University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (UC CARA)
4/1/2018

1. Committee participants

Committee members: Joseph Libonati (chair), Cynthia Degros, Marcia Dotson, Julie Fairman, Yasmina Al Ghadban, David Gordon, Yuhong He, Patty Lynn, Nicola Mason, Daniel Raff, Sarah Wipperman, Marcus Wright, and Guobin Yang.

Administrative liaison: Leo Charney (Provost’s Office)

Staff: Jennifer Canose (Provost’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 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.

2. Examine the resources available to Penn students while they study abroad.

3. Review admissions and financial aid policies and processes in consultation with Dean of Admissions Eric Furda.

4. Review the progress on the reorganization of the bookstore.

5. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee’s work in academic year 2018-19.

3. Meetings and main recommendations related to specific charges

The committee met five times this year to address all of the above specific charges.

4. Summary of Major Points Addressed by the Committee

1. The first meeting was held on October 16, 2017 and was spent on the history and background of each of the charges. Four subcommittees were formed to formulate specific questions and follow-up items for each of the specific charges. The committee agreed to focus equally on Charges #1 through #5. Detailed meeting notes are found in Appendix A.

2. The second meeting was held on November 30, 2017 and was spent discussing the Penn Global and Penn Abroad programs (Specific Charge 2). Nigel Cossar, Mark Dingfield, and Amy Gadsden were guests of the committee. Discussions focused on the cultural/practical preparations and support structures Penn Abroad provides to students. Several questions about student safety and the existing incident protocol were posed. The committee also discussed reviewing the academic rigor of study abroad programs and the difficulties students encounter because study abroad programs are not centralized in one location. Detailed meeting notes are found in Appendix B.

Recommendations
a. For student convenience, we suggest that the University consider developing a centralized, one stop, all-encompassing location for Penn Global and Penn Abroad programs.

3. The third meeting was held on January 25, 2018 and was spent discussing admissions and financial aid (Specific Charge 3). Eric Furda, Elaine Varas, and MaryFrances McCourt were guests of the committee. After a brief review of the cost of attendance at Penn, discussions on Penn’s grant based policy were initiated, with follow-up discussions on how financial aid is communicated to students, specifically to high need students. Given the large numbers of students requiring financial aid, the committee also addressed the staffing needs of the financial aid office. With respect to admissions, the committee reviewed admissions policies and discussed efforts to
recruit international students. Some discussion regarding first generation, low income students also occurred. Detailed meeting notes are found in Appendix C.

Recommendations
a. We suggest that the University consider examining the financial burden characteristics of middle income students.

4. The fourth meeting was held on February 22, 2018 and was spent discussing the Penn Bookstore (Specific Charge 4). Marie Witt and Chris Bradie were guests of the committee. A wide range of topics were covered, including: textbook affordability, the interrelationship between the bookstore and Barnes & Noble, Penn brand identity, and the evolution of the bookstore as a “place of community.” The committee also learned of the changing purchasing trends at the bookstore and projected future trends. Detailed meeting notes are found in Appendix D.

Recommendations
a. We suggest that the University continue to work closely with the bookstore in monitoring course expenses, particularly as the electronic educational landscape expands.

5. The fifth meeting was held on March 15, 2018 and revolved around the general environment for research at the University and identifying what changes or support could improve research productivity and creativity (Specific Charge 1). Dawn Bonnell was the guest of the committee. We covered the overall scope of the Vice Provost for Research and discussed some of the initiatives to spark research at Penn, like the University Research Foundation and the newly developed Targeted Investments in Research Discovery and Translation. Detailed meeting notes are found in Appendix E.

Recommendations
a. We suggest that the Vice Provost for Research continue to work on providing mechanisms of bridge funding to faculty who recently lost funding.

Recommendation of New Topics or Continuing Topics to be Addressed in 2018-2019

The Committee would like to recommend a trial experiment for next year in which it focuses more intensively on one specific issue each semester.

1. The Committee acknowledges the University’s efforts to make a Penn education affordable. Given the significance of this goal, the committee would like to address affordability (both school-related and cost of living expenses) for all undergraduate and graduate students, across the socioeconomic and cultural spectra. This work would include the University’s new initiatives for first generation low income students but also address the financial concerns of middle income and other students.

2. Given the significance of Penn’s educational mission, the committee would like to examine/review classroom instructor preparation (TAs, full/part time/adjunct faculty) prior to entering the classroom. This work would be conducted with the Center for Teaching and Learning, the Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty, and representatives from across the Schools.
CARA Chair Joe Libonati called the meeting to order at 12:05pm.

Members of the committee present introduced themselves. Marcus Wright will be replacing Peter Rockett as one of the two WPPSA representatives on the committee going forward.

Libonati reviewed the committee charges for 2017-2018 and discussed the overall timeline for the committee’s work, including monthly meetings and producing an end-of-year report, as well as a need to prioritize the charges. Leo Charney provided history and background for each of the charges. Regarding the first charge to explore research, this is a continuation of the same charge from 2016-2017; Vice Provost for Research Dawn Bonnell presented on this topic to CARA last year and could do so again this year. Charney advised the committee to determine specific topics within the broad category of research they would like to focus on. Regarding the second charge on study abroad, this is a new charge for this committee. Executive Director for Penn Global Amy Gadsden and Penn Abroad Director Nigel Cossar would be the best guests to invite on this topic. Regarding the charge to review admissions and financial aid policies, Dean of Admissions Eric Furda should be invited. Regarding the final charge to review the bookstore, this was a previous charge to the committee and concerns the shift in the bookstore to expand beyond books. Daniel Raff will be able to provide more information. Vice President for Business Services Marie Witt and Associate Vice President Christopher Bradie presented on this topic last year and can be invited to do so again.

