Minutes of a meeting of the Council of the Princeton University Community held February 15, 2016 in 101 Friend Center. Present were Council members Professor Beaver, Professor Braverman, Mr. Brown, Ms. Calhoun, Mr. Cannon, Professor Carvalho, Ms. Cheng, Ms. Czulak, Mr. Durkee, Ms. Edwards, President Eisgruber (chair), Mr. Flites, Professor Fore, Ms. Fransson, Ms. Goodstein, Ms. Hakim, Mr. Harris, Ms. Hastings, Mr. Hines, Mr. Kreutz, Dean Kulkarni, Mr. Kumar, Ms. Liang, Provost Lee, Mr. Marcus, Mr. McGhee, Mr. Mehra, Ms. Patel, Professor Priestly, Ms. Romero, Ms. Rosen, Professor Rouse, Dr. Sergienko, Professor Wysocki, Ms. Zheng. Ms. Halliday was secretary.

Approval of Minutes

The President requested and received approval of minutes of the December 14, 2015, Council meeting as circulated in advance of the meeting.

Strategic Planning Framework

The February CPUC meeting is usually a town hall meeting with President Eisgruber. This year the meeting was split between the President and Trustee members of the Wilson Legacy committee who were present to receive thoughts and ideas from the University community about questions related to Woodrow Wilson’s legacy and the general question of how the University recognizes its historical legacy.

The President began the meeting by discussing the recently Board-approved strategic planning framework report, a milestone in planning for the future that resulted from a two-year long Trustee review of University priorities. He urged members of the community to read the document now on the web (http://www.princeton.edu/strategicplan/framework/). Unlike other strategic planning efforts, the Board had not sought to produce a compendium of actions to take. The framework articulates the University’s mission and seeks to provide guidelines and principles that will help determine future priorities and use of resources, as explained in a Powerpoint presentation which is attached as Appendix A. The framework is meant to be flexible and reversible. The President described the three major themes: Reaffirm Princeton’s core values and commitments as a liberal arts research university; recognize Princeton’s responsibility for leadership in a world where superb education and research are urgently needed and are all too rare; respond to technology’s impact on society, education, and research. Among the core values enumerated in the presentation, he underscored two, both of which relate to graduate students: to provide stipends that will attract and support the best graduate students; and to adjust the size of the graduate student body strategically and selectively. Noting that the framework includes a proposal to increase the size of the undergraduate student body by 500 students, a graduate student asked about the adequacy of housing for graduate students, assuming that an increase in the size of the undergraduate classes will necessitate an increase in the size of the Graduate School. The President noted that the number of graduate students or size of the faculty would not necessarily increase with a larger undergraduate student body. The size of the
faculty and the graduate student body has continued to increase each year without an increase in the undergraduate student body. The President and Dean Kulkarni both noted that the size of the graduate student body is influenced primarily by the size of the faculty and their research interests, which can lead to the growth of certain disciplines or the addition of new academic disciplines. Princeton is committed to providing adequate support for graduate students and this support includes stipend levels in addition to housing. Housing has been recognized as an important element of the graduate student experience at Princeton, and if the graduate student body grows, then the University will consider new housing needs.

In response to a question about the commitment to increasing diversity on campus, the President agreed that diversity is an important consideration in the strategic planning framework, and the University is working to achieve this goal now, without any increase in the student body. But by increasing the number of students, the degree of freedom to admit a more diverse student body increases, given the current number of admission slots set aside for special cohorts like musicians or athletes. The small transfer program envisioned in the report could also increase diversity. That transfer program will not be implemented before fall 2018, giving sufficient time for the faculty to decide on requirements for accepting credits. During the discussion, the President noted that these efforts are not in and of themselves going to solve the “pipeline” problem that impacts efforts to diversify the graduate study or the composition of the faculty, but they would help put Princeton at the forefront of these efforts.

There was discussion about academic initiatives including enhanced support for engineering which has grown significantly. The President remarked on what he had learned through the strategic planning process about the importance of connections between the University and non-academic institutions. He pointed to the example of molecular biology’s connections to scientific research conducted with corporations that leverages the work on campus and can lead to new fundamental questions.

In response to a question about addressing student health concerns, including mental health and stress, the President pointed out that resources to support Counseling and Psychological Services will need to be increased as students are added. Replying to a more general question about the possibility of changing the academic calendar, the President said that Dean Dolan is leading a task force focused on a review of the general education requirements, and the calendar is a part of their charge since pedagogical concerns are of fundamental importance to the calendar.

