

University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (UC CARA)
4/4/2017

1. Committee participants

Committee members: Ani Nenkova (chair), Yuko Butler, Angela Mary Ddamba, Frederick Dickinson, Marcia Dotson, Eric Feldman, Heather Frattone, Naomi Kadish, Zinxin Lee, Bowen Lou, Nicola Mason, Megan Moser, Rahim Rizzi, PeterRockett.

Administrative liaison: Leo Charney (Provost's Office)

Staff: Nicole Tillman (Secretary's office)

2. Committee charges

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

2.1. 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.

2.2. Specific charges for 2016—2017

1. Study the library needs of faculty and recommend ways in which the library can better support their research.

2. Examine the general environment for research at the University and identify what changes or support can improve research productivity and creativity. This general charge of the committee has not been addressed in recent years.
3. Joint Charge with CCL-Review how sports and recreational activity opportunities for staff, graduate students and faculty is planned by the athletics department and how these can be improve the meet the needs and interests of these members of the Penn community.
4. Review and discuss this Committee's general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee's work in academic year 2017-18.

3. Meetings and main recommendations related to specific charges

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

A. Research productivity and creativity

The following list of questions was sent to Dr. Bonnell prior to the meeting:

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

Innovation and creativity: Are there any workshops or training session on creativity and innovation? How is research activity evaluated on the department, school and university level? Some of the issues on the balancing act between safe choices and innovation are discussed for example in this book recently---is there any similar self studies and initiatives going on at Penn?

The creativity crisis : reinventing science to unleash possibility / Roberta B. Ness.

http://dla.library.upenn.edu/dla/franklin/record.html?q=creativity%20crisis&meta=t&id=FRANKLIN_6333029&

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

The meeting was very informative. Vice Provost Bonnell provided an overview of recent funding trends, efforts to minimize administrative requirements for research, and interdisciplinary research carried out at university centers. She also talked about Pennovation and opportunities for commercialization.

At the end of the meeting Vice Provost Bonnell shared some of her personal experience on starting a novel large-scale interdisciplinary research effort. This resonated most with the committee members and the questions we had prepared ahead of the meeting. This will be a great start for a conversation next year.

Recommendations

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

Detailed notes on the meeting appear in Appendix A.

B. Recreation opportunities for staff, grad students and faculty

Dr. Grace Calhoun, Director of Athletics, spoke to the committee about varsity athletics, the tough requirements to raise funds for that, undergraduate recreational opportunities and briefly about graduate student participation in recreational sports. Use of the recreational facilities by staff and faculty was not really discussed.

Collecting information about recreational opportunities and the associated fees is not straightforward and requires much unintuitive navigation of the website.

Currently, 55% of undergraduates use the gym, but only 18% of graduate students and 9% of staff and faculty. The assumption is that grad students, staff and faculty live away from campus and prefer to use facilities closer to home. Would be useful to run a survey to figure out how if this is indeed the case.

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

Committee recommendations:

1. Create a position exclusively tasked with increasing recreational sports participation for both undergraduate and graduate students. Currently the goal is to have recreation break even but in the long term it is desirable to turn recreation as a revenue stream. These goals may at times conflict, so an effort fully focused to increasing participation is likely to be more successful. It can explore models similar to the Stanford student-led program (<http://web.stanford.edu/group/aerobics/about.html>) which is very popular and offers a variety of classes which at Penn would be considered special classes and would be much more expensive.
2. Work toward a model in which there is no difference in pricing and access between graduate and undergraduate students at Penn. Set goals for increasing participation from *both* groups. Run a survey to find out what fraction of graduate students are enrolled in a gym elsewhere to get a sense of the overall percentage involved in recreational sports activities.

3. The opportunities for on-campus recreational sports for staff and faculty were not properly discussed this year. They could be the focus of a future discussion, possibly jointly with the benefits committee. Especially for faculty living near campus, the Penn gym is the most convenient location for exercise and it is important to understand how the current facilities can provide better service. Also there are a number of afterschool programs and summer camp offerings related to sport. There is no central location where staff and faculty can check all offerings and it will be beneficial to create one. The pricing of these programs is often equivalent or higher than at other locations. In the discussion next year the committee can seek to understand if these prices reflect quality of the program or budget requirements. Similar to the recommendations for student recreational opportunities, it is important to explore the possibility of creating quality offerings that do not necessarily bring revenue to athletics but are self-sufficient in paying for coach participation and facility use, possibly with some funds going toward the sports club organizing the program.

Detailed notes on the meeting appear in Appendix B.

Library: Presenting at the meeting were Carton Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, and Kim Eke, Director of Teaching, Research, and Learning Services at Penn Libraries.

