COUNCIL 2011-2012 Year-End Reports

Committee on Committees
Report on the Functioning of Council Committees during Academic Year 2011-2012

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 Committees were asked for responses to the same 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, the Committee 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?
8. What was the role of the administration’s liaison in your Committee?
9. Did someone from the administration provide explicit feedback on last year’s recommendations? Was the feedback satisfactory? Were there any remaining aspects that have not been resolved or for which a path has not been developed?
10. Whom has the Committee consulted or met with during the past year?
11. Did the monitor from the Office of the University Secretary assigned to your Committee provide useful information? Was this person helpful or not needed?
12. What problems did the Committee encounter, e.g., access to necessary resources?
13. Did the Committee structure work involving opportunities for oversight, opportunities to work with your administrative liaison to resolve specific issues, and opportunities to generate larger recommendations?
14. What recommendations about the Committee’s process and organization would you make going forward?
15. Is there any question that should have been asked about the process that was not included?
16. Students only were asked: Do the student members feel their voices are heard? Was there a primary and an alternate student representative on each Committee?

Overall Comments
This is the first year that a relevant, high-level administrator attended a meeting early in the year of each University Council Committee and provided responses regarding the findings and recommendations from the previous year’s report. Committee members valued this important feedback, because it enhanced the continuity between the Committees’ charges, suggestions for action, and implementation by the University.
Also new this year, a Monitor from the Office of the University Secretary of the University attended each Committee’s meeting to provide a direct link with the administration to help facilitate the mission of the Committee. This person was to provide support to the Committee, in addition to the staff member and liaison assigned to the Committee. The Committees were unanimous in reporting that the Monitor was unnecessary, and that the position should be discontinued. The Committee on Committees recommended that progress and impediments related to the charges should be assessed via mid-year contact by the Office of the University Secretary with the staff, liaison, and chair of each Committee. A mid-year progress report should be shared with the Steering Committee and the Chair of the Steering Committee.

Each University Council Committee continues to 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 (1-3) issues that arise from last year’s agenda and recommendations, or new information. These issues might be explained 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. Most can be resolved by working directly with the administrators responsible in the focus area to clarify issues and consider policy modifications. Occasionally, after this path has not resolved an issue satisfactorily, a formal, carefully considered recommendation will be forwarded to Council Steering and possibly to Council itself.

Overall, the reduced number of major issues continues to be well received by the Committees, and the general consensus was that considerable progress towards issue resolution was made this year by consulting with relevant administrators that were invited to specific meetings. Recommendations for next year included scheduling adequate discussion time for the Committee after visitor presentations, and ensuring that the Liaison or a representative of the Liaison attended every meeting, because their participation was highly valued.

Several lingering challenges persist from last year:
• Appointment of, communication with, and attendance of student Committee members remain a concern. The Committee on Committees recommends that Committee staff members work with GAPSA and UA in the fall to disseminate descriptions of the Committees and their charges, and help notify appointees.
• The Committees on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA) and Campus and Community Life continue to express some frustration with the breadth of their general charge, and their charges should be clarified and stratified for next year.

• To provide logistical transparency, it remains important that the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Secretary of the University explain to each University Council Committee the role of the University Council Committees; last year’s charges, recommendations and formal feedback system; this year’s charges and mechanisms for resolving issues directly with administration or via Steering by University Council; and the role of the Liaison and Staff members assigned to the Committee.

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA)
General Comments: The Committee met monthly and functioned well. The Committee charges for 2011-2012 were focused on two areas, undergraduate research opportunities and academic integrity, and addressed one topic each semester. Some members felt each topic was too diffuse to permit identification and resolution of issues during a single year. However, the Committee also expressed concern that this limited focus on two topics was at the cost of providing oversight and monitoring for their many other charges. They recommended forming monitoring subcommittees next year, and invite administrative officials to report on issues that arise during the year. These monitoring meetings would be expected to result in formulation of specific, timely charges for CARA in upcoming years.

The Committee expressed frustration about challenges related to staffing.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that the University Council Steering Committee again limit this Committee’s specific charge to one or two topics for the Committee to focus on. The Committee on Committees also recommends that the Committee develop a procedure that will allow them to complement their more intensive specific charges and monitor the broader areas listed in the Committee’s general charge.

(continued on next page)
Committee on Committees

(continued from page 1)

Committee on Campus and Community Life
General Comments: The number of Committee meetings and attendance was not provided for this report. Members reported that the specific charges of the Committee were too broad in scope. For example, reviewing the PULSE survey results revealed multiple topics to investigate further, making it difficult for the Committee to formulate comprehensive recommendations in a single year. The Committee has a low turnover rate with good institutional memory, and therefore requested a multi-year plan for addressing issues. Members identified the University administration’s need to balance student satisfaction with dining services and maintaining a profitable business unit. These perceived competing goals impeded resolution of issues. Finally, some Committee members felt the Committee meetings would benefit from more formalized agendas with a more explicit link to the specific and general charges.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that the University Council Steering Committee provide more detail on this Committee’s one or two specific charges next year. The Committee on Committees also recommends that administrative feedback on this year’s recommendations be provided next year. Finally, the Committee should be offered the opportunity to establish a multi-year plan for monitoring climate issues among students, staff, and faculty.

Committee on Diversity and Equity
General Comments: In general, this Committee met monthly throughout the academic year. The Committee had four specific charges, and addressed each in one or two meetings. The administrative liaison provided valuable updates and suggestions for consultants who could report on topics of relevance to the charges. The new policy for limiting the number of and attendance of invited guests was effective, and allowed for frank discussion amongst Committee members.

The University Council Committee on Committees noted that the charges next year should be focused on one or two issues for investigation and recommendations for resolution. Several issues have now moved towards implementation (e.g., dissemination of diversity-related information via the Diversity website), and these areas should be monitored by the Committee next year.

Committee on Facilities
General Comments: This Committee met monthly throughout the academic year and is engaged. Invited guests provided important background about diverse aspects of the specific charges (e.g., legal, scholarly, administrative, aesthetic). Monthly minutes provided updates to absent members. The Chair expects to put forward one formal resolution for University Council to consider.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that the University Council Steering Committee restructure the charges next year into one or two major focus issues and one or two areas under its purview to monitor. The Committee on Facilities is encouraged to work with the Committee on Campus and Community Life on areas of mutual interest related to bicyclists and pedestrians.

Committee on Personnel Benefits
General Comments: This Committee functioned very well and meets once a month. A subcommittee focused on tuition benefits. The liaison from Human Resources worked with the Committee members to address all nine specific charges, and several have been resolved. It is expected that the Committee will focus on fewer issues next year. Committee members found the new policy for limiting the attendance of non-Committee members at meetings to improve the Committee discussion.

The University Council Committee on Committees recommends that the Committee on Personnel Benefits continue to provide complex background and proposal materials to members prior to the meeting to utilize Committee discussion time more effectively.

