

# Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (CARA)

Final Report for 2013–2014

April 12, 2015

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Committee Participants</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background and Charge to the Committee</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	General Committee Charge . . . . .	2
2.2	2014–2015 Specific Charges . . . . .	2
<b>3</b>	<b>Narrative</b>	<b>3</b>
3.1	Performing and Visual Arts . . . . .	3
3.2	Academic Integrity . . . . .	5
3.3	Changes to Van Pelt Library . . . . .	7
<b>4</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>9</b>

## 1 Committee Participants

**Committee Members:** Thomas Brinkerhoff, Jordan Dannenberg, Frederick Dickenson, David Hsu, Steven Kimbrough (chair), George Maliha, Nicola Mason, Ani Nenkova, Suzanne Oh, Therese Richmond, Rahim Rizzi, Peter Rockett, Paul Saint-Amour, Laurie-Ellen Shumaker, Eric Tepper, David Valentine.

**Administration Liaison:** Leo Charney (Provost’s Office)

**Staff:** Susan White, Nicole Tillman (Provost’s Office)

## 2 Background and Charge to the Committee

The Committee has a very broad charge that covers a considerable portion of the University. For the 2013–4 academic year, the standing general charges were as follows.

## **2.1 General Committee Charge**

The Committee on Academic and Related Affairs

- i. shall have cognizance over matters of recruitment, admissions, and financial aid that concern the University as a whole and that are not the specific responsibility of individual faculties, including the authority to carry out studies on existing recruitment and admissions procedures and their relationships with existing policies on admissions and financial aid and to recommend changes in policy to the Council;
- ii. shall consider the purposes of a University bookstore and advise the Council and the management of the University bookstore on policies, development, and operations;
- iii. shall review and monitor issues related to the international programs and other international activities of the University, including advice and policy recommendations in such areas as services for international students and scholars, foreign fellowships and studies abroad, faculty, staff and student exchange programs, and cooperative undertakings with foreign universities;
- iv. shall advise the vice provost and director of libraries on the policies, development, and operation of the University libraries;
- v. shall have cognizance over recreation and intramural and intercollegiate athletics and their integration with the educational program of the University, including the planning and provision of adequate facilities for various sports and recreational activities; and
- vi. shall have cognizance of all matters of policy relating to research and the general environment for research at the University, including the assignment and distribution of indirect costs and the assignment of those research funds distributed by the University, and shall advise the administration on those proposals for sponsored research referred to it because of potential conflict with University policy.

## **2.2 2014–2015 Specific Charges**

For the 2014–5 academic year, the specific charges were as follows.

1. Examine Penn's programming relating to the performing and visual arts as it intersects with programming for Penn students.
2. Review procedures and standards on academic integrity for graduate students.
3. Explore proposed changes to the Van Pelt Library and resulting impact on the library system generally.

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 2015–16.

### 3 Narrative

#### 3.1 Performing and Visual Arts

The Committee devoted its December 9, 2014 meeting to discussion of its charge to “Examine Penn’s programming relating to the performing and visual arts as it intersects with programming for Penn students.” The Committee’s discussion was assisted by Karen Beckman, Jaffe Professor of the History of Art and Director, Penn Art and Culture Initiative, who made a short presentation, answered questions from the Committee, and participated in the general discussion.

Professor Karen Beckman gave a presentation, updating the committee on the Penn Art and Culture Initiative. She explained that she is the Director of the Art and Culture Initiative and has one staff support person. She reported that their mission is to heighten awareness, increase diversity of use, and improve the pedagogy of arts and culture across disciplines. She reported that she works with a Steering Committee comprised of faculty from the School of Arts and Sciences, faculty from the School of Design, and Penn’s Art and Culture Center Directors.