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

Recommendations:

1. Ask humanities faculty to send ahead of time requests for books related to classes to be kept in the library rather than to be sent to the high-density location. It is ineffective to recall the books one by one.
2. Explore the possibilities for pitching library related projects to students in Engineering. There is a current project on enhanced visualization for digital browsing but progress on this has been slow. Teams of student volunteers or hired students may be able to provide reasonable solutions to this problem.
3. Embed a link to the library new acquisitions lists into the websites of Penn individual departments, to increase the chances of students and faculty noticing relevant new material. Ideally these should be augmented with images of the cover and table of contents. Borrowing patterns before and after including this feature can be compared to measure its effectiveness in advertising relevant library materials.
4. The major trend in the library has been towards using digital materials. The largest portion of the expenses goes towards digital subscription to journals. Library expenses would be much lower if more research were published in open access venues. It will be beneficial to organize an event, or a series of discipline-specific events, in which faculty can explore what they can do and what support they would need to shift their publication pattern toward open access venues.

Detailed notes from the meeting appear in Appendix C.

4. Recommended topics for 2017—2018

1. Continue the discussion on the general environment for research at the University and identify what changes or support can improve research productivity and creativity. Focus on developing criteria for evaluating research contributions and creating environment for interdisciplinary research.

2. Study the resources available to Penn students while they study abroad, particularly related to interpersonal violence and sexual assault. This charge was added in the previous year but the committee was not aware of the addition. The topic should be given high priority for next year.
3. Discuss admissions and financial aid. The topic has not been discussed in a while. Will be especially useful to discuss how economic diversity is shaped by admissions and financial aid policies, given recent discussions for the topic in the press:
<http://nyti.ms/2kClw0C>
<https://goo.gl/Q3rKrh>
4. Get an update on the bookstore
5. Continue the discussion on how sports and recreational activity opportunities for staff, graduate students and faculty as planned by the athletics department and how these can be improved. Best would be to discuss grad student needs and staff and faculty needs separately.
6. Review and discuss this Committee's general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee's work in academic year 2018-19.

Appendix A: detailed notes from meeting on research productivity and creativity

This UC CARA meeting was held on Tuesday, October 25th in Room 219 College Hall. Dr. Dawn Bonnell, Vice Provost for Research, presented to the committee.

At the meeting, Vice Provost Bonnell opened with an overview of the research enterprise. She discussed the downward pressure on federal budgets and how funding is depleting in purchasing power by 20% every year. Business is now supporting more research than the federal budget. Some of the strategic approaches to navigating the current climate are:

1. Seeding emerging research areas and ideas- to be the frontier of new ideas.
2. Pushing back on faculty burden so that people don't have to spend as much time on the administrative overload.
3. Advocate in both Harrisburg and D.C. to push back on regulation and increase budgets whenever we can.
4. Diversify our portfolio and increase the amount of innovation we have and the innovation when it comes to commercialization because when we get money from that, we pour it back into the research.

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

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

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

Bonnell explained that the administration burden in research is overwhelming and one of their goals is to minimize administrative activities by eliminating any self over regulation associated with research in areas where there are a lot of government and federal regulations and they also want to streamline classes (safety, lab training, and waste training, etc.). There have been some recent changes with the regulations regarding human test subjects with regard to the level of consent and oversight necessary depending on the type of test that the subject is participating in. Oversight is more specific to the type of testing taking place (i.e. you wouldn't need the same type of oversight for a test on ice cream consumption as you would testing a surgical procedure).

Bonnell shared information regarding the President's plan around Pennovation. Pennovation means innovation Penn's way. There are several aspects to Pennovation; the real estate aspect is Pennovation Works (formerly South Banks)- Working Dogs Center, Greenhouse from the Dental School and Engineering Research and Collaboration Hub are located there, Pennovation Center is a building, and the Penn Center for Innovation is the organization. Membership is open to the public as well as to Penn employees.

Bonnell explained that there are some interdisciplinary projects that are more obvious and easier to see from a top down level. For the smaller less obvious collaboration opportunities, the research department has developed small grants and external funding that is available to those who need it. The departments also try their best to support faculty when they have an interdisciplinary research idea that they want to develop and pursue as a project. There are certain requirements that they will have to meet, but the opportunities are available. Currently the focus is to increase communication to the schools, deans, and faculty to make them more aware that these opportunities are available.

Appendix B: detailed notes from meeting on recreational opportunities for staff, grad students and faculty

The University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (UC CARA) meeting was held on Tuesday, November 15th in the Brachfeld Conference Room (HH225) in Houston Hall.

Guest: Dr. Grace Calhoun, Director of Athletics and the Committee on Campus and Community Life.

