The University of Pennsylvania is unwavering in its commitment to being inclusive, innovative and impactful. Last summer, we charged the Campus Iconography Group (CIG) with advising us on ways to accelerate our progress in signaling those core values on our campus. The CIG has provided us with a set of recommendations which we accept and will work to implement in partnership with the Deans and the administrative Officers. We are grateful to the CIG members for this excellent report which will help ensure that, going forward, Penn’s accomplishments and aspirations are more fully illuminated in the images and built environment of our beautiful campus.

—Amy Gutmann, President
—Wendell Pritchett, Provost
—Craig Carnaroli, Executive Vice President

Campus Iconography Group Report

On July 2, 2020, President Amy Gutmann, Provost Wendell Pritchett, and Executive Vice President Craig Carnaroli announced the formation of the Campus Iconography Group (CIG). The Group was charged with providing advice “on further steps to ensure that the placement of art and statues and other prominent iconography better reflects our achievements and aspirations to increase the diversity of the Penn community.” The CIG was asked to engage the broadest range of constituencies to help ensure that the recommendations would enable the University administration to “fulfill our firm commitment to being the most inclusive, innovative and impactful university.”

The announcement of the CIG distinguished an important moment that was the culmination of conversations that had been underway regarding the explicit and subtle messages conveyed by campus iconography as well as concerns that the stories of some of the individuals valorized on campus were problematic or incomplete. The imagery and art on campus were explored as a result of recent events, including the renaming of Penn Commons, the research of the Penn & Slavery Project, and increasing calls from faculty, students, and staff that Penn’s portraits, statues, and other iconography better reflect the University’s strategic vision of inclusion, innovation, and impact as articulated in the Penn Compact 2022. The decision to seek a systematic assessment and recommendations regarding naming, renaming, replacement, and removal was further galvanized by the inequities brought into stark relief by the global health pandemic and the movement towards greater racial justice.

The CIG was co-chaired by Joann Mitchell, Senior Vice President for Institutional Affairs and Chief Diversity Officer, and Fritz Steiner, Dean and Paley Professor of the Weitzman School of Design, and its members were: William Gipson, Associate Vice Provost for Equity and Access; Charles Howard, Vice President for Social Equity and Community and University Chaplain; Lynn Marsden-Atlass, Executive Director of the Arthur Ross Gallery and University Curator; Medha Narvekar, Vice President for Facilities and Real Estate Services; Barbara Savage, Geraldine R. Segal Professor of American Social Thought in the Department of African Studies; Wendy White, Senior Vice President and General Counsel; and Mark Kocent, University Architect, who served as senior staff.

The CIG began its work as other colleges and universities also had renewed their focus on the messages conveyed by the representations, monuments, and symbols encountered on their campuses. As part of the CIG’s work, the reports and media coverage of many institutions including Brown, Stanford, University of North Carolina, University of Texas at Austin, University of Virginia, and Yale were reviewed. The CIG drew upon the work of those institutions as it sought to develop frameworks that it believed would work best for Penn. We also had the opportunity to speak with colleagues who were leading School-based committees engaged in similar work, most notably at the Perelman School of Medicine and Penn Carey Law School. The CIG also benefited from an early discussion with Kelly Lee, Philadelphia’s Chief Cultural Officer, who is leading the City’s review of whether and which changes ought to be made with respect to its iconography, street names, and other memorials of historical and contemporary figures. The CIG also had conversations with the Council of Penn and commissioned PennPraxis with Monument Lab to undertake five focus groups, including one with the Faculty Senate, to capture diverse views from alumni, students, faculty, and staff.

