

Committee on Academic & Related Affairs

Background and Charge to the Committee

The Committee has a very broad charge that covers a considerable portion of the University. For the 2012–2013 academic year, the standing general charges were as follows:

General Committee Charge

The Committee on Academic & Related Affairs:

1. Shall have cognizance over matters of recruitment, admissions and financial aid that concern the University as a whole and that are not the specific responsibility of individual faculties, including the authority to carry out studies on existing recruitment and admissions procedures and their relationships with existing policies on admissions and financial aid and to recommend changes in policy to the Council;

2. Shall consider the purposes of a University bookstore and advise the Council and management of the University bookstore on policies, development and operations;

3. Shall review and monitor issues related to the international programs and other international activities of the University, including advice and policy recommendations in such areas as services for international students and scholars; foreign fellowships and studies abroad; faculty, staff and student exchange programs; and cooperative undertakings with foreign universities;

4. Shall advise the vice provost and director of libraries on the policies, development and operation of the University libraries;

5. Shall have cognizance over recreation and intramural and intercollegiate athletics and their integration with the educational program of the University, including the planning and provision of adequate facilities for various sports and recreational activities; and

6. Shall have cognizance of all matters of policy relating to research and the general environment for research at the University, including the assignment and distribution of indirect costs and the assignment of those research funds distributed by the University, and shall advise the administration on those proposals for sponsored research referred to it because of potential conflict with University policy.

2012-2013 Specific Charges

For the 2012–2013 academic year, the specific charges were as follows:

1. Continue discussions concerning academic integrity. Follow up on ways to communicate to the Penn community the Best Practices that were drafted by the committee in consultation with Vice Provost for Education, Andy Binns. Consider engaging the Senate Committee on Students and the Educational Policy in this discussion. Discuss ways to increase the communication between the Office of Student Conduct and the faculty so that they can provide mutual support. Discuss how to enhance the coordination among the Schools in the area of academic integrity in order to avoid duplication of effort as individual Schools further investigate academic integrity.

2. Continue discussions on expanding the opportunities for undergraduate research. Consider an inclusive clearinghouse for undergraduate research opportunities. In consultation with the Office of the Vice Provost for Research Steve Fluharty, discuss new Conflict of Interest Policy reporting requirements for undergraduate research and travel. Develop a set of FAQs for appropriate and inappropriate faculty funding sources for undergraduate and graduate students engaged in research.

3. Monitor recruitment and admissions policies and practices and Dean Eric Furda's efforts to increase the diversity of Penn's student body.

4. Monitor International Programs and Vice Provost for Global Initiatives Zeke Emanuel's efforts to expand Penn's offerings for students.

5. Review and discuss this Committee's general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee's work in AY 2013-2014.

Narrative

CARA met four times during the 2012–2013 academic year. The first meeting had to be cancelled and rescheduled because hurricane Sandy closed the University on the planned day of the meeting. The Committee met once in the fall and three times during the January–March 2013 period. As a consequence of the disruption and follow-on problems with scheduling, what was logically our second meeting was chronologically our first and our chronological second meeting was (more) logically our

first.

In the event, the Committee's first two meetings focused on academic integrity and on monitoring recommendations and topics from the previous year.

After introductions and general discussion, the Committee's chronologically first meeting focused on academic integrity. Michele Goldfarb, Director of the Office of Student Conduct, attended the meeting and made a substantial presentation, discussing the chronic and indeed global issues related to CARA's charge addressing academic integrity. She focused primarily on student conduct with respect to academic honesty (viz. her position at OSC). She reported that SAS is discussing new ways to handle academic dishonesty along with the Honor Council, the Faculty Senate and the Council for Undergraduate Research. She further reported that while Penn (through her Office) sees approximately 60-70 cases of academic dishonesty per year, this is only a fraction of the total. Many, even most, academic integrity cases are handled by the professor or instructor and do not come to the attention of OSC. The University has not frowned upon faculty dealing with academic integrity.

After her presentation, the Committee engaged in a spirited discussion with Director Goldfarb. A rather broad variety of views, or rather, concerns or issues, were expressed. There were many cases of conflicting principles presented. Examples include:

- That OSC and Penn in general are too harsh on students accused of academic dishonesty and that OSC and Penn are too lenient;
- That there should be a Penn-wide uniform policy for treating academic dishonesty and that it is important for instructors to have discretionary powers in handling the students under their responsibility.

(Think: "Nothing ventured; nothing gained" and "Better safe than sorry" or "Look before you leap" and "He who hesitates is lost." Folk wisdom is replete with such pairs.)

In its (chronologically) second meeting, the Committee heard from Vice Provost Andy Binns, who provided a response to the Committee's report from last year by describing a number of ongoing activities at Penn that are actively addressing various issues related to academic integrity. He also provided a conceptual overview of the subject, as seen from his perspective.

Vice Provost Binns emphasized the importance of having an ongoing dialogue and information transmission, explaining that academic integrity is essential to the University. Key issues here are:

1. Student awareness

How can students be made more fully aware of rules, policies and options associated with academic integrity?

2. Faculty awareness

How can faculty be made more fully aware of rules, policies and options associated with academic integrity?

3. Process

By this he meant the substance of the rules characterizing academic dishonesty and the responses to apparent violations.

On the process issue, Vice Provost Binns indicated that a major report on academic integrity is being developed by the School of Arts & Sciences' Committee on Undergraduate Education and will be delivered to the Undergraduate Deans. Binns recommended that CARA review the report once it is finished. This report has not yet been made available to CARA.

