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PROF TOBIN: Thank you, David. He says he's been waiting years for the opportunity to do that. President Monaco is currently meeting with the president of Armenia, so he will be in shortly.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

AS&E COMMITTEE ELECTION RESULTS
PROF TOBIN: So as you probably know, it's election season, so we have some election results hot off the presses. I understand that Donald Trump has been elected to all of the committees. Ioannis, the results?

PROF EVRIGENIS: So let me start by thanking Jillian and Bryanna once again and everybody who ran. We're grateful to the candidates. We always need candidates, and if you didn't run, please consider running. The second thing I need to say is that the survey for committee preferences is about to go out. Please look out for it. And if you don't fill it out, you're fair game.

So results. First, for Budget and Priorities, Klaus Miczek from psychology was elected. Budget and Priorities for a one-year term, Ujjayant Chakravorty from economics. Committee on Committees, David Gute from civil and environmental engineering and Sarah Sobieraj from sociology. Committee on Committees for a one-year term, Modhumita Roy from English.

For the Executive Committee, Bruce Hitchner from classics and Vickie Sullivan from political science. A one-year replacement term for the Executive Committee, Mark Cronin-Golomb from biomedical engineering. Faculty Advisory Board, Anne Gardulski, earth and ocean sciences, and Yannis Ioannides from economics. For the Grievance Panel, we actually had two winners from history. The rules don't allow members of the same department to serve concurrently, and so Hugh Roberts, who won the full term, will be serving for the remainder after Kris Marjapra who won the one-year term serves that one-year term. And we're in the process working with the runners-up to find somebody to serve the one-year that we're missing.

Last but not least, Tenure and Promotion Committee, Andrew McClellan from art and art history and Krzysztof Sliwa from physics and astronomy are the winners. And one thing that we've not announced yet because we haven't had the chance is that due to an unexpected vacancy on T&P, Christos Georgakis from chemical biological engineering will be joining the committee as well. So I said, but I'll say it again. The survey is coming your way. Please fill it out. Thank you.

AS&E DIVERSITY FUND COMMITTEE
PROF TOBIN: Thank you, and Jillian has an announcement.

MS. DUBMAN: Hi, everybody. So about an hour ago, I sent out the most recent solicitation for Diversity Fund proposals to all faculty and staff. Just a few updates
about the process. These particular proposals are looking for -- if you're looking for funding for summer or fall 2016 activities, this would be the time. The deadline for applications is May 16.

Just one change on the actual solicitation that I want to bring to your attention: The committee changed the information about fostering engagement and collaboration. Whether this is among an existing group or groups or if it is an effort to generate new collaboration, the goal of this fund is to prioritize events aimed at multiple audiences and would strengthen knowledge and awareness within the Tufts community about issues of diversity, social justice, intersectionality, and/or campus climate.

The other changes I just wanted to bring to your attention are the detailed budget. We sometimes receive applications for events or projects that are a lot of money, so $10,000 or more, and you're looking for a portion of funding. And so if you have a project that has an overall budget of $10,000 or more, we're asking you to identify which portion of that project you're looking for funding from the Diversity Fund so we can identify what we're actually funding.

And then the final change is that it's really important to invite classes to these events. They should be open to the entire Tufts community. And so we've actually specified in the application materials to give the class title, course number, and instructor of the actual courses you plan on inviting. So if you have students you're working with, it's not just a bunch of classes in this department. We actually are looking for specific identifiable classes that you're looking to include in these activities. Thank you.

LECTURES CELEBRATING ENDOwed PROFESSORSHIPS
PROF TOBIN: Thank you, Jillian. And David has announcements about two upcoming lectures.

PROVOST HARRIS: Thanks, Roger. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm here just to draw your attention to what's already in the agenda for today. There's an announcement about two opening lectures associated with new endowed professorships. So the first one -- well, there's one on April 8th at 4:30 PM in this room with Jianmin Qu who's the new Dean of the Engineering School, but also the Karol Family Professor. Jianmin will be talking about the future of engineering education. It should be interesting to folks in engineering and folks interested in education, which I think covers everybody in the room.

The next one is April 12th. We have Malcolm Turvey, who's the inaugural Sol Gittleman Professor will be at ASEAN Auditorium to deliver a lecture entitled “The Medium Matters.” That's at 4:00 PM on the 12th, and I hope to see you there at both of those. Thanks.

NEW BUSINESS
DISCUSS AS&E BYLAW CHANGES

PROF TOBIN: Thank you, David. Turning to new business. As part of our ongoing effort to clean up the bylaws and that our committees do what they're supposed to do, we started looking at the bylaws for the Faculty Advisory Board for administration. And those of you who keep track of all the acronyms, that's an elected committee that largely in recent years and in pretty much everyone's memory has dealt with reviews of senior administrators. In fact, currently, as you all know, they're reviewing the dean of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences.

When we went and looked at their bylaw description, nowhere in there did it actually mention that job. Instead, it describes a series of functions that I would sort of broadly describe as a kind of liaison between the faculty and the administration and sort of broad-based powers to initiate various investigations and initiatives. And in fact, the more we read it, the more the people on the Executive Committee thought, “Wait, isn't that what we do?” because it really seemed that it was describing a lot of the function that the Executive Committee has evolved to do.

Whereas the bylaws of the Executive Committee don't really say a whole lot about that, except that we're supposed to help plan the agenda for these meetings. So in consultation with FAB, we designed a revision of these bylaws that explicitly state in the FAB bylaws that one of their tasks is to review senior administrators and preserves their ability to initiate actions or inquiries if they feel it necessary, but moves -- we've also written a revision of the bylaws for the Executive Committee that moves the large liaison function into the purview of the Executive Committee.

The one other change, substantive change, that's in the revision for the Executive Committee is there's a provision in there that calls upon members of the Executive Committee to serve as representatives to three trustees committees, and we felt that it would be helpful to have the possibility of members of appropriate other elected committees to serve that role.

In particular, it seemed that someone from the Budget and Priorities Committee could be a suitable representative of the faculty on the Trustees Administration and Finance Committee. That, in fact, might be more appropriate and be more helpful to B&P than having that representative come from the Executive Committee. So there's a provision in there that allows those representatives to be chosen by the Executive Committee from members of other elected committees.

So the text is given in the documents that you have in hand. Since this is a bylaw change, we will not be voting on it today. We can discuss it today, and if there are suggestions, we could make revisions, and then we will come back presumably at the May 4th meeting to take a vote on that.

