

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

General Committee Charge

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.

2021-2022 Specific Charges

1. Review and comment on current issues pertaining to Title IX. We should note that although this charge seems to be broad, we have specifically focused on Title IX as it pertains specifically to athletics for the past several years, since this charge was originally created through general charge (v) and last year's report specifically said that we needed to keep this focus.
2. Assess the University's need-blind admissions policy as well as its other initiatives for first-generation, low-income (FGLI) and middle to lower-middle income students, including the financial impact of the second-year housing and potential meal plan requirements, the ongoing progress of Penn First Plus programs, and the needs of specific populations, such as STEM and international students.

Summary of Committee Activity

The committee met seven times featuring different guests at all but our first introductory meeting where we set our agenda (September): Michele Rovinsky-Mayer, Associate Vice President for Equity & Title IX Officer to discuss Title IX issues pertaining to athletics (October); Alanna Shanahan, T. Gibbs Kane, Jr. W'69 Director of Athletics and Recreation; Rachel Kuperinsky, associate athletic director, compliance/senior woman administrator; and Rudy Fuller, senior associate athletic director, intercollegiate programs (November); Valerie De Cruz, director, Greenfield Intercultural Center; and Toyce Holmes, FGLI coordinator, Greenfield Intercultural Center (December); Marie Witt, vice president, Business Services; Karu Kozuma, executive director, College Houses and Academic Services; and Elaine Varas, senior university director of financial aid (January); members of the Student Athletic Advisory Committee (February); and Whitney Soule, Vice Provost and Dean of Admissions; and, again, Elaine Vargas, senior university director of financial aid (March).

Response to 2021-2022 Specific Charges

Title IX

1. Last year we recommended that DRIA's procedure for athletes to file complaints of gender inequities was too internal to DRIA, requiring students to begin by e.g. speaking with their coaches. Since such complaints ranged from equipment inequities to the possibility of "ghost athletes" to inappropriate behavior on the part of coaches such as bullying to extend-

ing practice beyond the prescribed time, causing students to be late to class—all anecdotal reports from past and then current student athletes—students needed resources outside DRIA. DRIA now provides a web page <https://pennathletics.com/sports/studev> that offers many different paths a student might follow. Director Alanna Shanahan is to be applauded for this change, as well as her attention to student-athletes' mental health and wellness. The promotion of associate director Rachel Kuperinsky to the position of compliance officer was also encouraging. The issue of funding equity was discussed, and the committee was told that DRIA seeks to share alumni donations across teams when there are corresponding teams—e.g. money donated to lacrosse or basketball is shared between the men's and women's teams, and alumni are informed of this. Gender-exclusive teams for which there is no corresponding team, such as football and sprint football, posed a greater challenge which was discussed. We also discussed the challenges of enrollment posed by such imbalances.

Recommendations:

- a. We applaud DRIA for its changes to procedures for student complaints. Its dedicated website was impressive. But the page is difficult to find from the Penn Athletics home page <https://pennathletics.com> (the student athletes we met with in February were unaware of it altogether). And once there, members of the committee also found it a bit overwhelming and imagine that many students do too. There are so many different paths a student athlete could take that determining which office to contact for which specific issue seemed overly difficult, leading to discouragement. Thus, the careful efforts of DRIA may end up producing the exact opposite result of what they intend. We recommend that 1) DRIA provide a clear link from their home page, and 2) edit this page to provide more direction, including perhaps hypothetical examples of particular issues and problems, pointing the best path forward for student athletes to take to resolve specific issues.
 - b. We also encourage the hiring of a DRIA-specific wellness officer or psychotherapist to help student athletes deal with the stresses unique to their experiences, such as Wharton has for its students.
2. In February, the committee met with members of the Student Athletic Advisory Committee (SAAC). An anonymous survey was sent beforehand to guide the committee's questioning, and several issues surfaced to be explored further: potential inequities in equipment, including locker room facilities; inequities in the provision of snacks for rehydration and energy restoration to assist with athletes' stamina; and the process of dealing with class absences required by practices and away games, including championship games, and mental health. These were the issues discussed with the SAAC representatives who were able to join us. We were particularly struck by reports of inequities in equipment, facilities, and food. Access to training staff also seemed to be an issue experienced by members of the women's teams, viz. less access provided in less formalized ways. Class absences were also an issue particularly stressed by the students, as currently it is up to individual student athletes to gain permission from individual professors to provide make-up exams and assignments, revealing that a number of professors are extremely unaccommodating. SAAC has conducted a survey of peer institutions that reveals a number of our peer institutions have policies in place to support student athletes in their requests and that either require or urge faculty to recognize the importance of athletics to a liberal arts education and to provide less burdensome accommodations. Their recommendations, which we support, are attached as an appendix with their permission.

Recommendations:

- a. Potential inequities in funding should be further pursued. Could certain female sports for which there is no equivalent men's teams, such as field hockey and volleyball, be paired with all-male sports like varsity football and sprint football?
- b. DRIA should advocate more strongly to the administration on the issue of course absences. Students cannot be left alone to deal with recalcitrant professors when they have conflicts with events that were not foreseen at the beginning of the semester, such as playoffs. For instance, letters from faculty coaches, or athletic directors, could carry more clout than requests by individual students. Penn has set a prec-

(continued on page 2)

Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

(continued from page 1)

udent in its policies concerning religious holidays, perhaps a similar policy could be developed along those lines. Students from SAAC, in fact, have developed such a proposal which we attach to this report and we urge the administration to consider it carefully. Though this may not obviously seem like a Title IX issue, since it presumably affects male and female students alike, it falls under CARA's general charge (v) listed above. Moreover, it is an area that holds considerable potential for professors to be affected by unconscious bias in setting their policies. Additionally, female teams and male teams have different practice times and game schedules and from the conversation with students, there seemed a distinct possibility that a number of female teams may have schedules that require more conflicts with courses and assignments than male teams—e.g. more weeknight games whereas men's games take place on weekends. There may be reasonable explanations for such inequities, such as the difficulties of juggling facility availability or coach availability, but if the results produce inequity, then those reasons need to be reassessed from different perspectives to see if there may be some underlying bias (e.g. are female teams more likely to be coached by overburdened or part time coaching staff?). These are questions that deserve further consideration and attention by DRIA.

First Generation/Low Income Students

1. Following discussions with Elaine Varas, Marie Witt, and Karu Kozuma in December, there appear to be significant disparities in how the University's costs of attendance are communicated to students, particularly as it pertains to the newly established requirements under the Second Year Experience (SYE). Student Registration and Financial Services (SRFS) has estimated the impact of this new requirement as significantly reducing the overall costs to FGLI second-year students. However, from survey results provided by the College Dean's FGLI Advisory Board, the requirement is unfavorable among FGLI students and perceived to be an overall financial burden.

