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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Bryn Mawr College is a small liberal arts college for women in suburban Philadelphia. The College enrolls approximately 1200 undergraduates and maintains graduate programs in eleven departments and a school of social work enrolling a total of nearly 250 full-time graduate students. In 2000, a new strategic plan, the Plan for a New Century, was approved by the College’s Board of Trustees. The Plan challenged the College to innovate without growth and focused on two broad areas: academic innovation and student recruitment and retention. In October 2002, the College opened a new campaign, Challenging Women, with the goal of raising $225 million. To date over $136 million has been raised. Implementation of the Plan established goals in five areas: academic innovation and faculty development, the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS), the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research (GSSWSR), information technology, and undergraduate student recruitment and retention. Recent financial constraints have exacerbated the tensions between the growth that naturally accompanies new initiatives and the need to avoid overreaching the resources of the College and our faculty and staff. Even in the face of these difficulties, the institution has made significant progress toward achieving the goals and objectives laid out in the Plan. The College has taken the opportunity presented by the Periodic Review to assess our implementation of the Plan in two broad areas: academic innovation, loosely encompassing the first four goals above, and student recruitment and retention. The review group, the College’s Council on Institutional Priorities, was also charged with reprioritizing the Plan to accommodate changes in the environment, both internal and external.

Acknowledging our tradition of supporting a faculty of strong teacher-scholars, the College recognized four goals in the area of academic innovation: recruiting and retaining a top-notch faculty, invigorating the curriculum, encouraging and supporting interdisciplinary work, and fostering scholarly productivity. In support of these goals the College has created interdisciplinary Centers, increased the frequency of faculty sabbaticals, planned to increase the number of ranked faculty to accommodate more frequent faculty leaves, added teaching postdoctoral fellowships to the sciences, started a program of Praxis courses, and enhanced the Arts program.

The College was founded to provide women with opportunities for graduate studies, and we continue to build on this tradition with small graduate programs in eleven departments in the humanities and sciences. Goals established in the Plan for the GSAS include strengthening the humanities programs and assessing the potential of the science programs. Specific objectives undertaken include regular reviews of the graduate programs, improved training in the humanities, and improving stipends for teaching assistants. The GSAS Dean has done an interim review of the science graduate programs, concluding that support should be redirected toward the most robust of the programs. The newly established Graduate Group in the humanities is providing strong disciplinary and interdisciplinary grounding for graduate students in Classics, Archaeology, and History of Art with a series of graduate seminars and a biennial Graduate Student Symposium.

GSSWSR, the first graduate school of social work in the country to grant the Ph.D., has developed its own strategic financial plan. The school seeks to bolster the recruitment of students, increasing both the size of the applicant pool and the student body; to enhance its degree programs; to increase outside funding for research; and to build a stronger alumnae/i network. The GSSWSR has moved strongly forward in these areas. A Board of Advisors is in place and active. Enrollments have increased. A new Center for Child and Family Well-being is raising the visibility of the program and creating new opportunities for research funding and curriculum development.

The Plan calls for building and maintaining a technologically sophisticated, College-wide learning environment and educating students to use and create new technologies. The College has committed to expanding the Computer Science program and restructured the ways in which we organize and deliver
information technology on campus. Library services are now integrated with computing services in a single organization. Locally-based organizations, “nodes,” are in place to provide support for information technology that is flexible and responsive to disciplinary needs. Planning for the library collection continues to occur in conjunction with Haverford and Swarthmore Colleges. The College now has more than 30 “smart” classrooms equipped with multimedia equipment in various configurations.

Maintaining an excellent and diverse student body is one of two major goals of the Plan. The quality of our students drives our culture of academic excellence and our tradition of achievement. Goals established in this area include increasing the size of the applicant pool and the student body, attracting a diverse and talented student body, controlling our discount rate and increasing the six-year graduation rate. To achieve this we have implemented a comprehensive admissions strategy, strengthened the athletics program, sought to improve student cultural and social life, and worked to increase opportunities for student internships. Applications to the College have grown steadily in the last five years. The College has shifted to using goals based not on the discount rate, but on net tuition revenue. The graduation rate has improved from 78% to 85% in the most recent year. New space for student activities has been opened, and renovations for the Campus Center are planned. Athletics is working to attract and support scholar-athletes and to offer more recreational and wellness opportunities for the larger student body.

The College has faced significant financial challenges over the past five years. In the summer of 2003, it was necessary for the College to cut more than 30 positions when it became clear that attrition would not forestall projected deficits. However, the outlook for the next few years is positive because of the implementation of almost $3 million in budget reductions in the current year, much improved financial markets, capital campaign success, and an improvement in the applicant pool. During the next five years, we expect that endowment income will become smaller and net tuition revenue larger as a percentage of total tuition revenues, although endowment income will continue to be the largest source of revenue for the College.

The College has developed and implemented a strategic plan growing out of the decennial Middle States review process of 1998-99. At the five-year mark, we have made significant progress toward the goals established by the Plan for a New Century. The goals and objectives set in 2000 have been assessed and re-prioritized in the context of the current institutional environment.
DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLEGE

Bryn Mawr College was founded by Dr. Joseph Taylor and a group of men and women belonging to the Religious Society of Friends as the first college for women with both undergraduate instruction for the A.B. and graduate instruction for the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees in all departments. The College held its first classes in the fall of 1885, and awarded its first degrees—one A.B. and one Ph.D.—in 1888. The College was first accredited by the Middle States Association in 1921; it was re-accredited during the 1998-99 academic year. Bryn Mawr offers a four-year, liberal arts curriculum for women. Students may do their major work in 34 areas of study. The College has cooperative exchanges with Haverford College, Swarthmore College, the University of Pennsylvania, and for juniors and seniors with Villanova University. The College has dual degree programs in city and regional planning with the University of Pennsylvania, and in engineering with the California Institute of Technology. The McBride Scholars program brings women beyond traditional college age to Bryn Mawr to complete the B.A.

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (GSAS) sponsors Ph.D. programs in nine departments and two M.A.-only programs (French and Geology). The Ph.D. programs include three in the graduate group in Archaeology, Classics, and History of Art; Russian (specializing in Russian-based SLA); Clinical Developmental Psychology; Mathematics, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. The GSAS admits men as well as women and has done so since 1931. The Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research (GSSWSR), founded in 1915 as the Carola Woerishoffer Graduate Department of Social Economy and Social Research, was the first program affiliated with a college to offer a Ph.D. in social work. The School has full- and part-time coeducational programs leading to the M.S.S. (Master of Social Service), M.L.S.P. (Master of Law and Social Policy) and the Ph.D. degree. A Center for Child and Family Well-being fosters an interdisciplinary focus through curricular development and educational and training opportunities. In addition, the School sponsors a non-degree continuing education program and certificate programs in conflict resolution, school social work, supervision, brief treatment, and child and adolescent psychotherapy. The M.S.S. program is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education, a specialized accrediting body recognized by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Located in Montgomery County, 11 miles west of Philadelphia, the College has a 136-acre campus. The College’s student residences offer a variety of housing alternatives, including cooperatives and foreign language houses. The College has reciprocal residential and dining arrangements with Haverford College. The residential capacity of the halls as of September 2003 is 1,211. Student rooms in all halls have a 10-Mbps Ethernet connection; the smaller houses where fewer than 15 students reside do not. Students are guaranteed housing on campus for all four years.

The College’s mission statement, as articulated for the Middle States Self-Study Report of 1998 (henceforth referred to as the Self-Study) is:

The mission of Bryn Mawr College is to provide a rigorous education and to encourage the pursuit of knowledge as preparation for life and work. Bryn Mawr teaches and values critical, creative, and independent habits of thought and expression in an undergraduate liberal arts curriculum for women and in coeducational graduate programs in Arts and Sciences and Social Work and Social Research. Bryn Mawr seeks to sustain a community diverse in nature and democratic in practice, for we believe that only through considering many perspectives do we gain a deeper understanding of each other and the world.

Since its founding in 1885, the College has maintained its character as a small residential community which fosters close working relationships between faculty and students. The faculty of teacher/scholars emphasizes learning through conversation and collaboration, primary reading, original research and experimentation. Our cooperative relationship with Haverford College enlarges the academic opportunities for students and their social community. Our active ties to Swarthmore College and the University of Pennsylvania, and the proximity of the city of Philadelphia further extend the opportunities available at Bryn Mawr.
Living and working together in a community based on mutual respect, personal integrity and the standards of a social and academic Honor Code, each generation of students experiments with creating and sustaining a self-governing society within the College. The academic and co-curricular experiences fostered by Bryn Mawr, both on campus and in the College's wider setting, encourage students to be responsible citizens who provide service to and leadership for an increasingly interdependent world.
INTRODUCTION

In 1999, and following immediately upon our ten-year review and re-accreditation by the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education, the College embarked upon a planning effort to define "how [Bryn Mawr] will educate as we begin the twenty-first century." Drafted by the President following a semester of open meetings coordinated by the Committee on Academic Priorities (CAP), revised and edited by the full community, and approved by the Trustees in March 2000, the Plan for a New Century identified the "abiding qualities" of the College and two fundamental and immediate challenges (for a text of the complete Plan, see Appendix 1 and http://www.brynmawr.edu/visit/plan.shtml). The Plan called for “investment in academic and associated co-curricular activities to accomplish five broad, non-prioritized objectives that we consider both critical to meeting the needs of the next generation of highly motivated students and firmly rooted in the College’s traditional strengths.” These five objectives are that Bryn Mawr graduates must be prepared to:

- live and work in a global environment;
- thrive in a context of rapid scientific change;
- work with, and give shape to, the powerful new information technologies that are transforming our society;
- meet the challenge of leading and serving in diverse communities;
- take the lead in the world of arts and letters.

Yet, as we exert our efforts and shape our dreams to meet these long-term objectives, the Plan reminded us of the two encompassing and immediate challenges for 2000-2010. We must

- foster academic innovation without significant expansion; and
- recruit and retain the most qualified students.

In the Plan, sections on "Educating for a New Century" and "Building the Bryn Mawr of the Future" addressed these two fundamental imperatives. Building on the broad objectives established in the Plan, specific goals and target dates for their achievement were developed in each of five areas: Academic Innovation and Faculty Enhancement; Student Recruitment and Retention; Technology; Graduate School of Arts and Science; Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research.