After the second meeting, the Committee reconsidered its agenda for the remainder of the year. Strong sentiment was expressed in favor of moving on to topics other than academic integrity. Upon suggestion from several Committee members, our third meeting introduced and focused on the subject of *course management software* systems, of which Blackboard, Webcafé and Canvas are examples that have been used at Penn. These systems impact the entire Penn community immensely, their use is pervasive and increasing, there are multiple options, and very much about them is in flux. For these reasons alone, the Committee took initiative to survey the situation.

Robert Ditto and Dave Comroe, from Wharton Computing and Instructional Technologies (WCIT), and Rob Nelson from the Provost's Office
(continued on next page)

COUNCIL 2012-2013 Year-End Reports

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

(continued from page 1)

fice, presented their views and engaged in discussion with the committee at its third meeting of the year. The WCIT representatives presented the history of Wharton's recent adaptation of Canvas to replace Webcafé. The impetus for the change was the fact that Webcafé is an old system with an antiquated feature set and maintaining it in the face of changes to modern browsers and other software elements is increasingly expensive. This led the vendor to announce that it would no longer update the system. Wharton was then faced with the problem of finding a replacement system quickly. Over the period 2008-2010 WCIT undertook studies and field-tested a number of systems, including Canvas and came to the conclusion that Canvas was the best choice for Wharton. Beginning in the fall of 2012 Canvas was fully supported at Wharton, and no new classes were put into Webcafé. The WCIT representatives report both positive and negative responses, but on balance they believe that Canvas is serving Wharton well and has gained broadly-based cheerful acceptance.

Rob Nelson, Executive Director for Education, discussed with the Committee the interest that the Provost and Vice Provost for Education have in course management systems. The Provost's Office recognizes that there is a greater need for coordination among technologies—technologies centered around the Schools to support their educational missions. Blackboard was initially offered as a centrally-operated system and was first launched in 2000 in Engineering. After having Blackboard at the University for 10 years, it was deemed time to look at it again and try to bring coordination among the Schools' technology. GSE has adopted CANVAS and LPS is adopting Canvas this year. The Dental School and the Law School, too, are preparing to adopt Canvas. Canvas is fast becoming an industry leader as an alternative to Blackboard. Just recently, the Council of Deans met to discuss the issue and to look at a campus-wide agreement with Canvas, thus reducing cost among the Schools. The University's next step is to consult with Instructure, the company that owns Canvas. The leading contender was Sakai CLE; however it offered no new technological advancements, and its foundation decided to halt development of a newer version. Instructure is a young and small company, which is a concern, but Nelson and his courseware management group are trying to mitigate those concerns. Blackboard, though large and established, has had some major problems. Canvas is also well-established and very well-funded. As an early adopter, Penn will have some leverage in the negotiations.

The Committee engaged in a spirited discussion jointly with all three presenters and the members expressed a diversity of judgments and opinions. These issues stand out as fairly representing a general consensus on the Committee:

1. Course management software does indeed present a number of important policy issues to the Penn community and CARA should actively monitor in this area beginning next year.

2. A particular issue of interest is whether and if so, how, there should be a Penn-wide, common course management system product in use. Points in favor include leverage with the vendor and reduction in learning costs for students taking courses in different parts of Penn. Points against include centralized management (Is it desirable? If so, how?) and concerns about Procrustean chopping and stretching.

3. Akin to the awareness issues identified by Andy Binns with respect to

academic integrity, the Committee noted that features in and uses of course management software have been and can be expected to be in continual flux. How can the Penn community make most efficient use of the information generated (both successes and failures) in this evolving context? How can the Penn community receive the best possible benefits of such systems?

In the fourth and final meeting of the year, the Committee focused on hearing reports on undergraduate research. Rob Nelson, Executive Director of Education, Office of the Provost; Harriet Joseph, Director, Center for Undergraduate Research & Fellowships (CURF); and Wallace Genser, Associate Director, CURF, attended as visitors, presenting information to the Committee and engaging in discussion with the Committee.

Both Harriet Joseph and Wallace Genser have joined CURF fairly recently. After an overview, their remarks focused on a fairly new program—Penn Undergraduate Research Mentoring (PURM)—that nevertheless antedates their arrivals at CURF. PURM matches and funds undergraduates with faculty early on in their careers for mentorship and has often proved to produce a transformative experience for the students and faculty involved. The program has been judged a tremendous success but is limited by the funds available.

Discussion ensued that raised ideas for improving awareness of the program, and for wider publicizing of Penn undergraduate research accomplishments, perhaps incorporating results from efforts not funded by PURM.

Finally, the Committee did not explicitly address items 3 (recruitment and admissions policies and practices) and 4 (international programs) in the charges for 2012-2013. Since these were addressed by other committees, and the CARA chair attended meetings at which these issues were discussed, the Committee opted to give these matters lower priority for this year.

Recommendations

1. On academic integrity, the Committee recommends that it should continue to monitor developments, especially policy matters such as those identified by Vice Provost Binns. However, absent new developments that call for evaluation and discussion, the Committee's sense is that this should be a lower priority matter for the next academic year, since there do not seem to be either glaring lacunæ or glowing opportunities in this policy area at the moment.

2. On undergraduate research, the Committee recommends that advertising and public relations efforts be increased, aimed at students, faculty and the general public. Also, the Committee hopes that program funding can be increased. Finally, the Committee recommends that this topic be a high priority item for the Committee next year, in part to explore ideas for increasing the scope of undergraduate research opportunities and the visibility of the results. Intriguing ideas were raised this year and the Committee hopes to explore them further next year.

3. The Committee believes that its initiative on examining course management software has proven rewarding and that there are many important related issues to monitor and explore. The Committee recommends that it be explicitly charged with this task during the next year.

