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BEYOND THE REACCREDITATION SELF-STUDY

Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore colleges collaborate to develop best practices for effective and sustainable department-level assessment of student learning.

Assessment at the level of the academic department has emerged at Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore as the central element of each institution’s response to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) standard on assessment of student learning. The reaccreditation processes are still ongoing at each campus, but each institution has made key commitments to building a culture of evidence about student learning within our academic departments.

We are each developing and in many cases implementing comprehensive plans for supporting assessment across all of our academic departments. It is equally true, however, that our early rounds of implementation have surfaced inconsistencies in our comprehensive plans. In addition, broader obstacles to sustaining these efforts beyond the self-study process have not received adequate attention. As we collectively look beyond this cycle of the reaccreditation process, we want to ensure that we use what we have learned and address questions of effectiveness and sustainability.

PROJECT OVERVIEW

It is for this task that Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore seek to collaborate with the support of a Teagle grant. In essence, we propose to shepherd three academic departments at each of our campuses through all stages of a single, focused “assessment loop” in relation to a central learning goal for their academic major:

Year One: Planning, coordinating efforts across departments and campuses
Year Two: Research and analysis; assessment of practice(s)
Year Three: Implementation of new or changed practice(s); reassessment; dissemination

We adopt this targeted focus in terms of the actual assessment work – three departments at each institution, each pursuing a single assessment loop – because we want to ensure that participating departments will select a substantive topic with real utility for them, assess it in an iterative fashion using multiple methods, and devote adequate time to the task of applying what they have learned and of disseminating their experiences and findings more widely.

Moreover, we have critical institutional goals for the project that depend on academic departments having a positive and meaningful experience with assessment. Through the close involvement of other stakeholders – provosts, institutional research officers, and students – we intend to use these efforts as case studies for identifying and resolving the obstacles to a broader and sustainable implementation of effective departmental
assessment. By sharing experiences amongst our Tri-college peers, whose institutions are similar enough and familiar enough to be relevant, while different enough to provide critical distance, we will deepen the “toolbox” of effective scenarios and useful perspectives.

Thus our broad goals for the grant are two-fold:

1. To support intensive efforts of selected departments to assess a key institutional learning goal(s) as it relates to their academic department, and to leverage these successful assessment models within, across, and beyond our campuses.
2. To create opportunities for close participation of non-faculty stakeholders in meaningful, useful department-level assessment efforts, and in so doing, learn to better evaluate and overcome the challenges to sustaining such work on a larger scale.

INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

As noted above, Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore have identified academic departments as the basic administrative building blocks of their institutional assessment plans, and have in various ways already committed to building capacity for effective department-level assessment in the years to come. To date, this effort has taken somewhat different forms on each of our campuses, and this diversity of approaches is part of what attracts us to collaborating on this effort.

BRYN MAWR

Bryn Mawr has required all departments to develop comprehensive assessment plans which state learning goals for their majors, and to fully describe how all requirements for the major are related to these learning goals. While it is not our expectation that departments will assess all learning objectives across all curricular elements every year, we will require departments to submit documentation of their annual progress toward this comprehensive goal. So, for example, Sociology is planning an assessment of whether a relatively new intensive “writing in the disciplines” course required as part of their major is achieving the goal of improving writing in terms specified by a department-defined assessment rubric. English is developing an assessment of the required senior thesis project using a rubric based on the overall learning goals for the major. Biology, meanwhile, has taken a closer look at the major’s “gateway” course, developing an assessment tool (see Appendix C) for assessing effective teaching practices in that course.

As a framework for these efforts, the Office of Institutional Research provides departments with reports summarizing a range of indirect assessments of their student majors, including data from senior surveys and transcripts of interviews with their majors from a senior exit interview process (a sample of one part of a departmental data summary and a copy of our senior exit interview form are attached in Appendix C). We are currently continuing to develop this report to include a fuller range of outcome measures, including planned
activities after graduation, PhD attainment rates by discipline, and alumni survey data. At the moment these materials are provided to departments in a supportive role only, without specific instructions on how to integrate them into their departmental assessment efforts. Improving this integration, ensuring that departments respond to the positive as well as negative trends in this information, is one of the administrative goals for this grant.