The periodic review process for the Middle States Association Commission on Higher Education has given us the opportunity to gauge our progress (1) with respect to our Plan and, as necessary, reprioritize and/or refine its goals; and (2) with respect to the Middle States Association’s expectations. This Periodic Review Report results from a process led by the Council on Institutional Priorities (CIP), which includes representatives from the faculty, undergraduate and graduate student bodies, administration,
and staff. Charged with advising the President on priorities and planning, CIP has welcomed the opportunity to take this purposeful look. The goals, their benchmarks, and our progress toward them are summarized in an implementation version of the Plan (Appendix 2), which has been regularly reviewed and modified since 2000 by senior staff, the trustees and some faculty committees. That chart, which summarizes the goals in each area and the initiatives in place to address them, underlies the structure of this report. CIP established two working groups, one to assess our progress in meeting the goals for student recruitment and retention, the other to examine our progress in the area of academic innovation (Appendix 3). The two groups began their work in early spring 2003 and met independently throughout much of the year to develop outlines for sections of this report, which were shared with groups of department chairs, the student major representatives, the student Curriculum Committee, CAP, the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum, and the various senior administrators, including the deans of the two graduate schools. Earlier drafts were reviewed by the members of CIP, and their comments inform this final version, which will soon be made accessible to the full community. For those readers not familiar with the impetus for it, it is important to note that the report is written for the Middle States’ reviewers. Much else is taking place at the College that we do not address here; this is, after all, a periodic report, which focuses on initiatives that were generated by the Plan, new to us, and for which we have available assessment data. Here we concentrate, first, on academic enrichment, and second, on student recruitment and retention. The President puts their interdependence succinctly:

. . . the notion of innovating academically [is] intrinsically deeply bound to the notion of keeping the College in a position to attract incoming students. . . . The lead item that recruits and retains students is program.

We conclude with a financial report, which substantiates the context within which the College has endeavored to meet its goals and move forward in a particularly challenging financial environment, and with new and positive major challenges we are setting for ourselves for the near future.

It would be best to acknowledge here that these have been difficult years; and that the sense of community and common purpose has been frayed. A mandate to do more with the same or fewer resources, to innovate and change without adding on, seems at present to have divided constituencies before achievements can bind them. Yet this fraying is not hard to fathom given the contributing factors of the College’s ambition, on the one hand, and its limited resources, on the other. In particular, and viewed from the perspective of our curricular offerings, a primary institutional characteristic is—and has been—that we try to do more than most institutions of our size. The most obvious examples of our ambition are our two graduate schools. To our traditional liberal arts core and in direct response to the five objectives, we are now adding programs and faculty members who are expert in both new disciplines and interdisciplinary areas. Ranked faculty numbers have increased by 13 (11%) since our last review (see below). This growth is the result of a period of careful planning, but because it has occurred
in a phase of tightened financial resources, increased demand for financial aid, and a modest decrease in student numbers, we have had to scale back in other areas, such as staff numbers and salary increases. Moreover, the commitment to the teacher-scholar faculty ideal has led us to enrich our sabbatical program to support better our faculty’s research needs. Whereas individual faculty members are benefiting from the program, it has caused additional strains, financial and otherwise.

Our curricular expansion has happened slowly, purposefully in part, incrementally and “below the radar” in part. And its effects, particularly when combined with a downturn in the performance of the stock market, have been dramatic. As described below, the College has had to take steps—which are unique in our history—in the past year to eliminate multi-million dollar projected deficits for the next three to five years. These decisions, taken after intense and painful review, have to some degree set the different constituencies of the College on edge, highlighting tensions in our existing cumbersome governance practices. The College’s Board of Trustees, aware of the limitations of their own practices and processes, revised their own governance; now— with faculty colleagues—they have devoted this year and will devote much of next year to a review of the College’s academic governance practices and policies. Out of this review, as we will explain below, we expect to have a renewed understanding of the meaning of shared governance and of community; agreement about the meaning of consultation, advice, and consent; cleaner lines of responsibility, and—where needed—reshaping of some administrative areas and of our committee structures and/or mandates.

Since our last Middle States review, there have been changes in many aspects of the institution. We have built and/or thoroughly renovated a range of buildings: for the Psychology department, for the Facilities Services and Housekeeping departments, for Admissions, Financial Aid and Public Affairs; for students living in handsome old dormitories, and for student activities. Elsewhere, classrooms, research and teaching laboratories, offices, and other facilities have been modernized. These—and substantial improvements to the grounds and playing fields—improve the quality of the residential experience for students, and the teaching, learning, working, and social environment for each of us.

Moreover, our engagement with the township and with community groups has grown via a range of initiatives which have brought already, or will bring, enrichment to those at the College and in the wider community. Community has often meant for us the bi- and tri-college community. Here, too, as we describe below, planful cooperation with Haverford and Swarthmore exists at many levels and yields many benefits. In particular, tri-college faculty development enrichment programs are benefiting both individual faculty members and the three institutions and will lead to significant faculty exchanges among us.
A number of new top administrators have joined us since 1999; some replace individuals who have left, others lead restructured departments/services, as will be described further on in this report. Appendix 4 lists the College’s senior staff and the dates at which each of these administrators took on their current posts. One last preliminary note: however focused our periodic review process has been, it has helped us inform our fund-raising efforts. We are in the midst of our most significant capital campaign ever. Launched in October 2002, the Campaign, entitled “Challenging Women: Investing in the Future of Bryn Mawr,” seeks to raise a minimum of $225 million by October 2007, for campus renewal and enhancement, faculty support, student support, and academic innovation. As of the end of May 2004, more than $136 million has been raised. For more on the Campaign, see http://www.brynmawr.edu/campaign.
A. INTELLECTUAL INVIGORATION

1. Academic Innovation and Faculty Development

In the sections below, we examine our progress toward the goals established in five thematic areas drawn from the *Plan for a New Century*. We begin with those initiatives that enrich the academic environment of the College for students and faculty and we close with initiatives more closely connected with the student life cycle, from recruiting new students to support for our graduates. We recognize that these two broad areas—the academic environment and the student experience—are not disjoint, but are closely intertwined and therefore the divisions below are somewhat arbitrary.

We put into place in our *Plan* a set of seven objectives to support the goals of recruiting and retaining a top-notch faculty, invigorating the curriculum, encouraging and supporting interdisciplinary work, and fostering scholarly productivity. These goals are clearly not new ones for the College: we acknowledge our faculty’s history of excellence as teachers and scholars and the high priority we put on continuing this tradition. Rather, these initiatives were created to offer the faculty new possibilities for the new century. Four interdisciplinary centers were created as “virtual spaces” in which innovation would occur, supporting the goals identified for academic innovation and faculty development, but without the need for new administrative frameworks. A newly enhanced sabbatical program has been introduced, helping the College to recruit and retain faculty and to sustain the scholarly productivity of the faculty. The College plans to expand the ranked faculty to afford departments and programs better coverage for more frequent leaves, allowing us at the same time to support the growth of interdisciplinary endeavors. Improving faculty salaries, another objective of long standing, also supports the goals expressed for faculty recruitment and retention. Two initiatives draw the scholarly work of the faculty into the classroom, thus invigorating the curriculum: teaching postdoctoral fellows have been appointed in the sciences, bringing new courses into the curriculum and contributing to faculty research, and *Praxis* courses in many disciplines enable students and faculty to work in the field (both literally and figuratively). Stronger arts programs enrich the lives of both faculty and students and play a role in an increasingly interdisciplinary scholarly culture. Other endeavors, such as a nascent program in Film Studies and the Computer Science program, also contribute to our culture of interdisciplinarity; hence, we assess their status below.

Meanwhile, continuing attention to planning is required if these new initiatives are not to contribute to increasing the programs at the College beyond our ability, both financially and as individuals, to support them. To this end, CAP undertook a study of departmental staffing practices; that study is also reviewed here. Effective use of the resources available to us in the tri-college consortium will also support these
and other curricular and faculty research initiatives; thus, continued attention must be paid to the relationships with Haverford and Swarthmore. Appropriate structures are needed to enable the faculty, administration and staff to plan effectively for innovation. The final objective in this area, to revise the College’s Plan of Government, seeks to create a streamlined plan of government to support better consultation, mutual planning, and implementation.

1.1 Centers for 21st Century Inquiry

The Plan for a New Century identifies the need to “foster innovation without expansion” as one of two major challenges facing the College.\(^3\) With the expectations that they would engage change and obsolesce over time, to be replaced with others, the Centers were purposefully not to be individually endowed. By providing various kinds of support, chiefly through intellectual community, they were intended to enhance research, learning and teaching, rather than to exist as permanent departments or programs. Faculty members would not be appointed to them, nor would they offer courses and majors. Faculty members were invited to propose the foci for the Centers, each of which was to cross boundaries between the disciplines in its programming. At the time of the Plan’s adoption and still, the four Centers for 21st Century Inquiry are dedicated to Ethnicities, Communities and Social Policy; International Studies; Science in Society; and Visual Culture.

The Center for Ethnicities, Communities and Social Policy brings together humanists and social scientists to explore diverse communities in the United States. The Center for International Studies provides a forum in which scholars from different backgrounds come together to define and research global issues. The Center also supports collaborative faculty-student cross-disciplinary research, which has as its goal the preparation of students for work in an increasingly interdependent global society. The Center for Science in Society engages scientists, social scientists, humanists, and other informed members of the political and scientific communities in conversations that are essential to continuing explorations of the natural world and humanity’s place in it. The Center for Visual Culture builds upon Bryn Mawr’s tradition as a leader in art history and archaeology by exploring the world of newer forms of media, from the invention of photography to the implications of interactive digital media.

As the Plan intended that the Centers be flexible, accommodating changing faculty and curricular needs, regular assessment of the Centers is essential. In the spring of 2003, the President asked for a first assessment of the Centers by both the Committee on Appointments (CA) and CAP. These two faculty committees assessed the Centers’ achievements relative to the goals expressed in the Plan and in the

---

\(^3\) The number of academic programs at the College has grown over the years. We now offer over 34 different undergraduate majors, supported by a permanent faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences of just over 120.
Centers’ own founding statements. The two committees used documents provided by the Center directors and solicited comments on the Centers from the entire community. The majority of respondents to the survey were faculty members; but a substantial number were other participants in the Centers, including alumnae/i, faculty from other institutions, and members of the staff. Fewer than one-third of the faculty responded to the survey. Faculty respondents, while roughly evenly divided across ranks and ages, and equivalent in numbers of junior and senior faculty, came principally from the humanities and sciences, with few social scientists weighing in on any center. The Center for Science in Society elicited the largest response. Overall, the low rate of response limits our ability to generalize from the data, but a few broad themes emerged.

