

University Council Committee on Academic and Related Affairs (UC CARA)
Preliminary report for 2015—2016
3/30/2016

1. Committee participants

Committee members: Ani Nenkova (chair), Thomas Brinkerhoff, Frederick Dickinson, Eric Feldman, Vera Krymskaya Nicola Mason , Suzanne, Oh , Chris Pastore, Rahim Rizi , Peter Rockett, Nathaniel Rome, Laurie-Ellen Shumaker, Jyothi Vallurupalli, Eliana Yankelev, Qianying (Jenny) Zhang.

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 2015—2016

1. Continue discussions about the library, including off-site storage of collections, study spaces for students and electronic browsing.

2. Continue to explore ways to develop the performing and visual arts at Penn, including ideas for increasing the integration of the arts into academic programming.
3. Review recent developments in Penn athletics, especially efforts to enhance a culture of respect and safety around athletic participation.
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 2016-17.

3. Meetings and main recommendations related to specific charges

The committee met three times this year to address the three specific charges. In addition, the committee communicated via email about planning additional topics for the upcoming year. The committee chair, Ani Nenkova, met with the chair of the facilities committee, Anne Moyer, to prepare questions and issues for discussion for the meeting on library.

Athletics: The meeting with the athletics representatives, Grace Calhoun and Linda Buonanno, was originally meant to focus on efforts to enhance a culture of respect and safety around athletic participation. The presenters touched on this topic but also covered many other topics, detailed in Appendix A.

Two issues requiring further discussion emerged:

- 1) The presentation covered statistics about school-wide participation, admissions and GPA of scholar-athletes. However, these numbers made no reference to the distribution of students across the four schools (SAS, Wharton, Engineering and nursing) nor to the distribution of grades in these schools. Without these for reference, it is hard to interpret the numbers for athletics. For the analysis of the distribution of undergraduate athletes by school, it would be meaningful to compare the presented numbers with the relative sizes of each of the schools. For this we will need the percentage of Penn undergraduates that are affiliated with each of the schools side by side the numbers we saw.

For the analysis of academic performance of student athletes, reporting the average GPA of athletes is not sufficient to compare them with non-athlete students. It would be more meaningful to see the variance as well. Interpretation of the numbers would be easier if the GPAs are presented as a histogram or a confidence interval for the mean is provided. Again, this number can be compared meaningfully with the histogram/confidence interval of the overall undergraduate population. Even better picture can be presented by showing the data broken down by school, as in the participation results.

If the university and colleagues at athletics are interested in monitoring participation and academic performance, the above will give a clearer picture of what is going on.

- 2) The issue of graduate student access to recreational facilities took up a large portion of the discussion. Gym access is included in the tuition of undergraduates but not for graduate students. Graduate students have lower rates of participation and have concerns over having to pay the fee. At the same time we acknowledge that participation in recreational sports activities is important for students' physical and mental well-being.

The difference between opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students was discussed more generally, beyond recreation participation. A couple of committee members suggested this as a possible topic for a CARA meeting, however the topic is more directly related to the Committee on campus and community life. We were unable to coordinate a joint meeting with this committee this year but look forward to seeing their analysis and recommendation and urge the university to continue discussion on the topic.

Arts: At the meeting devoted to the arts at Penn, Provost Anita Allen gave an informative presentation about ongoing initiatives and plans for the future growth of the arts at Penn. There are several initiatives for collecting information, including on the use of arts in academic instruction. The outcomes will be of great interest to the committee.

Detailed notes on the meeting appear in Appendix B.

The committee would like to point out two classes at peer institutions that combine arts and humanities with instruction in the medical school (writing/narrative and medical communication; fine arts and noticing details in medical practice):

<http://heymancenter.org/people/rishi-goyal/>

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2753.2008.01077.x/abstract>

<https://hms.harvard.edu/news/finding-art-medicine-2-22-13#>

The expressive and creative interaction technologies center at Drexel is a great example of combining arts and engineering:

<http://drexel.edu/excite/>

During the discussion it became clear that some courses do already integrate aspects of arts.

It will be great to have a comprehensive list of similar courses and initiatives at Penn, as well a more representative list of programs and courses at other institutions.

Library: On February 22, CARA held a joint meeting with the facilities committee, to discuss the library. Carton Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, and Kim Eke, Director of Teaching, Research, and Learning Services at Penn Libraries, were the presenters for the meeting. The presentations were replete with information on library growth and usage, which was incredibly helpful in understanding the complexity involved.

