Committee Charges
The committee covers a broad range of topics and has subsumed several more specialized committees on admissions, athletics, libraries, bookstore, research and international programs.

General Charges
The Committee on Academic and Related Affairs:
(i) 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;
(ii) shall consider the purposes of a University bookstore and advise the Council and the management of the University bookstore on policies, development, and operations;
(iii) 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;
(iv) shall advise the vice provost and director of libraries on the policies, development, and operation of the University libraries;
(v) shall have cognizance over recreation and intramural and intercollegiate athletics and their integration with the educational program of the University, including planning and provision of adequate facilities for various sports and recreational activities; and
(vi) shall have cognizance of all matters of policy relating to research and the general environment for research at the University, including the assignment and distribution of indirect costs and the assignment of those research funds distributed by the University, and shall advise the administration on those proposals for sponsored research referred to it because of potential conflict with University policy.

Specific Charges for 2016-2017
1. Study the library needs of faculty and recommend ways in which the Penn Libraries can better support their research.
2. Examine the general environment for research at the University and identify what changes or support can improve research productivity and creativity. This general charge of the committee has not been addressed in recent years.
3. Joint Charge with Committee on Campus and Community Life—Review how sports and recreational activity opportunities for staff, graduate students and faculty are planned by the athletics department and how these can be improved to meet the needs and interests of these members of the Penn community.
4. Review and discuss this committee’s general charges and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee’s work in academic year 2017-2018.

Meetings and Main Recommendations Related to Specific Charges
The committee met four times this year to address the three specific charges, with an additional meeting to come up with a list of questions and discussion topics for the year. Committee members completed an online form after the meetings on the research and recreational sports. The committee chair, Ani Nenkova, met with the chair of the campus and community life committee, Emily Hammon, to prepare a list of questions and issues to be sent to athletics before the meeting on recreation opportunities on campus for staff, graduate students and faculty.

Research Productivity and Creativity
The following list of questions was sent to Dawn Bonnell, vice provost for research, prior to the meeting:

Interdisciplinary research: How are the University and individual schools supporting interdisciplinary research, especially across school boundaries? How are researchers engaged in interdisciplinary research evaluated? What are notable examples of successful interdisciplinary collaborations, how did they get established and are there any generalizable patterns to indicate what is the best way to forge such collaborations? Is there any way to track how many attempts at interdisciplinary collaborations fail and how does the failure rate compare with those of initiatives within a single discipline?

Innovation and creativity: Are there any workshops or training sessions on creativity and innovation? How is research activity evaluated on the department, school and university level? Some of the issues on the balancing act between safe choices and innovation are discussed for example in the book, The Creativity Crisis: Reinventing Science to Unleash Possibility, by Roberta B. Ness. See http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/franklin/record.html?q= creativity%20crisis%26meta=+id%3A+FRANKLIN_63330294.g.

Are there any similar self-studies and initiatives going on at Penn?

Evaluation: How are the significance and impact of research evaluated at Penn and how do the standards differ across schools? Have there been any studies at the university to find out what faculty feel they need to be more productive and to have more real-world impact? Are some of these specific enough to be implemented?

The meeting was very informative. Dr. Bonnell provided an overview of recent funding trends, efforts to minimize administrative requirements for research and interdisciplinary research carried out at university centers. She also talked about the Pennovation Center and opportunities for commercialization. At the end of the meeting Dr. Bonnell shared some of her personal experiences on starting a novel large-scale interdisciplinary research effort. This resonated most with the committee members and the questions we had prepared ahead of the meeting. This will be a great start for a conversation next year.

Recommendations:
1. We suggest that the University carry out a survey to find out what faculty feel they need to be more productive and to have more real-world impact.
2. Organize a panel discussion or workshop focused on creativity and successful cross-disciplinary collaboration. These could address in more detail many of our initial questions and would be useful to advanced graduate students, postdocs and faculty.

Detailed notes on the meeting appear in Appendix A.

Recreation Opportunities for Staff, Grad Students and Faculty
Grace Callhoun, director of athletics, spoke to the committee about varsity athletics, the tough requirements to raise funds for them, undergraduate recreational opportunities and, briefly, about graduate student participation in recreational sports. Use of the recreational facilities by staff and faculty was not discussed.

Collecting information about recreational opportunities and the associated fees is not straightforward and requires much intuitive navigation of the website. Currently, 55% of undergraduates use the gym, but only 18% of graduate students and 9% of staff and faculty do so. The assumption is that grad students, staff and faculty live away from campus and prefer to use facilities closer to home. It would be useful to run a survey to figure out if this is indeed the case.

There is a program under way to raise undergraduate participation to 70%. After paying tuition, undergraduates are entitled to use the gym without further fees. This is not the case for graduate students who need to pay to use the facilities. The fee is modest: $362 for the full academic year for access to the gym for grad students, $464 for faculty. Access to group exercises requires a further fee of $150. Additional specialty classes are available for an extra cost. To access the tennis courts, grad students and faculty need to pay an additional annual tennis membership ($25 for grad students and $52 for staff and faculty) and an hourly fee for using the courts. For the faculty this is $25 per hour for the indoor courts and $10 per hour for the outdoor courts.

Recommendations:
1. Create a position exclusively tasked with increasing recreational sports participation for both undergraduate and graduate students. Currently the goal is to have recreation break even but in the long term it is desirable to turn recreation into a revenue stream. These goals may at times conflict, so an effort fully focused on increasing participation is likely to be more successful. We can explore models similar to the Stanford student-led program (http://web.stanford.edu/group/ aerobics/about.html), which is very popular and offers a variety of classes which at Penn would be considered special classes and would be much more expensive.
2. Work toward a model in which there is no difference in pricing and access between graduate and undergraduate students at Penn. Set goals for increasing participation from both groups. Run a survey to find out what fraction of graduate students is enrolled in a gym elsewhere to get a sense of the overall percentage involved in recreational sports activities.
3. The opportunities for on-campus recreational sports for staff and faculty were not properly discussed this year. They could be the focus of a future discussion, possibly jointly with the benefits committee. Especially for faculty living near campus, the Penn gym is the most convenient location for exercise and it is important to understand how the current facilities can provide better service. Also there are a number of afterschool programs and summer camp offerings related to sports. There is no central location where staff and faculty can check all offerings and it will be beneficial to create one. The pricing of these programs is often equivalent or higher than at other locations. In the discussion next year the committee can seek to understand if these prices reflect quality of the program or budget requirements. Similar to the recommendations for student recreational opportunities, it is important to explore the possibility of creating quality offerings that do not necessarily bring revenue to athletics but are self-sufficient in paying for coach participation and facility use, possibly with some funds going toward the sports club organizing the program.

Detailed notes on the meeting appear in Appendix B.

(continued on next page)
Presenting at the meeting were Carton Rogers, vice provost and director of libraries, and Kim Eke, director of teaching, research and learning services at Penn Libraries.

Vice Provost Rogers provided an update on the follow up from the discussion last year, on the library needs of humanities faculty. He and Dr. Eke talked about ongoing discussions with librarians about new services provided by the library (a recording studio) and about the trends toward digitalization of material.

Recommendations:
1. Ask humanities faculty to send requests in advance for books related to classes to be kept in the library rather than to be sent to the high-density location. It is not effective to do so and it sends the wrong signal to students.
2. Explore the possibilities for pitching library related projects to students in engineering. There is a current project on enhanced visualization for digital browsing but progress on this has been slow. Teams of student volunteers or hired students may be able to provide reasonable solutions to this problem.
3. Embed a link to the libraries’ new acquisitions lists in the websites of Penn individual departments, to increase the chances of students and faculty noticing relevant new material. Ideally these should be augmented with images of the cover and table of contents. Borrowing patterns before and after including this feature can be compared to measure its effectiveness in advertising relevant library materials.
4. The major trend in the library has been towards using digital materials. The largest portion of the expenses goes towards digital subscription to journals. Library expenses would be much lower if more research were published in open access venues. It will be beneficial to organize an event, or a series of discipline-specific events, in which faculty can explore what they can do and what support would they need to shift their publication pattern toward open access venues.

