Committee on Academic & Related Affairs

1. Background and Charge to the Committee

The Committee has a very broad charge that covers a considerable portion of the University. For the 2013-2014 academic year, the standing general charges were as follows:

1.1 General Committee Charge

The Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA)

1. shall have cognizance over matters of recruitment, admissions and financial aid to undergraduate students at 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 the 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 all of the 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.

1.2 2013-2014 Specific Charges

For the 2013–2014 academic year, the specific charges were as follows.

1. Continue discussions concerning undergraduate research. Follow up on recommendations that are aimed at raising the awareness of students, faculty and the general public and to discuss innovative ideas that were raised last year by the Committee. Explore ideas for increasing the scope of undergraduate research opportunities. Consider the best practices in place at Penn.

2. Continue present conversations with Business Services as the Bookstore is reorganized.

3. Continue annual dialogue with the Dean of Admissions, Eric Furda, at a joint meeting with the Senate Committee on Students and the Educational Policy (SCSEP).

4. 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 academic year 2014-2015.

2. Narrative

CARA met six times during the 2013-2014 academic year (October 2, 2013, November 18, 2013, December 6, 2013, January 30, 2014, February 14, 2014 and March 20, 2014). In addition, approximately six-eight preparatory and background meetings were conducted by the Chair for the purpose of gathering information for the Committee. We wish to express our gratitude for the time and attention provided to the Committee by various people, both at the CARA meetings and in the background meetings, including: Marie Witt, Chris Bradie, Dan Raff, John Mark Ockerbloom, Alice Xie, Rob Nelson, Beth Winkelstein and Wallace Genser.

2.1 Undergraduate Research

CARA’s second, third and sixth meetings were devoted to discussion of undergraduate research. In the second meeting the Committee heard from Ms. Winkelstein and Dr. Genser regarding the activities and findings of the Middle States Reaccreditation Undergraduate Research Committee. In the third meeting, CARA devoted its time to an extended discussion of undergraduate research with the aim of responding to Ms. Winkelstein’s and Dr. Genser’s suggestions to provide timely feedback to the Middle States Reaccreditation Undergraduate Research Committee. The following is a summary of CARA’s discussion on undergraduate research, which was forwarded to the Middle States Reaccreditation Undergraduate Research Committee on December 18, 2013:

CARA discussed a number of ideas for improving the general undergraduate research picture at Penn, as well as for addressing the recognized problem of under-reporting of, and under-recognition of, undergraduate research efforts by CURF. It identified possible tracking mechanisms that might more easily capture the number of undergraduate students applying for and participating in research activities, as well as ideas that might lead to greater participation by undergraduates in research. Suggestions included:

- Develop a module in Canvas for faculty to set up a research course that could track and record research activities. The Committee noted that Canvas will be up and running university-wide next fall and privacy issues might have to be examined.

- Track work-study student research activity data that might be easily obtained, if this is not already done.

- The Committee by consensus agreed to recommend that a new “institution” be created at Penn, perhaps called a supervised internship. It could be paid or not, depending on circumstances, but it would not be for course credit. Even so, there would be a way to record the internship and the supervising faculty’s assessment of it. Perhaps this could be done on Canvas. The records would become “official” in the sense that Penn would maintain the archives and students would be able to reveal the records to prospective employers and others they deem.

- Track the applications for research positions and look at any discrepancies particularly for underrepresented minorities. In addition, it would be useful to survey a more general population in order to assess the willingness of minority students to undertake research as well as their awareness of the available opportunities at Penn.

- Options for enhancing underrepresented minority applications other than the proposed summer program should be explored. The Committee discussed using monetary incentives for faculty members to take on more student research projects. It was thought that this might be effective in SAS, but perhaps not in the other schools, which tend to have more outside funding.

- Identify potential applicants for scholarships such as the Rhodes scholarship in their junior year and provide assistance to aid these identified students. It was noted that the CURF already does provide assistance but more support might be beneficial. The point was raised in the discussion that the majority of Penn Awards are given to seniors, but if we would award students in their junior year or earlier they would have stronger CVs for scholarship applications.

* In addition, at its sixth and final meeting of the year CARA heard from Alice Xie, an undergraduate who has been funded by the University Scholars program and has prospered under it. She offered the Committee thoughtful insights on the great value of the program. She also made a number of suggestions for improving the program, urging in particular more outreach to the broader student community. Rob Nelson reported on efforts by CURF aimed at earlier recruiting of students for undergraduate research and for applying for post-graduate fellowships. CURF presently provides considerable assistance to students showing interest in research and post-graduate fellowships and is examining ways to improve its support. At the same time, many of the prominent fellowships have rules prohibiting forms of direct assistance. A subtext here is that there is a general perception that Penn’s rate of placing students in top post-graduate fellowships is below its rate in producing excellent graduates with outstanding research achievements, and that it is to the advantage of the entire Penn community to promote and to display to the world excellence in undergraduate research.

2.2 Penn Bookstore

Business Services, working with Barnes & Noble, reorganized the Penn Bookstore during the summer of 2013. The results are visually striking. For instance, upon entering the store from Walnut Street, one is presented with a vista of clothing racks where bookshelves formerly stood. This development occasioned questions regarding the appropriateness of the changes and regarding what to expect for the future of Bookstores at Penn. In consequence, CARA was assigned to look into the matter.

