1. Background and Charge to the Committee

The Committee has a very broad charge that covers a considerable portion of the University. For the 2014-2015 academic year, the standing general charges were as follows.

1.1 General Committee Charge

1. The Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA)
   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 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 oversee 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, in order to assign 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 2014–2015 Specific Charges

For the 2014-2015 academic year, the specific charges were as follows.

1. Examine Penn’s programming relating to the performing and visual arts as it intersects with programming for Penn students.
2. Review procedures and standards on academic integrity for graduate students.
3. Explore proposed changes to the Van Pelt-Dietrich Library and resulting impact on the library system generally.
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 2015-2016.

2. Narrative

2.1 Performing and Visual Arts

The Committee devoted its December 9, 2014 meeting to discussion of its charge to “Examine Penn’s programming relating to the performing and visual arts as it intersects with programming for Penn students.” The Committee’s discussion was assisted by Karen Beckman, Jaffe Professor of the History of Art and Director, Penn Art and Culture Initiative, who made a short presentation, answered questions from the Committee, and participated in the general discussion.

Dr. Beckman gave a presentation, updating the committee on the Penn Art and Culture Initiative. She explained that she is the Director of the Art and Culture Initiative and has one staff support person. She reported that their mission is to heighten awareness, increase diversity of use, and improve the pedagogy of arts and culture across disciplines. She reported that she works with a Steering Committee comprised of faculty from the School of Arts & Sciences, faculty from the School of Design, and Penn’s Art and Culture Center Directors.

Dr. Beckman highlighted efforts to strengthen awareness, such as a new Penn Art and Culture Guide that is distributed to students and local hotels. She reported that there is an Art and Culture website that features information and links to art and cultural events at Penn and locally. She noted that there are individual stories of events at Penn and these are often written by students. She added that there is a weekly Art & Culture Newsletter with 2300 subscribers and a recent push for social media outreach.

Dr. Beckman explained that there is an interdisciplinary arts fund that supports art and culture initiatives at Penn that are collaborative and directly engage students. She explained that it aims to advance the role of art and culture in student and academic life and noted that priority is given to projects that aspire to engage a diverse range of students. She explained that a recent example of this is Mural Arts at the Lea School; a mural arts collaboration with Penn students and elementary school students in West Philadelphia.

Dr. Beckman reported that the Office of Admissions has made changes to promote the arts and culture at Penn. She explained that there is an admissions video featuring interviews with center directors and students majoring in the arts. She noted that the office holds special tours for a diverse range of high school and middle school students highlighting Penn’s art and cultural centers.

Dr. Beckman updated the Committee on art and culture pedagogical innovation. She explained that there are Freshman Seminars that focus on the arts such as the Writing About Art Seminar. She explained that the seminar engages in critical issues related to visual arts, with a focus on writing about contemporary exhibitions. She added that students visit and review Philadelphia area exhibitions, including shows at the Institute of Contemporary Art, the Barnes Foundation, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and local galleries. She explained that, in the seminar, students are able to practice different descriptive and critical approaches to writing about art works.

She reviewed a recent conference: The Humanities and the Arts in the Integrated Knowledge University (HAIKU), held at Penn on September 12-13, 2014. She explained that this conference explored what the humanities and the arts have to offer contemporary efforts to integrate distinct bodies of knowledge with the research university. She noted that the HAIKU Conference resulted in two days of lively multi-disciplinary discussions and performances about the future of the humanities within the creative research university.

The Committee wondered what Dr. Beckman is hoping to do next. She explained that it can be challenging to get support for arts and culture. She added that the School of Arts & Sciences Dean Steven Fluharty has agreed to make the arts a part of the SAS long-range plan. She added that she would like to activate the leadership in the other Schools and add other disciplines into the pedagogy for art and culture. She noted that she would like to see art and culture be stated as part of Penn’s mission with a big vision for expansion and investment that would require alumni support. She noted Penn alumni have offered support for arts and culture in the past.

The Committee wondered what Dr. Beckman would like to see at Penn after 10 years as a measure of success. She explained that her vision of success in 10 years would be a greater number of students participating in arts and culture at Penn and locally. She added that increased faculty diversity at Penn would foster her vision. She added that it would be useful to have a more flexible multi-use space on campus that could be used as studios or for film screenings or instructional use, or for all at once. She noted that it does not have to be fancy but should be a place to create and exhibit and learn.

The Committee asked Dr. Beckman to explain where there is resistance or impediments for arts and culture initiatives at Penn. She explained that Penn is thoughtful about how and where to spend money, which can be good for careful planning; however, she would like to see more ambitious and develop a broad long-range plan that includes increased funding for arts and culture.

The Committee asked if there are art and cultural opportunities with the health sciences. Dr. Beckman noted that the Steering Committee has not talked about that but there are many integrations that would be possible, such as medical imaging as part of art.

The Committee asked about the usage of the Platt Performing Arts House. Dr. Beckman stated that it is in high demand and therefore at maximum capacity. The Committee asked if there are efforts to get students to go to museums. Dr. Beckman cited several examples of efforts to get students engaged with museums, such as events at the Penn Museum and an event at the Philadelphia Museum of Art for freshman during New Student Orientation.

The Committee suggested that Dr. Beckman strategically focus on the four undergraduate Schools to bring a broader group together and get buy-in for art and culture initiatives at Penn. They recommended that she add membership from the four undergraduate Schools to the Steering Committee. These are points to consider for the report that Dr. Beckman will submit to the Provost and the School of Arts & Sciences Dean at the end of the academic year.

