

The University Council Committee on Facilities Annual Report 2015-2016

Chair: Ann E. Moyer, Department of History

General Committee Charge

The Committee on Facilities shall be responsible for keeping under review the planning and operation by the University of its physical plant and all services associated therewith, including transportation and parking.

2015-2016 Specific Charges

1. Consider the availability and cost of parking for members of the Penn community.
2. Continue discussion of active learning spaces on campus.
3. Explore ways to reduce barriers to interdisciplinary teaching and academic initiatives across different schools, including reducing costs for shared event spaces and audiovisual charges in different Responsibility Centers.
4. Continue to monitor and update the Penn Connects plan.
5. Follow up on Philadelphia Bike share and impact on campus and students.
6. Revisit efforts to reduce smoking on campus and consider expanding no smoking zones on campus.
7. 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.

In addition, the Committee met jointly with the Committee on Academic and Related Affairs because its first charge related closely to facilities: "Continue discussions about the library, including off-site storage of collections, study spaces for students and electronic browsing. "

Each charge is discussed below, followed by the Committee's recommendations related to that charge.

1. Availability and cost of parking

This issue was addressed at the September meeting; several representatives from Business Services addressed the committee. There are 26 parking facilities on campus, 8 garages and 18 lots comprising approximately 4800 spaces. There has been a fairly consistent number of permit holders over the years, with 4,243 permit holders this year. Prices, on average, are \$18 for a garage and \$12 for a lot. Garages are more expensive than lots to maintain; many have

aging infrastructure. Business Services has a six-year upgrade program that includes adding automated vehicle IDs, improving entries and exits, new signage, and sustainability initiatives, as well as general upgrades as needed. Business Services collaborates closely with the Climate Action Plan and considers parking an integrated component of all transportation services and sustainable transportation. Sustainability initiatives include electric charging stations, solar kiosks, bike parking, van/car pool, and the occasional parking program. A Penn ID will give users access to the Penn Transit options as well as the LUCY bus and Drexel transit. In the future, they would like to integrate Penn Card and the SEPTA pass. The new technology in the SEPTA contactless card makes this possible; they are awaiting the pilot to come from SEPTA.

Recommendations: Continue with ongoing programs and initiatives. Encourage additional bicycle parking within the garages as part of the garage upgrades. The Committee particularly welcomes the efforts to encourage use of public transportation and the co-ordination of public transit with private vehicles.

2. Continue discussion of active learning spaces on campus.

At the November meeting the Committee was joined by Bruce Lenthall, Executive Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning. We met in the Active Learning classroom at Van Pelt. Bruce introduced committee members to the features of active classrooms; some committee members have already used them.

There has been a growing demand for SAIL classes (structured active in-class learning), both for STEM and non-STEM classes since 2012. It is less clear how quickly demand will rise and what will be the ultimate level of demand for such classrooms. They require more instructional space and technology than do regular classrooms, though some other types of courses could use the spaces. Modular furniture might help ease potential problems if other kinds of courses are assigned to such spaces. The scheduling for the Active Learning classrooms is done centrally through SAS. The need for communication and support of faculty was also discussed; CTL continues to manage these issues.

Recommendations:

A. The Center for Teaching and Learning is already contributing significantly to the development and use of Active Learning Classrooms on the Penn campus. We would hope they could continue to serve as a central point for further development, particularly in working with individual departments:

- Information gathering: it would be helpful to know what departments (and perhaps which courses) want to increase their commitment to using active learning classrooms. What rooms are they now using? Do they want or need additional rooms and if so, what sizes? Do they have specific needs in terms of facilities in those rooms?
- Information distribution (orientation, training, and more): it would be helpful for CTL to work at the department level (in addition to its regular lunchtime discussions throughout the year) to help faculty learn how to redesign courses so as to use Active Learning classrooms effectively. This is especially important because these methods may be adopted by survey

courses that are taught regularly by more than one faculty member in a department, and also because effective use may vary considerably from one discipline to another.

B. Although it is still difficult to estimate long-term demand, it looks now as though Penn needs to add two Active Learning classrooms to the central pool classrooms over the next 3-5 years, in any case as quickly as is feasible. They should accommodate at least 100 students. These might be added in stages, but should be added nonetheless.

C. The criteria for assigning classes to central pool active learning classrooms need to be clear and well publicized, so that individual faculty members and department coordinators may plan and request them. The process needs to be streamlined and more efficient than at present.

D. In addition to the courses that need to be scheduled into Active Learning classrooms for the entire course, many more would benefit from occasional use for special projects. Therefore it would be helpful to have at least one such room centrally located and available for special bookings if that were possible.