Professor Beckman highlighted efforts to strengthen awareness, such as a new *Penn Art and Culture Guide* that is distributed to students and local hotels. She reported that there is an Art and Culture website that features information and links to art and cultural events at Penn and locally. She noted that on the website there are individual stories of events at Penn and these are often written by students. She added that there is a weekly *Art & Culture Newsletter* with 2300 subscribers and a recent push for social media outreach.

Professor Beckman explained that there is an interdisciplinary arts fund that supports art and culture initiatives at Penn that are collaborative and directly engage students. She explained that it aims to advance the role of art and culture in student and academic life and noted that priority is given to projects that aspire to engage a diverse range of students. She explained that a recent example of this is Mural Arts at the Lea School: a mural arts collaboration with Penn students and elementary school students in West Philadelphia.

Professor Beckman reported that the Office of Admissions has made changes to promote the arts and culture at Penn. She explained that there is an admissions video featuring interviews with center directors and students majoring in the arts. She noted that the office holds special tours for a diverse range of high school and middle school students highlighting Penn’s art and cultural centers.

Professor Beckman updated the committee on art and culture pedagogical innovation. She explained that there are Freshman Seminars that focus on the arts such as the Writ-

ing About Art Seminar. She explained that the seminar engages in critical issues related to visual arts, with a focus on writing about contemporary exhibitions. She added that students visit and review Philadelphia area exhibitions, including shows at the Institute of Contemporary Art, the Barnes Foundation, the Philadelphia Museum of Art, and local galleries. She explained that, in the seminar, students are able to practice different descriptive and critical approaches to writing about art works.

Beckman reviewed a recent conference: The Humanities and the Arts in the Integrated Knowledge University (HAIKU) held at Penn on September 12–13, 2014. She explained that this conference explored what the humanities and the arts have to offer contemporary efforts to integrate distinct bodies of knowledge with the research university. She noted that the HAIKU Conference resulted in two days of lively multi-disciplinary discussions and performances about the future of the humanities within the creative research university.

The committee wondered what Beckman is hoping to do next. She explained that it can be challenging to get support for arts and culture. She added that the School of Arts and Sciences Dean Steven Fluharty has agreed to make the arts a part of the SAS long-range plan. She added that she would like to activate the leadership in the other schools and add other disciplines into the pedagogy for art and culture. She noted that she would like to see art and culture be stated as part of Penn's mission with a big vision for expansion and investment which would require alumni support. She noted Penn alumni have offered support for arts and culture in the past.

The committee wondered what Beckman would like to see at Penn after 10 years as a measure of success. She explained that her vision of success in 10 years would be a greater number of students participating in arts and culture at Penn and locally. She added that increased faculty diversity at Penn would foster her vision. She added that it would be useful to have a more flexible multi-use space on campus that could be used as studios or film screenings or instructional use or for all at once. She noted that it does not have to be fancy but should be a place to create and exhibit and learn.

The committee asked Beckman to explain where there is resistance or impediments for arts and culture initiatives at Penn. She explained that Penn is thoughtful about how and where to spend money, which can be good for careful planning; however, she would like see Penn be more ambitious and develop a broad long-range plan that includes increased funding for arts and culture.

The committee asked if there are art and cultural opportunities with the health sciences. Beckman noted that the Steering Committee has not talked about that but there are many integrations that would be possible, such as medical imaging as part of art.

The committee asked about the usage of the Platt Performing Arts House. Beckman stated that it is in high demand and therefore at maximum capacity. The committee asked if there are efforts to get students to go to museums. Beckman cited several examples of efforts to get students engaged with museums, such as events at the Penn Museum and an event at the Philadelphia Museum of Art for freshman in New Student Orientation.

The committee suggested that Beckman strategically focus on the 4 undergraduate schools to bring a broader group together and get buy-in for arts and culture initiatives at Penn. They recommended that she add membership from the 4 undergraduate schools to the Steering Committee. These are points to consider for the report that Beckman will be submitting to the Provost and the School of Arts and Sciences Dean at the end of the academic year.