The committee discussed potentially adding new charges to this year’s list. Charney noted that two of the topics in the general committee charge, the library and athletics, have been covered more than once over the past few years. Suggestions included the security of students while studying abroad and mental health and wellness resources available to graduate (specifically PhD) students. The possibility of having a joint meeting with another University Council committee to discuss mental health and wellness was explored.

Yasmina Al Ghadban asked for clarification regarding the role of CARA in regards to admissions policies given the other groups and councils discussing this issue across the University; Charney clarified that CARA is unique in that it is an independent body.

Libonati suggested that four subcommittees be formed to formulate specific questions and follow-up items for each charge. The committee agreed and volunteers were organized as follows:

Charge 1 (research): Yasmina Al Ghadban, Guobin Yang, and Marcus Wright (suggested volunteer: David Gordon)

Charge 2 (study abroad): Yuhong He, Patty Lynn, and Marcia Dotson

Charge 3 (admissions and financial aid): Yasmina Al Ghadban and Marcus Wright

Charge 4 (bookstore): Patty Lynn (suggested volunteer: Daniel Raff)
The committee agreed that each subcommittee will prepare 3 to 5 questions or areas of focus for the invited guest speaker(s) for their particular charge. These questions should be prepared within the next month and submitted to the committee for feedback/discussion before they are sent out to the speakers. Following the meeting on their particular charge, each subcommittee will prepare a one to two paragraph summary of the meeting as well as recommendations for additional questions or areas for follow up. These recommendations and the summary of each presentation will be combined to form the end-of-year report that is submitted to the Secretary’s Office. Charney indicated that the Secretary’s Office strongly prefers to receive a few, key actionable recommendations. Charney also provided an overview of how the University Council subcommittees’ recommendations are received and responded to by the University each year.

The committee agreed to the following tentative general schedule of meetings/topics for the year. Charney will contact Dean Furda to assess when it will be possible for him to present given the admissions cycle and his travel schedule. Each meeting will be scheduled for 1 hour and 15 minutes, with approximately 50 minutes allotted to the guest speaker to present, and 25 minutes reserved for the committee to discuss the presentation and any outstanding issues.

November: Charge 3 (Admissions) or Charge 2 (Study Abroad)
December: Charge 3 (Admissions) or Charge 2 (Study Abroad)
January: Charge 1 (Research)
February: Charge 4 (Bookstore)
March: Meeting to prepare and review the end-of-year report

The need to carefully schedule the meetings so as not to conflict with student members’ schedules was noted. Due to changes in class schedules in the Spring semester, only the Fall semester meetings will be scheduled at this time. Meeting times will be determined by Doodle poll.

Before the close of the meeting, some additional ideas regarding the charges were discussed. Libonati offered additional thoughts on topics to explore within the research charge, including bridge funding for faculty whose grants run out; discrepancies in startup funding across different schools within the university; and access to university funds for research beyond funding that schools provide. Yuhong He suggested that the Office of Risk Management be invited to discuss study abroad.

Libonati thanked everyone for their participation and the meeting was adjourned at 12:45pm.
Appendix B:
University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA)

Meeting Minutes
November 30, 2017

CARA Chair Joe Libonati called the meeting to order at 11:00am, followed by introductions.

Nigel Cossar began with an overview of Penn Global and Penn Abroad, discussing how the office is structured. Penn has long history of sending students abroad and sends a very significant number abroad compared to our peers on semester basis.

The questions developed by the subcommittee were discussed as follows.

**We know that incidents are uneventful, but what pathways are put in place when our Penn students study abroad?**

1. *Please describe the cultural and practical preparation Penn Abroad provides students accepted into study abroad programs.*

Penn takes the semester study abroad experience very seriously. There are a number of touchpoints and advisors before, during, and after the experience. All students are assigned a global programs manager (GPM), who has expertise in a given program/location, and have a mandatory advising meeting. The GPM works with the student on their destination, application, and housing. All students are also assigned a home school study abroad academic advisor to support students academically through the process. Dual degree students meet with both schools to maintain progress towards graduation. All credit that is taken abroad must show up on their Penn transcript. Students should choose courses that fit their major and other requirements and that are eligible for credit. The courses show up on the transcript as Penn courses. Faculty assess courses through the XCAT system. Student meetings with their GPM and home school academic advisor are mandatory, as well as pre-departure activities. Students undertake a series of pre-departure orientations both online (Canvas) and in person on campus prior to their departure. These sessions provide both practical and cultural preparation, including health, safety and security advice. Students are also advised of the ongoing support from Penn during their time abroad (CAPS, Career Services, etc.). Any student that is going abroad maintains FTE at Penn, including access to all services on campus. All students have their programs registered on the Global Activities Registry (GAR) and are required to provide their travel details so their trips can be monitored. Penn Abroad works closely with Director of International Risk Management at Penn and International SOS (ISOS) to monitor the safety of the Penn community at home and abroad. All programs have on-site orientations that students are required to attend in the first few days upon arrival, with many also having required pre-departure sessions that are conducted online prior to departure.
2. Please summarize what supports are in place for Penn students when they study abroad? Please specifically address violence and sexual assault issues.