HAVERTOWN

Haverford is in the midst of its Reaccreditation self-study during the current academic year. One of the working groups convened for this self-study is the Assessment Working Group which includes representatives from the Provost’s Office, Institutional Research (IR), Institutional Advancement, the Dean’s Office, Computing Support, faculty, and students. This group, in concert with the other Self-Study working groups, has appraised the scope of assessment efforts already in place across the College, articulated the overarching goals for student learning (in the context of Haverford’s educational mission), and is laying the groundwork for a comprehensive assessment program moving forward.

The participation of Institutional Research in the Assessment Working Group has included planning support at a broader level. This contributed to the development of the working group process and an action plan with a focus on the elements of the assessment process (goal articulation / strategy / assessment / link-to-planning). Prior to this, IR has functioned at the institutional level in the development of our survey data collection plan and in the analysis of indirect assessment data for student learning outcomes. The results are analyzed and distributed to senior administration and other key department heads across the College. At the department level, formalized assessment of learning outcomes is embedded within the senior capstone experience required of virtually all Haverford students. Haverford’s faculty have articulated what this experience should encompass, with individual departments determining the appropriate disciplinary formulation the capstone should take. Within the Psychology department, for example, grading of their senior thesis is guided by a departmentally developed rubric aligned with key departmental learning goals. Another example of a real-time formative assessment is found in the Chemistry Department, where introductory courses use electronic “clicker” questions in class to provide instantaneous feedback on student understanding of important concepts.

As we formalize our measures of both institutional effectiveness and student learning, our assessment efforts can be characterized as being need-driven, logically executed, and largely occurring in the background with minimum visibility. We have focused much attention during this self-study year on articulating the goals most central to our mission. These critical conversations have identified our institutional targets for intensified assessment activities and have been part of our initiative to enhance the culture of evidence in decision-making.

SWARTHMORE

In 2005-06, Swarthmore established an Assessment Planning Committee to help formalize assessment policies and practices and to design a comprehensive Assessment Plan. Major components of the plan, which has been in place
since fall 2006, include regular external departmental reviews and a requirement that each faculty member
distribute and review course evaluations with the department chair in at least one course per year. In addition,
departments must meet at the beginning of each academic year to determine a focus for that year’s assessment
and hold end-of-year departmental meetings focusing on assessment and culminating in a report to the provost on
assessment of student learning. In the past two years these plans have created a cycle of assessment and planning
with departments.

These efforts are supported by the Institutional Research Office, which provides standardized as well as tailored
support to faculty and departments. It has, for example, provided consultation on survey design and survey
analysis, conducted analyses of student performance and retention across a course sequence as a function of
attendance at study sessions, and provided feedback to departments from senior surveys completed by majors.

The Assessment Planning Committee also supports departmental assessment efforts directly, generating materials
to help faculty and departments with assessment plan implementation, and makes recommendations regarding
specific assessment activities. For example, the committee developed a template for tracking assessment activities
by academic year and compiled the materials generated by those assessments, archiving this material with the
support of Institutional Research.

The Assessment Planning Committee is almost entirely comprised of faculty, and its members have always been
guided by the desire to balance the need to be systematic and comprehensive in assessment practices with the
College’s tradition of promoting faculty autonomy and flexibility. For example, course evaluations are developed at
the departmental level and combined with questions generated by each individual faculty member.

**Institutional context: Summary**

Thus each of our institutions is currently engaged with the task of department-level assessment of student learning
and is undertaking new efforts as well. However, these efforts do not uniformly exemplify the ideal we seek: they
revolve around idiosyncratic interests of individual faculty or courses within the department; they are focused on
peripheral aspects of the major; they focus on “satisfaction” as opposed to direct measures of student learning;
they were grant-funded and organized as one-off rather than sustainable assessment efforts, and so on.