Detailed notes from the meeting appear in Appendix C.

Two issues clearly stood out as needing additional discussion and an action plan:

1) Faculty members from the humanities strongly feel that the ongoing trend for digitalization and off-campus storage negatively impacts their ability to do research. This is despite the fact that the library is conservative in decisions about which books to send to off-site storage. The library is key for the research work of faculty in the humanities, yet they represent only a small fraction of all library users. The medical and engineering schools have very different modes of work (journals, with online access, is the main form of publication) but they are much bigger than SAS. *To ensure that the needs of the faculty members in SAS are appropriately met, we recommend that the university carries out a survey about the library needs of faculty in humanities.*

2) Student training on how to use the library has become more difficult, as many students in various schools and departments rarely need to check out physical books. The library offers excellent introductions for students, but these are most effective when done in the context of a specific class or assignment. This means that the library needs

the help of the faculty to create learning opportunities for students. *We recommend that the university surveys graduate and undergraduate chairs in departments across the university, to identify which groups of students get exposure to the library through ongoing classes and which would need special planning to get engaged.* Many freshmen get to work with library staff during their writing seminar, however the work flow does not apply at all to students in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences, who are not able to read original academic texts in their major so early on in their studies.

Finally, our discussion has made it clear that is impossible to have a conversation about the library in general. Undergraduate students, graduate students and faculty have different needs. Similarly, different schools and department have very different needs related to the library. We recommend that future discussions are planned for specific clearly identified sub-population of users. This will increase the efficiency of discussion and the likelihood that actionable recommendations will be reached.

4. Recommended topics for 2016—2017

1. Study the library needs of faculty in the humanities and recommend ways in which the library can better support their research. This charge combines two of the general charges of the committee: the development and operation of the libraries and the university environment for research.
2. Discuss the importance of writing, explain how students' progress through the writing program, and ways that we can improve on the program to ensure that every student is reached. Find out how much independent research and reading is expected of the students, and how do students use the library in the writing seminar assignments and how teaching writing is modified for students in the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences.
3. 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.
4. 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.
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 2017-18.

Appendix A: detailed notes from meeting on athletics

The committee held a discussion on athletics during the Oct 22 meeting. Two guests presented at the meeting: Grace Calhoun, Director of Athletics and Recreation, and Linda Buonanno, Associate AD, Recreation & Community Outreach.

Calhoun explained that this is her second year as the Director of Athletics and Recreation at Penn. She began her presentation with an overview of the Athletics Division and explained that it is a broad based division that sponsors

developmental and wellness programming for all students, faculty, and staff through intercollegiate teams, club teams, intramural teams, scheduled classes and programs, and drop-in activities. Calhoun provided a breakdown of the campus-wide participation for each division of Athletics and highlights for each group. Calhoun explained the core values of the Athletics department.

1. Holistic development- that programming of all types is co-curricular in nature and emphasizes individual development.
2. Partnerships- creating strong collaboration with other areas of campus to provide the best learning environments. Current projects include partnering with the medical school and high tech sports performance.
3. Winning with integrity- fostering an environment of high ethical standards, rules compliance, and unquestioned character. Calhoun believes that it is highly important to stay out of the news for the wrong reasons. Academic integrity is just as important and good sportsmanship.

Calhoun discussed the admissions practices in regard to the Athletics department. Admissions policy, as all Ivy League policy matters, are controlled by the eight Ivy League presidents. An academic index is used to ensure the student-athletes gaining admissions at each Ivy are representative of the overall class, and this is computed for each prospective student-athlete based upon a combination of GPA and test scores. Calhoun also provided the percentages for undergraduate academic pursuits among student-athletes at Penn. SAS has the highest percentage at 64%. Peter Rockett asked if the size of the schools have an effect on the percentage counts primarily. Calhoun explained that yes, there could be some differences in the overall percentages and the actual participation of undergraduate student participation based on the size of the school. Eliana Yankelev (UA member) agreed with Calhoun and stated that the Wharton school, for example, has a high percentage of student athletes, although the overall participation percentage presented only reflects a 24.7%.

Calhoun shared that the academic success rates for the Athletics division show a 96% graduation success rate and a divisional GPA average of 3.25. Penn athletes are academically among the top 10% in the country and 15 of 28 NCAA sports had a perfect score. The Athletics Division strictly follows the University policy regarding academic success and student-athletes are encouraged to value their academic success more than their sport.

