

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

Committee 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 the 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.

2018-2019 Specific Charges

1. Review and comment on the affordability of a Penn education for all undergraduate and graduate students by considering expenses related to tuition, fees, and costs-of-living and to socioeconomic and cultural concerns of both first generation and low-income students and of middle-income and other students.

2. In collaboration with the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty, and school-based representatives, review and comment on existing preparation provided to classroom instructors (e.g., teaching assistants and full-time/part-time/adjunct faculty).

Summary of Committee Activity

The Committee met five times during the 2018-2019 academic year. At the first meeting, the Committee reviewed the charges and established a working strategy for the year. In the second meeting, Bruce Lenthall (Executive Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning) provided an overview of the type of teaching preparation programs that exist at the various schools through the Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL). In the third meeting, the Committee debriefed on teaching preparation opportunities and discussed the schedule for future invited guests. Beth Winkelstein (Vice Provost for Education) attended the fourth meeting, where the topic of instructor evaluations was discussed. Lastly, Anita Allen (Vice Provost for Faculty) was our invited guest for the fifth meeting where she provided perspective on the significance of teaching practice in tenure and promotion. All guests were provided a list of discussion questions/discussion points prior to meeting with the Committee.

Response to 2018-2019 Specific Charges

Overview:

Educational excellence is a central tenet of the University of Pennsylvania. Given the significance of this topic, we prioritized our efforts towards the specific charge of reviewing existing teaching preparation. The University is currently implementing strategies related to affordability, i.e. the Penn First Plus Program; hence the Committee thought it prudent to examine this charge during the 2019-2020 academic year when more data become available.

Teacher preparation generally falls under two categories: 1) individuals starting their careers (new faculty, adjuncts, teaching assistants) and 2) already established instructors (those who are interested in applying new educational strategies and/or who want to improve their teaching practice).

For new faculty and lecturers, teacher preparation programs are not standardized across the University and vary from school-to-school. For example, some schools/departments have several hour-long teaching preparation sessions prior to the start of the academic year. Other academ-

ic units hold workshops and/or provide online orientations for new instructors while some schools/departments do not provide any preparation programs. Teaching preparation sessions are often led by school representatives with or without collaboration/consultation with CTL. CTL's role in school-led teaching orientations often centers on general teaching tools such as: course planning and design, assignments, examination preparation, and managing student expectations. CTL also offers classroom observations for both new and established instructors and provides instructors with teaching feedback upon request.

CTL commits significant resources toward preparing teaching assistants for the classroom. For example, a three-day training program is offered to new doctoral teaching assistants and is a requirement for many before entry into the classroom. There are approximately 300 doctoral teaching assistants who go through this program each year from a variety of schools (not all schools participate). CTL also offers separate orientations for undergraduate and Master's student teaching assistants, as well as SAIL classes (Structured Active In-Class Learning). SAIL training consists of a four-session program on preparation, in which 40 teaching assistants per year participate (as referred by faculty). CTL likewise offers mini-courses for professional development and workshops (120 workshops attended by over 2,000 graduate students).

Established faculty utilize CTL for a variety of reasons. Some faculty self-initiate consultation with CTL because they want to change or improve their teaching practices. Some established faculty are referred by their department because of teaching practices that may have been identified as 'poor.' Approximately, 80 percent of faculty self-initiate consultations with CTL, while approximately 20 percent are referred (with mid-career faculty assuming the largest number). CTL also offers 50 to 60 teaching workshops per year for all faculty.

CTL is also expanding its involvement with online course offerings. CTL has been instrumental in helping faculty design online courses and is collaborating increasingly with central and school online design teams to address larger teaching concerns. CTL is working toward increasing faculty participation at all levels.

Instructor feedback is an important tool for evaluating teaching practice. Department chairs and individual schools provide oversight to faculty regarding teaching practice, and teaching evaluations are considered a significant part of the tenure and promotion process. Course evaluations from students are the principal mode used in evaluating teaching practice. They are conducted in both paper and electronic formats. The metrics from course evaluations are complicated and can be marred with biases toward subject area, class size, and faculty identity. The University is working to refine course evaluations and improve the manner of processing them. Individual academic units often use additional methods of assessing teaching practice such as faculty peer evaluations and alumni surveys. Teaching assistant evaluation data are often funneled through the faculty to whom they are assigned and teaching assistants who teach their own sections or labs may not receive evaluation data themselves. More work is needed to refine teaching evaluations at all levels.

CARA Conclusions/Recommendations

- The University's offerings for teacher preparation for new instructors are very robust. CTL provides many programs for teaching assistant preparation. CARA applauds these efforts and recommends maintaining such programs.

- Individual academic units often provide teacher preparation for their new instructors. CARA encourages CTL to continue to supplement individual academic units as needed and continue to reach out to schools that currently commit few resources toward teacher preparation. Likewise, schools should reciprocally reach out to CTL to enhance teacher preparation.

- The total number of established faculty using CTL (both self-referred or referred from department) is not very large but varies greatly across schools. CARA recommends that CTL and individual schools forge further connections to increase faculty utilization (i.e., publicize the excellent CTL resources and offerings for faculty). If successful in expanding that effort, more CTL resources and staff will be needed.

- Varying class formats and class sizes (e.g., online courses and large gateway courses) require niche teacher preparation. CARA recommends that CTL continue to expand its role in helping faculty develop these types of courses.

- A number of courses are taught by new instructors who may not be aware

(continued on page 2)

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

(continued from page 1)

of Penn's core teaching values. CARA recommends that a central document summarizing Penn's teaching values/aims be regularly circulated around the University.

- Diversity and wellness are integral elements of the classroom experience. CARA recommends that CTL develop formal relationships with the offices of Diversity and Inclusion and Wellness in order to more deeply include training in these areas for faculty across all schools.

- The validity and utility of course evaluations are often questioned. CARA recommends that the University continue to reassess and test methods to best reflect teaching practice and examine processes in peer institutions.

Recommendations for Future Charges

1. Review and comment on the affordability of a Penn education for all undergraduate and graduate students by considering expenses related to tuition, fees, and costs-of-living and to socioeconomic and cultural concerns of both first generation and low-income students and of middle-income and other students.

