the committee’s work in AY 2011-2012.

The committee met seven times this year.

Monitoring Reviews Undertaken By the Committee

The committee invited the following speakers to address specific topics noted below:

- Sam Starks, newly appointed Executive Director of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs—purpose of the invitation: to welcome him and give him the opportunity to meet the committee, and to update us on his progress in the position.
- William C. Gipson, Associate Vice Provost for Equity and Access—purpose of the invitation: to update the committee on the focus group follow up from the PULSE survey, and to describe the many “pipeline” programs on campus.
- Andy Binn, Vice Provost for Education—purpose of the invitation: to provide an overview on student surveys and plans for a survey of enrolled graduate/professional students.
- Lynn Lees, Vice Provost for Faculty and Joann Mitchell, Vice President for Institutional Affairs—purpose of the meeting was to have the Diversity and Equity Committee provide input on the developing University of Pennsylvania Diversity Action Plan.

Specific Issues Addressed With Administrative Liaison:

1. Examining the process of following up the PULSE survey and establishment of focus groups. We learned that this process involved work during summer 2010 when this committee did not meet. The committee requested that, whenever possible, we be kept informed of new developments relevant to the issues raised of underrepresented minority students, and that consideration be given to involving one or more committee members in the planning and implementation of following up on student survey data in this area.
2. Examining the process of follow-up on the 2010 recommendation supporting the Personnel Benefits Committee (PBC) recommendation for the University to add coverage of medical care for transgender faculty and staff. Procedures were identified to continue to work with the PBC on this recommendation.

Formal Recommendations to University Council

1. We enthusiastically commend the administration’s current initiative of developing and implementing a diversity action plan focusing on recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. We recommend that consideration be given to the plan including such elements and strategies as:
   a) Working with the Office of the Provost and the Deans of the different schools to assess records and processes documenting recruitment, retention, and promotion of underrepresented minority faculty.
   b) Increasing participation in small group and online workshops on unconscious bias for search committee members across all schools of the University and consideration of making such training mandatory for all search committee members.
   c) Work with the Deans of the different schools to consider identifying 1-2 faculty members who would be granted release time from one course each in order to help implement the recommendations of the University of Pennsylvania Diversity Action Plan within each school.
   d) Continuing to work towards adoption of coverage for triadic care of transgender persons and a tax equalization strategy for partner benefits for faculty and staff.
   e) Continuing and strengthening the University’s pipeline initiatives for enhancing recruitment and retention of diverse and underrepresented minority individuals participation in University life at the pre-college, undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral level.
   f) We recommend that consideration be given to such elements and strategies as:
      a) Continue to disseminate the results of student and faculty surveys to relevant University groups and committees and broadly solicit participation of members of those groups in relevant follow up initiatives.
      b) Identify a target date for development and implementation of climate surveys among graduate and professional students, and among University staff.

Recommendations of Topics or Continuing Topics to be Addressed 2011-2012

1. Work with the Office of Affirmative Action on the development, dissemination, and monitoring of strategies to increase the prominence of diversity-related information via the University and School websites.
2. Work with the Office of the Provost and with the SCFDD to assess school-level facilitators and barriers to recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and to monitor the progress of the newly developed University of Pennsylvania Diversity Action Plan.
3. Work with the Office of the Provost and other appropriate offices to monitor University processes documenting recruitment, retention, and graduation of underrepresented minority undergraduate and graduate students.
4. Monitor the development and implementation of inclusive policies related to transgender health benefits and tax equalization, and progress on gender-nonspecific campus policies.