3. Explore ways to reduce barriers to interdisciplinary teaching and academic initiatives across different schools, including reducing costs for shared event spaces and audiovisual charges in different Responsibility Centers.

The charge was clarified for the Committee by Leslie Kruhly, Secretary of the University. There are three linked threads found in investigating the charge: people who want to book space on campus for talks, seminars, or other academic gatherings and meetings often find it difficult or impossible without having the right connections, and there is not a centralized system that allows for a comparison of spaces that may be available; people/departments want to control their space and fear that an effort to centralize their space will result in a loss of that control; the only centralized easily found and available spaces are managed by VPUL and there are charges associated with those spaces.

The issues admitted of no easy solution or recommendation. No existing Penn unit seemed an obvious potential home for information, reservations, or referrals. Perhaps a new module under Pennant could be used as a larger reservation system. Other possible recommendations seemed to raise new problems in turn. For example: it would be helpful to the Penn community to have a centralized "list" of spaces with contact info and perhaps other qualifying information such as IT availability, seating capacity, and costs (for example, security or cleaning). Yet such a list could create new or drive up current costs for the space if it had the effect of increasing requests for spaces controlled by units such as academic departments that lack sufficient staff to handle increased requests.

Recommendation: To address this issue in a way satisfactory to all stakeholders would require communication among them. We recommend that the staff members in charge of scheduling and managing such spaces in each of the Schools meet to discuss how and whether they want to go about sharing such meeting space and informing one another about availability. We also suggest a benchmarking study with other Universities who have a cost-center responsibility model to see how other such institutions manage this issue.

4. Continue to monitor and update the Penn Connects plan.

At the December meeting, University Architect (and Committee Staff Liaison) David Hollenberg presented an update to the Committee. He included accomplishments since 2006 as well as current and future projects. In 2006, the University purchased the Postal Lands, leading to a master planning effort. The lands included open space that is now Penn Park, the Post Office building that was immediately sold to the IRS, and the space in between that is ground leased to a developer to create Cira Centre South. The master planning effort, called Penn Connects, reserves the core of campus for academic uses; it locates more administrative units to the perimeter, focuses on connectivity, and expands Penn's character and resources. The capital projects from the plan were largely fund raised through President Gutmann's Compact and fundraising initiatives, in particular the Making History campaign. At the end of 2011, the plan was refreshed and published as Penn Connects 2.0. The focus brought attention to renovations on campus and added sustainability goals and major projects (>\$5 million) involving rehabilitation of existing buildings. Five themes were developed: 12 Outstanding Schools; Research and Clinical Care; Living and Learning; Campus and Community; Past and Future. Examples of projects in each theme were provided and discussed. The Plan runs to 2030 and incorporates Pennovation Works (previously known as South Bank or Marshall DuPont Labs).

Recommendations: The Committee is very impressed with the program, the priorities for which were set through the Penn Compact and Making History Campaign. It expressed a strong interest in seeing one feature added: more classroom space.

5. Follow up on Philadelphia Bike share and impact on campus and students.

This issue was addressed at the October meeting. Brian Manthe and Matthew Brown of Business Services presented on Philly Bike Share and Biking at Penn.

Philly Bike Share was launched in April 2015; it placed 600 bikes in 70 stations citywide. Three of the stations are on the Penn campus: 40th and Spruce Streets; 36th and Sansom Streets; the intersection of South Street and Convention Avenue. The stations on campus are highly utilized. Two new locations are being considered, outside of the Quad and at Pennovation Works. The capacity of the station at South Street and Convention Avenue may be expanded. The stations are easy to move, are modular, expandable and do not require a lot of infrastructure to install. General information can be found at www.rideindego.com.

Penn's Bicycle Planning Committee includes representatives of many campus units including Business Services, Facilities and Real Estate, Public Safety, Student Health Services, and Penn Cycle. That committee is charged with providing guidance and recommendations for Philly Bike Share, bike corrals, repair stations, commuter incentives and access, outreach, safety including increased use of helmets, and a bicycle master plan. The Committee would like to develop incentives that encourage the use of helmets; for example, Penn Cycle offers a helmet with the rental of a bicycle for the semester or year.

It was also noted that Penn has two repair stations, one at the 1973 Wing of the Chemistry Building and one outside of Pottruck. They have been well used. In addition, the City is considering extending the Chestnut Street bike lane west of 34th Street.

Recommendations: The Committee reiterates its support for additional bicycle parking space in Penn's parking garages. We recommend and encourage more efforts to promote helmet use (for example, publicizing Blue Cross's reimbursement program for helmet purchases).

Repair spaces: recommend the addition of instructions to aid riders with less experience in bicycle repair. They might be posted on site, or it might be more efficient to post a link to a website with instructions or videos, so that users could access the information via phones or other devices. We also recommend that the Bicycle Planning Committee keep an eye on potential competition for space use between Philly Bike Share racks and parking spaces for regular bicycles.