Committee on Academic & Related Affairs 2012-2013

Chair: Steven Kimbrough; **Faculty:** Paula Henthorn, Martin Keane, Michael McGarvey, Ani Nenkova, Mechthild Pohlschroder, Barbara Riegel, Marilyn Sommers; **PPSA:** April Herring, Jon Shaw; **WPPSA:** Suzanne Oh, Peter Rockett; **Graduates Students:** Yun Li, Peichun (Will) Wang; **Undergraduates:** Gabe Delaney, Andrew Jakubowski; **Liaison:** Leo Charney; **Staff:** Raisha Price

Committee on Campus and Community Life

2012-2013 Specific Charges

- Review the scope of services and access to CAPS on campus. Make suggestions for improvement where necessary.
- Discuss and understand the prevalence of, the offices responsible to oversee, the definitions of, and the University policies on bullying, including cyber bullying, and hazing throughout the University community.
- Discuss and consider the proposal to make the campus a smoke-free environment.
- Review and discuss this Committee's general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the Committee's work in AY 2013-2014.

The Campus and Community Life Committee met five times during the academic year. The Office of Student Life provided invaluable administrative support for the Committee. The themes that were most carefully discussed included the consideration of a campus smoke-free environment and retail changes in dining services. Bullying and CAPS were discussed at meetings focused on those topics.

The following decisions were made:

1. The CCL Committee recommends to the University administration that the campus adopt the following policy:

"All University of Pennsylvania facilities, buildings, and properties shall be smoke and tobacco free."

2. The CCL Committee recommends that the University should acknowledge explicitly that bullying is not just a criminal act. This could include either a definitive policy or an expanded conceptualization of the acts and behaviors that could be perceived as bullying.

Report Regarding Administrative Response to Last Year's Report

The Committee applauds the thoughtful and committed administrative response to last year's report. Guests included Vice Provost Andy Binns, Leslie Kruhly, Doug Berger, Taylor Berkowitz, Joe Fischer, Cherie Heller, David Hollenberg, Stacey Lopez, and Marie Witt. New Committee members commented on the responsiveness to the Committee recommendations. The issue of retail dining and the balance with the availability of AYE (All You care to Eat) options remained a concern for the Committee. The Committee believes that more information is needed about the financial structures, incentives, and disincentives that contribute to the shift from AYE to retail dining. It was felt this is especially pertinent to students on financial aid which supports AYE options and parents who trust that the University is working to support shared community activities through communal dining.

Report per Charges

1. Scope of services and access to CAPS

Bill Alexander from Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and April Herring from College Housing and Academic Services (CHAS) came as guests of the Committee to discuss service provision and service access. Their perspectives and reports, with the experiences of members of the committee, were valuable in discussing this charge. In addition, the Committee heard from members of Student Health Services and sought experiential information from faculty and staff who interface with CAPS.

CAPS provides support services for students in their adjustment to college life, with emotional issues, and with mental distress. CAPS offers clinical services, training, and outreach/prevention activities. Clinical services are what CAPS is most known for. Clinical services include counseling, group therapy, medication assistance, crisis management, and referral services. The provision of clinical services moves through triage, an initial consultation, follow-up care, and a walk-in service. There is a 24 hour on-call system as well.

Less known are the training and prevention services offered by CAPS. CAPS offers training opportunities for psychology, social work, and psychiatry trainees. It is one of the largest integrated training programs in the country. Similarly, CAPS is actively developing an active prevention and "Mental Health First Aid" program under the proactive leadership of Eran Magen.

Access to CAPS and functional availability of clinical services were discussed at length. Most consistently reported were wait times between initial triage and initial care appointment. There were numerous reasons for these that were discussed. Two issues that were highlighted were the unawareness of walk-in services as well as a general increasing demand for counseling services at Penn.

Other issues that were discussed include the self-advocacy that is required to access services, frequent referral outside of CAPS and copays that may discourage service use by low-income students, and the reintegration of persistently symptomatic students back into the general Penn community. Reintegration of persistently symptomatic students into the community, particularly students who express suicidal thoughts but are assessed to clinically not be at risk of suicide, is particularly disruptive to other students and non-clinically trained faculty and staff who are left to care for the symptomatic individuals. This is exacerbated by limited communication due to special privacy concerns around mental health.

The Committee engaged in a very active discussion about these issues and reached the following conclusions:

- Access to immediate services should not require the advocacy that it currently seems to need.
- Referral outside CAPS with copays is not feasible for low-income students and is cumbersome and daunting.
- Wait times after triage are too long. Students should receive their initial visit within three days or be made aware of walk-in availability.
- Eran Magen and the "Mental Health First Aid program" should be congratulated and the first aid training program should be increased.
- There needs to be better communication for student hand-offs between CAPS, the PEEC, and appropriate Penn staff to assure broad student wellness.
- CAPS may try group sessions or workshops on self-care as a way to manage increased demand.

2. Bullying, Cyberbullying, and Hazing

Ralph Delucia, Marcia Martinez-Helfman, and Scott Reikofski were guests of the Committee during the discussion of bullying, cyber-bullying, and hazing. Their perspective on University services to support community members in these areas demonstrated a high level of knowledge and expertise.

The Committee was informed about relevant policies that can apply to bullying and cyberbullying. These include the Non-Discrimination Statement, the Policy Prohibiting Workplace Violence, the Sexual Harassment Policy, the Policy on Acceptable Use of Electronic Resources, the Policy Against Retaliation, and Penn's Principles on Responsible Conduct. These policies allow for termination, suspension, arrest, or demotion. A list of potential offices that a community member could report bullying to includes: deans and department chairs, Staff and Labor Relations Department of Human Resources, Public Safety, the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity, the Office of the Provost, and the Penn Help Line (215-P-COMPLY). In each of these policies, actions, and offices, the definition of bullying was limited to a legal or criminal definition.