Chair: Nancy Tkac (Nursing); Faculty: Tulia Falletti (SAS), John Jackson (Annenberg/SAS), Grace Kao (SAS), Lisa Lewis (Nursing), Anna Malykina (Med), Yvonne Paterson (Med), Robert Preucel (SAS); PPSA: Delores Magobet (SEAS), Diane Sandefur (TRIO Veterans Upward Bound); WPPSA: Connie Gordon (Makau) and Michelle Wells Lockett (Med); Administrative Liaison: Lubna Mian (Provost’s Office); Graduate Student: Sandya Ajith (Med), Henry Friedman (Wharton); Undergraduate Students: Wendy De La Rosa (Wharton), Sasha Lagomba (Wharton); Invited Guests: Valerie Allen (African-American Resource Center), June Chu (Pan-Asian American Community House), Valerie De Cruz (GIC), Mary Lou de Leon Siantz (Diversity and Cultural Affairs), Gloria Gay (PWC), Johnny Inzarray (La Casa Latina), Nicole Maloy (Alumni Relations), Kevin Rurak (Public Safety), Bob Schoenberg (LGBT Center), Sean Vereen (Admissions); Staff: Gail Oberton (Equity and Access Programs).
Committee on Campus and Community Life

General Committee Charge

(i) shall have cognizance over the University’s communications and public relations activities in their various formats and media including electronic, audio (the telephone system), video and printed copy, and it shall monitor the University’s internal communications, the operations of the University Communications Office, communications to alumni, and the interpretation of the University to its many constituencies;

(ii) shall advise the Council on the relationship of the University to the surrounding community and the relevant University policies, work to ensure that the University develops and maintains a constructive relationship with the community, and monitor pending real estate activities of concern to the community;

(iii) shall have cognizance of the conditions and rules of undergraduate and graduate student life on campus, including 1) gathering and analyzing information concerning student life and student affairs and making recommendations to the Council; and 2) responding as appropriate to requests from and reporting information and recommendations concerning student life and student affairs to the vice provost for university life and other appropriate administrative officers; and

(iv) shall advise the president, the vice president for public safety, and the administrators or directors of specific buildings, offices, projects on all matters concerning safety and security in the conduct of their operations, including consideration and assessment of means to improve the quality and safety on the campus.

2010-2011 Specific Charges

1. Review the PULSE survey and other information about the climate among students, staff and faculty; evaluate the findings of these surveys; and consider how this information could be used to improve the quality of life at Penn.

2. Review the adequacy of dining services. In particular consider the manner in which the provision of dining services complements, enhances, and fits into the mission of the University.

3. Examine the role that the Civic House and the Platt Performing Arts House play in campus and community life.

4. Meet with the new director of the Office of Student Life to discuss the operation of that office and to gauge current perspectives on student life, and possible areas for committee engagement.

5. Review and discuss the committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given highest priority for the committee’s work inAY 2011-2012.

Reviews Per Charges

The Committee met 6 times.

1. The Committee met with Will Gipson, Associate Vice Provost for Equity & Access, and others regarding the PULSE survey, learned that the University is refining the data, and was satisfied with the direction that the University is taking in use of this information. The Committee would like to review this issue again next year.

2. The Committee met with Doug Berger, Executive Director of Business Services, and others from Dining Services and learned that Mr. Berger has put together a blue ribbon committee of stakeholders—including input from the Residential Advisory Board—to consider how the provision of food services fits into Penn’s mission; the Committee waits for the findings of that committee and would like to return to this issue next year.

3. The Committee met with Karu Kozuma, the new executive director of the Office of Student Life, and was impressed by his vision for and understanding of the lives of students at Penn. The Executive Director should be made an ex officio member of the Committee.

4. The Committee heard from numerous Directors of Centers and continues to be impressed by and grateful for the contributions that these Centers make to the life of our University.

5. The Committee heard from numerous Directors of Centers and continues to be impressed by the LGBT Center and the work of Penn’s administration.

6. The Committee toured Sansom Place to evaluate the ongoing renovations. Although probably not as extensive as everyone would like, the renovations are transformative. The Committee learned that although students in Sansom do not necessarily ask specifically for “community,” they do ask for many services that fall under the rubric of community.