CARA devoted two full meetings (the fourth and fifth) to the Bookstore issue. In addition, the Chair undertook about six-eight meetings for the sake of obtaining background information for the Committee. The Committee is very grateful for the time and energies provided to them by a number of people, especially Ms. Witt and Mr. Bradie of Business Services, Dr. Raff and of the Office of the Provost.

Upon reflection and collection of background information the Committee framed the Bookstore issue as having two parts:

1. Reviewing the recent changes at the Bookstore and assessing how the Committee should go forward, e.g., with changes to the changes, with new advising mechanisms, etc.

CAPA’s focus was a waying on this aspect of the issue.
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2. In anticipation of the finding that secular trends are fundamentally driving the changes in the Bookstore, and indeed in most bookstores, to raise the question: What values (if any) are lost or diminished because of these secular forces and how might any losses be recouped or at least defended?

CARA’s fifth meeting was focused on this aspect of the issue.

Regarding the first aspect of the Bookstore issue, the Committee heard from Ms. Witt and Mr. Bradie of Business Services and Dr. Raff, who has served on Penn committees overseeing the Bookstore and who undertakes scholarly research on the publishing industry. The underlying worry associated with this aspect of the issue is that the reorganization of the Bookstore signals a degree of abandonment of certain values historically associated with great bookstores and their communities. If so, certain obvious secular trends—electronic books, alternate media, online purchasing and rentals, etc.—would seem to be able to explain any decline in bookstore Vitality. Is this what is going on? What might we expect for the future? The Committee set out to answer these questions (as part of the first aspect of the issue).

What the Committee learned is heartening and encouraging. First, Ms. Witt and Mr. Bradie summarized the mission of the Bookstore as serving the Penn community and the Bookstore (Business Services in conjunction with Barnes & Noble) wishes to encourage the use of this room.

The Committee notes with pleasure the retaining of a vibrant book collection at the Bookstore and the exciting portents of the addition of the new meeting and seminar space in the Bookstore.

We turn now to the second aspect of the Bookstore issue: Are there values at risk in consequence of secular developments? If so, what can we do? The Committee devoted its fifth meeting to these issues, aided in the discussion by Ms. Witt, Mr. Bradie and Dr. Ocklerbloom.

The following points arise in this context:
1. Bookstores (and libraries) have historically afforded serendipitous discovery, in part by browsing in well-curated collections of books.
2. Community is another value that has been served; bookstores and libraries are places in which discussion is stimulated.
3. There are interesting software developments that seem to hold much promise in these regards.

Some examples:
- http://librarylah.law.harvard.edu/blog/stack-view/
- http://stacklife.law.harvard.edu/
- http://shelf.io/
- http://vimeo.com/57334719
- http://shelf.io/
- http://vimeo.com/57334719

It will be useful now to offer for discussion a slightly different—hardly conflicting—list of values pertaining to bookstores and libraries (and museums and archives) from the perspective of students, faculty and other knowledge creators at Penn, than was given by Business Services.

1. Curation.
   Intelligent and informed organization of materials to facilitate effective access to them. (This is an important service, historically, of bookstores.)
2. Serendipitous discovery.
   Good curation helps. So does community. So do size and depth of collections. (This is an important service, historically, of bookstores. Arguably, it is a value at risk diminution with smaller collections.)
3. Community.
   As described by Business Services. (see above).
4. Scholarly communication.
   (This is a recognized mission of the library.)
5. Preservation of records (written and otherwise, including data) for research and teaching purposes.
   (This is a recognized mission of the library.)
6. Facilitating access to information.
   (This is a recognized mission of the library.)

With the possible exception of #5, bookstores have served all of these values.

 Provisionally taking this list as adequate to support further discussion, what might be done to promote and strengthen these values at Penn? The Committee had two general ideas.

1. Idea events.
   Think prototypically of author events, aimed at a general audience, in which authors give presentations about their books, take questions from the audience and generally stimulate and promote intellectual discussion. All of this affords community, serendipitous discovery and other values.

   This is a well-established institution. The Free Library has a long-established, flourishing series. The Penn Bookstore have long had a series and now has a new facility for supporting such events (see above). Borders used to sponsor such events.

   (1) Surely it would be desirable to take steps to encourage having more such events on campus. How might we do this?
   (2) How might we generalize or abstract this institution, and encourage that?

   Here are some of the Committee’s thoughts. Every year, Penn picks a theme and encourages its discussion. Evolution was the theme during the year of Darwin’s bicentennial. Proof was a recent theme, and so on. Why not have evening events in which one or more speakers are invited to discuss the theme, perhaps to debate it or serve on a panel for discussion? Why not invite display of curations on the topic? If it’s evolution, then literature on evolution, etc. Why not invite the area bookstores to display their wares on the topic? And the library.

   This, too, can be generalized. Why limit idea events to Penn’s theme of the year. Invite clubs, student groups and so on to curate and promote an idea event. Undergraduate researchers, in particular, could benefit enormously by having opportunities to present at such idea events and to see the presentations of their peers. Organizing one would be a tremendous service to the community and enriching experience.

   We might look to Philadelphia’s First Friday institution as a model: an open cultural event that is a lot of fun, that happens regularly and that costs very little.

   Such thoughts might be encapsulated by saying the Committee suggests more systematic organization and promotion of idea events at Penn, involving all groups in, and members of the Penn community. Let there be a careful and thorough exploration of this idea.