Penn students maintain full time enrolled status during their time abroad, which entitles them to access the full suite of services as if they were on campus. Penn Abroad works closely with SHS and CAPS to ensure students are prepared as best they can be in relation to health and mental wellness for their time abroad, including Know Before You Go sessions in partnership with CAPS. Other campus partners include Student Disabilities Services, Career Services, and Weingarten. The Canvas modules have a list of resources.

When students are abroad in a Penn-approved program, Penn Abroad ensures there are equivalent services on site. A large percentage of these programs are bilateral partnerships, i.e., a similar institution with similar services. There are also programs at smaller centers and hybrid models, but they all must offer the same level of support. Students have access to partner program support services during their time abroad, with many Penn support services able to connect in with their equivalent office abroad. An example of this is CAPS who can link to a local service provider to support the ongoing care of a student.

Violence and sexual assault have been issues of focus over the last few years. Penn Abroad partners with Penn Violence Prevention (PVP) in the review of pre-departure materials, and other resources similar to the Know Before You Go, that are provided to students pre-departure. When students are abroad it can be a different space as it relates to sexual assault. Our office makes sure we know what we have to do when we are made aware of a situation abroad and provides information about how Penn responds to these incidents to our partners. Our partners are not compliant to Title IX because they are outside the United States, so there can be challenges. All students are given a passport insert with list of numbers, including PVP. Penn Abroad partners with International SOS, who has a dedicated team focused on violence and sexual assault when students are abroad. This team has language approved by Penn that is conveyed to a student calling in advising them of the confidential support services available at Penn. This partnership with ISOS was in part developed by the working group that Penn Global put together across campus to develop and deploy a special set of services for Penn students abroad.

• (additional question) What are rates of these incidents, and are students are made aware of the risks about going abroad?

Through coffee chats Penn Abroad does talk about safety. They make them aware about the destinations they are going to and help them look at crime reports, State Department reports, make informed decisions about that city site, be aware about where their housing is, and the challenges of cultural aspect. In some cultures, there is a different approach about how or whether one would report different activities. All we can do prior to their going is to be aware of their surroundings, housing, and have a plan of contact in place.

We do not have an official number of sexual violence incidents involving Penn students abroad. Students can choose not to report. The Director of International Risk Management receives regular reports. Anecdotally, we know there is not a significant number of sexual assaults abroad; most incidents reported to ISOS for Penn are robbery, petty theft, or similar types of incidents.

• (additional question) How does Penn integrate with resources at the host university given that Penn resources, while available, may seem distant to students?
Particularly for partners were Penn Abroad has a direct exchange relationship, there is a required orientation for students about the resources at that host university including health services, etc.

- (additional question) What is the amount of due diligence that is conducted before a program is established abroad? Are ex-post audits on standards and content conducted for courses, given that the courses go onto Penn transcripts and count towards a student’s GPA?

Penn Abroad has a formal 4 year review cycle for all programs divided into 4 regions, done in partnership with the undergraduate schools. The review typically takes 4-6 months and looks at everything from mission, responsiveness, communication, support services, and student evaluations. Schools have to look into academic quality, through XCAT, syllabi. This responsibility is explicitly on the schools, with support from Penn Abroad. Penn Abroad highlights issues that may be of concern for the schools.

3. For graduate students going abroad for academic related reasons during their study at Penn, who should they turn to for support and help in addition to their individual schools/programs?

Penn Abroad largely works with the undergraduate population. Graduate students should be working with their graduate programs and schools. Graduate students have access to the same support and resources, including International SOS, and can contact Penn Abroad. There is no requirement for a graduate student to list their travel in the Global Activities Registry but it is strongly encouraged.

What are the mechanisms used to prepare a student for their study abroad experiences?

1. How does Penn Abroad work with individual schools and/or Global Support Services such as the Committee on International Travel Risk Assessment (CITRA) to prepare students before they study abroad, and to support them during their study abroad?

Penn Abroad is a sitting member on CITRA, and the Global Incident Management Taskforce (GIMT), so is kept up to date on the latest travel warnings and advice as outlined by the US State Department and local authorities. When programs/countries move into heightened risk region, Penn Abroad works with students going to CITRA regions. Undergraduate students that are traveling to a Heightened Risk Region must first receive approval from Penn by following the Undergraduate Travel Request Process in order for their travel to be assessed, and approved (typically with conditions), following the process outlined by CITRA. This approval can be reneged at any time if the safety risk is too great. Penn generally takes the approach of managing risk as opposed to being risk averse; our peers have more restrictions on where students can go. The Global Activities Registry is closely connected to ISOS support. All students based on their location start to receive information before they go about the specific city and country where they are going, including CDC info, crime rates, and updates on any situations that arise (for example, the Barcelona referendum).

- (additional question) Who makes the decision if an area is not safe?

CITRA assesses a region based on US State Department travel warnings and ISOS. A heightened risk is considered above a medium risk, although there are regions that move in and out quite regularly. A collective decision that is made based on those authorities, also taking into account students’ prior
experience and background and their ability to handle the risk. There is a different risk management system for undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty.

- **(additional question) What happens when an approval is reneged?**

Depending on what point it is in the semester, there may be an opportunity for student to move to their backup location. If it is later in a semester, Penn Abroad assesses the actual location itself. Sometimes they evacuate students, working with ISOS, and then work with the undergrad schools on the academic credit piece. But it varies. Students have sometimes brought work back and then it was completed and assessed at Penn. For example, during the Paris terror attacks 2 years ago, a number of students returned early from Belgium. Penn Abroad ensured that they could complete rest of semester; the partner university still did the exams and the readings online. Our advice to students is that Penn provides resources to support them. It is their call if we aren’t asking them to return based on our assessment. Sometimes students still prefer to come back, and Penn Abroad makes sure they are aware of financial and academic implications. All of these situations are on a case by case basis.