University Oversight of Campus Design and Works of Art

The University has had policies, protocols, and committees that govern the design and naming of buildings and outdoor spaces as well as the acquisition and placement of art, including statues and contemporary works, for many years. Penn’s Board of Trustees has final authority for the approval of all campus building projects. The Trustees are advised by the President, Provost, Executive Vice President, and the Design Review Committee. In 2001, the Campus Development Plan was adopted by the Trustees. The Plan provided guidance for the future development of the campus and outlined “the ways that new buildings and open space should take account of neighboring structures, and serve the population intended.” In June 2002, following a review and comment period, the Trustees adopted “Design Guidelines and Review of Campus Projects,” which “outline a process that ensures that the specific surroundings and the campus as a whole are taken into account in each new building project.” The guidance addressed a range of topics including landscape, streetscapes, and signage; ADA accessibility; the integration of art in buildings, noting that whenever possible, projects were to “strive to create new art that advances the ways we think about the world we inhabit”; and the orientation of buildings, particularly those that border public streets, which should have entrances that are “visible to those arriving on campus and contribute to the life and activity of streets and walks.”

The Penn Connects campus development plan, approved by the Trustees in September 2006, reaffirmed Penn’s commitment to community engagement and building an inclusive campus. President Amy Gutmann stated that its name “underscore[d] our commitment to build ever stronger connections to our region and our world. We at Penn are committed to working collectively, locally and globally, to ensure that our contributions to human progress will benefit all who live and work in our community.” Penn Connects 2.0 was adopted in 2012 to enhance and reinforce the vision for the campus and respond to emerging sustainability goals. In 2018, Penn Connects 3.0 was approved and continued the transformation of Penn’s urban campus to support its teaching, research, and clinical care missions as well as to enrich the living and learning environments, strengthen community engagement, and advance sustainable leadership.

The University’s Art Collection includes more than 8,000 objects of significant aesthetic, historical, and market value. As is the case for other University assets, the Vice President for Finance and Treasurer is responsible to the Trustees for its oversight who has in turn delegated primary responsibility for the day-to-day oversight of the Collection to the Office of the University Curator. In 2002, the University Trustees established the Campus Art Committee to “review all outdoor art works, in relation to buildings and the 1% Fine Arts Program for art commissions.” In addition, “All pieces of sculpture or other works of art proposed to be installed in the campus landscape or on the exterior of buildings are to be presented to the Campus Art Committee for review, evaluation and acceptance or rejection, such action being forwarded to the Office of the President for confirmation.” The Campus Art Committee includes the University Architect, the University’s Landscape Architect, the University Curator, the Daniel Dietrich II Director of the Institute of Contemporary Art, and faculty members with expertise in art and architecture.

The Design Review Committee, which is co-chaired by the Dean of the Weitzman School of Design and the University Architect, includes the Vice President for Facilities and Real Estate Services, a University Trustee, several faculty members who are design professionals, and outside planners and architects drawn from the extended University community. A special subcommittee of the Design Review Committee may be created (and include faculty and administrators not on the Design Review Committee) for art projects. That subcommittee coordinates its work with the Office of the Curator’s Art Advisory Committee. In addition, the Cultural

1. See https://almanac.upenn.edu/archive/v50/n06/design_guide.html.
2. See https://almanac.upenn.edu/archive/volumes/v51/n33/OR-art.html.
3. See https://almanac.upenn.edu/archive/volumes/v51/n33/pdf_n33/052405.pdf.
Resources Subcommittee is charged with reviewing all campus projects that affect buildings of historical importance or within designated historical districts. The Cultural Resources Subcommittee was created in response to the demolition of Smith Hall to make way for the Vagelos Laboratories. The Cultural Resources Subcommittee is co-chaired by the Dean of the Weitzman School of Design and the University Architect and includes the Vice President for Facilities and Real Estate Services, faculty experts on historic preservation, a representative of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, and a representative of the Provost’s Office.

In 2003, the Art Advisory Committee was established to review and advise on proposed acquisitions, gifts, commissions, site-specific installations (inside and outside buildings), and general curatorial and collections management issues for the University’s Art Collection. The Art Advisory Committee must review all works being considered for loan or deaccessioning. The Art Advisory Committee includes the Vice President for Finance and Treasurer, Dean of the Weitzman School of Design, Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations, Senior Vice President and General Counsel, and University Curator.