2. Information discovery software.
   It is generally agreed that recommendation systems such as those in place on Amazon, BN.com and so on, are not ideally suited for serendipitous discovery. As a baseline, we might consider browsing in the stacks of the library. The recommender systems are not as good as that, surely. In fairness, they are designed to make sales, not to afford exploration and discovery.

   So, why not make software that affords discovery? One could do worse than starting by emulating online the experience of browsing in the stacks. We have Stack Life (http://stacklife.law.harvard.edu/) among other efforts.

   Points arising:
   (a) We need to be careful about recommending new software systems, especially systems embodying concepts not fully mature and tested. There is risk of spending a lot of money on something that doesn’t work. I suggest we would do better to propose ways forward incrementally to adopt and test such systems. Can we find an evolutionary, incremental way forward? Perhaps idea events could make use of such software?
   (b) The group at Harvard that produced Stack Life specializes in prototypes, open-sources all of its work and is very open to collaboration with other universities.
   (c) The PEN Library is actively exploring this area (software for discovery, etc.) and sincerely welcomes ideas and suggestions from the Penn community.

3. Recommendations
   In summary, CARA has three principal recommendations at this time.
   1. The concept of supervised internships as described above should be carefully and thoroughly explored and, we hope, implemented. Under this concept,
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students would undertake research with the supervision of a faculty member, who would provide a record of the student’s work and accomplishments, which could be used by the student to document the student’s experience. The work could be done either with or without pay, but without course credit in any case. The work record might be stored on Canvas or another courseware system. Penn would maintain the records and secure their integrity.

Anticipated positive consequences of instituting supervised internships include better, more thoroughgoing documentation of research at Penn, benefitting both Penn and individual students, as well as the faculty research projects in which they work. Financial costs should be minimal.

2. The concept of idea events as described above should be carefully and thoroughly explored and, we hope, implemented. Under this concept, there would be an organized effort to raise the level of activity of intellectual exchanges aimed at more general audiences, both at Penn and indeed in the larger community, rather than at disciplinary specialties. We note that undergraduate research would seem to offer exciting opportunities in this regard.

3. The creation and use of information discovery software should be carefully, creatively and thoroughly explored with, we hope, the goal of implementation. The Committee notes the downside risks inherent in open-ended information discovery software that can be contained with wise management and careful deployment. The Committee notes as well the exciting upside risks of aiding serendipitous discovery, facilitating intellectual and scientific communication, etc., that plausibly are in store.
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Committee on Campus and Community Life

2013-2014 Specific Charges

1. The Committee should review Penn’s engagement in and support of public elementary education in the surrounding community.

2. The Committee should review the role of historic preservation in the development of the main campus of the University and its off-campus properties.

3. As part of general charges (i), (ii) and (iii), the Committee should look at political discourse on campus and University support for local and national civic engagement.

4. 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 academic year 2014-2015.

5. In addition, as part of the administrative response to last year’s report and recommendations on bullying, the Committee was asked to develop additional information on bullying.

The Committee met five times during the year. Subcommittees met on the three specific charges as well as on the University request for information on bullying. The Office of Student Affairs provided invaluable administrative support for the Committee. The first charge occupied the largest part of the Committee and subcommittee work.

The following conclusions were reached by the Committee:

1. The University should proactively seek the opening of empty seats in the Penn Alexander School (PAS) to out of catchment children. The rationale for leaving empty seats in the upper grades of PAS is greatly outweighed by the negative appearance and inequities that are caused by closing them off to out of catchment students. The Committee strongly encourages the University to ask the School District of Philadelphia (SDP) that these seats, no matter how few, be available to non-catchment children.

2. The University should develop a seven-year plan to address the shifting support priorities and community needs around the Penn campus to achieve community development and educational equity in Penn’s West Philadelphia community including managing the last seven years of the PAS contracted support to the University in an independent sustainable manner after the contract ends.

3. The Committee strongly believes that the lottery system at PAS is more equitable than a first-come, first-served model for distribution of the limited number of seats in kindergarten.

4. The Committee recommends a definition of bullying that is adopted from organizational models available online. Specifics are described within the report below.

Suggested Charges for Next Year

1. Examine the role of and level of social cohesion in community life.

2. Review the system of housing assignments for Penn students both on and off campus. Look at Penn’s relationship with off campus housing owners and managers including Penn owned off campus housing.

3. Review green campus initiatives.

4. Review facilities costs and the costs when Penn cost centers purchase goods from other Penn cost centers.

1. Penn’s Engagement in and Support of Public Education.

In considering Penn’s engagement in and support of public elementary education, the Committee considered four issues: support for public elementary schools proximate to Penn, the new lottery system and the wait list that has been created at PAS, empty seats at PAS in upper grades and opportunities proximate to Penn, the new lottery system and the wait list that has been created at PAS, empty seats at PAS in upper grades and opportunities.

The Committee hosted several guests and sought input from several sources during the year. Representation from Lea, Powel, Greenfield, West Philly Coalition for Neighborhood Schools and the University presented to the Committee. Because representation from Penn Alexander School was not available, individual committee members sought input from individual parents from the PAS catchment. Leadership of the PAS HSA suggested the University could speak best on the issues.