Recommendation of the Committee

The Committee has one recommendation: Based on all of the persons with whom the Committee met, on communications with other Committees, and with discussions between the members of the Committee and various persons at Penn specifically to discuss this question, the Committee has learned of a growing apprehension. Many of our Schools seem to be considering creating or expanding non-degree conferring programs. These programs, which bear Penn’s name, promise to be very attractive, including to students outside of the United States. If these programs are created or expanded, an unknown number of students will be added to the population using services offered by Penn and by the surrounding community. If the University and/or the surrounding community cannot support these students, then their experiences outside of academics may be adversely affected. If large numbers of short term students have a lower quality experience, (a) Penn will not have lived up to its mission, and (b) stories from these persons could affect Penn’s reputation. The word “if” is highlighted because the committee was unable to obtain any reliable information on these possibilities. The critical first step in ascertaining whether there is in fact cause for apprehension is determining whether an increase in student population is actually likely. The Committee is willing to undertake the project of polling the schools, assembling the data, and reporting its findings. The Committee asks that the Central Administration ask for cooperation from the Schools. In the alternative, the Committee recommends that the Central Administration or the Faculty Senate assemble information on the projected numbers of programs and possible numbers of students enrolled.

Committee on Campus & Community Life 2010-2011

Chair: Philip Nichols (Wharton); Faculty: Kent Bream (Med), Andrea Doyle (SP2), Kathleen Hall (GSE), Judi Hollandier (Med), Chantia Hughes-Halbert (Med), Eileen Sullivan-Marx (Nursing), Henry Teune (SAS); PPSA: Gil Oberton (Equity & Access), Chris Pastore (LPS); WPPSA: Loretta Hauber (Weingarten Learning Resources Center); Joyce Woodward-Jones (ULAR); Administrative Liaison: Ajay Nair (VPUL); Staff: Lisa Payakovich (VPUL); Graduate Students: EmilyJoy Rothchild (SAS), Felicia Yen (Law); Undergraduate Students: Elizabeth Qian (Wharton), Mo Shahin (SAS).
Committee on Facilities

The Committee on Facilities is responsible for reviewing the planning and operation by the University of its physical plant and all services associated therewith, including transportation and parking. The Committee held seven meetings over the academic year and had one subcommittee specifically charged with monitoring open playing green space.

The Chair would like to thank the members of committee, David Holenberg, Taylor Berkowitz and our invited guests for their contributions and dedication to the Facilities Committee and its report for this year.

2010-2011 Specific Charges

1. Examine issues related to general-use space not controlled by specific schools. It should begin with a careful survey of the existing space and of the current unmet needs for such space.

2. Assess the progress that the University is making in bicycle and pedestrian safety. The new South Street Bridge is expected to reopen in late 2010, and the committee should note the effect of this opening on both vehicular and bicycle traffic to and from the campus.

3. Monitor the extent and use of green space on campus and receive updates on the progress of the Penn Park. Although Penn Park will probably not be complete by the end of the 2010-2011 academic year, the committee should monitor its progress and plans for understanding how it will be used by students, by other members of the Penn community, and by individuals from outside the Penn community.

4. Space at the north end of Penn Park has been reserved for “future development.” Discuss with University planners what is being considered for that development, and whether it will eventually present an opportunity to plan for facilities that would be a draw for all of the Penn community and which might help integrate the east campus with the rest of the University.

5. Review and discuss the committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given highest priority for the committee’s work in AY 2011-2012.

In addition to these charges, the Committee addressed several areas of new business during the year which, for the most part, fell under charge number 1 above, and included an investigation of status of lactation rooms on campus and condition of Guardian Drive, which will result in a formal recommendations from the committee. The Committee also reviewed issues that were brought to the Committee regarding Parking, ADA accessibility on campus, condition of Hamilton Walk, issues of package delivery to Greek houses, inappropriate use of automatic handicap doors on campus, and Hutchinson Gym renovations. The new monitoring, liaison, formal recommendation system worked well for our committee in its first year.

The remainder of the report has four sections. The first section of the report reviews how the Committee’s work on several of its original charges, and new business issues were addressed through the Committee’s monitoring role. The second section reflects how the Committee used its liaison and invited guests to resolve several issues that were brought to its attention during the year. The third section deals with two formal recommendations that the Committee will make which evolved from its investigations regarding lactation centers on campus and condition of Guardian Drive. The fourth section reviews the Committee’s own recommendations for topics or continuing themes to be addressed the following academic year.