So I'll open this up for questions or discussions. As always, we ask that you wait for a microphone and please identify yourself by name and department. Okay. Following that
DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON EPC PROPOSALS

PROF HABER: For the next matter, Anne Mahoney will discuss and then there will be a vote on two EPC proposals, one for an incomplete change in planning courses, and the other for planning course evaluations.

PROF MAHONEY: Thank you, Judith. I'm Anne Mahoney, Department of Classics and chair of EPC. We have two completely separate proposals that don't have anything to do with each other. I propose to take the easier one first.

This is to simplify the way we handle grades of incomplete. As things can't wait now, if you're giving somebody an incomplete, you also specify a default grade that will be given to the student if the student doesn't actually hand in the work. So I might say, “Based on what you've done so far, you have a C-minus. I will give you an extra six weeks. If you hand in the work within that time, you have a possibility of getting the A that you probably deserve. If you don't hand in the work, you get a C-minus.”

And when I put the grade on my grade roster, I pull down on the pull-down menu, I/C-minus, and then when the student actually turns in the work, and it's excellent (inaudible), I file a grade change form, and the student gets word of a grade the student actually deserves.

This is a little cumbersome, so the proposal is to simplify it, to get rid of the default grade all together. If the student never hands in the work, then nothing will ever change that grade, and the "I" for incomplete will remain on the student's transcript. We felt that this makes some sense, because if the grade shows up as a C-minus, and that looks like the student screwed up, had a bad semester, did bad work, whatever the case might be.

But if it appears as an incomplete, then it's obvious that something went wrong, the student had some personal crisis, a health problem, whatever it might be, and was not able to finish the work, and that's a different situation. That's much less bad for the student. It should be less of a blotch on the transcript.

Also, in view of the recent changes -- you all got an email yesterday announcing the grade changes can now be done online, there's no more filling in forms and things like that -- it becomes much easier to process an incomplete when the student hands in the work. All we have to do is go into SIS and put in the grade that the student actually deserves. No paperwork, no complications.

So this is what we propose. Incompletes will remain. No more default grades unless and until we, the responsible faculty member, get the work from the student and give the student the appropriate grade. That's proposal number one. Discussion?
PROF CEBE: Peggy Cebe, physics and astronomy. This would seem that the student could escape a failing grade by simply not turning in some work at the end of the term.

PROF MAHONEY: Provided that you're willing to give that student an incomplete. I mean, if the student is in the process of failing and doesn't ask you for an incomplete, then you're not going to give one. You're going to give the F. Incomplete is completely within our control.

DEAN GLASER: Jim Glaser, Dean of Arts and Sciences, political science, and formerly Dean of Undergraduate Education, when this provision came into being. And I think the reason that we did it this way was that we were finding that students lost the incentive to complete their incomplete in an expeditious way. And the longer that time goes by, the more difficult it can be to complete an incomplete, particularly if there's an exam that has to be taken. Because if you write a paper maybe six months later, that can happen. But the further you are away from the material, the harder it is to take the exam.

So I think we were trying to incentivize students so that those incompletes didn't sit there forever and incentivize students to get them finished sooner because it's better for them. So I have concern about losing that.

MS. JACK: Hi, JoAnn Jack. So I don't know who knows this or not, but we did have an internal audit this past year, and when we were asked for examples of the default grades, seven samples were chosen. Six out of seven had an I/A or A-minus grade. So it seems to appear that I think it's unclear what to do with those grades, Jim, and people might be just choosing that first "I" because it's the first one in the list.

DEAN GLASER: So the hope is that with the grade change online, those incompletes would get cleaned up much quicker. It doesn't seem to be working the way it was intended at all.

PROF KRIMSKY: Shelly Krimsky, UEP. Could you tell me how an incomplete is calculated in the grade point?

PROF MAHONEY: It's not, if I remember correctly. It's simply just -- like a withdraw or like an NG, the difference being that an incomplete can eventually become a grade. But while it's still an incomplete, it's not a grade. The student hasn't finished the course.

PROF DHINGRA: Pawan Dhingra, sociology. So in the student you talked about before with a C-minus -- we have a C-minus, but if he turned in the work, that would just give him credit for the course, even if he never completed the course. But under this new proposal, the person must turn in some work to get even credit for having taken the course, even if they would have gotten a passing grade with an incomplete?

PROF MAHONEY: Precisely, yes.
PROF DHINGRA: That might actually end up hurting students in some ways that's unintended as well.

PROF MAHONEY: That's why we brought it to the faculty for discussion.

PROF COUCH: Alva Couch, computer science. I thought about this quite a lot, and I think the new proposals a lot better, because I can submit an "I" and if the student does not show up in the six weeks, I can submit an F. And that is really the whole intent of this, is that if in fact we do have people who don't act in good faith, and, for example, missed the final exam and wouldn't get an F, we don't have to slap them with a provisional grade. We can actually say to come back in six weeks and say no and give an F for that grade, and that is allowed under the new system.

PROF ROGERS: Laura Rogers, education. Especially for those of us who teach in graduate programs, where the coursework and the professional field work aren't always synchronized, having flexibility to use incompletes or to post grades in a more flexible way to correct grading would be a huge advantage.

And I think the current method is really cumbersome, and it sounds like what people are pointing at is if we use the version that you're suggesting, which is that incomplete could remain and be incomplete, if those circumstances warrant it, or faculty could choose to change it to some other grade, I think as long as the student is aware of what the situation is, which I'm not 100 percent sure they were when we do the current incomplete version, to me, it sounds like it can only improve the situation of grading.

PROF HAMMER: I'm David Hammer. Just a quick point of clarification: In the new system, any grade can be changed to any other grade. So if you have an NG or you have an F, and some new information comes later, you could change it, as you could change an "I."

PROF TALIAFERRO: Jeff Taliaferro, political science department. Just a question for clarification, the way I read the new proposal, if the student doesn't complete the work in the six weeks the following semester, the grade of "I" remains on the transcript forever. We don't have the option.

PROF MAHONEY: No, we do. The grade of "I" remains on the transcript, but like David just said, we can change it. What's different is that the system isn't going to change it for us.

PROF TALIAFERRO: But we can only change it if the student submits the work.

PROF MAHONEY: Well, at your discretion. Alva was suggesting that if the student doesn't submit the work, and it's pretty clear that he's not going to submit the work, maybe you change the grade then.
PROF SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut, political science. I'm just recommending making the language clearer that that option is in there, because the current last sentence of that first paragraph sounds like if they don't hand it in you don't have the option of changing it. So if we do have the option, it should somehow be made clear, because a student can go in and see that and say, “No, wait, this is supposed to be (inaudible).” So we need to avoid those situations.

PROF MAHONEY: So we can add something like, “Will remain as an "I" on the student's transcript unless the faculty member changes it.”