Special Trustee Woodrow Wilson Legacy Committee

The President introduced Brent Henry, Vice Chair of the board of Trustees and chair of a special Trustee Committee on Woodrow Wilson’s Legacy at Princeton. Mr. Henry reminded those present that he and his colleague from the committee, Trustee Angela Groves, were present at the meeting to listen to comments about the questions raised this fall concerning Wilson’s legacy specifically but more generally about how the University recognizes historical figures on campus. He referred to the committee’s website http://wilsonlegacy.princeton.edu/ which invites comments (over 575 had been received to date) and he noted the opportunity on the website to
sign up for one of the smaller discussion meetings that the committee is holding. The questions of most interest to the committee as listed on the website are as follows.

- What are your views about Wilson’s record and his impact on Princeton as a faculty member and as President of the University?
- What are your views about Wilson’s record and impact as President of the United States?
- What are your views about Wilson’s legacy at Princeton today and about how Wilson is and should be commemorated?
- How do you think Princeton should think about and periodically examine its broader historical legacy and the representation of that legacy on campus?
- Please share any other views about Wilson and his legacy that you believe would be helpful to the committee.

He explained that the committee would look at the thrust of the comments; this is not intended as a vote on any particular course of action. The committee takes the long view. While it is important to acknowledge tradition and recognize contributions, the question is how to balance these considerations with those of the campus’ contemporary diverse community.

A wide-ranging discussion followed. Members of the audience, including students, faculty, staff and alumni, expressed a variety of viewpoints. Mr. Henry encouraged comments and suggestions. He reiterated that the role of the committee is neither to reflect a popular vote nor to reflect how the university community feels today. The committee must look beyond the immediate and beyond just Woodrow Wilson’s legacy. During the discussion he and Ms. Groves gave examples of similar reviews being conducted at other institutions of higher education, at Amherst, Yale and Oxford for example.

Some expressed the view that questions arising about legacy should be handled through pedagogy and in the classroom. Others noted that this is an opportunity to showcase some of the lost histories of Princeton – to present the contributions of individuals who are usually not singled out but are worthy models and represent an alternate history of the University. This could be an opportunity to recognize diversity especially going forward when naming opportunities arise. At issue is not just the presence of Woodrow Wilson but the absence of other individuals and the ideals they represent. This is an opportunity to articulate the Princeton of today. It was noted that student orientation provides an opportune time to reference traditions and the University’s history and to do so with a critical eye.

Some felt that the Woodrow Wilson School and Wilson College should keep the name but that the full legacy of Wilson should be prominently represented in these facilities. Some suggested there were particular reasons related to residential life and that do not apply to the school that argue for changing the name of Wilson College. For example, students are assigned to residential colleges; they do not choose them. It was remarked that questions about honoring individuals, by naming buildings or through art work on campus, for example, will continue to arise, and the current discussion may help be deliberate about choices.
Mr. Henry and Ms. Groves thanked the audience for their comments and suggestions and urged them to go to the website and to participate in the committee’s open forum on February 19 or in one of the smaller discussion groups scheduled on the website.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann Halliday
Secretary
Strategic Planning: Framework and Next Steps

Council of the Princeton University Community
February 15, 2016
Framework document issued

- Approved by Board of Trustees on January 30, 2016
- Designed to be flexible and revisable
Major themes

• Reaffirming Princeton’s core values and commitments as a liberal arts research university

• Recognizing Princeton’s responsibility for leadership in a world where superb education and research are urgently needed and all too rare

• Responding to technology’s impact on society, education, and research
Reaffirming Princeton’s core values

- Sustain a world class faculty in every field
- Enhance diversity and inclusivity at all levels and in all fields
- Ensure the vibrancy of residential life
- Reaffirm Princeton’s signature commitment to affordability in undergraduate education
- Provide stipends that will attract and support the best graduate students
- Adjust the size of the graduate student body strategically and selectively
Exercise leadership in education and research

• Begin planning to expand the undergraduate class by 125 students per year

• Increase socioeconomic diversity and add a small transfer admissions program

• Renew and enhance Princeton’s commitment to service

• Exercise visible leadership in the arts and humanities

• Increase scholarly strength in the study of key regions and cultures

• Build an interdisciplinary program and new facilities in environmental studies
Respond to technology’s impact

• Invest, including in new facilities, to support SEAS
• Expand faculty in computer science, statistics, and machine learning
• Develop and extend Princeton’s distinctive approach to entrepreneurship
• Support students and scholars in the use of digital techniques
• Continue to explore how online pedagogy can enhance teaching
• Cultivate Princeton’s innovation ecosystem
What’s next?

• Framework articulates general priorities, not specific actions

• Task forces continue to meet
  – Comments welcome!
  – Responses from administration will follow
  – If we are able to do everything the task forces recommend, we will have failed!

• Additional follow-up required