Committee on Committees 2011-2012
Chair: Susan Margulies; Faculty: Camille Charles, Ellis Golub, Bob Hornik, Steve Kimbrough, Chi-ming Yang; GAPSA: Holly Marrone; WPPSA: Loretta Hauber; UA: Frank Collleluori; GAPSA: Ed Chen; Staff: Susan White and Joseph Gasiewski

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

Executive Summary
CARA met monthly during the past academic year and focused its attention on two items. First, it examined the matter of academic integrity at Penn. This is where the Committee spent the majority of its time and met with a number of students, staff, faculty and administrators from across Penn’s campus as well as having conversations with other individuals at other universities and colleges. The results of these discussions include the following:

1. Academic integrity is an important topic to both faculty and students and procedures and policies to reinforce academic integrity at Penn are important and must be balanced with their effects on the academic lives of both students and faculty;
2. Academic integrity is a shared responsibility between faculty and students—both have a stake in its outcome;
3. After extensive consultation, the Committee developed a set of best practices that can be used by faculty to help further facilitate academic integrity at Penn;
4. There is more to do in this area and we suggest that next year’s Committee continue discussion and work on academic integrity.

Second, CARA started its consideration of undergraduate research. The results of this more limited discussion included the following:

1. Undergraduate research is a key differentiator for Penn and is aligned with its values and core strengths; there is enthusiasm among students, staff, faculty and administrators for providing this rich learning experience to all undergraduates who want to participate;
2. Ways to enhance and increase participation of undergraduates is an important part of the mission of the four undergraduate schools and each is pursuing its own strategy for implementing this with their students.

This is a topic that requires further discussion and is an ideal topic for CARA next year, especially given the self-study that occurs prior to Middle States Accreditation.

Specific Charges for 2011-2012

1. The University puts a high priority on research experience for undergraduates. However, the beginning review that CARA undertook last year suggested that there are many unknowns about these opportunities, and how many opportunities are available (both through formal programs, like PURM, and through informal mechanisms). Be sure to include research settings outside the four undergraduate schools. Are there students who want such experience but cannot find appropriate opportunities? Is there a need for more research opportunities to be offered? Have research experiences been productive for students given what is expected from them itself, by faculty sponsors, and by administrators? Develop recommendations about possible policy changes or program procedure changes, if needed.
2. Review the state of academic integrity procedures at Penn. There are issues of academic integrity associated with classroom performance (e.g., cheating, plagiarism) and issues associated with research (e.g., human subjects procedures, responsible conduct of research). The review of academic integrity may include examination of current approaches to educating students and instructors (including TAs) about principles and rules, as well as procedures for reporting and for adjudicating possible integrity violations. It may be useful to consider both the official framework and actual current practices and experience with regard to academic integrity procedures. Close coordination with the Office of Student Conduct and of the office charged with human subjects protection (Institutional Review Board) may be helpful in this process. Develop recommendations if appropriate.
3. 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 2012-2013.

CARA members thought the charge of the Committee is indeed very broad, perhaps too broad, and appreciated the more-focused specific charges above. They used the guidelines above to move forward with the two topics of interest for 2011–2012; namely, academic integrity and undergraduate research.
Representatives Meeting with CARA

The following people came to a CARA meeting and they provided useful context and specific information as well as answering questions and participating in discussions. We are enormously appreciative of their time and significant contributions to this report.

Academic Integrity:
- Andy Binns (Vice Provost for Education)
- Faye Cheng (Undergraduate Assembly, UA)
- Dennis DeTurck (Dean of the College)
- Susan Herron (Director of the Office of Student Conduct, OSC)
- Joan Gluch, (Associate Dean for Academic Policies, Penn Dental School)
- Barbara Mann Wall (Associate Professor, Penn School of Nursing)
- Georgette Phillips (Vice Dean, Wharton Undergraduate Division)
- Aaron Roth (Honorary Council)
- Cristina Sorice (Student Committee on Undergraduate Education, SCUE)
- Catherine Turner (Senior Associate Director, Center for Teaching & Learning)

- Santosh Venkatesh (Associate Professor, Penn Engineering)

Undergraduate Research:
- Martin Asher (Director, Research and Scholars Programs, Wharton)
- Andy Binns (Vice Provost for Education)
- Dennis DeTurck (Dean of the College)
- Wallace Gensler (Associate Director of Undergraduate Research, CURF)
- Joe Sun (Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, Penn Engineering)

CARA Discussion on Academic Integrity

Our initial discussion on this topic started with Andy Binns, Vice Provost for Education, during our first meeting as a Committee. He informed us of the work on academic integrity that was being done by the Council of Undergraduate Deans and also the federally mandated subject of Responsible Conduct in Research Training (RCR). He also noted the work of Bruce Lenthall, director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, who has done research on good teaching practices.

Santosh Herron, director of OSC, provided a comprehensive background on OSC and how cases of suspected student misconduct are handled. OSC is responsible for acting on behalf of the University in matters of student discipline. Their job is to investigate complaints regarding possible violations of academic integrity, determine whether or not violations have occurred and, if so, determine appropriate sanctions. OSC has both an educational and a disciplinary role. The educational part is working with students so that they understand their behavior, understand what is wrong with it, take responsibility for it, and sign an agreement acknowledging their responsibility and agreeing to sanctions.

Faculty have the right to treat cheating on their own (e.g., through a lowering of a grade because the work is not worth the original grade due to some unfair advantage obtained by a student) but cannot impose sanctions. It is the obligation of the Committee that serial cheaters tend to slip through the system if faculty do not report infractions to OSC. There is often hesitancy on the part of faculty to become involved with OSC by reporting cases.

Typical cases that come to OSC involve plagiarism, requests for re-grading (where original material has been changed by the student) and improper collaboration during exams or in other work.

One of the challenges for students, staff, and faculty is the lack of consistent guidance, terminology and practice in the area of academic integrity. For example, what is improper collaboration for one instructor or one course is sometimes considered normal for another instructor or course. There is a great variation in practice across campus when it comes to collaboration on assignments done outside of class. For this reason, the particular issue of collaboration outside for the classroom seems to be a massive gray area for students and one that is often not discussed carefully by faculty for their particular courses.

Catherine Turner, senior associate director of the Center for Teaching & Learning, provided an overview of the Center’s work with faculty and TAs. Standing faculty learn about academic integrity at Penn when they first arrive and also at some departmental meetings.

TAs from the School of Arts & Sciences, the School of Design and the School of Nursing attend a two and a half-day training session that covers academic integrity. TAs are taught about methods to write exams and other assignments so that plagiarism is more difficult, ways to help their students navigate ambiguous areas issues from collaboration among students, and methods to articulate appropriate academic integrity policies in their syllabi.

Members of CARA noted there is a perception that dealing with OSC is not always a faculty member’s preferred venue for dealing with issues of academic integrity. Two reasons were presented: (1) it is very time-consuming for faculty and that disciplinary hearings can take an enormous amount of their time, including extending beyond the academic period of the course. Most faculty members have heard of some previous colleague who spent an inordinate amount of time because of bringing a case to OSC or its predecessor. However, it appears that only a very small percentage of cases brought to OSC ever go to a hearing. The vast majority of cases (well over 90%) are dealt with through an agreement between OSC and the student. (2) Faculty are often reluctant to engage OSC for fear of creating a permanent mark on a student’s record. It is also possible that faculty perceptions are not in alignment with present reality and more could be done both in terms of communication and in addressing these concerns.