Monitoring

The Committee monitored the extent and use of green space on campus. The Committee had a presentation on Shoemaker Green from Edward Sidor and Marc Cooper, from Facilities Design and Construction Management. Construction of Shoemaker Green is scheduled to commence in the spring of 2011. It was determined that the space will be mostly passive, open green space with design principles similar to that of College Green. The space incorporates sustainable characteristics. Shoemaker Green will be used primarily and also for special events such as Penn Days. Consideration will be given to provide access to Penn Park during construction and improvements will be made to the 33rd Street Crosswalk to slow traffic and make it safer for pedestrians.

Mark Kocent, Principal Planner, spoke to the committee about Penn Connects and updated the committee on Penn Park. Penn Connects is a 30-year campus master plan. Phase I is nearly complete (2005-2010), with Phase II underway now (2010-2020). Penn Park will open in Fall of 2011. Circulation through the Park will be possible from the Walnut Street Bridge to the Holloback Center and to the Palestra and Weiss Pavilion.

Once Penn Park is open, construction on Shoemaker Green will begin. Access to Penn Park from campus will remain open via the newly widened sidewalk in front of Weiss Pavilion. The green space subcommittee toured the Penn Park construction site with Mike Diorka from the Department of Recreation. Overall, the committee is pleased with the plans which are being undertaken by the University concerning green space and open playing green space but plans to continue to monitor this issue.

2011. Circulation through the Park will be possible from the Walnut Street Bridge reopened in late 2010 and the Committee noted an improvement of vehicular and bicycle traffic to and from the campus. The Committee again benefited from an update from Mark Kocent concerning the progress that the University is making in this area. The University works with the City and PA Department of Transportation to restore bike lanes as needed. Public Safety enforces the parking regulations on campus, including double parking. Public Safety and FRES engage in the Share the Road campaign to help educate the Penn community in pedestrian and bicycle safety. Signage for bicyclists and pedestrians are discussed among FRES, Public Safety, and UPHS and are part of the transportation conversations with the City. The University has begun to add bike corrals around key areas of campus. One example of a bike corral is at 36th and Walnut Streets, on the south side. Additional signage and markings have been added to the 34th Street intersection between Walnut and Spruce Streets. The University has installed speed bumps that will calm traffic without interfering with emergency vehicles. Similar traffic calming measures will be taken at the 33rd Street intersection between Walnut and Spruce Streets. The University is also working with the City to designate areas, approximately three parking spaces long, for Penn Bus pick-up and drop-off as well as deliveries to area businesses along major corridors. The Schuylkill River Development Corporation has plans to widen the sidewalks along the Walnut Street Bridge by removing one lane of traffic, and placing lights in the portion of the sidewalk closest to the vehicular traffic, creating a larger buffer between pedestrians and the bicycle and vehicular traffic. For the most part the Committee has been pleased with the progress the University has made in these areas but during the year we were made aware of concerns regarding Guardian Drive and will make a formal recommendation concerning Guardian Drive in the third section of the report.

During the year several concerns were raised in committee regarding transportation and parking on campus. There were questions about how the parking fees are used and how parking subsidizes transportation or other programs. How are the parking facilities maintained? How are used assigned spaces, and can spaces be reserved within a garage? There were concerns about overcrowding in some garages. There were concerns raised that users were parking in handicap spaces and leaving their cars parked for an extended period of time. Users who have been using the spaces for a prolonged period of time were also often found to be overcrowded. There were also concerns regarding the cost of parking to individual users. There were concerns raised about safety in some garages as well. Based on these issues, the Committee was given an extensive overview from Marie Witt and Brian Shaw regarding the departments of parking and transportation. As a result of this review and subsequent follow up meetings with Ms. Witt and Mr. Shaw, most of the Committee’s concerns were resolved. Of particular interest, the University will begin ticketing illegally parked cars, likely beginning in May of 2011. There is also a plan to move longer term student parking to one centrally located underutilized garage on campus thus eliminating some the congestion in some of the more crowded garages. Business Services is in the process of designating spaces for hybrids to complement the goals of the Climate Action Plan. Business Services will work toward making this information more readily available and improving overall transparency regarding where parking revenues are being utilized. The Committee was for the most part satisfied with current progress being made by the University regarding parking and transportation but the Committee also felt that this issue would require further monitoring in the future. There was a motion to form a subcommittee for the purpose for the following year.