2.2 Academic Integrity

The Committee devoted its February 20, 2015 meeting to discussion (continued on next page)
of its charge to “Review procedures and standards on academic integrity for graduate students.” The presentation was assisted by Marcia Joan Glickman, senior case manager and mediation coordinator, Office of Student Conduct (OSC), who made a short presentation, answered questions from the Committee, and participated in the general discussion.

Ms. Glickman told the Committee that the primary goal of the OSC is to work as liaison to each School in matters of student academic misconduct. She reported that the Office of Student Conduct had a change of directors over the summer of 2014, followed by a full scale review of the office, assisted by a consulting firm. This led to a revamping of their operating processes. The new Director for the OSC is Julie Nettleton, who officially took on that role in November of 2014.

Ms. Glickman explained that the main goals of the office review were to find ways to make the OSC more faculty friendly, to un-complicate the case processing procedure, to make faculty aware that the OSC wants to be a resource that welcomes faculty questions and offers consultations, and to work on time concerns so that the entire process is not as time consuming. The typical cases that the OSC handles in regard to academic integrity deal with plagiarism and over-collaboration. The OSC processes 130–150 cases of academic integrity per year and 100 conduct cases per year. Overall, about 2/3 of the cases are undergrads and 1/3 are graduate students. In addition, a main upshot of the OSC review was to remove sexual assault cases from OSC. These cases are now handled through a separate office, with Christopher Mallios appointed as the Sexual Violence Investigative Officer as of February 1 of this year.

Ms. Glickman explained how undergraduate cases are investigated and processed through the OSC office. If a professor contacts the OSC regarding a student who has committed an act of misconduct, the OSC case manager will interview the student and the professor. The case manager will speak to the faculty with a 24-48 hour turn-around time in order to be able to notify the student promptly by letter of the specific issue (no notices are issued on Fridays). The student must then make an appointment with the OSC within seven days and is encouraged to bring an advisor to the meeting. A copy of the Code of Academic Integrity is sent via email to the student and the student has the option to leave the meeting at any time to get an advisor. The purpose of the meeting with the student is for the case manager to get the student’s perspective on the issue.

After the student meeting, the case manager determines whether or not to follow up with the professor. If the student is found to not be responsible after the investigation, the student is sent a letter stating this. If the student is found to be responsible, then the student is sent a charge letter, and a resolution proposal is sent to the professor. OSC does not impose sanctions (suspension, probation, or note on the student’s permanent record); instead, OSC only recommends them.

A change of policy has been decided and will be implemented beginning in October of 2015. Under the new policy, students who are found to be responsible for academic misconduct will receive a warning; but the letter of reprimand will no longer be a part of their permanent record. Only if they have a second violation will it become a part of their permanent record. Some students request a hearing or a second opinion for their cases. A hearing consists of three faculty members and two students who hear the case from the case manager and the student. Though some students may state that they did not know what they did was a violation of student conduct, the OSC does not take intention into account when assessing cases. The standard of proof requires is that there must be “clear and convincing evidence with 75% certainty” for a student to be found in violation.

The process for graduate students is only slightly different from the one just described, which applies generally. Ms. Glickman reported that graduate students are held to a higher standard when it comes to cases of academic integrity. Suspension is not imposed, and they may not be asked to leave the University right away, but any violation found will result in a letter appearing in their permanent record immediately. She also explained that the goal of the OSC is not to ruin the student’s life but to be fair to the academic process.

The Committee inquired about conditions for referring students to OSC. Ms. Glickman explained that all referrals are discretionary; there is no requirement to refer but OSC strongly recommends that any suspicion of an academic integrity violation should be referred. Only a TA or a professor can submit a referral. If a student contacts the OSC, the OSC will take the issue to the professor to see if the professor wants to pursue an investigation. OSC urges faculty to contact them early in the process; even if it is the suspicion of misconduct, the faculty member should at least contact the OSC for a consultation. The value of a process such as the OSC is to show that the University values classroom integrity.

The Committee asked how the OSC reaches out to students and emphasizes that students are aware of the University code of conduct. Ms. Glickman explained that many faculty have the code of conduct included on the front page of their syllabi, and the OSC gives workshops and offers talks with TAs. As an added measure, beginning in the summer of 2015, online academic integrity modules will be required for all undergraduates and new students to complete. The Weingarten Learning Center also offers sessions to teach students how to properly note and cite sources. In addition, Ms. Glickman asked what faculty or University organizations can do to be more helpful. Ms. Glickman explained that feedback is very important. The OSC wants to work together with the faculty to ensure that academic integrity expectations are as clear as possible with students. She reemphasized the need for faculty to consult and refer cases to the OSC.

The Committee also inquired whether there is a more proactive way for faculty to discourage cheating and if there is blocking software for personal laptop exams in the classroom. Ms. Glickman responded that the OSC would welcome more conversations with faculty regarding cheating and offered the OSC web address (www.osc.upenn.edu), which provides blocking software for exams.

2.3 Changes to Van Pelt-Dietrich Library

The Committee devoted its March 25, 2015 meeting to discussion of its charge to “Explore proposed changes to the Van Pelt-Dietrich Library, including the catalogue changes in retrieving the materials that were moved from the stacks.” Mr. Rogers explained that the largest problem that the Library faces is lack of space. He added that in recent meetings with GAPSA there was a notion that the Library was responsible for closing the Engineering Library and that this is not true. The individual Schools decide when to close a department library. The Library’s preference would be to put a library in every building in Penn, but there just is not enough space for that and the ultimate choice for closure or space reduction is up to the School. When a library is closed, the materials are moved to Libra, the Library’s long-term storage facility, located in New Jersey. The Library is currently working to make sure that all materials that were available in the stacks or that were moved to Libra are still accessible to faculty, staff, and students upon request.