2. Review and comment on admissions practices for all undergraduate students.

Committee Membership

Chair: Joe Libonati; **Faculty:** Julie Fairman, Daniel Raff, Marc Schmidt, Lisa Servon, Alan Strudler, Guobin Yang; **Graduate and Professional Students:** Gregory Callahan, Rina Madhani; **Undergraduate Students:** Dhruv Iyer, William Yoo; **PPSA:** Yuhong He, Patty Lynn; **WPPSA:** Rhonda Kirlaw; **Administrative Liaison:** Leo Charney; **Staff:** Diane Fasset

Committee on Campus and Community Life

Committee General Charges

The Committee on Campus and Community Life

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

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

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

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

2018-2019 Specific Charges

1. Continue to monitor the pathway of mental health care for students.

2. Continue to monitor the University's relationship to the surrounding community, with particular emphasis on community's experiencing increasing residency by Penn affiliates.

3. Continue to monitor pending real estate activities of concern to the community.

4. Review and comment on Penn's current internal communications activities, especially those pertinent to mental health care and University relations.

Summary of Committee Activity

The Committee met seven times during 2018-2019. The first meeting (9/17) included an overview of this year's charges as well as speakers who responded to the recommendations from last year's Committee. The second meeting (10/1) was devoted to discussing the current charges and possible speakers to address these. The third (11/15) and fifth (1/23) meetings featured speakers who addressed Charge 2. The fourth meeting (12/3) included speakers who addressed Charge 3. The sixth meeting (2/14) included speakers to address Charge 1. The final meeting (3/11) was devoted to summarizing issues discussed and discovered to date and proposed recommendations.

Response to 2018-2019 Specific Charges

1. Continue to monitor the pathway of mental health care for students.

Issues discussed and discovered

In the past year, the development and implementation of the Chief Wellness Officer position in the Division of the Vice Provost for University Life (VPUL), and appointment of Benoit Dubé to this position, have contributed to enormous success and progress in expanding the definition

of wellness at Penn, as well as in implementation and utilization of wellness services at Penn. Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) has made significant strides in service delivery including the addition of 24/7 phone access to clinicians, and revamped appointment and intake process—which resulted in significant reductions in wait times and an increase in student satisfaction. CAPS also increased outreach efforts (e.g., training, workshops, orientations), and the diversity of clinicians. The Committee noted the successful search and hiring of the new CAPS Executive Director, Greg Eells, who started at Penn in March 2019. The intentional efforts to increase the breadth and accessibility of CAPS services appear to be successful, and CAPS has added a full-time referral coordinator to assist students who want, and need, clinical care in the community. However, the Committee noted that with a distinct focus on CAPS and the services it is designed to offer to students, comparatively little outcome data are available about transitions of care and the referral pathway for students who are referred out of CAPS for short-term or long-term specialty care. Though the referral coordinator assists students seeking care in the community, and Student Health Services has staff who oversee and manage insurance questions that arise from non-CAPS care, once students have been discharged from CAPS, relatively little seems to be known about their wellness, functioning, or ongoing ability to access needed services, despite, in many cases, continuing to be Penn students.

The Committee also noted that many of the most visible mental health related activities and services are geared towards undergraduates, with more limited visibility of resources and services for graduate and professional students, and post-doctoral fellows/researchers. Existing services and resources include weekend CAPS hours added primarily to address the needs of professional students who face challenges presenting at CAPS during weekday business hours, and an embedded CAPS clinician program which began as a pilot in the professional schools to meet professional students' unique needs and demanding schedules. This program grew to have CAPS clinical staff residing in Dental Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Medicine, and Law, and further expanded in AY18-19, to serve the Wharton community, from Ph.D. students to MBA to undergraduates. Also in AY18-19, CAPS trained and helped launch "Penn Franklins," a peer listening group of, and for, graduate and professional students, modeled after Penn Benjamins, a similar group that has regular hours to address peer issues among undergraduates. Other programs, including dedicated group therapy programs for graduate/professional students, the I CARE program, and the "Day of Play," part of the broader "Thriving at Penn" initiative, reflect partnerships among the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA), the Undergraduate Assembly (UA), and VPUL. Nonetheless, faculty, professional students, and post-doctoral researchers are not necessarily aware of these resources/services as they are launched and implemented. Faculty also are not always aware of services (through CAPS, the Student Health Service, and the Weingarten Learning Resources Center within the Office of Student Disabilities Services) available for students who self-disclose and/or present documentation of conditions such as psychological/psychiatric disabilities and autism spectrum disorders.

(continued on page 3)

Committee on Campus and Community Life

(continued from page 2)

Recommendations

1. Design and implement a systematic measure of referral tracking/care transition for students requiring mental health services beyond CAPS. Consider assigning a dedicated care coordinator for anyone who comes through CAPS to ensure transitions are successful throughout the student's pathway of care for the remainder of their time at Penn.

2. Broaden visibility and thus accessibility of mental health resources available for professional and graduate students, and post-doctoral researchers/fellows. Enhanced visibility could, for example, include links and brief descriptions on academic program websites (e.g., the Biomedical Graduate Studies website) as well as targeted media and social media awareness campaigns. Small, easily implemented changes could also be modeled after the efforts for undergraduates and have some impact, for example, the "relaxation room" already added to the biomedical library. Enhance visibility of resources available for students who disclose conditions and for whom special supports/services/resources may be needed.

2. Continue to monitor the University's relationship to the surrounding community, with particular emphasis on communities experiencing increasing residency by Penn affiliates

Issues discussed and discovered

During AY17-18, CCCL heard from leaders in the neighborhoods west of Penn campus, south of Market Street. Because of increasing development and Penn presence in neighborhoods north of Market Street (e.g., Penn Presbyterian campus), the Committee focused this year's discussion on community relationships in these Powelton area neighborhoods. While acknowledging that Drexel is the primary academic institution in that area, the Committee heard that Penn has engaged with neighborhoods in several ways, including promoting access to health care, education, and economic development. In particular, Penn is contributing to the renovation of Saunders Park (39th-40th and Powelton), a public green space adjacent to Penn Presbyterian campus. Penn's Graduate School of Education (GSE) and the Netter Center are involved in the Alain Locke School District of Philadelphia public school (45th & Haverford). The Provident Mutual Building (46th & Market) is a major development project by the Philadelphia Health Management Corporation, described as an "octopus" health campus—a center that includes other smaller non-profits and would be a federally qualified health center. It is expected that Penn Medicine will have some presence in this health center. Penn Presbyterian is a Level I trauma center requiring helicopter transport, which creates substantial noise and disturbance for some nearby residents. The University has worked with the community to attempt to mitigate this issue. In addition, a new Radiation Oncology building is being built on the Penn Presbyterian campus.