**Project description**

The three-year process we propose (see p. 1) will provide three academic departments at each institution with the
time, institutional support, and resources to tackle assessment of a learning goal that is central to the major, with
an emphasis on goals and assessment strategies that highlight the special nature of our small-college, liberal arts
educational experience. A significant aspect of that support will be the consortial organization of the effort, which
will provide for a collaborative exchange of ideas and also prompt departments to see their assessment work in a
larger context. Devoting one full year to two aspects of assessment work that are sometimes neglected – planning
(year 1) and “closing the loop” (year 3) – will ensure that departments give these critical aspects of their efforts their due.

Beyond providing opportunities for cross-institutional discussion on department-level assessment, the second critical aspect of the three-year effort will be to promote collaborative discussion on the administrative and logistical aspects of department-level assessment work. Department-level assessment of student learning means different things and creates different challenges in the various areas of our college administrations. Provosts tend to view department-level assessment from the institutional level, as a challenge of coordination and centralization, and of where to situate it with respect to other incentives and management processes applied at this level; faculty are more concerned with issues of coordination, workload, and responsibility within their department; institutional researchers, finally, focus on questions of efficiency and centralization in supporting departments’ data and analysis needs.

Departmental assessment work thus surfaces natural tensions, and this means that all stakeholders must each be engaged at all stages of the process for it to yield effective and sustainable results. Much as we want faculty to “own” department-level assessment and to view it as a meaningful professional responsibility on our three campuses, we recognize that it is equally an administrative responsibility to provide the support and resources necessary for them to take that step, especially at the initial stages. The departments, in turn, have a responsibility to be sensitive to the needs of the institution as a whole; each party is a partner in ensuring that these efforts are effective. At small liberal arts colleges with limited administrative resources such as ours, this also means paying special attention to cost-effectiveness. This is the context in which we plan to exploit the individual departmental assessment “models of success” as case studies for addressing difficult organizational questions of coordination, accountability, and sustainability.

**Coordination**

How will we align student learning goals and measurement techniques developed for the academic major with those of the institution as a whole? What administrative structures can best facilitate cross-institutional collaboration on assessing common learning goals, achieve efficiencies in measurement and reporting, and encourage common academic departments across institutions to support each other in their assessment work?

With regard to the first question, in the Tri-college consortium, Haverford’s approach to department-level assessment has been very much from the perspective of institution-wide learning goals. Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore have essentially deferred the question of integrating institutional and departmental learning goals, and so this is one area where we know we can learn from one another. With respect to the second question, we believe our consortium offers an as-yet untapped economy of scale that can potentially make department-level assessment work more efficient and meaningful, both through sharing of best practices, but potentially also through formal commitments to implement assessment strategies cross-institutionally.
**Accountability**

What administrative structures (committees, staff roles, timetables, procedures, reporting) and technological systems are required to ensure that academic departments actually use assessment results to inform their planning and resource allocation?

Year Three of the grant will be devoted to “closing the loop” with the three participating departments in relation to their selected learning outcomes, and to sharing these examples of improving student learning outcomes as case studies for evaluating the costs and benefits of different assessment strategies. We especially will encourage the development of cost-effective models that involve cross-institutional collaboration within the Tri-college consortium. Our proximity to one another, for example, means that the ideal of “third-party” accountability may in some instances be approximated in a cost-effective way, as Tri-College faculty support parallel departments in implementing their assessment protocols (e.g., reviewing senior theses or other culminating samples of student work).

Another key goal for the participants will be to use these case studies to inform the revision of the current template for periodic departmental self-studies and external reviews, to more centrally emphasize assessment of student learning outcomes as a basis for planning, decision-making, and resource allocation at this administrative level.

**Sustainability**

What resources and administrative structures are required to sustain successive cycles of continuous improvement within our academic departments over the years to come?

