The Committee on Facilities was responsible for reviewing the planning and operation by the University of its physical plant and all services associated therewith, including transportation and parking. The Committee held six meetings over the academic year.

2014-2015 Specific Charges:
The Committee was given a series of charges to consider this academic year. The six charges included three that were continuations of previous years’ charges, and two that were new. The sixth was a general charge that the Committee addresses each year. The charges that were discussed were:

1. Monitor the progress of the Penn Connects Plan, especially with respect to implications for traffic and transportation at the South Bank.
2. Examine new developments relating to campus safety, with particular attention to impact on classroom security and possible changes to the physical plant.
3. Continue to investigate the adequacy of instructional space on campus, with particular attention to classroom size and meeting technological needs.
4. Explore possibilities for a more collaborative approach to conference and event spaces on campus.
5. Monitor the progress of the Bike Plan developed by the Bike Planning Committee as it enters its implementation phase.
6. Review and discuss this Committee’s general charge and identify two or three issues that should be given the highest priority for the committee’s work in academic year 2015-16.

Discussions on the specific charges:

Penn Connects plan: The Penn Connects and Penn Connects 2.0 plans were reviewed and discussed. David Hollenberg presented an outline of both, reviewing what has been accomplished during the first phase of the plan as well as presenting future components. The first Phase of the Plan, from 2006-2010, generated 4.8M GSF of new and renovated space, including ten major new buildings and twelve major renovation projects. Phase 2 (Penn Connects 2.0), from 2011-2030, enhances the framework from Phase 1 and adds sustainability goals as well as an increased focus on comprehensive renovation projects and on living and activity spaces. The five themes of Penn Connects 2.0 were described and these include 12 Outstanding Schools, Research and Clinical Care, Living and Learning, Campus and Community, Past and Future. The extension of the campus into South Bank, now called Pennovation Works, was discussed and the plan for a shuttle to Pennovation Works was mentioned. (Shuttle access between the campus and Pennovation Works is currently on an on-call basis.)

Campus safety: A discussion of campus safety occurred during the December 2014 meeting which was held at the offices of the Division of Public Safety. The
meeting included presentations by Captain Joseph Fischer, Kathleen Shields Anderson, and Mitchell Yanak. This included discussion of pedestrian and bicycle safety, an overview of campus safety, and other initiatives being sponsored by the Division of Public Safety.

The presentation on pedestrian and bicycle safety initiatives overviewed the issues that exist in this domain on campus. As there is a large, dense population of bicyclists, pedestrians, and vehicles on campus, there always will be some conflict, but the Division of Public Safety actively manages such interactions to a greater degree than occurs throughout the rest of the City. Captain Fischer explained that there are a number of particular trouble spots: Convention Avenue and South Streets, Walnut Street between 34th and 38th Streets, Spruce Street between 34th and 38th Streets, and University and Woodland Avenues. To help mitigate the issues at these locations, Penn is working with the City. For example, the University is supporting efforts to reinstate the bike lane on Chestnut Street, which would make biking on Chestnut Street safer, and cut down on the number of bicyclists going the wrong way on Walnut Street. Captain Fischer informed us that bicyclists have to follow the same motor vehicle rules as a driver and that Public Safety has a “Share the Road” campaign for three days each semester where they crack down on potential violations. In the last three day campaign, Public Safety stopped 677 bicyclists to inform them of violations, but only gave out a few tickets. Public Safety is also tackling the increasing problem of texting while walking. This is an increasing problem for pedestrians and cars on campus as the pedestrians are not aware of their environment and are prone to get into an accident. To counter these issues, Public Safety has gotten the speed limit on Walnut Street lowered to 30 mph to try to calm traffic, along with employing an electronic device that registers the speed of vehicles. They constantly try to encourage and educate the Penn community about safety policies Penn has and about the traffic laws that apply on and around the campus.

Kathleen Shields Anderson provided an overview of the Division of Public Safety. They are a community-based police department that includes police officers, fire and emergency services, technology and emergency communications, security services, special services, and finance and administration. The Division works closely with the City police. They also partner with the surrounding community organizations, including the University City District, and officers receive annual diversity training in addition to ongoing tactical training.

Mitchell Yanak explained several other safety initiatives across campus, including Operation Building Safe, lighting surveys, Contactless PennCard, Penn Guardian, Penn Alert, analytic cameras, and the outdoor siren system. Operation Building Safe will involve having all perimeter doors to all buildings having only card access. Visitors will be allowed access to buildings remotely through a monitored motion-sensitive system. They cited the cost of having a guard at the entrance to all buildings as the impetus of this electronic system. This last presentation raised issues about classroom safety and the possibility of
having panic buttons in classrooms and other systems in place. This was said not to be effective and was not planned.

At the end of the February meeting, the issue of classroom safety was raised again. The Committee was impressed with the training and responsiveness of our Division of Public Safety as well as the physical plant of public safety. The Committee raised questions about staff and faculty preparedness for safety emergencies on campus (e.g. shooter, fire, etc.). The Committee was interesting in determining if there are programs in place to educate faculty and staff on these matters. Overall, the Committee believed that faculty and staff would appreciate a proactive drill or training that will help individuals know what to do in these different safety emergencies.