Dr. Reikofski from the Office of Fraternity and Sorority Affairs discussed the proactive education campaign that is being implemented to extend programming to stop hazing to all student groups and societies. Hazing is a particularly challenging issue because many student group members believe that bonding, an act critical to group identity, can only occur through hazing. The University specifically does not support this conclusion regarding hazing and is carrying out a multipronged program to prevent hazing and change the common beliefs related to bonding and hazing. [Last year's CCL Committee identified and acknowledged the potential benefits of "collective transgression" but not at the level of hazing.]

The CCL Committee discussed bullying at length. While the Committee recognized the extensive programs, offices, and policies that could address bullying on campus, a basic internet search for resources on "bullying" at Penn did not identify any resources. Simply, a community member who felt

(continued on next page)

COUNCIL 2012-2013 Year-End Reports

Committee on Campus and Community Life

(continued from page 3)

bullied and searched “bullying” at Penn for support would not easily identify any resources. Similarly, while the Committee could discuss anecdotes of bullying that occur primarily in the superior (by rank or supervision)-employee relationships, there are no clear statistics on prevalence or severity.

The Committee made three conclusions:

- The University should adopt explicit statements or policies on bullying specifically so that a community member who searches for support on the issue would come across the policies and offices that could support them.
- The University should acknowledge explicitly that bullying is not just a criminal act. This could take the form of an explicit policy or an expanded conceptualization of the acts and behaviors that could be perceived as bullying. Less emergent cases of bullying still negatively impact the work, social, and learning environment at Penn.
- Objective data should be collected on bullying and cyber-bullying.

3. Smoke-Free Campus

The Committee discussed at three formal meetings and numerous informal conversations the issue of a smoke-free campus. The Committee received this issue from an open-forum suggestion in 2011-2012. The issue was also presented at several meetings and discussed with several constituents of the University outside the CCL.

The Committee, within its scope and abilities, heard presentations from advocates for a smoke and tobacco free campus, clinicians within the University of Pennsylvania Health System and Student Health Services, reviewed data from campuses who have gone smoke-free, reviewed data on health and smoking, and reached out to student life, human resources, and other offices of the University.

Historically all buildings and space within 20 feet of entrances have been smoke-free by University policy since 2006. More recently, Penn Medicine is banning tobacco use by all new employees starting on or after July 1, 2013. Similarly, hospital accreditation standards prohibit smoking on hospital property or the building of smoking shelters on hospital property. Finally, the new outdoor spaces on campus including the amazing Penn Park and Shoemaker Green already have smoke-free policies.

In considering a policy change, benefits that were identified of a smoke and tobacco free university environment include:

- Individual health benefits of not smoking or using tobacco
- Decreased uptake of smoking in students who attend smoke-free college and university campuses
- Community benefit to decreased exposure to second hand smoke, tobacco products, and tobacco by-products
- Decreased group health and life insurance costs
- Improved community environment
- Improved work environment especially around entrances to buildings that are currently used by smokers
- Decreased disability and employee illness
- A policy environment that is consistent with evolving hiring policies such as the tobacco use ban for new employees of Penn Medicine
- Increased ease of accreditation standards for health care facilities

Marginal costs of a smoke and tobacco free campus that were identified were:

- Limitation of individual freedoms in an increasingly large geographic area. The change in the policy would increase the area one could not smoke from 20 feet from a building entrance to the lawns, porches, and other properties of the University. This could impact several “long-term loved” employees of the University.
- Implementation Costs including signage, marketing, notification, and removal of smoking shelters, cans, or facilities.
- Decreased break time for tobacco users who must go further off campus during their breaks to find a place to use tobacco.

Key issues that were not fully defined by the Committee, brief discussions of these issues, and brief committee responses include:

- *The definition of “campus”*—In an urban environment, the line between Penn property and public thoroughfare is not obvious to an individual. While the proposed policy change applies only to Penn properties, the Committee believes the University Office of Government Relations should work with the city health department, Drexel University, and the Science Center to include contiguous sidewalks, parks, and public thoroughfares.
- *Implementation of the policy*—There are marginal costs in chang-

ing signage and communications. There can also be challenges in incorporating change in an institutional environment. The University should support Human Resources, OSC, and Facilities in their implementation of the policy. Implementation should take place over a period of time.

- *Education and Addiction Treatment*—Stopping smoking is difficult and long-term loved employees are truly valued members of the Penn community. Community members who smoke should be supported in the efforts to quit through the existing personnel benefits programs, the student health programs, and dissemination of information about state and city quit support programs.
- *Enforcement*—The campus ban should utilize the same enforcement mechanisms that the building and entrance ban currently utilize. This includes compliance through community norming, peer enforcement, and standard student and supervisory oversight, disciplinary, and feedback processes. Similar to the current building and entrance based ban, it is likely that the office of public safety will rarely be involved.

The Committee felt there were three opportunities for the University around a smoke and tobacco free campus:

- a. Lead the Ivy League as the first Ivy League institution to implement a smoke and tobacco free environment campus-wide.
- b. Work with the city, Drexel, and the Science Center to make a significant area of the city smoke and tobacco free.
- c. Join more than 1,100 smoke and/or tobacco free campuses nationwide including statewide bans in IA, AR, and OK.