Detailed notes from the meeting appear in Appendix C.

Recommended Topics for 2017-2018
1. Continue the discussion on the general environment for research at the University and identify what changes or support can improve research productivity and creativity. Focus on developing criteria for evaluating research contributions and creating an environment for interdisciplinary research.
2. Study the resources available to Penn students while they study abroad, particularly related to interpersonal violence and sexual assault. This charge was added in the previous year but the committee was not aware of the addition. The topic would be given higher priority for next year.
3. Discuss admissions and financial aid. The topic has not been discussed in a while. It will be especially useful to discuss how economic diversity is shaped by admissions and financial aid policies, given recent discussions for the topic in the press: http://nyti.ms/2kChv0C and https://goo.gl/Q9rKh
5. Continue the discussion on how sports and recreational activity opportunities for staff, graduate students and faculty are planned by the athletics department and how these can be improved. It would be best to discuss grad student needs and staff and faculty needs separately.
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 2018-2019.
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Appendix A
Detailed notes from meeting on research productivity and creativity
This UC CARA meeting was held on Tuesday, October 25 in Room 219 College Hall. Dr. Bonnell presented to the committee.

At the meeting, Dr. Bonnell opened with an overview of the research enterprise. She discussed the downward pressure on federal budgets and how funding is dependent on power by about 20% every year. Business is now supporting more research than the federal budget. Some of the strategic approaches to navigating the current climate are:
- Seeding emerging research areas and ideas—to be the frontier of new ideas.
- Pushing back on faculty burden so that people don’t have to spend as much time on the administrative overload.
- Advocate in both Harrisburg and D.C. to push back on regulation and increase budgets whenever we can.

Dr. Bonnell shared that the total number of research awards is increasing due to the evolution of the research portfolio. Interdisciplinary research through Penn centers and institutions impact innovation, research, commercialization, educational programs, curriculum development and community outreach. The centers and institutions can be used to foster any combination of the aforementioned programs. Penn has about 140 centers and institutions on campus divided by three groups; department based, school based, and university based. There are different models for center funding: endowed—Leonard Davis Institute for Health Care Economics (LDI) and Penn Institute of Urban Research (IUR), supported by grants—LRSM, education support—PHI, commercialization support—IRI, and gift support—Kleinman Center for Energy and Wharton Public Policy Initiative. Penn is one of the leaders in interdisciplinary research, the use of our centers creates a very fertile platform for interdisciplinary collaboration and supporting students across disciplines.

Dr. Bonnell discussed the role of innovation in regards to research at Penn. One of the goals is to take discovery to the marketplace in order to make a social impact on the world. The Penn Center for Innovation was recently restructured featuring a few components: a new ventures component (starting companies), a component that does alliance management (sponsoring research relationships with companies) and a licensing component.

Commercialization strategies are another component of the research department. The commercialization strategy includes strategic alliances, venture backing, institutional partnerships and spin-offs. Through the Pennovation Center, there are 140 start-up companies (projects). Penn helps move the research from the idea to becoming a company and then divests as soon as possible because Penn is focused on promoting the ideas more than making money.

Dr. Bonnell explained that the administrative burden in research is overwhelming and one of their goals is to minimize administrative activities by eliminating any self over-regulation associated with research in areas where there is a current project on enhanced visualization for digital browsing but progress on this has been slow. Teams of student volunteers or hired students may be able to provide reasonable solutions to this problem.

The topic should be given high priority for next year. Dr. Calhoun shared an overview of Athletics at Penn. Penn has a broad-based division, meaning that it is expansive. Penn fosters 33 intercollegiate varsity sports and 40 club sports with a variety of degrees of competitiveness.

(continued on next page)
The committee asked what happened to the project to digitally enhance images of the stacks shelves for book searches, a virtual visit to the library. Mr. Rogers explained that it may be a concern moving forward but not currently. He explained it has been an interesting transition from print to digital, but right now the demand is more for digital materials as it makes the access to the information more immediate for the consumer. The libraries have continued to brainstorm how to best serve the current needs of the students while still showing support for the digital material. Mr. Rogers replied that it is also interesting to see how the different schools and disciplines are working those conflicting needs. Math scholars want to keep books in print whereas medical scholars have more of a digital focus.

The committee asked if it were possible to re-categorize the different types of digital services and learning tools that the Library has to offer students, faculty, staff and the Penn community. Mr. Rogers suggested that the committee consider inviting Bruce Lenthall from the Center for Teaching and Learning or Brian Baker, director for the Center of Learning and Analytics for more information regarding digital learning and information at Penn.

Mr. Eke shared information regarding the different types of digital services and content producing organizations came together to create this annotation layer. The program facilitates close reading, social reading, and individual annotation of digital materials that are PDF and web-based. It allows students and/or faculty to engage in particular points of text and link to other resources.

Dr. Eke enthusiastically shared that the Library just launched a free library recording station located on the third floor of Van Pelt. It is open to all of the campus community for individual or group use. The Library has staff available that provide an orientation to use of the equipment and assistance as needed. Virtual reality tech options are also available. The Library has also developed fluency courses and workshop series on teaching and learning how to use the different types of technology offered through the University.
The complexity of navigating the health care system could be a barrier for students in need of mental health care. While CAPS has detailed data on utilization and wait times, it would be very informative to improve our understanding of unmet need (overall or among particular groups such as minority, LGBT, or international students) and to improve our understanding of those referred out of CAPS.

Recommendations
1. Improve data for understanding utilization and barriers to utilization. The committee was impressed with CAPS data on utilization and wait times, and recommends supporting and augmenting efforts at benchmarking and data collection. This effort might include additional efforts to gather data on referrals out and tracking of follow-up care, as well as data collection aimed at understanding scale of and contributors to unmet need at Penn, possibly in comparison to our peer institutions.  
2. Continue to monitor known or logical barriers to access, and seek strategies to alleviate barriers. Complexity of the mental health services and insurance, availability, and cost could pose barriers to seeking care among overwhelmed students. To address the problem of complexity, the committee suggested that Penn consider creating/piloting “health advocates” for students, who could help students navigate mental health services and insurance issues. Regarding availability and costs, the committee supports ongoing efforts to increase capacity at CAPS, including hiring more staff, increasing evening and weekend hours, cooperating with 3535 Market Street providers, and potentially expanding service locations. The committee also recommends continuing to monitor the supply of providers outside of Penn accepting insurance. The committee recommends consideration of whether it is viable to offer mental health services in-house, utilizing tuition fees. In addition, the committee recommends to consider whether there are possible uses of technology that could facilitate student access to care through reminders or other nudges to follow up.

Charge 2: Examine the merits of the University building on its work over the past couple of years to reduce sexual harassment and violence among students to develop parallel policies and practices to address sexual harassment and assault that involve faculty and staff as victims or as perpetrators.

Issues discussed and discovered
The committee was concerned that programs developed for students may not necessarily apply well to faculty and staff. The committee was concerned that programs developed for students may not necessarily apply well to faculty and staff. The committee noted that Penn has clear policies and lists of resources for support on various websites. However, it is currently not easy to find available resources for faculty and staff who might be experiencing or witnessing incidents of this nature. We did not find prominently displayed information about legal rights and reporting responsibilities of faculty and staff. The committee concluded that there was a real need for data to inform decisions about next steps, but expressed significant concerns about the feasibility of gathering usable, accurate data on this sensitive topic.

The committee noted that Penn has clear policies and lists of resources for support on various websites. However, it is currently not easy to find available resources for faculty and staff who might be experiencing or witnessing incidents of this nature. We did not find prominently displayed information about legal rights and reporting responsibilities of faculty and staff. The committee concluded that there was a real need for data to inform decisions about next steps, but expressed significant concerns about the feasibility of gathering usable, accurate data on this sensitive topic.