Specific issues associated with portions of the neighborhoods north of Market St. were identified. These neighborhoods are part of the Promise Zone, which occupies roughly two square miles in West Philadelphia—Schuylkill River to east, Girard Ave. to north, 48th Street to west, Sansom St. to south. This Promise Zone is one of five such regions in the United States designated in 2014 by President Obama as locations of deep and persistent poverty and targeted for greater opportunities by enhancing access to education and jobs and by decreasing crime. In conjunction with the City, Drexel University is the primary academic institution involved in this effort. The Promise Zone has attracted a variety of researchers at many levels and from various local institutions who have approached residents about conducting research, but who do not necessarily provide feedback or results to individual participants or community leaders. This research recruitment influx led the community to initiate a West Philadelphia Promise Zone Research Connection, which seeks to "ensure accountability, community involvement and data sharing for all research conducted in the Promise Zone to ensure that resources are mobilized for, and benefit, the community." There is also tremendous development pressure from "flippers" in these neighborhoods. Mold and lead stemming from demolitions are a major health issue. The Committee learned of some opportunistic forces at work in the context of this development pressure, contributing to issues of predatory lending, title disputes and theft, and lack of historical preservation. Some programs at Penn are aiming to provide tailored education and programming for community residents—consumer advocacy, and assistance in keeping people in their homes. Students from

several nearby academic institutions, attracted by new development, are beginning to reside in these areas (e.g., 39th & Haverford).

Consistent with last year's reports from community leaders southwest of Penn campus, community leaders in the Powelton area expressed some concerns about the increasing presence of students and other young people who are not always as invested in the community and may be "un-neighborly" to long-time residents. There is an overall perception of increasing parties, trash, litter and noise, and a sense that some students have not yet learned to be responsible tenants. There was also concern that some students may unknowingly support "slum landlords" by renting from absentee landlords who poorly manage their properties, which contributes to quality of life issues for surrounding homeowners. While historic and contemporary data about off-campus housing trends for Penn students suggest that few lived in the areas north of Market St., it is possible that the rapid development of student oriented housing has attracted more Penn students in recent years. Community leaders acknowledged the lack of clarity as to which local institution any given student attends, but also expressed uncertainty about the appropriate contacts at Penn to discuss such concerns. They also shared an interest in having a greater Penn delegate presence at their community meetings. They suggested incorporating community input or reviews into off-campus housing listings so that students may make more informed decisions about landlords. The new requirement for first- and second year Penn undergraduates to live on campus, along with the construction of the New College House West (near 40th & Walnut Streets), may attenuate some of the Penn student presence within the broader West Philadelphia neighborhoods. However, the Committee noted that Penn affiliates not only include undergraduate students, but also graduate students, post docs, faculty, and staff. The "imprint" of Penn affiliates, defined more broadly, seems to be under continuing and ongoing expansion and is viewed in some ways as a successful outcome of the University's many programs and resources aimed at increasing the services and desirability of the surrounding neighborhoods. However, it is unclear whether the distribution of resources is consistent with the current geographical span of Penn affiliates. In addition, as noted by the Committee in prior years, the community remains unaware of some resources available to them.

Recommendations

1. Evaluate the span and density of Penn affiliate residency in West Philadelphia neighborhoods by aggregating data of students, other Penn's affiliates, and Penn itself. Data points for a heat map, perhaps developed by the Executive Vice President's office, could include students/post-doc/staff/faculty residential addresses, including Penn housing program recipients, and Penn-owned properties.

2. Consider how this affiliate map may be used to evaluate the distribution of resources (e.g., Penn Police patrol zone; Penn escort/bus services; collaborations with University City District on other services provided, such as trash/litter removal) within the surrounding neighborhoods.

3. Consider a portal, real-time website, or a centralized resource (with contact information) geared towards providing information about available resources to neighborhoods within Penn's span.

4. For neighborhoods that are identified as growing in the number of Penn affiliates but that also have a heavy concentration of affiliates of other area universities, consider collaborative efforts among institutions regarding resources and points of contact.

5. In the neighborhoods closest to Penn Presbyterian, consider greater representation of Penn delegates at community meetings and events. For example, community leaders expressed interest in hearing directly from hospital representatives, early in the planning process, regarding the significance or importance of new constructions (e.g., the radiation oncology building).

6. Incorporate community in decision-making and training for off-campus living skills into the Second Year Experience, and include reports or reviews from community members into off-campus housing listing or materials.

7. For community-based research, increase efforts to foster awareness across University researchers in the importance of providing research feedback or reports to community participants and leaders. Because some research occurs in the context of student class projects and research projects assigned by individual faculty members and may not be subject to

(continued on page 4)

Committee on Campus and Community Life

(continued from page 3)

Institutional Review Board (IRB) review, planned research should minimally be brought to the attention of undergraduate deans. To minimize “research fatigue” and participant burden of particularly “targeted” subgroups, it may also be important to consider ways to coordinate faculty/student research efforts across courses or independent studies, for example in consultation with curriculum Committees. For protocols under Penn IRB regulatory control, the IRB perhaps in coordination with the Netter Center, could be consulted for development of University-wide guidelines or procedures for researchers to disseminate their findings to relevant communities.

3. Continue to monitor pending real estate activities of concern to the community

Issues discussed and discovered

Retail and housing development on and around Penn campus continues to grow at a rapid pace. Construction of the New College House West (40th & Walnut) began in AY18-19 and will be a 450-bed, 250,000 square foot residential building for sophomores, juniors, and seniors. This development went forward with input from the surrounding community. Those who live and/or work on or near campus desire a range of affordable retail options. The Committee noted that selection of some retail options on campus, in Penn-owned properties, are not necessarily geared toward the wider Penn or neighboring communities. For example, Committee members observed that the recently developed Franklin’s Table food court, which opened in AY18-19, features high-cost fare. Some vendors at Franklin’s Table initially did not accept cash, which was seen as prohibitive for some community members and Penn staff, and raised socioeconomic concerns. In March 2019, the city of Philadelphia became the first city in the U.S. to pass a ban against cashless stores, so the Franklin’s Table stores that did not accept cash will have to begin accepting cash in AY19-20 or face fines.

Recommendations

1. Include input from representatives of various stakeholder groups (staff, faculty, students, community members) in making decisions regarding retail options on and near Penn’s campus.

2. Continue engaging in discussions with the community regarding the New College House West development and its impact on the neighborhood.