Mr. Rogers explained that Van Pelt-Dietrich Library has been fundraising for and trying to create a presence for the management and preservation of Penn’s very extensive rare books collection. Books in the collection have not always been housed in a secure facility with the proper air quality. Moreover, the Library has run out of expansion space completely. They are hopeful that the fundraising will help to offset some of the costs of moving and the necessary changes. In addition, it is expensive to keep the licenses for online materials (such as periodicals) current. The Library is trying to find a balance between how to increase the intake of new material and how to preserve the rare materials. The biggest changes to Van Pelt-Dietrich Library have been to the 5th and 6th floors. There has been an increase in the teaching space on the 6th floor and preserve boxes have been added to the 5th floor to display and preserve some of the smaller rare materials.

Mr. Rogers shared that there is a paper conservation lab (that will be staffed) in the works to preserve and conserve the books and materials that the Library has, so that generations to come can continue to enjoy the use of these materials. He is particularly excited about the paper conservation lab; it will be something new. He has assessed the materials that have been moved to storage and the catalog of books. Some of the materials have been displeased with the moving of materials to storage (Libra, New Jersey). There are over 80,000 print volumes per year that have been moved since the 1970s. The Library is in the process of developing a high density storage catalog. Although this is costly and time consuming, it is high on the priority list. With the current system, the Library has an 18-day turnaround on an inter-library loan request. He has an idea of a microfilm or digital, that will have a vast amount of material which can fulfill requests as needed. Members of the Committee praised the FacultyEXPRESS system. Mr. Rogers added that other systems that faculty and staff can use are BorrowDirect and E-ZBorrow. The Library is working to make access as user friendly as possible and feedback on how the systems are working is welcome.

Issues were raised about the Dewey classification system, or rather (continued on next page)
er about Library materials so classified. Committee members noted that the old browsing function experience was lost when the materials were moved to off-campus storage. The Committee asked if there is a new browsing function that might be used for items classified with the Dewey system, or if putting movable stacks in Van Pelt would provide space to move some of the materials back from the storage facility. Mr. Rogers explained that unfortunately it is structurally impossible to add any more movable stacks in Van Pelt. The Library tries to make sure that high interest materials are kept on site, but if by chance an item is moved to storage, users should contact the Library to see what might be done. This is an issue for all research libraries, not just Penn. The amount of material greatly exceeds the space available. The Library has been working on enhancing call number searching and call number browse interface, but that takes time.

The Committee asked about digital efforts in regard to licensing, digital materials, and historical materials. Mr. Rogers explained that Penn has been slowly digitizing its materials over the years but not in a very systematic way. It has mostly been done at the request of a faculty member when need for the digital material arises. This process is very expensive and because of copyright issues nothing that post-dates 1923 can be digitized. Most recently, the Library was able to make materials from the HathiTrust Digital Library available to the Penn community. These materials comprise a vast digital library that includes materials pre-1923. We are sending our own digital materials to be added to HathiTrust. The Library is often approached by vendors who offer digital back-up files for our materials and as the funds become available we are making more strides to digitize our materials.

The Committee asked about the budget and how funds are allocated to the Library. Mr. Rogers explained that the Library budget is well supported by the Penn community but it is not unlimited. Penn is part of a few consortia that share collections across institutions to help meet the demand for information from staff and students.

The Committee asked about technology transfer and how the Library can ensure that digitized materials will be long lasting and effective. Mr. Rogers explained that it is hard. They are trying to transfer materials from tapes, CDs, cassettes, etc. over to digital material. This can be difficult, time consuming, and costly. The Library is trying to build collections that scholars for generations to come can access and use and the problem with digital material is that the licensing may not allow it to be available in 20 years, let alone several years down the line. The Library is very concerned about this as we move forward.

The Committee asked about Scholarly Commons, what it is and how effective its use has been. Mr. Rogers explained that Scholarly Commons is a repository for the scholarly output of researchers at Penn. It promotes dissemination of their work, preserves it in a freely accessible, long-term archive, and can be accessed worldwide. Scholarly Commons contains materials chosen by Penn departments, Schools, centers, and institutes, and users have access to materials free of charge. Users who upload articles are also given regular reports on how many people are accessing that articles so they can see exactly how much feedback they are getting for their work.

The Committee asked about study spaces in the libraries. Mr. Rogers shared that the focus has shifted toward providing more spaces that promote teaching and learning across the curriculum. The Library recently built a collaborative classroom that is small but has been getting a lot of use and a lot of positive feedback. There is a value to libraries as community spaces that really bring students and faculty together and there is a loss of that community space when libraries are closed or shut down.

The Committee asked what it can do to help the Library. Mr. Rogers stated that it would help if we added it to the agenda for next year to take a more holistic look at what the future library space on campus should look like, and to take the time to discuss, as Penn grows, whether or not we could really live with a smaller library footprint. What does the Library of Penn’s future look like? As the campus grows, will we continue to increase library and study spaces just as much as we increase dorm and classroom sizes?

3. Recommendations

The Committee recommends the following for the 2015-2016 academic year:

1. The Committee recommends that for the 2015-2016 academic year it continue to monitor the Library and also delve into issues arising, including those suggested by H. Carton Rogers (holistic look at future library space, etc. see the report above), as well as issues raised by the Committee this year (e.g., study space for students, electronic browsing facilities) and last year (e.g., idea events, electronic browsing facilities).

2. The Committee recommends that for the 2015-2016 academic year it continue to monitor the role of the performing and visual arts at Penn and also delve into issues arising, including those raised by the Committee (e.g., connection to idea events, ways of more thoroughly incorporating the arts into Penn life).