We note that academic integrity is a shared responsibility of both students and faculty. Students see cheating as undermining their own learning experience and would like to see it eliminated. Faculty also see cheating as undermining the learning experience but sometimes do not give enough attention to prevention. The Committee heard from many of the guests we met with that faculty need to take far stronger positions with regard to cheating and that the University needs to provide clearer guidelines to the faculty to help streamline the message to students. We recommend preventative measures be taken by faculty at the beginning of each course by having a discussion regarding academic integrity as it applies to the course, especially in the issue of collaboration outside of class. Additional preventative measures include the design of assignments and exams so that cheating is more difficult. Although most of our discussion was with regard to academic integrity and undergraduates, our graduate students also need education in this area. Some of this is accomplished through TA training but faculty advisors could also play a key role here when their graduate students first arrive on campus. The faculty perception of OSC and the facts of what procedures are typically involved in most of the cases is not consistent. There is an opportunity to increase the communication between faculty and OSC in order to better support the academic code of integrity. Finally, faculty and staff advisors should discuss this with incoming freshmen as part of their one-on-one orientation to first semester students.

We also recommend that students themselves get more involved in academic integrity. As one example, this could be done through the help of peer-advisors and RAs who are prepared to discuss this with incoming students early in the year.

Best Practices: The work in this area is perhaps best summarized by a list of best practices, things that could be done to enhance academic integrity. These include:

1. Reduce the opportunity for cheating. The faculty has a responsibility to put in place appropriate measures to discourage academic dishonesty.
2. Use appeals to morality and self-respect; faculty can articulate these ideals explicitly in class.
3. Discuss the code of academic integrity in detail. This should be part of the faculty introduction to each course.
   a. The first lecture should clearly and seriously include this topic.
   b. Students suggested that penalties need not be draconian but need to be smart.
4. Faculty should note the specific guidelines for collaboration on homework, because this is a gray area that appears to have many variations depending on the department and instructor and is sometimes very confusing to students.
5. Faculty can use additional preventative measures:
   a. Let students know what will happen to them if they do not abide by the code of academic integrity.
   b. Stay in the classroom during exams.
   c. Have enough TAs in the classroom monitoring exams.
   d. For some courses, extra versions of exams (not the same to each student); this is being used in some quantitative courses.
   e. Require students to place electronic devices at the front or back of

4. We understand there is work in the College that is intended to address some of these issues and to improve the tracking of serial cheaters. In addition, we understand that the Schools and OCS are working on a document to enhance communication about the work of OSC over time.

5. One guest has pointed out that adjunct faculty and other non-standing faculty, in particular, may not have appropriate education in how to treat suspected violations of the academic code of integrity.
the classroom during exams, not next to their desks.

6. Use the statement of academic honesty on the blue books and have it typed in other exams and homework (e.g., projects, comprehensive exams).
   a. This statement does not seem to be widely used but is thought to be effective by both faculty and students.
   b. Use it consistently and have it signed (e.g., at the beginning of each exam).

7. Work on take-home exams in large classes is notoriously challenging with regard to academic integrity—use sparingly or avoid.

8. For group projects, one strategy to encourage academic honesty is to have students estimate the percent effort or participation grade of other group members.

9. Faculty can be specific, this helps (e.g., “I have turned in people before and I will turn them in again. Students violating the Code of Academic Integrity will get a grade of F for the assignment or will be sent to the OSC”).

7. One guest noted that a potential pitfall in having students provide a portion of their grades for other students in a group is that students in a competitive environment may mark down classmates or gang-up on a particular classmate in order to improve their own standing. We do not know how common these actions are.

that provide students with funding and connections to faculty researchers. There is also an informal program that links undergraduates to faculty and Penn students over lunch.

In Penn Engineering, Joe Sun, vice dean for academic affairs, noted that all students are involved in research and design through a project that they work on in their senior year in small groups with the assistance of faculty from across campus. The Summer Undergraduate Research in Engineering (SURE) Program, the International Summer Undergraduate Research Experience (SURE) Program and the Rachleff Scholars Program are all ways in which undergraduates can participate in research in Penn Engineering. In addition, the Vagelos Integrated Program in Energy Research (VIPER) enrolls undergraduates who are interested in energy science and engineering and provides them with a research experience.

It was clear to our Committee that undergraduate research is enthusiastically supported by students, staff, faculty and the administration. Schools have found their own ways to tailor programs to their constituencies and this linkage of undergraduates to mentors and research groups provides a powerful learning experience. The goal here should be to have research opportunities for any Penn undergraduate who is interested. It is advantageous to have this research formally documented. We also recommend that students be encouraged by their faculty mentors and advisors to seek out local and national meetings to present their work.

Conclusions

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity at Penn is both a shared responsibility and a concern of students and faculty. A number of measures to encourage academic integrity have already been put in place but are not used consistently. There are a number of preventative measures that can be used and we encourage our faculty colleagues to note the best practices listed and to use them appropriately in their own teaching. One of the keys to reaching the occasional cheater is to set the guidelines and tone early in each course and early in the student experience at Penn.

The only way to stop serial cheaters is to have a record of these individuals. This is difficult if faculty do not communicate incidents of academic code violation to OSC. There is an opportunity to increase the communication between OSC and the faculty so that they can provide mutual support. At the moment there appears to be little awareness on the part of faculty as to the details of what OSC does.

There are also a number of different policies among the schools and several schools are evaluating their own policies on academic integrity. The Office of the Provost is a place that could bring schools together to exchange ideas and perhaps to provide guidance on baseline concepts and expectations for faculty and students.

With respect to the next year, there is more that should be done with respect to coordination among the schools in the area of academic integrity; we encourage CARA to look at ways to enhance these interactions in order to avoid duplication of effort as individual schools further investigate academic integrity.

Undergraduate Research

Undergraduate research is an enormous positive for Penn in both recruiting and in the undergraduate learning experience. Schools have innovative and effective programs. We would like to see a research opportunity for each undergraduate who desires it. We sense that increased funding, in particular, is needed to make this a reality.

We have only begun the conversation across campus on undergraduate research and this seems to be an appropriate area for continued work by CARA. There is the challenge of finding increased funding to further support undergraduate research and travel, and there are also matters of student protection and potential conflicts of interest. With regard to future discussions on this subject, particularly with the August 2012 implementation of NIH conflict of interest regulations that apply to faculty at all universities, there should be a consideration regarding faculty extramural activities (private consulting) and undergraduate research opportunities to ensure that university resources are not used inappropriately for extramural benefit. Neither of these two areas was investigated this year.

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs 2011-2012

Chair: Dwight Jaggard; Faculty: Jean Bennett, Paula Henthorn, Martin Polin; GAPSA: Debbi Gilal, Jon Shaw; WPPSA: Peter Rockett, Suzanne Oh; UA: Abe Sutton, Ariel Rosenbaum; PPSA: Christopher Pupik Dean, Yao Peng; Administrative Liaison: Leo Charney; Staff: Ralph Dispigno and Raisha Price
Committee on Campus and Community Life

Specific Charges for 2011-2012

1. Continue to 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. Continue conversations with dining services to discuss the adequacy of dining services and follow up on last year’s meeting to discuss the findings of the Blue Ribbon Committee of stakeholders and the Residential Advisory Board put together by Doug Berger, executive director of the Business Services Division. Consider how the provision of food services fits into Penn’s mission.

3. Consider the implications of creating or expanding non-degree conference programs for non-academic life.

4. 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 2012-2013.

5. Identifying two or three charges for AY 2012-2013.
   a. The Committee should consider a reduced number of charges but explore them more deeply.
   b. The Committee should consider the proposal to make the campus a smoke-free environment.
   c. The Committee would like to understand the prevalence, the officials responsible to oversee, the definitions of, and the University policies on bullying, including cyber bullying, throughout the University community.