4. Review and comment on Penn’s internal communications activities, especially those pertinent to mental health care and University relations

Issues discussed and discovered

The Committee was provided an overview of major methods of internal communications at Penn. The Committee learned the process for the development of the communications protocol regarding deaths of students and was impressed with the appropriateness and soundness of this approach. Such communications to students appear strong. Communications to the Penn community about University activities, especially through *Penn Today*, disseminate very well the accomplishments of faculty and students. *The Daily Pennsylvanian (DP)*, which is an independently run 501(c)(3) organization, receives no faculty guidance or oversight, yet has a significant impact on the image of Penn, both inside and outside of the institution. It may sometimes be misinterpreted, both internally and externally, as an official source of University news or information. Official University communications may then see the need for a counter-voice or balancing of perspectives through other outlets.

Recommendations

1. Though the *DP* is independent of Penn, the Committee recommends maintaining a relationship and regular communications with *DP* editors. In addition, Penn should revisit with *DP* editors the possibility of a University staff or faculty advisor, to assist the *DP* staff in best practices and journalism principles (e.g., media guidelines for reporting suicide).

2. Consider complementary strategies to disseminate news at Penn, for example through a “student news bureau” organized and facilitated by Annenberg.

Recommendations for Future Charges

1. Continue to monitor the entire pathway of mental health care for students.

2. Continue to monitor the University’s geographical “imprint” and relationships with the surrounding community, including housing issues, off campus behavior, and the use of these communities for scholarly research.

3. Review and comment on Penn’s communications and public relations activities, especially as it pertains to Alumni and other constituencies.

4. Review and comment on current safety and security on Penn’s campus and the surrounding neighborhoods.

Committee Membership

Chair: Monica Calkins; **Faculty:** Maja Bucan, Brenda Casper, Delphine Dahan, Nancy Hodgson, Catherine McDonald, Mark Trodden; **Graduate and Professional Students:** Jennifer Phuong, Anubha Tyagi; **Undergraduate Students:** Jess Andrews, Oluwafeyikemi Makinde; **PPSA:** Traci Chupik, Tessa Mansell; **WPPSA:** Mariel Featherstone, Maureen Goldsmith; **Administrative Liaison:** Monica Yant Kinney; **Staff:** Emily Hobbs

Committee on Diversity and Equity

Committee General Charges

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.

2018-2019 Specific Charges

1. Review and comment on student experiences of microaggressions and bias and school mechanisms and practices for reporting and addressing.

2. Examine current and potential mechanisms and practices for campus wide information dissemination, particularly pertaining to topics and resources on diversity and equity.

3. Understand and comment on the difficulties of being a faculty of diversity (underrepresented minorities (URM), women, etc.), especially with regards to instances of bullying/microaggressions induced by senior faculty and staff.

Strategies and Focus of Inquiry

As the Committee for the 2018-2019 academic year was largely made up of members serving on the Committee for the first time (only three returning Committee members from 2017-2018), the chair decided to host an initial conference call to get all of the Committee members on board with the general charge of the Committee. Also discussed was what is expected of Committee members and how exactly the recommendations made by the Committee can influence University policies. This first conference call also served to start a preliminary discussion of the specific Committee charges, before the first in person meeting, that were selected by last year’s Committee. This initial meeting set the stage for future meetings of the Committee.

Number of Meetings

The Committee had three conference calls and four in person meetings over the academic year.

Summary of Committee Activity

1. The Committee had its first conference call on October 17, 2018. The purpose of the conference call was to introduce all the new Committee members to each other, and also to discuss the specific Committee charges and ways to tackle these charges during the upcoming year, with the possibility of revising the language around some of the charges. At this first conference call, Sam Starks went over what was discussed by last year’s Committee and how these new charges came to be. The two charg-

(continued on page 5)

Committee on Diversity and Equity

(continued from page 4)

es recommended by last year's Committee were numbers 1 and 2 above, "Review and comment on student experiences of microaggressions and bias and school mechanisms and practices for reporting and addressing," and to "Examine current and potential mechanisms and practices for campus wide information dissemination, particularly pertaining to topics and resources on diversity and equity." Some questions about what confidential resources exist for students were discussed, and reporting structures for students and faculty/staff that are different from one another. Overall, it was felt that the chain of command is not always clear, and that the current system may not also have enough confidentially around reporting.

2. The Committee had the first in person meeting on November 6, 2018 to discuss the 2018-2019 charges. A discussion on the first charge concerning student experiences of microaggressions and bias, and school mechanisms and practices for reporting, were led by Sam Starks. He described how this charge was implemented following comments from students during the *Listening to Diversity* forum. The Committee also discussed and agreed to host the *Listening to Diversity* forum again in the spring. The undergraduate students on the Committee, Luke Kerner and Oluwafeyikemi (Feyi) Makinde, led a discussion on the Bias Form and information dissemination. They mentioned how they either would rather talk to one another about concerns or, in the case of a classroom bias/aggression, would rather comment on this in the course review. The second charge of examining the current and potential mechanisms and practices for campus wide information dissemination were then discussed. Students said they go to familiar websites and they prefer to obtain text messages and emails. Sam Starks mentioned that Penn has a Diversity@Penn website designed to keep the Penn community informed. It was asked if metrics on the usage of that website could be obtained. It seemed like everyone was more or less content with how all types of information are disseminated at Penn through email, phone messages, texts, websites, departments, centers, etc., for all student, staff and faculty levels.

3. The Committee had a second conference call on November 14, 2018 to continue to discuss finalizing the 2018-2019 charges. We started the meeting with a discussion on the Bias Form, but it was realized that there is not enough data on usage of the Bias Form (which just went live in the fall) to assess its effectiveness. Dr. Irina Marinov spoke about bias and how it affects male and female faculty, and that there may be a need for mechanisms for submitting formal complaints. This then led the Committee to slightly switch to a conversation on bullying and macroaggressions, specifically at the faculty level. The Committee asked if Penn offers training that addresses bullying and microaggressions of faculty, and Sam Starks noted that Penn does have this type of training, but that it is not mandatory for faculty. He suggested that we invite someone from Faculty Affairs to give the Committee an overview of training in this area, but that the Committee's focus needs to be focused in scope. The meeting concluded with a conversation about reporting, with notes that each school has its own reporting structure and that the Ombuds Office is also a good place for mediation.