The Committee discussed this charge as both a geographic charge with particular attention to schools near the University campus as well as a Penn community-member based charge with a focus on schools where Penn community members may send their children. Except for the Penn Alexander School, no community-member based data were available. This represents an opportunity for the University to understand the educational needs and decisions of its students, faculty and staff with children. Based on the lack of personnel based data, the Committee decided to focus on public elementary schools geographically close to Penn’s campus. Of the open schools in the 2013-2014 academic year, this included: Powel (University catchment area), Penn Alexander, Lea and Greenfield. The committee early in the year was able to engage with parents and organizations associated with the Lea, Powel and Greenfield schools.
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from an economically disadvantaged background (93.7%). Of the comparison schools, it has the largest population of students with disabilities and the highest population of students who are English Language Learners. Profoundly, the Lea School population has grown 64% from 2011 to 2013. There is great need at the Lea School for support. While the Nett Center is engaged in ABCS collaborative activities at the Lea School, there is significant need for human and physical plant investment at the Lea School. There are Home and School Association fundraisers and classroom supply requests at Lea. There is no history of direct funding requests to funds controlled directly by the principal. The parent community, based on the demographic data of students, does not have the economic capacity to be a significant funder of and financial investor in the physical plant or personnel of the school. Despite the physical plant and personnel needs, it is recognized how international, educationally diverse and personally invested the Lea community is.

The Penn Alexander School has the lowest African American (25.1%) and highest Asian (17.7%) student population of the comparison schools. The white student population is on par with Greenfield. PAS has the lowest economically disadvantaged rate (27.3%) and lowest disabled student percentage (4%). The economically disadvantaged rate of 13% in PAS through all children from the co-located Head-Start program were admitted to PAS before catchment children. This policy is reportedly changing in the coming year. While the other comparison schools saw significant population increases over the last three academic years, PAS had increased 0% (one additional student). PAS receives parent support through the Home and School Association and parent groups. The school receives $1,300 in direct cash support from the University each year (over $700,000 last year). These funds are controlled at the school level and have been responsibly overseen by a single principal since the school was founded.

As the year progressed, the Committee began to focus on the differences ethnically, socio-economically and in PSSA performance at the 4th grade level, Lea and PAS. The geographic proximity to each other with immediate adjacent catchment areas was noted. While there was not an assumption of causality, the cash investment the University makes in the PAS is associated with a less diverse school population and better performance in the PSSA examinations. This remained troublesome across the Committee in light of the University’s stated goals in the Penn Compact.

The University initially invested in the PAS in order to improve the community around Penn. This has been achieved on multiple measures. There are, however, emerging differences between the two schools that the Committee presents above that contrast with the larger University socio-social goals. It was presented by multiple parties, from a broad range of perspectives, that the University’s cash investment in PAS was not sustainable or replicable. Anecdotally it was also presented that the two communities are different based on the monthly-paid/weekly-paid Penn faculty/staff worker needs, it is recognized how international, educationally diverse and personally invested the Lea community is.

The Committee presented above that contrast with the larger University socio-social goals. It was presented by multiple parties, from a broad range of perspectives, that the University’s cash investment in PAS was not sustainable or replicable. Anecdotally it was also presented that the two communities are different based on the monthly-paid/weekly-paid Penn faculty/staff worker needs, it is recognized how international, educationally diverse and personally invested the Lea community is.

The Penn Alexander School has the lowest African American (25.1%) and highest Asian (17.7%) student population of the comparison schools. The white student population is on par with Greenfield. PAS has the lowest economically disadvantaged rate (27.3%) and lowest disabled student percentage (4%). The economically disadvantaged rate of 13% in PAS through all children from the co-located Head-Start program were admitted to PAS before catchment children. This policy is reportedly changing in the coming year. While the other comparison schools saw significant population increases over the last three academic years, PAS had increased 0% (one additional student). PAS receives parent support through the Home and School Association and parent groups. The school receives $1,300 in direct cash support from the University each year (over $700,000 last year). These funds are controlled at the school level and have been responsibly overseen by a single principal since the school was founded.

As the year progressed, the Committee began to focus on the differences ethnically, socio-economically and in PSSA performance at the 4th grade level, Lea and PAS. The geographic proximity to each other with immediate adjacent catchment areas was noted. While there was not an assumption of causality, the cash investment the University makes in the PAS is associated with a less diverse school population and better performance in the PSSA examinations. This remained troublesome across the Committee in light of the University’s stated goals in the Penn Compact.

The newly implemented lottery system has created a wait list for students not admitted. Anecdotally, the Committee heard that everyone that was left on the wait list for 2013-14 and who had not made another school choice at the opening of school in September 2013 was admitted to PAS. The Committee also heard anecdotally that students left the waiting list because they understood they would not be admitted. There was no objective data on who was balanced to children on the waiting list. The University has an opportunity to track where kids who are initially put on a wait list due to excess demand end up. Currently the school has been able to meet the wait list demand only for those who do not elect other options while on the wait list. There is an opportunity to understand who gives up on the wait list, why, and where they end up.

A constructive basis for the Committee to highlight the University investment in the Lea School through the Penn-Lea liaison Caroline Watts and the ABCS investments coordinated by the Petter Center.

With the significant investment from the Philadelphia Water Department (Greening Lea), PECO and the community members of the Lea School, it became clear to the Committee that there is an opportunity for the University to engage on an original basis in support of public elementary education with the Lea School. The Lea School is soon to celebrate its 100th anniversary in a classic building. Instead of direct cash support opportunities, there is the opportunity to remake the physical plant of the Lea School as well as the overall perception of Lea in the community. Lea is a dignified community that values learning diversity and it’s international population. The Committee continued its discussions with a clear understanding that Penn’s engagement in and support for public elementary education has shifted over the last 20 years from a neighborhood development program to a social justice issue. While the University should not try to take on the educational challenges of the entire city, there is an opportunity for leadership around:

a. carving out an opportunity for partnership, investment and collaboration at
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the Lea School beyond the ABCS model and without direct cash support,

b. developing a national model for other institutions to imitate, and
c. working with other Philadelphia institutions to coordinate partnership
    activities so that together there is a broad social impact on Philadel-
    phia education.