In 2019, the University established a Naming Policy, revised in 2020, that applies to all naming opportunities for recognition purposes. The Policy includes but is not limited to buildings and indoor and outdoor spaces as well as to Schools, academic and administrative units, professorships, scholarships, and the like. The University’s Naming Policy provides that “the appropriateness of the name in a public context should always be taken into consideration, recognizing that every Penn Name is conferred by the University subject to its continuing obligation to protect the University’s traditions, mission, and values.”

The University Curator, Vice President for Finance and Treasurer, and Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations review requests for contributions and gifts to the University Art Collection. A School, Center, Division, or Department that is approached about making a gift of art or other iconography to the University refers the request to the University Curator’s Office where a recommendation will be made regarding whether to accept the gift, and if so, further steps are taken to ensure that all legal and fiscal requirements (including compliance with IRS regulations) are fulfilled. Generally, donors are asked to provide 10 percent of the value of the piece of art to assist with the care and maintenance of the object. If a piece of art is purchased that is valued in excess of $1,000, the acquisition is to be reported to the Office of the Curator to ensure proper documentation as part of the University Art Collection.

If a School, Center, or Department commissions or receives an offer of a gift of sculpture to be placed on campus, the Office of the University Architect must be notified. The University Architect will present information regarding the proposed project and its artist to the Campus Art Committee, which is chaired by the University Curator, for review based on the material and formal characteristics of the work in question, the proposed location, maintenance requirements, and funding for the care and maintenance of the sculpture. If the sculpture is a prospective donation to the University subject to its continuing obligation to protect the University’s traditions, mission, and values.

Requests to deaccession artworks are serious matters and must be made in writing to the Office of the University Curator. The request must include the rationale for the request and provide information regarding any special considerations related to a gift agreement (if applicable), and any other legal requirements. If the artwork for which deaccessioning is sought is valued at less than $5,000, the Office of the University Curator, in consultation with the Office of General Counsel, will determine whether the request will be granted. If the object is valued at more than $5,000, a more fulsome review is required, and the Office of General Counsel and other appropriate advisors must be consulted for approval. If the artwork is valued in excess of $100,000, the President also must be consulted for approval of the request.

Occasionally, requests may be received for the loan of an object in the University Art Collection. All such requests are to be referred to the Office of the University Curator who will enlist the support of the Office of Risk Management and Insurance to assure that any objects loaned from the University’s collection are properly insured. Copies of all loan agreements and other documentation are to be submitted to the Office of the University Curator to ensure that records are centrally maintained regarding the location and loan arrangements made with respect to an object that belongs to the University. Similarly, requests to reproduce or copy artwork in the University Art Collection are to be referred to the Office of the University Curator.

Key Findings

During consultations with community members and the focused conversations facilitated by PennPraxis with Monument Lab on the CIG’s behalf, it became apparent that there was a lack of awareness of the above policies and protocols regarding naming and the management of the University Art Collection. The CIG also reviewed the membership of existing committees and found that there is significant overlap on all relevant committees The CIG urges that the membership of each committee be reviewed to add diversity and establish reasonable terms for service. In addition, it would be helpful to have either a single website or have information on the sites of the Office of the Curator, the Division of Facilities and Real Estate Services, and elsewhere that provided a single location where all relevant policies and protocols can be found. This would also address, at least in part, the calls for increased transparency regarding how decisions are made regarding naming opportunities, acquisitions to and deaccessions from the University Art Collection, and to remove or change the names of buildings and other spaces.