4. The Committee had a meeting on December 12, 2018 to continue discussing finalizing the 2018-2019 charges. The Committee again discussed the Bias Report Form and how it could be distributed campus wide, as it was felt it might not be readily accessible to everyone. Sam Starks noted that the Bias Report Form is governed by Joann Mitchell who disseminates the concerns outlined in the report to the appropriate resource (school, department, or center) within the University community. He further mentioned the AAU Climate Survey that would be occurring this year, and it was suggested that the Committee invite Joann Mitchell, Vice President of Institutional Affairs & Chief Diversity Officer, to discuss the survey and how it is specific to Penn. The Committee then had a discussion on latent bias training, and the imbalance of power regarding junior faculty here at Penn. Some Committee members noted that their departments have some types of this training that urges colleagues to attend, but that the content does not make anyone feel singled out. Eric Schelter added that Penn should provide a safe setting to encourage and support faculty, particularly URM and women, to speak about their concerns. The meeting ended with a Latent Bias presentation by Lubna Mian (Executive Director, Faculty Affairs) which highlighted topics on Unconscious Schemas, Inconsistent Standards, Gendered Praise, and Bias Interrupters. The presentation was incredibly well received by the Committee, who wished

this presentation could somehow be seen by faculty in all departments.

5. The Committee had the first conference call of the new year on January 16, 2019. The Committee continued their discussion of biases faced by junior faculty. Dr. Marinov spoke about discrimination and harassment that is endured by female junior faculty, and mentioned that this topic of faculty "bullying" is now being reviewed by scientific societies such as the American Geophysical Union (AGU). She agreed to send everyone handouts regarding harassment and discrimination that she had been given at an AGU society conference workshop. Eric Schelter then led a discussion on how the Committee could advocate and raise awareness for junior female faculty who may be experiencing biased behavior. It was discussed if there was a way to survey junior faculty to get more information on what they might be experiencing and what resources might be accessible. Sam Starks mentioned the Gender Equity/Minority Equity Reports, which are now combined in the Faculty Inclusion Report produced through the Provost's office, and that he would report back with a brief summary on it at the next meeting. It was asked if the Committee could be given more information about the questions on the survey, how data is collected, and what Penn is doing in response to the report. The Committee decided to add a new charge for this year, "Understand and comment on the difficulties of being a faculty of diversity (URM, women, etc.), especially with regards to instances of bullying by senior faculty and staff." The Committee created the first sub-Committees of the year with Angela Rivers and Tiffany Perkins reporting back on the Bias Report Form, Eric Schelter and Irina Marinov scheduling a meeting with Lubna Mian (Faculty Affairs) to discuss female junior faculty issues, and Tiffany Perkins leading resource gathering on the staff survey.

6. The Committee held its next meeting on January 30, 2018. The Committee discussed reviewing Penn's code of ethics, and noted that there are numerous links when reviewing faculty and staff policies. Irina Marinov sent a PDF file and link to the group on the topic of faculty harassment and bullying. The conversation included that Penn's academic code of integrity needs to be addressed and, if found lacking, suggestions to update the language could be recommended. It was asked if Lubna Mian's "Latent Bias" presentation could be streamlined to include issues surrounding female junior faculty. Eric Schelter and Irina Marinov agreed to bring this up with her at their upcoming meeting with her. It was settled that the Committee would first start with reviewing the Penn *Faculty Handbook* and *Principles of Responsible Conduct* at the next meeting to begin to explore this topic.

7. The Committee held its last meeting of the academic year on March 18, 2018. The primary focus of this meeting was a discussion of the Penn *Faculty Handbook* and *Principles of Responsible Conduct*. In reading through the various links of the Principles of Responsible Conduct, there were a couple places that described ethical and responsible conduct of faculty, especially with regards to respect in the workplace, and also in reporting suspected violations. However, the Committee found the text/language surrounding many areas of faculty microaggression and harassment were lacking (i.e., complaints against faculty, and policy against retaliation). While text additions to the Penn *Faculty Handbook* and *Principles of Responsible Conduct* need to be made, it was also discussed that these additions will not solve major problems without a culture change on campus that needs to come from the top down administratively.

Listening to Diversity: A Forum for the Penn Community

On March 13, 2019, the *Listening to Diversity* forum was sponsored by the University Council Committee on Diversity and Equity, the Faculty Senate, and the Penn Forum for Women Faculty. *Listening to Diversity* is a public forum that will provide all members of Penn's campus community the opportunity to voice their concerns and share their suggestions for how to work together to bring about change. The *Listening to Diversity* Forum was very well attended by faculty and staff across all of Penn. One of the issues that came out prominently at the Diversity Forum is the large discrepancy in solving diversity and equity problems across various departments and schools at Penn. Specifically, some issues that get solved transparently in some departments and schools do not get solved in other departments. Speakers suggested that the morale of minority faculty and staff is connected in part to the training and interest of the deans of their schools in Equity/Diversity issues, as well as the programs put in place in their schools. Other topics that were discussed included:

- The need to increase hiring pools to include minorities

(continued on page 6)

Committee on Diversity and Equity

(continued from page 5)

- Eliminating barriers to success for administrative assistants
- Developing better working relations between the diverse populations at Penn
- Unconscious bias training for faculty and staff
- Recommend every school and center have a diversity Committee to address issues/concerns
- Penn needs to continue recognizing diversity as an intimate problem and deal with it as a campus
- Address structural issues that can hinder advancement and retention
- Address avoidance of raced based discussions in the classroom

Response to 2018-2019 Specific Charges

Charge 1: Review and comment on student experiences of microaggressions and bias and school mechanisms and practices for reporting and addressing.

The Committee had several discussions on the student experiences and mechanisms of reporting bias and microaggressions, and noted that many reporting schemes seem to be in place. Nevertheless, this is not always clear, as this exists in different places and forms within departments and schools. Student Committee members felt adequate mechanisms were also in place as well. The usefulness of the new Bias Form could not be determined, as it is new this year and there is not enough data to access. Nevertheless, the Committee felt that students had several avenues for reporting microaggressions and biases, and feel that this charge was discussed fully and no further recommendations were proposed.

Charge 2: Examine current and potential mechanisms and practices for campus wide information dissemination, particularly pertaining to topics and resources on diversity and equity.

