

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Yale College Expansion
May 12, 2014

Table of Contents

1. Members of the Committee..... 2
2. The Committee’s Charge 3
3. Process 3
4. Working Groups 4
5. Community Engagement..... 5
6. Recommendations 5
7. Next Steps 9

1. Members of the Committee

Mary Miller

Dean of Yale College and Sterling Professor of History of Art (Co-chair)

Ben Polak

Provost and William C. Brainard Professor of Economics (Co-chair)

Ron Breaker

Henry Ford II Professor and Chair, Molecular, Cellular, & Developmental Biology

Rick Bribiescas

Professor and Chair, Anthropology

Jane Edwards

Senior Associate Dean and Dean of International & Professional Experience, Yale College

Alan Gerber

Charles C. & Doratheia S. Dilley Professor, Political Science

Jonathan Holloway

Professor, History and American Studies; Professor and Chair, African American Studies; Master of Calhoun College

Amy Hungerford

Professor, English and American Studies; Master of Morse College; Chair, Council of Masters

Gundula Kreuzer

Associate Professor and Director of Graduate Studies, Music

Kyle Vanderlick

Dean of the School of Engineering & Applied Science and Thomas E. Golden Jr. Professor of Engineering

Karen Wynn

Professor, Psychology

Kurt Zilm

Professor, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering

Staffing the Committee:

Lloyd Suttle, Deputy Provost for Academic Resources

Alison Coleman, Special Assistant to the Provost

2. The Committee's Charge

On October 3, 2013, President Peter Salovey asked the university provost and the dean of Yale College to convene a committee to provide guidance as Yale moves toward breaking ground on two new residential colleges. The target date to meet the fund raising goal for colleges 13 and 14 is June 30, 2014. The current plan calls for breaking ground in February 2015, with the colleges open for occupancy in August 2017.

President Salovey's charge to this committee focused not on whether Yale College should be expanded with two additional residential colleges (the Yale Corporation voted to do so in June 2008) — or, indeed, on the buildings themselves (a review conducted by the provost's, Yale College dean's, and facilities offices in fall 2013 identified significant savings in building costs and resulted in the addition of 54 beds between the two colleges through adoption of a room and suite configuration consistent with that of the existing 12 colleges). Instead, this committee was asked to look at how best to accommodate an undergraduate student body grown by 15 percent — that is, an increase of 200 students per class over the current base class of 1,350, which will bring the total undergraduate student body to 6,200 (an increase of 800 students in total). The committee's focus is on teaching, learning, and student services, and on what Yale will need to do to accommodate these additional students.

3. Process

In its first meeting the committee was given a straightforward assignment: to consider the incremental annual operating costs to support the larger student body within the context of the net revenue generated by tuition and board from the additional students. That is, 800 more students total will create net revenue per year of roughly \$30 million; the increased operating costs associated with supporting these additional students cannot exceed that amount. The provost and dean asked the committee to develop a prioritized list of recommendations for how best to allocate this \$30 million, delineating what *must* be done to successfully accommodate the increased student body and what *would be desirable* to do, financial conditions permitting. This report lays out those recommendations.

To undertake this analysis, the committee began with a series of full-group meetings and then broke into subgroups, each charged with a specific area of focus. As a full group, the committee began by reviewing the 2008 *Report of the Study Group to Consider New Residential Colleges* with a particular eye to examining that committee's recommendations to determine which of the proposed actions already have been accomplished.

In conducting this review, the committee found that much progress already has been made along the dimensions called for in 2008. One recommendation of the 2008 report was the development of a corridor of activity from lower Prospect Street — formerly seen as a “dead zone” with little student activity — to Science Hill, in order to shift the perceived geographic center of the Yale College campus. This has been achieved with opening of the Center for Engineering Innovation & Design at 15 Prospect, a destination that has already changed student traffic patterns. Furthermore, the Center for Science & Social Science

Information in Kline Biology Tower has become a major student draw, along with a popular café and lunch destination on the first floor of KBT. Not only does the stretch of Prospect Street that runs along the east side of the new colleges site teem with student foot traffic both day and night, but the amenities have changed the neighborhood's human ecology.