PROF RUANE: Kim Ruane from the math department. I kind of thought the original -- I mean, I don't know, because I wasn't on whatever committee decided it -- but it seems the issue of not being able to change it without having to do a form is the reason why we should change it maybe back to what we had before, where you don't have the provisional grade, because I know for me, personally, I love this provisional grade thing because then I don't have to fill out paperwork.

So now that we can change the grade, it seems that it's actually better for everybody, because if the person who would get a C-minus, even if they never did any other work, the faculty member can go back in and change that to a C-minus, or if the person didn't do a final exam, they can go in and change it to an F. And it seems like it's allowing that flexibility that somebody just said. It's weird to undo something we just did recently, but now that we don't have to do paperwork, it's a good thing. I like it.

PROF MAHONEY: That's exactly what we're thinking.

PROF NAPIER: I had a student who was a senior once, and she wasn't expecting to graduate, but she did, and never completed her coursework for the "I," so it stayed a permanent "I." If a student takes a leave of absence their senior year and doesn't graduate, is it possible then to correct the grade in five or six years?

PROF MAHONEY: Carmen, can you speak to that?

DEAN LOWE: Yes, you can. If a student is still enrolled, they have not graduated, and you as the professor remember the student and want to do that, you certainly can. It's at your discretion.

PROF NAPIER: But once they graduate, the graduate's through, right?

DEAN LOWE: That's correct.

DEAN GLASER: Something David Hammer said I just wanted to respond to. He said you can change Fs and NGs and presumably other grades as well, and I think we strongly discourage that. In fact, I think it's actually -- and Carmen, correct me if I'm
wrong -- that you're not allowed to do that.

And there's a reason, and that is around summa, magna cum time, there are students who will come looking for changing their B-plus into an A-minus so that they can get above the thresholds. And when I was in Dowling, we would see that that happened very regularly, and actually happened from the same faculty.

So I just want to put a warning out there that you want to be careful about how much discretion you want to give faculty to change grades later.

PROF MAHONEY: I don't think we're changing that. Faculty have always had the ability to change grades when it's appropriate to do so. Like if I've discovered I've left out one assignment from the calculation that someone actually did hand in -- this is a case that actually happened to me a few years ago -- the only thing that has changed this week is if we do have occasion to change a grade, it's easier to do so.

But our reasons for doing it, the legitimacy of doing it, that hasn't changed. And as Kim just said, the fact that you no longer have to go through a horrendous half-page form, taking seven whole minutes to change a grade simply means that we can resolve incomPLEtes more easily. It doesn't change anything else, or isn't meant to change anything else.

DEAN LOWE: Anne replied to Jim's concern, and I want to loop back in with two more facts about incompletes. So Jim is rightfully concerned about professors inflating grades right before magna and summa decisions, and we also are concerned about grade changes that maybe are questionable or concerning.

So there is with this new system, to simplify and make it easier with paperless grade changes, there will be a report generated daily. It will go to me and the registrar and a few other key people. So if there's something suspicious or unusual, I can reach out to the faculty member and say, “What happened? Why did you make all these changes?” And if it's problematic or concerning, I can certainly send it to you, Jim.

MS. JACK: And Jim, just on that same topic, just so everybody knows, when a grade change form came through our office on paper, it gets processed. So actually now, we're going to really be looking at it.

DEAN LOWE: And back to the incompletes, right now, with the current tentative grade and with the default grade and incomplete, students don't actually see that. All they see is incomplete. So they don't know an incomplete could turn into an F, or an incomplete could turn into a C. They have no way of knowing, unless they talk with you.

And if a student has an incomplete that remains on their transcript, they get no credit for that work, for that class. So if they have an incomplete in a math class they need to graduate and they don't ever finish that class, they will not graduate.
PROF COUCH: I have a question for Carmen as a point of clarification. As I understand, if an incomplete stays on the transcript, and the student graduates, that incomplete becomes a matter of record. Is that correct?

DEAN LOWE: Yes.

PROF SCHILDKRAUT: Debbie Schildkraut again. Just one quick question: I was thinking about if we submit that incomplete for a student, before it would automatically convert to another grade, will this system have a way to remind us? If the student disappears and never hands it in, will we get a reminder, “Hey, do you want to change this grade or is this going to stay?” That would be very helpful, because we forget sometimes who has an incomplete if they disappear.

PROF MAHONEY: It would, wouldn't it? Can we consider that an enhancement request?

MS. JACK: We can consider it. It would take some work to do, but we could do it.

PROF MANZ: Beatrice Manz, History. You've added language, “The instructor must enter the new grade within two weeks.” And that strikes me as potentially troublesome if -- and I've had this happen -- someone who has been out of school, sort of disappeared for three years and comes back in the middle of the summer, and suddenly, you're off on a trip, and the work comes in, to be sort of liable that way makes me a bit nervous.

PROF MAHONEY: Yeah, we've changed "should" submit within two weeks to "must" submit within two weeks. The two weeks has been there all along.

PROF MANZ: So maybe the "should" would be better than the "must," but I just fear in the litigious society that you could get complaints when a student, as I said, comes back out of the blue and a time when you're simply not --

PROF MAHONEY: Yeah, we can put "should." There's no problem with that.

PROF RIDGE: I was the chair of the Curriculum Committee or EPC when we dealt with this last time, and one of the reasons that I think that the system was changed is because there were students that had as many as eight or nine incompletes on their transcript. And there was really no intention, or there may have not been an ability to finish those courses for some reason. But we were trying to find a mechanism to clear up that problem, and that was one issue.

And the other thing I would mention, in the case of Alva's comment, if he gives an incomplete to a student, and that student doesn't complete the course in good faith, and he thinks the student should have an F, why wouldn't he just give him an I/F and be
done with it? It would essentially be the same thing. He wouldn't have to come back and
give the student an F. That's the way it would be recorded. And I don't really
understand what the advantage is here of doing things this way.

PROF MAHONEY: Well, this gets back to what JoAnn said earlier that -- what you just
said is my understanding of how it was supposed to work, but I don't know, maybe it
wasn't adequately documented or whatever -- but the observation in the registrar’s
office was that that wasn't how it was working, and what we discussed in EPC, we
conjectured that what people were putting in was not the grade that this student is going
to get if nothing ever gets turned in, but the grade that I predict the student is going to
get when they do turn in the work, and if I just put that in as the default, then when I
get the work and I grade it and it's wonderful, then the A will just happen, and I won't
have to do anything.