2. **What kind of support does Penn Abroad provide by itself or in collaboration with individual departments/schools to help with study abroad students’ transition back to Penn campus, especially for those who left for a semester or longer?**

Penn Abroad works with CAPS and other relevant campus services to support students’ transition back to campus following their study abroad experience. All Penn Abroad programs have a post-experience evaluation survey (sent in the last week abroad) and in-person re-entry event to support students in their transition.

Although very few students attend reentry programming, Penn Abroad works in partnership with CAPS and Career Services to provide information sessions as part of their re-entry, and with some undergraduate schools who also extend similar support and events for their students. Penn has in the past partnered with other local universities to put on a re-entry conference; however, very few students actually went. So Penn Abroad will be working on developing programming that is more Penn-specific in collaboration with the new Penn Abroad Leaders (PALs) student advisory group.

Penn Abroad would like to have more students participate in reentry programming, to help students think about their experience and how to apply it for their future. Partners such as CURF (helping them think about how to apply this on their resume or for fellowships) or Career services (leveraging study abroad experience for a potential employer) are interested as well. But students get back to campus and quickly back with their friends and back into Penn. The subcommittee offered various suggestions for different ways to approach reentry programming, including offering it at the end of the semester while the students are still abroad, or at end of the next full semester now that they have been here a whole semester, or during advance registration. The survey is not required, but Penn Abroad has approximately a 40% response rate. The decision to hold back credit belongs to the schools and is not an option for Penn Abroad. The subcommittee suggested Penn Abroad look at ways to increase student participation in reentry programming and provide more feedback on their experiences.

- **(additional question) What is Penn Abroad doing to promote study abroad to diverse audiences? Is there a diverse array of students taking advantage of these opportunities?**
Diversity and access to all of our programs is front and center to everything Penn Abroad does. Penn Abroad works to increase access for students of all backgrounds, partnering with offices on campus such as PennCap to promote opportunities and offer tailored information sessions. Penn Global has started Penn Global seminars, which are regular courses with an embedded travel component. Penn Global has focused on promoting and creating these programs with a diverse audience in mind. Students may be more likely to go on a short term experience instead of a whole semester. Penn Global continues to work to ensure it is responding to what Penn students want and what barriers may be in their way.

3. **What are your core values for choosing a partner University to participate in Penn Study Abroad?**

Penn Abroad and Penn Global work to support Penn’s vision through the Penn compact Inclusion, Innovation and Impact, identifying ways in which to enable a wider participation of students on global programs. Such programs include semester, short term (Penn Global Seminars), and summer internships. Penn Abroad is not the final decision maker on any programs – this is mainly managed by the schools. Before any program is established, due diligence and in many cases site visits are conducted. Programs are evaluated based on metrics including academic quality, student enrollment, support services, housing, cultural and linguistic integration, majors available, diversity in disciplines and destinations. Establishing a partnership involves a formal agreement with many partners including the Offices of General Counsel, Risk Management, and Privacy and can take up to 18 months. Once a program is approved it falls into a 4 year review cycle, which will now be expanded to include internship sites.

**What avenues can a student take when they are in need of financial assistance as they study abroad?**

1. **Does the University partner with overseas corporations/universities to assist a student in need of employment?**

Penn Abroad provides advice to students on this issue. Students may have the option of working in their host country, though this is subject to the laws of the country and their visa status as a student. In most places, depending on visa status and the student’s passport, students can work 10-15 hours a week. While Penn Abroad does not discourage working, they want to make sure students are able to arrive and get settled in before they consider getting a part time job. Penn Abroad works with the partner universities to provide information about work opportunities and links to their career services offices.

2. **What are the financial obligations for Penn students who study abroad?**

3. **Do Penn students receive any financial assistance from their overseas universities?**

Penn charges home school tuition for our semester abroad experiences. When students go abroad, they maintain FTE and pay a study abroad fee. Penn Abroad has a close partnership with Student Financial Services (SFS). Budget sheets are prepared for every program by semester, and shared with SFS who uses the budget sheet details to repackage aid based on the cost of attendance for the given program. Their aid package changes to support them to ensure they that they are not disadvantaged in going abroad; in most cases funds are increased. A student is only expected to pay the home school tuition, not more if the abroad program’s tuition is higher. Financial aid for Penn Global Seminars follows a similar process. Sixty percent of students who have completed a global seminar are on financial aid.
Penn Abroad also runs an internship program in the summer that provides aid to students to go and work abroad, and maintains a list of scholarship opportunities for students.

**What do you think of the past and future for students who study aboard?**

1. **On average, how many Penn students were enrolled in the study abroad program for the last 2 years?**

   For traditional semester-long programs: for 2015-16, 553 students went abroad out of 799 applications. Some students do not finish their applications or withdraw. For 2016-17, 477 went abroad out of 722 total applications. For 2017-18, 492 are committed from a total application base of 703.

   These numbers are only roughly 25% of the total Penn students who go abroad each year. About 2000 Penn students go abroad each year; 75% of them (mostly graduate students) are going on less than a semester program. This reflects the national trend of growth in short term programs. They can be very effective and pedagogically rigorous, and be an attractive way for students to get international experience. The other 75% of students include a mixture of graduate students and Penn Summer Abroad programs (managed through LPS). Penn Abroad sees their role as a supporter and consolidator of information about these programs, providing more of a one stop shop model.