Recommended Frameworks

As a University whose founding dates back to 1740, some of the behavior and beliefs of those for whom buildings have been named, portraits commissioned and otherwise honored are antithetical to Penn’s contemporary commitment to inclusion, innovation, and impact. Similarly, the mores and values espoused by the broader society have evolved and modern-day discoveries have discredited some of their beliefs. Penn’s founder Benjamin Franklin was a slave owner until he became an influential abolitionist during the latter part of his life. Early administrators and faculty benefited from the labor of enslaved people, including in the maintenance of University property. In addition, some of the pseudoscience regarding racial differences that advanced by Penn faculty members. In a few instances, the behavior that has come to light is so abhorrent that their names or likenesses have been removed from the campus.

The CIG grappled with how decisions should be made by an institution dedicated to the advancement of knowledge about removal, renaming, or replacement of campus iconography. It was the unanimous view of CIG members that naming policies should be made by an institution dedicated to the advancement of knowledge about removal, renaming, or replacement of campus iconography. It was the unanimous view of CIG members that naming policies should be made by an institution dedicated to the advancement of knowledge about removal, renaming, or replacement of campus iconography. It was the unanimous view of CIG members that naming policies should be advanced by Penn faculty members. In a few instances, the behavior that has come to light is so abhorrent that their names or likenesses have been removed from the campus.

The CIG recommends that the decision on whether to remove, replace or rename must rely upon a set of criteria—where the criteria themselves may evolve over time—and also on a case-by-case complex set of contextual judgments. The CIG proposes that the following framework should be used to evaluate proposals to rename, replace, or remove a name (the order in which a factor is listed is not intended to signify any priority for its consideration):

- **The centrality of the person’s offensive behavior to his or her life as a whole:** The case for renaming is strongest where the honoree’s offensive behavior is inextricably connected with their public persona. The case for renaming is weaker where the honoree’s offensive behavior, though publicly known, is not a central or inextricable part of their public persona—especially when, despite the objectionable behavior, other aspects of the person’s life and work are especially significant.

- **Harmful nature and impact of the honoree’s behavior:** The case for renaming is strongest where the behavior of the person for whom a feature is named or otherwise honored is morally repugnant and that morally repugnant behavior has a significant negative effect on the core University missions of pursuing knowledge, receiving an education, and service for the public good. Thus, the case for renaming is stronger to the extent that retaining a name creates (or contributes to) an environment that injures the ability of students, faculty, or staff of a particular gender, sexual orientation, race, religion, national origin, or other characteristic protected by University policy, to participate fully and effectively in the missions of the University. The case is also stronger to the extent that the morally repugnant behavior is especially egregious (e.g. in violation of basic constitutional rights of life and liberty), violates core principles of academic integrity (e.g. academic fraud or misconduct), or if the President, in consultation with the Trustee Executive Committee, concludes that the appropriateness of the name in a public context should always be taken into consideration, recognizing that every Penn Name is conferred by the University subject to its continuing obligation to protect the University’s traditions, mission, and values.
Committee, determines that continued name association between the University and the individual (or entity) compromises the public trust or is detrimental to the traditions, mission, or values of the University. In assessing the harmful nature and impact, the salience of the named feature for members of the Penn community should be considered. The case for renaming is stronger when the name is prominent and encountered in a personal or intimate setting (e.g., a student residence) and generally is weaker where the feature is a relatively impersonal and rarely encountered place. As a result, when several features are named after the same individual, the impact may be more harmful for some features than for others.

- **Community identification with the feature.** The case for renaming is weaker where the feature is part of a valuable positive tradition or identification shared by a substantial number of Penn community members, including alumni.

- **Strength and clarity of the historical evidence.** The case for renaming is strongest when evidence of the honoree’s wrongful behavior is clear and unambiguous. It is weakest when the evidence is scant or ambiguous.

- **Relation to the University’s history.** The case for renaming is weaker to the extent that the honoree had a more significant role in the University’s history, and stronger to the extent that the honoree is a person without a significant connection to the University. (The concern about “erasing” the University’s history is diminished to the extent that the honoree’s connection to Penn’s history is incidental.)