The following position was unanimously supported by members of the Committee:

Based on the community health benefits reviewed and the marginal costs of implantation;

With sensitivity to the long-term, loved community members who will be affected by an additional smoke and tobacco free area beyond the current smoking-banned Penn buildings, public transportation, restaurants, bars, and public buildings;

The CCL recommends that the University adopt the following policy:

“All University of Pennsylvania facilities, buildings, and properties shall be smoke and tobacco free.”

(While the recommendation is for a policy change currently, the Committee recognizes that implementation of the policy would take place over a period of time which would include communication, education, and implementation activities.)

During the academic year the Committee was approached by or received supporting statements from several groups and programs at the University about the smoke and tobacco-free campus. These include a student group at Wharton, a Facebook group (Minimize Smoking on UPenn’s Campus), individual students, the Center for Public Health Initiatives, and Campus Health Initiatives at Student Health Services.

Priority Issues for AY 2013-2014

1. As part of the general charges, the Committee should consider a specific look at the university role in historic preservation in the University City community. The University is a significant property holder and can have significant influence on decisions about and the character of the University City neighborhood.

2. As part of the general charges, the Committee should examine Penn’s role in fostering education of Penn community member’s children in the surrounding community.

3. As part of general charges, the Committee should look at political discourse on campus and university support for the discourse. Specifically this includes support for student groups that relate to the electoral process and the opportunities to host candidate political debates.

The following Penn community members served on the Campus and Community Life Committee. Their time, attention, and input are greatly appreciated.

Committee on Campus and Community Life 2012-2013

Chair: Kent Bream; **Faculty:** Janice Asher, Christopher Lance Coleman, Andrea Doyle, Campbell Grey, Matt McHugh, Devra Moehler, Melissa Wilde; **PPSA:** Heather Calvert, Karima Williams; **WPPSA:** Loretta Hauber, Joyce Woodward-Jones; **Graduate Students:** Jiaqi Ge, Steph Mannis; **Undergraduates:** Dan Bernick, Aditi Srinivas; **Liaison:** Karu Kozuma; **Staff:** Amelia Carter

Report of the 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.

2012-2013 Specific Charges

1. Work with the Office of the Provost and with the Senate Committee on Faculty Development, Diversity, and Equity (SCFDDE) to assess the impact and effectiveness of school-level facilitators and their interactions with faculty search processes to identify university-wide barriers to the recruitment and retention of a diverse faculty; and to monitor the implementation of the University of Pennsylvania Diversity Action Plan.

2. Monitor University processes documenting recruitment, retention, and graduation of underrepresented minority graduate and undergraduate students with the Office of the Provost and any other appropriate university offices.

3. Assess progress on gender-nonspecific campus policies relating to faculty, staff, and students.

4. Assess the efforts to build cultural understanding, inclusiveness, and support across campus related to one of the following: different faith traditions, race, socioeconomic status, gender identity or sexual orientation.

5. Review and discuss this Committee's general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee's work in AY 2013-2014.

Priorities

After reviewing its charges, the Committee set three priorities for 2012-2013:

- Efforts to increase student diversity, in particular, PhD student diversity. PhD students were chosen as the focus given that they contribute to faculty diversity nationwide and undergraduate diversity had been the focus of prior Committee work.

- Efforts to increase cultural awareness and sensitivity among students, in particular, undergraduates. Undergraduates were chosen given the importance of reaching the largest number of students and addressing these issues as soon as possible in their educational careers as well as the availability of clear intervention points.

- Efforts to increase faculty diversity, in particular, to get a sense of how the nascent Diversity Search Advisor program is going.

The charge related to gender-nonspecific (i.e., transgender) policies was not made a priority of the Committee this year because it was thought that several groups on campus are actively working on the topic and considerable progress is being made (e.g., the introduction of gender-neutral toilet facilities across campus).

Number of meetings: The Committee met six times.

Major Points Addressed By The Committee

The Committee addressed multiple topics, often by inviting speakers to address specific topics as noted below:

1. In November, University Secretary Leslie Kruhly presented the Committee with its charges for 2012-2013, and Lynn Lees, Vice Provost for Faculty, reviewed the University's responses to last year's committee recommendations.

2. In December, the Committee discussed its charges and set priorities for the year. Although Committee members indicated their primary interests and the idea of subcommittees was introduced, in practice, the priorities were addressed by the Committee as a whole.

3. In January, Andy Binns, Vice Provost for Education, provided an overview on University processes to increase the number of traditionally underrepresented students in PhD programs at Penn. New to the established "pipeline" efforts are the 2012 Ivy Plus STEM conference, Penn's decision to partially fund the McNair Scholars program after it was not re-funded by the federal government, and the development of partnerships with Historically Black Colleges and Universities, (HBCU) in particular, Tuskegee University.

4. In February, the Committee engaged in a lively discussion about cultural sensitivity awareness among members of the undergraduate community. Potential intervention points identified New Student Orientation, Division of University Life programming, online training for incoming freshman prior to their arrival on campus, and workshops for Residential Advisors and Graduate Advisors through the college house system.

5. In March, Martin Redman, Executive Director of College Houses and Academic Services (CHAS), spoke to the Committee about the diversity of RA and GA staff and the diversity training provided to them (two hours of a 24-hour training are allocated to diversity and this session is facilitated by volunteers from the Greenfield Intercultural Center). He reported that some College Houses offer additional training and estimated that about 180 of the events for residents are related to diversity (e.g., religious ceremonies and cultural traditions).

6. In April, the Committee met. First, Andy Binns, Vice Provost for Education, provided an overview of data re: PhD students, including time to degree, percent completing degree, admissions data and some exit climate survey results. Following this overview, there was a joint meeting with the Senate Committee for Faculty Development, Diversity and Equity. The focus was on their review of Diversity Action Plans and our survey of Diversity Search Advisors.