The committee learned that a module for online delivery was developed to address sexual violence resources. The committee suggested that Penn consider creating/piloting “health advocates” for students, who could help students navigate mental health services and insurance issues. Regarding availability and costs, the committee supports ongoing efforts to increase capacity at CAPS, including hiring more staff, increasing evening and weekend hours, cooperating with 3535 Market Street providers, and potentially expanding service locations. The committee also recommends continuing to monitor the supply of providers outside of Penn accepting insurance. The committee recommends consideration of whether it is viable to offer mental health services in-house, utilizing tuition fees. In addition, the committee recommends to consider whether there are possible uses of technology that could facilitate student access to care through reminders or other nudges to follow up.
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Recommendations

1. The committee supports efforts to develop an online provision of training. The committee does not have a position on whether the training should be mandatory, but suggests that the strengths and weaknesses of mandatory training should be carefully considered. Along with content addressing sexual harassment and violence among students, the training could include material specifically addressing the situation of faculty/staff—information about sexual harassment in the workplace, legal rights and reporting responsibilities. Such training would provide an opportunity to familiarize faculty and staff with currently available resources.

2. Consider augmentations to Penn’s website and other methods to improve communications to faculty and staff of rights and reporting responsibilities related to sexual harassment and violence.

Charge 3: Joint charge with facilities. Examine the Riverfront Development plans to identify unattended opportunities for improving housing, safety, or community engagement opportunities.

Issues discussed and discovered

The committee saw informative presentations about large-scale, disparate, and complex initiatives happening or planned in the riverfront area. These initiatives involve not only different parts of Penn, but Drexel, Amtrak and the city of Philadelphia. The planned and ongoing changes, if realized, seem likely to transform the community.

Recommendation

1. The Riverfront Development plans seem to involve disparate initiatives with the potential to fundamentally change the local area. The likely implications of these changes—good and bad—are important and also quite challenging to anticipate, given the complexity of initiatives and stakeholders. To offer more effective ongoing monitoring, the committee recommends formation of a committee or working group involving three kinds of members: a) representatives of Penn’s major redevelopment initiatives; b) faculty from urban planning and urban design; and c) community stakeholders.

Charge 4: Joint charge with CARA. Review how sports and recreational activity opportunities for staff, graduate students and faculty are planned by the athletics department and how these can be improved to meet the needs and interests of these members of the Penn community.

Issues discussed and discovered

The committee noted that with administrative data and user surveys, more comprehensive information about utilization, barriers to utilization, and user satisfaction could be collected and analyzed to better understand barriers.

To address cost barriers for graduate students, the committee was in favor of considering changing to a system for graduate students similar to that offered to undergraduates, in which students pay a recreation fee in their student fees that includes access to all student recreation facilities at peer institutions.

The Provost on March 13, which stated, “All full-time graduate and professional students will have access to the Pottruck Health & Fitness Center, Sheerr Pool, and Fox Fitness Center included in their general fee.”

3.3 The committee remained concerned about costs as barriers to faculty and staff.

During the meeting, concerns about a deficit at the Division of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics were discussed. At the present time, efforts to address the issue are focused on fundraising and external business (rather than cutting expenses), but the sustainability of this approach is not yet certain.

Recommendations

1. Support emerging efforts to collect and analyze more systematic administrative data and survey data to address questions about barriers to participation, utilization patterns, and preferred programs.

2. Explore avenues to increase subsidies and incentives for participation for faculty and staff, possibly through HR benefits and other means.

3. Monitor the deficit situation to see if fundraising and business initiatives can ameliorate the problem. Support efforts by the Division of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics to explore alternate models of support for recreational services at peer institutions.

Charge 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 2017-2018.

General comments

The committee felt that the general charges were appropriate, but challenging in depth and breadth. The previous year’s committee had five faculty members, but this year’s committee had just four faculty members. Committee expertise on the various general and specific charges improves with numbers. It would be helpful to add one to two more faculty members.

Recommendations for Next Year’s Committee

1. Given the changing insurance landscape, and evidence of increased demand for mental health services, mental health services access to students needs continued monitoring. Continue to monitor barriers to mental health services, and support efforts to collect better data on mental health services accessibility.

2. Monitor and support efforts by the Division of Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics to explore alternate models of support for recreational services at peer institutions.

3. Consider a more specialized committee or working group to monitor the Penn riverfront initiatives in the coming year.
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Meeting 1: Introduction of charges; discussion of response to last year’s charges (October 3, 2016)

Speakers:
Amy Gadsden, Executive Director for Penn Global Rudolfo Altamirano, Director of International Student and Scholar Services (ISSS)
Mark King, Associate Provost for Health and Academic Services
Bill Alexander, Director of Counseling and Psychological Services Leslie Kurhly, University Secretary
Elaine Varas, Director of Financial Aid

Meeting 2: Discussion of 2016-2017 charges, discussion of speakers who could present information about each charge (November 2, 2016)

Meeting 3: (Joint with CARA) Sports and recreational activity charge (November 16, 2016)

Speakers:
Grace Calhoun, Director of Athletics and Recreation

Meeting 4: Mental health services charge (November 28, 2016)

Speakers:
Max King, Associate Provost for Health and Academic Services
Bill Alexander, Director of Counseling and Psychological Services
Leslie Kurhly, University Secretary

Meeting 5: (Joint with Facilities) Riverfront Development charge (January 25, 2017)

Speakers:
Tony Sorrentino, Assistant Vice President, Office of the EVP
David Hollenberg, University Architect
Mark Kocent, Principal Planner, Office of the University Architect

Meeting 6: Sexual harassment and violence charge (January 23, 2017)

Speakers:
Sam Starks, Executive Director of the Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Opportunity Programs
Jessica Mertz, Director of Sexual Violence Prevention

Meeting 7: Discussion of report points (March 20, 2017)

Closed discussion.

Meeting 8: Finalize report (April 5, 2017)

Closed discussion.
Committee Charges

General 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.

Specific Charges for 2016-2017

1. Obtain data relating to the diversity of Penn staff and discuss the University’s efforts to recruit and retain diverse staff.
2. Examine the campus climate and experiences of LGBTQ students, staff and faculty.
3. Examine and discuss the pilot survey and data on graduate students, with a particular focus on diverse graduate students.
4. Continue to monitor efforts related to the campus climate for low-income and first-generation undergraduate students.
5. Review and discuss this committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee’s work in academic year 2017-2018.

Strategies and Focus of Inquiry

To begin the committee’s work for the academic year, the chair hosted an initial conference call to discuss the committee’s charges before our first in-person meeting. This way, our first in-person meeting was to discuss and decide on our strategy of inquiry for the committee’s charges. During the first in-person meeting, the chair asked the group to form subcommittees for each of the charges. The chair expressed that this would enable deeper and more efficient inquiry into each of the charges. Each subcommittee was tasked with the responsibility of discussing strategies for inquiry, conducting certain parts of the inquiry, and developing recommendations all in concert/consultation with the larger committee. Due to the overlapping nature between charges one and two and between charges three and four, this led to the formation of two subcommittees; (1) on diverse graduate students and low-income and first-generation undergraduate students and (2) on LGBTQ students, staff and faculty.

In addition, as a result of the anxieties and concerns experienced on campus due to the sociopolitical climate, the committee decided to partner with the Faculty Senate and the Penn Forum for Women Faculty to host a public forum titled Listening to Diversity. This event was followed up by IRB approved interviews conducted by graduate social work students in Amy Hillier’s course on Understanding Social Change: Issues of Race and Gender. Each student used the same interview guide, had participants sign a consent form, and recorded and transcribed 22 interviews.

Number of Meetings

The Committee had one conference call and met in person six times.

Major Points Addressed by the Committee

1. The committee had an initial conference call on September 27, 2016. The committee discussed how to do charges serious justice in the limited time allotted. The chair asked the group what charges should be focused on so it could hit the ground running. The committee agreed that we should do follow up on charges three and four and further inquiry into charge one and two.
2. On October 11, 2016, the committee had its initial in-person meeting. The committee was joined by the following invited guests: Jacqueline Amparo, associate director, Equity and Access Programs, VPUL; Valene de Cruz, director, Greenfield Intercultural Center, VPUL; Rob Nelson, executive director, Office of the Provost; Monica Yant Kinney, executive director, strategy, communications and external affairs, VPUL.