The following questions were sent to Dr. Calhoun prior to the meeting:

- Before the meeting, can the athletics folks send a link to the web page where grad students, faculty and staff can look up fitness options available through Penn.

- During the previous presentation, Grace mentioned the many general and mental health benefits of exercises. Yet some grad students perceive the fee as deterrent for participation. How are the goals to generate revenue and to increase participation balanced?
- Can grad students use the gym for free?
- What are peer institutions' policies about grad student use of the gym and what are their fees.
- Compare membership prices with local gyms (Sweat fitness, YMCA, etc)
- Is there a website with all sports after school programs and summer camps?
- Is there any coordination with other programs at Penn aimed to encourage faculty and staff to purchase properties in West Philly?
- Are there statistics about the number/percentage of grad students, faculty and staff that use different facilities?
- What are the rationales followed when setting prices for Penn affiliates and non-Penn affiliated participants in sports programs?

Dr. Calhoun shared an overview of Athletics here at Penn. Penn is has a broad based division meaning that it is expansive. Penn fosters 33 intercollegiate varsity sports, 40 club sports with a variety of degrees of competitiveness. They range in opportunities from highly structured like varsity clubs to more recreational based clubs. There are approximately 350 intramural teams featuring approximately 3,200 undergraduate, graduate, and faculty/staff participants. There are two primary fitness centers and as of Sept. 2016, the fitness centers have approximately 19,000 visits per week. 55% of the undergraduate student body participates. There were 47,000 fitness group participants (yoga, Pilates, spinning) in 2015-2016. There are 25 facilities contained in one athletics complex, Penn Park has two turf fields and tennis courts and Franklin Field has a track open daily for recreation.

Calhoun shared a quick look at the Athletics budget. For the current fiscal year, the Athletics is running a deficit budget at about \$47.7 million where \$46.4 million is revenue; from that about \$20 million is from Penn assistance, \$10 million from gifts and endowments, and \$7.7 million from recreation and student fees and club membership dues. Fundraising has been an increasingly important revenue source for Athletics where about \$20 million in gifts is raised annually. One area that Athletics is working toward growing is the divisional endowment. During the last major fundraising campaign for the University, Athletics raised \$125 million and of that \$9 million went toward the divisional endowment.

Regarding generating revenue, Athletics is not looking to make money from recreation fees and dues, but more to break even. There are facilities bills, staff payment, operations, and maintenance, etc. and the revenue has to cover those expenses.

Calhoun discussed ways to increase recreation advertising within the campus community. One way is to show the pricing comparison compared to other gym memberships. The overall price and amount of access to facilities and equipment is a better package deal for individual use. The Athletics department is looking into ways to better promote that information to the general Penn public, staff, faculty, and graduate students.

The committee discussed the possibility that part of a facility may be dedicated to faculty because some faculty may be reluctant to exercise alongside their students. Some universities (UT Austin) have such facilities.

Moving forward the department is conducting more surveys and collecting better data on facility use to aid in these efforts. Reed (Campus and Community Life Committee Member) suggested using surveys as a part of the sign up process for new and renewal memberships as another way of collecting data. Another area of focus for promotion is amongst the graduate students. The committee asked why recreation isn't included in the graduate student's financial packages the way it is for undergraduates. Calhoun shared that they are working on a financial model to prepare for ways to incorporate the fee into the graduate student package but that also must mean that they need a higher population of graduate students who are seeking to use the facilities. Currently 8-10% pay the fees and never attend the gym.

The committee asked if it is possible for some students opt out of the recreational package. Calhoun said that it would have to be either an individual decision or everyone will have to pay, it would be too complicated to try and give too many options. The committee also asked if all of the schools have been included in these conversations regarding graduate students and athletics. Calhoun shared that the Provost and all Deans are updated on all of the Athletics developments.

Below are the additional questions that were sent to Calhoun.

Q: Do you know how many faculty and staff and how many grad students are at Penn? Having the total will help us figure out how the percentage compare.

A: The most recent official numbers are:

11,588 undergraduate
13,288 graduate
17,354 faculty/staff

Q: What percentage of Penn undergraduates use the gym? What percentage of graduate students? What percentage of faculty members?

A: For this fall semester, an average of 55% of undergraduate students visited Pottruck and Fox Health & Fitness Centers. There are currently 2,343 graduate students who have paid memberships at a student discount rate and 1,580 staff/faculty. With student wellness being critically important, we are currently developing a strategic plan for Recreation that looks to increase *undergraduate* participation to 70% over the next 3 years.

Q: Does recreation subsidize intercollegiate athletics?

A: No, in fact Recreation is currently operating in a deficit and the Division is subsidizing Recreation.

Q: Is the income from the one division separate from the other?