There are strengths that are common to all or most of the Centers. Strong and enthusiastic leadership got the Centers off the ground. The Centers have engaged a broad swath of faculty, crossing departmental and divisional lines as well as age cohorts. Faculty members reported that they particularly enjoyed the opportunities created by the Centers for lively, collegial, and informal conversations across the disciplines. These conversations, while requiring little in the way of monetary resources, appear to be bringing as much, or more, to our community of scholars as some of the colloquia and lectures also sponsored by the Centers over the last several years. The Centers are contributing, albeit unevenly, to greater interdisciplinarity and enriched communication within our academic community. The markers for this progress are more qualitative than quantifiable and include the following: discussion groups supported by outside funding (see below) which have taken on a tri-college presence; potential book projects; and new research partnerships across disciplinary and institutional boundaries. Thus far, we have added more than 10 new interdisciplinary courses to the curriculum, stimulated by work in the Centers. Examples are: “The Stuff of Art,” a non-majors laboratory science course, supported by both the Center for Science in Society and the Center for Visual Culture; “Women, Sport, and Film,” taught jointly with Smith and Wesleyan; and “The New African Diaspora: African and Caribbean Immigrants in the US,” which grows out of a faculty member’s research supported by the Center for Ethnicities, Communities and Social Policy. In addition, the Center for International Studies’ steering committee has been working on defining an international studies major and has worked with the Curriculum Committee on a minor that it sees as a first stage in the institution of the major.

As the Centers evolve, it is not always clear how effectively their governance has functioned. In some, the director “governs;” in others, a steering committee leads. The interests of the directors have strongly shaped the direction each Center has taken; while these directions may intersect with faculty interests, faculty interests do not always seem to be driving the Centers’ planning. CAP and CA, individual faculty members, academic administrators, and development officers see a need now for more involvement in strategic planning on the part of the faculty groups served by Centers and, in particular, their full steering
committees. We need to encourage the Centers to put more effort into fostering opportunities for broader participation among colleagues. We hope to see the roster of active participants changing and broadening over time. Program planning by the full steering committees is now the basis for requesting annual operating budgets.

Communication and visibility are another area for consideration. Communication, these days, is facilitated by e-mail. Yet many members of the community have a sense that they are “drowning in e-mail,” to the point that the sheer volume of promontional material emanating from the Centers in effect tends to reduce their visibility to the faculty. Moreover, their visibility to undergraduate students is an issue that the Centers, for the most part, yet to address in explicit ways. For those members of the faculty participating regularly in a Center or Centers, there has surely been some trickling down into the classroom and supervision of students’ independent work. Participation certainly will continue to energize the curriculum. However, the Centers do need to be seen as inviting and vital spaces in which undergraduates can be actively involved on an ongoing basis, as well as sources of sponsorship for their research projects and internship opportunities. Several of the Centers have supported these types of opportunities. The Center for International Studies sponsors a grant program for student research projects, which allows students who are abroad for their junior year to stay there to complete research for senior theses. The Center for Ethnicities, Communities and Social Policy has funded approximately six undergraduate student internships per year for the last three years. The Center for Visual Culture supports both graduate and undergraduate student projects.

All of the Centers must begin fundraising in earnest now that their grant-based start-up support is ending. Whereas an objective of the Campaign is to provide longer term funding for innovative efforts like the Centers, in the interim funding must come from gifts specifically in support of the Centers. For the Centers to thrive and be able to experiment, they will also have to supplement the level at which the College is currently able to sustain them by means of gifts and grants. One Center has already been successful in its applications to two leading foundations, obtaining a planning grant from The Ford Foundation and a grant to support visiting postdoctoral fellows from The Rockefeller Foundation. The very process of seeking support from a wide variety of sources will lead in the long term to stronger foundations for each of the Centers, greater visibility, and viability. For example, we will be able to implement The Science in Society Undergraduate Fellowship Program, having recently had our application to The Howard Hughes Medical Institute funded. This program will encourage students to develop novel interdisciplinary majors reflecting the Center’s interest in connecting the sciences and non-sciences. Two cohorts (each of two students) of Science in Society Undergraduate Fellows will be supported with summer internships and travel allowances to attend meetings. The proposal includes
funds for science outreach to local schools, activities which will be coordinated by the Center for Science in Society.

Recommendations:

- Encourage larger, broader Center steering committees to work with directors to support new faculty cross-disciplinary scholarship.
- Raise funds to insure that the Centers may continue.
- Increase Center participation by undergraduate students and alumnae.
- Find more effective and less intrusive ways of maintaining the visibility of Center activities.
- Have CAP and CA continue to assess the Centers.
1.2 The New Sabbatical Leave Program and Discipline-Spanning Positions

In order to attract and retain the best students, we know that we must sustain a strong faculty of teacher-scholars. Sabbatical leaves are one of the major ways of ensuring a faculty member’s intellectual vitality, and thus, in the Plan, the College proposed that its leave program be enhanced to make it comparable to the policies at our peer institutions. At the same time, we noted that we would have to reduce leave replacement costs and raise funds to endow a limited number of additional faculty positions for the purpose of leave replacement. The Board of Trustees approved the new sabbatical program in fall 2000. The transition for faculty to the new leave program began in 2001-02 and will be fully implemented in 2005-06.

Under the new program, tenured members of the faculty are eligible for leaves of either one full year after 12 semesters of teaching or one semester after six semesters of teaching. A faculty member taking a year’s sabbatical is entitled to her or his full annual salary, contingent upon having made timely and substantial efforts to obtain outside funding to support the leave. Faculty members taking a one-semester sabbatical are expected to teach three courses in the non-sabbatical semester. This is a change in the plan introduced at the end of 2002 prompted by the change in the financial environment within which the College is operating. The College had hoped to have faculty who planned to take their leaves after six semesters of teaching alternate between fulfilling 3/5ths and 2/5ths of their teaching load in successive leave years, but the current financial environment has made this too costly. Many faculty members are aware of how costly the new sabbatical program is and, alert to the College’s financial pressures, seek a re-evaluation of the trade-offs it has required. As had been anticipated, the most difficult aspect of the leave program has been managing its effect on the curriculum. In order to contain the costs of the program, we have reduced the number of replacements for faculty on leave. Instead, we are encouraging much closer cooperation with Haverford and Swarthmore Colleges in conjunction with more efficient departmental and programmatic planning. Some academic departments and programs are succeeding in this tri-college collaboration; for others, collaboration is more difficult because of cultural and logistical barriers.4

In time, and as intended in the Plan, the College will need to add tenure track faculty to ease the needs for replacements. These new positions are to provide a buffer against leaves (thus reducing our reliance on interim hires) and to enable us to enhance our academic programs (see below). We are seeking support for these faculty positions in our capital campaign. At present, sabbatical replacement costs in the transition are assisted by a grant of $1.3 million from The Pew Charitable Trusts; the grant is also

4 Logistical barriers include the overall course schedule compression (with peak hours on peak days) and the two-site issue in having a class on one campus followed immediately by a class on the other. Cultural barriers between counterpart departments are, by nature, more subjective, more difficult to pinpoint, and more demanding to address.
supporting search and replacement costs for some of the new expansion positions on which we have been able to move forward.

In 2000-01 CAP began planning for the proposed additional faculty positions. CAP’s goals were, first, to add positions that could provide for continuity and coverage for courses with large enrollments or for required major courses. Second, CAP hoped to craft positions in ways that would foster interdisciplinary teaching and research among and within the existing departments. In 2000-01 and, again, in 2001-02, CAP solicited proposals from groups of departments for the new positions, which are locally referred to as “spanning positions.” Departments and programs were asked to submit proposals, which CAP then ranked according to the two criteria above. In the end, CAP recommended adding the following 10 new positions to the Arts and Sciences faculty: Computational Science, Legal Studies, Environmental Studies, Romance Languages and Literatures, Urban Social Problems and Policy, Anthropological Psychology, Drama, Comparative Literature, a Social Science quantitative methods position, and a Statistics position in Mathematics. Currently, the objectives call for having made hires for five of the 10 planned discipline-spanning positions by the end of 2005-06.\(^5\) We have filled the first two of these positions with a computational biologist and a legal scholar. Next year we will search to fill the Comparative Literature slot, enabled by a recent grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.

**Recommendations:**

- Have CAP prioritize the other seven positions in its current pool with respect to the needs of the College when next we are able to resume hiring.
- Establish a reasonable timetable for the hiring of the additional spanning positions recommended by CAP based on the current, more constrained, financial projections. How many of these hires can we reasonably expect to make in the next five years?
- Work through TCCAC to reduce the logistical barriers toward curricular cooperation with Haverford.

1.3 Faculty: the Composition of the Faculty, Faculty Development, and Salaries

1.3.1 Composition of the Faculty

In the current year we have 127 ranked faculty members, an increase of 13 since 1998-99. This increase is the result of a decision by the Board of Trustees to increase the size of the continuing faculty in order to meet the interest in and demand for new disciplines (including Film Studies and Computer Science) and to staff “against” leaves with continuing faculty rather than with interim appointments. As noted above, \(^5\) To address curricular goals for innovation articulated by CAP beyond the new sabbatical policy, we have also added tenure track positions in African History, Asian American Studies, Computer Science (2), Film Studies, and our Growth and Structure of Cities program.
because of our new, more generous sabbatical program, faculty members are away on research leave twice as frequently as they were in the past. The Trustees determined that an increase in the size of the ranked faculty would assure greater continuity and stability in the curriculum. This increase in ranked faculty size has enabled us to attract talented young scholars, many from racial/ethnic minorities that have been underrepresented historically at Bryn Mawr, and to help shift the composition of the faculty in terms of gender and rank, as well. Thirty-four assistant professors have joined the faculty as a result of searches since 1998-99. The increase in faculty size has helped to ameliorate a previous top heaviness in the composition of the faculty. These shifts are best communicated in a chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranked faculty</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professors</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Full Professors</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of females</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of tenured faculty who are females</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority representation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority percent</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age</td>
<td>Not available</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in the Composition of the Ranked Faculty

Faculty growth has increased racial/ethnic diversity particularly in the junior ranks, as 11 of the 34 new assistant professors (32%) are members of minorities historically underrepresented at the College. The number of minority faculty members will increase even further in 2004-05, as a result of recent hires. A significant trend in predicting the long-term diversity of our faculty in the future is that minorities and non-minorities are achieving tenure at nearly equivalent rates. To illustrate that trend, here are the data on hires for the period September 1993 through the present year. (This does not include new hires made for 2004-05.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of women</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of men</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minorities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall number reviewed for tenure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number achieving tenure</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of positive tenure decisions</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minorities reviewed for tenure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of minorities achieving tenure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of positive minority tenure decisions</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of positive non-minority tenure decisions</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although we now have a better distribution in terms of rank, we do have an aging faculty. Some 27 members of the faculty were 60 or older when the academic year began, 36 were 50-60 years old, 34 were between 40 and 50, and 30 were less than 40 years of age. With retirement approaching for so many—our faculty rarely stay on past 67—we expect to continue the pace of turnover we have experienced recently. Ten tenured faculty members have retired since the 1998-99 academic year; another 10 are expected to retire in the next five years. The College is taking a more supportive role in counseling about the possibility of planned, phased retirement and is offering financial planning to facilitate decision-making. This “planful” approach has been abetted by an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation “Mellon 2000 Funds” grant to allow for some hiring in advance of retirement in the humanities. By providing the funding for overlapping appointments, the grant enables us to eliminate harmful years-long gaps in departmental staffing and to lessen some of the pressures on those faculty members who are approaching retirement.