The Committee met five times. The Office of Student Life provided invaluable support in arranging meetings and meeting places. Fitting with the purpose of the Committee, we were able to meet in the LGBT Center, the ARCH, Houston Hall, and the VPUL offices.

Report per Charges

1. PULSE Survey—The Committee met after attending the PULSE Survey qualitative results presentation in January. To provide a brief background, the PULSE Survey was a broad survey of undergraduates regarding their experiences at Penn. The original survey instrument found differences in student experience based on race and ethnicity, particularly around respect and community. The Provost’s Office subsequently asked Dr. Judy Shea, to explore the meaning of the quantitative differences using qualitative methods. Dr. Shea presented her findings from seven focus groups held with oversampling of student leaders and minority students.

On the issue of respect: While the purpose of the group was to understand the issues of disrespect found in the quantitative instrument, the focus group participants did not initially identify it as an issue or a problem. On further probing, participants from a minority background were able to identify instances of disrespect. These instances described an environment of insiders versus outsiders, a classroom perspective of either being overlooked or having the expectation of “speaking for the race.” The larger issue that was identified by all groups regardless of race, LGBT status, or leadership role was the threat, or reality, of experience as an asset or liability based on socio-economic status (SES). It was strongly felt that SES highly determines students’ undergraduate experience outside the classroom. While people talk about race, SES is the issue. SES leads to both segregation and isolation in the Penn community and creates feelings of pressure or stigma in individuals. Specifically there is pressure on students from low SES to “keep up” with the “Penn way.” It was felt that this carries over into the classroom especially around professor expectations of purchasing course materials and in course discussions. Students recommended more events with more programmed and structured interactions. The participants also recommended more recruitment and retention of minority faculty.

The issue of community, focus group participants reported that Penn fosters segmentation into small, target, or affinity groups. Students felt more connected to small groups than to the University as a whole. They did not feel community existed at the University level. The pigeonholing into small groups was especially felt among minority participants. Places that the University fosters community include the College Houses and particularly the freshman houses, extracurricular activities that are part of their academic careers, majors, shared backgrounds, and mutual friends. The students recommended improved mentoring, spreading the Activity Fair over time, improved roommate matching, more group and forced class [year] activities, interactions between upper and incoming classes, late night activities, and “improved off-hour eating options through non-union labor.”

In summary, though, students felt Penn was an “ivy buffet” and a “complex mosaic” of “unexpected treasures.” Generally participants were happy and required probes to find negative issues. Essentially all said they would come to Penn again.

Our conclusions and recommendations:

a. It is difficult to know if the findings are doing great or doing terribly. The comparison can be compared to the national survey on student engagement? Even if a national comparison said we were doing well, we should not rest when there is an opportunity to do better.

b. SES is an issue inside and outside the classroom.

c. The Committee concludes that SES probably needs more study to understand class differences. This may interact with other demographic variables.

d. The CCL Committee believes there is communication to faculty that should be done right away about the classroom environment. Specifically, the focus group findings around pressures on students from lower SES backgrounds should be shared. In addition, the findings around African American students feeling the expectation of “speaking for the race” should be shared with faculty.

e. The focus group data should be used to inform the next iteration of the PULSE Survey.

f. There are some within Penn messaging about belonging at “Penn” or “Not Penn” that may be about non-Penn community members but that may carry into our Penn community around SES. An example of this would be neighborhoods we live in, security of places around Penn, or activities outside of Penn to participate in.

2. Dining Services—The Committee met with Doug Berger and Pamela Lampitt. The recent renovations to McClelland Hall were discussed including the co-location of retail and all you care to eat environments. Plans for strategic renovations of Class of 1920 Commons were described focusing on creating a central gathering space and supporting the mission of the University. Hill dining renovation plans were also described. Bon Appetit was recognized and congratulated for being an excellent partner of the University which provides good service to the University community.

Current AY new meal plan designs were described as well as the philosophy of creating a broad menu of plans for different types of students. These range from high dining dollar, low meal swipe plans to unlimited meal swipe plans (the EAT plan). There were some challenges this year over some students taking advantage of loopholes in certain plans.

Finally, the strategic role of providing dining services as part of the University mission was discussed. Specifically, there is a broad spectrum of roles of dining services at peer institutions. Some institutions see dining plans as a revenue center that can subsidize other institutional activities. Other institutions see providing environments where academic discourse can occur over meals as core to the institutional mission and subsidize the plans. In addition, it was noted that what this provides space for interactions and access that is not based on SES status (see PULSE Survey above). Penn’s model is strongly consistent with the former (revenue center that can subsidize). While the Penn consumer price of meal plans is consistent with or less than other institutions, there is a “University services” or allocated cost charge to these revenues which reduces the funds available for dining plan product. While the fungible nature of money prevents direct assignment of these “allocated costs” to other expenses, the business model of the University may connect these subsidies to Penn child care, transit, and mail services.

Our conclusions and recommendations:

a. Dining services should be provided as part of the mission of the University to create non-classroom space and time to develop intellectual discourse and that is not accessed based on SES status.

b. GAs and RAs in the College Houses could become ambassadors for dining services and communicate about the variety of meal plans available to students.

c. Integrating faculty into dining services is a desirable way to support the academic mission of having dining. This includes supporting faculty meal plans as well as the Provost’s Office continuing to support special dining service meals for specific classes. Advertising the extant Provost’s Office support for these themed meals would be helpful.

d. In co-located retail and all-you-care-to-eat environments (McClelland and soon Commons and Hill), there needs to be better management of al-you-care-to-eat operations to match inventory availability for both choices. The Committee also supports “meal equivalent” availability for retail purchases.

e. The issues of allocated costs are part of the University’s complex
The Committee strongly supports dining as a space for developing students’' intellectual and democratic skills. The Committee also supports the subsidy of child care for low wage workers. De-linking these two important missions may be a solution.

f. See below regarding internal competition.

3. Non-Degree conferring programs—This issue was discussed at our last meeting of the year. Kathy Urban came from FPS to assist us in discussion the issue. It was clear that the issue is not easily defined in that there are credit granting non-degree programs including visiting students and Quaker consortium students, non-credit non-degree certificate programs, other teaching or training programs including conferences and specific department or office independent-activities, and commercial space and staff rental opportunities. This diversity of programming makes it difficult to define “non-degree conferring programs.”

Our conclusions and recommendations:

a. Non-degree offerings seem to be managed on an ad-hoc basis specific to the program, office, department, or division that is hosting it. If non-degree programs are to grow, there needs to be institutional coordination to deal with any issues the University may face. The status quo allows programs to start without looking at the impact on the University environment.

b. Revenue (central administration or local office) is an attractive benefit of non-degree programs but may contrast to the degree granting mission of the University. These revenue generating activities can create demand for space, structure, and services that is then taken away from Penn community members who are involved in the degree granting mission. Conference Services is the most visible provider of non-credit non-degree programs but there are other autonomous programs that create competition for space, infrastructure, and support.

c. Support services should be available for enrolled non-degree students including crisis management, health services like CAPS, career services, and library resource privileges. The Committee recognizes there is a cost associated with these but did not have the information or resources to understand if these costs are already paid through central subvention or would need to be paid in addition to current support.

d. See below regarding internal competition.