Recommendation: Increase transparency surrounding the various costs of attendance through multiple channels of communication. This includes publicly posting the financial analyses by SRFS on a centralized platform, providing an in-depth breakdown of costs of attendance by Business Services, and tasking SRFS and GIC staff and student representatives to communicate the benefits of the SYE for FGLI students.

2. In January, following separate discussions with the Greenfield Intercultural Center (GIC) and Elaine Varas, international FGLI students are facing unique challenges unlike the rest of the FGLI community. First, international students often are unaware of what FGLI is and may be reluctant to identify as such. International students may not initially be proficient at articulating their needs or, in some cases, their circumstances may change dramatically while they are attending Penn, as has commonly happened throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. Second, international students are taxed on all grant-based financial aid which imposes unmet financial need that the University is not currently supporting.

A further question that remains unresolved, but of which Penn is aware, is Penn's current sub-matriculation policy, which re-characterizes undergraduates currently pursuing the MA degree as graduate students, which in turn changes their funding situation if they are receiving fellowship aid. The chair consulted with the new Vice Provost for Education Karen Delfsen and was told her office is aware of and concerned about this issue, that they were working on it, but that there was no easy fix.

Recommendation: Penn should increase support for international FGLI students. Financial support should be offered to offset the tax on grant money given to international students. Community support should be offered to assimilate international students into the FGLI community so that they are aware and able to use all the available resources. Furthermore, the sub-matriculation issue needs to be addressed as soon as possible, as it would seem a form of class discrimination, in effect barring students dependent on financial aid from taking advantage of the BA/MA option.

3. In our March meeting with Vice Provost and Dean of Admissions Whitney Soule and again with Senior University Director of Financial Aid Elaine Varas, they reported that the need-blind admission policy for domestic students does not inhibit low-income students' opportunity to be admitted—for instance, factors like an applicant's school's rates of col-

lege-bound seniors are used to infer a context of potential disadvantage in academic backgrounds which need-aware admissions might reveal more directly. They reported that FGLI admission has been slowly increasing each year. They also stated that the University cannot commit to need-blind admissions for international students. Admissions has also taken measures to increase FGLI representation on campus through initiatives such as Coalition for College, QuestBridge, and accepting any requests for application fee waivers not covered by the Common/Coalition Application. Since Dean Soule was just recently appointed to her position, she did not offer any substantial changes to the admissions process aside from amending the recommendation letter requirements to two teachers and one adult to allow for underfunded school districts. She also remained committed to including FGLI transfers in the enrollment plan of each class, which generally plans for approximately 200 admitted applicants.

Recommendation: Admissions and Financial Aid should meet with incoming University President M. Elizabeth McGill and commit to a deadline to achieve a need-blind admissions policy for international students.

Proposed Future Charges

1. Continue, under general charge (v), to pay attention to Title IX issues as they pertain to athletics.

- a. Investigate the course absence problem, including how Penn can best implement a policy that supports student athletes, including attention to issues of potential gender and racial disparities in the execution of any course absence policies.
- b. Investigate the possibilities concerning equity in team funding to provide better recharging stations for student athletes. Students' educational experience is compromised if they come to class depleted by training without adequate recovery and refueling. This requires more evidence-based data gathering and it is not clear how a University Council committee is situated to conduct such data gathering.
- c. Continue its attention to issues pertaining to the emotional and mental health and well-being of student athletes by further engagement with CAPS and exploration of other sources on campus for students to gain assistance with a wide variety of problems they may be having. This would include following up on last year's recommendation that CAPS start to collect anonymous data.

2. The Committee should continue its investigation of FGLI issues, particularly pertaining to:

- a. International students' participation in need-blind admissions, as well as other issues pertaining to international students' ability to afford their education at Penn, including better ways to facilitate the communication of appropriate information.
- b. Submatriculation as it pertains to the impact on FGLI students' financial aid.
- c. Given that we met with Whitney Soule during her first application cycle, the Committee should meet with her again to follow up on the need-blind admissions policy and any new methods to increase FGLI representation on campus.
- d. Other issues suggested by various committee members falling under the FGLI charge include:
 - i. The existence of student centers such as Greenfield or MAAKU provide excellent resources for many FGLI students, but do they create a "silo effect" that leaves the general culture of Penn unchanged? How can that culture be changed to make Penn more welcoming to FGLI students? This question should be further explored.
 - ii. Attention to minimum wages for student research assistants with financial need: is Penn keeping up with inflation?
 - iii. Specific issues pertaining to FGLI students interested in pursuing STEM fields.

Committee Membership

Chair: Nancy Hirschmann; **Faculty:** Montserrat Anguera, Jessa Lingel, Janice Madden, Mecky Pohlschröder, Paul Schmidt; **Graduate and Professional Students:** Jaydee Edwards, Hoang Anh Phan; **Undergraduate Students:** Xavier Shankle, Austin Smith; **PPSA:** Katherine Primus, Rashmi Kumar; **WPPSA:** Anna Boffice, Cyd Di Loretto; **Administrative Liaison:** Leo Charney; **Staff:** Jessie Burns

Appendix: University of Pennsylvania's Course Absence Policy

Prepared by Robin Panzarella, Piper Bond, Jackie Bruder, and Hannah Liu

The phrase “Ivy League” rose to fame in 1954 with the formation of the NCAA Division I athletic conference. The University of Pennsylvania has maintained its prestige and respect as one of eight Ivy League members ever since. Accordingly, student-athletes have been a fundamental part of the University of Pennsylvania since 1872, the Ivy League since 1954, and continues to be so today. This document addresses a large barrier that student-athletes face when representing the University and proposes a solution that would give student-athletes the opportunity to contribute to Penn’s legacy both on and off the field.

Current Policy

At the University of Pennsylvania, attendance policies are up to each professor’s discretion and often are communicated through a course’s syllabus. Some professors have strict attendance policies, while others have none at all. Through Penn InTouch, students may submit Course Absence Reports to notify a professor of their absence; however, these absences are not constituted as “excused.” Because of this, student-athletes can be penalized for missing class to represent Penn at a school-sponsored sports competition.

The Issue

During spring 2021, a survey was conducted with 7 athletic teams at Penn, gaining responses from roughly 30% of Penn’s student-athletes. Out of 290 respondents, 182 (62.8%) had lost points in a class due to an athletic competition, and 116 had dropped a class because a professor was not accommodating of their athletic competitions.