But we aren't sure. But what triggered this discussion was JoAnn coming to EPC and
saying, “Hey, we've looked at how people are using these default grades, and they're all
putting in A’s, what's up with that?” And that's not what was intended. And since
there's a happy coincidence of the easier mechanism for changing grades when
necessary, we figured this was a good time to reconsider the default grades.

PROF RIDGE: It sounds to me like there was a problem of what people perceive the
default grade to mean. I think a lot of people thought the default grade is what the
student will get if they complete the work. You know, maybe there was a way -- I'd
have to look at the way grades are recorded again -- but it's possible that people were
perceiving it the wrong way.

PROF MAHONEY: If there is no more discussion, we should vote on the amendments.
Unless people want to discuss it further, in which case we're going to have to table it.

So there are two amendments to be voted on in the order of appearance in the text. One
is four lines up from the bottom, change "The instructor must enter the new grade
within two weeks" to "The instructor should enter the new grade within two weeks." All
in favor? Opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, we take that amendment.

The next amendment at the end of that paragraph, add to the last sentence, "A course
uncompleted by the designed time will remain as an 'I' on the student's transcript, unless
the faculty member changes it." All in favor? Any opposed? Any abstentions? Okay, we
now have an amended motion.

The vote is now on the motion as amended. This would be to get rid of default grades
associated with incompletes, and not to change any incompletes into anything
automatically, but to leave it in our hands to change it. All in favor? All opposed? Any
abstaining? The motion carries.

DISCUSS AS&E BYLAW CHANGES (continued)
PROF HABER: I think before we take up the next matter, which is very substantial, Roger has a clarification of the matter he discussed.

PROF TOBIN: So Mark asked me to make clear with regard to the bylaw changes, there are two proposals that will be voted on separately, and I just want to make sure everyone understood that we were intending to have an opportunity to discuss both of them. And it's the revision to the FAB bylaw and the revision to the Executive Committee bylaw.

Since we need to have an opportunity to discuss both of them before we bring them back for the vote, I want to make sure that everyone understood that that was the opportunity, or if not, to take this opportunity, if you were waiting for me to open the discussion on the Executive Committee bylaw revision, and I didn't. All right, in that case, I will take them both as having been discussed today. Thank you.

PROF DEVOTO: Without objection.

DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON EPC PROPOSALS
PROF HABER: And Anne will pick up the discussion.

PROF MAHONEY: Okay, this is the hard part. A little over a year ago, when EPC presented a proposal for displaying the results of course evaluations, this faculty sent it back, asking for a redesign, and we've gone and done it. I want to give a shout out to last year's co-chair, Montserrat Teixidor, who did most of the work on getting this design put together, working with the technical folks, working with student members of EPC. There's been a lot of student input into this, because this proposal is at least partially for the students.

So you have before you another proposal for how to display results of course evaluations. The idea is that as this faculty voted something like seven or eight years ago, we do wish to display the results of course evaluations to the community, to each other, to the students. We want students to be able to see them, because we think that our own course evaluations are at least marginally more reliable than certain websites, whose name will not pass my lips.

We want to make the numerical results available. This proposal also allows for making the comments available, because we all know the comments are important. There is also a mechanism so that the faculty member has to opt in to having comments displayed. I need to say, all right, for this course, you may display the comment, but except for this one that calls me some unprintable name, we can leave that one out. And there will be a committee that will judge such cases.

But I might say for some other course, let's not display the comments on this one. That will be up to the individual faculty member. We'll see how this works for a while before thinking about what we want to do more broadly.
The idea is that there will be a first screen that shows a couple of selected questions, and these are the questions that the students selected as being the most useful -- potentially the most useful to them. They are not the same as the questions that we have selected as the ones most useful to us when we are evaluating faculty members in tenure or promotion decisions. They're the ones that the students thought would be most useful in figuring out what courses they want to take.

Then there's a mechanism for drilling down so that you can see all the numbers with histograms, averages, that kind of thing, and you can see the numbers for any course. Then there is a stick to go with the carrot. If a student has not filled in course evaluations for the most recent semester for which the student had course evaluations to fill in, then the student does not get to see course evaluations.

Doing this doesn't make them secret, because they can ask a friend, “Hey, can you show me blah, blah, blah,” but the idea is that we should eventually create a culture where people are filling in their course evaluations, because we keep trying to do that because we want that to work.

So this is the proposal, go ahead, tell me about it.

PROF MIRKIN: Sergei Mirkin from biology. This is a great proposal, but as you pointed out, it seems to be the percentage of students submitting their evaluation, which is particularly sensitive matter for smaller size courses, especially if you're teaching a course of 15 people, and three people send me the evaluation, usually these are unhappy people, or very happy people, but as a rule, these are not happy people. And that really skews the course evaluation.

So I think this is a great proposal (inaudible) if most, if not all, students fill in their evaluation. I think we shall mandate evaluations. Or we can do it, if you don't want to mandate it, in a nicer way, we can follow the Harvard model where to complete an evaluation, you learn about a grade one week ahead of time.

PROF MAHONEY: We've already done that.

PROF MIRKIN: Okay, but really, right now, what I see in smaller courses, like ten, twelve students, that three or four evaluations are the most you get. And I think that's very unfair to the teacher.

DEAN BAUER: Anne knows exactly what I'm going to say, because until I was recently taken off EPC because of my new duties, I said this about 100,000 times, so I apologize. Every school I know of that has online evaluations tells students that they cannot see their grades as they appear until they finish their course evaluations. Every school that has done that has seen an uptick in the number of evaluations that are completed so that you start to get towards a reasonable percentage.
Every semester that we've done this, the percentage has dropped. I think we're now at something like 62 or 63 percent. I'm not a statistician, but I am a faculty member who teaches courses, and I'm very alarmed.

First of all, we can have -- I'm looking at David Hammer -- we can have a whole conversation about the value of course evaluations -- David, don't say anything about that -- but we do -- I think if we are using these instruments, it is -- and I have to say, as the dean, making decisions about the fates of part-time lecturers, full-time lecturers, tenure cases, I mean, we are trying to do this with some grain of salt and look carefully at the comments.

I cannot say -- I'm so frustrated by this. I do not know why the EPC will not bring a vote on that question.

PROF MAHONEY: Nancy, we voted on that at the last meeting. We have passed that.

DEAN BAUER: I'm so sorry. I'm so embarrassed.

PROF MAHONEY: You are right. We agreed with you. It's all good. This has been done. We're now moving on to the next brick in the wall.

DEAN BAUER: I won't ask again. I'm glad I got to say it to this group of people, though.

PROF GARDULSKI: Anne Gardulski from earth and ocean sciences. It says that you can, as an instructor, even allow the comments or opt out of having the comments. I assume you can also opt out of having the numerical scores put on. I would hope so. I don't think that that should be a default.