6. Revisit efforts to reduce smoking on campus and consider expanding no smoking zones on campus.

The meeting of March 21 was devoted to this charge. The Committee was joined by Ashlee Halbritter, Director of Campus Health; Frank Leone, MD, Director of Comprehensive Smoking Treatment Program; and Sue Sproat, Executive Director of Benefits, Human Resources. Leone summarized the three-year task of a campus committee established to explore what a smoke-free campus would look like, how such a transition would affect the Penn community, and how to move in that direction. It seemed imperative to avoid creating a punitive environment. Attention therefore had focused on ways to modify the campus culture, and that committee created a list of recommendations and activities.

Penn implemented policy changes as well, with a number of changes effective as of September 2015. As of that date, smoking outdoors between buildings is no longer allowed, in a "tobacco-free" policy that included e-cigarettes and chewing tobacco. "No smoking" decals were added to campus maps and signage. Smoking cessation programs were made widely available to staff and students, along with "Be in the Know" health incentives. Beginning with Fall 2016, orientation will include a statement that the campus is tobacco-free, and will note both health and environmental concerns. Future plans include additional signage; publicity as part of student events such as Spring Fling; removal (with monitoring for effects) of some outdoor smoking poles.

Recommendations: The Facilities Committee supports the work of the university committee that led to the ongoing programs and policies. Signage and publicity seem vital to informing the Penn community about current policies as well as continuing to help shift attitudes. Because the program is continuing to change and development, continued monitoring is important.

An additional meeting was held jointly with the Committee on Academic and Related Affairs on February 22, 2016 to discuss library issues. Also present were Kim Eke, Director for Teaching, Research, and Learning Services, Penn Libraries, and Carton Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries. Rogers presented a clear and succinct summary of library space and storage issues at Penn's libraries from the opening of the Furness library in 1891. Issues of space and the use of high-density off-site storage face every major research library. So too the issues of online publication, storage, and access. Eke gave an overview of other services that are available through the library. They have staff that can help faculty design their course assignments, use Canvas tools, and facilitate in-class activities. Weigle Information Commons also provides technology workshops. All of these options can help students learn how to do research.

Discussion ranged from the selection criteria for storage to the use of services such as Borrow Direct to share resources among research libraries. A number of significant issues were raised relevant to facilities:

1. The features that characterize the use of library and library-related resources are not only changing over time; they are also changing differently by discipline. Policies must vary accordingly; there is no "one size fits all" approach.
2. Van Pelt-Dietrich was set up to serve more than SAS; it also serves SP2, GSE, and Wharton. Those units do not share similar usage patterns, nor do they share priorities about facilities and space allocation. They also differ in their possession of secondary libraries, especially as individual Schools/Centers have chosen to close Departmental Libraries.
3. The relationships between subject or other specialty libraries and Van Pelt is complex and inconsistent. Some units have individual libraries; others do not. Who has the authority to make decisions about space and storage seems less than clear. For example: when SEAS decided to close its library, it found that there was still a set of hard copies that were often consulted. They needed to remain accessible. Thus they were moved to Van Pelt, which added to the space problems at Van Pelt. SAS disciplines that rely solely on Van Pelt, such as the departments of English or History, suffered from the decision by SEAS though they had no input on that decision.
4. Funding models for Van Pelt define its function inconsistently. Although it serves some disciplines as a research facility, its budget differs considerably from those of research facilities in STEM fields; for example, it does not benefit from grant money by researchers as a laboratory building does. In addition, there is a misperception that funding depends in part on the number of undergraduates who enter the library. This puts pressure on the library building itself to serve as study space.

Recommendations:

Library needs vary enormously by field. The use of digital resources, the need for access to hard copy printed texts, and more differ greatly from one discipline to the next, and it appears those paths of development will continue to diverge. University plans and policies for library and information issues must therefore reflect this diversity. Further, it is clear that library space is at

a premium, and the closure or reduction of specialty libraries is placing additional stress on Van Pelt that needs to be addressed.

The Committee also has a recommendation about the process of joint committee meetings. The Committee agrees that such Joint committee meetings can be valuable. It would be most effective if the process were built in from the outset. That is, in the process of generating the charges for the individual committees, a charge relevant to more than one committee would ideally be assigned jointly to those committees at the outset of the academic year. The Committee supports more such joint meetings.

7. 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.

1. Continue to monitor bicycle plan, including its role as part of Penn's overall commuting and parking programs.
2. Continue to monitor smoking on campus.
3. Continue to follow up on the issues related to Active Learning classrooms.