Anita Mastroeni gave a brief description of the Graduate Student Survey results. The survey was not sent to graduate and professional students only. The survey was sent to JD’s or graduating PhD students. Dr. Mastroeni noted that the survey asked a lot about demographics, i.e. sexual orientation, parental status, married status as well as quality of academic programs, campus life interaction for diverse groups, and climate around sexual violence. She noted that underrepresented students reported a less favorable experience at Penn. Survey results are still preliminary as they are still analyzing the data. The committee invited her back later in the academic year to provide a more fuller report of the survey results.

Ms. de Cruz gave an update on the Greenfield Intercultural Center’s (GIC) efforts related to campus climate and experience for undergraduate students of low-income and first-generation undergraduate students. She mentioned that GIC has a partnership with PennFirst and work closely with PennKIP. The office also supports Quest Scholars, a program for freshmen that helps first-year students acclimate to Penn.

Ms. Amparo briefly discussed with the group that some first generation/low-income students have a difficult time paying for storage space to put away their summer items. She added this may seem trivial but the additional cost could have a negative impact on a first gen/low income student. A textbook donation program was also established where students donate their gely used books to help students who cannot afford to purchase new books on their own.

Ms. Yant Kinney shared information about her partnership with GIC celebrating the new First Generation/Low Income (FGLI) program. She briefly discussed her advocacy role on behalf of the students. In addition to financial support, students may be impacted by a family crisis that may need immediate action. Students could be faced with raising money to get back home to a family crisis or to eat. She added that VPUL is working with donors to help students with clothing and transportation needs. Regarding committee concerns of a marginalizing institutional culture, Rob Nelson also shared with the committee that it is difficult to solve classroom discourse. A concern was raised about information not being in one place. It was noted that a lot is being done, but in silos and that students do not have access or know where to go for information. Ms. de Cruz agrees that Penn needs an institutional model to remove that barrier. In addition, GIC would like to reach out to students early on especially over the summer months to get students acclimated before the semester begins.

Regina Austin reported briefly on the Faculty Senate Committee on Diversity & Equity work on Penn’s LGBTQ community. She said the LGBTQ community feels excluded and believes Penn undervalue them. She said that the LGBTQ community would like to be included in all plans that include diversity. She also noted that a LGBTQ faculty support group was created in 2015. She spoke briefly about data from in addition to providing tokens to students who may live off campus. She noted that the center is in partnership with Development and Alumni Relations to host seminars for students to discuss career goals, needs and resources on campus.

Ms. Yant Kinney shared information about her partnership with GIC celebrating the new First Generation/Low Income (FGLI) program. She briefly discussed her advocacy role on behalf of the students. In addition to financial support, students may be impacted by a family crisis that may need immediate action. Students could be faced with raising money to get back home to a family crisis or to eat. She added that VPUL is working with donors to help students with clothing and transportation needs. Regarding committee concerns of a marginalizing institutional culture, Rob Nelson also shared with the committee that it is difficult to solve classroom discourse. A concern was raised about information not being in one place. It was noted that a lot is being done, but in silos and that students do not have access or know where to go for information. Ms. de Cruz agrees that Penn needs an institutional model to remove that barrier. In addition, GIC would like to reach out to students early on especially over the summer months to get students acclimated before the semester begins.

3. The committee convened again on November 15, 2016 with Vice Provost for Education, Beth Winkelstein, as an invited guest. Dr. Winkelstein spoke to the committee about institutional culture. She noted that Penn faculty should address the elitist discourse in the classroom. Dr. Winkelstein mentioned that some professors believe that some programs are more sensitive to students who are not as financially well off as some of their classmates by assuming they have money to travel off campus or outside of Philadelphia like the wealthier students can. She spoke briefly to the disconnection on the faculty side. Vice Provost Winkelstein mentioned that focus should be on giving all undergraduate students access to an educational experience at Penn particularly FGLI students. She mentioned that in the spring of 2015, 12 people convened to discuss ways to help these students. Dr. Winkelstein noted that Penn needs to promote and carve out grassroots initiatives that can be presented to students upon their arrival to campus. She further said initiatives have been presented to the Deans to help change the culture. These include enabling more inclusive classrooms via training by the Center for Teaching and Learning. It was stated that if the training becomes mandatory then Penn should provide it to make for a better academic environment. One of the challenges is that most schools do not want to change the Center for Teaching and Learning in their schools because faculty do not want to be told how to teach in their courses. Dr. Winkelstein noted that there is a need to change faculty culture. One way to do this could be to have faculty participate in coordinating programs for incoming freshman students. She concluded that in lieu of the past events (i.e., related to post-election events), there is a strong need for a cultural change here at Penn.

The committee also discussed the material effects of the election results and how they impact our committee’s work. We agreed that given our committee’s general charge that we should try to learn as much as possible from the campus community to make recommendations that might be pre-emptive for future concerns. One of the ideas discussed was to convene a public forum.

4. On December 16, 2016, the committee convened with invited guest Joann Mitchell, vice president of institutional affairs, Office of the President. The meeting opened with the discussion of possibly renaming the Ombudsman Office. Ms. Mitchell asked for the committee’s advice on the name change. She mentioned that the Faculty Senate Tri Chairs have been considering a name change for some time and that the Ombudsman office has had the
same name for over 40 years. The committee had no objections and were supportive of this proposal.

Sub-committee reported on their work on each respective charge. The committee discussed interest in reviewing the 2015 faculty climate survey consisting of LGBT data from Vice Provost Anita Allen’s office. Kristin Field and Ezekiel Dixon-Roman met with the LGBTQ+ Faculty Diversity Working Group and discussed what they learned. Ms. Field noted that LGBT reporting is very low and that data is difficult to collect leading increasingly difficult to incentivize the diversifying of faculty and staff. He also added that more systematic mechanisms of focused data collection on LGBTQ (and diversity more broadly) related programming, professional development, course/curricular content, speakers and who is doing the work for each faculty and school. It was also suggested that more follow up needs to be done on LGBTQ faculty hires who decide not to come. Ms. Austin mentioned that they spoke briefly to Vice Provost Allen about doing a qualitative study to find out what the climate is like. The sub-committee would like to receive data capable of being disseminated without identifying people and qualitative data on the data gathered to be available in the LGBT center.

It was noted that while Diversity Search Advisors (DSA) have been a helpful mechanism for diversifying faculty searches there are concerning limitations. DSAs are often on search committees in smaller schools but this is not necessarily the case in larger schools leaving important parts of the faculty search process to not be fully informed by the DSAs.

The committee was updated regarding the developments of the public forum. The chair spoke with Leslie Kruhly, Office of the Secretary, to get the support of the University Council and Karl Kozuma, of VPUL, in order to get the support of VPUL. Sam Starks and the chair also met with Amy Hillier, associate professor, city and regional planning and the chair of Penn Forum for Women Faculty, and Laura Perna, professor, Graduate School of Education and chair of the Faculty Senate, to develop and organize a partnership with their respective committees. It was also noted that Vice Provost Anita Allen is supportive of the public forum as well. The chair noted that we want to have a conversation, not a political statement, or take on an ideological position.

The fourth in-person meeting was convened on January 17, 2017. The committee was updated on sub-committee work and discussed additional people to invite and areas of inquiry. The chair talked about the need for providing additional resources to graduate students. It was noted that Dr. Mastroieni recognizes that there are issues that need to be addressed. It was commented on how data is being interpreted and the politics of data around what is made visible and what is made invisible via data. A graduate survey was implemented to identify where things seem to be going well and where attention is needed. Unfortunately, some departments have opted out and chose not to participate. It was noted that FGLI received resources over the winter break because of awareness; while there were graduate students that were also in similar need. It was also announced that the committee was hosting the public forum on “Listening to Diversity” for faculty, staff and students on Tuesday, January 24, 2017 in the Class of 1978 Orrery Pavilion, Van Pelt Library. The goal of the forum was to provide members of our campus community (faculty, staff and students) the opportunity to voice their concerns and share their suggestions for how we might work together to bring about productive change. The event was sponsored by The University Council Committee on Diversity & Equity, the Faculty Senate, and the Penn Forum for Women Faculty.