2. **What are Penn Abroad’s goals in helping and supporting students in the next 5 years?**

   Penn Abroad collaborates alongside other departments in Penn Global under a strategic framework for Penn’s Global Initiatives. Penn’s Global Strategic Framework is encapsulated by three pillars: Educate Global Citizens, Catalyze Transformative Ideas, and to Bring Penn to the World and the World to Penn. The next five year plan (2018-2023) is currently being considered by the University community, before being ratified by the Board of Trustees in Spring 2018.

   Penn Abroad aligns their goals with Penn’s Global Initiatives in mind. Educating Global Citizens is a goal where every student shall have a meaningful global experience abroad. Penn is investing significantly in this space to create new opportunism and programs, including taking a good look at the semester program and responding to greater demand in short term programs.

   Penn Abroad went through a review 1.5 years ago and restructured this past spring to create a one stop shop space and new advising model. Even if Penn Abroad doesn’t manage the programs, they can still advise on the program. The one stop shop model has benefits for students and schools, as it can be very confusing for undergraduate students to have study abroad programs spread across campus. Penn Summer Abroad (managed by LPS) is exclusively SAS courses, though they share technology with Penn Abroad. Changes to the management structure would be a part of a larger structural conversation. Despite the fact that Penn Abroad is resource constrained, they have trained their staff to be able to advise on all programs and recognize the importance of collaborating with very strong partnerships across the university. The current director Nigel has only been here for 2 years and has done a great job restructuring the office and training the staff.

   Penn Abroad is also focusing on building stronger campus partnerships and conducting an overhaul of preparation materials and advice, ensuring information is timely and relevant, and conveyed in an easy-to-digest format for students.
CARA Chair Joe Libonati called the meeting to order at 11:00am, followed by introductions.

Elaine Varas talked about the structure of SRFS and provided definitions and explanations for the following terms:

**Cost of Attendance (COA)/Budget:** what a student is going to need to be a student at Penn. It includes tuition, fees, books, supplies, and components for housing and board (meals). In addition, we include miscellaneous (personal) allowances for sundry items and transportation. We don’t assume the student has a car, but we allow for local transportation. All of those are established up front. COA is determined on a tentative basis with 3 breakdowns: on campus, off campus (apartment), and with family.

**Self-help/Summer Savings:** With every institution there is the expectation that families will contribute to education. The family contribution is a combination of analysis that is done from the FAFSA profile and internal forms, and provides processors an ability to calculate the reasonable expectation for a family to contribute. Another part is the student contribution (summer savings). We do expect students to contribute to the family contribution. The third component is the work study award, which allows them to work on campus and help themselves with miscellaneous expenses. All of these are incorporated into their package (the Expected Family Contribution (EFC) = parent contribution + student contribution). SRFS has a new Director of Communications, who is working to put all of this information on a website so that it is clear and understandable and incorporate the student perspective.

3.1. **Penn’s Grant-Based Policy**
Our policy is called an “all grant based aid policy.” When we package a student, we are going to package them up to their need figure with Penn grant (institutional aid) and a self-help component (work-study). There are families that might need to borrow a loan at some point; a family might say “we know you’ve calculated our EFC at $6,000, but we don’t have that.” That’s when we counsel them about educational loans. These are intended for a student’s education, through the federal government, and are very different than a private loan. They allow for deferment, forbearance options, and income based repayment. Educational loans help families meet that gap.

Part of our grant based policy is that it is intended to help students while they are here as a full time undergraduate student. The expectation is that they complete the degree in 8 semesters and 4 years, and that has always been the policy. We need to make sure that students are being supported but also understand that it was not intended to help a student submatriculate and get a master’s or additional degrees. We are working with all of the schools and advisors to make sure that everyone understands the policy and that students are getting consistent information.

We will always cover students if there are extenuating circumstances such as health issues. What really comes off the table are the submatriculants. The intent of the policy was not to help students getting additional degrees. Penn is supporting 8 semesters of undergrad aid. If you are graduating from Penn with
multiple degrees and you are having to take little bit of debt in the 5th year, that’s not necessarily inappropriate. For the 8 semester policy, a lot of thought and partnerships went into that. The financial aid office is not the first step making these decisions; we work with advising offices and schools to come up with a plan.

Coordinated dual degree programs, such as Nursing/Wharton dual degrees, are covered. Prospective students should be told that they are eligible for additional aid to cover this program for 5 years.

**How is this information being communicated to students?**
We want to have formal student advocates. We have gotten the message out across the deans and academic advisors, but we have to get the message out to the students as well. We would like to develop a one stop shop, and help students figure out how to break down barriers to feel comfortable asking these sometimes sensitive questions. One initiative we have developed is proactive reporting, where we reach out to students in advance of aid changes or students going on hold. Sometimes it is simply because students have forgotten to fill out a form.

**3.2. High need Students**
We are working with student groups, and also getting the financial aid staff out to where the students are versus always having them come to us. The energy has been focused on first generation, low-income (FGLI) students so far. Elaine has a regular standing lunch with the FGLI student group and is coordinating to participate in board meetings. We have met with SAB, UA, SCUE, and 5B, to give them this information and clear up the 8 semester rule. We are working to improve outreach on campus. Financial aid should be consistent, defensible, and fair, and a partnership between the financial aid counselor and student. We’ve worked over the past 6 months to document our policies, procedures, and develop templates for the counselors to make sure they are covering all of the questions with each student. We are thinking about exploring closing the office one morning a week to focus on staff training, as well as setting up an appeals committee. Where we need the jumpstart is more of the student voice. They are going to be able help us help them more at the level they need to be connected with.