4. Internal competition issues addressed by the 2011-2012 charges—The Committee found in discussing the charges that internal financial competition from Responsibility Center Management may have long term effects on intra-institution collaboration and cooperation and that internal economies and shared mission may be compromised. The University should think strategically about the effect of internal competition on the institution and the role of competition for revenues and avoidance of expenses within the institution. The Committee felt this competition probably promoted intra-institutional exclusion rather than the desired internal efficiency of Responsibility Center Management. While creating good fiscal management, RCM may also create competition for external revenues which lowers marginal revenues. It may also create monopoly power with intra-institution expenses which drives up these costs. Stewardship and revenue generation in RCM may tax mission based activities. This was particularly seen with the dining services discussion and the non-degree activities. It also probably contributed to the exclusion of bicycle commuters from benefits (see additional issues below). The Committee felt this issue sat behind many of its charges but also felt that this issue was beyond the scope of this Committee.

Report of Additional Issues Discussed

1. Hazing—During the time of the first meeting of the year, there were significant public allegations of hazing within the Undergraduate Assembly. The public discussion of these allegations included an understanding that hazing was prevalent in non-Greek student groups and that it was desired by some students. The Committee used the first meeting of the year to discuss the issue of perceived hazing within the University community.

The anti-hazing policy of the University focuses on fraternities and sororities. Perceived hazing, however, is managed through the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs and is a reference to including “initiation rituals,” “rites of passage,” “initiation rituals,” and “collective transgression.” In these contexts the spirit of the rituals and the voluntariness of participants in the rituals was emphasized.

The Committee made the following suggestions:

a. Perceived hazing compromises inclusion of potential new diverse members to our community.

b. The hazing policy should focus on the University community broadly. The specific mention in the Penn Book Antihazing Regulations reference to including “fraternities and sororities” in the University community and the policy should apply more broadly.

c. The Antihazing Regulation Section B is too specific in naming what hazing is and should be less so. It may give the appearance than non-listed activities are not hazing.

d. Faculty and College Houses staff should have training on looking for and talking about hazing.

e. There is value to collective transgression and the University should not attempt to micro-manage group rituals.

2. Bicycles on Campus—A Committee member brought to the Committee an additional issue of bicycle commuter benefits. The Committee accepted the issue of bicycles on campus onto its agenda. The Committee recognized the positive climate, environment and physical health impact that bicycling to, on, and around campus has. The Committee discussed two issues in particular around bicycles: the availability of the federally allowed bicycle commuter benefit and the campus environment of bicycles and pedestrians mixing.

Section 132(f) of the IRS code allows for qualified reimbursement of qualified bicycle commuter expenses which includes expenses of the purchase of a bicycle and bicycle improvements, repair, and storage. (IRS publication 15-B). For IRS purposes, these expenses are equated to the provision of transit passes and qualified parking. While the University offers (income tax-free) fringe benefits for (petroleum-based) transit and parking, it does not support employees who choose to bicycle to work with the same allowed fringe benefits.

The Committee then discussed the physical environment on campus with increasing numbers of bicycles. The growing number of bicycles on campus creates a potentially dangerous environment when pedestrians and bicyclists mix. The Committee was grateful for the significant increase in bicycle lanes and marking/signage of bicycle lanes on campus.

The Committee made the following recommendations:

a. For fairness and environmental sustainability, the University should support bicycle commuters with the IRS allowable fringe benefit for bicycle commuting.

b. Bicycle bans on pedestrian walkways should be expanded beyond Locust Walk during limited hours to all pedestrian walkways, including Hamilton Walk, during all hours.

c. Maintenance of bicycle bans on pedestrian walkways should be better managed either positively through community communication or alternatively through more enforcement.

d. Campus design for campus bicycle based transportation should continue to be developed so community members traveling across the campus can travel more efficiently. This includes:

i. Continuous improvement of street-based bicycle paths

ii. Creation of bike-designated paths (Sansom St., Curie Blvd.)

iii. FRES developing “bike-campus maps” to emphasize how a biker can get around campus

iv. The development of more advanced bicycle corrals including support for electric bikes and facilities (changing/shower) for people who bike before, during, or after work.

Chair: Kent Bream; Faculty: Andrea Doyle, Kathy Urban, 1st Titi, Jai, Angola Mills, Ben Nathans, Jordan Schmidt, PPSA: Chris Pastore, Karima Williams; WPPSA: Loretta Hauber, Joyce Jones; UA: Nikita Anand, Tiffany Zhu; GPPSA: Maria Murray; Administrative Liaison: Karu Kozuma; Staff: Laura Harcourt
Committee on Diversity and Equity

Specific Charges for 2011-2012
1. Work with the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs 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 Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity (SCFDDE) to assess school-level facilitators and barriers to recruitment and retention of a 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. Communicate with the University Council Committee on Personnel Benefits concerning their progress in the development and implementation of inclusive policies relating to transgender health benefits and tax equalization, and monitor progress on gender-nonspecific campus policies.
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 2012-2013.

Major Points Addressed by the Committee
The Committee invited the following speakers to address specific topics noted below:
1. Lynn Lees and Joann Mitchell spoke to the Committee about the progress of the Faculty Diversity Action Plan.
2. Andy Binns, vice provost for education, provided an overview on University processes for monitoring and ensuring the success of diverse/underrepresented/at risk students. He also briefly updated the group on student surveys with respect to climate assessment.
3. Diane Sandefur spoke to the Committee about the Trio Veterans Upward Bound program and of Penn’s participation in the Yellow Ribbon program.
4. Bob Schoenberg provided an update about LGBTQ progress and concerns.
5. John Jackson provided an update about University-level planning for the Faculty Diversity Action Plan.
6. A joint meeting with the Senate Committee for Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity was held on March 19.

Recommendations to University Council
1. We enthusiastically commend the administration’s Diversity Action Plan focusing on recruitment and retention of diverse faculty. We recommend that consideration be given to ongoing implementation of 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. Encouraging participation by all faculty in small group and online workshops on unconscious bias, covering all types of bias, including racial, class, gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, and religion, and making such training mandatory for all search Committee members.
   c. Work with the Deans of the different schools to ensure that faculty members charged with development, implementation, and monitoring of School Diversity Action Plans be given appropriate compensation and release time.
   d. Continuing to work towards adoption of 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.
2. We commend and support the efforts of the administration to assess student and faculty perceptions of campus climate as it relates to a thriving, diverse, academic community with mutual appreciation and respect. We recommend that consideration be given to such elements and strategies as:
   a. 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.

Recommendation of Topics for the Following Year
Work with the Office of the Provost and other appropriate offices to monitor University processes documenting recruitment, retention, and graduation of underrepresented minority graduate students.
1. Assess the progress of building cultural understanding, inclusiveness, and support across campus related to different faith traditions.
2. Work with the Office of the Provost and with the SCFDDE to assess school-level facilitators and barriers to recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty and to monitor the progress of the newly developed University of Pennsylvania Diversity Action Plan.
3. Monitor the development and implementation of inclusive policies relating to tax equalization and other matters related to recruitment and retention of LGBTQ persons, and assess progress on gender-nonspecific campus policies relating to faculty, staff, and students.