This topic was brought forth from the *Listening to Diversity* session in 2018. Most Committee members felt that while information is available around resources and events, that it is often redundant across department/schools or uneven (i.e., some offices do a much better job than others). Specifically, it was noted that some schools are well served by their designated Office of Diversity (e.g., Medical School), while in other schools the burden of advancing on Equity/Diversity issues falls on the shoulders of the Deans, without a specialized office in place. This also raises issues of inequity in how some faculty/staff issues are resolved across the University (better in some schools than in others). As Penn is a very decentralized institution, better coordination of information dissemination would make efforts to promote diversity more effective. The Committee's recommendation is that it would be better served if each school would consider creating/designating an Office of Diversity (some already exist, such as in the Perelman School of Medicine, Penn Nursing, and Penn Dental), and if those offices could better coordinate so that all students, faculty, and staff would get the same information from their respective schools. If Penn created a centralized Equity/Diversity office, to be led by the newly announced position of an Associate Vice President for Equity and Title IX Officer, this could serve as the epicenter for such cross-school coordination to take place.

Charge 3: Understand and comment on the difficulties of being a faculty of diversity (URM, women, etc.), especially with regards to instances of bullying/microaggressions induced by senior faculty and staff.

Several Committee members commented that there are various challenges and issues that URM and women junior faculty face pre-tenure, and that often this is a result of "bullying" by senior faculty members and staff. The Committee has studied Penn's *Responsible Code of Conduct and Faculty Handbook*, and determined that language surrounding bullying/intimidation of faculty by other faculty is severely lacking. This is especially evident when comparing Penn's policies to other universities and professional societies that have recently added such guidelines/policies covering faculty bullying into their official handbooks. This was unanimously accepted by the Committee as a new charge for this academic year, and we are still in the middle of deciding on new language recommendations for the Penn *Responsible Code of Conduct and Faculty Handbook*. Next year, we will look for ways for Penn to improve and expand the discussion and resources for bullying, hostile and intimidating behavior (microaggressions), gendered harassment, and non-violent sexual harassment. These harassments need to be defined clearly and more extensively in the newly proposed Penn sexual harassment policy (and other relevant policies) and specifically in the *Faculty Handbook* (https://provost.upenn.edu/policies/faculty-handbook/other-policies/vi-e#_ftn2). Mechanisms need to be put in place at Penn to address these issues, e.g., via a centralized website (see for example <https://hr.wisc.edu/hib/>), by defining clear codes of faculty and staff conduct, and by finding ways to take action against aggressors and to support victims.

Recommendations for Future Charges

As most of the Committee was made up of new members (including the chair), the Committee took a little longer to get settled in and focus our diverse thoughts on the two charges recommended from last year. Additionally, due to strong discussions on microaggressions, the Committee added one new charge this year on understanding the microaggressions junior faculty face. Therefore, we recommend that we continue our work next year on 2 of the 3 charges we tackled this year as listed below:

1. Examine current and potential mechanisms and practices for campus wide information dissemination, particularly pertaining to topics and resources on diversity and equity to have a better centralized effort in these areas.

2. Understand and comment on the difficulties of being a faculty of diversity (URM, women, etc.), especially with regards to instances of bullying/microaggressions induced by senior faculty and staff to support setting up mechanisms at Penn to address the issues.

Committee Membership

Chair: Ben Garcia; **Faculty:** DaCarla Albright, H. Gerald Campano, Antonio Garcia, Irina Marinov, Timothy Rommen, Eric Schelter, Ebony Thomas; **Graduate and Professional Students:** Francisco Saldaña, Laronda Thompson; **Undergraduate Students:** Luke Kertcher, Oluwafeyikemi Makinde; **PPSA:** Cynthia Kwan, Kathy Tang; **WPPSA:** Tiffany Perkins, Angela Rivers; **Administrative Liaison:** Sam Starks; **Staff:** Kuan Evans

Committee on Facilities

Committee General Charges

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.

2018-2019 Specific Charges

1. Continue to monitor progress of all-gender restrooms on campus.
2. Continue to monitor tobacco-free initiatives on campus.
3. Continue to monitor the bicycle, commuting, and parking program, and explore traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety on campus.
4. Review and comment on Penn Connects and Climate Action Plan initiatives.

Summary of Committee Activity

The Committee met six times during 2018-2019. In addition to scheduled meetings to address our specific charges, meeting time was scheduled for orientation, review of our general charges, and time dedicated to discussion of any formal recommendations from the Committee and review of our final report.

Response to 2018-2019 Specific Charges

1. Progress on All-Gender Restrooms on Campus

This charge was discussed by Committee at the meeting on December 3, 2018. We welcomed Erin Cross, Director of the LGBT Center, as a guest to our meeting.

Erin Cross and Taylor Berkowitz gave a presentation on all-gender restrooms on campus, providing critical insight and experience in this area to the Committee. Philadelphia is the 6th friendliest LGBT City in the US and Penn has been named the #1 trans-friendly campus. The average transgender population nationally is 0.5 percent, the Penn campus has 3 percent of its students identified. This does not account for staff or faculty. It was explained that the students/staff/faculty who work or study in a building without an all-gender restroom can sometimes have health issues from trying to go extended amounts of time between restroom breaks. All-gender restrooms serve everyone and work better for families or those who may need assistance. As an urban campus, space is an extremely valued commodity, particularly when balancing programmatic and social needs on a complex,

(continued on page 7)

Committee on Facilities

(continued from page 6)

diverse, and interdisciplinary campus. Further, many of our historic buildings do not have any single-use restrooms and cannot be easily retrofitted. Single-use restrooms also separate and exclude a segment of the population.

In 2011, the Provost's Office, VPUL, LGBTTC, and Facilities and Real Estate Services formed a partnership to identify and convert 80 single-use restrooms to all-gender. An online map identifying the over 120 current locations of all-gender bathrooms is on the FRES website: (<https://www.facilities.upenn.edu/maps/printing-campus-map>). We have continued to identify the need to convert and add new all-gender restrooms on campus. With the renovation of Hill College House, all of the restrooms in the residence hall are all-gender, including the multi-stall restrooms on the residence floors. The multi-stall all-gender restroom is desired because not all buildings have a single-use restroom, and it is considered more inclusive since it does not isolate or exclude anyone, and is a growing trend nationally both at educational institutions, theaters, and restaurants. The University engaged an architect in a feasibility study to determine the scope and order of magnitude costs to convert a gendered multi-stall restroom to an all-gender multi-stall restroom. The project Committee which consisted of representatives from the Provost's Office, LGBTTC, FRES, and five Schools/Centers, agreed on the characteristics and guidelines necessary for the conversion: visual openness at the entrance with glazed entry doors; maximum privacy between the stall with either a partition system or full height walls; each stall or toilet room needs ventilation and lighting; multiple panic alarms and more circulation space by the sinks; and eliminate sight traps at the entrances. The signage standard is the same as for the single-use all-gender restrooms and should just state "Restroom," along with a room number. In public areas the sign may state "All Gender Restroom." It is up to the individual Schools and Centers to prioritize the conversion during restroom upgrades and improvements. The renovation costs for a conversion to all-gender for a multi-stall restroom is more than a typical refresh or replacement of fixtures, so funding is critical.