PROF MAHONEY: Actually, we did not allow for that. I mean, obviously, things can be changed, proposals can be amended, but we decided that it would be more valuable if all of the numerical data were there for suitable courses. Very small classes, no. Classes, in which a very small percentage of evaluations got filled in, as Sergei was just saying, no.

But if I'm teaching a course of 30 people, and 22 of them fill in their evaluations, there we go. We just played the numbers. This releases the current proposal. Obviously, we can try and see how it works and change it.

PROF TEIXIDOR: What about first time faculty?

PROF MAHONEY: Right, yes. Faculty teaching in their first year at Tufts would also not have their numbers shown.
PROF SCHILDKRAUT: So I wonder given what Nancy recommends and what we just voted on whether it makes sense to wait and see -- if the main rationale for this is to increase response rates, I don't see the value in changing two things at the same time. Rather, let's change that one, since that one seems far less controversial and maybe wait a couple of semesters to see what that does.

Last semester was the first time I had 100 percent response rate in my course, and all I did was say I'm leaving the room for ten minutes, please fill out your evaluations, and they all did. So it didn't take that much class time. They all have laptops, and everybody did it.

PROF RUANE: From what you just said a few minutes ago -- I must be unclear on something -- you said there were certain stipulations about like if a class was really small, or if the response rate was really low that those numbers wouldn't be published, is that what you said?

PROF SCHILDKRAUT: Yeah, that's the idea.

PROF RUANE: Are there thresholds for those that have already been decided?

PROF MAHONEY: The threshold is in the proposal. So the EPC has decided it, but obviously it's here to be voted on. Courses for which fewer than six evaluation forms are completed, and that could be -- those five evaluations might be the whole population of the class, or it might be five out of a course of 20, or whatever.

PROF RUANE: So it's not a percentage, then, like it said in the notes?

PROF MAHONEY: No.

PROF RUANE: Just the number six, that was the only one?

PROF MAHONEY: Right, because what if it's like a 200-person class, and only seven fill it out. That in itself is interesting information. And, here, I'm thinking about something that happens in the Ex College. I've been on the Ex College board. And one of the things that you get if you're evaluating a course that an Ex College visiting lecturer has taught before and proposes to teach again, you get the evaluation figures from the Ex College's own instrument, and you also get told how many people are in the class and how many of those filled it out. And that's always interesting information. “Hmmm, there were 12 people in the class, but only eight of them were present to fill out the evaluation. I wonder if there's something screwed up here.” So if we had a class of 200, and seven -- which, to my knowledge, is greater than six -- were filled out, then that would also be worth knowing about.

PROF COUCH: I apologize, Anne, for blindsiding you on this, but it would make me feel a lot better about putting the comments out if I had a 200-word response, if I could
write something as an instructor that says, “I hear you, I want to do better,” and I would allow the negative comments in if I could do that. I'm very nervous about putting in a number of negative comments without actually acknowledging them. And I think that it would be a major change in my attitude for publishing comments if I had that ability, even in a very small way, to say, “I hear you.”

PROF MAHONEY: I don't feel blindsided at all. That's a lovely, creative suggestion.

PROF HABER: Might I ask, how long do instructors have to allow comments to be published? It doesn't make that clear.

PROF MAHONEY: You mean how long before one has to decide on it?

PROF HABER: Yes.

PROF MAHONEY: I don't think we've addressed that.

PROF TEIXIDOR: That's going to be determined by the needs of the technology, because we want the comments to be available when the students sign up for the next semester. So it's not going to be a very long time. But I assume that if you don't make the deadline, you can put them later.

PROF HABER: We would be notified if you want your comments available to us now or something like that, right?

PROF TEIXIDOR: Hopefully, yeah.

PROF ROGERS: Laura Rogers, education. I was one of the people who worked on trying to revise the student course evaluation so that it would give faculty the kind of information that would be useful to them and give students information that would be useful to them. So we really thought about this as eventually coming to the point where students would have access to the information on student course evaluations.

I don't know if it would make sense at some point to convene faculty to say, “Is the student course evaluation as it's currently constructed giving you information that is useful to you?” I mean, we're not talking right now about the substance of the student course evaluation. I'm talking about a procedure. I think it's a procedure that's well overdue, but I wonder if people also feel like -- and I hesitate to raise that, because being evaluated is not something that in my experience Tufts faculty really embrace. You're not even that happy sometimes about having to evaluate your students that you really don't like this -- I mean, what I've noticed over the years. That might be changing. And I think this would be a great opportunity to think about if we are getting the information we need, and if we are collecting the information that would be useful to students as we move forward.
PROF TOBIN: Roger Tobin, Physics and Astronomy. I just have a very small point. In the first paragraph, you say the number to be made available will include the mean score. In the second paragraph, you say that on the first screen, they're going to see the median. And I wonder, “Why the distinction?”, and I would suggest that mean is more appropriate, since the median is going to be four.

PROF MAHONEY: One of them is a typo. I think we decided to go with mean for everything because the median is kind of meaningless -- I don't even know off the top of my head whether these scores are a one to five scale or a zero to four scale.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: One to five.

PROF MAHONEY: But it will matter, right, in terms of calculating the mean, but matter less in terms of calculating the median. But the intention is to use the same average in each case.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Average is the mean. Median is not the mean.

PROF MAHONEY: To me, the median, the mode, or any measure that you want is okay but (inaudible), use the same one.

PROF DeBOLD: Joe DeBold from psychology. With regards to the central tendency for any data that is not normally distributed -- and these are not normally distributed -- the median is more appropriate than the average or mean.

But what I actually wanted to say was in response to an earlier comment, and that was about waiting on this. As Anne mentioned at the beginning, we voted several years ago to make the evaluations available. We've been waiting a long time.

PROF POTT: Martha Pott, child study and human development. I just want to clarify the comments. So it appears -- my interpretation is that an instructor would have to opt in if you wanted the comments, right, but that any comment could be deleted by you before it's shown, right?

PROF MAHONEY: With approval of a committee, yes.

PROF POTT: That's what I wondered about. Doesn't this feel kind of unwieldy, because even -- you know, some comments are just kind of silly, and maybe it seems kind of undignified to have it on there. I mean, who wants to look at all these and decide what can be opted in and opted out.

PROF MAHONEY: It is unwieldy, but we figured we wanted to put some safeguards around it, because we've never done anything with comments before, and we figured better to be a little bit cautious. Someplace where I used to teach, the comments were published, and someone I think selected which ones, because they were printed in print,
and with limited space. And we all lived. I mean, I was a graduate student, and my comments got published. I got my degree anyway. But we want to be gentle with ourselves the first time through just to see how it works.