Student-athletes feel strongly that this lack of support from the University hinders their performance both in the classroom and on the playing field. In this survey, respondents were given an opportunity to share additional comments. To highlight a few:

- “Athletic events and competitions are mandatory and our commitment to this University in the sphere of sports. By no means should student-athletes be punished for simply fulfilling their obligation to this school.”
- “Both athletic and school performance is hampered due to conflicts with exams and competitions. Many students have to take exams while traveling in much less than ideal circumstances. More accommodations should be made for students-athletes as it is unfair that we are put into less favorable positions compared to the regular student.”
- “As an athlete, it’s already tough enough to make schedules without receiving any priority, so when we are able to make a schedule during our seasons, it is so tough to be penalized for something we are required to attend. Athletes really do the most to try and make it work on our end. I even took a test at 6 a.m. before a travel day. We would all really appreciate the University recognizing the work we put in during season by declaring absences for sports competition as excused.”

The Ivy League

Out of the seven other universities who compete in the Ivy League athletic conference, Columbia, Princeton, and Yale all recognize athletic competitions as excused absences in some form. While Cornell does not do so officially, their absence policy encourages professors to “respect the value of out-of-classroom learning that occurs through participation in varsity athletics and are expected to develop ways for course requirements to be met if and when there is a conflict with a student-athlete’s athletic schedule.”¹

At Columbia, a school-wide policy states that “student-athletes who miss classes and/or exams as a result of representing the University at an approved athletics contest may be permitted to make up the work and/or take the exam at another time or location.”²

At Princeton, “Missed classes due to travel for University-sanctioned competition are excused absences, but absence from class because of athletic competition does not excuse a student-athlete from any course requirements.”³

At Yale, “Dean’s Excuses may be issued to postpone exams, quizzes, and other generalized in-class assignments due to conflicts with varsity athletic competitions or travel.”⁴ Because of Penn’s lack of a school-wide attendance policy, using Yale’s current Dean’s Excuse format as a precedent is sensible.

Proposed Policy Changes

Ideal Proposal

The University of Pennsylvania must implement an official policy for excused absences.

Professors and faculty of the four undergraduate schools are expected to follow this policy. Students will submit absences through Course Absence Reports on the University’s student registration and information system, currently named Penn InTouch. Not only will this create consistency across courses and schools, but it will prevent confusion and unnecessary difficulties for both professors and students. For absences longer than five days, students must contact their school’s advising office.

The University of Pennsylvania’s list of excused absences for all students will include the following:

- Religious observance
- Family emergencies such as a death in the family
- Medical reasons
- Participation in varsity athletic competitions

Alternative Proposal

Penn’s varsity athletes may request a “Athletic Director’s Excuse” from their respective school to postpone exams, quizzes, and other in-class assignments due to conflicts with athletics competitions or travel to and from competitions. Student-athletes are required to notify their professor of these conflicts at the start of the semester or as soon as their team’s athletic schedule is finalized. Failure to do so may result in their school’s dean denying their request for a “Athletic Director’s Excuse.” If granted, a professor must honor the “Athletic Director’s Excuse” and coordinate with the student-athlete an appropriate accommodation.

To which student-athletes would this policy apply?

This policy change would apply to all varsity level sports, as indicated under “Teams” on www.pennathletics.com.

Final Thoughts

The University of Pennsylvania prides itself on having well-rounded students who have the opportunity to pursue and succeed in a number of endeavors. Athletics plays a large role in maintaining a holistic view that the University of Pennsylvania provides the necessities for students to triumph not only in academics but also in many other facets of life. Athletics has an impact on the entire university by contributing to school-spirit and entertainment in ways that other extracurriculars do not. In addition, athletics brings funding to the University of Pennsylvania through alumni donations from the Penn Champions Club, which raised over \$241 million in 2021⁵ for competitive excellence, student-athlete experience, attracting talent, and campus engagement. Student-athletes need more genuine support from the University of Pennsylvania to excel in all aspects of university life, and this policy change would have an enormous impact on that goal.

¹ <https://theuniversityfaculty.cornell.edu/the-new-faculty-handbook/6-policies-and-assistance/6-1-instruction/understanding-student-accommodations/>

² <https://bulletin.columbia.edu/general-studies/academic-policies/athletics-academic-absence/>

³ <https://goprincetontigers.com/sports/2021/9/9/student-athlete-handbook-2021-22.aspx>

⁴ https://s3.amazonaws.com/yalebulldogs.com/documents/2021/8/23/SAH_Final.pdf

⁵ <https://pennathletics.com/news/2021/11/3/general-penn-athletics-raises-241-million-during-game-onward-campaign.aspx>

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.

2021-2022 Specific Charges

1. Continue to review Penn's approach to providing social services for drug and alcohol use, and mental health promotion and explore how partnerships with Penn research and service organizations and external organizations impact the approach taken to address these issues for Penn affiliates and across the surrounding community.
2. Review and comment on public-facing information, the transparency of strategic planning, and monitoring of changes over time, as they relate to the impact of residency by Penn affiliates, Penn real estate and economic development, and public safety initiatives on the surrounding community.

Summary of Committee Activity

The committee met five times during 2021-2022. Meetings were supplemented with review of materials that informed committee members' understanding of the background and campus and community context for each charge. The first meeting (10/7) included an overview of the year's charges and substantive changes from the recommendations proposed by the 2020-2021 committee, discussion of each, and development of a list of speakers to inform a set of recommendations. The second meeting (12/8) was devoted to Charge 1, to learn about the scope and coordination of Penn's approach to providing social services for drug and alcohol use, and mental health promotion through Penn research and community engagement organizations. The third meeting (1/20) continued to address Charge 1 and was devoted to understanding the scope and coordination between the Penn Division of Public Safety, Allied Barton Security Services, and University City District Safety Ambassadors, as well as public-facing information on public safety initiatives and public safety concerns on the Penn Campus and surrounding communities. The fourth meeting (1/29) featured Tony Sorrentino, administrative liaison to this committee and a representative of the Office of the Executive Vice President, who responded to Charge 2. The fifth meeting (3/28) continued to address Charge 2 with a speaker from the Office of Government and Community Affairs and discussion of recommendations for current and future charges. Exhibit 1 details each speaker invited to comment on all committee charges.

Response to 2021-2022 Specific Charges

1. Continue to review Penn's approach to providing social services for drug and alcohol use, and mental health promotion and explore how partnerships with Penn research and service organizations and external organizations impact the approach taken to address these issues for Penn affiliates and across the surrounding community.

Issues Discussed and Discovered

The committee's approach to this charge included in-committee speakers from the Netter Center for Community Partnerships, the Center for Public Health Initiatives, the Division of Public Safety, Allied Barton Security Services, and the University City District.