Additionally, the earlier report called for a modest expansion of Yale College faculty. In the six years since that report the total ladder faculty of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences has grown from 651 to 700 to prepare for the increase in teaching demand that will be generated by the additional students. Although our faculty-student ratio currently is at an all-time high, the committee notes that this increase has not been across the board. The median class size for undergraduate courses is now 10, and in many courses a 15 percent increase in enrollment will have positive impact. However certain areas of high or increasing teaching demand — e.g., psychology and computer science — have not seen proportionate increase in faculty. This will require careful review once the work of the Academic Review Committee, currently ongoing, has been completed.

The 2008 report also called for an appointment of an associate dean for the arts; in 2010, Dean Miller appointed Susan Cahan to this role, lending new coordination to the fine and performing arts in both curricular and extracurricular forms. Many physical improvements to the campus — among them, the development of the Farmington Canal passageway (pedestrian and bicycle path) that borders the west side of the new colleges site — have come on line. Enhanced police and security support has also been put in place since the 2008 report identified the need.

4. Working Groups

The committee next reviewed detailed projections, produced by the provost's and finance offices, of the expansion's impact on Yale's operating costs. The projections were generated based on a 15 percent increase in student population, and were subdivided into categories including residential college operations, Yale College operations, teaching costs, academic support, and university support. The provost asked the committee to challenge the assumption of an across-the-board cost increase of 15 percent and to look line by line at the projected expenses, making recommendations on where this increase (or an even greater increase) is necessary and where it is not. The committee was further asked to identify possible gaps in the projections and areas demanding further evaluation. For example, how many extra sections will we need in introductory chemistry and introductory writing courses? Do we have sufficient classroom capacity? How will demands for advising, teaching, and extracurricular programming be met? Are there tipping points that we will reach, particularly in arts programs?

The committee identified four key areas for detailed study, as follows:

1. Teaching fellows and non-ladder teaching
2. Classrooms, scheduling, and laboratories
3. Seminars and advising
4. The Yale College experience

The committee members broke into working groups which met intensively over a period of four months to study data and bring in consulting partners from the registrar's office, Yale College dean's office, and other areas. The groups' findings were reported to the committee as a whole for evaluation, discussion, and prioritization. The resulting compiled recommendations are described in section 6.

5. Community Engagement

The committee sought feedback from the campus community to inform its work. It held a series of open meetings with FAS faculty, co-hosted (with the Yale College Council) two undergraduate student forums, and made an interim report to the faculty at the Yale College Faculty Meeting on March 6, 2014.

The open meetings for faculty were held on Old Campus, Lower Hillhouse, and Science Hill. All members of the Yale College Faculty Meetings were invited to participate. Attendance was modest (owing perhaps partly to inclement weather) but the faculty members present provided valuable insight and raised some issues (e.g., implications of the expansion for computing facilities) of which the committee had previously been unaware. Based on participants' interest, much of the discussion at these meetings focused on issues related to teaching demands, teaching of sections and labs, and the "preceptor" concept recommended by the subcommittee on teaching fellows and non-ladder teaching and endorsed by the committee as a whole (see section 6).

Two undergraduate forums were held, each with a specific area of focus. A forum on academic services included leaders of student publications, members of student organizations on academics and honors, and students on standing committees and advisory groups. A forum on student life included members of performance groups, leaders of student organizations and Greek life, religious and cultural groups, and athletes. Meetings also were held with members of the Yale College Dean's Advisory Committee and with students actively involved with the Center for International and Professional Experience. One area of particular student interest is the planning for the leadership and community of each of the new colleges (appointing masters, deans, and fellows; enrolling the first freshman class and populating the upper classes in the early years). The full details of this planning will happen outside of this committee's purview. In the recommendations, we emphasize the importance of an early start to this process.

At the March 6 Yale College Faculty Meeting the committee gave an interim update and preliminary report on the group's core findings and key areas for faculty discussion and input.

6. Recommendations

Each subcommittee submitted a report of its findings, and the committee as a whole then met to review, compile, and prioritize its recommendations, which follow. These include

several “must-do” measures (underlined): that is, steps that the committee believes are essential and without which the success of the expansion will be in jeopardy. The recommendations also signal key areas of focus which will require ongoing planning, analysis, and careful prioritization of resources.