3. The Committee notes that changes have been afoot with Penn athletics and that CARA’s writ, perhaps uniquely among the peer committees, extends to athletics. In consequence, the Committee recommends that for the 2015-2016 academic year it be charged with monitoring and reviewing recent developments in Penn athletics.
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Committee on Campus and Community Life

The Committee Charge

The Committee on Campus and Community Life (CCLC) is an established committee of the University Council, which is charged with the following four general areas of responsibility:

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

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

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

4. It shall advise the president, the director of public safety, and the administrators or directors of specific buildings, offices, or projects on all matters concerning safety and security in the conduct of their operations, including consideration and assessment of means to improve safety and security on the campus.

The University Council issued four specific charges to the 2014-2015 Committee that fall under the general domain of its responsibilities:

1. Consider trends in university responses to allegations of sexual assault and Penn’s response to these trends.

2. Follow up on the recommendations of the Commission on Student Safety, Alcohol, and Student Life.

3. Consider enhanced advising and support structures for international students.

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 2015-2016.

Committee Processes

The Committee conducted its work through three means: (1) full Committee meetings; (2) subcommittee meetings; and (3) individual outreach and information collection by members of the Committee. Over the course of the year, the full Committee met four times with invited guests who had deep knowledge about one or more of the issues related to the Committee’s charge. The first of those meetings (October 29) focused on updates from key stakeholder groups regarding issues falling under the Committee’s purview. The second (December 2) focused on the University’s commitment to and engagement with the Philadelphia Public Schools—particularly its engagement with Penn Alexander and the Lee School, and developments following the issuance of the 2013-2014 Committee report. It (continued on next page)
also focused on the University’s efforts to prevent sexual violence and to educate the community on the issue of sexual violence in general. The third meeting (January 20) focused on responses to the recommendations of the Commission on Student Safety, Alcohol, and Student Life and support needs and the University Council’s request that the Committee examine needs for enhanced advising and supports for international students and scholars. A fourth meeting (February 4) focused on off-campus student housing. A fifth meeting (February 18) was attended only by the Committee and focused on recommended priority issues for next year’s Committee to address.

Subcommittees conducted preparatory work for various meetings and follow-up, as warranted.

Main Conclusions of the Committee

Penn’s engagement with the Philadelphia Public Schools.

The Committee commends the University for its continued efforts to support the Philadelphia Public Schools, particularly two elementary schools within University City—the Penn Alexander School and the Lea School. However, the Committee also noted that the University’s involvement in the District schools extends well beyond these two schools.

Penn Partnership Schools. The ongoing contract with the School District for support of the Penn Alexander School (due to expire in 2021) has been influential in creating a high performing school, which since its inception has served a highly diverse population. However, the Committee noted that the Penn Alexander School appears to be serving decreasing proportion of low-income and minority students—a result that University representatives suggested may be a natural result of area gentrification.

The Committee followed up on an observation from the 2013-2014 Committee that the Penn Alexander School sometimes had vacancies in the higher grades—a consequence of the school not admitting students from outside the Penn Alexander catchment area. As of this report filing, the School Enrollment Policy still limits enrollment to students residing within the designated catchment area for the school.

The University has a very different model of support for the Henry C. Lea School that it believes is more sustainable and easily reproducible. This model focuses on material consumables and staff/infrastructure access rather than the contracted fiscal support model used at Penn Alexander.

The Committee did actively examine developments at the Lea School since the prior Committee’s report.

The Committee looked for obvious evidence of systematic teaching or research programs associated with either or both of these schools and did not identify any.

Recommendation 1: The University and the Graduate School of Education in particular should engage more actively with both area schools and the school district in general to develop sustainable partnerships that support research and promote improved practice.

Recommendation 2: The University should work with the school district to secure ongoing access to data support monitoring and improvements in practice at not only the Penn Alexander and Lea Schools, but at other partnership schools.

Recommendation 3: The University should consider conducting a survey to determine what elementary school children of Penn faculty and staff attend and the factors that affect their decisions.

Recommendation 4: The University should work with the District to allow Penn Alexander to develop a policy that would allow parents from outside of the catchment area to apply to send their child to Penn Alexander and that would require the school to accept such applicants on a fair basis (e.g., by lottery) if it has capacity.

More general engagement with District schools. The Committee noted that Penn has many students, faculty, and staff from across campus who engage with Philadelphia Public Schools, including through Academically Based Learning Courses, faculty-initiated research projects, and volunteer activities. Notable important recent developments include efforts of faculty in the Graduate School of Education and the School of Social Policy & Practice to build capacity in initiatives to create integrated data systems and their partnership programs.

Recommendation 1: The University should conduct a periodic evaluation of its support of and outreach to Philadelphia Public Schools.

Recommendation 2: The University should create and maintain a central database of information about student and alumni support of the University’s role in the Philadelphia Public School system in other ways, such as active knowledge-sharing platforms and active discussion of best practices.

Report of the Commission on Student Safety, Alcohol, and Student Life. In response to the 2013-2014 Committee’s report, this year’s Committee examined steps the University has taken to address two particular areas of concern raised by the Commission—sexual assault and interpersonal violence and bullying.

Sexual assault and interpersonal violence. With respect to the University’s response to concerns about sexual assault and interpersonal violence, the Committee commends the University for its decision to establish the Office of Student Sexual Violence Prevention and Education. In a very short time period, the office (of one staff) has made considerable progress in raising awareness of sexual violence, educating students about signs and protective actions, and improving awareness of resources available to victims or witnesses of sexual assault and personal violence.

The office has developed some good educational resources, created inventories of resources to support witnesses to or victims of sexual assault and interpersonal violence against students, and developed and offered staff training on the resources available to students. For example, the various resources include the following: Student Health Services, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), Penn Women’s Center, and the Division of Public Safety Special Services Unit.