One of the most important features of the three-year proposal is also the simplest: The grant will create time and space in which the perspectives of all administrative stakeholders in assessment work – faculty, provosts, and institutional researchers – will be represented. One concrete outcome will be careful records of the time spent on the project, so as to have a consensual understanding of the resource requirements for conducting this work. Another concrete outcome will be a shared “toolbox” of assessment strategies, but importantly also a rubric for assessing the cost / benefit ratio for these strategies. By having all stakeholders at the table throughout all stages of the work, by the end of the grant we will be well-positioned to identify ways to more efficiently use our existing resources and to more clearly understand where additional resources (i.e., faculty release time, reallocated or additional administrative support, reallocated or additional technological support, or a combination of these) might best be allocated to support these efforts going forward.
WORK PLAN

PROJECT LEADERSHIP

Under the grant, each campus will organize “institutional teams” comprised at minimum of the following stakeholders:

- Provost (or Associate Provost tasked with oversight of assessment)
- Institutional Research Director
- One to two faculty representatives from each of three departments

Each of us has selected three academic departments, one from each academic division (Humanities, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences), to participate in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty representatives</th>
<th>Bryn Mawr</th>
<th>Haverford</th>
<th>Swarthmore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social sciences</strong></td>
<td>Sociology Mary Osirim(^a)</td>
<td>Psychology Wendy Sternberg</td>
<td>Educational Studies Diane Anderson Lisa Smulyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Humanities</strong></td>
<td>English Warren Liu</td>
<td>History James Krippner(^a)</td>
<td>English Peter Schmidt(^a) Craig Williamson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural sciences</strong></td>
<td>Geology Arlo Weil(^a)</td>
<td>Chemistry Alexander Norquist</td>
<td>Computer Science Tia Newhall(^a) Lisa Meeden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provost / Associate</strong></td>
<td>Provost Kim Cassidy</td>
<td>Associate Provost Wendy Sternberg</td>
<td>Associate Provost Lisa Smulyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional Research</strong></td>
<td>Director Mark Freeman(^{b,c})</td>
<td>Director Catherine Fennell(^c)</td>
<td>Director Robin Shores(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Department chair \(^{b}\)Principal investigator \(^{c}\)Institutional primary contact

KEY ACTIVITIES

In addition to implementing the assessment strategies within each department, each institutional team will participate in the following grant-sponsored activities:

- Two, tri-college, two-day retreats at the beginning and middle of the academic year; venue to rotate among the tri-college members.
- Invite experts in department-level assessment from other colleges or organizations to the initial effort to kick off the retreat. We will likely consult with Teagle and use their “Teagle Assessment Scholars” directory for this purpose.
- Two, two-hour team progress meetings within each institution per year, in the middle of the fall and spring semesters.
• Year Three participation in an extra-institutional forum or workshop.
• Year Three participation in an intra-institutional presentation to other academic departments.
• Year Three “training” and guidance to new departments.

**Selection of Assessment Topics**

Departmental assessment projects will be developed by the faculty representatives themselves in consultation with their departments, within the following parameters:

• They will focus on the **direct** assessment of student learning outcome(s) as stated in departmental assessment plans.
• They will identify the curricular processes currently in place that are intended to produce the assessed learning outcome(s).
• They will propose a process by which assessment results will be collectively evaluated by all department members, and changes to curricular processes proposed.
• They will commit to re-assessing student learning outcome(s) during Year Three in order to evaluate whether curricular changes realized the desired changes in student learning outcomes.

Based on the discussions we have had with departments thus far, the departmental projects will likely take one of two forms:

1. A project that evaluates a single curricular element or process (examples thus far include a core course in discipline-specific research methodology, an introductory survey course, or the senior thesis project) in light of its effectiveness in realizing specific department-level learning goals;
2. A project that evaluates a single key learning goal (e.g., quantitative literacy, effective writing within the discipline) across the curricular processes that are intended to realize that learning goal for majors.

An example of the first variety currently in the works in one of our departments is direct assessment of student work from a junior-level required course in writing in the discipline. The work will involve the development of a formal, statistically validated rubric for evaluating student writing from this course and applying that rubric to a sample of student work. The form of the curricular change will depend on the results of the assessment work, but one result for student majors will certainly be improved clarity (for students and faculty) on what the goals of the course are, as well as more individualized instruction based on an examination of student writing prior to enrolling in the course.

