Minutes of a meeting of the Council of the Princeton University Community held March 10, 2014 in Betts Auditorium of the School of Architecture. Present were Council members Ms. Banks, Mr. Brannon, Ms. Brown, Ms. Cherrey, Ms. Clifton, Ms. Cohen, Ms. Dressel, Ms. Dromboski, Ms. Du, Mr. Durkee, President Eisgruber (chair), Ms. Funk, Professor Haykel, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Kugelmass, Provost Lee, Dr. Leifer, Mr. McDonough, Mr. Morrell, Ms. Nutchern, Mr. Okuda-Lim, Ms. Riihimaki, Mr. Robertson, Ms. Shahbender, Ms. Smith, Dean Smith, Professor Starr, Ms. Stoneman, Ms. Taubin, Ms. Wright, Professor Wysocki. Ms. Halliday was secretary.

Approval of Minutes; Meningitis B Update

The President called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m., and after the roll call he asked the Council for approval of the minutes of the meeting of February 10, 2014. The minutes were approved in the form in which they had been distributed in advance of the meeting. There were no questions.

The President introduced Executive Vice President Williams for an update on the University’s response to meningitis B. No new cases have been reported. The clinic to administer the second dose of a vaccine against the disease for undergraduates and certain other individuals on campus had again been remarkably successful; 88% of undergraduate participated. Ms. Williams urged all to remain vigilant; those who have been vaccinated can still transmit the disease. The President reported that public health authorities who have been involved in the clinics have been amazed at the cooperation of students and smoothness with which the vaccination process has been conducted.

Middle States Commission on Higher Education Review [MSCHE]

The President introduced Deputy Dean of the College Clayton Marsh and Professor of Germanic Languages and Literatures Michael Jennings who are leading Princeton’s MSCHE’s re-accreditation process which is necessary for all degree-granting institutions of higher education. Information presented by them at the CPUC meeting is attached as Appendix A. The process includes demonstrating compliance with 14 standards and Dean Marsh highlighted one as an example, Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning. The self evaluation of student learning allows Princeton to focus on the importance of the senior thesis and independent work guidelines. The University also chose to conduct a self-study on international initiatives as part of the compliance process. This allows Princeton to assess goals and the organization structures in place to achieve these goals, and to review enrollment and participation patterns. He mentioned that the participation rate for significant international experiences (at least 4 weeks’ experience) has jumped from 39 to 56 percent in five years. Members of the council discussed obstacles that discourage students from participating in these experiences, and Professor Jennings and Dean Marsh described efforts to make participation easier, with help from departments and individual faculty members. Professor Jennings noted work underway to create a “Princeton” study abroad program and the important role of the Council on International Relations which also brings faculty from abroad to Princeton.
The President thanked Dean Marsh and Professor Jennings and their colleagues who had devoted considerable time and effort to completing the requirements of the accreditation process and to make the process useful to the University especially as it considers international programs and experience.

Undergraduate Advising

Senior Associate Dean of the College Claire Fowler described a three-year review of freshman and sophomore advising conducted by her office with help from college staff including Director of Studies of Whitman College, Justin Lorts. Survey information gathered over the past three years is attached as Appendix B. Survey results underscore the advantages of developing an advising community that maintains a central role for faculty but also involves other resources—other students and residential college staff, for example. The Office of the Dean of the College instituted pilot programs on the basis of survey results including freshman seminar advising groups, and residential college advising communities that link RCAs, peer advisers and resident graduate student advisers. Training of peer advisers has been strengthened and these students have become a key component of the community advising model. The President noted the important role advising plays in building lasting connections between faculty and students which go beyond any guidance about particular course selections. Members of the council drew attention to the contributions that resident graduate students living in the residential colleges can make to informal mentoring and advising. Dean Fowler said that the RGS’s have been a real success in the colleges and she welcomed their thoughts. In response to a question, an experiment in Wilson College was described that included linking an academic adviser to an RCA group. The results are good if the fit is right, and the faculty member can build relationships outside of his or her field.

During the discussion Dean Fowler said that there are about 90 faculty members in A.B. fields and about 30 in B.S.E. fields who serve as advisers, and one result of the survey is better “feedback loops” to faculty about advising. Noting that improving advising is an ongoing process, Dean Fowler urged those with suggestions to contact her.