- The committee learned that the Netter Center for Community Partnership has a scope that is Philadelphia-wide, but concentrates on the communities near to Penn's campus in West Philadelphia. Through 40 full time staff, 120 part-time staff, 900 student volunteers, 400 paid student workers and 1,800 students enrolled in academically based community service classes, the center has a wide reach. One primary connection to the communities surrounding Penn is in the support of Philadelphia public schools, including afterschool and summer programs. The intent of Netter Center partnerships, especially in University-assisted community-based schools, is to focus on being in place in the long term, without an exit strategy, and in concordance with the values-based approach that underlies the anchor institution framework.
- The Netter Center supports mental health and wellness through partnerships with organizations and institutions. Examples discussed included partnership with the Children's Hospital of Pennsylvania and the Healthier Together Initiatives, focused on West Philadelphia communities; the Stress Less initiative for health-care providers responding to traumatic situations, which is now being expanded to Netter Center-supported schools; and Uplift, which connects Penn students with K-12 summer program students. Though there is only anecdotal evidence, the Netter Center recognizes that civic engagement and community service itself often supports student wellness.
- The committee discussed that there is likely broad, but currently under-numerated, impact given the multitude of partnerships and programs supported through Netter Center activities. We learned that while not yet complete or publicly available, the center is evaluating its impact on economic health, educational health, and physical health in Philadelphia, and is starting to look at their impact on mental health and wellness as well.
- The committee discussed the Center for Public Health Initiatives (CPHI) and how as a research and service organization its activities support social services for drug and alcohol use, and mental health promotion. The center's community health work is broadly focused on West and Southwest Philadelphia. CPHI collaborates with the Penn Health System to conduct its required community health needs assessment, the last of which was in 2019.
- Regarding social services for drug and alcohol use, we learned that CPHI supports training on opioid reversal and treatment. During the pandemic, research and outreach came to a halt and CPHI activities pivoted to COVID-19 response, the rates of opioid overdose increased significantly. In 2021, CPHI has resumed trainings and distribution of Fentanyl testing strips in the community, and are partnering with MERT to bring trainings to the Greek Life community at Penn.
- CPHI supports several activities related to mental health and wellness. There are projects that predated the pandemic and are being resumed, which support primarily Penn University and Health System Affiliates. These include weekly wellness walks, Nature Rx programs, and the Penn Food Farm program. The Food Farm program supports the distribution of food locally, including as part of the Hospital of the University of Pennsylvania Food Farmacy, for food insecure students and Health System staff. The demand far exceeds capacity highlighting the problem of food insecurity on campus and with the Health System.
- The committee discussed that the demand for CPHI initiatives is not commensurate with current infrastructure, in part because Penn does not have a school of public health. CPHI brings together faculty who would typically work in this area, but with-

(continued on page 5)

Committee on Campus and Community Life

(continued from page 4)

out the resources a school would bring. From the experience responding to the pandemic, CPHI identified support is needed in a greater focus on responding to the opioid crisis in, for example, ensuring harm reduction supplies across campus facilities, augmenting food insecurity work, and consideration of the potential that a school of public health could make to capitalize on the renewed recognition of the need for public health highlighted by COVID-19.

- The Penn Division of Public Safety (DPS) and affiliated Allied Barton Security Services, and the University City District (UCD) discussed its current collaborative approach to providing social services for drug and alcohol use and mental health crisis response. UCD is a 25-year-old partnership of anchor institutions, business leaders, and community members in West Philadelphia that is focused on public safety, public properties, public infrastructure, business development, street cleaning and homeless outreach services. The UCD public safety ambassadors are funded through UCD, of which Penn is a large contributor, along with other area institutions. While their funding is separate from DPS, they share in a collaboration to public safety and public well-being via a weekly meeting to discuss strategy and response, and a shared radio network.
- We learned that Penn Police have increased training for officers on issues related to drug dependency and mental health. All officers are trained in administration and carry Narcan, and have administered it to 34 people within the Penn Police patrol zone since 2016. Penn Police received multiple trainings on mental health crisis response with the goal of getting people to care with the least amount of interface with officers. Newer training initiatives have focused on recognizing and responding to people with autism and on active bystander training for all officers. In addition, there is a new co-responder pilot program for mental health response, which requires both a social service provider and police officer to respond to calls for mental health needs. The department is also exploring working with the School of Social Policy & Practice for additional response strategies for mental health crises on campus.
- We discussed Allied Barton Security Services under the direction of the DPS. There are 460 officers assigned to the Penn campus, as either bike patrol, college house security, building security, or Health System security, and work primarily within the boundaries of the Penn and Penn Health System campuses. Allied Barton security officers are trained in first aid and CPR, but do not have specific trainings on response to drug and alcohol use and mental health promotion at this time.
- Finally, UCD does outreach through their catchment with people experiencing homelessness and mental health crises. There are full-time staff working in these areas with a focus on forming relationships with community members, but in response to serious mental health needs will call Penn Police or Philadelphia Police if they feel that there is need of higher levels of intervention.

Recommendations

1. We recommend review of harm reduction initiatives for alcohol and drug use on campus and for members of the surrounding community, and that access to Narcan be available in all Penn residential facilities.
2. We recommend review of the opportunity to increase food security for Penn University and Health System affiliates and in the surrounding community.
3. We recommend a comprehensive evaluation of Penn's impact on the health, economy, and built environment on campus and in the surrounding community. This evaluation could cull existing University resources but ideally would be carried out in partnership with a third-party non-affiliate for transparency and include a plan to make findings widely accessible.

2. Review and comment on public-facing information, the transparency of strategic planning, and monitoring of changes over time, as they relate to the impact of residency by Penn affiliates, Penn real estate and economic development, and public safety initiatives on the surrounding community.

Issues Discussed and Discovered

The committee's approach to this charge included review of public-facing information on current Penn websites and in-committee speakers from the Division of Public Safety, the Office of the Executive Vice President, and the Office of Government and Community Affairs.

- The committee reviewed public-facing information available on the website of the Division of Public Safety, noting a substantial increase in the information since its review a year ago. We learned from our discussion with DPS leadership that this was, in part, the outcome of a review that was supported by Penn's Quattrone Center. The review prompted the DPS to build greater transparency. There is now a dedicated web page for policies and procedures, including CCTV rules and responsibilities, information about equipment and vehicles, and agreements and relationship with Philadelphia police department and police directives. The DPS is also building on greater engagement by partnering with the Netter Center to mentor students in West Philadelphia, and meeting with community associates and centers on campus to talk about the process for working with police. DPS has a dedicated advisory board wherein there are representatives from the Spruce Hill and Walnut Hill neighborhood associations, and a pastor of a local church. In addition, they are in the early stages of working on a community survey.
- The committee noted the extent of programs through various Penn entities that interface with local schools and students and discussed the need to evaluate and measure the impact of current and past strategies around the support of public education in Philadelphia. The committee feels that there is an opportunity to communicate the impact of University policy and programs in the West Philadelphia community and enhance transparency. A next step for the committee would be to evaluate what kind of data are needed and how best to communicate transparency on the impact of ongoing policies and programs.
- The committee reviewed trends in residence of Penn affiliates across Philadelphia, reinforcing what we reviewed in the previous committee year that 19146 has the greatest number of employees of Penn and Penn Medicine as residents, and that over 50% of University employees reside outside of Philadelphia. In University City, the cost of a home and rental of a one-bedroom apartment has doubled, the overall population has increased, as has median level of highest education achieved, median household income, and number of jobs since 2007. West and Southwest Philadelphia are largely comprised of rental neighborhoods, and there are not many ownership opportunities and 43% of residents are rent burdened. There are fewer than 8,000 affordable rental units in the area, which means that only 25% of current need is being met by affordable rental unit supply. The committee discussed the intersection of these shifts with the concerns over the University Townhomes sale. The University of Pennsylvania's position is in support of affordable housing but the University does not have plans to purchase the property to create affordable housing on this site.
- The committee discussed the University's investment in local public schools. We learned that school funding is directed out of the President's Office and Graduate School of Education. The new funding of Lea Elementary School will support a 100% economically disadvantaged student body. The school has capacity to enroll 500, and currently serves 446 students; two thirds of whom come from households inside the catchment area and one third of whom come from households outside the catchment area. According to Volume 66 (22) of the University of Pennsylvania *Almanac*,