During the year concerns were also brought to Committee’s attention concerning the American Disabilities Act and whether the University was meeting standards regarding university-owned buildings, particularly the Greek houses on campus. The Committee questioned if the University should contribute to the maintenance of the buildings since they own the
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property. Tom Hauber gave an overview of how renovations work within the Greek houses. There are 24 University managed Greek houses and 12 privately owned houses. There are not additional funds dedicated to the Greek houses at this time. In 2005, the University conducted a study of the Penn-managed houses to assess code upgrades, deferred maintenance and ADA. From 2005–2009, VPUL completed all code upgrades and life safety issues. Starting in 2010, they have focused on deferred maintenance projects. The Greek houses are not part of the allocated cost pool. Rather, they pay rent to the University. The fraternities and sororities are responsible for maintaining their houses and can work with VPUL to hire contractors to do repairs as needed. VPUL will continue to address ADA needs as they arise. Last year, a ramp and 1st floor bathroom were renovated in the ATO house to meet a student’s needs. VPUL has also gone back to the National Chapters to ask them for their help on deferred maintenance and ADA issues. Some of the houses are very difficult to make ADA compliant but we make as many accommodations as possible. VPUL is also reassessing the deferred maintenance needs of the houses in comparison to the 2005 study. Many of the needs were taken care of when the code upgrades were made, so they suspect that the need will be lower. Ryan Rose, the University liaison with the Architectural Barrier Removal Program (ABRP) and manager of ADA projects for FRES, further updated the committee on this issue. FRES gets a sum of money every year from the FRF pool to use as needed. Most of the funds are used to retrofit student dorm rooms. It can cost $20,000–50,000 to fit specific needs for a student in a room that already complies with ADA code. Another reason most ADA upgrades are made on a case-by-case basis is that the need of each student, staff, or faculty member is specific and the code may change throughout the years, so a retrofit to a building today is not necessarily compliant in five years. A recent renovation included a ramp to the cafeteria in Hill House. Based on this information from Mr. Hauber and Mr. Rose, the Committee felt the University was meeting, if not far exceeding, the ADA standards. It should be noted that Committee felt that meeting the needs of any disabled member of University of Pennsylvania community should be of the highest priority despite any financial implications.

Concerns were brought to the Committee regarding whether smoking would be allowed in Penn Park. Through conversations with Mike Diorka, Department of Recreation, this issue was clarified. During official events in Penn Park, smoking will not allowed and it will be enforced in the area of the event. There are no further limitations in the other areas of Penn Park.

Concerns were brought to the Committee regarding the loss of locker and shower space in the Hutchinson Gym during upcoming renovations. Dr. Diorka again clarified this issue for the Committee. During the renovation of Hutchinson, a reduced number of large lockers will be available for both men and women. The women’s showers will remain accessible and the Department of Recreation is working on a solution for the men’s showers. Although Dr. Diorka could not guarantee this would be the case concerning the locker rooms in the Hutchinson Gym, he did say it was a priority and the committee was satisfied with recreational efforts in this area.

Admittedly, the Committee did not substantially address two of our charges during this academic year: dealing with space at the north end of the area of Penn Park which had been reserved for “future development” and examining issues related to general-use space not controlled by specific schools. The chair felt that these topics were too broad to be adequately explored and that other issues raised to the Committee had higher priority. The Committee did consider the lactation centers in its formal recommendations which one could argue fall under the general use space charge. The Committee will consider these broader charges in the future if the need arises.

Work with the Administrative Liaison

Several issues that were brought to the committee’s attention during the year were able to be handled through our liaison, David Hollenberg, who was assisted by some of our invited guests during the academic year.

One of the concerns was the condition of Hamilton Walk. Hamilton Walk is in poor condition and the Committee felt that restoration should be considered. After discussions with Mr. Hollenberg, it was discovered that several projects were going around the issue of Hamilton Walk. In the near future, thus any repairs that would be done will likely need to be redone given the extensive work that will be done there. The committee agreed with this assessment and will continue to monitor the progress on Hamilton Walk in the future.