*Campus Bike Plan:* Over the Spring and Summer of 2014, both a new bicycle policy and an online bicycle map was launched. The campus was also recognized by the League of American Bicyclists with a Silver Bicycle Friendly University (BFU) award. An update to bicycle policy and planning was also provided. The Philly Bike Share program is coming to campus. There will be three trial Philadelphia Bike Share stations on campus near the University City train station, at 36th and Sansom Streets, and at 40th and Spruce Streets. The stations are not permanent and can be moved if needed. The City of Philadelphia will monitor the stations.

*Institutional Space/Classrooms:* One of the largest issues from last year is investigating the availability of classroom space. The Committee discussed this issue for two full meetings (January and February 2015) and part of a third (November 2014). In the first meeting on this subject, the Committee began by reviewing the issues raised in the FY14 final report and minutes from the previous year’s discussion. Using this as a springboard, the Committee raised a number of potential issues that needed further investigation and dialogue. A list of over 15 questions was raised to present to the Provost and Registrar’s Office for further clarification. These could be summarized as issues related to: 1) Improving communication between the Registrar’s Office and Faculty, 2) Understanding how classroom assignments are generated and how data-driven is this methodology, 3) Understanding how active learning classrooms play into the process and 4) Planning for future spaces and needs.

These questions were then directly addressed at our February 2015 meeting by Jeff Douthett, Director of Classroom Technology Services. Jeff gave a thorough overview of the classroom assignment process and then answered the questions from the Committee that were raised in the prior meeting. Highlights of his overview were that the classroom pool consists largely of rooms that Schools did not want to manage, the classroom committee outfits the spaces with the most flexibility and largest requests, and that the Registrar’s Office has two fulltime staff to oversee the classroom pool and the scheduling process. The classroom assignment process begins with the Registrar using the previous
year’s classroom assignments and then adjusting the schedule as needed. A chart outlining the percentage of classrooms used each hour between 8am and 8pm was distributed to the Committee, which was very helpful in understanding the issues facing the Registrar’s office in scheduling pool classrooms. This led to further discussion about “on block” and “off block” scheduling, with a recommendation that departments should think about coordinating their faculty to fill in the blocks of times throughout the week to make off block scheduling become essentially on block. Further discussions between the social science departments and the Registrar’s Office will likely lead to solutions to accommodate classes at new times and also keep the rooms more occupied throughout the week. It was noted that individual faculty do not communicate directly with the Registrar’s Office and should only do so through their department.

Jeff Douthett also discussed the issues with active learning classrooms. These classrooms take up more space – when created in a renovation they can require two regular classrooms to create an active learning classroom. Active learning classrooms use 25 square feet of space per student versus 12-15 square feet of space per student in a traditional classroom. Three more active learning classrooms are currently planned and then the University will wait to see what the demand is and how they may be able to accommodate it. If next year’s Facilities Committee would like to learn more about the success of the classrooms, and how they work, we can ask the Center for Teaching and Learning to speak with the Committee.

Conference and event spaces: In the February 2015 meeting, the Committee discussed issues related to event spaces. The Committee recognizes that we have a decentralized funding structure; however there is a need for centralized space reservation system. Similar to the central pool classroom, there is a desire to have an online schedule that identifies and displays all of the spaces on campus with configuration options, cost, and contact information. Ideally, the system would also show availability. The Committee realizes that further questions need to be addressed such as: Should all Schools and Center have to participate in a centralized booking system? Could individual departments hold spaces for private use? Who funds the cost of this system? Who would run such a system? No answers were provided, but this was discussed as a possible future charge for the Committee.

Additional discussion topics: The Committee reviewed, in the November 2014 meeting, aspects of the Century Bond HVAC and lighting projects that were identified and are being implemented. This included a report that the first HVAC project is complete and has provided for an efficient energy use with intended financial returns. The Committee had an update on the lactation spaces on campus and was happy with the continued progress of the availability and discussion of lactation spaces on campus.

Recommendations to the University Council and/or the Community
1. The Committee acknowledges that the Registrars office does a yeoman’s job of juggling all the requests and issues that are involved in assigning classrooms to classes each semester. Some of the frustration that exists on part of the faculty likely occurs from a lack of communication and understanding of the process. Therefore, we recommend increased communication between the Registrar or assigned members of each department about the process. This could include an information session prior to the classroom assignment process. In addition, the Registrar’s Office should inform departments about the ability to discuss sharing of classroom times to achieve more flexibility in scheduling of pool classrooms.

2. Penn Public Safety performs an outstanding job of keeping the University campus a safe and livable environment. While unusual events are fortunately rare, the Committee feels that Public Safety should further work with schools/departments at the beginning of the year on training/refreshing of procedures for safety emergencies on campus. This could include an email blast with links to all Public Safety protocols and information for these high risk situations.

3. While acknowledging that each school controls event spaces within the school, the Committee recommends that a central on-line portal be created for knowing what spaces exist, when and if they are scheduled and whom to contact about access to these spaces.

Recommendations of Topics for Next Academic Year
1. Continue discussion of adequacy of classroom spaces for specific class types and active learning spaces.
2. Continue update of Penn Connects plan including learning more about Pennovation Works.
3. Follow up on roll out of Philadelphia Bike share and impact on campus and students.
4. Review issues of Transportation and Penn Transit Routes and timing.
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