### **3.2 Academic Integrity**

The Committee devoted its February 20, 2015 meeting to discussion of its charge to “Review procedures and standards on academic integrity for graduate students.” The Committee’s discussion was assisted by Marcia Joan Glickman, Senior Case Manager and Mediation Coordinator, Office of Student Conduct (OCS), who made a short presentation, answered questions from the Committee, and participated in the general discussion.

Marcia Glickman told the Committee that the primary goal of the OSC is to work as liaison to each School in matters of student academic misconduct. She reported that the Office of Student Conduct had a change of directors over the summer of 2014, followed by a full scale review of the office, assisted by a consulting firm. This led to a revamping of their operating processes. The new Director for the OSC is Julie Nettleton, who officially took on that role in November of 2014.

Glickman explained that the main goals of the office review were to find ways to make the OSC more faculty friendly, to un-complicate the case processing procedure, make faculty aware that the OSC wants to be a resource that welcomes faculty questions and offers consultations, and to work on time concerns so that the entire process is not as time consuming. The typical cases that the OSC handles in regard to academic integrity deal with plagiarism and over-collaboration. The OSC processes 130–150 cases of academic integrity per year and 100 conduct cases per year. Overall, about  $\frac{2}{3}$  of the cases are undergrads and  $\frac{1}{3}$  graduate students. In addition, a main upshot of the OSC review was to remove sexual assault cases from OSC. These cases are now handled through a separate office, with Christopher Mallios appointed as the Sexual Violence Investigative Officer as of February 1st of this year.

Glickman explained how undergraduate cases are investigated and processed through the OSC office. If a professor contacts the OSC regarding a student’s work, the OSC case manager will launch an investigation. The case manager will speak to the faculty with a 24–48 hour turnaround time in order to be able to notify the student promptly by letter of the specific issue (no notices are issued on Fridays). The student must then make an appointment with the OSC within 7 days and is encouraged to bring an advisor to the meeting. A copy of the Code of Academic Integrity is sent via email to the student and the student has the option to leave the meeting at any time to get an advisor. The purpose of the meeting with the student is for the case manager to get the student’s perspective on the issue.

After the student meeting the case manager determines whether or not to follow up with the professor. If the student is found to not be responsible after the investigation, the student is sent a letter stating this. If the student is found to be responsible, then the student is sent a charge letter, and a resolution proposal is sent to the professor. OSC does not impose sanctions (suspension, probation, or note on the students permanent record); instead, OSC only recommends them.

A change of policy has been decided and will be implemented beginning in October of 2015. Under the new policy, students found to be responsible for misconduct will receive a warning but the letter of reprimand will no longer be a part of their permanent record. Only if they have a second violation will it become a part of their permanent record. Some students request a hearing or a second opinion for their cases. A hearing consists of three faculty members and two students who hear the case from the case manager and the student. Though some students may state that they did not know what they did was a violation of student conduct, the OSC does not take intention into account when assessing cases. The standard of proof requires is that there must be "clear and convincing evidence with 75% certainty" for a student to be found in violation.

The process for graduate students is only slightly different from the one just described, which applies generally. Glickman reported that graduate students are held to a higher standard when it comes to cases of academic integrity. Suspension is not imposed, and they may not be asked to leave the University right away, but any violation found will result in a letter appearing in their permanent record immediately. She also explained that the goal of the OSC is not to ruin the student's life but to be fair to the academic process.

The committee inquired about conditions for referring students to OCS. Glickman explained that all referrals are discretionary; there is no requirement to refer but OSC strongly recommends that any suspicion of an academic integrity violation should be referred. Only a TA or a professor can submit a referral. If a student contacts the OSC, the OSC will take the issue to the professor to see if the professor wants to pursue an investigation. OSC urges faculty to contact them early on in the process, even if it is just a suspicion of misconduct the faculty member should at least contact the OSC for a consultation. The value of a process such as the OSC is to show that the University values classroom integrity.