Committee on Diversity and Equity 2011-2012
Co-Chairs: Judy Shea and Nancy Tkacs; Faculty: Horace Delisser, Nader Engheta, Lisa Lewis, Julia Lynch, Anna Malykhina, Chi-Ming Yang; PPSA: Sharon Bryan, Delores Magobet; WPPSA: Erin Lemons, Michelle Wells Lockett; UA: Angel Contrera, Ivy Epstein; GAPSA: Paule Joseph, Koeun Lee; Administrative Liaison: Lubna Mian; Staff: Gail Oberton
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Committee on Facilities

The Committee on Facilities was 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 six meetings over the academic year. The Committee had one subcommittee specifically charged with monitoring open playing green space.

Specific Charges for 2011-2012

1. Continue to study and monitor lactation spaces and policy on campus.
2. Continue to monitor parking on campus and specifically whether the Committee’s concerns regarding parking continue to be addressed.
3. 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.
4. Continue to monitor and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety. This charge will result in a formal recommendation from the Committee in this year’s report concerning Guardian Drive.
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 2012-2013.

In addition to these charges the Committee addressed several areas of new business during the year, which included the safety of major intersections on campus, the condition of landscaping and trees on campus, concerns with parking and transportation on campus, concerns regarding the University’s energy policies and energy conservation, and finally concerns regarding external lighting around Franklin Field.

The monitoring, liaison, formal recommendation system worked well for our Committee, as did the addition of formal responses to recommendations from the 2011 report from the University. These were received at our first meeting. Anne Papageorge and Marilyn Kraut responded to our recommendation about lactation spaces on campus and concerns regarding the safety of Guardian Drive. These responses will be reviewed later in this report as last year’s recommendations and responses have generated further formal recommendations and improvements.

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 any issues that were brought to its attention during the year. The third section deals with further formal recommendations that the Committee will make which have evolved from its investigations regarding lactation centers on campus. The fourth section reviews the Committee’s own recommendations for topics or continuing topics to be addressed the following academic year.

Monitoring

The Committee monitored the extent and use of green space on campus.

There were concerns raised in the Committee regarding the condition of trees and landscaping on campus, particularly how the trees in Penn Park would be cared for in the future. Robert Lundgren and Robert Flowers presented the Committee with an overview of the campus and the specific maintenance plans for Penn Park. The campus has 200 different species and over 7,000 individual trees, Penn works with the Morris Arboretum staff, all of whom are receiving specialized training. It was also explained to the Committee that maintaining trees in an urban setting, particularly on roadways, is challenging. When trees develop disease in this setting sometimes large groups need to be sacrificed for the good of other plantings. It is the goal of the landscaping and arborists to have healthy mature trees in all available street spaces whenever possible. The Committee was satisfied with the explanations provided by Mr. Lundgren and Mr. Flowers and will continue to monitor this issue over time.

Overall, the Committee is pleased with the plans which are being undertaken by the University concerning green space and open playing green space, but there are plans to continue to monitor this issue.

The Committee continues to monitor the University development particularly the eastward expansion and the use of the Grays Ferry site. Anne Papageorge gave an overview of Penn Connects Plan 2.0. This version of the Campus Master Plan is different from the first in that it focuses on new construction and large renovations projects, separates the projects into those that will take place within the next phase and then beyond, and incorporates the Grays Ferry property. The plan was created by a Committee consisting of a cross-section of the University. There are five themes in Penn Connects 2.0: 12 Outstanding Schools; Research and Clinical Care; Living/Learning; Campus and Community; and Past and Future. There are a number of new and renovation projects that are planned within each theme. The Grays Ferry property will have a flexible framework to allow for development based on market demand. The plan is currently being explained to stakeholder groups including the Facilities Committee on University Council and will be finalized this semester.

The Committee continued to monitor the progress that the University is making regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety. For the most part the Committee has been pleased with the progress the University has made in these areas, although the Committee still has concerns regarding Guardian Drive. We are happy to report the University has begun to address these issues.

The safety concern regarding Guardian Drive was brought to the Committee’s attention from members of the Committee due to concerns from their constituents in last year’s report. Guardian Drive is a service drive that begins at Fagin Hall and the Johnson Pavilion and runs west towards 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 Anatomy and Chemistry. As such, most pedestrians just walk on the street. The Committee feels these conditions may pose an injury risk to pedestrians. Admittedly, the Committee does not have knowledge of or documentation of injuries occurring on the drive. The Committee formally recommended in last year’s report that repairs and renovations to Guardian Drive be given a higher priority so that potential for pedestrian injury can be lessened. Anne Papageorge provided a response to our recommendation about Guardian Drive at the beginning of this year. Ms. Papageorge commented that no substantial work to Hamilton Walk or Guardian Drive would take place until the building projects along the walks are complete. Locust, Woodland, and Hamilton Walks are prioritized over Guardian Drive. FRES did agree to investigate the area to see if there are patches or some interim work that may help the issues. Patches to the existing sidewalk occurred this Spring and FRES has hired a consultant to study the deliveries, traffic patterns, and pedestrian safety on Guardian Drive. The consultant will make recommendations of how to improve the pedestrian experience and safety along Guardian Drive. The Committee will continue to monitor this area and would like to continue to see improvements that will improve the pedestrian experience, particularly sidewalks.

The Committee is concerned with safety of several major intersections around campus. As these concerns have grown, one of our faculty mem-
bers, Rachel Weinberger, was able to incorporate this research into her curriculum. The students from the Transportation Methods Class gave three presentations on the following intersections: Guardian Drive at University Avenue and Curie Boulevard; South Street Bridge at Convention Avenue and I-76; 34th Street from Walnut to Spruce Streets. The Guardian Drive intersection is confusing due to poor sidewalks and confusing traffic signs. The students have proposed the following as solutions—to make Guardian and Curie one-way streets (with additional signage and signs as necessary), complete the sidewalks on Guardian Drive, and only allow commercial vehicles on Service Drive. South Street Bridge and Convention Avenues appear dangerous for pedestrians due to traffic turning left off of University Avenue and turning right onto campus onto University Avenue. The proposal is to increase the left turn lane time, move the eastbound bus stop toward the west slightly, and add banners to the light posts to calm traffic. I-76 has similar conflicts—the proposed solution is to have raised speed tables at 76 exits, add a green buffer and make automatic pedestrian crossing signals. At 34th and Walnut Streets, the students suggest bumping out the curb on the northwest corner, moving the bus stop to the west side of 34th Street, and increase the signal timing across 34th Street on the south side. The students suggest consolidating the signage and adding a speed limit of 15 mph mid-block. At the Spruce Street intersection, the roads need to be repainted and resurfaced, color the bicycle lane, switch the bike and parking lane on Spruce Street, and move the bus stop to the other side of Spruce Street. The Committee will make one formal recommendation based on this work concerning Guardian Drive. It will also make pedestrian and bicycling safety a priority for next year. Of particular concern is that, although bicycling is an important part of campus transportation system, there is a feeling that bicyclists are not following traffic laws on streets around campus, putting themselves and others at risk of injury. The Committee remains concerned about pedestrian and bicycling safety on campus and will continue to make it a priority.