1. **Timing.** At the time of the committee’s charge, the implementation plan for the expansion called for a phased approach to increasing the student body, with the freshman class size ramped up one year prior to the new colleges’ opening. This approach had its roots in the original timeline for renovating the 12 existing colleges and opening the two new colleges. Under that plan, the “swing space” housing on Tower Parkway would be used to accommodate students from the colleges being renovated. When all 12 renovations were complete, it would be used to house the freshman class of the two new colleges in the year prior to the buildings’ opening.

Because the economic downturn of 2008 onward led to a delay in building the two new colleges, a gap opened in this schedule. Rather than having the swing dorm sit vacant, we have used it as supplementary housing; currently the building is home to just over 150 members of the junior class. Following the original plan to bring in freshmen a year early would mean ramping *down* the freshman class by 50 to 75 students in each of the next two years to free up the swing space housing.

Members of the committee were united in their concern about this approach, citing: (1) the difficulty that would ensue from a period of shifting numbers/course enrollments from one class to the next, and most specifically the fact that we would need to shrink the size of incoming classes immediately in order to have sufficient housing for an expanded freshman class in 2016; (2) the benefit of having new facilities (e.g., dance studios, rehearsal space) in place at the same time that enrollment is increased; (3) the advantages presented by having a full additional year to lay groundwork in systems and processes that will support the larger student numbers; and (4) the unintended consequences of having two colleges of students without key residential components, especially dining halls. The committee therefore recommends that the expansion not be phased, but rather that the freshman class be increased for fall 2017 to coincide with the colleges’ opening for occupancy.

2. **Classroom space.** The committee considered classroom availability and capacity — and transparency into the availability of teaching spaces — to be of paramount importance. Careful review showed that the large majority of courses will have capacity to enroll 15 percent more students in their existing locations with no changes made. In a very few instances additional resources would be beneficial: for example, an additional TEAL class room or a larger computer lab for computer science. A key issue to be addressed is that in a small number of large courses (e.g., introductory psychology, economics, and biology), a 15 percent increase will push the course enrollment over the maximum capacity of our largest classrooms. The committee recommends that departments be encouraged to consider a variety of options for addressing these. Specific strategies might include offering the same course twice in a given semester, moving the largest courses into early morning time slots (see

recommendation 3), or devising means of dividing large courses into smaller ones that are more manageable in spaces that already exist on campus. These and other creative approaches may help to alleviate pressure points.

The committee found that Yale's current fragmented system of monitoring and allocating classroom space, along with the unpredictable enrollment fluctuations of shopping period (see recommendation 5), makes it difficult, verging on impossible, to compile full data on these spaces and their use. A promising step is the software currently being implemented by the registrar's office which will significantly improve our ability to slice across classroom data, course enrollments, and schedule slots. The committee recommends that the registrar's office be supported in implementing this system as fully as possible. This includes allocating time to doing a complete survey of classroom facilities not currently included in the registrar's domain. The committee further recommends that classroom spaces that are under control of departments or other entities (i.e., not centrally managed) be tracked in the new system. Departments would retain first rights to use of space but effort could be made to ensure that classrooms are more fully utilized.

3. **Course scheduling.** The committee's review of data on course capacity brought to light significant missed opportunities for better allocation of space and time due to the existing "bands" of the day into which courses are scheduled. For the long-term health of the curriculum and of the students, the committee recommends that the current schedule structure be thoroughly and carefully reviewed and that measures be taken to shift course offerings to earlier in the day and more broadly across the teaching week — with the majority of courses, if not all, fitted into standard time slots.
4. **Non-ladder instruction, TAs, and sections.** One area of clear and pressing need will be non-ladder teaching. Certain courses that are integral to the curriculum rely on non-ladder instructors. This includes key gateway courses in English, languages, and certain science/QR courses. For these, the committee recommends a small, targeted increase in funding for non-ladder instruction. The committee also recommends that some flexibility be accorded with respect to class size limits (e.g. from 12 students to 13 students) in these courses.

In the case of larger courses reliant on TAs for section teaching, the committee was mindful of the fact that the size of the graduate school is not (and should not be) tied to teaching needs — that is, we will not fill the increased demand for sections simply by adding more graduate teaching fellows. Instead, the committee recommends, again, that more flexibility be accorded with respect to section sizes, and that the use of non-traditional approaches to section instruction — e.g., professional students as teaching fellows, undergraduate peer tutors, and preceptors to oversee and teach gateway courses — be further developed and made more institutional. The expanded use of peer tutors and preceptors would provide in-class training and could serve as valuable entry points to career pathways for undergraduates and newly minted Ph.D.s, respectively.