1.3.2 Faculty Development

Whereas the new age span is good, for it assures both the continuing presence of established faculty leaders and “doers” and the infusion of—presumably even more energetic—younger scholars, it does divide the faculty into groups which are at markedly different stages of their professional and personal lives. For that very reason and because we are too small a college to offer our faculty as much intellectual colleagueship as one would expect at larger institutions, we have derived great benefit from a generous tri-college grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. The resulting Mellon Tri-College Faculty Forum (2001-04) has been aimed at strengthening the roles of liberal arts faculty in a changing world and throughout their changing careers. Directed by a steering committee drawn from the ranks of the three colleges, the Faculty Forum has provided a variety of faculty development activities designed to identify and address the work-life constraints faculty members feel at different career stages, from the recently hired to senior faculty members who are contemplating retirement. The Faculty Forum has identified four goals, important to faculty as their careers grow and change: (1) greater visibility for faculty research within and among the three institutions, to enable faculty to find others with common interests, (2) scholarly exchange and collaboration, to help the faculty build intellectual communities, (3) support for innovation in teaching, research, and institutional life, and (4) creative thinking about time management. The Faculty Forum has programmed extensively, helping faculty members find ways to meet these goals. Nearly three-quarters of eligible faculty participated in the Faculty Forum’s programming last year. It has been particularly effective in introducing new tri-college faculty to one

---

6 In a relatively informal study conducted by Bowdoin College on faculty age distribution in 11 Northeast colleges, based on 2001-02 data, we had an older faculty than many of our peers.
another across campus and department lines, to acclimate them to the expectations of the colleges, and to help them establish professional and intellectual associations.

Other new initiatives have been introduced to spur or nurture faculty development. For example, for junior members of the faculty and to encourage the habit of seeking outside support of research, the Provost has begun to give “incentive awards” to those who apply for outside grants, whether they get the grant or not. For funding leaves, including the Junior Faculty Research Leave, and for professional visibility, an active and successful grant-getting profile is important, even given the greater difficulties humanists face in comparison to scientists and social scientists in securing support.

During the search in 2001-02 for a new Provost, the faculty discovered that it had become difficult for many of its members to imagine taking on the position while maintaining any significant scholarly connection. This was because of the growth that has occurred in the range of provostial responsibilities. As a result, the members of the Provost’s search committee, drawing on their extensive discussions with members of the faculty, recommended establishing part-time associate provostships which would enable mid-career faculty members to “try on” administration. It remains an objective for the College to provide interested faculty members with opportunities to develop broader administrative understanding and experience applicable to their careers here or elsewhere.

1.3.3 Faculty Salaries

“A faculty of teacher-scholars of the first rank is the most important factor in ensuring the College’s continued excellence,” we state in our Campaign goals. Monies raised during the Campaign for faculty salaries will support several new tenure track faculty positions, the new sabbatical leave program, and the objective to raise faculty salaries to competitive levels. For years we had been assessing our faculty salaries in comparison to other highly selective colleges and universities, principally COFHE members, and seeking to reach the median average salary in the group. In spring 2002, we redefined the comparison group, and it now comprises the 12 other COFHE colleges plus Haverford. This is a highly competitive aspirant peer group, including as it does some of the best-endowed colleges in the country. The challenge to Bryn Mawr can be seen when we compare some AAUP salary data. Although our faculty salaries have been higher than the 90th percentile among all 1,400 institutions reporting to the reporting AAUP, this does not reflect our aspirant peer group with which we compete when we recruit new faculty members. In the tables below, we compare the average Bryn Mawr salary at each rank to the

---

7 Through 2001-02, our comparison group was comprised of Brandeis, Brown, Carleton, Haverford, Pomona, Smith, Swarthmore, Wellesley, Wesleyan and Williams. In 2001 we amended the peer group so that it now is comprised of Amherst, Barnard, Carleton, Haverford, Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Pomona, Smith, Swarthmore, Trinity, Wellesley, Wesleyan and Williams.
median of the average salaries of faculty in each of these ranks at the other thirteen comparison schools for two selected years. We begin with 2001-02:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2001-02 Averages within Ranks</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Prof</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
<td>$91,761</td>
<td>$67,666</td>
<td>$55,044</td>
<td>$76,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median of 13 peers</td>
<td>$99,748</td>
<td>$68,760</td>
<td>$55,062</td>
<td>$80,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our rank in the cohort of 14 schools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For 2003-04, the data is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2003-04 Averages within Ranks</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>Associate Prof</th>
<th>Assistant Prof</th>
<th>Weighted Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
<td>$94,205</td>
<td>$68,117</td>
<td>$54,416</td>
<td>$76,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median of 13 peers</td>
<td>$108,400</td>
<td>$73,900</td>
<td>$59,600</td>
<td>$85,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our rank in the cohort of 14 schools</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our ability to improve faculty salaries has not matched our intentions, given the constrained financial environment. It is, however, worth stressing that our starting salaries have been competitive with those of our peers, as is our sabbatical program. When we are making tenure track offers, we have found that the salary we can offer is not an impediment in the vast majority of cases. Candidates choose to come because of the junior faculty research leave, the sabbatical program, and the promise of initial and subsequent research support. Candidates choose not to come to the College either because of a spouse’s or partner’s employment or because they prefer a career in a research university. According to a 2000 Harvard study on faculty recruitment,⁸ assistant professors come to new positions for the following reasons, in rank order: geographic location; work balance; department quality; chance of tenure; salary; and institutional prestige. In recent years (and before the current year, in which there were no salary increases), we had been increasing the salaries of assistant and associate professors by giving each of these cohorts a higher salary increase than we allotted full professors. Our reasoning was (1) to address the salary needs of younger faculty members who, in general, have greater demands on their income (mortgages, student loan indebtedness, and young families) than do older members of the faculty and (2) to minimize the need for concerted catch-up later on.

In communicating comparative salary data to the Board of Trustees and to faculty members, we have sought to locate comparative faculty salaries within broader economic data, for example, housing costs and local consumer price indices, and within the broader contexts of compensation and workload,

---

⁸ The Project on Faculty Appointments, Harvard University, 2000, surveyed 2,719 candidates for junior faculty positions from high-ranking research universities and assessed job factors affecting the choice of faculty positions. See http://gseweb.harvard.edu/~hpfa/.
including benefits, the sabbatical program, and the teaching load. However, these measures often do not affect the general perceptions among our faculty members that they are not doing as well as their average peer in the comparison group. Salaries are not only real and useful, but they are perceived by some as an indication of the value the College places on each individual. Given that we are one of the best endowed institutions within the universe of American higher education, it is often difficult to communicate the message within the community that we are indeed going through a period of constrained financial resources (as we describe in the financial section, below). The combination of these factors—little actual or comparative salary improvement in recent years, perceptions of salary as an expression of individual value, and difficulty in communicating the financial environment—has contributed to a morale problem within the faculty and within other constituencies, as well. However, when the College had to take the historic step of laying off employees last summer, a number of faculty members and members of the staff volunteered, to their credit, to take pay cuts so that the layoffs might not occur, even though it would have taken an impossibly high 30% average wage reduction among faculty to balance the budget. Nevertheless, this shared sense of community has itself significant value.

Recommendations:

- Develop a sense of how far we can reasonably move faculty salaries in the next five years and communicate this to faculty. Do this within the College Budget Subcommittee of CIP (in concert with Board of Trustees’ Finance Committee).
- Continue our efforts to seek external funding to support hiring in anticipation of retirement.
- Encourage faculty with the skills and interest to take on administrative roles. The College has a continuing need in its administrative structures for those who can maintain a faculty perspective and who are well steeped in the institution.
- Continue more prospective planning for faculty retirement.

1.4 Teaching Postdoctoral Fellows

The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation has long made it possible for us to have two or three postdocs in the humanities and humanistic social sciences, but we had no comparable programs for recent Ph.D.s in the sciences. In 2000, the College received a $750,000 grant from the W.M. Keck Foundation. To date, we have hosted four postdoctoral fellows, two in Chemistry, one in Computer Science, and one in Mathematics; two new fellows have been appointed for 2004-05. Recently, CIP asked faculty members who were supervising the fellows to assess the impact of the program in three areas: Has the program stimulated any changes in research and curriculum? Has having the fellows made a lasting difference for the College? Should we continue to have such programs?
Faculty members report that impact on research has varied. While Chemistry and Math reported that their fellows have had minimal impact on those disciplines, Computer Science reported that its fellow provided a tremendous boost to the small and growing program and, helped catalyze the development of a new group in emergent systems, an activity which led to a tri-college Mellon Faculty Forum on Emergence in which some 15 faculty members from Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore are now participating. Some unique research collaborations have resulted from the group which are having an impact on the continuing Computer Science curriculum. Future collaborations among faculty members and a former Keck Fellow may lead to research grants and other collaborative activities. The Computer Science experience provides a model for the future equivalent of the Keck Fellows Program, that of a "revolving-door" position to bring bright young scholars to the campus for extended stays, where they can contribute to a dynamic intellectual environment, while gaining teaching experience. Chemistry reports that its postdoctoral fellows provided strong advising to undergraduate and graduate students, and contributed to curricular development in both upper and lower division courses. A new approach to working with students in Introductory Chemistry was piloted by one fellow; a second fellow brought additional expertise in plant biology into the biochemistry course required for majors. Some of these initiatives will be continued by the faculty. The fellows also assisted the departments in covering for faculty members who were on leave. Nevertheless, as the department weighed the advantages, many felt that the principal benefits of the positions have accrued to the candidates, who are exposed to pedagogical and research structures appropriate for liberal arts environments. By the end of this year three of the four Keck Fellows will have gone on to faculty positions at Williams College, Manhattan Marymount College and St. Lawrence University. Their earlier-than-expected securing of tenure track positions—an important measure of the program’s success—has enabled us to extend the program and recruit two new fellows for 2004-05.