During the year, several concerns were raised regarding transportation and parking on campus. Brian Shaw gave an update on Transportation and Parking—specifically, he described three new initiatives that are expected to launch over the next couple of months. The first is ticketing for parking violations. Violators will have the opportunity to appeal and can pay and manage their tickets online. Permit holders will get three warnings initially. The program is designed to ensure spaces for monthly customers, limit violators, and enforce the low emission spaces. The second program is an enhanced carpooling program. The carpool will allow registered people to park in locations that they normally wouldn’t be able to due to a wait list or popularity. The third program is for occasional parking. You must live two or more miles away and have a driver’s license to qualify. The program entitles you to two free uses per year, and ten more uses at discounted rates either at Penn Park or the Garage at 40th and Walnut Streets. Staff and faculty members can be charged via payroll. The Committee was satisfied with explanations given by Mr. Shaw regarding Transportation and Parking and will continue to monitor this area.

Concerns were raised by the Committee concerning the University’s energy use. The University is currently installing electric, steam, and water meters at the building level to determine more accurate usage. The UA is currently piloting a sensored lighting program with their Eco-Reps. Julian Goresko and Travis Douglas presented an overview of the Eco-Reps program. It is a self-selecting, volunteer program that allows students, staff and faculty the opportunity to have a role in the implementation of the Climate Action Plan. The student program is included in the College Houses, Greek Chapters, and Hillel, where the reps create programs and initiatives to increase awareness and work toward sustainability goals. The staff and faculty reps share best practices, work together on subcommittees, and serve as peer educators. Mr. Goresko and Mr. Douglas encouraged individuals to have their department, school, or center have a Sustainability 101 presentation to help make work practices green and to identify or volunteer as an Eco-Rep.

Liaison

One issue was brought to the Committee’s attention during the year and was handled through our liaison, David Hollenberg, and the Division of Facilities and Real Estate during the academic year. Concerns were raised regarding lighting around Franklin Field. Particularly noted was some broken lighting on the eastern side of the Field. This was addressed and the lighting was repaired or replaced during the semester.

Formal Recommendations

Lactation Spaces

A. Investigation

A concern was brought to the Committee’s attention from its constituents last year that the University may not have been meeting the needs of nursing mothers due to a lack of University-wide lactation centers. The Committee felt this was an important issue and spent a significant amount of our time over the past two years investigating this issue. An extensive review of the benefits of breast feeding, a review of the University’s response to the Health Care Reform Act of 2010, the status of lactation centers on campus in 2010-2011, and design guidance of lactation centers can be found in last year’s report. Based on this investigation, the Committee made a formal recommendation last year which included:

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.

The University did respond to our recommendation. Anne Papageorge and Marilyn Kraut responded to the Committee in our first meeting. The University had worked on the issue during the summer and has made it a priority. The Division of Human Resources has rolled out a policy that goes beyond what the law requires. The policy and other materials are available from Human Resources online, listed under the “Penn’s Nursing Mothers Program.” Facilities staff initiated a mapping exercise to identify the current existing spaces and the criteria to determine their appropriate dispersion throughout campus. Distinctions needed to be made between the School/Center specific spaces and those that are open to the Penn community. The University and Committee felt that visitor’s needs should also be taken into account. Both the need and the geographic location will continue to be assessed as both HR and FRES staff continue to work with the Penn Women’s Center, Family Resource Center, and the Office of the Provost during the year. The Committee felt the response was appropriate. 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.

The Committee benefited from discussions with Anne Papageorge, Vice President of Facilities and Real Estate Services, Felicity Paxton from the Penn Women’s Center, Marilyn Kraut from the Division of Human Resources, Anita Mastroianni and Lubna Mian from the Provost’s Office. 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 working on these issues and have provided assistance to the Committee.

During this year, our guest speakers gave an overview of the progress that has been made regarding lactation spaces on campus. They felt that the HR Policy has helped staff and faculty; however, it is still difficult for some students—particularly those in professional programs. They hoped to propose a policy that will be applied to all students, but this has proved challenging. The Committee continues to be concerned that our University policy does not address undergraduate or graduate students. We learned that this is an issue throughout universities in the United States. Developing a workable policy on this issue would make University of Pennsylvania...
nia the leader in this area. There have been issues with several designated spaces on campus not being adequate. At a minimum, the spaces should have privacy, cannot be a bathroom, and should have a comfortable chair. It is best if a sink and shelf are also in the room. The Committee and the guest speakers agree that they would prioritize having more spaces over improving the spaces that currently exist. In fact, if the room is too comfortable, it can become a problem with turnover for the space for only lactation purposes. FRES presented the results of their mapping exercise. A map was shared with the Committee so they could see how the lactation spaces were spread throughout campus. The spaces available for lactation more than doubled in the past three years. With an increased number of spaces, more women are utilizing the lactation spaces—and particularly those that provide hospital grade pumps. During this time, GAPSA has purchased three hospital grade pumps for campus spaces. However, many rooms still do not have pumps in them. The Committee feels that hospital grade breast pumps provide the advantage of women being able to express their milk more quickly and therefore return to other activities more quickly. The Committee feels that GAPSA should not have to continue to invest their resources to support pump purchases on campus. The Committee also thought it was a good idea to institute a HR pump purchase program for staff and faculty. There were also concerns raised that pumps that are purchased be standardized so that women do not need to purchase several different pump attachment systems. The Committee remains concerned that the availability of permanent space throughout campus, particularly in certain high volume buildings and schools, remains a significant issue. This includes a lack of permanent lactation rooms in Jon M. Huntsman Hall and the Law School complex. The Committee is concerned that visitors do not have a space to nurse or pump on campus.

B. 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 has already made a tremendous effort in this area, but the Committee feels it could do even more to support nursing mothers and their families.

1. The Committee continues to be concerned that our policy does not address undergraduate or graduate students. The Committee feels that students need to be formally included in our University policy. The policy needs to ensure that student mothers have access and time to use these spaces.

2. 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 students, staff, and faculty. It would certainly make Penn a more family-friendly space. At a minimum, permanent spaces need to be added to Jon M. Huntsman Hall and the Law School.

3. Spaces need to meet minimum standards, should have privacy, cannot be a bathroom, and should have a comfortable chair. It is best if a sink and shelf are also in the room. It is also important that lactation spaces be designed so that they do not encourage unnecessary repose.

4. The Committee recommends that an effort be made so that all permanent rooms on campus are equipped with a hospital grade pump. In addition, we recommend that all pumps purchased on campus are Medela Breast Pumps—therefore the same attachments can be used across campus and women do not need to purchase several different pump attachment systems. The Committee is concerned that GAPSA has been assuming the burden of buying lactation pumps on campus and would like to see the University assume this role.

5. The Committee suggests that the University initiate a pump purchase program for members of community who cannot get access to rooms with a permanent pump.

The Committee plans to keep this topic open for the next academic year. 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

1. Continue to study and monitor lactation spaces and policy on campus.
2. Continue to monitor Parking and Transportation on campus, including the potential expansion of the shuttle service to the Graduate Hospital area.
3. 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.
4. Continue to monitor and improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.
5. Monitor and receive updates on University development/Penn Connects Plan.

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.

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

The Committee met five times this year, and we have one more meeting scheduled for April 24 to continue discussion on tuition benefits, and to discuss the new charges for FY 2013. Two new members were added to the Committee this year; Christopher Lance Coleman, Faculty-School of Nursing, and Soojin Park, Faculty-Perelman School of Medicine.