PROF ORIANS: Colin Orians, biology. I teach a class with 100 students. Invariably, there are some positive comments and negative comments. I am definitely not going to opt into the comments, because then I have to go through each one of them and decide if it should be selected or not selected, and I would never run for EPC if I were going to have to be the one who decided if a comment was to be included or not included. So I don't think -- I mean, I like the idea of comments being public, but I don't like this system where I have to go through the 100 comments, decide which ones I want to keep, and then go through a committee and ask my colleagues to have to evaluate that. So I'm not in favor of public comments in this particular iteration. It just seems like a lot for these large classes.

PROF HESCOTT: Ben Hescott in computer science. I remember the days of small classes of 100. I am also very, very worried about -- I guess I just want to share -- I will always opt out. My comments are very good, let's say, but they're mostly inappropriate, and they're very good comments. They're not things that I think I would want to sort of have publicly out there. They're slightly embarrassing. They're embarrassing in an excellent way, but they're slightly embarrassing.

So it would be something where I like the idea as well, just as Colin, but I'm very worried about this sort of togetherness of the proposals. I wonder if we could separate the comment piece of this from the numerics and move forward with the numerics to sort of see how they're going and then consider what we might do with comments?

PROF HABER: We're going to have to decide to vote or to table, because there's another matter that takes the remaining time.

PROF TOBIN: It sounds like from the last couple of things that perhaps we should offer an amendment. Perhaps the amendment should be simply to delete Paragraph B, right, eliminate the comments issue, but leave everything else intact? And maybe if we voted on that, discussed and voted on that, and then vote on the overall proposal.

PROF MAHONEY: If we can do this expeditiously. So there is a motion to delete Paragraph B. Is the motion seconded? All in favor? Any opposed? Okay. So now we move to a vote on the proposal as amended. All in favor? All opposed? Anyone wish to be recorded as abstaining? Then the motion passes.

OVERVIEW OF RESIDENTIAL STRATEGY WORKING GROUP AND UPDATE OF CURRENT FINDINGS

PROF HABER: Next, I'd like to call on Provost Harris to give us an overview and update on the Residential Strategy Working Group.
PROVOST HARRIS: Thank you. So we've got 20 minutes. So here's what I want to do. We have something called the Residential Strategy Working Group. What I want to do today is share with you where we are, why we created this, what we've been finding, and what happens from here to the end of this stage of the whole process.

We're not going to have time for in-depth conversation about the whole thing, but you know I'm right over there. Jim Glaser, Jianmin Qu, Patricia Campbell, my partners in leading this, we're available and happy to have follow-up conversations with folks.

So why are we doing this? Let me motivate it in the following ways. Let me start with our budget situation at the university. So what you see here is across the whole university -- this is the unrestricted net operating income. What you can see is going back to 2008, you see a 34-million-dollar surplus. And then you come over here, and you can see for fiscal year '16, which is about ten, you see at $3 million, and you see something similar in '17 and some growth out here, but still, numbers that aren't very large, especially when you think about a million-dollar budget, that's not a lot of surplus.

Now, why do we care about surplus? It's not profit. Surplus is what we use to invest in the university. So we want to build a building, want to do a range of other things. This is surplus that allows us to do this, our savings to reinvest in our university. So it's important, obviously. That's problematic.

When we juxtapose that against something really interesting -- and this is a good week to talk about this, because we're about to announce the students who are admitted for the next class -- as you all know, while we are having budget challenges we are in the very fortunate position of seeing demand among students, undergrads in particular, that are going up and up and up, not only in terms of applications in general, which you can attribute some of that to the common app, but also looking at early decisions, those kids who are saying (inaudible) “If I don't get into somewhere else, but this is where I want to be.” Huge growth in that over the last seven to ten years. So that's the first piece.

Second piece. The green line, which is now a Waiting for Godot piece, but at some point, it's going to come, and, really soon, four or five years probably. You can look at college in Boston as being a stock -- as you read the Boston Globe, you saw we're not sure how much it's going to cost, that slows things down. But independent, in anticipation of this -- another thing is you're seeing the rents go up, up and up.

I just had a couple of students in my office yesterday. Just for example, and I don't think this is unusual, one of them said she pays $850 off campus, and next year, the rates get to $900. That's a roughly 12% increase in housing. And we're hearing things like that from other students we're talking to. It's only going to get worse when you have the green line.

Third, Somerville. Somerville is saying they're enforcing an ordinance which says no
more than four unrelated individuals in a dwelling. By the way, it's independent of how many bedrooms there are, which is interesting, but that's the story. And again, one of the stories a student told me yesterday -- and this is consistent with what we're hearing -- is students in Somerville -- I haven't shared this with my colleagues yet -- the students in Somerville, they know when an inspection is going to happen, they're actually moving people out, all their stuff somewhere, to make it look like only four people live there, and then move their stuff back in after the inspection. They're trying to figure out ways to make this work because that's cheaper than actually splitting rent four ways instead of five or six.

The point of all this is that we have two big challenges. One, we have this challenge where we have declining budget surpluses, and we have selectivity going up, and that's an interesting opportunity. But then also, we have this current and looming worry about the affordability of housing for our students off campus.

So what do you do about this? Well, you might say, “Well this isn't that hard. Why don't you just add students, right? Build additional housing on campus and increase the number of students, assuming that there's a positive net revenue from adding students, and problem solved.” Not exactly.

So Present Monaco created the Residential Strategy Working Group and asked me to lead this in partnership with Patricia Campbell on one side, particularly Residential Strategy Working Group 1, RSWG1, and with Jim Glaser and Jianmin Qu on the other side. What are we doing?

What we're looking at on the first part is: where are our residences; what's the quality of our residences; what's the off campus like; where do our students live; what's the quality of the places where they live; how much does it cost on campus; how much does it cost off campus; looking at issues like, how many years of on campus housing do we have versus peers; and also if we are going to add beds on campus, where would we add the beds and how much would it cost and what kind of beds would we want to add? Are we adding Miller, Houston style or are we adding Sophia Gordon style? Those are the kinds of questions that come up primarily in RSWG1.

In RSWG2, you have fundamental questions: how many students should we have; how many undergrads? We're focused primarily on undergrads here. How many undergrads should we have at Tufts University, what's the mix of schools, and what's our housing strategy? And those are a whole bunch of things that go into this notion of a housing strategy. Think, for example: Do you have faculty in residence or not? Do you have a section that's just for first-year students? -- A whole bunch of issues.