Recommendations

The Committee overall is pleased with the progress that has been made here, but recommends continued effort to convert more gendered restrooms to all-gender, in particular, the multi-stall restrooms. We understand that these conversions are an active process, the Committee would like to follow the progress of these conversions over the next year and potentially begin to specifically identify publically accessible and classroom buildings on campus without all-gender restrooms. The Committee also recommends that central administration consider novel ideas to incentivize conversions in Schools or central administrative buildings where all-gender bathrooms do not exist.

2. Tobacco-Free Initiatives on Campus

The Committee discussed this topic on January 29, 2019, and welcomed Ashlee Halbritter, Director Campus Health, to aid in the discussion.

In 2015, Penn updated its no smoking policy to include e-tobacco products, hookahs, and certain outdoor areas. In 2017, the policy was revised again to include all outdoor spaces. The campus has been non-smoking since this point. As an urban campus, public sidewalks will continue to be a location where smoking is allowed, although with a continued culture change it is hoped that the number of smokers on campus will continue to decrease. The policy is written in the spirit of a culture of compliance rather than enforcement. The efforts have been focused in communications, removing environmental cues such as tobacco urns, and providing tobacco cessation resources. Information is included in New Student and Staff Orientations, on lawn signs 1-2 times per year, no smoking symbols have been added to the campus open space blades, directional signage, and exterior campus maps, and an online map of tobacco-free spaces is on the Facilities website. In the future, the team would like to see each school get more personally involved in the tobacco-free campus efforts. Each School/Center is so distinctive, and has the most direct communication with their constituents, that their direct involvement would likely have a stronger impact. The Committee is also interested in the current and long-term effects of the use of e-tobacco products are having on our community, including compliance within the program.

Recommendations

The Committee is pleased with the progress being made in this area, but wishes to continue to monitor this initiative, particularly the effects of e-tobacco products.

3. Bicycle, Commuting, and Parking Programs

This charge was reviewed at our meeting held on February 25, 2019.

This year's review focused primarily on campus vehicular circulation. Mark Kocent provided an update to the 2009 Campus Traffic and Circulation Study. To date, all of the recommendations from the 2009 Study have been implemented, with the exception of an upcoming 2020 PennDOT construction project to calm traffic on the I-76 eastbound exit at University Avenue. The University has just completed a new study for 2018, with Facilities and Real Estate Services, Penn Medicine, Business Services, and Public Safety represented on the Committee for the 2018 Study that focused on the health system precinct. There were 51 intersections looked at in the study, the most critical is the intersection at 34th Street and Grays Ferry Avenue, which has a very low capacity. The second lowest capacity intersection is South Street and Health Sciences Drive. The University is just completing this study and is exploring options to improve these areas with other stakeholders including the City of Philadelphia. Future plans by the University to improved campus traffic include clear wayfinding and destination signage; widen Health Sciences Drive toward South Street; encourage increased service to University City train station once the SEPTA 2020 Arsenal Interlocking Reconstruction Project is complete; and investigate creating a quadrant interchange at 34th Street & Grays Ferry Avenue.

One issue that was raised by the Committee was the issue of delivery and service vehicles parking and blocking pedestrian pathways. The Committee Liaison acknowledged this as an on-going issue, which the University is currently working to improve but that may deserve continued monitoring by the Committee.

Recommendations

While the Committee has no formal recommendations, the Committee is impressed with the work the University continues to do to improve automotive traffic and safety throughout the University, specifically goals to improve traffic around the Health System. We eagerly await progress in this specific area once the results of the 2018 traffic survey are formally reviewed and further strategies can be developed. We recommend continued efforts to alleviate vehicular traffic near campus, including incentivizing public transportation and other modes of non-vehicular transportation. The Committee will continue to monitor progress, including issues that arise with parking and likely a more formal investigation of the issue of service and other vehicles parking on campus sidewalks.

4. Penn Connects Initiatives and Climate Action Plan

Two meetings were devoted to this charge.

On October 17, 2018, Mark Kocent, University Architect, gave a presentation on Penn Connects 3.0. Penn Connects, our campus master plan, was created in 2006, and then renewed with Penn Connects 2.0 in 2011. Penn Connects 3.0 is from 2017-2022, and utilizes the themes established in 2.0: Teaching & Scholarship; Research & Clinical Care; Living & Learning; Campus & Community; Past & Future Reinvestment. The Plan aligns the strategic vision, capital campaign, and campus development goals of the University. Phase 3, or 3.0, will add approximately 2.5 million square feet (sf) of new construction and renovate 600,000 sf of space. Specific projects and renovations were discussed in detail, including updates on current projects, including: Penn Medicine's Pavilion (including a pedestrian bridge from the University City Train Station to the hospital); Center for Healthcare Technology (including a new daycare facility); Wharton Academic and Research Building; New College House West; and the Penn Museum Renovation of the Coxe and Harrison Wing.

On November 14, 2018, the Committee held a meeting with multiple members of the Sustainability Office regarding implementation and progress of the Climate Action Plan.

The initiative started in 2007, when President Amy Gutmann signed the Presidential Climate Commitment. In 2009, the Climate Action Plan was written, and it was renewed in 2014 with Climate Action Plan 2.0. In the fall of 2019, a new sustainability plan will be launched. The initiatives or focus areas for the Plan are: academics, waste minimization & recycling; physical environment; utilities & operations; transportation; purchase practices; outreach & engagement. There is now a Sustainability Course Inventory, key academic initiatives, and an alternative spring break for students. Our campus has almost 300 species of trees, and over one million gross square feet of LEED certified buildings on campus. Bike parking spaces and repair stations continue to be added, and 49 percent

(continued on page 8)

Committee on Facilities

(continued from page 7)

of Penn employees use commuter benefits. Green catering practices, environmentally friendly print and online defaults, and Penn Marketplace enhancements contribute to better purchasing practices. Outreach and engagement continue with student, staff, and faculty eco-reps and the establishment of SAGE, the Student Advisory Group for the Environment.