A: Yes, revenue and expenses associated with administering the Department of Recreation and all related recreational activities are reflected within that department's overall budget. And then within the recreation department, the various programs have dedicated budgets such as Intramurals, Sport Clubs, Outdoor Adventure, etc.

Q: Is recreation looking only to break even while encouraging participation that is as wide as possible, or is it (also) looking to make money/raise funds?

A: It is imperative that Recreation not only service the Penn Community as best as possible through providing health, fitness & wellness programs and activities but that it cover its own direct costs that include not only those expenses associated with running the business such as staffing, equipment and utilities but also cover expenses for its use of the many different shared athletics facilities. Ideally, Recreation would be considered a revenue center for the Division where it contributes to a cash reserve to help cover unanticipated risk specific to the Department and would assist with covering deferred maintenance costs for the Fitness Centers that is currently being subsidized by the Division.

Appendix C: detailed notes from meeting on the library

The University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (UC CARA) meeting was held on Wednesday, February 22, 2017 in room 219 of College Hall. Presenting at the meeting were Carton Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, and Kim Eke, Director of Teaching, Research, and Learning Services at Penn Libraries.

Rogers began by going through the questions that the committee sent to him ahead of time, in preparation for this meeting. The discussion is summarized below.

1. Can you provide follow up from our last meeting regarding the Humanities faculty in relation to the library? Faculty in the Humanities expressed concern that the developments in digitalization do not fully serve their needs. Rogers explained this will be an ongoing conversation with the Humanities faculty. They have yet to have a meeting with the department partially because there was no need to have a meeting this year as the Library is currently unable to shift any materials from Van Pelt/Dietrich or any other campus library to the high density storage facility in South Jersey because they are out of space there as well. He has been spending the last year trying to gather the funds (\$2.5 million) to expand the storage facility or build an additional building.

Rogers shared that Penn participates in resource sharing with other schools. He recently had a conversation with the Provost regarding book storage and collateral exchange for relationships with other schools. Penn currently has 6.5 million print volumes in storage. Penn isn't going to add more funds for more facilities because the demand/ trend has shifted more toward digital versions of media. Members of the committee asked if it were possible to request a larger group of books from storage for class coursework, so that students can access the printed text. Rogers explained that it could be done, but it kind of defeats the purpose of storing the books as the space is so limited in the storage facility and in the stacks. He continued to share that all of the books in storage are classified- protected in the Library of Congress. Penn bibliographers spend a lot of time to make sure that the right books are going to storage based on regular use and general circulation. The storage facility currently has a one in, one out process for recirculating the books. In other words, if a large number of books are taken from storage and put back into regular circulation, another group must go to the storage facility.

Committee asked for an update regarding the Biomedical library. Rogers shared that the building that housed the biomedical library- that space is currently under renovations and they have a fundraising plan to upgrade the space once it is available again.

The committee inquired about usage data and if the same space concerns surround digital material. Rogers replied that it may be a concern moving forward but not currently. He explained that it has been an interesting transition from print to digital, but right now the demand is more for digital materials as it makes the access to the information more immediate for the consumer. Rogers continued that it has also been interesting to see how the different schools and disciplines are working those conflicting needs. Math scholars want to keep books in print where medical scholars have more of a digital focus.

The committee asked what happened to the project to digitally enhance images of that the stacks shelves for book searches- a virtual visit to the library. Rogers shared that nothing has been finalized but they are still working on it. The virtual visit would include a call number search with a similar effect of title and author and would include all of the books that Penn owns.

2. The second question from the committee- What are the differences in learning outcomes from digital vs print? And if those differences have an impact on citation analysis? Rogers suggested that the committee consider inviting Bruce Lenthall from the Center for Teaching and Learning or Brian Baker, Director for the Center of Learning and Analytics for more information regarding digital learning and information at Penn.

Eke shared information regarding the different types of digital services and learning tools that the Library has to offer students, faculty, staff and the Penn community. She shared a detailed overview of some of the services currently available. She said that there is a movement toward social reading on multiple devices and open scholarship of the web. Hypothesis is a tool that the Library offers that is an open annotation platform – publishing library and content producing organizations came together to create this annotation layer. The program facilitates close reading, social reading, and individual annotation of digital materials that are pdf and web-based. It allows students and or faculty to engage in particular points of text and link to other resources.

Eke enthusiastically shared that the Library just launched a free library recording studio located on the 3rd floor of Van Pelt. It is open to all of the campus community for individual or group use. The Library has staff available that provide an orientation to use of the equipment and assistance as needed. Virtual reality tech options are also available. The Library has also developed fluency courses and workshop series on teaching and learning how to use the different types of technology offered through the University.