(continued on page 6)

COUNCIL 2021-2022 Year-End Reports

(continued from page 5)

Penn has committed to providing financial support that includes in-kind resources, valued at \$816,500 annually over five years. This builds on previous investments in the Lea School from Penn's Office of the President and GSE of more than \$300,000 annually in recent years. Members of the committee questioned why Lea School was chosen of all of the schools with need in the area and emphasized that, in the future, communicating the process of supporting schools is necessary. Currently, community members are stating that it feels like a decision was made without substantive community voice and the committee feels that greater transparency is essential and largely unmet need in this area.

- The committee reviewed public-facing information on real estate and construction development. Pennconnects.com maps all building under current development through 2022. This site does not include projects under consideration.
- The committee met with the University's Assistant Vice President of Community Relations, who connects Penn to neighborhood civic and other organizations, primarily in West and Southwest Philadelphia and Gray's Ferry neighborhoods, through outreach and a monthly meeting, which has been held virtually since the pandemic and which often attracts an attendance of nearly 100 people. The focus of outreach is communication and transparency and bringing community concerns internally so that response can be communicated and coordinated. Recent community concerns have been interests that include the increase in community gun violence and safety concerns, quality-of-life issues, and access to the University and its campus. There has also been concerns noted about affordable housing and around issues of poverty and displacement. The speaker emphasized the extent to which Philadelphia needs collective efforts and collaboration with other anchor institutions to contend with the scope of current challenges, and reflected the need to work more closely with the Philadelphia School District to improve the experience of public-school students so that they can envision the University as a place where they may be qualified to attend. He suggested restarting programs like College Days, which brings early middle school students on campus and help prepare them and their families for all aspects of higher education.

Recommendations

1. The University should develop and communicate metrics to share annually that illustrate the changing dynamics of the University City neighborhood it is a part of, to illustrate how current changes in the local housing market, investment in local schools, and demographics are tracked and addressed and to be aware of challenges leading to equitable growth.
2. The changes made to enhance public facing information by the DPS are substantial and may serve as a model for other University entities. Still, we recommend public-facing anonymous reporting of service calls and UPPD stops by location and by affiliate type, mapped to identify on or off campus location, in parity to what is reported for Philadelphia Police.

Recommendations for Future Charges

General comments

The committee felt that the general charges were appropriate, but continue to be challenging in breadth. Because the scope of social services required to attend to students, faculty, staff, and community members who live and work on and around the Penn campus are critical issues for local engagement/development with expanding and ongoing prioritiza-

tion, it is appropriate to continue to focus on aspects of specific charges for 2021-2022 in the 2022-2023 academic year but to hone in on issues of public education and comprehensive community assessment. We suggest that a representative from the Office of Government and Community Affairs is added as an administrative liaison to this committee. Committee members felt that there would be value in inclusion of community members/non-Penn affiliates given that the charges are in direct relationship to community concerns and community life. We discussed the challenge in finding one or even a group of community members to represent community voice. In the absence of a specific individual, future committee work should require opportunities to garner more partnership/perspective from community groups and leaders.

We recommend that in the next academic year, the committee be given a single charge/focus so that substantive review and recommendations can be made. In priority order, our recommendations for future charges are as follows:

1. Review and comment on public-facing information, the transparency of strategic planning, and the impact and goals of Penn's initiatives and investments on public education in Philadelphia.
2. Explore the need for and ideal conduct of a community needs and impact assessment for public safety, public health, and community quality-of-life in the communities surrounding Penn's campus.

Committee Membership

Chair: Sara Jacoby; **Faculty:** Francesca Russello Ammon, Courtney Boen, Elinore Kaufman, Terri Lipman, Mark Stern; **Graduate and Professional Students:** Tiffani Rose Brown, Robert Watson; **Undergraduate Students:** Jennifer Salako, Daniela Uribe; **PPSA:** Laurie Actman, Laurie Hall; **WPPSA:** Cyd Di Loretto, Erin Gautsche; **Administrative Liaison:** Tamara Greenfield King, Anthony Sorrentino; **Staff:** Emily Hobbs Vanarello

Exhibit 1: Committee Speakers 2021-2022

10/7/2021

1. Lizann Boyle Rode, Associate Vice President, Office of the University Secretary

12/08/2021

1. Cory Bowman, Associate Director of the Netter Center for Community Partnerships
2. Jennifer Pinto-Martin, Executive Director of the Center for Public Health Initiatives
3. Heather Klusaritz, Director of Community Engagement, Center for Public Health Initiatives

1/20/2022

1. Kathleen Shields Anderson, Interim Vice President, Division of Public Safety
2. Michael Fink, Chief, University of Pennsylvania Police Department
3. Louis Petrecco, Director Security Services, Allied Barton
4. Alan Gary, Senior Vice President, Public Safety and District Services, University City District
5. Matt Berghaiser, President, University City District

3/05/2022

1. Tony Sorrentino, Assistant Vice President, Office of the Executive Vice President

3/28/2022

1. Glenn Bryan, Assistant Vice President of Community Relations, Office of Government and Community Affairs

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.

2021-2022 Specific Charges

1. Identify where structures and practices (at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels) perpetuate biases and systemic racism as they apply to the remit of the University Council.
2. Identify and recommend ways to overcome barriers to inclusion and diversity within and across faculty, staff, administration, and the student body

Strategies and Focus of Inquiry

The Committee was made up of many members who were serving for the first time, so we focused the initial meetings on getting to know one another, having informed discussions on the charges and prior work of the committee, and also creating subcommittees tasked to work on the two charges. After these first meetings, the rest of the committee meetings were focused on discussions of charges, with occasional meetings with different Penn administrators.