Recommendations:

- Science chairs and CAP should assess the teaching postdoctoral program in the sciences as Keck funding is expended and consider what changes, if any, to the program might strengthen it.
- The Resources Office should continue to seek funding to support the postdoctoral program in the sciences.

1.5 The PRAXIS Program
One of the largest changes in the sense of student opportunity for growth outside of the classroom has been the establishment of the Praxis Program. In 1999, the College’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee—comprised of students, faculty and members of the administration—considered how better to combine practice and theory in the curriculum and to offer internships for credit. The Undergraduate Dean along with the Internship Committee, now known as the Praxis Council, developed “In Praxis,” an academic initiative that provided three models or templates for courses combining practical and theoretical work.

Praxis students and professors work with the Praxis Director and a community partner to help place students in internships and jointly define the learning goals for each experience. In 2000, the College received a grant from the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation for $150,000 for a two-year period in order to expand the existing program and assess its role in the undergraduate life. In 2001, the first Praxis course was taught through the English department; “Major Texts in the Feminist Tradition in the West” had an undergraduate enrollment of 12 Bryn Mawr students. The caliber of class discussion differs from a regular lecture or seminar class, in that students are able to use their “real world” experiences to draw connections between the text, theory and their internship experience.

Through spring 2003, 28 faculty members have taught 42 Praxis courses. The number of students participating in the program has also grown since the pilot course. We went from the original 12 students enrolled in the first Praxis I courses to more than 125 students enrolled in Praxis I courses in 2003-03. The Praxis office is also collaborating with the Community Service Office and the GSSWSR on a partnership with the town of Norristown (the Community Partnership in Action) which has served to expand the program even more. The Praxis program has been a successful way for us to bridge the gap between classroom learning and the larger community. As the program continues, we are seeking to extend student and faculty participation. New initiatives are under way to aid faculty in course development throughout the curriculum and to recruit new faculty to the program.

Recommendation:

- Given the resource-intensive nature of these courses, have Curriculum Committee and CAP consider what is an appropriate size for the Praxis program overall.

1.6 The Arts Programs and the Conversion of Arts Faculty Status

The College’s small but thriving arts programs play a significant role in attracting and retaining students. Its faculty members are actively engaged in the College’s recruitment process, and the opportunities they provide through teaching, hosting visiting writers and performers, and overseeing an array of extra-
curricular activities enrich the students’ lives. Maintaining and enhancing active arts program requires strong and stable leadership in each of its facets, i.e., Theater, Dance, and Creative Writing. Originally, the arts programs were envisioned as having only continuing non-tenure track appointments, complemented by faculty members on interim appointment. The intent was to ensure the introduction of fresh perspectives by cycling arts faculty in and out on limited terms. Moreover, it had seemed that the standards of publication we had for tenure track appointments could not be reconciled with arts faculty members’ achievements. Some of the faculty and administration recognized, however, that arts faculty members were, indeed, productive scholars and writers, members of scholarly communities beyond the College, and would surely be on a tenure track (and tenured) at many of our peer colleges. We recognized that our ability to recruit and retain able leaders in these roles in the future would be stronger were we to be able to offer tenure track positions. Thus, in 2002-03, the CAP and CA jointly recommended that the College convert the positions of the arts directors to tenure track positions. This was done and our directors of Creative Writing, Dance, and Theater are now tenured associate professors. Having now recognized the significance of the directors of these programs, we are turning our attention to the College’s arts facilities in our campus planning.

Recommendation:

- Develop flexible, modern spaces for the arts.

1.7 Interdisciplinary Work

We do not seek interdisciplinarity as an end in itself, rather—as we note in the Plan—our increasingly interdisciplinary curriculum and the research of many faculty members follow from our objectives. Research and teaching in the humanities, the natural and physical sciences, and the social sciences now frequently cross disciplinary boundaries and are reliant on ever more sophisticated technology. Research tools are increasingly shared across methodological cultures. We prepare students to bring a social and ethical context to science. Archaeologists, anthropologists and geologists, for example, all increasingly rely on GIS (Geographical Information Systems) software. Faculty research in the visual cultures can be as demanding of computer resources as that in sciences. Interdisciplinary ventures and venues abound on campus. Some are curricular and result in new and/or revised course offerings; others revolve around the scholarly interests of faculty and students. The interactions are both formal and informal. Obviously, the four Centers are poised to play a significant role in the interdisciplinary culture of the College, as will many of our new faculty members, both replacements for others who leave and new faculty hired to support the sabbatical program. The College Seminar program contributes to the interdisciplinary environment on campus; many of the faculty members who are active in the program teach at times with colleagues from other divisions, and the topics are often those that can be approached.
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from many angles, such as time, gender, film, and robotics. The College has a significant investment in these new types of cross-cutting programs, but we also have an abiding interest in sustaining a number of already well-established interdisciplinary programs, including Africana Studies, Comparative Literature, East Asian Studies, Environmental Studies, Feminist and Gender Studies, and the Growth and Structure of Cities. In this section, we introduce two of the young interdisciplinary programs, which have their origins in a CAP response to a request from the President in 1998 to identify those areas in which curricular development needed to occur. CAP recommended three areas, with a related (and now completed) hire in each: Film Studies, Computer Science, and Ethnic Studies (Asian-American, specifically).

1.7.1. Film Studies

Since 2000, the College has appointed two young scholars of film. The first was appointed in September 2000 to the English department, filling an existing tenure slot that had been redefined to encompass film; the second was appointed in September 2002 to a new (additional) tenure track slot in the History of Art. With this “critical mass” of two film scholars, it was time to pursue formalizing Film Studies at the College. In 2002, a survey estimated that 15-20 Bryn Mawr undergraduates would declare as minors, if they had the option.\footnote{A more recent survey had 213 respondents. 24.5% reported they had learned of the Film Studies minor from their instructors and 34.4% from an e-mail announcement. In terms of their interests, 54% said they would definitely attend film festivals; 33% were definitely interested in production courses emphasizing digital video film-making; 35% were definitely interested in production courses emphasizing acting, directing and art design; and 34% were “definitely” interested in production courses emphasizing screenwriting. 32% gave the inclusion of courses on entertainment and copyright law a low priority; 46% were “definitely” interested in special film screenings with lectures. Of the 213 respondents, 18% (29) are now likely to or definitely intend to declare a Film Studies minor.} Again, in fall 2002, CAP convened members of the faculty (specifically, those who regularly use and/or teach film in their courses) to discuss existing faculty resources that contribute to the presence of film in the curriculum and to review our potential programming options. Through this process, the wider curricular presence of film was assessed, and we were assured that we had an array of courses offered within other disciplines to complement the core sequence of film courses the two new assistant professors were beginning to offer. CAP felt that the moment had arrived to pursue a formal program by offering a minor in Film Studies. The potential minor would bring curricular shape and direction to film offerings which had been scattered about the curriculum, interest present and potential students, and be an attractive new area in which to seek outside support. By the end of the academic year, the steering committee established for Film Studies brought a proposal for the minor to the undergraduate Curriculum Committee, which the Committee approved.

1.7.2 Computer Science

In 1998, planning began for an increase in the scope of our Computer Science program, which at the time comprised one tenured faculty member in Mathematics. One of the broad objectives in the Plan is to
prepare students “to work with, and give shape to, the powerful new information technologies that are transforming our society.” To meet such a goal, we stated that “we must expand our small program in computer science, support interdisciplinary collaborations that expose more students to the study of technology…” By now, we have added two tenure track positions to the existing Computer Science program and have increased the faculty in other departments and programs of the College who can contribute to and enhance the goals of an interdisciplinary program. Because of the new faculty members, the curriculum has expanded, and now includes courses such as “Compiler Construction” and “Androids: Design and Practice.” The work of these new faculty members has been supported by renovated research space, teaching labs, and initial research awards for equipment. We have in place a basic infrastructure to encourage visiting scholars. A multi-year grant from the W.M. Keck Foundation has enabled the College to add postdoctoral positions in the sciences (see above). In fall 2002, a Keck postdoctoral fellow joined the Computer Science program. Her arrival helped catalyze the initiation of a weekly faculty/student study group on “emergence,” which continues this year through the Tri-College Faculty Forum (see above). Her course on “Emergence” will continue as a part of the curriculum. This year a faculty member from Pomona College is spending his sabbatical year here as a visiting research fellow in order to do collaborative research with our faculty members. Thus far, it has not been feasible to find a role for Computer Science in the College’s graduate program due to the continuing review of the status of the graduate schools (see below) and to the separation of Computer Science from Mathematics. By actively participating in the CSem program, computer scientists are meeting another of their goals. They have offered “Weaving the Web” (twice) and “Robots Gone Berserk: A Look at Robots in Film.”

In fall 2003, a new minor in Computational Methods was proposed, the purpose of which is to foster the interdisciplinary role of the Computer Science program. Students in this minor will acquire knowledge of computer problem solving, learn to program in several languages, and take computational modeling courses in their own “home” disciplines. Participating departments include Physics, Chemistry, Geology, Economics, Archaeology, Philosophy, and the Growth and Structure of Cities. New computational modeling courses to serve the minor are being planned, as well, including “Geographical Information Systems” (in Geology), “Visualization: Art & Science” (in Computer Science), and “Computational Ecology” (in Biology). The role the Computer Science program plays at the College has grown significantly over the last five years. It is now administratively independent of the Mathematics department. Continuing student interest in the field is demonstrated by the numbers of students declaring majors and minors: in the graduating classes 1999 through 2003, there were 10 majors and five minors. Enrollments, both in courses and independent study units, over this same five-year period totaled 583. The program’s activities are playing a vital role in the intellectual life on campus.

Recommendations:
• Assess success of the new interdisciplinary programs after five years in terms of student enrollment, impact on cognate departments, and faculty research. Our challenge is to encourage the innovation interdisciplinarity brings without growth and without compromising our traditionally strong disciplinary base, within a constrained financial climate.

• Establish expectations that contributing—or cognate—departments consider the needs of interdisciplinary programs in general in their long-term curricular planning and advise the programs of their own needs and plans.

1.8 The College Seminar Program

In fall 1997, the College launched the CSem program, replacing a required two-semester freshman English writing sequence that had been in place from 1958-1996 and the bridging program (Liberal Studies) that replaced it. CSEms were conceived as small courses organized around broad questions, which were to be approached in a “predisciplinary” or interdisciplinary manner. Most seminars were developed by a cluster of faculty members who were drawn from several disciplines and taught parallel sections, averaging 16 students each. Frequent writing and individual attention to each student’s prose were hallmarks of these courses. Originally, a student was required to take two CSEms, including one in her first semester. Though not an outgrowth of the Plan, the CSem program supports several of the Plan’s objectives, including enriching a student’s curricular experience in her first two years at the College and engaging her on questions of science and technology. Overall, by bringing faculty members from the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities together into teaching clusters, the CSEms are part of our general movement toward an integrative, cross-disciplinary approach to teaching and learning. The participation of 20% of faculty members in the sciences sends a clear message to those students who have come to Bryn Mawr to major in science that critical thinking and writing are crucial as well to their science education, and that science at Bryn Mawr is truly a “liberal art.” Equally, it supports our contention that all students, regardless of their ultimate choice of field, need to be comfortable with scientific questions and approaches.