In exploring ease of accessibility to the many resources available to victims and witnesses, the Committee noted that it could be difficult to locate resources, depending on the initial point of entry to the University’s website. Notably, it seemed especially challenging to find resources if one was not starting from within the Penn website.

The Committee offers the following recommendations for strengthening its response:

Recommendation 1: Consider expanding the responsibilities of the Office to include awareness training for Penn staff and faculty, as well as students, perhaps by fostering greater collaboration and coordination between this new Office and the Title IX Office, which has responsibility for prevention efforts targeted at staff and faculty.

Recommendation 2: The University should continue to invest in improving ready access to information about campus resources to help witnesses to or victims of sexual assault or interpersonal violence. This might include a diagram of services that survivors of violence can access on campus.

Recommendation 3: Improve the visibility of online resources including preparing the online resources to be more easily accessed by users other than students.

Bullying. The Committee commends the Office of Affirmative Action & Equal Opportunity Programs (OAAEO) for its efforts to improve support to vulnerable populations on campus including those who are experiencing workplace harassment of any kind. University officials acknowledged that bullying is a major issue on campus and the University has a responsibility to educate students, staff, and faculty on the range of behaviors that constitute bullying and the various sources of support.

Recommendation 1: The Committee recommends that a clear definition of the behaviors that constitute bullying be incorporated into the code of student conduct as well as in documents and training governing the behavior of faculty and staff.

Recommendation 2: The Committee recommends that supports for victims of bullying be available to the entire University community, including faculty and staff.

Recommendation 3: The Committee recommends that the University improve accessibility on the web to information that would help faculty, staff, and students identify bullying and support services available to those who have witnessed or been the victim of bullying or harassment.

Advising and Support Structures for International Students.

The Committee examined the challenges that international students face in their studies and personal lives, focusing particularly on issues that have been raised by the Assembly of International Students—concerns that may contribute to a persistently low four-year graduation rate as compared with other students, including under-represented minorities. The two most pressing concerns raised in a recent joint report by the Undergraduate Assembly (UA) and the Assembly of International Students (AIS) to President Gutmann (September 2014) are (1) the need for an enhanced orientation and (2) the creation of adequate, “designed” community efforts for international students.

The focus of support for international students is through the International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) Office, which reports having initiated a number of actions over recent years aimed at improving the experiences of and outcomes for international students. Recent initiatives include the creation of the International Student Advisory Board (ISAB), the International Partners Outreach Group (IPOG), and the International Students and Partners at Penn (ISP). Most recently, the University created a new position of Program Coordinator within the Office of International
nal Student and Scholar Services (ISSS) dedicated to improving the in-
tegration of the international community within the University—a posi-
tion now held by Ryan Villanueva.

In light of the University’s commitment to global issues and the num-
bers of international students enrolled, the Committee offers three recom-
mandations:

Recommendation 1: The University staff responsible for new student orien-
tation should work with the AIS and the ISAB to re-design new student orien-
tation to include more and better structured opportunities for international stu-
dents to both build a supportive community of international students and to fos-
ter supportive relationships with domestic students.

Recommendation 2: The University should examine the general level of re-
sources dedicated to international student orientation and support currently pro-
vided in relation to international support service needs.

Recommendation 3: Work with the AIS and the ISAB to monitor University pro-
cesses documenting recruitment, retention, and admini-
stration on specific diversity issues that may arise on campus.

Recommendation 4: The University should work with landlords to encour-
ge more undergraduates to remain.

Recommendation 5: The Committee encouraged the University to consid-
er reinstating a survey of students regarding their housing experiences, simi-
lar to the Penn Course Review. However, to avoid problems encountered in a
prior survey conducted by GAPSA of off campus residents (e.g., low response
rates), the University should consider working with stakeholders to manage the
survey. As such, the Committee recommends that the University engage with student bodies and organizations to develop the survey, and may consider off-
serting support such as student contact information, PennKey authentication, or
making and distribution to assist in student implementation of the survey.

Suggested Charges for Next Year’s Committee

1. Systematically examine the range of experiences of international students and
identified priorities for improving the on-boarding and ongoing support of
this community.

2. Examine the breadth and depth of Penn’s engagement with the City in the
areas of health, education, social services, criminal justice, and community
and economic development and make recommendations for improving the coordi-
nation and benefits to Penn and the community of such engagements.

3. Examine the University’s policies related to sexual harassment, assault,
and bullying that involve faculty and staff, as victims or as perpetrators, as well
as the services to address such issues.

4. Examine the riverfront development plans and assess whether they pres-
ent opportunities or threats to issues of central importance to campus and com-
munity life, for example, related to housing, safety, or community engagement
opportunities.

Committee on Campus and Community Life 2014-2015

Chair: Rebecca Maynard; Faculty: Janice Asher, Jonah Gelchb, Campbell Grey, Amy Hillier, Daeyeon Lee, Serena Mayeri, Matt McHugh; 
PSSA: James Allen, Peter Gemmellaro; WPPSA: Simch Katsnelson, Joyce Woodward Jones; Graduate Students: Jiewen Jiao, Demetri Morgan; Undergraduates: Daniel Kahan, Alex Zimmermann; Lia-
ison: Karu Koizum; Staff: Amelia Carter

Committee on Diversity and Equity

Major Points Addressed by the Committee

1. The first meeting was held on October 29, 2014 and was spent review-
ing the University’s response to last year’s Committee recommendations. Lub-
na Mian and Leslie Laird Kruhy were invited guests. The Committee was
brought up-to-date on Committee recommendations made on monitoring Divi-
sity Search Advisors. The Committee also discussed the 2014-2015 charg-
es and agreed through subsequent meetings to focus on the charges related to
retaining diverse staff and underrepresented, diverse graduate students.