Summary of Committee Activity, Pt. 1: Full Committee

The Committee met virtually over the 2021-2022 academic year to consider specific charges from 2021-2022 and explore emergent concerns. Over the course of six meetings, four themes repeatedly emerged as key concerns in our discussions.

Campus Spaces for Minoritized Groups

This topic initially emerged during our September 2021 meeting, when student committee members reported ongoing debates over whether the cultural centers located in the lower level of the ARCH Building should be moved to a more visible location, like one of the current fraternity houses on Locust Walk. This led to discussions about campus spaces for other minoritized groups, including more prayer spaces for Muslim students and more gender-neutral restrooms for transgender and gender-nonbinary members of the Penn community. To offer context for the dilemmas surrounding the restroom issue, Sam Starks noted that the age of Penn's older buildings is a major hurdle in creating more gender-neutral restrooms. He also pointed out that architects hired by the University have worked hard to add more gender-neutral restrooms on campus.

To get a fuller understanding of the desire for more gender-neutral restrooms, the Committee spoke with three guests during our November 2021 meeting: Erin Cross, the executive director of Penn's LGBT Center; Dani Bassett, the J. Peter Skirkanich Professor of Bioengineering; and Beans Velocci, an incoming assistant professor of the history and sociology of science. Our three guests described the difficulty of finding gender neutral restrooms across campus. They also stressed that relying on single-gender restrooms places transgender and gender-nonbinary Penn community members at risk for harassment, and they underscored the dehumanization felt by these community members from not having adequate access to something as essential as safe restrooms. They urged us to push for more gender-neutral restrooms across campus.

Following the example of our November 2021 meeting, the Committee intended to invite guests who could provide more insights into the debates about relocating the three cultural centers from the lower level of the ARCH Building. The Committee chair met privately with a University administrator who was knowledgeable of the issue. After learning about the lack of consensus among student advocates about the relocation issue, the chair decided to table discussion of the issue for now.

Staff DEI Climate Survey

Stemming from the first charge – identify where structures and practices (at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels) perpetuate biases and systemic racism as they apply to the remit of the University Council – the Committee honed in on the need to understand how staff experience the University's DEI culture. A DEI climate survey targeted specifically toward staff emerged as a potential next step. Following Sam Starks' suggestion, the Committee spoke with Rume Joy Azikiwe-Oyeyemi, the executive director and chief of staff of Human Resources, to get a sense of what an undertaking like this would entail. Ms. Azikiwe-Oyeyemi noted that it might be more practical to explore a major initiative like a staff DEI climate survey once a new University president was in place. She also encouraged the Committee to reach out to two or three vendors to compare costs, survey resources and procedures, etc.

Coordination, Transparency, and Accountability of DEI Structures and Procedures

With members from multiple University schools and departments, it became clear to the Committee early on that gauging the state of DEI efforts across so many campus spaces would be difficult. This realization fueled considerations of centralizing the University's DEI efforts, creating more transparency around DEI structures and procedures, and establishing DEI accountability metrics.

In response to these discussions, Sam Starks informed the Committee that he was trying to gather DEI officers from various units within Penn to share insights. Building on and benefitting from his lead, the Committee had the opportunity to speak with three DEI officers during our February 2022 meeting: Raquel Arredondo from Penn GSE; Beverly Crawford from Penn Dental; and Captain Nicole McCoy from Penn Public Safety.

The discussion with the three guests touched on a number of issues, including the following:

- Faculty of color recruitment and retention;
- Exit interviews with faculty of color;
- DEI, racial literacy, and anti-bias trainings;
- Building trust with the surrounding community.

Afterwards, the Committee agreed that more meetings with DEI officers would be beneficial to our work.

Recruitment and Retention of Minoritized Faculty

The importance of recruiting and retaining faculty members from minoritized backgrounds surfaced several times during the Committee's conversations. One such moment was during the November 2021 meeting when our guests noted the challenge of recruiting and retaining trans and gender nonbinary faculty given the currently limited number of gender-neutral bathrooms around campus. Faculty recruitment and retention also emerged during the February 2022 meeting with DEI officers. Both Ms. Arredondo from Penn GSE and Dr. Crawford from Penn Dental mentioned their schools' interests in growing a more diverse faculty. Additionally, Dr. Crawford noted the particular difficulty faced by women of color faculty members in finding supportive mentorship leading up to promotion. This conversation concluded with a discussion about exit interview practices across campus when faculty from minoritized backgrounds leave the University.

A very special thanks to Kuan Evans, whose meeting minutes were an invaluable resource in the drafting of this section.

Summary of Committee Activity, Pt. 2: Subcommittee Work

Subcommittee #1

The members of this subcommittee were DaCarla Albright, Pam Gallo, Miriam Harris, Nyzinga Patterson, and Jenni Punt.

Action item: Request visual of DEI committees/groups/efforts so that we can identify gaps and enhance communication across Penn to leadership.

We have expanded this action and support continuing the effort to gain a better sense of DEI efforts across the University—at the school level and University level—and communicating successes to all constituents.

- a. We found the visiting DEI officer perspectives this year very valuable and recommend that this committee continue to invite DEI representatives from around Penn. This effort can help us identify gaps, opportu-

(continued on page 8)

Committee on Diversity and Equity

(continued from page 7)

nities, and successful approaches that could be shared widely. Perhaps next year we can discuss how these findings could be shared widely.

- b. We would like to make a request for a more complete “map” of DEI efforts and at the very least a list of DEI officers across campus. This transparency would be very useful not just for our committee but for many others at Penn.
- c. We would also like to request a better understanding of how charges and ideas are communicated to leadership.

Action item: Recommend a needs assessment of staff (Qualtrics with QR code). Determine/enhance the role of HR in disseminating information on resources, needs in each division/unit.

We recommend continuing the effort to assess staff needs (climate survey as subcommittee #1 supports, too).

- a. We appreciated the visit by an HR representative and suggest inviting more staff representatives who can offer perspectives on challenges and opportunities.
- b. We recommend that we discuss better/best ways to disseminate information about DEI efforts to staff, faculty and students (as well as results of surveys, exit interviews when and if they are available).

Subcommittee #2

The members of this subcommittee were Delaney Holder, Mary Kinney, Guerline Laurore, Eric Schelter, Rebecca Stuhr, and Flavia Vitale.