Concerns were raised concerning difficulties for students living in Greek Houses having packages delivered. Marie Witt offered to look into a better way to have packages delivered to the Greek Houses. She has reported that the Executive Director for Business Services responsible for Housing, Off-Campus Services, Conferences and Dining had been meeting with Dr. Ajay Nair from the Associate Vice Provost (VPUL) regarding the issue of package delivery to the Greek Houses and that the issue would likely be resolved with packages being delivered to the college houses. Starting in Fall of 2011, Housing Services will be offering academic year parcel holding services to off-campus residents including those living in fraternities and sororities.

The committee was concerned with the number of people who use the handicap buttons on campus to open doors when they do not actually need the handicap button. It uses excess electricity and lets out a lot of heat and air conditioning from the buildings needlessly. The Committee recommended a sticker or sign, or replacement button to be put on/near the handicap push-buttons that indicates something along the lines of “please use only when needed—help us conserve energy”. FRES is currently actively working on appropriate signage that will accomplish this goal.

Formal Recommendations

Guardian Drive

A. Investigation

Relating to the Committee’s charge to monitor bicycle and pedestrian safety, a safety concern regarding Guardian Drive was brought to the Committee’s attention from members of the committee itself due to concerns from their constituents. Guardian Drive is a thoroughfare which begins between the Nursing School and Biomedical Library and runs to University Ave. The drive is open to vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Because of development in this area of campus, it has become an increasingly frequent area for pedestrian foot traffic. In the estimation of the Committee, the overall condition of the drive with regards to pedestrian use is poor. It does not have sidewalks in some areas. Where sidewalks are present, they are in poor condition, particularly on the west end near the pond. As such most pedestrians just walk on the street. The Committee feels these conditions may result in injury risk to pedestrians. Through discussion with our Liaison, David Hollenberg, we learned that future renovations planned for Guardian Drive but timing of these renovations may not be in the near future.

B. Recommendation

- The committee is recommending that repairs and renovations to Guardian Drive be given a higher priority so that potential for pedestrian injury can be lessened.

Lactation Centers and Rooms: (Formal Recommendation)

A. Investigation

The concern that the University may not be meeting the needs of nursing mothers due to lack of University-wide lactation centers was brought to the committee’s attention from its constituents. The Committee felt this was an important issue and spent a significant amount of our time this year investigating this issue and developing a formal recommendation. The committee benefited from discussions with Felicity Paxton from the Penn’s Women’s Center, Marilyn Kraut from the Division of Human Resources, and Dr. Diane Spatz, Associate Professor of Health Care of Women and Childbearing Nursing. While reviewing this issue, we found that the Human Resources Division has been working with its representatives in the Schools and Centers to roll out the Health Care Reform Act of 2010 legislation. Despite this, the committee was still concerned that the University may need to make further progress to accommodate those in the Penn community who wish to make the choice to breast feed and to pump breast milk while on campus. We also learned that the University is lagging behind others in addressing this issue. For example, Children’s Hospital of Pennsylvania has an extensive program with an expectant mother’s website and program along with 14 designated lactation rooms on its campus. Harvard has 20 spaces.

B. Current conditions on campus

1. Response to the Health Care Reform Act of 2010

The Health Care Reform Act of 2010 included a Lactation Amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) requiring employers to provide FLSA-covered employees: (This is weekly paid staff at Penn)

a. A reasonable break time for an employee to express breast milk for her nursing child for 1 year after the child’s birth each time such employee has need to express the milk; and

b. A place, other than a bathroom, that is shielded from view and free from
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intrusion from coworkers and the public, which may be used by an employee to express breast milk.

The law applies only to weekly-paid staff. To its credit, the Penn Division of Human Resources is developing a policy that will apply to all staff at Penn, not just the weekly-paid staff. It is clear from our discussion with Human Resources that the lactation center policy is something that it considers a priority. In the Human Resources policy, it is stated that it will provide information and specs for offices that wish to develop state-of-the-art lactation spaces or something more than the minimum requirements of this legislation. It is also stated that it will work with Quality of Work Life Office to see how things are going and if need is exceeding school/center options for space.