After the first two years of CSEms, the Curriculum Committee reviewed the program. In that review the key issues for meeting the objectives for the program were identified as follows: our ability to staff the program with faculty members who have long-term relationships with the College (that is, our tenured, tenure track and continuing non-tenure track faculty); an approach which considers questions within a framework that does not presuppose disciplinary structures; and the cluster-teaching model for course development. The Arts and Sciences faculty renewed its commitment to the program for another three years, at the end of which a formal assessment was to occur. The faculty were, however, divided in their
support, and the vote to renew the program was very close. The Curriculum Committee reviewed the
program again in 2002-03 and brought three modified models to the Arts and Sciences faculty for its
consideration. Changes to the existing program were proposed in order to make it easier to staff and to
provide more flexibility in content and pedagogical approach. The strong commitments to critical
thinking and to the assessment of student writing by means of individual conferences were preserved. In
spring 2004, the faculty voted to approve a one-semester model, which will take effect with the class
entering in the fall of 2004.

1.9 Strategies for the College

As the 1999 Middle States Evaluation Team noted:

.... Bryn Mawr’s curriculum is ambitious in its coverage. . . . It has grown to the point where it is
now said to stretch the resources of the faculty to the breaking point. The faculty can widen the
curriculum and it can deepen the curriculum, but . . . it can no longer do both.

We continue to have a significant imbalance between the size of our curriculum and the student bodies
that sustain it. As we consider the various initiatives we have developed to support the Plan, we also
must consider how to introduce new initiatives without imperiling the traditional strengths of the
institution. Ongoing planning and evaluation of these efforts is critical to our ability to continue to
innovate in an environment where resources are not infinite. The faculty must play a strong role in this
work, and shared governance practices must be in place that enable faculty and administration to work
together to plan, solve problems, and innovate.

One example of how faculty might offer advice in institutional budget and planning lies in the recent
recommendations made by CAP with respect to departmental staffing practices in the undergraduate
college and how those practices play out in terms of teaching load. CAP offered its study and
recommendation to the departments and programs and to the Provost so that requests for staffing could
be reviewed within a broad institutional context, informed by the voice of the faculty. As these
conversations and others proceeded, they highlighted the need for a system of governance which enables
issues of resource allocation to be tackled effectively and consultatively by members of the faculty, staff,
and administration, adding additional weight to our need to complete the revision of our governing
documents which began several years ago. Finally, more effective planning within the tri-college
consortium could help us keep sectors of our curricula wide and deep without overextending the
resources of any of the three institutions. Strong links between the three institutions are essential on
many levels, from the departments through the provosts, presidents, and trustees.
1.9.1 What Is a Course?
CAP began by exploring the variability of departmental practices that affect staffing, drew on enrollment data, and held conversations with departments, individual faculty members, and the Provost. The data gleaned from these sources were summarized and shared, first with department chairs and, then, with the faculty as a whole. CAP solicited advice from the faculty about the current practices, asking them, in particular, to consider what might be sound normative practices for the College. Based on the principles it heard expressed by the faculty, CAP developed its set of recommendations, which it shared with the faculty and the Provost in April 2003 in the report, “What Is a Course?”

Not surprisingly, there seem to be almost as many answers to the question—“What Is a Course?”—as there are courses. The culture at the College encourages pedagogical exploration, and the courses that result are not always cast in the mold of a standard lecture or seminar. Tutorial-like teaching occurs in the sciences in advanced lab courses and elsewhere throughout the curriculum. Large master classes supported by more intimate drill and/or discussion sections characterize instruction in many disciplines, from Chemistry to Chinese. Given the variety of instructional and scholarly approaches and learning modes found at the College, CAP did not seek to recommend a "one-size-fits-all" set of practices. Rather, it offered a set of shared principles for departments and the Provost to consult as they craft sustainable curriculum and staffing plans. Recognizing that there might be difficulties in implementing these principles, CAP further recommended that when departments and the Provost cannot agree, they seek the advice of the faculty through its committees—CAP and the Curriculum Committee.

CAP’s overarching concern in its study was to acknowledge—as one faculty member put it—that “the guiding principles that should be used to keep the workload equitably distributed among faculty [are] respect for everyone’s integrity, the expectation that one’s colleagues are making good and sensible choices about their commitments, and open communication.” CAP drew on two fundamental principles. First, in many ways the definition of what constitutes a course is strongly connected to our curricular structure, that is, the pedagogy particular to a given discipline. Choices need to be made strategically and be informed by the voice of the faculty through its committees. Strategic, institution-based planning of the curriculum (i.e., with an eye to the totality of the undergraduate curriculum) thus emerges as a critical need for the College. At present, one body—the Curriculum Committee—approves new courses and reviews programs (such as CSEms), while another body—CAP—is charged with advising the President and Provost on major academic resource allocation. Second, choices made must be made in a manner that is sustainable by the institution, by departments, and by individuals. The College needs to be alert to

10 The full report is available at http://www.brynmawr.edu/cap/course.doc.
making choices that could inadvertently and adversely affect our goal of building a strong undergraduate
college, and it must be certain that departmental curricular needs and plans match staffing levels in such
a way that programs and individuals can thrive over the long term.

CAP identified five strategic areas in which departmental practices varied significantly, practices which
require the investment of substantial resources by the College and/or are closely connected to our
institutional identity: very small courses, large courses, team teaching, laboratory teaching, and the
"senior experience." CAP’s recommendations in these areas are summarized in Appendix 5. Much of the
subsequent dialogue, which has taken place in the student newspapers, the student curriculum
committee and other student organizations, and at meetings of department and program chairs, has
focused on the recommendations related to the frequency of offering very small courses and to team-
teaching. Some have voiced concerns about content, fearing the faculty might be pressured to alter
courses in ways that are inappropriate either for the discipline or the College merely to boost enrollment;
that the implementation of CAP’s recommendations might prove to have other unacceptable curricular
outcomes; or that departmental autonomy or even academic freedom would be compromised. With
respect to small courses, CAP had found that departments have been devoting a significant fraction of
their faculty resources to very small courses in the undergraduate curriculum.11 Small courses are found
throughout the curriculum and, for the most part, are directly proportional to the total number of courses
offered by each division, with the exception of the social sciences division.12 These courses amounted to
the equivalent of seven full-time-equivalent faculty positions. Very small courses arise for many reasons,
some of which are not systemic but idiosyncratic (such as an unusually small major course, new courses
seeking to build a constituency, an interim faculty member’s offering). Some courses, we all agree, will
always attract a small number of students, but others might benefit from less frequent offering or some
revision in content or format. Even if the community were to agree unanimously that reducing the
number of small courses should be a priority in order to enable us to undertake other initiatives, we
recognize that it will require time, understanding, and careful departmental and interdepartmental
planning to reach an acceptable equilibrium among small, medium and large courses.

This past fall, departments and programs presented their staffing and curriculum plans for 2004-05 to the
Provost, demonstrating that—with few exceptions—they had begun to work within the CAP guidelines.
Some departments found the guidelines helpful in initiating a review of their curriculum and staffing
practices. One department, which committed a relatively vast amount of its total teaching resources to

11 Over the last five years (from AY 99 through AY03), the number of regular undergraduate courses (not including
senior research units, independent study courses, senior seminars, or senior conferences) enrolling fewer than five
students has been as follows in AY 99: 36, AY 00: 36; AY 01: 38, AY 02: 45; AY 03: 35. This means that 7-8% of regular
undergraduate courses enroll 1-4 students.

12 There the percentage of courses with fewer than five students is 2/3 that of the other divisions.
the “senior experience” and had—as a result—limited resources for intermediate level courses, is now
rethinking the senior year. Another department used the guidelines to help refashion its curriculum and
devises a new three-year plan. Some chairs began to use the guidelines to reconsider extraordinary team-
teaching efforts within their departments, thus enabling broader coverage of their fields, while others,
reaffirming the value of team-teaching, will continue to offer such courses, balanced against other
departmental needs. Some departments have used the guidelines to assign faculty to the senior exercise
or to assign teaching credit for large-enrollment courses, making possible more equitable distribution of
work. This spring, when a course had a very low enrollment, the chair asked the instructor to divide
another equivalent course with a mid-size enrollment into two sections and to cancel the course with a
very low enrollment. A low-enrollment entry-level course in another department prompted the chair to
revise the curriculum by offering the course annually instead of each semester, and to re-open
conversations with Haverford counterparts about closer coordination of their discipline’s curricula.

While the dialogue about “What Is a Course?” will and should continue, CAP expects that faculty and
students will, over time, recognize that balancing different curricular choices is critical to the College’s
ability to sustain and enhance existing programs and to fund new ones, and that choices made in one
department or program inevitably affect other departments and programs.

Recommendations:

- Monitor course size distribution and attend to student concerns about both large and small
course sizes, while maintaining an optimal number of courses.
- Develop a plan for creating programs and departments and for considering ways in which
existing offerings may be phased out or changed significantly.
- Pursue clarification of academic governance so that issues of responsibility, representation
and process are addressed.

1.9.2 Plan of Governance

For the past several years many individuals have been involved in producing a new plan of governance
for the College that will be mutually agreeable to the Board of Trustees, the faculty, and the
administration, and—at the same time—accurately reflect current or proposed institutional practices with
respect to the distribution of authority and responsibilities for different operations among these same
constituencies. Since September 2003, a task force representing the faculty, administration, and trustees
has met on the occasion of regular meetings of the Board of Trustees to refine and supplement a draft
document originally produced by a faculty committee charged with revising the existing Plan for the
It is anticipated that a draft of the new Plan of Governance of Bryn Mawr College will be ready for dissemination to all faculty and members of the administration by the end of the current academic year, or, at the latest, in September 2004. Following ample opportunities for discussion and deliberation of its contents in the fall semester, a final version of the plan should be approved by the end of the 2004-05 academic year.

The new Plan of Governance of Bryn Mawr College is envisioned to be a relatively brief document, especially in comparison to previous governance documents. Many practical details covered in these earlier documents, however, will need to be re-incorporated into a new set or sets of faculty (or academic) by-laws. It is the feeling of members of the present task force that this work of modification and reconciliation should be carried out by another representative faculty group. Consequently, we do not yet have a timetable for revising the By-Laws.