The following changes to the Penn Personnel Benefits package will take place in the coming year:

- Transgender Health Benefits (THBs), with transgender surgical benefits, for employees.
- Penn has contracted with Health Advocate as a partner for wellness.
- Medco will be the new Pharmacy Benefit Manager effective July 1, 2012, replacing CVS.

Below are the Specific Charges for 2011-2012 with the corresponding status of each one:

**Specific Charges for 2011-2012**

1. Explore the possibility of providing tuition subsidies to employees who take classes at institutions other than Penn, particularly as this may pertain to those who do so in order to improve their chances of gaining admission to Penn.

   The Committee has concluded that the most compelling case for an “other than Penn” tuition benefit relates to those who wish to take Penn courses, but do not meet the normal admissions standards. It has been argued that such applicants could possibly demonstrate their academic abilities by taking courses elsewhere, then gain admission to a Penn program. We then discovered that the College of Liberal and Professional Studies (LPS) currently has an open enrollment policy for summer term courses. Since these courses possibly provide that same function, the committee decided to monitor the impact of the LPS enrollment policy to determine if this has helped those who were previously unable to gain access to Penn.

   This charge is still open and discussion will continue.

2. Revisit the issue of providing Transgender Health Benefits to Penn employees.

   The Committee is in agreement with this charge, and these benefits are being implemented on July 1, 2012. The PBC now considers this charge to be closed.

3. Review the requirements of Health Care Reform and consider needed changes in University benefits.

   The following items were implemented in 2011 as part of the Health Care Reform:
   - Break time/private rooms provided for nursing mothers
   - Dependent coverage to age 26
   - No lifetime dollar limits on Health Insurance benefits
   - Federal regulations no longer permit reimbursements from Flexible Spending Accounts, Health Savings Accounts and Health Reimbursement Arrangements for non-prescription items.
   - Income-based Medicare Part D premiums were initiated resulting in higher premiums for some participants.

   Reporting of the value of health care coverage on employees’ W-2 forms will begin at the start of the 2013 calendar year. The value of an individual’s health care coverage is calculated based on the plan he/she is enrolled in for the calendar year. The amount of the employer’s contribution to an employee’s Health Savings Account is to be included in this figure. Even though these data are to be reported to the IRS, they do not have any tax implications, at least for now.

   Additionally, in 2012, the “comparative effectiveness group health plan fees” will begin (this is the fee that will fund research on clinical outcomes, etc). The fee will be $1 per year per plan participant in the first year, $2 per participant per plan year in the second year and will be indexed thereafter. It is not yet known how and to whom Penn will pay this fee.

   The following items will go into effect in 2013:
   - Federal regulations will reduce the cap on FSA contributions to $2,500 from Penn’s current $4,000 plan limit.
   - Higher Medicare payroll taxes on wages exceeding $200,000/individual and $250,000/couple. It is not yet clear how combined income will be measured, for example, the combined income of a Penn employee whose spouse is employed elsewhere.
   - The default option for health insurance coverage will be automatic enrollment of all full-time employees; however, people will have the option to decline coverage.

   Starting August 1, 2012 health insurance plans must cover women’s preventive health care, such as mammograms, screenings for cervical cancer, prenatal care, and other services. Although not required to do so until August 2012, Penn will offer this coverage for the plan year beginning on July 1, 2012. This charge will continue during implementation of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

4. Review the policy that makes certain prescribed medical services unavailable through in-network sources and effectively requires that they be purchased from out-of-network suppliers. Use of out-of-network services entails both higher co-pays and falls under deductible requirements. In this situation such add-on costs do not reflect a choice by users to go out of network, but a choice by Penn not to contract with any supplier.

   This charge originally related to the Keystone POS and the PennCare plans, but since the Keystone POS plan was terminated on June 30, 2011, the charge now only relates to the PennCare plan. The specific issue is durable medical equipment (DME). The PennCare plan is a “Preferred Provider Organization” (PPO). As such, using providers within the PennCare network results in the lowest out-of-pocket costs, and using providers outside the network cost more, depending upon the relationship between PennCare and the provider. Using providers not in the PennCare network but within the “Personal Choice Network” results in higher out-of-pocket expenses and using providers that are “out of network” results in the highest out-of-pocket expenses. The PennCare network does not include DME providers because PennCare only provides health care. It does not sell equipment, but the Personal Choice Network does, and therefore the out-of-pocket expenses are higher for those services. This information is clearly stated in information Penn provides to the community, but perhaps it should be emphasized more strongly. The PBC now considers this charge to be closed.

5. Review whether to request that Human Resources staff consult with the Committee when making decisions about whether to comply with state mandates which are optional for the University. This issue arose in reference to autism and when the Penn autism benefit was initiated. Since Penn is self-insured, it is not obligated to follow state mandates; however, Penn reviews each state mandate to determine feasibility and appropriateness for its plans. In this instance Penn and the PBC concluded that the state mandated autism benefit should be provided as part of the benefit package, but since the autism mandate start-date fell within a plan year, Penn opted to start the benefit at the beginning of the next plan year. The PBC agreed with this decision. The PBC now considers this charge to be closed.
6. Monitor the effectiveness of Aetna’s disease management procedures. The Aetna HMO plan was terminated June 30, 2011, but some of the services provided under the Aetna program are now being provided through the new relationship with Health Advocate, see #7 below. The PBC now considers this charge to be closed.

7. Explore the possibility of providing health advocates/patient navigators as a benefit for employees. Penn has contracted with Health Advocate, effective July 1, 2012, as a partner for wellness and advocacy services. They will provide a number of services to members of the Penn community and their families, for example, helping people to make healthy changes in their life styles by getting fit and losing weight. The Committee will monitor the effectiveness of the services provided.

8. Explore the possibility of raising the maximum annual dental benefit. The Committee reviewed the economics of dental insurance, and found that having dental insurance operate more like medical insurance is not an option. In order to avoid large premium increases, we looked for plans that combine higher maximum benefits with higher deductibles. Unfortunately, such plans do not exist in the market. The PBC now considers this charge to be closed.

9. Review current policies for health insurance for faculty and staff who reach the age of Medicare eligibility. Is it possible to offer an insurance alternative which takes advantage of Medicare programs which (a) maintains a high level of coverage, (b) lowers costs to faculty or staff and (c) lowers costs to the University. Under current Medicare regulations, the employer-provided insurance is considered primary. As a result, no additional benefits would be obtained by offering such a plan to active employees over 65. The PBC now considers this charge to be closed.

10. 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 2012-2013.

Proposed Specific Charges for 2012-2013
1. Revisit the possibility of providing tuition subsidies to employees who take classes at institutions other than Penn, particularly as this may pertain to those who do so in order to improve their chances of gaining admission to Penn.
2. Continue to review the requirements of Health Care Reform and consider needed changes in University benefits.
3. Monitor the effectiveness of the Penn’s program with Health Advocates.

Committee on Personnel Benefits Report (continued from page II)

Committee on Personnel Benefits Report
(continued from page II)

Committee on Personnel Benefits 2011-2012
Chair: David Pope; Faculty: Tom Baker, Erling Boe, Christopher Coleman Lance, William Daily, Nancy Hanrahan, Scott Harrington, Soojin Park; PPSA: Victoria Mulhern, Eleanor Rupsis, Jared Susco; WPPSA: Peter Rockett, Joyce Woodward-Jones; Administrative Liaisons: Jack Heuer, Susan Sproat; Staff: Sheila D. Hall