On February 21, 2017, the committee was joined by invited guest Amy Castro Baker, assistant professor, School of Social Policy and Practice, Erin Cross, senior associate director, LGBTQ Center, Amy Hillier, associate professor, School of Design, and Anita Mastroieni, director, Graduate Student Center. Dr. Baker, Dr. Hillier, and Ms. Cross gave a brief description about the work they are doing via Penn Futures in the Graduate School of Education, School of Nursing, and School of Social Policy & Practice. They spoke about the work they are doing with the GSE, SP2, and the SON to infuse LGBTQ content into the curriculum. Dr. Hillier noted that the Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia, the Perelman School of Medicine and the LGBTQ Center at Penn submitted proposals to train graduate students. The training will focus on field work and policy among other things.

Dr. Baker said that there is space on campus where people would like to integrate LGBTQ issues into the curriculum but do not know how or where to get help. The desire to train nurses, social workers, and teachers to work with queer youth has received positive energy especially from faculty. Dr. Hillier added that Penn feels it is time to build knowledge to queer Penn because most LGBT students feel excluded and asked the committee, “How do we build diversity?”

Ms. Cross added that the LGBT Center has a resource group. The LGBT Center offers a site for faculty members who have come out and will gladly help with the transition. Dr. Hillier asked the group, “How could Penn be proactive without being illiberal?” She noted that when gay graduate students come to campus for an on-site visit they often feel isolated and even more so if they decide to study here. Ms. Cross said if students cannot identify with someone who may be like them, then they will not even consider studying at Penn.

Ms. Cross added that an organization called LGBTQ Employees At Penn (LEAP) is a small group dedicated to the retention and elevation of Penn’s Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer employees of the University of Pennsylvania. This group is open to all staff, faculty and postdocs, exhibiting a diverse range of interests at Penn. She also said that the LGBT Center knows that there may be some staff members who prefer to keep their sexual orientation private, but noted that they have incurred debt from their undergraduate studies. She said that the LGBT Center is not an investigative office but a supportive one and added that the Center is very case specific.

She said that they normally serve students but have been known to help staff members too but serving staff and students has drained the center’s resources. She then said that she would like to see the curriculum focus more heavily on gender identity.

Dr. Hillier added that she does not believe that LGBT staff, students and faculty feel Penn offers a safe space to be themselves. Furthermore, she said, people need acceptance and quite often feel alienated by the University. Ms. Cross added that the faculty need to feel that they are a part of the community and not be made to feel tokenized once they decide to come out. She stated that Penn still has a way to go but has been doing things correctly. She noted that there is considerable variability in where specific schools are in being more responsive to LGBTQ diversity.

Dr. Mastroieni stated that she received good data overall from the graduate student climate survey. Graduate students rated their academic experience at Penn very high. The survey revealed that minorities gave a low ranking on life experience at Penn. The survey also noted that graduate students who are from underrepresented groups are carrying a huge amount of debt in comparison to their counterparts. Some students reported debt as a major burden that has been responsible for retention issues. She also stated that most students come in with debt from their undergraduate studies.

Dr. Mastroieni noted that some PhD students are taking on less debt but have noted that they have incurred debt from their undergraduate studies. It was noted that schools such as SP2 have the issue of trying to recruit underrepresented students to their relatively expensive programs. She said that the focus on graduate financial aid last campaign was widely successful. The report is online if anyone would be interested in reviewing it.

The committee discussed interest in reviewing the 2015 faculty climate survey. Graduate students rated their academic experience at Penn very high. The survey revealed that minorities gave a low ranking on life experience at Penn. The survey also noted that graduate students who are from underrepresented groups are carrying a huge amount of debt in comparison to their counterparts. Some students reported debt as a major burden that has been responsible for retention issues. She also stated that most students come in with debt from their undergraduate studies.

Dr. Mastroieni noted that some PhD students are taking on less debt but have noted that they have incurred debt from their undergraduate studies. It was noted that schools such as SP2 have the issue of trying to recruit underrepresented students to their relatively expensive programs. She said that the focus on graduate financial aid last campaign was widely successful. The report is online if anyone would be interested in reviewing it.
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Dr. Mastroieni noted that some PhD students are taking on less debt but have noted that they have incurred debt from their undergraduate studies. It was noted that schools such as SP2 have the issue of trying to recruit underrepresented students to their relatively expensive programs. She said that the focus on graduate financial aid last campaign was widely successful. The report is online if anyone would be interested in reviewing it.

The committee discussed interest in reviewing the 2015 faculty climate survey. Graduate students rated their academic experience at Penn very high. The survey revealed that minorities gave a low ranking on life experience at Penn. The survey also noted that graduate students who are from underrepresented groups are carrying a huge amount of debt in comparison to their counterparts. Some students reported debt as a major burden that has been responsible for retention issues. She also stated that most students come in with debt from their undergraduate studies.

Dr. Mastroieni noted that some PhD students are taking on less debt but have noted that they have incurred debt from their undergraduate studies. It was noted that schools such as SP2 have the issue of trying to recruit underrepresented students to their relatively expensive programs. She said that the focus on graduate financial aid last campaign was widely successful. The report is online if anyone would be interested in reviewing it.
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2016-2017 Constituency Status Summary
First Generation/Low Income (FGLI):

In the time since the creation and housing of the FGLI initiative in the Greenfield Intercultural Center, the FGLI student leaders and administrators have made steady progress toward promoting the well-being of FGLI students. This is demonstrated via several initiatives including, but not limited to, the FGLI campus wide food drive and FGLI student support structures. This progress is well noted and is encouraging to the committee overall. The mass mobilization for FGLI students is speaking and continues to speak to the altruism and concern of individuals at the University toward their wellbeing. Moreover, it is assumed that in tandem with the vigorous work of these students and administrators to address the concerns and needs of FGLI students, the University community has responded well to these efforts. As will be covered in detail in the concerns section, the ongoing progress of this constituency will be contingent on the institutional willingness to address concerns which occur across several student groups.

Diverse Graduate Students:
The 2016-2017 academic year presents a continuation of the ongoing work to support diverse graduate students. This year, graduate and undergraduate students from marginalized minority groups have voiced their concerns about university expansion, incidents of hate, the discrimination on the university campuses and larger administrative and financial support for diverse student groups campus wide. Several diverse graduate student groups (BGAP-SA, SCRWP, LaGAPSA, LAMBDA Grads, BGWA) have voiced their concerns regarding these issues as well as student leadership burdens and institutional memory.

Concerns & Analysis

The two core and central issues which occur as motifs across several diverse student groups, particularly those of which this report is concerned, are fragmentation and transparency. It is suggested here and has been corroborated by the work of an on-campus public hearing and data collection efforts that responsibility centered management may constrain the possibilities for the unification and well-being of diverse graduate student groups. Specifically, the decentralized nature of the university produces a system that is experienced by marginalized student groups as fragmented and diffused, lacking strong mechanisms of information coordination and dissemination. While the committee’s analysis is that the structure of the current system may be constraining possibilities for marginalized student groups, it is also strongly believed that there are more effective mechanisms and practices that can be implemented within the structure of responsibility centered management that can be more responsive to the needs and concerns of diverse graduate students.

Diversity Climate & Data

The committee found the variable nature in which schools and colleges support the collection of data on diversity climate concerning. The survey of diverse graduate students, which was piloted in April 2016, was a positive step in remediating this problem, however concerns remain. The committee believes that the collection of this data from students rather than from students and school administrations further exacerbates the opaqueness of the diversity climate of the university. The lack of universal participation from all schools and programs leaves open questions and gaps of knowledge and accountability.

Continuing with the motif of fragmentation and transparency, diverse graduate student groups and FGLI students have and will continue to need dedicated and reliable support (administrative and financial) from the University administration.