Because the old Plan for the Academic Government until lately (and in violation of one of its own provisions) had only received piecemeal attention for more than thirty years, the opportunity to set the academic, administrative, and executive structures visible in the College today against its provisions has been illuminating. Indeed, the long lapse of time has had rather a “Rip Van Winkle effect,” rousing the attention of the faculty. Now alert to the issue, faculty members have been having lively and fruitful discussion in the meetings of the task force. No less is expected for the future course of the draft document through the meetings of faculty and administration that will follow.

1.9.3 Bi- and Tri-College Cooperation

In 1977, Bryn Mawr and Haverford College entered their first formal agreement of cooperation, declaring:

The central objective of this plan is the strengthening of the academic programs offered at both colleges so as to provide greater diversity of intellectual pursuits while also maintaining the distinctiveness and enhancing the excellence of each college.

By now, cooperation characterizes far more than our academic programs. It is essential to our sense of ourselves. It is effective, close and compatible in some sectors; is felt as a constraint in others; and offers a greater breadth of opportunity for most. At each institution we may define ourselves in contradistinction to the other, but in the larger realm of private higher education, we—two gemlike institutions—are siblings. Our major differences are that Bryn Mawr admits only females at the undergraduate level and has graduate students. What makes us distinctive from Haverford College also makes us distinctive in higher education. Proximity, high standards for students and faculty alike, history, size, and relative selectivity within the universe of higher education bond and bind us. The presidents, provosts, deans,

---

13 The existing Plan and By-Laws are available on the Provost’s website, http://www.brynmawr.edu/provost/.
and chief financial officers of the two colleges meet regularly, and also, although somewhat less often, with their Swarthmore peers. Joint Board committees ensure consultation and understanding at the institutional level. We have bi- and often tri-college arrangements for staff development workshops, physical plant purchases, dining services planning and purchasing, telephone administration, inter-college transportation, our career development services, student clubs and activities, software contracts (course management systems, specialized software applications), and our Internet service contract. Many of our academic programs and some of our departments are bi-college in nature (see below). The two colleges share performance programs in theater, dance, orchestra and chorus. A tri-college library consortium and governing board oversees our three libraries, while the libraries themselves mediate the technologies that underpin research and scholarship. A series of foundation grants have assisted the libraries in implementing bi- and tri-college instructional technology initiatives, for language instruction and for library improvement. Since the 1999 Middle States review a new group, known as TIGR (Technologies Interest Group) has met regularly to discuss tri-college technology issues along the lines of the tri-college library consortium (see below).

Major foundation grants encourage the two colleges and Swarthmore to plan and work in concert to advance our programmatic richness and administrative efficiency. The Andrew F. Mellon Foundation has been especially engaged in augmenting tri-college cooperation, underwriting most recently several grants for faculty development, keyed to address cohorts of faculty at different stages of their careers, through workshops, retreats and collaborative projects, as noted above. In the fall of 2003, the three colleges began work on a major grant proposal to underwrite a tri-college traveling professorship program to bring the special expertise of some of the best of our 400-plus faculty regularly to counterpart campuses, rather then depending on the cross-registration of students to create consortial exchange. Cross-registration enables our students to extend the range of their studies beyond our departments and programs to those unique to Haverford (Music, Religion, Linguistics [dependent on Swarthmore], Astronomy, and Fine Arts); gives Haverford students access to programs unique to Bryn Mawr (Archaeology, Geology, Growth and Structure of Cities, Italian, Russian, and History of Art); and supports small shared programs which neither of us could maintain on our own (Africana Studies, Comparative Literature, East Asian Studies, Education, Feminist and Gender Studies, Neural and Behavioral Sciences, Peace and Conflict Studies). In some of these smaller programs (usually more recent additions to the undergraduate canon), the approval of a tenure slot at one institution greatly enhances the bi-college program. For example, the new Comparative Literature position at Bryn Mawr is expected to give the bi-college program its first full-time “dedicated” faculty member and leader, augmenting what has been a program run by a committed steering committee. Better cooperation yields results for a program: because of newly attained harmony, the East Asian Studies program, a current poster-child of bi-college academic cooperation, is seeking bi-college departmental status and to enter a more vigorous
complementary and intensive relationship with Swarthmore’s Asian Studies efforts. There are sad tales, too, when bi-college programs falter and faculty are at odds; or more correctly, when faculty members are at odds, then bi-college programs falter. Some might say this happens because our institutional cultures differ; others say the effort to cooperate is worth it because of the dividends it yields for faculty and students, alike.

Bi-weekly meetings of the provosts (joined, since fall 2002, by the two associate provosts) assure excellent communication and understanding of one another’s concerns, help them address common problems, and are fundamental to advancing institutional cooperation. Together, provosts plan the departments and programs for which an outside review is timely; determine which departments and programs would benefit from the attention of the presidents and the Two-College Committee on Academic Cooperation; apprise one another of the agendas of parallel, major standing committees (e.g., Bryn Mawr’s CAP and Haverford’s Education Policy Committee); plan presentations to trustees; and seek ways to enhance the welfare of departments and faculty members. Trust between the chief academic officers is essential in helping them work effectively with one another and with their own faculty in shaping the colleges’ futures.

Recommendation:

- Constantly re-infuse bi-college collaboration into College policies, practices, etc.
In 2000, an *ad hoc* faculty committee reviewed the College’s Arts and Sciences graduate programs, proposing that one general criterion might be used for evaluating graduate programs at Bryn Mawr: Does the program make us a better research-oriented liberal arts college for women than we would be without it? Subsequently, the Plan called for testing the viability of the science graduate programs, which were under-funded and recruiting relatively few students, by raising their financial aid allocation to a more competitive level. An evaluation of these programs’ success would lead to a decision on their long-term viability in the future. The science departments conducted self-studies and set specific objectives for the near future. In 2003, the Dean of the GSAS made an interim assessment of the science programs’ progress toward their goals and the likelihood of their continued viability. She found that some departments were on track to meet their objectives with regard to recruitment of students, while others were not. The Biology and Geology departments had suspended admission to their Ph.D. programs altogether. The Dean concluded that the remaining programs would not be able to demonstrate viability without some modification of the existing structures of admission and financial aid, which threatened to starve programs that are currently academically robust and have promise of long-term viability.

Strategies suggested in the Dean’s report to enable the Chemistry, Math, and Physics graduate programs to flourish, either as they presently exist or in other forms, include the following: the reallocation of resources previously assigned to Biology and Geology to the remaining science programs in order to increase stipends for teaching assistants and to provide for some College-funded research assistantships; highlighting interdepartmental collaboration and research to make small stand-alone programs more robust; and the introduction of increased flexibility into the financial aid process through the creation of a single science pool in place of departmental allotments. Some progress towards implementing these strategies has been made with the commitment to support two new research assistantships in 2004-2005 and the enhancement of financial aid packages by means of increased summer support and a higher subsidy for health insurance. Discussions concerning a possible Graduate Group in the Sciences, modeled on the Graduate Group recently formed by three humanities programs, were not successful but were superseded by an exciting pre-proposal to an NSF program (Integrative Graduate Education and Research Traineeship, [IGERT]) to support interdepartmental graduate training in Computational Science and Modeling. If funded, this initiative would involve faculty members in Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics, and Physics.

The Graduate Group in Archaeology, Classics and History of Art, established in 2001, encompasses students and faculty in three departments that share space and resources in the Rhys Carpenter Library and collaborate in many scholarly, professional, and social activities. The Group’s most important
Curricular innovation is the interdepartmental seminars, or “GSems”, which are co-taught by faculty in at least two and often three departments. GSems offer students and faculty the opportunity to compare disciplinary approaches to shared critical discourses (e.g., gender theory) and to explore overlaps and threads in realms of knowledge (e.g., the "classical tradition"). The biennial Graduate Student Symposium is a model for the successful integration of scholarship in the areas represented by the Graduate Group. This ambitious symposium attracts graduate student contributors from all over the United States and abroad, and is organized entirely by students. Recognizing the vitality of these graduate programs and the need to insure their continued support, the College has submitted to the NEH a proposal for a Challenge Grant in the amount of $441,600 (to be matched 4:1) to fund the staffing of GSems, fellowships, internships, and visiting scholars.

Taking seriously the mandate of the 2000 ad hoc committee to ascertain that our graduate programs "make us a better research-oriented liberal arts college for women than we would be without it," the GSAS has been especially attentive to the degree to which individual programs benefit the undergraduate majors in the same department, and has seized opportunities to improve the visibility of the GSAS to undergraduates and the degree of interaction among graduate students and undergraduates, especially in the humanities where this interaction occurs less naturally than in the laboratory sciences. The Mathematics Department, praised by external reviewers in 2003 for the "excellent synergy between the graduate and undergraduate programs," has been held up as a model for other graduate programs. Math’s external reviewers noted that the graduate program allows the strongest undergraduates to be challenged in graduate seminars, and that the graduate students serve as role models for undergraduates who aspire to graduate school. The combined A.B./M.A. program, which allows exceptionally well prepared undergraduates to earn two degrees in four or five years, was made more visible and accessible through a prominent link on the College's new website and clarification of the application requirements by the Undergraduate Dean’s Office. In fall 2003, and for the first time, graduate courses appeared in the online course guide. These strategies resulted in increased undergraduate participation in graduate programs, including the first-ever admission of a Swarthmore College student to the A.B./M.A. program (in Math). Another welcome innovation was the decision to invite a graduate student to mentor the undergraduate Hanna Holborn Gray Scholars, who will be pursuing research projects in the humanities during the summer.

**Recommendations**

- Clarify the process by which the "viability" of the science programs will be assessed, including who will make the assessment and on what criteria.
- Foster reconfiguration of science graduate training on the lines of the NSF (IGERT) proposal.
• Support continuing success of the Graduate Group in Archaeology, Classics, and History of Art.
• Make GSAS a higher priority in the next website redesign, since recruiting depends on website effectiveness.
3. THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND SOCIAL RESEARCH

Against the backdrop of the College’s Plan, GSSWSR undertook its own strategic planning initiative, designed to secure its financial and programmatic future. The 1990s had posed significant challenges to GSSWSR. High enrollment in the early 1990s gave way to enrollment declines that mirrored national trends among graduate social work programs. Graduate donor participation rates fluctuated after reaching a high of 27% in 1991, steadily declining over the decade, and reaching a low of 14% by 2000. The withdrawal of federal funding from social welfare also affected public money available for research grants, making the chase for such funding increasingly competitive.