The committee asked how does the OSC reach out to students and ensure that students are aware of the University code of conduct. Glickman explained that many faculty have the code of conduct included on the front page of their syllabus, and the OSC gives workshops and offers talks with TAs. As an added measure, beginning in the summer of 2015, online academic integrity modules will be required for all undergraduates and new students to complete. The Weingarten Learning Center also offers sessions to teach students how to properly note and cite sources.

The committee asked what can faculty or University organizations do to be more helpful. Glickman explained that feedback is very important. The OSC wants to work together

with the faculty to ensure that academic integrity expectations are as clear as possible with students. She reemphasized the need for faculty to consult and refer cases to the OSC.

The Committee also inquired whether there was a more proactive way for faculty to discourage cheating and if there is blocking software for personal laptop exams in the classroom. Glickman responded that the OSC would welcome more conversations with faculty regarding cheating and offered the OSC web address, [www.osc.upenn.edu](http://www.osc.upenn.edu) which provides blocking software for exams.

### **3.3 Changes to Van Pelt Library**

The Committee devoted its March 25, 2015 meeting to discussion of its charge to “Explore proposed changes to the Van Pelt Library and resulting impact on the library system generally.” The Committee’s discussion was assisted by H. Carton Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, who made a short presentation, answered questions from the Committee, and participated in the general discussion.

The Committee asked if Rogers could explain why so many of the stacks were removed and some of the changes to Van Pelt including the catalogue changes in retrieving the materials that were moved from the stacks. Rogers explained that the largest problem that the Library faces is lack of space. He added that in recent meetings in GAPSA there was a notion that the Library was responsible for closing the Engineering library and that it is not true. The individual Schools decide when to close a department library. The Library’s preference would be to put a library in every building in Penn, but there just is not enough space for that and the ultimate choice for closure or space reduction is up to the School. When a library is closed the materials are moved to Libra, the Library long-term storage facility located in New Jersey. The Library is currently working to make sure that all materials that were available in the stacks or that were moved to Libra are still accessible to faculty, staff, and students upon request.

Rogers explained that Van Pelt Library has been fundraising for and trying to create a presence for the management and preservation of Penn’s very extensive rare books collection. Books in the collection have not always been housed in a secure facility with the proper air quality. Moreover, the Library has run out of expansion space completely. They are hopeful that the fundraising will help to offset some of the costs of making the necessary changes. In addition, it is expensive to keep the licenses for online materials (such as periodicals) current. The Library is trying to find a balance between how to increase the intake of new material and how to preserve the rare materials. The biggest changes to Van Pelt Library have been to the 5th and 6th floors. There has been an increase in the teaching space on the 6th floor and preserve boxes have been added to the 5th floor to display and preserve some of the smaller rare materials.

Rogers shared that there is a paper conservation lab (that will be staffed) in the works to preserve and conserve the books and materials that we have, so that generations to come can continue to enjoy the use of these materials. Rogers is particularly excited about

the paper conservation lab, although it will be some time before it is functional. Rogers discussed the materials that have been moved to storage and the catalog of books. Some of the faculty has been displeased with moving materials to storage (Libra, New Jersey). There are over 80,000 print volumes per year that have been moved since the 1970s. The Library is in the process of developing a high density storage catalog. Although this is costly and time consuming, it is high on the priority list. With the current system, the Library has a 1–2 day turn around on weekdays and they now have a weekend staffer who can fulfill requests as needed. Members of the Committee praised the Faculty express system. Rogers added that other systems that faculty and staff can use are Borrow Direct and Easy Borrow. The Library is working to make access as user friendly as possible and feedback on how the systems are working is welcome.