An example of the second variety is an effort in a social science department to assess the goal of, “understanding the logic of scientific inquiry and applying it in the context of appropriate research design.” The assessment work here will first involve mapping precisely where in the required curriculum, beyond the required research methods
course, this core competency is explicitly nurtured. Samples of student work will be evaluated in the context of this learning goal across a range of these curricular experiences.

**TEAM RESPONSIBILITIES**

Non-faculty team members will be required to participate in each of the “key activities” above and, in the context of their administrative roles, provide support to the departments’ ongoing assessment at all phases. Portions of the “retreats” will be devoted to evaluating questions of administrative efficiency, workload, and opportunities for cross-institutional collaboration.

The responsibilities for Provosts / Associate Provosts are as follows.

- Provide leadership at the retreats and the on-campus team progress meetings, and to the departments’ ongoing assessment efforts at all phases.
- At the conclusion of Year One and Year Two of the grant, compose a summary of experiences and insights on the role of providing leadership to department-level learning assessment; in Year Three a summative summary to be prepared. These will be journalistic, targeted toward the institutional teams, but also to provosts or assessment leaders at other campuses. These will be placed on the project website (see below) and may also be submitted to publications such as Inside Higher Ed or the Chronicle of Higher Education.

The responsibilities for institutional research team members are as follows:

- Provide analytical support to the departments’ assessment work at all phases.
- Maintain a time diary of institutional research staff time devoted to supporting these three efforts over the course of the grant. A common format for these will be developed and the diaries will be posted to the project website.
- At the conclusion of Year One and Year Two of the grant, compose a summary of experiences and insights on the role of providing leadership to department-level learning assessment. By the end of Year Three a summative summary to be prepared. These will be journalistic, targeted toward the institutional teams but also to institutional researchers or assessment leaders at other campuses. These will be placed on the project website (see below) and may also be submitted to publications such as Inside Higher Ed or the Chronicle of Higher Education.

The responsibilities for faculty representatives are as follows:

- In consultation with their department, identify a minimum of two “assessment loops” that the department would be interested in implementing, of substance and complexity worthy of a three-year focus. One of these will be selected in consultation with other faculty representatives across the Tri-
college consortium in Year One to ensure topical and methodological diversity, but equally to allow for departmental collaboration where assessment processes share common goals or methods.

- In consultation with their department and with the support of the institutional team, formulate research questions and collect data to implement the planned assessment of student learning goal(s). Each participating department agrees to allocate some time on their departmental meeting agenda for updates and progress reports, to be used as needed at the discretion of the primary faculty representative.
- Write up a report summarizing the research results and findings in Year Two, and report back to their academic department. A required element in these reports is a set of explicit recommendations for change in curricular practices to be implemented in Year Three.
- In Year Three, faculty participants will lead their department’s effort to implement recommended curricular changes for which there is departmental support and resources. Student learning outcome(s) will be re-assessed in the context of evaluating the impact of curricular change(s).
- Present an annual progress report to their campus in all years of the grant at an institutional academic venue such as a regular or specially scheduled faculty meeting or a series of department chair meetings.
- In Year Three present their results and experiences at an extra-institutional forum such as a special AICUP conference or AAC&U or MSCHE conference.
- Faculty representatives, along with the institutional team members, will serve a consultant role to the next round of departmental participants as part of the third year of the grant activities.

**OUTCOMES**

As noted at the outset, the core goals of our grant are two-fold. First, we aim to directly implement three models of effective assessment of student learning in three departments on each of our campuses. The content of those models and the learning goals to be assessed will be fleshed out in the course of the grant period, but they will involve direct assessment of key departmental learning goals at a level of substance and depth that is not always attainable within our regular annual departmental assessment process. Importantly, participating departments will implement and evaluate the impact of curricular changes on student learning in Year Three of the grant.