Historic Preservation

A subcommittee was formed to consider the issue of historic preserva-
tion in the development of the University main campus and outlying prop-
erties. The Committee reached out to community members including ad-
ministrators at the University. The subcommittee was not successful in de-
veloping a focus or receiving formal presentations regarding historic pres-
ervation and development on University properties during the academic
year. Therefore, the Committee does not have specific recommendations in
a report, affirming, supportive, evaluative, reflective or any other manner
for this charge.

Political Discourse on Campus and Local & National Civic Engagement

The Committee heard reports from the Office of Government and
Community Affairs, the Penn Political Coalition and the Office of the Vice
Provost for University Life. The charge of political discourse focused on
three aspects: bringing speakers to campus, limitations on University sup-
port for current candidates and the student expressed sentiment of an un-
safe University environment to be politically different.

Unique, the University has two federal mandates under the Higher
Education Act regarding political discourse and engagement. The Univer-
sity must promote voter registration and acknowledge Constitution Day
on September 17. The Office of Government and Community Affairs ac-
tively maintains oversight and implementation of these two charges.

There is regular enthusiasm during presidential election years to bring
candidates or debates to campus. Due to Penn’s 501c3 status, Penn cannot
raise money to advance a candidate or idea. Any partisan activities
 cannot be supported with University funds or resources. This has a significant
impact on the implementation of civic engagement and political discourse
on campus in practice. In addition, while a debate could be hosted on
 campus, concern over the cost, security and access by the Penn commu-
nity limit the implementation. A potential solution is to focus on debates
about ideas or non-national elected positions. Local candidates would not
have the logistical and security issues that a national campaign requires.

As an active campus, faculty often exercise their individual right to
free speech in the classroom, their offices or on University resources like
e-mail to advance a political ideology or advance a specific candidate. This
individual expression by faculty to students may have two outcomes: it
could provide an educational opportunity for students or it may silence
students due to the power differential and role faculty have in evaluat-
ing students. Student guests and representatives described to the Commit-
tee the importance of a political identity as similar to a cultural, gender or
racial identity. Political tolerance or sensitivity towards political identity
could be an opportunity for development in the faculty and staff. One op-
portunity is to help faculty and staff develop John DiLulio-like statements
such as “I have these viewpoints but I am excited to hear what you have to
say,” when they talk about political issues in the classroom.

The Penn Political Coalition (PoCo) hosts Political Action Week every
two years. This is part of their mission to develop political discourse on
 campus. There is a strong desire to see Penn as a space for engagement.
There are challenges, however, to implementing this desire. The prohibi-
tion on political activity due to non-profit status above is a challenge.
This means that students cannot have a petition at an activity where University
funds have bought food as part of a larger event. The cost of Facilities is
prohibitive and student groups cannot afford these costs. Even when cer-
tain student facilities are designated as free, staffing, cleaning or security
costs present a barrier to student groups. Finally, honoraria are difficult to
manage given the size and system for funding student groups. One solu-
tion is utilizing the Penn PoCo Synergy Fund and growing this as a strate-
gic opportunity for growing national civic engagement.

In order to create a safe and non-disruptive environment on campus,
the University maintains a program for Open Expression. The goal of the
program is to encourage conversation but not disruption. Open Expres-
sion faculty and staff volunteer monitors attend protests that are on cam-
pus. The Committee received a report that it is difficult on campus to sup-
port the open expression of viewpoints that are not supported by the ma-
jority of community members.

The Committee discussed the myriad of topics around political dis-
course and national engagement and endorses a goal of growing discourse
and engagement. This recommendation, however, comes with sensitivi-
ty towards the risk of an environment dominated by majority views. The
Committee endorses the following:

a. Political views that are expressed in an environment where there is a
   power differential or a clear majority view point can border on bullying.
b. Defining banned political activity instead of permitted activity may have
   a chilling effect on achieving the goal of expanded discourse.
c. Seeking opportunities to support open expression that is not based on
events (protests or meetings) could be considered.
d. The University could seek data from seniors on their experience with
   political repression

e. The University could work to support political discourse that encourages
   an exchange of ideas rather than the discovery of a single best answer.
f. Faculty and staff openness could be increased.

Follow Up on Bullying definition

A subcommittee was formed to address the request regarding bully-
ing in the administrative response to the AY13 report. The subcommittee
used internet based searches as well as conversations with campus stake-
holders in considering a definition. The following definition of bullying is
recommended:

a. Bullying can be exhibited by an intentional physical, psychological, ver-
bral, nonverbal, written or electronic act of series of acts directed at another
person, which occurs in and/or around the a university setting, that is severe,
persistent or pervasive and has the effect of doing any of the following:
   i. Substantial interference with a community member's role.
   ii. Creation of a threatening and hostile environment.
   iii. Substantial disruption of the orderly operation of part of the
organization.
b. Bullying is characterized by the following three (3) criteria:
   i. It is intentional or deliberate aggressive behavior or harm doing, and
   ii. It is carried out repeatedly over time, and
   iii. It occurs within an interpersonal relationship where there is an
   imbalance of power (e.g. one (1) person is physically larger,
   stronger, mentally quicker or by position, profession or socially
   more powerful).
c. Bullying takes many forms and can include a variety of behaviors.