Update on Graduate Student Housing

Provost Lee introduced the discussion about graduate student housing by placing housing in the broader context of how the University can use limited resources to ensure that advanced degree candidates receive an excellent education. He described the current report as an update on what has been planned and implemented. Vice President for University Services Chad Klaus and Executive Director of Housing Andrew Kane provided details about the new Lakeside apartment complex and gave information about how the University calculates housing capacity. This information is attached as part of the presentation in Appendix C. The first priority continues to be housing first-year students. (DCE—dissertation competed enrollment and VSRC—visiting student research collaborator students are eligible but not counted in “housing potential.”)

A wide-ranging discussion followed including how decisions are made about types of units and location of housing. Such decisions are driven by surveys of students but also by practical considerations. For example, the number of pet-friendly units is limited because they require immediate access to the outdoors; the University’s decision not to retain Millstone apartments in its graduate student stock was the result partly of long travel times for shuttles. The increased diversity
of housing stock as Lakeside comes online will help curb some of the uncertainty about housing and the necessity for students to change units as they progress through the Graduate School. It was noted that rents for University housing do not cover the University’s investment costs. The University is adopting a variety of models for adding new housing. For example, the University will own Lakeside. American Campus Communities, which is developing Lakeside, is partnering as well with the University on faculty-staff housing units being constructed at the Merwick-Stanworth location but in that case the company is financing the project and will recoup costs in rents.

Questions were asked about the outlook for the future. Unknown factors will significantly influence decisions including a new campus plan, the changing composition of the enrolled graduate students and changing capacity needs. Even the distribution of units is difficult to predict since preferences and trends change over time regarding types of units. The Housing Office has been assisted in making decisions by surveys of graduate students, close partnerships with the GSG, and analyses of census data. For example, the decision to try new types of units at Lakeside was the result of graduate student surveys. And this type of consultation is expected to continue as the next campus plan is developed.

The President noted that these conversations about housing will continue, and thanked Messrs. Klaus and Kane for the presentation.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Halliday
Secretary
Middle States Accreditation

CPUC
10 March 2014

Professor Michael Jennings
Dean Clayton Marsh
Overview

- Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE)
- Demonstrating Compliance with 14 Accreditation Standards

Work of the Steering Committee:
  - Document Roadmap
  - Self-Study on International Initiatives
  - 18 months; more than 60 faculty members, staff and students

- Peer Evaluation Visits (March 2014)
- Commission Ruling (June 2014)
Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning

- Assessment of student learning demonstrates that, at graduation, or other appropriate points, the institution’s students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional and appropriate higher education goals. (MSCHE Standard 14)

- Senior Thesis as Capstone of Undergraduate Education

- Independent Work Guides

- Director for Undergraduate Research (Pascale Poussart)
Self-Study: International Initiatives

- **Scope of the self-study:**
  - mission and goals
  - organizational structure
  - international studies at Princeton
  - study abroad and other SIES
  - strategic partnerships
  - administrative support

- **Recommendations for further consideration**
Questions?
Office of the Dean of the College
Residential College Advising Survey

Summary prepared for the CPUC
March 2014
Residential College Advising Survey

Goals:

- Find out more about how freshmen and sophomores use academic support services and the academic advising system, especially faculty advisers and peer advisers
- Use survey itself as a means of educating students about resources and of encouraging students to make use of a robust advising community (or network) rather than rely on a single faculty adviser
- Assess our effectiveness in conveying that message

Process:

- Survey administered three times: December-January 2011, 2012, and 2013
- All freshmen and sophomores were invited to participate; on average, 50% of all freshmen and a third of all sophomores took the survey
Advising expectations

Guiding Principles for Advisers

• Get to know your advisees
• Be familiar with the University’s general education requirements and convey the purpose of a liberal arts curriculum
• Be accessible, and a gateway to other resources
• Refer students in difficulty to academic services

Guiding Principles for Advisees

• Help your adviser get to know you
• Be prepared for advising meetings
• Take initiative and get connected
• Take responsibility for making informed choices
So, how is your relationship with your adviser?

- **Transactional**: “I met him for the first time when I needed my APF signed. He wasn’t the same guy I had last semester, but I never talked to that guy either.”