2. The second meeting was held on November 19, 2014. Chaplain Charles
Howard and Joseph Gusiewski were invited guests. The Committee was giv-
en updates regarding 2013-2014 recommendations on religious diversity and
inclusivity.

3. The third meeting was held on December 5, 2014 and was spent dis-
cussing the 2014-2015 plan of action for the Committee. There were no in-
volvings this year for the committee.

4. The fourth meeting was held on January 28, 2015. Invited guests were
Sharon Jacobs (Human Resources), Donna Showell (Human Resources), and
Emma Grigore (PSSA Chair Elect). The Committee was briefed on compens-
ation and recruitment for University staff. The Committee was also briefed
on Penn Professional Staff Assembly’s agenda on staff diversity. The Com-
mmittee further discussed plans and strategies to accomplish Committee goals

(continued on next page)
for the year.

5. The fifth meeting was held on February 23, 2015. Sharon Aylor (Human Resources) was the invited guest. The Committee was briefed on conflict resolution strategies, performance management, and engagement for staff. The Committee further discussed the challenges of determining appropriate merit-based pay decisions, particularly for high achieving staff, in addition to its various charges, and how these issues may be addressed by the Committee in 2015-2016.

6. The sixth meeting was held on March 24, 2015. The graduate student representatives on the Committee presented data they collected on the experience of diverse graduate students at Penn. They conducted semi-structured interviews and focus groups and analyzed several documents related to diverse graduate students. They reported variable diverse student opinions of their experiences at Penn.

Recommendations to University Council

1. The Committee applauds the University’s efforts in recruiting and retaining diverse staff. However, the Committee is interested in further examining data related to upward mobility of staff and the diversity of staff management who are likely directly involved with making upward mobility decisions. While the Committee made some significant strides in understanding these relationships, the Committee would like to further examine this situation in 2015-2016 before providing specific recommendations to the University Council.

2. The Committee applauds the University’s efforts in recruiting and retaining diverse graduate students. However, the Committee recommends that the University find additional ways to specifically reinforce graduate student retention and to provide an optimal university experience for diverse graduate students who may otherwise feel isolated from the mainstream. To that end, the Committee suggests the following:

A. Conduct biennial campus climate surveys of all graduate students with special follow-up questions on inclusion for those identifying diverse backgrounds. Better data is needed to compare the experiences of different types of graduate students and to identify the unique challenges faced by diverse and underrepresented groups. Subsequent targeted qualitative interviews with diverse students are also recommended.

The Committee on Facilities was responsible for reviewing the planning and operation by the University of its physical plant and all services associated therewith, including transportation and parking. The Committee held six meetings over the academic year.

2014-2015 Specific Charges:
The Committee was given a series of charges to consider this academic year. The six charges included three that were continuations of previous years’ charges, and two that were new. The sixth was a general charge that the Committee can address each year. The charges that were discussed were:

1. Monitor the progress of the Penn Connects Plan, especially with respect to implications for traffic and transportation at the Pennworks Ventures.

2. Examine new developments relating to campus safety, with particular attention to impact on classroom security and possible changes to the physical plant.

3. Continue to investigate the adequacy of instructional space on campus, with particular attention to classroom size and meeting technological needs.

4. Explore possibilities for a more collaborative approach to conference and event spaces on campus.

5. Monitor the progress of the Bike Plan developed by the Bike Planning Committee as it enters its implementation phase.

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 academic year 2015-2016.

Discussions on the specific charges:

Penn Connects plan:
The Penn Connects and Penn Connects 2.0 plans 2.0 plans were reviewed and discussed. David Hollenberg presented an outline of both, reviewing what has been accomplished during the first phase of the plan as well as presenting future components. The first phase of the plan, from 2006-2010, generated 4.8M GSF of new and renovated space, including ten major new buildings and 12 major renovation projects. Phase 2 (Penn Connects 2.0), from 2011-2030, enhances the framework from Phase 1 and adds sustainability goals, as well as an increased focus on comprehensive renovation projects and on living and activity spaces. The five themes of Penn Connects 2.0 were described and these include 12 Outstanding Schools, Research and Clinical Care, Living and Learning, Campus and Community, Past and Future. The extension of the campus into South Bank, now called Pennovation Works, was discussed and the plan for a shuttle to Pennovation Works was mentioned. (Shuttle access between the campus and Pennovation Works is currently on an on-call basis.)

Campus safety: A discussion of campus safety occurred during the December 2014 meeting, which was held at the offices of the Division of Public Safety. The meeting included presentations by Captain Joseph Fischer, Kathleen Shields Anderson, and Mitchell Yanak. This included discussion of pedestrian and bicycle safety, an overview of campus safety, and the safety initiatives conducted by the Division of Public Safety.