Calhoun discussed the culture of respect and safety within the Athletics division. Regarding student conduct, a divisional task force was convened last fall where minimum divisional and team discipline standards were established that cover alcohol, drug use and general conduct. Students can be suspended from practices, games, and/or removed from their team, and coaches can elevate their standards regarding the level of punishment for bad behavior. There is an anti-hazing policy coupled with programs like CAPs, and Student Life where students and staff can make connections and referrals regarding misconduct. Sexual misconduct prevention is taken very seriously at the University, and the division offers public safety/ special services meetings, visual campaigns, coach and student-athlete education, and participation in Penn Student Advisory Group. As a requirement, incoming students will have to sign off on policies showing that they agree and understand conduct issues.

Linda Buonanno explained that her primary goals within the division are advocating wellness through campus recreation, engaging the campus community (students, faculty, and staff) to strive for fitness and wellness, providing broad based opportunities to participate through programming and sports activities, and benefitting all dimensions of wellness; physical, emotional, spiritual, creative, sexual, intellectual, occupational, and social. The way that the Division plans to meet these goals is through strengthening existing campus collaborations to better support student needs and the needs of the broader campus community. They have been seeking new ways to connect with the other campus groups, and provide information to those groups of the services and programs available to everyone. The

recreation and community outreach webpage was recently relaunched with updated information and a more user friendly outlook.

The committee asked how student groups are encouraged to participate in getting funding for their group activity. Buonanno explained that they are currently in talks regarding refunding and that there are opportunities available depending on the group/ activity, they just need to get connected with the recreation department for the requirements and for the next steps toward getting that financing.

The committee asked what is the problem or challenge with getting graduate students to participate. Buonanno discussed that one of the biggest challenges the Division has faced is connecting and engaging with the graduate students. Many of them feel like they don't have access and the Division is trying to make that information and access clearer. Many have expressed that they want to participate, but they just don't know how. Since the Division has made more of an effort to reach the graduate students, there has been an increase of 500 grad students so far this year. The committee suggested sending information directly to the departments and that Athletics join with Admissions to help them get information to the graduate students. Buonanno said they will take those suggestions into consideration.

The committee asked if the fee portion is a deterrent for grad students participating. Although the fee amount may deter some, the main issue may be more a question of how to pay. Buonanno explained that many students have expressed to her that the fee itself is the issue. She explained that the best solution is to break up the misinformation with real facts and work through the feedback, and to continue providing the correct information to the grad students encouraging them to participate.

The committee asked if Athletics attends and presents at Graduate orientations. Buonanno explained that Athletics does attend and present at most Graduate orientations, and it has made a difference.

Buonanno stated that the department welcomes participation and suggestions and she provided the Athletics and Recreation web address, <http://www.upenn.edu/life-at-penn/sports> which provides access to all of the programs and services offered by the Athletics division.

Appendix B: detailed notes from meeting on the arts

The committee meeting on Oct 29 was devoted to discussion of the arts at Penn: *Continue to explore ways to develop the performing and visual arts at Penn, including ideas for increasing the integration of the arts into academic programming*. Anita Allen, Vice Provost for Faculty at Penn, was the invited guest.

Provost Allen explained that she has been assigned to work with some of the major arts institutions on campus; Annenberg, Arthur Ross Gallery, The Penn Museum, and ICA, and she also serves as chair of a Provost Arts Advisory Council. This Council is comprised of faculty in the arts and leaders from various art programs on campus whose focus is to think strategically about where the arts at Penn needs to go, and the next moves to get there.

Provost Allen presented a brief overview of where the arts are currently and some of the more specific goals for the arts at Penn. She explained that the arts are thriving at Penn. There are many organizations that involve students, faculty, and staff in the arts and numerous opportunities for education in the arts, entertainment, enrichment with activities such as glee club and theatre, the law school has a civic light opera, and writing center and writing programs, etc. Penn has several arts based institutions, community engagement programs, an annual children's festival, performing arts center, teen performances at the rotunda which are open to the community, and several arts

exhibitions throughout campus. Some exciting news, the University is in talks with Comedy Central who is considering broadcasting from the Annenberg Center during the Democratic Convention.