- **The University’s prior consideration of the issue.** The case for renaming is strengthened when the University’s offensive conduct came to light after the naming, or where the issue was not the subject of prior deliberation. The case for renaming is weaker when the University addressed the behavior at the time of the naming and nonetheless decided to honor the person, or when the University has already considered and rejected a prior request for renaming. (The original decision deserves some degree of respect if the decision makers considered the competing interests, but not if they made the decision in the absence of relevant facts, or if they did not address the honoree’s questionable behavior at the time of the naming.)

- **Possibilities for mitigation.** In considering whether to retain or eliminate a name, the University should take into account whether the harm can be mitigated and historical knowledge preserved by recognizing and addressing the individual’s wrongful behavior. When a feature is renamed or when the name is retained but was considered a close question, the University should consider describing the history in a prominent way—at the feature, where practicable, or in some other suitable location.

- **Donor Agreements and/or Other Legal Responsibilities.** A search for any gift agreements as well as curatorial and archival records should be conducted when an item is presented for consideration of removal, renaming, relocation, replacement or other significant change. The Office of General Counsel and the Division of Finance should be consulted to determine whether the University has any legal obligation to maintain the name. The President, or a designee, with the Division of Finance should consult with a donor. In the event the naming is of a donor, the donor must be informed and consulted, and the name does not violate any terms of the donor’s Agreement or the University’s gift acceptance and management policy.

There are 59 public sculptures on display on campus, including **Brick House** by Simone Leigh, which was installed in the fall of 2020—the first of a Black woman and it was sculpted by a Black woman. Nine of the 59 sculptures on display are the work of women artists, including the iconic **Split Button** by Coosje van Bruggen with Claes Oldenburg, and two are the work of people of color (Brick House and the **Antillean Couple** by Augustin Cárdenas). There are more than 8,000 works in the University Art Collection; approximately 300 women artists created 700 pieces of art, and 22 are known to be the creations of 11 people of color. In the fall of 2021, Penn Medicine’s newly commissioned work by Maya Lin, tentatively titled **DNA Tree of Life**, will be installed in the lobby of the new Pavilion. Additionally, the University owns hundreds of portraits of individuals that were donated to or commissioned by various Schools and Divisions, most of which are of White men. Faculty, students, staff, visitors, and applicants for academic programs or employment have commented on the lack of diversity in the portraits prominently displayed, including those in College Hall; in part resulting from the relatively recent appointment of women and people of color to leadership roles at Penn. (The first woman to serve as Penn University and the first president in the University’s history, President Faghih is a woman.)

**The CIG was energized by the possibility of finding ways to ensure that the campus environs better reflected Penn’s commitment to inclusion, innovation and impact. We considered a wide range of opportunities in the years ahead for all parts of the University to creatively and effectively illustrate in multiple venues that Penn welcomes and values the diverse perspectives of its faculty, students, and staff. Penn seeks to recognize the contributions of the transformative leaders who helped make it one of the world’s most highly regarded research universities as well as alumni whose accomplishments reflect Penn’s strides from excellence to eminence—particularly those whose stories had not been widely known. Moreover, there are opportunities to better educate members of the community and visitors about the University’s artwork and the artists who created it. The following framework for assessing whether proposed additions help demonstrate the University’s commitment to inclusive excellence is proposed.**

1. **Significant connection to the University’s history.** The case for naming or adding iconography to the collection is strongest when the honoree had a significant impact on Penn’s history or reputation.

2. **The centrality of the person’s contributions to advancing diversity, equity, and inclusion.** The case for naming or adding iconography to the collection is stronger if the prospective honoree’s achievements made a significant contribution to the arts, sciences, professions, education, politics, military, and/or the public good. Those individuals whose contributions have been under-recognized should be given special consideration.

3. **Positive impact of the honoree’s contributions.** The case for naming or adding iconography to the collection is strengthened when the prospective honoree’s contributions have had a significant positive effect on the University or the larger society, particularly the pursuit of knowledge, teaching, and service for the public good.