The presentation on pedestrian and bicycle safety initiatives overviewed the issues that exist in this domain on campus. As there is a large, dense population of bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles on campus, there always will be some conflict, but the Division of Public Safety actively manages such interactions to a greater degree than occurs throughout the rest of the City. Captain Fischer explained that there are a number of particular trouble spots: Convention Avenue and South Streets, Walnut Street between 34th and 38th Streets, Spruce Street between 34th and 38th Streets, University and Woodland Avenues. To help mitigate the issues at these locations, Penn is working with the City. For example, the University is supporting efforts to reinstate the bike lane on Chestnut Street, which would make biking on Chestnut Street safer, and cut down on the number of bicyclists going the wrong way on Walnut Street. Captain Fischer also informed us that bicyclists have to follow the same motor vehicle rules as a driver and that Public Safety has a “Share the Road” campaign for three days each semester during which they crack down on potential violations. In the last three-day campaign, Public Safety stopped 677 bicyclists to inform them of violations, but only gave out a few tickets. Public Safety is also tackling the increasing problem of texting while walking. This is an increasing problem for pedestrians and cars on campus as the pedestrians are not aware of their environment and are prone to get into an accident. To counter these issues, Public Safety has gotten the speed limit on Walnut Street lowered to 30 mph to try to calm traffic, along with employing an electronic device that registers the speed of vehicles. They constantly try to encourage and educate the Penn community about safety policies Penn has and about the traffic laws that apply on and around the campus.
Kathleen Shields Anderson provided an overview of the Division of Public Safety. They are a community-based police department that includes police officers, fire and emergency services, technology and emergency communications, security services, special services, and finance and administration. The Division works closely with the City police. They also partner with the surrounding community organizations, including the University City District, and officers receive annual diversity training in addition to ongoing tactical training.

Mitchell Yanak explained several other safety initiatives across campus, including Operation Building Safe, lighting surveys, Contactless PennCard, Penn Guardian, Penn Alert, analytic cameras, and the outdoor siren system. Operation Building Safe will involve having all perimeter doors to all buildings having only card access. Visitors will be allowed access to buildings remotely through a monitored motion-sensitive system. They cited the cost of having a guard at the entrance to all buildings as the impetus of this electronic system. This last presentation raised issues about classroom safety and the possibility of having panic buttons in classrooms and other systems in place. This was said not to be effective and was not planned.

At the end of the February meeting, the issue of classroom safety was raised again. The Committee was impressed with the training and responsibility of our Division of Public Safety as well as the physical plant of public safety. The Committee raised questions about staff and faculty preparedness for safety emergencies on campus (e.g., shooter, fire, etc.). The Committee was interested in determining if there are programs in place to educate faculty and staff on these matters. Overall, the Committee believed that faculty and staff should be actively involved in this area of concern that will help individuals know what to do in these different safety emergencies.

Campus Bike Plan: Over the spring and summer of 2014, a new bicycle policy and an online bicycle map were launched. The campus was also recognized by the League of American Bicyclists with a Silver Bicycle Friendly University (BFU) award. An update to bicycle policy and planning was also provided. The Philly Bike Share program is coming to campus. There will be three trial Philadelphia Bike Share stations on campus, near the University City train station, at 36th and Sansom Streets, and at 40th and Spruce Streets. The stations are not permanent and can be moved if needed. The City of Philadelphia will monitor the stations. Institutional Space/Classrooms: One of the largest issues from last year is investigating the availability of classroom space. The Committee discussed this issue for two full meetings (January and February 2015) and part of a third (November 2014). In the first meeting on this subject, the Committee began by reviewing the issues raised in the FY14 final report and minutes from the previous year’s discussion. Using this as a springboard, the Committee raised a number of potential issues that needed further investigation and dialogue. A list of over 15 questions was raised to present to the Registrar’s Office for further clarification. These could be summarized as issues related to: 1) improving communication between the Registrar’s Office and Faculty; 2) understanding how classroom assignments are generated and how data-driven this methodology is; 3) understanding how active learning classrooms play into the process; and 4) planning for future spaces and needs.

These questions were then directly addressed at our February 2015 meeting by Jeff Douthett, director of classroom technology services. He gave a thorough overview of the classroom assignment process and then answered the questions from the Committee that were raised in the prior meeting. Highlights of his overview were that the classroom pool consists largely of rooms that Schools did not want to manage; that the classroom committee outfits the spaces with the most flexibility and largest requests; and that the Registrar’s Office has two full-time staff to oversee the classroom pool and the scheduling process. The classroom assignment process begins with the Registrar using the previous year’s classroom assignments and then adjusting the schedule as needed. A chart outlining the percentage of classrooms used each hour between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m. was distributed to the Committee, which was very helpful in understanding the issues facing the Registrar’s office in scheduling pool classrooms. This led to further discussion about “on block” and “off block” scheduling, with a recommendation that departments should think about coordinating their faculty to fill in the blocks of times throughout the week to make off block scheduling become essentially on block. Further discussions between the social science departments and the Registrar’s Office will likely lead to solutions that will accommodate classes at new times and also keep the rooms more occupied throughout the week. It was noted that individual faculty do not communicate directly with the Registrar’s Office and should only do so through their department.

Jeff Douthett also discussed the issues with active learning classrooms. These classrooms take up more space—when created in a renovation they can require two regular classrooms to create an active learning classroom. Active learning classrooms use 25 square feet of space per student versus 12-15 square feet of space per student in a traditional classroom. Three more active learning classrooms are currently planned and then the University will wait to see what the demand is and how they may be able to accommodate it. If next year’s Facilities Committee would like to learn more about the success of the classrooms and how they work, we can ask the Center for Teaching and Learning to speak with the Committee.

Conference and event spaces: In the February 2015 meeting, the Committee discussed issues related to event spaces. The Committee recognizes that we have a decentralized funding structure; however, there is a need for a centralized space reservation system. Similar to the central pool classroom, there is a desire to have an online schedule that identifies and displays all of the spaces on campus with configuration options, cost, and contact information. Ideally, the system would also show availability. The Committee realizes that further questions need to be addressed, such as: Should all Schools and Centers have to participate in a centralized booking system? Could individual departments hold spaces for private use? Who would fund the cost of this system? Who would run such a system? No answers were provided, but this was discussed as a possible future charge for the Committee.