As defined in this policy, bullying refers to direct or indirect action, which
may include but is not limited to:

   i. Physical-touching, hitting, kicking, pushing, shoving, getting an
      other person to hurt someone
   ii. Verbal-name-calling, teasing, taunting, gossiping, and spreading
      rumors
   iii. Nonverbal-threaten, intimidation, obscene gestures, isolation,
      exclusion, stalking, reprisal and retaliation
   iv. Cyber bullying-using electronic or communication devices
      through means of social networks, email, instant or text messaging,
      tweets, blogs, photo or video sharing, chat rooms, boards or web
sites.

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 2013-2014

Chair: Kent Bream; Faculty: Janice Asher, Andrea Doyle, Campbell
Grey, Randall Mason, Rebecca Maynard, Matt McHugh, Guobin Yang;
PPSA: James Allen, Heather Calvert, WPPSA: Joyce Woodward-Jones;
Graduate Students: Shicong Meng, Tianyuan Shi; Undergraduates: Chris-
tian Cortes, Alex Zimmerman; Liaison: Kuru Kozama; Staff: Amelia Carter
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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.

2013-2014 Specific Charges
1. Recommend options for developing/expanding/supporting programs to build cultural understanding, inclusiveness and support across campus related to different faith traditions.
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 Senate Committee on Faculty Development Diversity and Equity (SCFDE) to continue to monitor the effectiveness of the school-level facilitators, and to assess the progress in implementing the University of Pennsylvania Diversity Action Plan.
4. Related to the above, aid in identifying ways to strengthen and support the newly-instituted role of Diversity Search Advisor.
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 academic year 2014-2015.

Priorities
At the first meeting on October 9, 2013 the Committee agreed to focus on Charges #1 and #4.

Number of Meetings
The Committee met five times.

Major Points Addressed by the Committee
1. The first meeting was held on October 9, 2013, and was spent reviewing the University’s response to last year’s Committee recommendations. Dr. Anita Allen and Ms. Stacey Lopez were invited guests and Rev. William Gipson was also invited but was unable to attend the meeting. The Committee also discussed the 2013-2014 charges and agreed to focus on the charges related to the Diversity Search Advisor (DSA) and religious life.
2. The second meeting was held on November 25, 2013, and was spent discussing the Diversity Search Advisor role with invited guests Dr. Nancy Tkacs and Dr. James Guevara. It was revealed that some DSAs at PSOM were junior faculty and replace them with tenured faculty by the end of the fiscal year.
3. The third meeting was held on December 10, 2013, and was spent discussing the landscape of religious life on campus with invited guest Chaplain Charles Howard. The Committee agreed to revisit the DSA discussion at the subsequent meeting.
4. The fourth meeting was held on January 14, 2014, and was spent revisiting the DSA discussion for the purpose of identifying recommendations to submit to the University Council. There were no invited guests. Ms. Mian updated the Committee that a plan was developed to phase out the DSA appointments who are junior faculty and replace them with tenured faculty by the end of the fiscal year.
5. The fifth meeting was held on February 21, 2014, and was spent revisiting the discussion about religious life for the purpose of identifying recommendations to submit to the University Council. There were no invited guests. Ms. Mian informed the Committee that Dr. John Jackson would be working with the DSA’s centrally.

Recommendations to University Council
1. The Committee applauds the University’s efforts in developing and implementing the role of Diversity Search Advisor (DSA). The Committee encourages the University to reinforce that DSAs should be tenured and standing faculty and where they are not, a plan should be in place to replace them with faculty adhering to the DSA guidelines.
2. The Committee acknowledges that the University has attempted to communicate the importance of the goals in the Diversity Action Plan and the DSA role. However, the Committee recommends that the University find additional ways to reinforce the importance of the DSA role to all faculty in order to ensure there is buy-in for diversity search efforts. To that end, the Committee suggests the following:
   a. Add an administrative note specifically addressing the DSA role to effort reports on individual faculty academic plans.
   b. That schools require DSA specific updates to appointment committee and search committee reports when such reports are generated.
   c. That the University and schools consider participation of DSAs in promotion reviews.
   d. Schools could consider making DSA activities eligible for incentives including added compensation when the time commitment exceeds anticipated hours.
   e. The University should encourage these actions (a to d) through changes to the DSA guidelines and outreach to schools.
3. While the average time dedicated to DSA activities is five hours per month, the committee is variable across schools and departments. The Committee recommends capping the number of searches one DSA can conduct at one time and appointing more than one DSA where necessary (particularly for DSAs for whom the position is not part of an administrative role).
4. The Committee considers that religious groups are important catalysts for strengthening the Penn community and for providing for the health, well-being and vitality of students. The Committee recognizes that there are disparities in the resources religious groups receive, though it acknowledges that the disparities may be for reasons beyond the University’s control. The Committee encourages the University to continue finding ways to support religious groups and the work of the Office of the Chaplain. To that end, the Committee recommends that the University increase the yearly allocation to the Faith Fund from $10,000 to $40,000 to ensure that the diversity of faith communities on campus, as represented by 42 groups, is adequately supported.
5. Feedback from students and the Chaplain demonstrate that there is a need to provide additional climate spaces for religious groups for purposes that include worship, prayer, events and advising. The Committee acknowledges that the University recently dedicated space in Houston Hall to the Interfaith Fellows, but that this may only be adequate as a short-term solution. The Committee agrees that an Interfaith Religious Center, similar to Hillel and the Neumann Center, would strengthen the Penn community, help in the provision of care with respect to health and wellbeing and further distinguish Penn as a preeminent educational institution. However, the Committee acknowledges that it has a limited understanding of the scope of the need. To that end, the Committee recommends that the University focus more attention on determining the space needs of religious groups, which could include:
   a. Comparing the spaces provided at Penn with those provided by peer institutions
   b. Forming a task force to work with the Office of the Chaplain and the Provost in determining the needs and challenges faced by religious groups