- **Transformational (1)**: “My adviser sat down with me in our first meeting and just tried to get to know me and the difficulties I was having in trying to choose a major. He picked out specific courses tailored extremely specifically to my interests and needs, but assured me that if I decided in a week that I did not like them, I could feel free to come back in and choose new courses for Spring semester. At our next meeting we talked about my career goals and fine-tuned my schedule for next semester, and I am thrilled with the outcome. He is the best adviser that I could ever ask for.”

- **Transformational (2)**: “I realize upon taking this survey that I had not been taking full advantage of my advisor, and relied more on peers and upperclassmen when talking about academic schedule structuring. I look forward to having more meetings with her next semester, and getting her opinion on how to proceed with my academic career at Princeton.”
Freshmen: How many times in the fall semester have you met in person with your faculty adviser?

- Not at all: 81% (2012), 82% (2013)
- Once: 10% (2012), 10% (2013)
- Occasionally (2-3 times this semester): 8% (2012), 7% (2013)
- Frequently (4 or more times this semester): 1% (2012), 1% (2013)
How satisfied have you been with the academic advising and support that has been provided by your faculty adviser?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshmen</th>
<th>Sophomores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>Generally satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ODOC Advising Survey Summary for CPUC

March 2014
Freshmen: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:
(Not applicable response added in 2012)

- I feel comfortable talking about my academic interests with my faculty adviser.
- I feel comfortable talking about my extra-curricular commitments (e.g. varsity athletics, performance groups, etc.).
- I am comfortable talking with my adviser about how my major might relate to my career interests and ambitions.

[Bar charts showing percentage of responses for each year from 2011 to 2013 for each statement, with categories: Strongly agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly disagree, Not applicable]
Freshmen: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:
(Not applicable response added in 2012)

I have discussed possible majors with my adviser.

When I’ve been struggling with a class or an academic issue, I’ve reached out to my faculty adviser for advice.
Freshmen: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:
(Not applicable response added in 2012)

My adviser is in a field relevant to my current academic interests. (added in 2012)

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Not applicable

2012:
- Strongly agree: 4%
- Agree: 31%
- Disagree: 25%
- Strongly disagree: 12%
- Not applicable: 9%

2013:
- Strongly agree: 3%
- Agree: 36%
- Disagree: 22%
- Strongly disagree: 9%
- Not applicable: 3%
Freshmen: In the fall semester, how often did you turn to the following people for academic advice? (One or more times)

- Princeton friends
- Residential College Adviser (RCA)
- Faculty adviser
- Parents
- Professors
- Preceptors
- Peer Academic Advisers
- Friends from home
- BSE Peer Interactor
- Other family members
- Director of Studies
- Teammates
- Resident Graduate Students
- Residential college dean
- Other university administrators
- Director of Student Life
- Athletic coach
- Team faculty fellows

Bar chart showing the percentage of freshmen who turned to each person or group for academic advice over the years 2011, 2012, and 2013.
Creation of Advising communities

• Recognizing that students seek advice from multiple sources, we decided to shift the emphasis away from a single source of advice towards the idea of an “advising community,” of which faculty advising is one part

• Over the three years we engaged in a number of pilots including:
  • Freshman seminar advising groups
  • Residential college advising communities to complement faculty advising, linking RCAs, academic peer advisers, and resident graduate students

• Given how much students rely on peers for advice, we decided to enhance the peer adviser program:
  • 2011: piloted in 3 colleges;
  • 2012: adopted new model in all colleges;
  • 2013: standardized fall training for all peer advisers.
Peer advising is now a crucial component of the advising community model

- Peer adviser affiliated with RCA advising group
- Full-year commitment of active relationship
- Peer advisers and RCAs are cross-trained to support both A.B. and B.S.E. freshmen
- Peer advisers are drawn from A.B. and B.S.E. departments
- Freshman contact with peer advisers has increased substantially over past 3 years
Freshmen: How many times do you estimate that you’ve communicated with your peer academic adviser this semester?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 Control</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011 Pilot</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about your interactions with your residential college Peer Academic Adviser (PAA):

It was helpful to have my PAA’s input when I was planning my schedule and thinking about courses.

I feel that I can contact my peer academic adviser with questions.

I have talked to my peer academic adviser since Orientation (for example, at a study break, meal, etc.).