Currently, when a need arises most Schools and Centers plan to have their Building Administrators identify a temporary space for accommodating nursing mothers’ needs. The burden is placed on a nursing mother in need of a lactation room to contact administrators to arrange the service. One could see how this could be difficult, particularly for students and graduate students. The committee feels this creates an unnecessary barrier and may result in women choosing not to breast feed.

2. Current lactation facilities on campus

The University of Pennsylvania does have lactation centers and rooms already in use:

1. The Family Resource Center in Houston Hall has private rooms which can be used without reservation.
2. Penn’s Woman’s Center at 3643 Locust Walk has private rooms that can be used without reservation.
3. Graduate Student Center at 3615 Locust Walk has private rooms that need to be reserved.
4. HUP has a lactation room in the maternity ward in the Silverstein building for patients and employee use. It should be noted that this is a locked unit so access is limited and there are concerns about infant safety that need to be addressed with each visit.
5. We understand that some Schools have lactation rooms that may be currently open to all, but if use is too great then they will be limited to schools. We are confirming that the following Schools have such lactation spaces.
   a. Annenberg
   b. Nursing
   c. Engineering

Overall, there is a dearth of established lactation space on campus for students, staff, residents, and faculty. These rooms are in central campus, not within easy walking distance of most areas of campus. While it is true that nursing mothers can go through the process of contacting administrators to have temporary rooms established, this again seems burdensome and difficult. Standard lactation rooms should have a lockable door, sanitary, comfortable seating, a sink, electrical outlet, appropriate lighting, and curtains for multiuser rooms. Thus, the committee feels the University of Pennsylvania may not be providing an adequate number of spaces open to the entire Penn community geographically spread throughout campus.

It should be noted that the Penn Women’s Center, Family Resource Center, Graduate Resource Center, and members of GAPSA have spent a significant amount of time thinking about these issues and have offered to provide assistance to the Committee, as appropriate.

C. Recommendations

In summary the committee feels that mothers should not have to choose between providing human milk for their baby and returning to work or school. The University, while making an effort in this area, could be doing more to support nursing mothers and their families. The Committee feels that the addition of more permanent spaces that are open to the entire campus community would help with recruitment and retention of both students and staff and would certainly make Penn a more family-friendly space. One could hire a consultant to determine easily converted spaces at appropriate geographic distribution throughout the campus that could serve students, faculty, and staff.

Further, the committee makes the following recommendations regarding lactation rooms on campus:
1. Make access to lactation spaces throughout campus a priority.
2. Initiate a study to better assess the needs and resources on campus.
3. Develop a clear policy that breast pumping is accepted and supported at every level of the University for members at any level.
4. Increase the number of permanent lactation rooms that are open to the University community and are geographically dispersed throughout campus to meet the need.

In order to accomplish the above recommendations, the committee would like to capitalize on the existing expertise on campus and use them as a resource. The University and Committee may also need additional resources from the University to hire a consultant.

The committee plans to keep this topic open for the next academic year. In addition, we will form a subcommittee to monitor its progress. We look forward to hearing your response and hope that you share in our commitment to this issue.

Recommendations of Topics or Continuing Topics to be Addressed for Next Academic Year

A. Continue to study and monitor lactation spaces and policy on campus (priority item).
B. Continue to monitor parking on campus and specifically whether the Committee’s concerns regarding parking continue to be addressed.
C. Continue to monitor the extent and use of green space on campus and receive updates on the progress of the Penn Park and Shoemaker Green.
D. Continue to monitor and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.
E. Monitor and receive updates on University development/Penn Connect Plans.
F. The Committee historically addresses new issues which come to its attention during the academic year. The committee is open to addressing new issues from University Council or its constituents in the upcoming year.
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Personnel Benefits Committee

The Personnel Benefits Committee issued an interim report prior to the April Council meeting since they still have more Committee meetings yet to be held. The final report of the Committee will be published in Almanac this fall after it is released.

Meanwhile, their interim report, along with the other committees’ final reports are on the University Council website: www.upenn.edu/secretary/council/committees.html.
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