Recommendation of New Topics or Continuing Topics to be Addressed the Following Year
1. The Committee acknowledges the University’s efforts to recruit diverse faculty, but recommends also focusing on the retention of diverse faculty.
2. The Committee recommends focusing on the recruitment and retention of diverse graduate students.

Note: The Committee considers “diversity” comprehensively, to include components of identity including but not limited to race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, faith traditions and socio-economic background. The Committee recommends including these varied identity components when examining faculty and graduate student recruitment and retention.

Committee on Diversity and Equity 2013-2014
Chair: Joe Libonati; Faculty: Regina Austin, James Cornish, Ezekiel Dixon-Roman, Chenoa Flippin, Wei Guo, Jonni Moore, Reshma Munbodh; PPSA: Tia Dreher, Kristin Field; WPPSA: Ashley Gripper, Rosa Vargas; WPPSA: Ashley Gripper, Rosa Vargas; Graduate Students: Paule Joseph, Johanna Marcus; Undergraduates: Thando Ally, Joyce Kim; Liaison: Lubna Mian; Staff: Iris Leon
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.

2013-2014 Specific Charges

1. With the support of the Classroom Committee, investigate the adequacy of classroom and event space on campus, including various sizes, formats (dry/wet labs, lectures, discussions) and technology needs, with special attention to the central pool classrooms and suggest changes to ones that need it most. Consider alternative spaces to enhance access to high-traffic classrooms.

2. Working with Parking and Transportation Services, discuss and recommend a comprehensive bicycle communication plan for the campus with a focus on routes and paths, construction detours and parking for bikes on campus. This discussion should include the public safety and facilities needs and concerns.

3. Investigate and understand the maintenance of Penn’s buildings, including the new Century Pool program. Suggest ways that the Penn community can assist Facilities in the effort to make Penn’s campus more energy efficient.

4. 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 academic year 2014-2015.

In addition to these charges the Committee addressed a few other areas of business during the year.

Specific Charges

Classrooms

The committee discussed classrooms on two occasions.

In the November meeting, Don Calcagni and Jeff Douthett spoke about central pool classrooms. The Central Pool was created in 1992 from the Office of the Provost in an effort to update the classrooms on campus. The rooms are donated to the Provost Office by Schools. The rooms must meet certain criteria, and if accepted into the pool, the Provost Office maintains the classrooms through capital renovations and technology upgrades as appropriate intervals. In return, the room is centrally scheduled with the Office of the Registrar and the rooms can be rented to external groups through Perelman Quad. There is a $2 million budget for renovations for all of the central pool classrooms each year. This budget generally meets the needs of the pool. There are 199 classrooms in the pool at the moment, representing 45% of the classrooms on campus. There is an effort to renovate the rooms with durable materials and supply technology that will last as long as possible. The most popular size classrooms are those that can accommodate 50-70 students, as well as seminar and conference-style classrooms.

There are enough classrooms to serve the needs of the community, however all classes cannot be accommodated during the highest demand times (Monday–Thursday, 10 a.m.–2 p.m.). The Central Pool Committee is also considering converting some of the current or new classrooms to active learning spaces. Active learning spaces provide a 90-seat count at 7’ round tables, each of which has power and a white board. Since this initiative is new, the classroom space needs to be linked to a need by the curriculum.

The Committee returned to the topic of classrooms during the March meeting.

Andrew Binns and Michelle Brown-Nevers started the conversation about classroom spaces at Penn by explaining how the central pool classrooms are scheduled. There are approximately 200 classrooms in the pool. The classrooms are booked by weighing several criteria including the time of the course, faculty teaching schedules and the subject matter as it relates to certain buildings or specific class needs. Priority is given for classes that can be scheduled within the blocks set by the Registrar’s Office. Typically 60-minute blocks are set for Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays between 8 a.m.–2 p.m., with 90-minute blocks available after 2 p.m. Tuesday and Thursdays are typically reserved for 90-minute blocks. The Committee raised concerns about classes that do not fit within the blocks, and also the need to accommodate academic events that need classroom space, possibly one for one day. An additional need was expressed for classrooms that can serve 35-50 people. There is not currently a formal way for the faculty to communicate their needs, or potential future needs as classes grow, to the administration. The administration is going to look into the following: three hour room blocks in the morning, particularly for smaller rooms for seminars; how to prioritize majors in the system (this may be possible in a few years with the replacement of SRS); how academic events can be prioritized for one day, how to consult with other departments, but may not be undergoing major renovations and consulted otherwise; communication about the process and system both from and to the registrar. One possible avenue for communication is during new faculty orientation, or it was suggested that one year after faculty are at their position this process get reviewed. Likewise, it is helpful for the Registrar’s Office to know about new classes that will rely on the pool before they make their space request so that the Office has more time to plan. All of these needs to be balanced with a changing pedagogy that will continue to incorporate more active learning classrooms.