Another initiative is financial literacy. There are some students who have to navigate the financial process on their own and others who are not engaged at all, and it is our job to help both: for the student who has no support system, to make sure we are walking them through step by step, and for the other student, it’s our job to teach them and help them understand their part and how this works. We always require that student give us permission to talk to their families.

Regarding mechanisms to help students who are food insecure – there are a couple of issues. If you are living on campus, it is one thing, but if you are not, we have to give you one lump sum up front. That’s part of the huge push to increase financial literacy. High need students may also be in the difficult position of feeling like they need to send money back home to their family. Last year, we helped anyone who reached out, but the students had to know to ask. This year we proactively did some outreach to high need students, and some signed up. We work with Business Services to figure out best way to meet food needs without being wasteful.
3.3. **How many financial aid officers do we have? Are you adequately staffed?**

The number of aided students has grown. We do not know ratio of aided students to counselors. Currently we have 12 counselors and are hiring 4 more, which would bring us back up to our regular staff level after reorganization (part of which was focused on creating a team dedicated to graduate students). We are evaluating the responsibilities of the staff and talking to the schools about what they need and our plans for increased outreach.

Our other responsibilities are walk-ins and calls, and day to day volume. A one stop shop might help address about 80% of the general questions, and allow our counselors to do the intense one on one counseling, but we need to know that we have the time to do that. There are large systems issues as well, with data flowing in and out of the institution. We also are focusing on federal compliance issues.

3.4. **Admissions**

Penn is part of the American Talent Initiative, supported by Bloomberg Philanthropies. The goal is to increase the number of Pell grant recipients by 2025. The goals of the ATI are to ensure: need based financial aid is prioritized; students are coming in to welcoming community; and any gaps between groups in retention and graduation rates close.

For international students outside North America, we are not need blind. There is a sense that maybe this is something we would like to work towards, which is different from 5 years ago. The fundraising goals are becoming clearer about what it would take to do that.

In terms of composition of the student body, this represents about $10 million in FY2015 total of about 260 students outside of Canada and Mexico. In Admissions, we sit with applications from around the globe, coordinated dual degree, and ones applying for Financial Aid. We try to allocate dollars in a way that we can spread them out. Over a 4 year period we are trying to build a diversity of voices across our campus and spread offers out; this is the hardest part of our work.

We don’t have a quota. Students that are applying from some regions just might require more money; we are seeing different levels of need across the globe, with some regions that are needier than others. Admissions has been holding regional summits with alumni and donors, to make the case for fundraising goals for international financial aid. We may need a more regional strategy.

For any student that checks the box that they are applying for financial aid, if that application is identified as a potential admit, it goes to SFS. Once an international student is admitted, financial aid does the package for them like any other student. The same aid policies apply; they are going to be fully funded. For situations for international students where there is a gap, and they can’t access the US loan system, there is a funding source through SFS to address these situations through a Penn loan fund.

We have an international work study funding allowance for international students interested in working, using Penn money rather than federal money. Students still need to make sure they are abiding by immigration requirements, the number of hours they can work, etc.
For international students who are sponsored by government or companies, are there different options for them to secure additional funding if they want to change their major?

We do have international students who for multiple reasons, change their major, or came in as non-financial aid, but something happens and they now need financial aid, we work with them. We are need aware because we have a certain amount of funding that we can support these students with. We are very careful with the funding, and look at extenuating circumstances such as geological or family crises.

3.5. First Generation, Low-income Students
Building on the work of the FGLI Summit from last spring, Provost Pritchett has an executive planning group that is looking at impacting the graduation rate and making the Penn experience the same for all students. We do so much currently for FGLI students, but we didn’t have it in one place. Is what we are doing effective? What more can we do? What incremental funding should there be?

We have realized the importance of peer counseling and mentorship. We can do many things from a financial aid perspective, but only if you know to ask. We are working on enhancements and trying to get the message out better to students. The student body has changed, that trajectory will continue, and the students have a voice that they didn’t have before. The success of the last 10 years is why we are having these conversations.

Regarding the *New York Times* article: the cohort they looked at graduated between 2001-2013. The last class that would have been admitted in that range was the first class that had the grant based policy and our partnerships with Questbridge. We have changed in the last 10 years, and I’m sure some of this will change. The bottom point in that article is $19,800, and the fact that we have 3% (about 330 students) in that range is actually significant. When you go to that group’s average SAT score on 2400 scale, it’s a 1326. That’s going to be a limited pool for us no matter what you think about test scores. Regarding Pell grant recipients, except for USC, Penn graduates more recipients in any of the top private/public 25. If we can increase that number up by 1-2%, we can move that up even more.

We haven’t touched on middle income students – it’s a national discussion not just a Penn discussion. Looking at institutional aid over the last 10 years, it’s grown at more than 2 times the tuition rate. It’s a delicate balance, particularly in the class we are competing in when you look at the endowment of other institutions competing for the same students and the same aid.