My peer academic adviser has reached out to me since Orientation.
Progress over the last three years

- Move towards the concept of an “advising community”
- Greater understanding by students of the network of advising resources available to them
- Increased use of a better trained peer advising corps
- Better understanding of the role of the faculty adviser
- Feedback loop to faculty about what is effective in both transactional and transformative advising conversations
Do you think you made the most of the advising opportunities made available to you this fall?

Freshmen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sophomores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Princeton University
Graduate Student and Faculty/Staff
Housing Master Plan

CPUC Meeting
March 10, 2014
Graduate Education at Princeton

• Commitment to sustaining excellence in our Graduate Program: recruitment of top talent, and sustaining quality of training

• How can we make a positive difference in the world through our graduate program? Open questions:
  – Respond to excess demand for Princeton graduate education by increasing enrollment?
  – Improve conditions even more for the same number of graduate students?
  – Each would require resources

• Future action on housing is one option, but not the only one

• Today’s presentation: not a discussion about future decisions; instead a report on what was planned and implemented
Housing Master Plan: Program Drivers

• Age and condition of buildings
• Functional obsolescence of buildings
• Program of replacement, not growth
• Imperative to address health, safety, and accessibility upgrades
• Commitment to continue housing majority of graduate students
Housing Master Plan: Evolution

2004-07 - Planning for Graduate Student and Faculty/Staff Housing
2009   - Impact of economic conditions
2010   - Selection American Campus Communities (ACC) as Developer Partner for Lakeside
         - Market Studies, Surveys and Graduate Student Focus Groups
         - Start of 18 month Plenary/design sessions with Graduate School and Graduate Students
2011   - Decision made for University to own Lakeside Apartment structures
2012   - Start of site preparation for Lakeside
Graduate Student Housing: Lakeside Apartments

Program
• 715 beds/329 units
• Apartments and Townhouses
• Mix of 1, 2, 3, 4 bedrooms
• Multiple bathrooms in shared units
• Furnished and pet friendly units available
• Phased occupancy
• Demolition of Butler upon availability of all units at Lakeside

Amenities/Features
• In-unit dishwasher, washer/dryer
• Parking garage wrapped by residential buildings
• 6,000 SF community building
• Basketball court, children’s play area, volleyball court
• Tiger Transit/School bus stop
Lakeside Townhomes and Apartments
Lakeside Progress Photos
Lakeside “The Commons”
Eligibility & Capacity Methodology

**Eligibility**
- Fully enrolled for AY
- Meet housing need for all first-year students
- DCEs and VSRCs are eligible, but not counted in “Housing Potential”

**Capacity**
- Students enrolled within prescribed length of academic program = “Housing Potential”
- Capacity determined by graduate student occupancy ratios per unit type – based on past utilization e.g. 2 BR could be occupied by 2 students or 1 student with family
- Models inventory occupied by both single students and students with families
## Housing Capacity

### Graduate Student Housing Capacity
Lakeside 329 units; Stanworth to Grad FY12-14; Butler demolished

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students Eligible for Housing</td>
<td>1,988</td>
<td>2,074</td>
<td>2,097</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td>2,204</td>
<td>2,270</td>
<td>2,268</td>
<td>2,353</td>
<td>2,363</td>
<td>2,365</td>
<td>2,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Units (Apts and Dorms)</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>1,251</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Capacity (# of Students)</td>
<td>1,645</td>
<td>1,704</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>1,923</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential % of Students Housed</strong></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students Housed (enrolled)</td>
<td>1614</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>1645</td>
<td>1699</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1677</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Eligible Students Housed</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Faculty/Staff Housing Capacity
Merwick online in FY15; Stanworth online in FY16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th>08-09</th>
<th>09-10</th>
<th>10-11</th>
<th>11-12</th>
<th>12-13</th>
<th>13-14</th>
<th>14-15</th>
<th>15-16</th>
<th>16-17</th>
<th>17-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Rental Units</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Purchase Plan Properties</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative gain (loss)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Faculty/Staff Units</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative gain (loss)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(25)</td>
<td>(48)</td>
<td>(81)</td>
<td>(197)</td>
<td>(274)</td>
<td>(261)</td>
<td>(176)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Students Housed by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year 2013 - 2014</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Contract Holders</th>
<th>% of Students with Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full-Time Degree Candidates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Year</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Off Campus Housing Resources

- Off Campus Housing website:  www.princeton.edu/housing
  Contact:  Sarah Major at smajor@princeton.edu
- Local affordable housing options
- Area partners