Second, we will devote attention to organizational questions of cost-effectiveness and sustainability. We believe this parallel focus is a unique strength of our proposal, reflecting the seriousness of our commitment. Though we unambiguously define assessment of student learning as a faculty responsibility, we acknowledge that this represents a major cultural shift in how faculty roles are defined on our campuses, one that will require significant administrative leadership and support. We realize that our departmental assessment plans will not implement themselves: Put another way, the considerable organizational resources required to help all our academic departments effect this cultural shift will not simply fall into place as a result of our each pursuing three “models of success” on our campuses over a three year period. This parallel goal of our proposal reflects our desire to be more intentional, intelligent, and transparent about what those organizational resources and structures might be.
We expect that this task of being more declarative about the goal of institutional cost-effectiveness and sustainability will help us identify cross-departmental and cross-institutional efficiencies for carrying out this work, and so will help us to use the limited resources of our small campuses wisely. Additionally, careful monitoring of the time and resources required to implement these three case studies within the grant will provide data from which we can extrapolate and build consensus about what it will take to implement this kind of meaningful department-level assessment institution-wide.

In summary, then, the key outcomes of the three-year effort are envisioned as follows. Within the context of the three participating departments:

- At each institution, three academic departments will assess key student learning outcome(s), evaluate assessment results in light of the curriculum, make changes to their curriculum designed to improve student learning, and evaluate the impact of these changes in terms of student learning.

And with respect to the organizational goals for the project:

- We will have built a “toolbox” of successful models of assessment work, leveraging our cross-institutional efforts, with faculty contacts behind them, that will provide a resource (available on the web) to other faculty conducting assessment in their own departments across our institutions and beyond. Importantly, this “toolbox” will include not only instruments and models for department-level assessment of student learning, but also organizational insights and models for sustaining a culture of assessment in a small liberal arts college context.
- We will have built new relationships and opportunities for cross-institutional collaboration on assessment work, as well as a cohort of faculty that more deeply understand the potential benefits of this work, who will serve as ambassadors to others within and across our institutions.
- We will develop resident expertise on the technical and technological aspects of assessment work.
- On the administrative side we will be better able to evaluate the time and resources required to do assessment well at the department level, and to allocate responsibilities appropriately for the work among the various stakeholders.
- If the project does identify a need for additional staff to make this work sustainable, we will have a clearer understanding of precisely what functions those staff should support.
- We will have identified efficiencies that can be achieved through cross-departmental and cross-institutional collaboration.
- We will have developed administrative models for incorporating assessment of student learning outcomes into the content of periodic departmental reviews.
**DISSEMINATION**

Another way we also plan to leverage our success within the grant toward building a culture of assessment for the long-term is through a range of dissemination activities. We have alluded to some of these already.

Intra-consortium dissemination:

- Faculty representatives formally present their work / findings at least once annually to other faculty at their institution (faculty meeting or department chairs meeting).
- Faculty representatives consult in Year Three with a new round of departments in undertaking this work after the grant period.

Extra-institutional dissemination:

- Creation of a Teagle project public website that will include materials from the nine departmental examples of assessment (instruments, rubrics, assessment plans, research reports, presentations), contact information for faculty representatives, and other materials such as templates for institutional research data reports, departmental periodic reviews, and project time diaries for institutional research.
- The website will include narratives from institutional researchers and provosts / associate provost team members on the department assessment process.
- Faculty present their work at a regional conference on department-level assessment sponsored by the Association of Independent Colleges of Pennsylvania (details remain to be worked out, but AICUP has reciprocated our interest). Alternatively, the grant will be used to sponsor travel to a national assessment forum such as the AAC&U or Middle States annual meeting. In either scenario, faculty presentation of their results and insights to an extra-institutional audience will be a requirement of participation.
### APPENDIX A: PROJECT TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 2009</td>
<td>Year one tri-college retreat</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010 academic year</td>
<td>Participating departments plan assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2009</td>
<td>Year one first on-campus team meetings</td>
<td>Respective campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2010</td>
<td>Year one second tri-college retreat</td>
<td>Haverford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2010</td>
<td>Year one second on-campus team meetings</td>
<td>Respective campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2010</td>
<td>Year two first tri-college retreat</td>
<td>Swarthmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011 academic year</td>
<td>Participating departments implement assessments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2010</td>
<td>Year two first on-campus team meetings</td>
<td>Respective campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>Year two second tri-college retreat</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>Year two second on-campus team meetings</td>
<td>Respective campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2011</td>
<td>Year three first tri-college retreat</td>
<td>Haverford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012 academic year</td>
<td>Participating departments implement changes; reasse; disseminate and present findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2011</td>
<td>Final on-campus team meetings</td>
<td>Respective campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012</td>
<td>Final tri-college retreat</td>
<td>Swarthmore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2012 – June 2012</td>
<td>AICUP conference or AAC&amp;U conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: PROJECT BUDGET