Issues were raised about the Dewey classification system, or rather about Library materials so classified. Committee members noted that the old browsing function experience was lost when the materials were moved to off campus storage (Libra). The Committee asked if there is a new browsing function that might be used for items classified with the Dewey system, or if putting movable stacks in Van Pelt would provide space to move some of the materials back from the storage facility. Rogers explained that unfortunately it is structurally impossible to add any more movable stacks in Van Pelt. The Library tries to make sure that high interest materials are kept on site, but if by chance an item is moved to storage, users should please contact the Library to see what might be done. This is an issue for all research libraries, not just Penn. The amount of material greatly exceeds the space available. The Library has been working on enhancing call number searching and call number browse interface, but that takes time.

The Committee asked about digital efforts in regard to licensing, digital materials, and historical materials. Rogers explained that Penn has been slowly digitizing its materials over the years but not in a very systematic way. It has mostly been done at the request of a faculty member when need for the digital material arises. This process is very expensive and because of copyright issues nothing that post-dates 1923 can be digitized. Most recently, the Library was able to make materials from the Hathi Trust available to the Penn community. These materials comprise a vast digital library that includes materials pre-1923. We are sending our own digital materials to be added to the Hathi Trust. The Library is often approached by vendors who offer digital back up files for our materials and as the funds become available we are making more strides to digitize our materials.

The Committee asked about the budget and how funds are allocated to the Library. Rogers explained that the Library budget is well supported by the Penn community but it is not unlimited. Penn is a part of a few consortia that share collections across institutions to help meet the demand for information from staff and students.

The committee asked about technology transfer, how the Library can ensure that digitized materials will be long lasting and effective. Rogers explained that it is hard. They are trying to transfer materials from tapes, CDs, cassettes, etc. over to digital material. This can be difficult, time consuming and costly. The Library is trying to build collections

that scholars for generations to come can access and use and the problem with digital material is that the licensing may not allow it to be available in 20 years let alone several years down the line. The Library is very concerned about this as we move forward.

The committee asked about Scholarly Commons, what it is and how effective its use has been. Rogers explained that Scholarly Commons is a repository for the scholarly output of researchers at Penn. It promotes dissemination of their work, and preserves it in a freely-accessible, long-term archive and can be accessed worldwide. Scholarly Commons contains materials chosen by Penn departments, schools, centers, institutes, and users have access to materials free of charge. Users who upload articles are also given regular reports on how many people are accessing that article so they can see exactly how much feedback they are getting for their work.

The committee asked about study spaces in the libraries. Rogers shared that the focus has shifted toward providing more spaces that promote teaching and learning across the curriculum. The Library recently built a collaborative classroom that is small but has been getting a lot of use and a lot of positive feedback. There is a value to libraries as community spaces that really bring students and faculty together and there is a loss of that community space when libraries are closed or shut down.

The committee asked what it can do to help the Library. Rogers stated that it would help if we added it to the agenda for next year to take a more holistic look at what the future library space on campus should look like. To take the time to discuss, as Penn grows, whether or not we could really live with a smaller library footprint? What does the Library of Penn's future look like? As the campus grows will we continue to increase library and study spaces just as much as we increase dorm and classroom sizes.

## **4 Recommendations**

The Committee recommends the following for the 2015–16 academic year.

1. The Committee recommends that for the 2015–16 academic year it continue to monitor the Library and also delve into issues arising, including those suggested by H. Caron Rogers (holistic look at future library space, etc., see the report above) as well as issues raised by the Committee this year (e.g., study space for students, electronic browsing facilities) and last year (e.g., idea events, electronic browsing facilities).
2. The Committee recommends that for the 2015–16 academic year it continue to monitor the role of the performing and visual arts at Penn and also delve into issues arising, including those raised by the Committee (e.g., connection to idea events, ways of more thoroughly incorporating the arts into Penn life).
3. The Committee notes that changes have been afoot with Penn athletics and that CARA's writ, perhaps uniquely among the peer committees, extends to athletics. In

consequence, the Committee recommends that for the 2015–16 academic year it be charged with monitoring and reviewing recent developments in Penn athletics.