In Addition:

The Committee co-chairs:

1. Referred to the Benefits Committee an issue related to the equitable application of Penn's in vitro fertilization coverage as it applies to potential fathers as well as potential mothers.

2. Were provided with an advance draft of the gender equity report.

Recommendations to University Council

1. As in AY11-12, 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 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. Compile the data such that like questions are summarized across multiple groups of interest (faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students).

(continued on next page)

COUNCIL 2012-2013 Year-End Reports

Committee on Diversity and Equity

(continued from page 5)

3. We recommend that attention be given to increasing improving cultural sensitivity and awareness among all members of the Penn community.
 - a. Begin with an initial focus on undergraduates and identify opportunities to provide cultural sensitivity education.
 - b. Adopt a broad focus, extending beyond the usual gender, race/ethnicity and sexual orientation, to include (at least) socioeconomic status and religion.

Recommendations of Topics or Continuing Topics to be Addressed the Following Year

1. Devote effort to examining options for developing/expanding/supporting programs to increase cultural sensitivity and awareness among undergraduates.
2. Continue to 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.

3. Work with the office of the provost and with the SCFDDE to continue 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.

4. Related to the above, follow-up on multiple points raised in the inaugural survey to DSAs. Training and meeting options could be enhanced. Continue monitoring the appointment of Diversity Search Advisors and their activities. Focus on distinguishing their roles from those of Diversity Officers, and look closely as issues related to placing DSAs within their own departments and /or having them at ranks lower than Full professor.

Committee on Diversity and Equity 2012-2013

Co-Chairs: Judy Shea and Susan B. Sorenson; **Faculty:** Nader Engheta, Tulia Falletti, Chenoa Flippin, Grace Kao, Joe Libonati, Ezekiel Dixon-Roman; **PPSA:** Sharon Brokenbough, Kayla Crawley Haidara; **WPPSA:** Michelle Wells Lockett; **Graduate Students:** Akeesha Washington, Paule Joseph; **Undergraduate Students:** Adrienne Edwards, Nikhil Kumar; **Liaison:** Lubna Mian; **Staff:** Gail Oberton

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 seven meetings over the academic year.

The Committee was asked specifically in its charges this year to:

1. Continue to study and monitor parking and transportation on campus, including the potential expansion of the shuttle service to the Graduate Hospital Area, south of South Street and new "South" campus. (Including GAPSA after-dark transport)
2. Discuss and monitor bicycle-on-campus policies and pedestrian safety. Discuss increasing incentives for bicycle commuting possibly with pre-tax reimbursements for bicycle commuting costs, bicycle maps to communicate pathways and policy, and the availability of lockers and showers on campus. Continue to monitor pedestrian safety on Guardian Drive.
3. Monitor the development of lactation spaces and policy on campus to ensure that there are an adequate number of permanent lactation spaces on campus. Follow up on the recommendation for a pump purchase program.
4. Receive updates on facility plans and the extent and use of green space on campus, including Penn Park and Shoemaker Green.
5. Review and discuss this Committee's general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the Committee's work in AY 2013-2014.

In addition to these charges the Committee addressed several areas of new business during the year, which included energy conservation.

Specific Charges

1. Parking and Transportation

Brian Shaw, Director of Transportation and Parking in the Division of Business Services, provided an update on several new initiatives. A parking ticketing program was started in May 2012 in the garages resulting in 1,200 tickets without any tows. They are tracking multiple offenders and giving warning to permit holders. Both the carpool and occasional parking programs have started, and they hope to grow them throughout the year. Additional wayfinding signage has been instated in the garages, and the garages have been renamed to reference their location to limit confusion. The pay stations at remote lots have been very successful. Capital investments have been made including new LED lighting in Garage 26 and improved security at Garage 40. There is a new Penn Bus that uses clean diesel fuel, has a lower floor for accessibility and a higher seating capacity. Some of the bus stops have been relocated for safety and Penn has applied to the City for more loading zones along Walnut Street.

Mr. Shaw also responded to some of our charges for this year. Regarding the expansion of the South of South shuttle, the Department would need additional resources to add this additional loop. They cannot extend the current shuttle service without additional resources. There is not a current plan to add a shuttle to South Bank, but this will be considered once there is a critical mass of people, departments, and businesses.

2. Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety

Maureen Rush, Vice President of Public Safety; Mark Dorsey, Chief of Police Public Safety; Captain Joseph Fisher, Public Safety and Kathleen Shields Anderson, Public Safety, provided an update on bicycle, pedestrian and vehicle safety on campus.

Public Safety gave a thorough overview of the Share the Road program. The Share the Road program is a daily occurrence; however a few times each year publicity is increased, and results are measured for specific time frames. The campaign increases occur in late March, just before Spring when the number of bicycle riders increases significantly and in late August-early Fall to engage with students, staff and faculty returning or coming to campus. Each campaign has become increasingly more successful with more collateral given out and more bicyclists and vehicles stopped and given warnings. As needed, additional campaigns are added. For example, last October a five-day campaign was run at the intersection of Convention Avenue and South Street.