A. Personnel

I. Wages

(Year 1: $28,786; Year 2: $28,786; Year 3: $28,786; Three-Year total: $86,357)

- The Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore Colleges will each seek four faculty leaders to participate in the three-year effort. Each will receive a $1,500 annual stipend for a total annual stipend cost of $18,000.
- Bryn Mawr College’s Director of Institutional Research will direct the Tri-College effort. The College will hire a professional staff person to assist him on average 3.5 hours per week (0.10 FTE) to sustain the other assessment duties of his office that he is unable to perform because of Teagle-funded activities.
- Bryn Mawr College will hire an administrative support person for on average 3.5 hours per week (0.10 FTE) to assist with the coordination duties related to the Teagle-funded activities.

II. Fringe Benefits

(Year 1: $8,813; Year 2: $8,813; Year 3: $8,813; Three-Year total: $26,439)

- The benefit rate on the salaries of faculty is 28%.
- The benefit rate on the salaries of professional staff is 34%.
- The benefit rate on the salaries of clerical staff is 36%.

B. Other expenses

III. Meetings

(Year 1: $7,350; Year 2: $3,350; Year 3: $3,350; Three-Year total: $14,050)

- The colleges will conduct two (2) two-day planning retreats each year of the three-year grant period. Budgeted expenses include materials and supplies; meals, and the honoraria and travel/lodging of outside experts. These meetings will rotate among the three campuses.

Program Administration

(Year 1: $1,300; Year 2: $1,300; Year 3: $1,300; Three-Year total $3,900)

- To support program administration activities, $900 is budgeted per year for two luncheon meetings on each of the three campuses ($300/institution/year).

IV. Assessment instruments and Resources

(Year 1: $400; Year 2: $400; Year 3: $400; Three-Year total $1,200)

V. Dissemination

(Year 1: $0; Year 2 $0; and Year 3: $19,200; Three-Year total: $19,200)

- The college has budgeted $4,200 in Year Three for registration fees for 12 of the program participants ($350/registration) to attend and present at an assessment conference. The budget includes travel to and lodging ($1,250/participant) of the 12 program participants.
### A. Personnel

#### I. Wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Twelve faculty participants ($1,500 / year / faculty)</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff (Principal investigator release)</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support (avg 5.5 hrs/week)</td>
<td>$5,286</td>
<td>$5,286</td>
<td>$5,286</td>
<td>$15,857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### II. Fringe Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>$5,040</td>
<td>$5,040</td>
<td>$5,040</td>
<td>$15,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff</td>
<td>$1,870</td>
<td>$1,870</td>
<td>$1,870</td>
<td>$5,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>$1,903</td>
<td>$1,903</td>
<td>$1,903</td>
<td>$5,709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Compensation sub-total:** $37,599 $37,599 $37,599 $112,796

#### B. Other Expenses

#### III. Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$1,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Co retreat meals (rotating across three campuses)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus lunch meetings (separately on each campus)</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$900</td>
<td>$2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Expert/s</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorarium</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting sub-total:** $400 $400 $400 $1,200

#### IV. Assessment instruments and resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| $400 $400 $400 $1,200

#### V. Dissemination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>3-Year Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference registration</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging and travel</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Compensation sub-total:** $8,650 $4,650 $23,850 $37,150

**GRAND TOTAL** $46,249 $42,249 $61,449 $149,946