Bicycles

In the December meeting, Brian Shaw explained that a Bike Planning Committee was created in June and presented an update of their work to date. The Committee created criteria for the location of bike racks, incorporated bicycle needs into the Instruction for Design Professionals and is in the process of developing a bike communication plan and Revised Bicycle Policy. A copy of the draft bicycle policy was passed out to attendees and the Committee. A draft bicycle map that includes the location of the bike racks, trolley tracks, no riding zones and bicycle routes was also reviewed. The City of Philadelphia is slated to roll out City-wide Bike Share locations in the Summer/Fall 2014, including four proposed locations on campus.

The Committee also received another report from Mr. Shaw about the Bike Planning Committee during the March meeting. He reviewed the history of the Committee, their charges and intentions and distributed the Policy that is currently being reviewed by the higher administration. A campaign announcing the new policy and bike improvements on campus will include events, advertisements, PR, listservs, committees and social media. Social media, in particular, will be a way to have “conversations” amongst bicyclists and the administration, including possible construction detours and other alerts. Business Services is setting up a comprehensive bicycle page that will make it easy to find information and resources. Penn is applying to receive a Bike Friendly Campus designation from the League of American Bicyclists. The Bicycle Friendly University program evaluates applicants’ efforts to promote bicycling in five primary areas: engineering, encouragement, education, enforcement and evaluation/planning. The areas are all included in the current Bike Plan. The adoption of the new bike policy and the campaign described above is just the beginning: the work of the Bike Planning Committee will continue to evolve as the campus changes.

The Committee expressed their appreciation of the work by the Bike Planning Committee, particularly in respect to new communication materials, the maintenance of bike lanes during construction, proactivity with respect to the bike share program and the addition of new bicycle parking.

The Committee would like to see continued engagement between the Bike Planning Committee and other groups with interests in University City, including Drexel, UCD, the BCGP and the City of Philadelphia to better promote biking as a sustainable form of transportation.

Century Bond

Also in the November meeting, John Zurn explained the Century Bond Project. The University bonds with a 100-year payback term at a very low interest rate. The University made this investment to address major deferred maintenance issues on campus that could not otherwise be funded. $100 million is for strategic reserve project designated by President Gutmann. $200 million will be invested into HVAC and lighting upgrades in the oldest buildings and those with the highest energy payback. A construction management firm that specializes in this area analyzed the buildings on campus in order to create a strategy for the projects. 17 buildings have been identified for an HVAC (heating, ventilating, air conditioning) upgrade and 44 buildings will receive lighting upgrades; many of these projects are already in construction. The University will continue to reinvest the energy saving in order to pay back the loan and continue to spend the capital at the same time.

The Committee commended the Century Bond program, especially with respect to the energy savings afforded by the upgrades.

Other Points Addressed During the Year

The Committee began the year with a presentation by Mark Kocent, who presented a detailed overview of Penn’s campus planning and development efforts since the start of the Penn Connects plan in 2006. Projects were highlighted in both the first phase, as well as the second phase, called Penn Connects 2.0.

The Committee also continues to monitor lactation space usage. The University has had a positive response from departments and divisions across campus and there is a significant increase in the number of lactation spaces, as well as the creation of the Nursing Mothers Policy, and an increased publication of the lactation locations. The University does not feel that it is in any one Center or Division’s purview to implement a pump (continued on next page)
The Committee met six times this year. In addition to the topics addressed in the specific charges, the Committee discussed a variety of topics related to personnel benefits, including changes to retirement benefits, changes to employee health benefits, and the Affordable Care Act and the Express Scripts, Inc. (formerly Medco) formulary change.

2013-2014 Specific Charges

1. Continue to discuss and 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 benefits design, communication and utilization.

2. Continue to discuss and review the requirements of Health Care Reform and changes in University benefits.

3. Continue to monitor the effectiveness of Penn’s program with Health Advocate.

The Committee was actively and productively engaged in monitoring Penn’s wellness initiatives. The Committee worked with Human Resources Department personnel to evaluate the proposed survey to be included as part of a Health Risk Assessment met with Staywell, the vendor responsible for implementing the wellness programs, to understand their services and provide feedback.

This charge should continue.

5. Discuss and review Penn’s current Maternity Leave Policy for staff in comparison with work-relief policies offered at peer institutions.

The Committee addressed this charge as part of the ongoing discussion about benefits at Penn. Of note, the Committee discussed with Human Resources staff the development of private, employment-based exchanges that involve a “defined contribution” approach to health care benefits. It was the sense of the Committee that these developments should continue to be monitored but that the University’s present approach to health benefits is meeting the needs of the Penn community. The Committee recommended Human Resources for participating with a research project involving Wharton faculty member Katie Milkman on ways to increase the take-up of retirement benefits for participating with a research project involving Wharton faculty member Katie Milkman on ways to increase the take-up of retirement benefits.

This charge should continue.

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 to have an impact in AY 2014-2015.

The proposed high priority issues for AY 2013-2014 are: (1) discuss and review the University’s short-term and long-term disability policies for staff in comparison to those of peer institutions; and (2) discuss and review the proposed changes to University smoking policies in relation to University personnel policies.