The committee also considered the assignment of teaching fellows. To address teaching needs in a concerted way, the committee recommends that the allocation of teaching assignments be addressed through central oversight within the revised FAS decanal structure. This office would respond equally to TF supply, course demand, and pedagogical needs. The committee proposes that this office's work be informed by the guidance of a committee charged with reviewing substantive resource allocation issues such as section sizes across different classes, consistency of resource allocations, and TF supply/demand.

5. **Shopping period.** The committee recommends continued close examination of the impact of "shopping period" on our ability to anticipate and respond to resource allocation needs. In 2014-15 there will be some adjustments to shopping period. The committee feels that more changes likely will be needed to offset the unpredictability of course enrollments.
6. **Community/leadership.** The committee believes that a smooth opening of the new colleges will require careful attention to the identification and transition planning of their leadership (masters and deans), fellows, staffing, and initial population of students. The committee proposes that the two new masters be nominated at the end of spring 2016 (one year prior to the colleges' opening; it may be effective for one of these masters to be "transferred" from an existing college to provide experienced perspective) and that the new deans be appointed at the beginning of spring 2017, with one full semester to plan for the colleges' opening; and that operational and support staff for the new colleges be in place at the beginning of summer 2017. To prepare for freshman advising in colleges 13 and 14, the committee suggests that faculty fellows for the new colleges be recruited as soon as the new masters are appointed, possibly "seeding" the fellowships by transferring some fellows from existing colleges. The plan for the initial population of the colleges with upperclassmen also will need careful consideration. The responsibility for this community and leadership planning will fall to the next dean of Yale College.
7. **Student life and co-curricular experience.** The subcommittee on the Yale College experience paid particular attention to the extracurricular arts programs, athletics, student organizations, cultural centers, and programs managed through the Center for International and Professional Experience (CIPE), including career services — and the spaces these programs inhabit or deploy for their purposes. The following areas merit continued attention and further study.
 - Increased demand for certain types of fellowship funding — particularly for summer science and engineering research opportunities, which have been affected by reduced outside grant funding and which are crucial to students' success and persistence in STEM fields — will need to be addressed. In undergraduate career services, special attention should be given to the current demand for health professions advising.

- The renovation of Hendrie Hall by fall 2016 will yield net growth of practice spaces for solo practice and lessons and the new colleges themselves include rehearsal spaces that will enhance the student experience. The growth in the student body likely will create growth in the undergraduate demand for music lessons; the capacity to handle this growth will need to be examined.
 - Demand for indoor and outdoor athletic facilities will need to be monitored, with particular attention to maintenance of facilities and equipment. The committee notes that intramural sports — with the addition of two new colleges’ worth of teams — will need careful attention. One possible approach would be to divide IMs into two divisions so that every team does not have to play every other team. The committee suggests that students be engaged in considering possible alternative structures.
 - Students already feel that pressure on existing spaces for meetings of student organizations — and for such activities as tutoring, collaborative study, and organizational planning — is problematic. The committee proposes a careful review of existing and new spaces for which a system of online reservations can be devised.
8. **Additional budget analysis.** The committee determined early in its proceedings that a subset of the projected budgetary implications of the expansion should be investigated outside the scope of the committee itself. The provost’s office is undertaking an analysis of key areas not covered by the committee or its subgroups, including university services (e.g., transit) and academic support (e.g., library fees).

7. Next Steps

The recommendations outlined above represent clear and highest-priority actions identified by the ad hoc committee to prepare for supporting a Yale College student body expanded by 15 percent, as well as key areas that will merit ongoing consideration and analysis. Much of the responsibility for the implementation of the recommendations — and for prioritization of additional measures — will, necessarily, fall to the next dean of Yale College who will oversee the expansion in partnership with the provost’s office and the new dean of the FAS, among others. Throughout its work and across all of its subgroups the committee found numerous reminders of the fact that any planning for the expansion, even just three years out, represents a moving target: it is impossible to predict every facet of student need or interest, economic circumstance, or evolving pedagogical practice. For this reason, the committee recommends that a small standing committee of faculty, administrators, and students — chaired by the dean of Yale College and supported by the provost’s office — be established to address concerns that arise ahead of, and in the first years following, the new colleges’ opening.