The Division of Public Safety works with campus partners to help increase awareness and safety as well. These partners include, but are not limited to, the UA, GAPSA, Philadelphia Bicycle Coalition, Pennsylvania Department of Transportation, Neighborhood Bike Works, University City District and AlliedBarton. In February, Public Safety handed out bike lights with the Philadelphia Bicycle Coalition at the South Street Bridge on two evenings. Public Safety has also increased the number of AlliedBarton patrols in January along Locust Walk that monitor buildings and also safety on Locust Walk. Public Safety is also working with the University City District to make a collective request to the City with all of the universities in University City to stripe the bike lanes and add a bike lane on Chestnut Street. Safety fairs are being held at buildings throughout the year to educate the University community about safe practices. Bicycle and laptop registration is highly encouraged.

Mr. Shaw provided clarification of the pre-tax bicycle subsidy recommendation. The current provision through federal law states that expenses related to bicycle commuting can be reimbursed up to \$20/month with a maximum of \$240/year. It is not a pre-tax program, and the costs need to be reconcile with receipts each month. Further, this subsidy cannot be combined with any other transit or parking subsidy. This is a higher subsidy than the more expensive SEPTA pass, and the management of the program would cost more than the actual subsidy. If the law changes and a pre-tax program is instated, Penn will consider adding it to their programs.

3. Lactation Space

A written history and overview of lactation spaces on campus was given to the Committee, followed by a progress report from Felicity Paxton and Anita Mastroieni based on our recommendations from last year. It was noted that the number of spaces on campus has doubled since September 2011. A map of the spaces has been added to Facilities and Real Estate website, and the HR policy and communications have increased both awareness and the number of spaces on campus. Up until now, GAPSA

(continued on next page)

Committee on Facilities

(continued from page 6)

has funded some of the hospital grade pumps that are in the spaces open to the University community. They have also funded pump attachment kits that are available through the Penn Women's Center.

4. Green Space and Public Space Maintenance

University Architect David Hollenberg gave an update presentation on open space on campus. The open space on campus is the glue that ties the buildings and campus together into a cohesive family. Locust Walk was recently completed. Improvements were made to the 3600, 3800 and 3900 blocks that included replacing brick to make the Walk safer and provide for a better pedestrian experience; however the project also wound up including and replacing City utility infrastructure that was under the Walk. Penn Park is another recently completed project that increased the green space on campus by 20%—more than 500 trees were planted in Penn Park alone. To give people an order of magnitude, it is roughly the same size as Battery Park City. There is a huge cistern underneath the fields that captures rainwater that is used for irrigation throughout the site. The Park provides a direct pedestrian and bicycle connection from Walnut Street and is open until midnight. Shoemaker Green opened in September 2012 and extended the open space network between the center of campus and Penn Park. It is a pilot project for the Sustainable SITES initiative, which is similar to LEED for buildings but is for landscape projects. The Sustainable SITES initiative requires not only sustainable design and construction methods, but also maintenance standards. The rain garden and cistern in Shoemaker Green help with the campus stormwater management plan. Kane Park, located between 33rd and 34th on Spruce Street, opened in December 2012 and transformed an asphalt parking lot into public green space. Additional plantings are scheduled for this Spring. The space improves the pedestrian experience and connection between campus and hospital.

Upcoming projects discussed were Walnut Street Streetscape to continue the softening of the pedestrian experience between Center City and campus. Improvements to the landscape around the Ring Squash Courts will improve the connection between Shoemaker Green and Penn Park. This project will occur after the Hutch Infill project is complete. Updates to the Generational Bridge will occur over the next two years that will improve the donor signage.

Other Points Addressed During the Year

The Committee received a report on campus sustainability. Daniel Garofalo and Sarah Fisher presented the new Green Labs practices programs to the Committee. The 3,946 laboratories on campus consume 45% of the University's energy use. The program consists of practices that reduce energy, but also those that reduce and conserve water. The Sustainability Office created a Best Practices Manual for labs to follow. If 70% of lab occupants and the department chair sign a pledge, the lab will receive a sticker that designates their lab as a "Green Lab". They have created posters and other informational pieces that will be posted on the Green Campus Partnership website in December. The Green Office certification program was also discussed.

The Committee would like to see better communication channels between building occupants and maintenance requests. Some Committee members were unaware of the Building Administrators for their workplace. The Committee encourages discussion between students and the developers/maintainers of AiM, the online service request program. FRES will meet with a student from the Committee this Spring and will address their concerns with the online system.

Recommendations to the University Council and/or the Community

1. The Committee is pleased with the increase in the number of lactation spaces on campus, as well as the Nursing Mother's Program. The Committee feels that the University should explore a campus-wide pump purchase program and/or a program that provides discounted pump attachment kits to make pumping at locations that provide the hospital-grade pumps easier. GAPSA has funded both attachment kits and hospital grade pumps for the campus-wide community in the past. The Committee does not feel that GAPSA is an appropriate funding source. The University community would benefit from an increased pump purchase/attachment kit program funding centrally from the University.

2. Communication to constituencies throughout campus has been a recurring theme that spans the issues as they are discussed. The Committee is unsure of the best way to address communication gaps, but recommends that communication channels be studied. The Committee noted examples of good communication: for example the programs run by the Department of Public Safety to inform bicyclists about laws, safety and bicycle registration. However, there were gaps in this information. For example, bicycle riders on the Committee were surprised to learn that the health insurance plans offered by Penn cover the cost of bicycle helmets.

3. The Committee would like to see a strategy that includes better communication regarding bicycle practices on campus. Highlights should include preferred bicycle routes for riders, revised bicycle routes during construction, and University policies. The Committee has added comprehensive communication about bicycle practices on campus to our list of topics to be addressed for next year.

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

1. Monitor the progress of the Penn Connects Plan, including the progress of the development of South Bank. (The Committee would like to have an update at the first or second meeting of each year to help give background.)

2. Investigate the adequacy of classroom space on campus, including various sizes and technology needs, with special attention to the central pool classrooms.