Provost Allen shared that the President and Provost are committed to supporting the arts at Penn. It has been calculated for fiscal 2016, basic subvention is about \$75 million spread over the various groups and organizations within Penn. The Development office confirmed that from the 2015 campaign, \$265 million were raised towards the arts from the very generous support of donors and alumni.

Provost Allen discussed that there is a sense that there is an arts race going on among elite institutions with the inference that these universities are putting large amounts of money into capital projects, museum and arts centers. Many are concluding that schools are reasserting the essential value of the arts to a well-rounded education. But the question is, do you assert that value by building buildings or do you assert that value in other ways, developing curriculum, etc.? We (Provost Arts Advisory Council) are trying to figure out what is going to be Penn's way to underscore the importance of the arts to education. For a lot of students there are ways that engaging in the arts supplements their education via the performing arts and object based learning that complement their enrichment. The Provost Arts Advisory Council was established last semester and as previously stated; their role is to underscore the centrality of arts and culture here at Penn. They want to build on the success of the Provost Arts Initiative from 2012-2015 managed by Professor Karen Beckman. Some of the accomplishments from the Arts Initiative were the freshman seminars in the arts, and the distribution of 26 inter-disciplinary grants to further arts practice at Penn and research. The Provost Arts Advisory Council facilitated the creation of a first time arts and culture brochure distributed to hotels and visitors centers throughout the city to emphasize all of the arts organizations on our campus and the city at large. There is also a new arts and culture website that has a calendar of arts events on Penn's campus and stories of student and faculty arts activities. They are also currently in development of an arts and culture app.

Provost Allen explained that some additional goals of the Provost Arts Advisory Council are to examine the best practices among peers, while maximizing Penn's distinctive attributes and to synergize diverse arts organizations, genres, and campus groups. They are also seeking to foster new approaches to teaching and learning using the arts and art resources, with hands on learning through the arts, and to support new campus arts initiatives for education and enrichment.

The committee asked what exactly was considered the arts at Penn. Is it just performing arts, the humanities, history? Provost Allen said that primarily we are talking about theatre - Annenberg Center, design and architecture, dance, ballet, music (all forms), musical performance and composition, digital media, painting and visual arts, film, manuscripts, rare books, the museum, fine literature, creative writing, Kelly Writers House, Arthur Ross Gallery, the arts are very broad, but history is not part of the arts. We (the Council), are thinking of ways to make the arts bigger and better, and looking for more opportunities to integrate those genres into academic learning. Most recently we have had some professional performers interacting with students in private classes and seminars.

The committee asked Provost Allen to explain a little more about the Provost Arts Initiative. Allen shared that the Provost Arts Initiative was a three year program that was run by Beckman. Now, the Provost Arts Advisory Council is the new group that is focused on defining the future of the arts at Penn, where it is going, and the necessary steps to reach those goals. They also aim to find out what will be Penn's signature contribution to student education around the arts compared to other institutions.

The committee asked who is the new face of the arts at Penn. Allen explained that there isn't just one person, but a shared responsibility among the Council. The committee also asked if there were other faculty on the Council other than Beckman. Provost Allen replied that there are several other faculty members on the Council, some from Design and Humanities. Faculty members are critical and appreciated for the time they commit to the Council and

for the unique perspectives and ideas that they bring. If they find that more faculty involvement is needed, they are open to creating a subcommittee to meet that need.

The committee asked if there is data on how many students take advantage of the art galleries and museum exhibits on campus and if there a difference between undergrad and graduate students. Provost Allen stated that there is data on student visits to the museum, and students use their access to these exhibits in different ways; seminars, performances, etc. This data is currently collected informally. The Council is working on refining the data and compiling the statistics specific to art involvement at Penn into a written document. The committee asked if there was a survey that could help with collecting this data. Provost Allen explained that there isn't a survey at this time, but that is a tool that the Council would consider using to gather information.

The committee asked how do students prioritize what events to attend, since there is so much going on at Penn. He also asked how students can find balance with already heavy course loads that may not allow them to take an academic arts class or participate in an activity within the arts. Provost Allen stated that it might help to provide students with a better understanding as to why the arts are important to help change the notion that general arts courses aren't necessary. Currently, the Admissions tours include a segment on the arts at Penn that includes a video presentation that gives incoming students a sense of the arts opportunities available within the University.

Appendix C: detailed notes from meeting on the library

CARA charge: Continue discussion about the library, including off-site storage of collections, study spaces for students and electronic browsing.

