University Committee on Campus and Community Life
Final Report
2010-2011

2010-11 Specific Charges

1. Review the PULSE survey and other information about the climate among students, staff and faculty; evaluate the findings of these surveys; and consider how this information could be used to improve the quality of life at Penn.

2. Review the adequacy of dining services, In particular consider the manner in which the provision of dining services complements, enhances, and fits into the mission of the University.

3. Examine the role that the Civic House and the Platt Performing Arts House play in campus and community life.

4. Meet with the new Director of the Office of Student Life to discuss the operation of that office and to gauge current perspectives on student life, and possible areas for committee engagement.

5. Review and discuss the committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given highest priority for the committee’s work in AY 2011-2012.

Reviews Per Charges

The Committee met six times.

1. The Committee met with Will Gipson and others regarding the PULSE survey, learned that the University is refining the data, and was satisfied with the direction that the University is taking in use of this information. The Committee would like to review this issue again next year.

2. The Committee met with Doug Berger and others from dining services and learned that Mr. Berger has put together a blue ribbon committee of stakeholders – including input from the Residential Advisory Board – to consider how the provision of food services fits into Penn’s mission; the Committee waits for the findings of that committee and would like to return to this issue next year.

3. The Committee met with Karu Kozuma, the new Executive Director of the Office of Student Life, and was impressed by his vision for and understanding of the lives of students at Penn. The Executive Director should be made an ex officio member of the Committee.

4. The Committee heard from numerous Directors of Centers and continues to be impressed by and grateful for the contributions that these Centers make to the life of our University.

5. The Committee met with Bob Schoenberg, Director of the Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Center, to discuss the effect on Penn of recent acts of discrimination around the country. The
committee continues to be impressed by the LGBT Center and the work of Penn’s administration. Some members of the Committee expressed concern over the delays in creating a physically acceptable environment for transgender members of our community.

6. The Committee toured Sansom Place to evaluate the ongoing renovations. Although probably not as extensive as everyone would like, the renovations are transformative. The Committee learned that although students in Sansom do not necessarily ask specifically for “community,” they do ask for many services that fall under the rubric of community.

**Recommendation of the Committee**

The Committee has one recommendation: Based on all of the persons with whom the Committee met, on communications with other Committees, and with discussions between members of the Committee and various persons at Penn specifically to discuss this question, the Committee has learned of a growing apprehension. Many of our Schools seem to be considering creating or expanding non-degree conferring programs. These programs, which bear Penn’s name, promise to be very attractive, including to students outside of the United States. *If* these programs are created or expanded, an unknown number of students will be added to the population using services offered by Penn and by the surrounding community. *If* the University and/or the surrounding community cannot support these students, then their experiences outside of academics may be adversely affected. *If* large numbers of short term students have a lower quality experience, (a) Penn will not have lived up to its mission, and (b) stories from these persons could affect Penn’s reputation. The word “if” is highlighted because the committee was unable to obtain any reliable information on these possibilities. The critical first step in ascertaining whether there is in fact cause for apprehension is determining whether an increase in student population is actually likely. The Committee is willing to undertake the project of polling the schools, assembling the data, and reporting its findings. The Committee asks that the Central Administration ask for cooperation from the Schools. In the alternative, the Committee recommends that the Central Administration or the Faculty Senate assemble information on the projected numbers of programs and possible numbers of students enrolled.
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