Key Discussion Themes:

- a. Space as an overarching theme: gender neutral bathrooms, prayer/meditation room. Cultural organizations have outgrown the spaces and need to be moved from the current location in the lower level of the ARCH Building.
- b. Why have underrepresented minority (URM) faculty left Penn? What are the statistics for URM faculty losses from Penn in the past 10 years? How have barriers to success contributed to people leaving? Are there common themes and reasons for URM faculty leaving Penn that have emerged over the last years? The subcommittee would like to hear from the Vice Provost for Faculty on their data.
- c. Conduct a staff climate survey.
- d. What are Penn’s values/overall goals for DEI across campus? Does the university have a campus wide mission statement for DEI? How has the decentralized model for DEI across Penn’s campus worked/not worked in support of Penn’s overall mission?
- e. Lack of specificity in achieving DEI goals on campus, how do we define success? (increasing professional support for diverse faculty – how is success achieved? How long do they remain on campus (retention policies), surveys directed at diverse faculty to see how/if they are supported after recruitment? What are statistics of success in retaining diverse faculty?) What is the process chain for students to bring forward issues of DEI to the administration that they can have confidence that their concerns will be addressed?
- f. We should pursue the roundtable – scheduling DEI reps from each of the 12 schools to visit the committee. Failing that, each member of the subcommittee should engage with their local representatives about DEI barriers that are faced locally.

Response to 2021-2022 Specific Charges

Charge 1: Identify where structures and practices (at the University, school, departmental, and individual levels) perpetuate biases and systemic racism as they apply to the remit of the University Council.

Recommendation: We encourage the University Council to engage the incoming University President in a conversation about a staff DEI climate survey. The goals of this conversation would be to (a) identify staff DEI experiences as an ongoing concern at the University and (b) open dialogue with the President about the possibility of a staff DEI climate survey under her administration.

Charge 2: Identify and recommend ways to overcome barriers to inclusion and diversity within and across faculty, staff, administration, and the student body.

Recommendation: Institute the following checklist across schools/programs to retain underrepresented faculty and insure a toxic-free environment for their success:

We encourage the University Council to facilitate a dialogue between University facilities leadership and members of Penn’s transgender and gender-nonbinary community about the availability of gender-neutral restrooms. Such dialogue seems crucial to striking a balance between recognizing architectural and resource challenges and considering the lived experiences of vulnerable populations most affected by the lack of gender-neutral restrooms. Since the absence of dialogue will only further marginalize transgender and gender-nonbinary populations on campus, the initiation of this dialogue by the University Council could be an important step toward overcoming barriers to inclusion and diversity within and across faculty, staff, administration, and the student body.

Recommendations for Future Charges

The 2021-2022 Committee recommends that next year’s committee continue to work on the two charges tackled this year. Below are specific issues worthy of the Committee’s consideration during the 2022-2023 academic year.

1. Continue to monitor minoritized groups’ concerns regarding inclusive and affirmative campus spaces and determine if any further recommendations on this issue should be made to the University Council.
2. Follow up on this year’s staff DEI climate survey recommendation to gauge progress and determine the need for additional recommendations.
3. Continue to examine the challenges associated with the recruitment and retention of faculty from minoritized backgrounds and determine if specific and achievable recommendations can be offered to the University Council.
4. Continue to meet with Penn DEI officers to inform our understanding of DEI issues that are surfacing across campus, emergent strategies for addressing those issues that are showing promise, and specific recommendations that might emerge from ongoing dialogue with DEI officers.

Committee Membership

Chair: Ed Brockenbrough; **Faculty:** DaCarla Albright, Sarah J. Jackson, Jennifer Punt, Eric Schelter, Flavia Vitale; **Graduate and Professional Students:** Pamela Gallo, Guerline Laurore; **Undergraduate Students:** Sarah Asfari, Delaney Holder; **PPSA:** Nyzinga Patterson, Rebecca Stuhr; **WPPSA:** Miriam Harris, Mary Kinney; **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.

2021-2022 Specific Charges

1. Explore right-of-way management on pedestrian pathways, specifically University, vendor, public vehicles driving and parking legally and illegally on campus pathways raising security and safety concerns.
2. Explore weekend and evening parking policies at Penn, and the discontinuation of past policy to allow faculty and staff to park for free in open Penn parking lots during off-hours (N lots).

Summary of Committee Activity

The Committee met five times during 2021-2022.

The first meeting was held remotely on 10/6/21, we were joined by guest, Lizann Boyle Rode (Associate University Secretary). The Committee reviewed our charges for the upcoming year and purpose of University Council Committees with the chair and Ms. Rode. The committee had not made any formal recommendations in 2020-2021, although Ms. Rode and the chair updated the committee on several issues that had been addressed by our committee in previous years including wastewater testing programs for COVID and the progress made on all gender bathrooms and Wellness Spaces at the University. The committee did address a potential new charge concerning meeting space for cultural groups on campus. Based on a review of this topic, it was found that the Office of President, Provost, and University Life were actively addressing this issue at the time and the Committee agreed to table this issue as it was already being addressed by the University.

The second meeting of the Facilities Committee of the Facilities Committee was held remotely on October 29, 2021. Mark Kocent, University Architect, presented an update to the Penn Connects Plan. The plan was created in 2006, and then updated in 2012 and 2018. The principals and projects of the plan are guided by five themes—Teaching & Scholarship, Research & Clinical Care, Living & Learning, Campus & Community, and Reinvestment. The plan also supports the University's sustainability initiatives. Major projects completed since 2006 include: Singh Center for Nanotechnology; Perry World House; Levin Building; Perelman Center for Political Science and Economics; Academic Research Building; Penn First Plus; Tangen Hall; Perelman Center for Advanced Medicine; Pavilion; Lauder College House; New College House West; Penn Park; Shoemaker Green; Weitzman Plaza; Pennovation Center and Lab; FMC Tower; Cira Garage and Green; and Evo. Planned projects to be completed within the next five years include: Boathouse; Ott Indoor Training Facility; Student Performing Arts Center; GSE renovation and expansion; Vagelos Center for Energy Science and Technology; and Amy Gutmann Hall.

The third meeting of the Facilities Committee was held on November 17, 2021 via Zoom. We were joined by following guests: Kathleen Anderson, Casey Ann Busch, Michael Fink, and Maureen Rush. The Committee reviewed the charge pertaining to pedestrian safety and vehicles on sidewalks. The Division of Public Safety (DPS) has many plans in place to protect the safety of bicycle riders and pedestrians. The work with the City on Vision Zero, enforce bike lanes from delivery vehicles and ride-share, particularly in the retail corridors. A layby was created for trucks on 34th Street between Walnut and Spruce Streets. DPS has positioned Allied Barton guards and bike patrol at all gateways. E-scooters are an issue on the sidewalk and has increased since the campus reopened after the COVID shutdown. Also after COVID, the campus community needed to be reeducated about the rules on our campus. They also work with UPHS to position traffic control aides at key intersections such as Convention Avenue and South Street. DPS coordinates Penn construction projects with other projects in the area to ensure there are no conflicts with street shut-

downs and large equipment. DPS is aware that at times there are Facilities and Real Estate Services (FRES) vehicles on the sidewalk, but it is usually due to emergency work that needs to be performed. DPS worked with the Division of Facilities and Real Estate Services to establish legal and safe parking spaces for FRES maintenance vehicles and create speed pillows on 34th and 33rd Streets to slow traffic. DPS is continuing the Share the Road campaign that began several years ago. All bike lanes will be repaved and restriped in the next two years. Education continues to be key in maintaining safety.