There has been a 6 percent decrease in total landfill waste since 2014. The campus has an 11 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions since 2014. By 2042, the goal is to have over a 50 percent reduction from the baseline established in 2009. It is possible that Penn will have to participate in the purchase of carbon offset credits in order to meet the goal. It was noted that the Health System is not part of the current campus analysis. The issue of our carbon footprint due to air travel was extensively discussed during the meeting. Air travel in FY17 accounted for about 23 percent of total emissions, and in FY18 it was about 25 percent. Furthermore, this is only a partial accounting, as this data reflects air travel booked or reimbursed through our Concur system and does not reflect student travel expenses.

There were several concerns raised by the Committee regarding this charge. There were concerns raised by the Committee regarding why it will be necessary to buy carbon credits to meet our goal of 50 percent reduction of greenhouse gases by 2042. There were also concerns raised regarding the substantial impact of air travel on Penn's carbon footprint and whether Penn's current use of air travel is appropriate and justified based on its mission.

Recommendations

The Committee has no recommendations regarding Penn Connects initiatives. There is a concern regarding the University's Climate Action Plan and the Committee eagerly awaits the rollout of the University's sustain-

ability plan this fall. The Committee does see the tremendous progress the University has made to lower its carbon footprint, however, concerns have been raised by the Committee regarding the potential need for the University to buy carbon credits to meet its reduction goals. The significant impact air travel has on Penn's carbon footprint should be further explored to better understand the data. The Committee also feels that an awareness campaign to faculty and staff regarding the impact of air travel on the campus footprint may influence a positive behavior change.

Recommendations for Future Charges

The Committee feels that all of its specific charges are still active and should be continued for review by next year's Committee including:

1. Continue to monitor progress of all-gender restrooms on campus.
2. Continue to monitor tobacco-free initiatives on campus.
3. Continue to monitor the bicycle, commuting, and parking program, and explore traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety on campus.
4. Review and comment on Penn Connects and Climate Action Plan initiatives.

Specifically, of concern within these topics are the progress the University is making regarding all-gender restrooms, particularly multi-stall all-gender restrooms; and the substantial impact air travel is having on Penn's carbon footprint and whether the University's use of air travel is appropriate and can be justified based on its mission.

Committee Membership

Chair: Michael McGarvey; **Faculty:** William Braham, Erick Guerra, Jinyoung Kim, Allison Lassiter, Kathryn Michel, Claire Mitchell; **Graduate and Professional Students:** None appointed; **Undergraduate Students:** Amani Bey, Maria Curry; **PPSA:** Patrick Dolan, Tom Wilson; **WPPSA:** Laura Naden, Lara Fields; **Administrative Liaison:** Mark Kocent; **Staff:** Taylor Berkowitz

Committee on Personnel Benefits

Committee General Charges

The Committee on Personnel Benefits shall have cognizance over the benefits programs for all University personnel. The Committee shall consist of eight faculty members (of whom one shall be a member of the Senate Committee on the Economic Status of the Faculty), three representatives of the Penn Professional Staff Assembly, and three representatives of the Weekly-Paid Professional Staff Assembly. The vice president for human resources, associate provost, and director of benefits shall serve as non-voting ex officio members.

2018-2019 Specific Charges

1. Review and comment, as necessary with the Facilities Committee, on the availability of day care and lactation rooms for new parents and mothers.
2. Review and comment on the University health insurance plans and the potential impact of "Be In The Know" and related wellness programs.
3. Review and comment on expanded education and information to employees and retirees on financial planning for and throughout retirement.

Summary of Committee Activity

The Committee met four times during 2018-2019.

The Committee reviewed the Financial Wellness program, Retiree Medical program, and was updated on the program's budgetary status, and heard changes to the EAP (Employee Assistance Program). Penn Behavioral Health (PBH) chose not to continue as provider for behavioral services so the EAP business was moved to Health Advocate in July of 2018.

Retiree dental rates have increased but the coverage has been enhanced. The Committee also reviewed tuition benefits for retirees and eligible dependents, the availability of a Penn ID for retirees wishing access to the Library and gym, the ability to continue long-term care insurance, and their ability to access the Health Advocate for any needed assistance.

The Committee was informed that, for the active employee benefit plans FY20, net drug expenses showed a decrease, so that benefits contributions for employees will be held flat for the second year in a row. Dental rates will also be flat and there will be a reduction in Supplemental Life Insurance rates. Life Insurance has been moved to MetLife, and short and long term disability medical certifications will be administered by Broadspire.

The Committee noted that travel insurance is available for Business Travel via the International Services Office and Risk Management.

There is a continuing effort to review the opportunity to expand the Tuition Benefit Program to cover accredited special programs for dependents who cannot attend traditional undergraduate degree programs. Programs of this design are offered to those on the autism spectrum, but also available for other cognitive, emotional, and behavioral disabilities. Special programs are postsecondary non-degree granting opportunities to teach individuals life skills for use in the real world (e.g., social skills, academic skills, skills for basic life functions).

Response to 2018-2019 Specific Charges

The issue of day care and lactation rooms, inherited from the previous year, was reviewed. It is recognized that the availability and quality of these spaces varies. These rooms are the responsibility of the individual schools. As this is mainly a problem in the purview of Facilities, we do not recommend returning to this topic without material changes in circumstances.

We reviewed and commented on the University health insurance plans and the potential impact of "Be In The Know" and related wellness programs.

The Committee reviewed and commented on expanded education and information to employees and retirees on financial planning for and throughout retirement.

Recommendations for Future Charges

1. Review the University Health Benefits and insurance offerings for Active employees and Retirees.
2. The Committee should hear an update on University Wellness including Financial Wellness and Financial Education.
3. The Committee should be updated on Behavioral Health Benefits from Quest Behavioral Health (who will take over the services from PBH and Health Advocate (EAP)).

Committee Membership

Chair: Jonathan Moreno; **Faculty:** David Balamuth, Markus Blatz, Scott Harrington, Tanja Kral, Olivia Mitchell, Andrew Postlewaite; **Graduate and Professional Students:** N/A; **Undergraduate Students:** N/A; **PPSA:** Ashley Bush, Desiree Fleck, Adam Roth Saks; **WPPSA:** Darlene Jackson, Rhonda Kirlaw, Rosa Vargas; **Administrative Liaisons:** Jack Heuer, Susan Sproat; **Staff:** Melissa Brown