The middle 50% apply to wider range of schools, apply for merit scholarships, and maybe opt out of applying to us entirely. They may consider in state options, honors colleges, and some of our peers who are very directed on merit aid.
CARA Chair Joe Libonati called the meeting to order at 11:05am, followed by introductions.
Chris Bradie provided an overview of the University’s relationship with Barnes & Noble (BN). Our relationship with BN goes back to 1996. BN operates the bookstore, including trade books, textbooks, general merchandise, and the café. They have 3 main responsibilities per the contract: 1) procure and provide course materials and trade books, 2) promote and enhance the Penn brand, and 3) provide a place of community and gathering on campus. The vision is to maintain the distinctiveness of an academic bookstore and enhance the retail experience.
The BN contract provisions have evolved, including these key changes over time:

- Books
  - Textbook affordability
    - The contract has grown to reflect this as a priority. There are now limits on markups and margins for textbooks, which is unique in retail; requirements to offer options for multiple formats so people have choices (new, used, digital, and/or rental); and price matching against other providers (this provision is only two years old). If you wish to use the bookstore to buy your books, we want to make sure it is a cost-neutral option for you.
    - For the price matching program, when price matching on Amazon the price used is the retail Amazon price.
    - There is a GAO report from 2008 examining what drives the upward cost of course materials. The report found it is mainly practices on the publishers’ side, and practices which restrict channels of availability. Those practices restrict channels, but not sourcing on the BN level.
    - The amount of customers choosing to rent textbooks has increased to just over half.
  - Trade book assortment
    - Changes have been made in response to the 2014 CARA report calling to “maintain a collection of well curated titles appropriate for a university community”. We have a number of qualitative provisions in the BN contract. We heard curation and discovery needed to be prioritized (“serendipitous discovery”)

- Brand identity
  - Merchandise must meet specific guidelines
    - University Council Committee on Manufacturer Responsibility best labor practices, diversity of price points, social responsibility, brand standards;
    - Commitment to alumni catalog to make sure there is engagement with the alumni community
    - Penn affiliate discounts (faculty/staff discount 10%), Penn specific endeavors
  - The bookstore works with student research groups; for example, we worked with a Wharton student group to see why/how alumni engage with branded products; found correlation between feelings of engagement and purchase of merchandise.
Most of revenue comes from branded merchandise. We set the margins and the price on course materials at a level we’ve fixed; we reduced the amount in the latest contract.

**Place of Community**

- Creation of dedicated study space and café and shared spaces: SEPTA center, Penn card office, computer connection
- Commitment to customer service/feedback mechanisms
- New Guest Author space: free and open to the public. Repurposed area from café
  - 76 events in 2017
  - 30 of 76 were faculty or Penn authors
  - 1000 attendee’s overall
  - 15-40 attendees per event on average
  - Seats 75 guests comfortably
  - Multimedia/A/V
  - BN built for us at our request (this is not retail space)
  - Usually set up now as a quiet reading room/study space. Open and available to reserve for public events.

Marketplace dynamics impact revenue categories, and consumer purchases have changed over time.

- Decline in proportion of sales from textbooks; recalibration in consumer preference in what they are purchasing from the campus store. This is all consistent with what you see in bookstores commercially as well as general retail overall.
- Increased competition from online competitors and diversity of options for purchasing books
- In 2008 there was the national GAO report that caused a national effort to lower the cost of textbooks; this has resulted in efforts to lower the cost of each book and change ratio of required to recommended books, including looking at things like bundling vs. not bundling, changing books to recommended instead of required, etc.
- Trade books – emergence of kindles and digital books has really affected that sourcing; the book industry has changed overall.
- There are a number of factors that drive decrease in a proportion of business. It is not just an exit of the market.
- The relative percent of revenue from general merchandise has increased
- The café has remained stable (only about 2% of revenue each year) as the number of cafes across campus has proliferated and increased competition
- Price points of general merchandise and the idea of choice: there is something in the bookstore that is accessible for everyone. We work on the assortment, and there isn’t anything in the assortment that is not selling to someone. This also goes back to Penn’s strong standards for social responsibility. We work on various affordability strategies, such as sales of 20% off, brand discounts on particular items, and special faculty/staff discount events.

Regarding the outlook for the next five years and “tension” between business and mission:

- This is one of the things that differentiates an academic from a regular bookstore. This means that BN must be willing to take a lower markup on the books and must offer a robust merchandise selection to maintain the business; everything cannot be a business decision. From a business standpoint, we need to make sure we watch that dynamic. It is a business concern, but this is a mission driven operation.
- There are colleges and universities that really look at the bookstore as a landlord/tenant relationship. Conversations in those relationships are about things like commission, not like at
Penn. They are not facing the same kind of balancing act of maintaining the academic mission. There is a reality of the business, but also a dedication to the mission.

Space allocations maintain strong book presence
- Generally, proportion of space needs to be consistent with where revenue is coming from
- Our space allocations don’t actually map to sales volume
- Renovations in 2013 – slightly more general merchandise space instead of trade books
  - Textbooks: 18% of sales, 12% of sq. ft.
  - Trade Books: 15% sales, 34% of sq. ft.
  - General Merchandise: 65% sales, 42% of sq. ft.
  - Café: 2% of sales, 12% of sq. ft.

The trade books department
- The bookstore has approximately 51,000 unique titles
- This assortment ranks in BN’s top 5 accounts (in terms of $ and #)
- Used to be 100,000, but there is a new normal and a new top
- Buying decisions are uniquely tailored to colleges and universities
  - Analysis at national, regional, local, peer-group, and campus-specific levels
  - On average, approximately 27,000 titles are in “key collegiate subjects”
  - Subjects reflective of the collegiate market (ex: art, technology, cultural/gender)
  - Subjects within the collegiate market and curated based on Penn-specific trends (ex: architecture and design; business; economics; theology)

Course Materials
- Responding to a changing landscape
- Contract emphasizes commitment to cost-saving strategies
  - Used (25%) Rental available new or used (50%)
  - All contractual provisions with BN
  - ISBN transparency in HEOA guidelines
  - 85% of inventory available as rental (17% in 2010); 55% choice rate
- Ordering facilitated by Faculty Enlight (online resource)
  - 650 faculty and course coordinators use it
- Metrics
  - FY17 total year actual sell-thru of approximately 61% (consistent with BN average)