Administrative Support and Institutional Memory

All student leaders take on extra responsibility; that is part and parcel of the leadership experience. However, our ongoing inquiry does not indicate that the University provides adequate administrative support and advisement from university administrators to ensure the streamline function and progress of these organizations. This is especially true in the case of underrepresented and marginalized students who must manage their academic, personal, and professional lives steeped in an often hostile interpersonal university climate. These pressures, coupled with a rapid leadership succession for graduate student groups, makes the sustenance and management of these organizations a challenging task. Concerted University administrative support is necessary to ensure the thriving of these organizations and the preservation of their institutional memory. It is suggested that support in these regards would greatly improve the function of these organizations and decrease the burden on student leaders in both FGLI and diverse graduate student groups.

Financial Support

FGLI and the diverse graduate student groups at Penn are funded through fragmented and uncertain streams of financial support. Extended timetables in processing and access to and quantity of funding from organizations like GAPSA offer diverse graduate groups from maximizing their efficiency. The funding of these organizations usually happens in mid-October of each academic year which limits the ability of diverse graduate student groups to coalesce their prospective new members. Further, the funding allocated to the IDEAL (Inclusion, Diversity, Equity, Access and Leadership) Committee for diverse graduate student groups is not stable in allocation or structure. It is often asked of these graduate student groups, unlike student governments, to request and work continually for additional funds through individual event applications to support their already limited budgets. Equitable, timely, and guaranteed funding should be made available to diverse graduate student groups and FGLI. With the student populations they serve, any time lost in supporting their wellbeing is consequential.

Decentralization (fragmentation) and administrative autonomy (lack of transparency) has been efficacious and advantageous in the management of the university more broadly, however, it also presents challenges for marginalized students to navigate the university terrain.

Work on LGBTQ Faculty, Staff, & Students

The following focuses on the concerns and analysis of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) faculty, staff, and students.

Concerns & Analysis

With the LGBTQ community there are two concerns that are intricately tied. The first pertains to being safe to identify and being “out.” These concerns are always both personal and political. It is for the latter reason that the second concern emerges regarding the reporting of conflict, sexual violence, discrimination, or bias. That is, for one to report on various events or situations, they must first identify. These concerns are particularly pertinent to the LGBTQ community has or where to go to learn about what resources or regulatory mechanisms exist. For instance, the Philadelphia Commission on Human Relations (PCHR) has been investigating racism and class elitism in the Philadelphia Gayborhood and such intragroup or intersectional conflict in the employment context is a problem that the PCHR has regulatory power like the EEOC with regard to discrimination based on sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity. These sorts of legal protections and institutional policies are not easily learned or identified as a member of the Penn community.

At present, cultural resource centers such as the African American Resource Center do not have LGBTQ-specific resources. AARC’s current practice is to refer staff to the LGBTQ center (which is student-centered), or to refer to the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) where community-specific resources and counseling can be obtained. Robert Carter, Jr., associate director of the African American Resource Center, made clear that they do not turn anyone away and work together with other campus resource centers to meet the needs of the Penn community.

In the recent Faculty Inclusion Report (Almanac March 21, 2017), we learned about the University’s exceptional scholarship in LGBTQ studies and its contribution to changes in federal law. We also learned about the institution’s efforts to address concerns of climate including the development of LG-BQA working groups, reviewing and changing of institutional policies and projects that seek to make school curriculum more inclusive. What seemed to be absent from this report were the reported numbers of LGBTQ-identified faculty, growth, and specific mechanisms for diversifying the faculty in this area. As the committee learned, despite the knowledge and function of DSAs, there continue to be faculty search questions on the legality of including LGBTQ identified faculty candidates as a target of opportunity, a topic that DSAs are providing clear training on.

The committee believes that we are just beginning to get a grasp on what’s involved for examining LGBTQ experiences and resources on campus and thinks much more work needs to be done.

(continued on next page)
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Listening to Diversity Public Forum

On January 24, 2017, the University Council Committee on Diversity & Equity, the Faculty Senate, and the Penn Forum for Women Faculty in partnership with the Campaign for Community collaboratively organized a public forum, Listening to Diversity. We organized and hosted this event because of our deep concern for the effect of the sociopolitical context on our campus community and our interest to try to enable more effective ways for addressing these concerns. Listening to Diversity provided all members of our campus community—faculty, staff, and students—the opportunity to voice their concerns and share their suggestions for how we might work together to bring about productive change. University community members were able to participate in person at the forum and/or digitally via an established e-mail specifically for this event. Approximately 48 faculty, students, and staff attended the forum from eight schools of the University.

The following were the most salient concerns and recommendations that were expressed in no prioritized order:

1. Inclusion of military veterans in the definition of diversity as well as responsive resources for their needs.
2. More diversity in the curriculums by way of authors and content.
3. Incorporation of the history of West Philadelphia and the Black Bottom in undergraduate and graduate program curricula.
4. A required foundational course on diversity.
5. Unconscious and implicit bias training as well as diversity sensitivity training.
6. Improved retention of diverse faculty and increased faculty diversity.
7. A central university office of diversity.
8. More attention to the needs of immigrant students.
9. Structural/institutional change, rather than putting the onus of change on students.
10. An anonymous online bias and bigotry reporting system.
11. A strategic plan to recruit more graduate students from underrepresented backgrounds across schools at Penn, particularly within the doctoral programs. (Person spoke of being the only Latinx student in their program and the program’s history of Latinx students being extremely low.)
12. Acknowledgement by Penn leadership of the issues of race, socioeconomic, institutional racism, white skin privilege, etc., that exist on campus and in neighborhoods. Leadership should acknowledge these issues proactively, rather than reactively, and acknowledge that these issues happen to and affect not only students, but faculty and staff as well.

This was followed up by interviews that were completed by graduate social work students in Dr. Hillier’s course, SWRK713, Understanding Social Change: Issues of Race and Gender, specifically to share with the University Council Committee on Diversity & Equity.

Recommendations to University Council

For charge on LGBTQ Faculty, Staff, & Students

1. In order to address the lack of data issues, the committee requests that the university do a staff survey, similar to the Surveys of the Penn Community performed for other University populations (http://www.upenn.edu/ir/surveys.html) that asks about community climate and broader issues than in the current “Penn Staff Survey.” This survey currently only has one question directly asking about the campus diversity/inclusion climate: “I feel Penn values diversity (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, language, education, ideas, and perspectives).” A staff survey that borrows from some of the questions from the other population surveys (e.g., “Felt insulted or threatened based on your social identity [e.g., sex, race, ...]” “Witnessed someone else being insulted or threatened based on some aspect of that individual’s social identity...”; “Satisfaction with LGBT center...”) would be useful to understand staff inclusion and diversity climate and satisfaction.

2. Considering what the committee learned regarding the LGBT Center being primarily a student-serving center and being over extended by serving faculty and staff, the committee recommends that the LGBT Center be expanded by being provided with a staff member who is dedicated to working with LGBTQA faculty and staff. The college and the School of Arts and Sciences should be charged with leading this effort and implementing more venues and resources to have “safe space” conversations about LGBTQ issues and staff/faculty diversity.

3. Provide easily accessible standardized information to all staff members (monthly, weekly, soft/hard funding sources) about LGBTQ inclusion and equity resources, programs, groups as well as process for help with solving related problems.

4. Expand the LGBTQ curriculum inclusion work of Amy Hillier, Amy Baker, and Erin Cross to all 12 schools at Penn.

5. Given the recent Faculty Inclusion Report, the committee is recommending a university-wide cluster hire in LGBTQ studies. This will help to diversify the scholarship, curriculum, and potentially faculty. All of which will provide added value to enriching student experience, recruiting top students, and providing needed representation among the faculty.

Recommendations based on committee’s general charge and inquiry.

1. While the Diversity Search Advisors have been a necessary and efficacious method for increasing diversity among the faculty across campus, this mechanism is limited. DSAs are limited in at least two ways: (1) DSAs are not always members of the faculty search committees leaving gaps in the search process and (2) they only work on faculty searches. The committee recommends that in addition to DSAs, the University establishes a required training workshop on equity and inclusion in hiring practices that includes coverage of unconscious bias and best practices for hiring for diversity. Peer institutions such as Duke University already require such training for anyone participating on a search committee.