Recommendations to the University Council and/or the Community
1. The Committee acknowledges that the Registrar’s Office does a yeoman’s job of juggling all the requests and issues that are involved in assigning classrooms to classes each semester. Some of the frustration that exists on part of the faculty likely occurs from a lack of communication and understanding of the process. Therefore, we recommend increased communication between the Registrar or assigned members of each department about the process. This could include an information session prior to the classroom assignment process. In addition, the Registrar’s Office should inform departments about the ability to discuss sharing of classroom times to achieve more flexibility in scheduling of pool classrooms.
2. Penn Public Safety performs an outstanding job of keeping the University campus a safe and livable environment. While unusual events are fortunately rare, the Committee feels that Public Safety should further work with Schools/departments at the beginning of the year on training/refresher of procedures for safety emergencies on campus. This could include an email blast with links to all Public Safety protocols and information for these high risk situations.
3. While acknowledging that each School controls event spaces within the School, the Committee recommends that a central online portal be created for knowing what spaces exist, when and if they are scheduled, and whom to contact about access to these spaces.

Recommendations of Topics for Next Academic Year
1. Continue discussion of adequacy of classroom spaces for specific class types and active learning spaces.
2. Continue update of Penn Connects plan including learning more about renovation Works.
3. Follow up on rollout of Philadelphia Bike Share and impact on campus and students.
4. Review issues of Transportation and Penn Transit Routes and timing.

Committee on Facilities 2014-2015
Chair: Eric Marsh; Faculty: Zahra Fakhraai; Tanja Kral; Kathryn Michel; Ann Moyer; Masao Sako; PPSSA: Elizabeth Hartzell, Kristen McMullen; WPPSA: Linda Satchell; Irene Tan; Graduate Students: Sibi Vijayakumar, Andrew Wang; Undergraduates: Kat McKay, Darren Tomasso; Administrative Liaison: David Hollenberg; Staff: Taylor Berkowitz
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The primary focus of the committee this year was on the redesign of the University’s short-term disability policy. In addition, the Committee dealt with a variety of other benefit matters discussed below.

**2014-2015 Specific Charges & Recommendations for Future Charges**

1. Discuss and review the University’s short-term and long-term disability policies, with a particular attention to impact on maternity leave.

   The Committee worked closely with Human Resources (HR) to evaluate the current short-term disability/maternity leave policy (STD), to consider alternatives, and to recommend a revised policy. In particular, the current policy suffers from two major defects. First, employees are required to use all sick leave and paid time off (PTO) before using STD. Second, employees who must go on long-term disability (LTD) are likely to run out of STD benefits before LTD benefits are available at six months. Under the new plan recommended by HR and the Committee, employees will not be required to exhaust their sick leave or PTO before using STD. In addition, the new plan guarantees employees that STD will not be exhausted before the transition to LTD, but provides that after six weeks, STD steps down from 100 percent of pay to 75 percent of pay. The new plan is expected to be implemented in two phases over the next two years. The Committee expects to continue to work with HR on the implementation of the new plan. Of particular interest to the Committee are the restrictions on the use of part-day leave by exempt employees.

   The Committee recommends that it be charged with monitoring the implementation of the revised STD policy.

2. Continue discussion of mental health benefits and compliance with new federal regulations.

   The Committee met with representatives of Penn Behavioral Health and discussed mental health benefits, including the Employee Assistance Program. Overall, the Committee believes that mental health benefits are good, but is concerned that there are weaknesses in the administration of out-of-network claims.

   The Committee recommends that it be charged with reviewing the effectiveness of the administration of out-of-network mental health benefits.

3. Continue to discuss and investigate how information on health insurance and retirement alternatives is disseminated and possible improvements thereto.

   The Committee invited Katherine Milkman to present work-in-progress of her and her co-authors’ investigating the effect of alternative forms of pension enrollment. The Committee encourages HR to continue to work with scholars investigating the effectiveness of alternatives to traditional enrollment procedures.

   This charge should continue.

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

   HR provided an update to the Committee on health care implementation issues, particularly with respect to part-time employees. The sense of the Committee is that HR is dealing effectively with health care reform. In the context of expected changes for open enrollment, the Committee also discussed whether the upcoming (2018) excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage is likely to affect plan design.

   This charge should continue with a particular focus on reviewing the overall health plan design and pricing given health care reform and the current health market.

5. Continue to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of Penn’s wellness initiatives, including Penn’s program with Health Advocate.

   HR provided updates to the Committee on Penn’s wellness initiatives and Health Advocates. The sense of the Committee was that these are valuable services and should be continued.

   The Committee met with Frank Leone who discussed the work that is being done towards a tobacco-less campus. Finally, the Committee received a presentation from Mitesh Patel on studies being performed on the effectiveness of wellness incentives on physical activity.

   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’s work in academic year 2015-2016.

   Highest priority should be given to monitoring the changes in the STD policy and monitoring the implementation of changes to health plan design and pricing given health care reform and the current health market.

**Other Matters Discussed**

1. Same-sex partner benefits.

   The Committee discussed same-sex partner benefits. Given that same-sex marriage is legal in most if not all states in which Penn employees currently reside, the question of whether Penn should phase out benefits for same-sex partners was raised. The sense of the Committee was that any decision should wait for the Supreme Court’s expected decision this summer.

   The Committee should be charged with monitoring same-sex partner benefits and making appropriate recommendations.

2. The Committee reviewed a variety of other benefit issues throughout the year, including retiree benefits and open enrollment materials.

   The Committee should be charged with reviewing benefit issues, including retiree benefits, as they arise or are brought to the Committee’s attention throughout the year.

   The Committee met six times this year.

**Committee on Personnel Benefits 2014-2015**
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