Penn Book Center
- Got into textbook business after 2008 GAO report, then returned to their core business and left the textbook market

Feedback Mechanisms
- Campus wide survey
- Advisory group (faculty, staff, undergraduate and graduate students)
- Web based feedback forms
- Focus groups and surveys on specific programs
- Meetings with course material coordinators

2018 refresh
- Facilitating “serendipitous discovery”
• Investments to distinguish and differentiate upper level amenities
  o Consolidate split between academic sections
  o Expanded focal section of Penn faculty and alumni authors
  o Additional information desk on 2nd floor
  o Cohesive flow of academically oriented subjects (fiction will remain on first floor)
  o Adjacencies to the Penn Card center, computer connection, café, quiet space, marketplace
  o Facilitate shopping experience on ground floor
    ▪ Increasing table displayed books (60% of trade titles are sold off tables, not shelves)
    ▪ Repositioning and enhancing children’s and young adult sections
    ▪ Increasing assortment of items appropriate for faculty, staff, and alumni
    ▪ Increasing of more robust academic titles on floor 2

Future Trends and Responsive Strategies
• Barnes and Noble College is distinct from Barnes & Noble, Inc.
• Challenges include
  o Increase in alternative sources facing all areas of the organization
  o Prioritizing affordability has an impact on revenue/margins
  o Maintaining top position requires significant financial investment
  o Ongoing assessment
  o Commitment by BN to implement strategies that are uniquely tailored to Penn
  o Active collaboration between Penn and BN
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CARA Chair Joe Libonati called the meeting to order at 10:05am, followed by introductions.

Overview of VPR
Vice Provost for Research Dawn Bonnell discussed ways that her office is advancing research and innovation at Penn. In a general sense, VPR has several different activities:

- Supports our research enterprise: $1.5 billion
- Supports our research infrastructure, including categories such as clinical trials, buildings such as the new Singh building, and offices such as those that provide for safety
- Empowers interdisciplinary and cross school interactions: 172 research centers across campus; some report directly to VPR.
- Strategy and looking forward in the future. From that perspective, look at where trends are in research, try to find opportunities where Penn has specific strengths that could be raised to the next level with additional support. For example, this year we stood up Penn Health Tech.
- One of the roles of VPR is to work with schools and provide resources that are not school-specific. They work to advocate for our research with state and federal agencies. And have resources that we use to support research around the campus.

University Research Foundation (URF)

- URF supports scholarships across campus, providing financial support for research, seminars, and conferences.
- 2010-2017:
  - $11M has been invested in our faculty
  - Biomed (42%), natural sciences (19%), humanities (21%), social sciences (16%); distributed amongst the schools
- Most proposals are given to SAS, but the average award amount is higher in SEAS and PSOM
- New program started in 2017 to support activity strategically targeted to emerging research directions: Research Development Grant. It is a two stage program that walks people through the requirements- first phase is a planning grant that helps them in an emerging area, and the second is a larger grant over 2 years, so people can get the information to get outcomes that would be necessary to get a larger grant
- Impact seminar fund: average grants of $20-50k, when the goal is to raise stature by having event here
- There is also a more the general conference fund: average grants of $3-5k, with a requirement for a school match.
- There are advances that have been made with this fund, and we need to do a better job communicating that to the community. We are going to make this into a brochure.
- There are various opportunities for students to apply for conference grants (not through VPR).
- Research Development Grant: the first one we gave was to museum
- Overall, the university spent about $450 M on research in our last fiscal year, and got around $1B in external funding. The Deans spend additional money on top of this.
• The URF effectively supporting young scientists, junior faculty, and senior scholars: there doesn’t seem to be a tendency to award to one group over another.
• Success rate: the largest variable that contributes to this is the number that are submitted. PSOM has a lower success rate because we get about 4-5X as many. SP2 has a higher success rate, because we don’t get as many of them. For most cases, the rate is higher than federal grants.
• Barrier that URF doesn’t effectively solve: bridge funding. There is a bridge funding program within RFDF. The Deans know about it and they can propose bridge funding and have the school provide a match. VPR can help communicate about this program better.

**Targeted Investments in Discovery and Translation**

VPR is announcing two new financial support structures:

1. Provost’s Discovering the Future Fund. Support for blue sky/high risk/high reward research
   a. Addresses problem with flat funding and more translational research
   b. Emphasize that we are going to continue to support discovery research
   c. Award amounts of $100-$400k
   d. Solicitations on a bi-annual basis, no guarantee of award
   e. Based on scientific merit and
      i. Unanticipated or surprising results that alter current understanding, change trajectory of a field, or establish a new research topic
      ii. New concept that is original and exciting but lacks sufficient evident to move toward acceptance
      iii. New combination of trans-disciplinary concepts
   f. Funding decision made by VPR and committee

2. Accelerating from Lab to Market
   a. Pre-seed grants that move discoveries from lab to market
   b. Total program will be $2.5M over 5 years
   c. Funding based on scientific and technical merit and potential for commercialization
   d. Funding decision made by VPR and committee

**Stress and Wellness**

• This is not VPR’s purview, but to address wellness at Penn, the Provost has a Campaign for Wellness.
• Are we socializing properly the idea that not everyone has to be an academic?
• Should we make sure we are systematically helping grad and post doc students look at opportunities beyond academia?