2. While each school is required to provide comprehensive diversity reporting, the reported information is not systematic and can easily lead to gaps in reporting. The committee is recommending that a survey is developed to capture school-based faculty and student demographics; diverse curricular content, programming, and speakers; who is doing the work (i.e., standing faculty, adjuncts, or staff); and funding opportunities.

Recommendation of New Topics or Continuing Topics to be Addressed the Following Year

1. Obtain data related to the campus climate and experiences of LGBTQ students, staff, and faculty.
2. Review parental policies and resources for students, staff, and faculty.

Note: The Committee considers “diversity” comprehensively, to include components of identity including but not limited to race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, immigration, and legal status, disability, mental health, veteran and family status, faith traditions and socio-economic background. The Committee recommends including these varied identity components when examining faculty, staff, and graduate student recruitment and retention.
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Committee on Facilities

Committee Charges

General Committee Charge

The Committee on Facilities shall be responsible for keeping under review the planning and operation by the University of its physical plant and all services associated therewith, including transportation and parking.

2016-2017 Specific Charges

1. Continue to monitor the bicycle plan, including its role as part of Penn’s overall commuting and parking programs.
2. Continue discussion of efforts to reduce smoking on campus and expanding no smoking zones on campus.
3. Continue to follow up on the issues related to Active Learning classrooms.
4. Joint Charge with the Committee on Campus and Community Life (CCL)—Examine the Riverfront Development plans to identify untapped opportunities for improving housing, safety, or community engagement opportunities.
5. Monitor the progress of the Climate Action Plan 2.0.
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 2017-2018.

The Committee met a total of six times over the October-February period and representatives gave presentations on the respective charges. One of the meetings was held jointly with CCL to discuss Riverfront Development plans.

Each charge is discussed below, followed by the Committee’s recommendations related to that charge.

1. Bicycle, Commuting and Parking Programs

There were two meetings devoted to this charge. In the first meeting on October 13, 2016, the Committee welcomed Brian Manthe, Director of Business Services, who gave an overview of biking, parking, and transportation at Penn. The second meeting scheduled for February 9, 2017 was cancelled due to weather. PowerPoint slides for the planned presentation by Chloe Cerwinka, Landscape Planner from Facilities and Real Estate Services (FRES), were distributed instead and the Committee responded with comments and questions through email exchange.

The bike infrastructure has been growing and will continue to grow, building on collaboration between FRES, Business Services, and Public Safety, advised by an even more broadly representative University Bike Committee. There is now an additional bike repair station at 34th and Chestnut streets, several new bike corrals have been added, and there are protected bike racks in the garage at 34th and Chestnut streets. The bike parking will continue to expand, both inside and outside of garages. There is a new Bike Commuter Expense Reimbursement Program that allows commuters by bike to submit expenses up to $240/year beginning in tax year 2017. Eligible participants must have commuted by bicycle over 50% during any given month, but can use SEPTA in the winter months, for example. An additional Philadelphia Bike Share station will be added near the Vet School. There will be another Bike to Work at Penn Day on May 19, 2017.

The City has received funding from the state Multimodal Transportation Fund for Phase 1 of calming Chestnut Street from 34th Street to 45th Street and is moving forward on the City Council legislation process as well as design, outreach and stakeholder coordination. They intend to remove one of the three driving lanes for traffic calming, move the bike lane to the left side to avoid bus conflicts, and establish a parking-protected bike lane. The City is also coordinating with PennDOT to relocate the existing right-side bike lane east of 34th Street to the left side in conjunction with the Chestnut Street Bridge replacement project. Penn is closely monitoring these developments, and maintains direct contact with the City about them.

The parking garages at Penn continue to get facility upgrades and renovations. The elevators in the garages will be renovated in the next three years. The Penn Buses are upgraded and include bike racks on every bus, and are all ADA compliant. There is a new FMC shuttle and the Pennovation Works shuttle, which has been expanded. A pilot SEPTA@Penn Transportation Center was set up in the back of the Penn Bookstore last fall. Staff are available to answer questions and tokens are sold there.

Recommendations: The Committee is impressed with the many new efforts that encourage use of bikes and public transportation. We recommend continued cooperation with the City, which is aggressively pursuing new initiatives to improve bike accessibility.

2. Efforts to Reduce Smoking on Campus

Ashlee Halbritter, director of Campus Health, and Chris Hyson, senior health and wellness specialist from Human Resources, spoke to the Committee on January 24, 2017 about the initiatives to make Penn a tobacco-free campus. The Surgeon General has recommended that campuses should be a priority to become tobacco free. Frank Leone chaired a committee from January 2014 to July 2014 to research how to make this happen, and to develop implementation recommendations. The Committee determined that the approach should be one of a culture change, with respect for choices and not demand. In September 2015, Human Resources broadened the policy to include outdoor spaces as well as indoor spaces. The University added no smoking signs to 15 campus maps and to 50 of the directional blade signs throughout campus and at specific outdoor spaces such as Penn Park, Kane Park, and Shoemaker Green. A brochure was developed with resources for Penn staff, faculty, students, as well as University contractors. Communications efforts have been made through student groups, flyers, Penn@Work, and Penn News.

This year, Penn, specifically the Division of Human Resources and Campus Health and Student Health Services, received a grant from the American Cancer Society and CVS for $20,000 to continue implementation of the program. The money will be spent on communications, additional signage, and an urn removal pilot program. The urn removal pilot program will look at the effects of removing the ash cans from four locations on campus for approximately eight weeks. Currently about 1% of students are daily smokers, however 25% are considered social smokers. Metrics will be used through an annual student national survey, counselor sessions, participation in the tobacco cessation program and the Be In the Know program that is administered by the Division of Human Resources.

Recommendations: Continue with ongoing programs and initiatives. The Committee will monitor the outcome of the urn removal program and how the initiative continues to be communicated.

3. Issues Related to Active Learning Classrooms

On December 8, 2016, the Committee welcomed John MacDermott from SAS Computing and Jeff Douthett from Classroom Technology Services, who gave a comprehensive history and overview of active learning classrooms at Penn. In May 2013, the University’s first such classroom, Vagelos 2000, 42-seat capacity, was created by the Chemistry Department, which continues to manage it. In Summer 2013, the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) developed a SAIL (structured, active, in-class learning) program that helped train faculty to teach in these rooms and provided consultation as needed. During the Fall of 2013, some classes were taught in the active learning style but without a proper classroom. In January 2014 ARCH 208, 56-seat capacity (central-pool classroom) became available as a new multipurpose space and active learning classroom. In Spring 2014, the Van Pelt Collaborative Classroom, 50-seat capacity, was added followed in the Fall 2014 by DRL 3N1H, 60-seat capacity (central-pool) and in the Summer 2015 Towne 217, 90-seat capacity, managed by Penn Engineering. In the Fall 2015, another central-pool classroom was added, DRL A5, 72-seat capacity. In order to create DRL A5, two central-pool classrooms (formally A5 and A7) were combined to make one active learning room. In Fall 2016, a new room in the Levin Building, 72-seat capacity, managed by SAS, was added, and in the Spring 2017 Wharton will add a mixed-use room.

The technology varies between these rooms and they have varying success rates (based on faculty and student feedback), but are generally highly used throughout the week. Usage continues to increase and John MacDermott helps faculty find the right fit for their classroom and timeframe. He asks for requests for active learning spaces a few weeks before they are normally due so that the times that the classes are given can be adjusted to accommodate as many classes as possible. The longitudinal study to measure the success of these classrooms is still pending. The number of depart.

(continued on next page)
ments that want access to a larger (~120 seat capacity) active learning room is growing rapidly. Current central pool classrooms cannot be used to create one. The central pool classrooms are needed for block schedules and are currently occupied more than 90% of the time. Faculty and staff in DRL also expressed their concerns about lack of access to their active-learning classrooms during off hours during which the rooms are locked.