The committee welcomed Rogers and Eke, who discussed briefly discussed their roles at Penn Libraries; Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, and Eke, Director of Teaching, Research, and Learning Services at Penn Libraries.

Rogers began his presentation with a brief history of Penn Libraries. Furness Library opened in 1891 with room in it for 300,000 books with plans to take down the rear wall and extend the stacks should the library reach capacity. Since that time, the University has added numerous on site libraries (including departmental libraries for each of the schools under the University) with a book volume of over 6 million. Given this tremendous increase of printed materials, in 1998, the Libraries began moving lesser used volumes to off campus collections in a space rented from Drexel University. The Drexel space housed 1.6 million volumes and when that reached capacity, Penn opened a new space, the Penn Libraries Research Annex (LIBRA) in 2011, located in New Jersey. Students, faculty, and staff can still request books that are located in the LIBRA facility and those books are delivered within one to two days from LIBRA to any campus library and journal articles can be scanned and delivered electronically.

Rogers shared that the overpopulation of books is not a Penn specific problem, but one that may colleges and Universities face. Three major reasons for the high volume of books and printed materials are;

1. The explosion of print volumes and books in the 20th century.
2. The lack of physical space on campus to expand libraries into.
3. The cost of keeping lesser used literature.

In a study conducted by Paul Courant, Univ. of Michigan faculty member, in 2010, he found that the onsite cost is \$4.26 per book per year, vs. the offsite cost of \$0.86 per book per year. Rogers shared that one of the national conversations between Library directors is the creation of regional storage facilities instead of maintaining

individualized facilities by each institution. This also opens up a greater opportunity for shared materials between schools.

Rogers explained that there are two types of communities within the University that utilize the facilities, those who rely heavily on electronic information and have abandoned printed books and those who rely on the printed materials. A challenge that the library has faced is bridging the gap between the two. The Digital Library Resources have exponentially increased, and the library now caters to over 1.5 million users in the past year with 6.9 million article downloads, over a million e-books. The Library has spent almost \$19 million on digital information. The increase in digital information has allowed us to connect with other library collections and share that digital information between Universities.

Following Rogers presentation, Eke shared information regarding integrating research literacies into Penn courses to support young scholars. The Libraries offer services to develop course assignments, plan and facilitate in-class activities, design Canvas tools course, and a Pilot Library Lounge. By the end of a research –intensive course, students should be able to distinguish source types, determine authority and credibility, implement search strategies, and build arguments. Eke further explained that by using fresh approaches, librarians can help faculty design engaging course activities and assignments that help students acquire essential research literacies. The committee commented that these resources have been very helpful to students when they have large research projects. Unfortunately, for students who don't have larger projects, they sometimes ignore the in class presentations.

The committee asked what is the policy for deciding which books stay on the shelf and which are sent to storage. Rogers explained that every book that is sent to LIBRA is individually selected by a subject specialist, based on his knowledge of the field, the current research and teaching interests at Penn, various bibliographic data, use metrics, and consultation with constituents, as needed. They also monitor the circulation of books from LIBRA on a monthly basis. If a book circulates more than two times in the previous twelve months, it is returned to its campus location.

The committee asked Rogers how does the Van Pelt Library deal with Departmental Libraries and with the needs of faculty who don't have a specialized library? Rogers explained that the Van Pelt Library serves the information and service needs of four schools; SAS, Wharton, SP2, and GSE. All central services are housed in Van Pelt; acquisitions/ordering, licensing, cataloging, digitization services, preservation/conservation, core systems support, desktop support, and HR & Finance. Staff in Van Pelt work closely with their counterparts in the departmental Libraries in designing services and outreach models that work for the entire community as well as meeting the specific needs of local constituent groups. For those departments that do not have their own library space, the Library has a large network of liaisons –subject and/or department focused- that are charged with working closely with “their” faculty and student communities.

The committee asked what are the biggest challenges facing the library system. Rogers shared that their biggest challenges are;

1. Creating discovery tools that provide better access to the extraordinary amount of information purchased and licensed for the Penn community.
2. Working with faculty and students to create better researchers and productive life-long learners.
3. Embedding Library services fully into the researcher and user workflow.
4. Supporting author/researcher education, especially early career researchers.
5. Developing the Penn Libraries role in the whole research data arena.
6. Space, always the final frontier.
7. Digital preservation.
8. Managing the digital/print divide with limited resources.
9. Getting better access to potential donors, better articulation of the enduring value of the Libraries.