4. **Strength and clarity of the historical evidence.** The case for naming or adding iconography to the collection should be borne out by strong and unambiguous historical evidence of the honoree’s contributions.

While there are many instances in which a proposed honoree will meet all four criteria, the CIG’s recommendation is that anyone so honored should meet at least three of the criteria outlined above. The University has recognized some of its alumni, notably Sadie T. M. Alexander for whom the Penn Alexander School and a professorship in Penn Carey Law School are named. Also, the 125 Years sculpture project on Woodland Walk by Jenny Holzer honors many distinguished alums, including President Emerita Judith Rodin. A number of Penn alumni who might be recognized were discussed, including renowned architect Julian Abele (BArch ’02), women’s rights activist Alice Paul (PhD 1912), and architects Liang Sicheng (GAR’27) and Huanyin Lin (BFA’27) who are among the founders of modern Chinese architecture. Finding ways to honor distinguished alumni who made significant contributions both in the U.S. and globally would be particularly inspiring for current and prospective students. While physical representations will be welcome, the CIG urges the use of innovative strategies not limited to depictions or other physical representations in order to educate about the accomplishments of extraordinary people who are Penn alumni or who have made an indelible mark on the life of the University.

**Review of Requests for Naming, Renaming, Replacement, or Removal**

In instances in which a gift agreement is proposed that may include the naming of a building or other physical space or that of a professorship, scholarship, fellowship or the like, the senior development professional in the School is charged with consulting with the Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations regarding the recognition prior to discussion of the proposal with a donor. In the event the naming is of a building or any other naming opportunity valued in excess of $1 million, the Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations also discusses the proposal with and seeks the approval of the President. The University’s Naming Policy also provides that "gift agreements must expressly state that names of buildings and physical spaces are retained until it requires significant renovation or replacement, at which time the University may rename it while continuing to appropriately recognize the original gift."

All such requests should initially be submitted to the relevant Dean or Vice President. The University generally refrains from naming buildings, spaces, scholarships or professorships after an individual or group in the absence of a gift agreement with a donor. On occasion, the University will honor an individual who has made significant and sustained contributions to the history of the University as was the case for example when Rodin College House was named for Dr. Judith Rodin upon her retirement as Penn’s President. Similarly, a decision may be made to honor a significant historical figure

---

who has a Penn connection and has enriched the diversity of the campus, the
{canon or both, as was the case for Dr. W. E. B. Du Bois for whom Du
Bois College House is named. Ultimately, all such proposals are submitted to
and reviewed by the relevant School Dean or Vice President as well as the
Senior Vice President for Development and Alumni Relations and the
Senior Vice President and General Counsel before being forwarded to the
President for approval and, in most instances, to the Board of Trustees.

Renaming, replacement, or removal should only be undertaken, as
discussed above, when providing education and context is determined to be
an insufficient response to the morally abhorrent behavior of the person
recognized. In those instances in which a member of the community
believes that renaming, replacement, or removal may be appropriate; the
submission of a written request that describes the specific conduct that
warrants consideration of renaming, replacement, or removal; provides
supporting evidence of that behavior; and details how the request is aligned
with the framework recommended above should be submitted to the Dean
of the relevant School or to the Executive Vice President. After the Dean
or Executive Vice President has reviewed the request, a recommendation
will be sent to the President that includes a statement of the reasons for
the recommendation. The President may either ask an existing consultative
group or constitute a special committee to review the recommendation and
the underlying evidence before making a decision. The President’s decision,
made in consultation with the Trustees Executive Committee, will be final.