**Recommendations:** Explore the possibility of creating a new 100+ capacity room. The Committee commends the critical roles taken by Classroom Technology Services and SAS Computing for overseeing the construction of the new SAIL classrooms, as well as CTL in bringing faculty together to discuss new and innovative pedagogical methods and their assessment strategies. The Committee feels further communication about CTL’s programming would benefit both faculty and students. We also recommend a study to explore ways to allow access to the central pool active-learning classrooms during off hours.

### 4. Joint with CCL – Examine the Riverfront Development Plans

At the joint meeting with CCL on January 23, 2017, David Hollenberg, Mark Kocent, and Tony Sorrentino presented to the Committees how our University is involved in surrounding City projects, how the **Penn Connects** Plan interacts with the City, and the work that is happening at Pennovation. At the root of our campus plan, **Penn Connects**, is the intention to connect Penn to Philadelphia. Many projects have been completed since 2009, including large scale City and private driven development surrounding campus. Those projects include Cira Centre South comprised of the FMC Tower, Cira Garage and Green, and EVO, spanning 30th Street between Walnut and Chestnut Streets. In addition, projects that are beyond **Penn Connects** but with which Penn is involved include the 30th Street Station District Plan, created by a large number of stakeholders including Amtrak, SEPTA, Drexel, PennDOT and Brandywine Realty Trust; Schuylkill Yards with Drexel and Brandywine Realty Trust; uCity Square with the University City Science Center and Wexford Science and Technology.

Pennovation Works is a University initiative that is located on the former site of DuPont Chemistry Labs, on the edge of Philadelphia’s Gray’s Ferry neighborhood. Penn has invested in this area by creating Pennovation Works and Center, but also by extending the mortgage incentive program to include these boundaries. There are both Penn – including Transportation and Penn Vet Working Dog Center—and non-Penn tenants located at the Works. The centerpiece of the Works is the Pennovation Center, home to the Penn Engineering Research and Collaboration Hub (PERCH) lab, co-working space, laboratories and inventor garages. The entire complex is intended to be a site for innovation and business incubation, offering high-tech office space, a 24 hour gym, event and seminar space. Opening in the next year are the Perelman Center for Political Science and Economics with a forum, seminar rooms, and classrooms, and the renovation of Hill College House, which will have seminar rooms. Additional upcoming projects include a renovation within the University Museum, Ringe Squash replacement, new Wharton academic building and substation replacement, century bond investments, Pennovation Works investments, New Patient Pavilion and the Center for Healthcare Technology.

**Recommendations:** Continue with ongoing programs and initiatives. The Committee recommends a study to improve access for pedestrians and cyclists to Pennovation Works.

### 5. Monitor the Progress of the Climate Action Plan 2.0

Dan Garofalo, Director of Sustainability, provided an overview and update to the Climate Action Plan on November 10, 2017. The sustainability initiative started with President Gutmann signing the President’s Climate Commitment in 2007, which initiated the creation of the Climate Action Plan completed in 2009. In 2012 Penn committed to carbon neutrality by 2042 and in 2014 Climate Action Plan 2.0 was initiated. FRES works with other Divisions, students, and groups on campus to create and execute the Climate Action Plan, and the FRES team monitors, tracks, and reports on the progress of the Plan and runs the outreach and engagement component. There are seven initiatives within the Climate Action Plan: Operations and Utilities; Waste Minimization; Purchasing; Physical Environment; Transportation; Academics; Outreach and Engagement.

The presentation largely focused on the physical environment piece as that most closely relates to the charges of the Committee. The goals include a 7% energy reduction and a 10% carbon reduction by 2019, projects over $5 million will target a minimum of LEED Silver certification, the creation of Green Guidelines for Renovations, Stormwater Masterplan, LEED Credit Bank, and the creation of an Ecological Stewardship Landscape Plan. In Climate Action 2.0, the boundaries for monitoring the carbon footprint of the University have been expanded to include the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania, Morris Arboretum, and the New Bolton Center. There are also goals for leased space and real estate projects on campus. There are sustainability coordinators and eco reps in all of the Schools and Centers, Green Office and Green Living Certifications, as well as the Green Fund Grant program that provides seed money to students, staff, or faculty with new ideas about making the campus more sustainable.

**Recommendations:** Climate Action Plan 2.0 has made tremendous progress through its first 2.5 years of the 5-year program. The Committee will continue to monitor ongoing programs and initiatives over the remaining 2.5 years.

### 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 2017-2018

- Continue to monitor the bicycle, commuting, and parking program.
- Continue to follow up on issues related to Active Learning classrooms.
- Continue to monitor tobacco-free initiatives on campus, including the urn removal project.
- Receive updates on Penn Connects initiatives and Climate Action Plan 2.0.
- Study and investigate the history and progress of gender-neutral restrooms on campus.

### Committee on Facilities 2016-2017

**Chair:** Masao Sako; **Faculty:** Tom Daniels, Kathryn Michel; **PPSA:** Maura Tucker; **WPPSA:** Leon Malloy; **Graduate Students:** Suraj Bhardwaj, Jessie Haeun Yi; **Undergraduate Students:** Timothy Chang, Michelle Xu; **Liaison:** David Hollenberg; **Staff:** Taylor Berkowitz.
The Committee on Personnel Benefits

2016-2017 Year-End Reports

The Committee focused on a variety of benefits issues this year. The issues discussed are identified below in the context of reviewing the charges for this year and recommending charges for next year. The Committee continued to have a strong working relationship with its Administrative Liaisons, Jack Heuer, Vice President Human Resources, and Susan Sproat, Executive Director Human Resources, Benefits. We expect the Committee will have met eight times by the end of the year.

2016-2017 Specific Charges & Recommendations for Future Charges

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

We are in a time of great uncertainty and change for health care. We are likely to see a continuing evolution of health care benefits over time. The Committee has worked to become better educated about plan design and to be involved with the annual adjustments to health benefits at an earlier, more formative, stage. Our administrative liaisons have been supportive in this process including arranging for Towers Watson, the University’s Benefits consultant, to meet with the Committee over the summer in order to provide a health benefits tutorial. We believe that this has been a productive process and should continue.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends it be charged with continuing to review health care benefits in light of evolving legal and market conditions.

2. Review Penn’s provision of benefits for new parents.

The Committee spent several meetings discussing the scope and adequacy of benefits for new parents. The recent change in the short-term disability policy, which no longer requires exhausting of sick leave and paid time off, is an important enhancement of benefits for new parents. The Committee considered whether to recommend further enhancements. The Committee discussed a variety of formal and informal measures designed to assist new parents, including discussing whether the university should develop a paid parental leave benefit. The Committee believes that any such recommendation would be premature and that next year’s committee should continue to monitor this issue. The Committee was concerned with long waiting lists at the University’s child care center and notes that the planned opening of a child care center affiliated with the University’s Health System should help expand child care options at and around Penn.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that it be charged with continuing to monitor the adequacy of benefits for new parents.

3. Continue discussion of Penn Behavioral Health.

The Committee has scheduled a meeting with Angel Medina, the Interim Director of Operations for Penn Behavioral Health. The Committee met with Mr. Medina last year and was encouraged by the improvements being made in the administration of Penn Behavioral Health.

**Recommendation:** The Committee recommends that it be charged with continuing to monitor the effectiveness of the administration of mental health benefits and the adequacy of mental health benefits.

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

Penn’s wellness initiatives have continued to expand. The Committee has monitored this expansion. The sense of the Committee is that these are valuable services and should be continued. The Committee also believes that it is important to monitor such initiatives so that they provide benefits to the University community without infringing on individual privacy or personal autonomy.

**Recommendation:** This charge should be continued.

5. Miscellaneous charges:

• Continue to monitor retirement benefits in coordination with the Faculty Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty.

• Continue to discuss and investigate how information on benefits is disseminated and possible improvements thereto.

• Continue discussion of same-sex partner benefits and the transition to parity.

**Recommendation:** These charges can reasonably be considered as part of the Committee’s general charge.

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 2017-2018.

**Recommendation:** Highest priority should be given to the four specific charges described above.
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