The fourth meeting of the Facilities Committee was held remotely on February 2, 2022.

The Committee received an update on parking and transportation from Brian Manthe, senior director of Business Services. The issue of discontinuation of weekend and evening parking for open lots on campus was discussed. This issue was resolved through the liaison function of our committee. It was in fact found that this benefit continues to exist and it had been removed from the Penn Parking website in error. Mr. Manthe had already made adjustments to Penn Parking website and assured the committee that Penn staff with parking permits would continue to be allowed to park on open lots during evening and weekend hours for free.

The inventory of parking lots has been decreasing due to construction projects, making availability limited, particularly in the most desirable garages. Since COVID began, the revenue from transient parking has increased due to low SEPTA ridership. PennRides has also seen increased demand and is a success story with higher ridership and lower wait times. Additional PennBus East and West drivers and buses were added to help with the demand. People are using PennRides on Request more than the PennBus, however. There seems to be a need for more transit north and south of campus, rather than just east and west. Permit parking holders can park in lots with their tag on weekends and after hours on weeknights.

The fifth of the Facilities Committee was held remotely on March 21, 2022. The Committee reviewed its work from the year and recommended potential charges for next year's committee.

Response to 2021-2022 Specific Charges

The Committee is pleased with the University's current administration of right-of-way management on pedestrian pathways and agrees that the University's current management of pedestrian and bicycle safety should be commended.

The Committee is pleased to report that concerns raised regarding discontinuation of evening and weekend parking for permit holders in the University's open air parking lots was a clerical error. Penn permit holders continue to have this benefit and the benefit will be updated on the Penn Parking Website. In addition, the committee is pleased with the University's progress and management of its parking facilities and transportation services.

Recommendations for Future Charges

The Committee makes the following recommendations for charges for 2022-2023:

1. Explore how the University provides inclusive accommodations on campus.
2. Review the progress the University has made in attaining its goal of carbon neutrality by 2042. What are the future plans to assure that we reach this goal?

Committee Membership

Chair: Michael McGarvey; **Faculty:** Paulo Arratia, Cary Coglianese, Megan Ryerson, Michael May, Nicholas Pevzner; **Graduate and Professional Students:** Baha Bachnak, Michael Krone; **Undergraduate Students:** Shan Shan Liang, Andrew Spangler; **PPSA:** Nico Meyering, Natalie Walker; **WPPSA:** Cyd Di Loretto; Raymond Johnson; **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.

2021-2022 Specific Charges

1. Read, review, and comment on updates related to the administration of retirement benefits including recent retirement plan changes, with specific focus on the coronavirus pandemic's potential impact on these benefits.
2. Read, review, and comment on the impact of remote work, specifically related to working from other states, on Penn employee benefit programs.

Summary of Committee Activity

The Committee met four times during 2021-2022.

At the beginning of the academic year, the committee was provided with a comprehensive overview of University benefits and the scope of the benefits program, ranging from health plans to insurance offerings, retirement savings, and tuition benefits as well as leave of absence and disability insurance policies. Focus was given to the impact of colleagues working remotely and out of the area on these benefits programs. Detailed information on 2022 retiree benefits was presented to the Committee.

In the fall of 2022, the Committee received a comprehensive update and in-depth analysis of the impact of remote work on benefits and was informed of the University's extension of the remote/hybrid work model through the end of the academic year. It was discussed that geographic distribution of employees working remotely from outside of Pennsylvania adds complexity to Penn's benefit programs as it relates to adequate access, perceived equity of program offering, and State mandated requirements. Health benefits that could be impacted by remote work were explained. The Committee discussed the implications and issues related to the University moving from a regional employer to a national employer.

In respect to retirement savings investment accounts, Nicholas Matera from TIAA reviewed the successful transition from a multi-vendor environment to single recordkeeper platform and explained its positive implications. These include tens of thousands of new enrollments, lower administrative fees for participants, increased access to financial consultation, only one statement for participants, and a streamlined investment menu. The Committee was pleased to learn that participation in financial consulting and wealth management support sessions, advising through the TIAA Retirement Call Center, and online webinars have increased significantly.

During an annual benefits update, the Committee was informed in great detail about the status of current benefits programs, their sustainability, and future plans.

The Committee was provided with an update on wellness, behavioral health, and retirement savings. Penn Healthy You, Be in the Know, and the MindWell at Penn programs have been very popular and several adjustments have been implemented since their inception. Numerous events are being offered, both in person and virtually, with high employee participation. The Committee learned of a 1% Penn contribution increase for each level of the Basic Retirement Savings plan and the Matching Plan. The one-year waiting period will be eliminated for new participants.

Response to 2021-2022 Specific Charges

The Committee reviewed and commented on issues related to the University's health benefits and insurance offerings for active employees. It was informed that benefits and insurance offerings are the same for employees who work remotely and those who work on campus during the pandemic. The Committee recommends continuing the review of health benefits and insurance offerings for active employees working remotely in the future.

The Committee learned about the challenges stemming from the widespread geographic distribution of employees working remotely from outside of Pennsylvania and the added complexity to Penn's benefit programs in respect to adequate access, perceived equity of program offering, and State mandated requirements. The Committee discussed the implications and issues related to the University moving from a regional employer to a national employer.

The Committee recommends continuing the review of the impact of remote work, specifically related to working from other states, on Penn employee benefit programs.

The Committee reviewed and commented on the transition from a multi-vendor environment to a single recordkeeper platform for retirement savings investment accounts. The Committee was pleased to learn about the positive implications of this transition, along with an increased interest and participation in financial education resources that are available to faculty and staff. The Committee also reviewed and commented on the positive updates on wellness, behavioral health, and retirement savings programs.

Proposed Future Charges

1. Read, review, and comment on updates related to the administration of retirement benefits including recent retirement plan changes, with specific focus on the coronavirus pandemic's potential impact on these benefits.
2. Read, review, and comment on the impact of remote work, specifically related to working from other states, on Penn employee benefit programs.

Committee Membership

Chair: Markus Blatz; **Faculty:** Janice Bellace, Paula Henthorn, Yasmin Kafai, Desmond Oathes; **Graduate and Professional Students:** N/A; **Undergraduate Students:** N/A; **PPSA:** Alisha George, Valerie Morgan, Bryan Wilkinson; **WPPSA:** Stacie Anderson, Joseph Jackson, Rosa Vargas; **Administrative Liaisons:** Jack Heuer, Susan Sproat; **Staff:** Melissa Brown; **Ex-Officio:** Laura Perna