And as partners in all of this, this is a quite large group. It's over 30 individuals -- faculty, staff, students, undergrads are on it, as well as others around the university -- and the faculty came -- the Committee on Committees we reached out to, as we tended to -- the AS&E Committee on Committee to get nominations for faculty. So that's what
we're up to.

So why is this hard? So I'm sure all of you have in your head already reasons that this is complicated. So here are some of them. You have to answer a bunch of questions. Well, first of all, what are the financial costs and benefits? That's an obvious one that you want to think about. Is it really net positive in terms of revenue?

But then there's a whole bunch of thorny issues. Financial aid strategy. Well, if you added X students, and you said they were all going to be full pays, you obviously could do better in terms of bottom line than if you added X students and they were all full need, right? Where in that continuum do we want to be?

The Tufts culture: I like to think about this. There are just over 5,000 undergrads here. If you increase that by one, so what? But if you tripled it, this would be a fundamentally different university than it is today. So you have to think about the culture and all the things that means.

The surrounding community: There's a lot of students who are out there, and so we don't control that piece, so we should be thinking about the impact on the neighborhoods, for many reasons, not least of which is because that affects our relationship with the community, which affects our ability to do things on campus.

Faculty-to-student ratios: We want to make sure that the experience of the students is held constant, and in some cases, you might actually want that experience to improve if we feel that we already have too much stress in certain places. And I heard your comment earlier, Ben, for example.

Then the composition of the student body: Again, it's not just economic, but there's other aspects as well in terms of where students are from, what they're studying and so forth. And then competitiveness is an issue. Lee Coffin was a part of this group. Among other things, we heard a lot about what attracts students to Tufts and thinking, “Would the attractiveness of Tufts change in a fundamentally different way if we were a lot bigger or we had more on campus housing, on and on, compared to the group of schools that we compete with?”

So those are just some of the things that we think about. So what did we find? I just want to share with you some of the findings and where we are right now. It was quite interesting to see.

How many students are at Tufts and has it been constant over time? The answer is no. In fact, if you go back -- I don't think there's anybody who was here at this point, there were only about 2500 undergraduates, but about half the size we are now. And at one point, this was all of it, so we were really tiny, going way back here. But if you go back to the early '60s, it's about half the size.
You see a precipitous decline happening over the '60s, '70s. You get more stability here, but that's a decent increase throughout. And this is how many engineers, and this is how many A&S students. So you can see the difference between A&S and E wasn't that big back here, but the increase has been disproportionately on the A&S side compared to the engineering side over time.

Now, where do the students live and how has that changed? So again, the big block on the back in the blue, this is the number of students. This is taking out the study abroad students. This is the number of students we have. And what you have here is the percent of the undergrads -- those not studying abroad or on leave -- the percent in the blue who live in university housing. And you can see it's mid-sixties, it goes up, and then it's falling over this period. It's now down to around 65 percent.

And here, which is interesting, this is the occupancy. This is how many beds we have on campus. And I only put two here, because these are the dorms we added. Most of our housing is quite old. We had Sophia Gordon in the 2000s, in the 1990s, roughly at South Hall, but there's not a lot of new housing that's been constructed over this time period. As a matter of fact, something I'll talk about in a moment.

So where do our students live? Over 30 percent of them live off campus. They're roughly equally split between Somerville and Medford with a slight leaning towards Somerville, and about 90 percent of them live within a mile. So most of them live in walking distance. So it's not a commuter school. This is a walkable school for folks if they live here, or they're in walking distance, the vast majority of them. And the ones who are beyond a mile, we actually aren't sure about the validity of a lot of those addresses. So we think a lot of them probably live closer.

Housing quality: Now, this is what I was saying earlier about the age of housing. I don't know how many of you have been in dorms lately, but a lot of them -- you know, we've been working on them and sprucing them up, but a lot of them need sprucing up. So the FCI, which was something I didn't know, but now I know well, is it's basically deferred maintenance divided by the value of that unit. And so if you had a one, that would basically say you should not be putting any money into this thing, because the deferred maintenance is equal to the value.

Here, we have an FCI for on campus housing as .48, which is quite poor, and 75 percent of them are before 1970. Off campus, we're not sure yet. We're getting that information, but we're not hopeful in terms of the quality of off campus housing. Our sources say that a lot of it's not so great.

Now, how about years on campus? So Mary Pat McMahon is part of the group, and her colleagues went out and talked to peer schools and found that we have far less on-campus housing than the vast majority of our peers, and we also found that we manage the off campus experience less than some other peers.
And there are many ways in which that could be managed; everything from helping guide students in terms of what residences, what dwellings are available and quality and so forth to imagining someone who's thinking about how you organize activities in certain neighborhoods. And so there's a range of things you could do, but we're not doing those things right now off campus.

Housing strategy: We are on the right tail of the distribution that Mary Pat looked at, which was a lot of schools.

DEAN MCMAHON: About 25.

PROVOST HARRIS: About 25 schools, in terms of the percent of undergraduates who are in dwellings that don't have some sort of supervision. Think RAs.

DEAN MCMAHON: No, 90.

PROVOST HARRIS: It was about 90 schools. So think RAs, for example. About a quarter of the students are in residences -- this is on campus -- that don't have RA type people in them. And that's something that's very unusual in terms of peers.

Housing costs: So it's around $7,000, a little over $7,000 a year for housing. It's $500 extra if you have a single. That's the only difference. Some schools we found have huge ranges in terms of how many different gradations and the range, and ours is very narrow. Roughly $7200, we're at $500 for a single. Off campus, we're still getting the data, but it looks like it's somewhere in the $500 to $900 a month, more think to the right side than the left side of that, maybe. And that's usually a 12-month, not the academic year.

So what about expanding on campus housing? So there are options. Our challenge is not what you might think, which is there's nowhere to put additional beds. There are places to put beds. So, for example, very creative folks in operations have identified things such as Miller, Houston. Think about adding additions on the grass side, the sort of minimal part that might go over the road there, for example. You could do things to add to those buildings, and at the same time, increase the accessibility. Those aren't accessible buildings. And make some other positive changes that would improve residential life.

There are opportunities to put new dorms on campus. There are several sites that have been identified from studies in the last decade, and we actually have a housing study that's been going on. You may have interacted with them. As I described it, we're trying to understand if we can and should increase the number of beds, and what they're working on is if we do, we want to get as ready as possible to move on that, as opposed to now waiting a year to start thinking about it. So that's happening as well.

Last couple of things: Cost is a challenge. So we charge -- I already told you -- we
charge a little over $7,000 a bed. The estimate is that the new beds are going to cost --
we're still working with the numbers, but it's at least two times -- at least, probably
more than two times what we currently charge a bed. So that creates a challenge. And
there's also the capital cost upfront in terms of taking on debt.