3. Recommend a comprehensive bicycle plan for the campus. The Committee would like to see additional attention to bicycling on campus that includes routes and paths, parking, safety and security, as well as a strategy for bikes on campus.

4. Investigate and understand the maintenance of buildings, including the new Century Bond program.

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

Committee on Facilities 2012-2013

Chair: Stephanie Weirich; **Faculty:** Cindy Connolly, Zahra Fakhraai, Joshua Klein, Ed Macarak, John MacDonald, Eric Marsh, Ann Moyer; **PPSA:** Marcy Weitz, Thomas Wilson; **WPPSA:** Linda Satchell; **Graduate Students:** Benjamin Chrisinger, Shyam Sivakumar; **Undergraduates:** Anthony Cruz, James Fangmeyer; **Liaison:** David Hollenberg; **Staff:** Taylor Berkowitz

Committee on Personnel Benefits

The Committee met seven times this year, with the final meeting on April 16. The Committee will meet one more time in August to discuss retiree medical and prescription drug benefits.

2012-2013 Specific Charges

1. Continue to review the requirements of Health Care Reform that will go into effect in 2013 and beyond, and consider needed changes in University benefits.

The Human Resources department briefed the Committee on a variety of implementation issues related to Health Care Reform. Among these issues, the new 30 hour rule defining who is a full time employee eligible for health benefits may have the most significant impact on employment patterns at the University, particularly for adjunct and other part time or short term positions. It is the sense of the Committee that the University is appropriately engaged with Health Reform implementation issues.

This charge should continue during implementation of the Affordable Care Act.

2. Monitor the effectiveness of Penn's program with Health Advocate.

The Human Resources department briefed the Committee on utilization of the new Health Advocate program. It is the sense of the committee that the program provides a useful service for employees but that many people are not aware of the range of services that were available. Committee members encouraged the Human Resources Department to continue communications regarding the program and to work with Health Advocate to develop additional measures of the effectiveness of the program.

This charge should continue for at least one more year.

3. Investigate how information on health insurance and retirement alternatives is disseminated, how constituencies use this information, and how the communication and decision process can be improved. Explore how Penn can productively engage with faculty conducting research related to employee benefits in order to improve Penn's benefit design, communication, and utilization.

The Committee invited faculty to present research related to employee benefits at each of its meetings this year. This innovation was very well received by the Committee and by the faculty invited to present their research. This year the research presentations principally focused on retirement benefits. Professor Jill Fisch and assistant professor Tess Wilkinson-Ryan both from the Law School presented their research on retirement investments, with a special focus on the importance of fees. Assistant professor Katy Milkman from the Wharton School presented her research on retirement program participation during the November meeting, with a special focus on the role of "prompts" to increase participation. Professor Olivia Mitchell from the Wharton School presented her research on pensions during the April meeting. Based on these presentations and a briefing from the Human Resources Department, it is the sense of the Committee that University employee participation in retirement savings programs is at or above that of our peer institutions but that additional outreach that takes into account the research findings could improve participation. Committee members were impressed with the research presented by our faculty and encouraged by the willingness of the Human Resources Department to engage with the re-

search in order to improve the communication and decision process.

The HR department will be working directly with Dr. Milkman and her colleagues to participate in her research over the next several months.

This charge should continue.

4. Monitor the implementation and effectiveness of Penn's wellness initiatives.

The Committee was actively and productively engaged in monitoring Penn's wellness initiatives. Early in the fall the Committee worked with Human Resources Department personnel to evaluate a proposed survey to be included as part of a Health Risk Assessment. The Committee invited Dr. Ezekiel Emmanuel to discuss the smoke free campus initiative. The Committee also received a briefing from committee member Dr. Carolyn Cannuscio regarding similar initiatives on other campuses. Committee members were generally supportive of the concept of Penn becoming a smoke- and tobacco-free campus. It was the sense of the Committee that there are important implementation details to be worked out and that any smoke free campus policy should be announced well in advance of implementation, as part of a larger policy to improve the health and wellness of the Penn community. Committee members expressed concern regarding policies—like those recently implemented in the Penn health system—that limit the employment eligibility of people who use any tobacco products.

This charge should continue.

5. Continue monitoring the impact of the LPS open enrollment policy for the summer term to determine if this has helped those in the Penn community who do not meet the typical admissions standards.

The LPS open enrollment policy has made it possible for Penn employees who do not meet the typical admissions standards to take courses at Penn. The LPS program is eager to enroll additional employees through the open enrollment policy. Some such employees have entered into degree granting programs. Access to the LPS program is a valuable benefit that has helped some employees, but it has not, and cannot be expected to, address access for all.

The CPB considers this matter to be closed.

6. Review and discuss this Committee's general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee's work in AY 2013-2014.

The proposed high priority issues for AY 2013-2104 are: (1) monitoring and evaluation of wellness initiatives, (2) monitoring and evaluating the take-up of the high deductible health plan, and (3) furthering the engagement between University researchers and Human Resources to improve retirement planning and health care benefit selection and utilization by University employees.

Committee on Personnel Benefits 2012-2013

Chair: Tom Baker; **Faculty:** David Balamuth, Eric Bradlow, Carolyn Cannuscio, Scott Harrington, Andrea Liu, Daniel Polsky, Irene Wong;

PPSA: Emma Grigore, Eleanor Rupsis, Jared Susco; **WPPSA:** Peter Rockett, Joyce Woodward-Jones; **Ex Officio:** Jack Heuer, Susan Sproat, Lynn Lees; **Staff:** Sheila Hall, Liz Salasko, Geri Zima