Recommendations

The CIG discussed a number of near-term and longer term opportunities to
make significant progress in having the University’s iconography better
reflect the University’s commitment to inclusion, innovation, and impact.
We understand that the University intends to embark on a campus planning
process in the near future. An update of the campus plan presents an oppor-
tunity to reframe the University’s history in an aspirational way that “to create new
ways we think about the world we inhabit,” and “contribute to the life and
way we think about the world we inhabit,” and “contribute to the life and
activity of streets and walks” on campus and in the community. Continuing
its efforts to make the campus welcoming and engendering a greater sense
of community and belonging should be among the objectives of the plan-
ning process. A great deal of progress has been made since 2002 when the
Trustees adopted the Design Review Guidelines. The Weitzman Plaza, for
example, has opened up a major public entrance to the campus and offers
a terrific exemplar of the possibilities that lie ahead. Similarly, the recently
renovated section of Woodland Walk behind Steinberg Hall-Deitrich Hall,
the sloped lawn in front of Lauder College House, and the public green in
front of the New College House West are examples of intentionally cre-
at- ed open spaces that welcome the broader community to participate in
and enjoy the campus. The new campus plan can help identify other such
opportunities and also suggest suitable locations for additional works of art.

As described above, the University has several committees that work
assiduously to oversee the design integrity of the campus and the artworks
that are part of the University Art Collection. The membership of those
committees should be more diverse and inclusive. The CIG urges that the
membership of each committee be reviewed to add diverse perspective, add
diverse ideas, and examine the perspectives of community members who
would need to be carefully curated so as not to lose its impact and lends
itself to the enlistment of students and faculty to assist with the necessary
research and curation.

The CIG recommends that, partnering together, the University and every
School and Resource Center establish a fund to support the acquisition of
art to increase the diversity of the people represented in campus art-
work and the artists who create it. Particular attention should be given to
the inclusive efforts of people who have made significant contributions to Penn
and to the world who are unrecognized or under-recognized. Additionally,
these funds could provide resources for educational programming about
the artists or the people represented. Priority should be given to supporting
innovative ideas and installations such as the augmented reality campus
Tour that was recently launched by the Penn & Slavery Project. Given
space limitations, the Art Advisory Committee or another group could be
asked to consider the most effective way to use the campus as a virtual
gallery with exhibits and installations that are displayed for a period and
rotated periodically to highlight artists, people or milestones in Penn’s
history. Interested Penn students could also be commissioned to under-
take research projects with a faculty member to help illuminate aspects of
Penn’s history and or the stories of distinguished alumni who have made
significant contributions to the United States, and the world (e.g.
August Nathaniel Lushington V’1897, the first Black person to graduate
Penn Vet; Antonia Villaruel, the first Latina to be appointed to the
standing faculty of Penn Nursing and the first Latinx person to serve as
Dean; or Hettie Simmons Love WG’47, the first African American to earn
an MBA from Wharton).

One of the issues that was evident during focus group conversations
and other consultations was the lack of awareness of the University’s various
policies, procedures, and governance mechanisms. The CIG recommends
the creation of a website that brings this information together in a
single location that can be linked to other websites to increase awareness of
and provide some transparency regarding the decision-making pro-
ces associated with the acquisition and deaccessioning of artworks and
other cultures as well as naming opportunities for buildings.

The CIG believes that the recommendations cited above are neces-
sary steps to making Penn an even more welcoming campus, one that is
committed to working to honor and fully explicate its distinguished
and complicated history. At the same time, our recommendations will help to
ensure that the artworks on display better represent the University’s stra-
tegic vision of inclusion, innovation, and impact as articulated in the Penn
Compact 2022. As it works to ensure that Penn’s built environment and
its artistic representations more fully and clearly embody our University’s
mission and values, Penn will be better positioned to continue to attract
and retain excellent students, faculty, and staff from across the country
and around the world.

1 For examples, see https://anthropology.sas.upenn.edu/about/land-acknowl-
edgement, https://www.penn.museum/land,
and https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/
news/the-one-university/2018/11/18,
dobbs.
2 See https://nlltribe.com/land-acknowledgement.
3 www.upenn.edu/almanac
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