So last slide: Where are we? So a number of conclusions at this point. I don't think I'll
have anybody arguing with me when I say that the current capacity of the campus has
been reached. We're not seeing a lot of excess capacity in health services. We're not
seeing a lot of excess capacity in the library. We're not seeing a lot of excess capacity
around the university beds, dining and so forth. So it's not just add students, and don't
worry about reinvesting.

Second, there's a delicate balance that has to be struck between making sure this is a
university that can at least, and in fact, more than balance the books so that we not only
break even, but we have money to reinvest in the many things we're going to have to
reinvest in the capital side.

But also making sure that while we're trying to do this, we're able to continue to have a
university where faculty and staff and students are excited about being, because that's
the life blood, right? If we balance the books, but then people don't want to come, it
doesn't work. If people want to come, but we can't balance the books, it doesn't work
either. So we've got to figure out that delicate balance.

Third, there's this challenge in trying to think about the extent to which you're going to
add beds for first- and second-year students, and the extent to which you're adding beds
that brings students back from off campus.

John Barker regularly says -- and I listen to him, and others say as well -- we have a
two-year experience. Students study -- they're on campus for two years. A bunch of
them go off campus for a semester or a year and start study abroad. Then they come
back to campus, but not really. They live off campus, and they're just not so connected.
And so we want to try and bring some of those students back on campus especially if
the costs off campus are going to get worse and worse.

And then lastly, make sure we know more about our competitive position. So how any
change would affect that. We have limited time. We're going to give you an overview of
where we are now, what's happening next. We're continuing to collect information,
continuing to have conversations with our colleagues. We met with community
members in Medford, for example, and doing other things.

We'll produce something for Tony before the end of the academic year and talk again
with the trustees. Again, this is something about which Jim and Jianmin and Patricia
and I have been meeting regularly as sort of a leadership group, but also having quite
regular meetings of this much bigger group. So I'll stop there. We've got about five
minutes for discussion.
PROF MIRKIN: So that's a really very interesting presentation. Two questions. Over the increasing number of students, there will probably be an increase in the number of faculty, but what would the cost be?

And then the second question of consideration that right now, we really don't have enough TAs for larger lecture classes, because if the student population increases, we will have to deal with that as well. I mean, on one hand, I understand the financials. That's quite clear, that we need to generate some more income. But on the other hand, it's not at all clear to me after all is said and done, will we actually generate extra income by increasing the numbers?

PROVOST HARRIS: Absolutely, Sergei. So this is one of the key questions we've been asking, which is, a, is reinvestment required? and b, how much investment is required? And it's a really challenging issue to nail down, but at some point, if sufficient reinvestment is required, because we don't want to degrade the Tufts experience, then from a financial perspective, it doesn't make any sense. And so that's what we've been trying to get a handle on.

PRESIDENT MONACO: Just to say, Tom McGurty has a model in which if you say, “If I want to increase the number of students by 100, then how many new faculty? And what services would have to increase?” So he's got from talking to people and understanding what we currently provide, it's all factored in. And then after all that cost is calculated, then you can figure out, “Well, how much have you made which you can invest in the beds?” So it's not just all on full tuition that these people would bring in.

PROF MIRKIN: So the answer is how do we (inaudible) actually make extra revenue?

PRESIDENT MONACO: Yes, there is extra revenue, but you have to calculate all those costs. It is done in the model, and hopefully the model is accurate, but it's as accurate as our knowledge at the moment.

PROVOST HARRIS: And we came at this two ways. One, mechanical, sort of what are the current ratios assumed, and then second, went out and actually talked to folks who were on these services to try and understand if it's excess capacity or not. So we've got two different ways of coming at this.

PROF ORIANS: I would actually argue on number one, that we've actually exceeded our carrying capacity given the stories I've heard from students who are trying to live in Somerville and Medford and the perceived cost of housing increases that are going to happen. So I think we're over the carrying capacity. The question is: How can we have a gentle downturn where we have a catastrophic sort of population decline in (inaudible) terms?

Anyway, my real question is given the fact that I think we need to bring more students
back on campus for lots of reasons, I don't quite understand how you doubled the cost per student after the construction of the new space? Why is the cost of the bed, once it's constructed, twice the current cost? If you could just explain that a little.

PROVOST HARRIS: So I will give a little bit, but then I'll pass it to my colleague. So we don't disagree on that first point. It's interesting, when you ask different units what's a required reinvestment, it's nonlinear, which at first, seems weird. So we asked if you add 50 or 100, 200 students to the current capacity, what would you need to add to the library, whatever it is? And it goes like this, nonlinear, then linear afterwards. And what they're basically saying is what you just said. They're saying I'm already over capacity.

So the first group, I did a big investment. Once you sort of effectively right size, then it won't be quite as much. So that's the first piece. The second one, the short answer is that you have to pay the full cost of construction in the second piece, and the current cost isn't necessarily full housing cost.

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT CAMPBELL: Right. So there are really two pieces to the answer. One is that what we charge now for housing, the roughly $7200 a year, is well below market. And most of our peers, we've looked at that as well. They differentiate the cost of housing based on the quality of housing. So on our campus, if you were in Sophia Gordon, you'd be paying more than if you were in Houston or Miller. And we have not done that, for some good reasons. We haven't wanted to have all the wealthy students in one building and people who are not wealthy in another building. So really good reasons.

So our current revenue for housing isn't really sufficient to support the cost of housing. So when you look at that factor and the fact that new construction -- now, we're really trying to hone our estimates on that and see if there aren't ways to build very efficiently. It's expensive to build in an organization like ours. So can we find a design build opportunity that's less expensive.

But nevertheless, it's way more in terms of debt, the operating costs to actually support a new building than what we currently have. And it's fair to say in this room, it's worked economically for Tufts to have housing be lower than it might be. For all the smart math minds in the rooms, it's obvious. If we're charging everyone a higher tuition and lower housing and board costs, it's better for us financially, and I think that's part of how we got to that place, in addition to the fact that we wanted to keep the charges equal across buildings. Is that helpful?

PROVOST HARRIS: So, I'm sorry. I'm looking at the time, and we are at our time. So a lot more I'm sure that people want to talk about. So I can talk with Roger and his colleagues to see how we get more conversation. Know that there are faculty on the committee, so that's also another way to get through it. But mostly, today we wanted to make sure you knew what we were up to, knew some of the key issues, and then to
spark the conversation. So thank you.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Respectfully Submitted,

Jillian Dubman
Secretary of the Faculty for Arts, Sciences & Engineering