Strategic changes promise GSSWSR relatively brighter prospects. In 2000, the Trustees urged the implementation of a five-year plan to restore financial equilibrium. A summary of the goals of the plan is included in Appendix 6. Now, in the third year of this plan, several positive trends are evident. Applications and admissions have rebounded. The entering cohort in 2002 was our highest in the past six years, and the 2003 entering class ties another cohort as the second highest in the past five years. Academic qualifications remain high. Additional recruiting staff has produced dramatic increases in admission inquiries. The fundraising efforts, spurred by the appointment of the School’s first Director of Development, have culminated in two record-setting levels of donations and two challenge-gift campaigns designed to increase the number of new donors. Plans to expand our alumnae/i network have yielded the creation of several regional alumnae/i groups that we anticipate will not only enable graduates to re-connect to the School but also assist with student recruitment efforts. The implications for improved alumnae/i giving are also apparent.

The School’s Board of Advisors is a valuable resource. Now in its second year and chaired by a member of the Board of Trustees, the advisors counsel the President and the Co-Deans regarding long-range planning. Comprised of both alumnae/i and non-alumnae/i friends of the School, the Board has initiated reviews of marketing and non-tuition revenue-generating strategies. Curricular innovations promise to yield admission benefits and improved perception of our programs within the region. The new Center for Child and Family Well-being will build direct service, policy, and research linkages, as well as provide a forum for interdisciplinary faculty research and interdepartmental programming. The associated specialization in Child and Family Well-being has attracted its first cohort of students, and we anticipate further increased student interest. The specialization has also been an effective student recruitment tool, as prospective students appreciate the post-graduate benefits of an in-depth exploration of issues affecting children and families. Additional curricular re-organization, including our revamped concentration in Policy, Practice and Advocacy, has generated strong student support and equally solid appeal among our alumnae/i.
GSSWSR enjoys heightened visibility within the region—an outcome with clear recruitment and program implications. The Scott Lecture series, sponsored by the Center for Child and Family Well-being, has attracted alumnae/i and other members of the professional community. That Center has launched an annual conference, which also attracts a broad audience and raises the GSSWSR’s regional and national profile. Outreach efforts to non-profit agencies in the city of Philadelphia, including a workshop on media relations, have been very well received. The GSSWSR and the College’s Community Service Office and PRAXIS Program (see above) have forged strong relationships with agencies in the nearby borough of Norristown. The resulting partnership will create additional field placement, volunteer, and service-learning opportunities for graduate and undergraduate students.

Recommendations:

• Maintain improvements in admissions acceptance rate and meet goals under five-year plan.
• Continue curriculum innovation and increase the pool of child and family specialization students.
• Continue expansion of the donor base and of alumnae/i development activities.
• Continue efforts to heighten visibility, especially through the annual Child and Family Well-being Conference, the Scott Lecture series, and participation in the College's Community Partnership in Action initiative.
4. TECHNOLOGY AND LIBRARIES

The Plan for a New Century strongly emphasizes the need for students and faculty to use, manage, and create new technologies. Building on our traditional strengths in the sciences and with the goal of increasing the representation of women in high-tech fields, two broad objectives were established from the Plan: enabling all our graduates to flourish in an increasingly technological world, and facilitating the use of technology in the laboratory and classroom by the faculty. The first objective, discussed above, is represented by the significant expansion of the program in Computer Science. The second objective has been to invest in a technologically sophisticated learning environment. To this end, we have reconfigured the infrastructure and staffing related to information technologies and the libraries, tightly integrated the two functions, and moved planning and management for different areas closer to the users. We have also significantly invested in renovating spaces for teaching and learning and using information technologies on campus.

4.1 Information Services

The period since 1998-99 has seen a significant shift in how the College manages and plans for information technology. The top two positions in the libraries and in computing services have been merged into a single position of Chief Information Officer, now held by the former Director of Libraries. Both the information technology and library organizations have been reorganized into Information Services in order better to integrate their functions, and to support a distributed model for information technology, which in some ways parallels our distributed library system. Information Services has, in its two years of existence, developed a campus-wide online calendar and taken the lead in redesigning the College’s website. Four “nodes” have been created, for the sciences, social sciences, humanities, and administration. The three academic nodes bring together librarians, computer support specialists and instructional technologists knowledgeable about the node areas, able to respond to local issues, and available to assist in local planning for technology and information. Each node has representatives from the departments it serves. We will describe one of the nodes as an example of the concept.

4.2 Distributed Information: The Nodes

The Science node, the first to be introduced, includes a director, a UNIX/LINUX support position and a desktop resources staff position. The resources of two librarians, posted to Collier Library, are available to the node. Centralized support is provided for networking and some user services. The node does not have a dedicated budget, but applies to the general information services pool for financial support for its initiatives. Current projects in the node include the construction of a Beowulf cluster initiated by Computer Science and Physics faculty, the Survey Response Clickers (for interactive teaching and electronic voting), and a cluster of workstations to support computational chemistry, physics, and
mathematics research. The new node structure was assessed in spring 2003, via a survey, which showed excellent support for the model in the user-community, but which also underscored the need to devote additional resources to solutions of complex problems for a small minority of users.

4.3 The Collections
The tri-college libraries have a “collections grant” from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation designed to help the three colleges’ libraries work together to control costs while maintaining the quality of the collections. One of the most pressing problems for all three libraries is the shortage of space for more books. Swarthmore and Haverford are nearly at capacity. At Bryn Mawr, we expect to cope for another five to ten years without undertaking any of the major renovations that were planned a few years ago. Providing new space is a very expensive way of addressing the problem of shelf space for books, and at this point, adding to their libraries’ square footage is not at the top of any of the colleges’ lists of priorities. Rather, the libraries propose to reduce the number of volumes we are storing. A collection study, undertaken last year, showed that the tri-college libraries contain a large number of books which rarely circulate and that many of these little-used books are held by more than one library. Planning is under way to prune the collections, cooperatively. Through this initiative, we expect to gain several years’ worth of growth space to add to our collections, while increasing the number of distinct titles available to students and faculty in the tri-college community. The libraries are currently using Anthropology in a pilot project of book-culling and are encouraging faculty to take an active role in making decisions about which books are kept and where they should be located. After this spring, the libraries expect to increase the pace of the project, so that review of most of the major areas will be completed within the next two years.

4.4 “Smart” Spaces
The College has more than 30 “smart” classrooms and teaching laboratories, each of which has video-data projection equipment, network connections, and a host of other multi-media equipment and peripherals in various configurations. These rooms are used for courses and course-related laboratories. Smart classrooms are located throughout the campus and serve all disciplines. With few exceptions, all classrooms are networked. Classroom equipment and software are reviewed annually and replaced on schedule (or, if needed, earlier) to assure good functioning. The nodes and the audio-visual staff support the classrooms, offering training for faculty members and problem-solving when difficulties occur.

Recommendations:

- Review Information Services periodically in the interest of providing the best support to faculty, students, and staff.
• Perform an external review of the College Collections to assure both stewardship and affordability of these historic resources.
• Continue tri-college cooperation in collections and technology ventures, including tri-college grant applications.
• Increase the quality and number of technology-enabled classrooms.
B. STUDENT RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

Building on analyses in our Self-Study and the Plan, we have addressed the necessity to expand the pool of applicants because it is “the continuing quality of our students—their ability, diversity, intellectual curiosity, and character—that defines the culture of learning and the tradition of achievement which distinguish Bryn Mawr.” In the Plan, we noted the factors which, we believed, would contribute positively to our recruitment and retention goals. We must:

- find new ways to speak proudly and persuasively to potential students, and to enhance the visibility of Bryn Mawr in the public eye;
- increase support for financial aid at the undergraduate and graduate levels if we are to continue to enroll diverse and genuinely talented classes in the twenty-first century;
- continue to focus on innovation within the curriculum of the first two years;
- extend possibilities for service learning, internships, and undergraduate research;
- and sustain and enhance the quality of student life at the College well beyond the academic core.

We identified three aspects of student life which would require continued or increased attention:

- making campus diversity work;
- expanding opportunities in athletics; and
- enhancing social and cultural life.

In this section we review our progress in meeting our recruitment and retention goals by attending to the factors noted above. Drafted by members of a sub-committee of the CIP, this part of the report describes that progress in interwoven quantitative and qualitative sections.

1. Optimal Enrollment

Recruitment and retention are often addressed as discrete topics and their challenges assigned to separate offices. However, we know that this is an erroneous divide and, since 1993, have been taking an increasingly comprehensive enrollment management approach when establishing goals or evaluating progress toward meeting enrollment goals. In 2002-03, the President created the Enrollment Management Advisory Group composed of senior-level administrators, two faculty members, and an undergraduate student to guide enrollment efforts and make recommendations for improvement. The formation of this new advisory group was, in part, in response to changes in staffing in Admissions and

14 From the Plan for the New Century.
Financial Aid. A new Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid began in 2002-03, as did a new Director of Financial Aid. They, with the Director of Institutional Research, who joined the College in 2000-01, have been taking a closer look at the quantitative measures and qualitative assessment of goals related to recruitment and retention. The three major issues that the advisory group addressed in its first year were admissions “messaging,” enrollment projections, and financial aid.

We begin with the four enrollment goals which we identified as a result of our Self-Study and in the Plan (see Appendices 1 and 2).

1.1 2000 Goal #1: Increase applicant pool by 25%

In the Plan, we proposed an increase in the size of the undergraduate applicant pool from nearly 1,600 applicants to 2,000 by 2006-07. Preliminary figures for the applicant pool of the class entering in fall 2004 show a steep climb to 1,925 applications. This constitutes an overall increase in the applicant pool of nearly 25% in the five-year period, 1998-99 through 2003-04:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class entering</th>
<th>Fall 1998</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>1,599</td>
<td>1,595</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1,522</td>
<td>1,743</td>
<td>1,748</td>
<td>1,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>943</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollments</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admit %</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yield %</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median SAT</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1320</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admissions Statistics

Not apparent in overall admissions statistics, but significant, is a growing racial/ethnic diversity. The applicant pool for the class entering fall 2004 includes the highest proportion of Black and Hispanic applicants in the last 10 years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class entering</th>
<th>Fall 1998</th>
<th>Fall 1999</th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black Applicants</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic Applicants</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application Counts of Underrepresented Minorities by Race/Ethnicity

---

Fall 2004 data as of May 27, 2004
While pleased with the accomplishments reflected in these admissions figures, we recognize that the continued growth of the applicant pool depends on the success of progressive admissions marketing initiatives, as called for in the Plan. This would position the College positively in relation to competitors, while presenting a consistent and accurate image to the public. The Admissions Messaging Task Force, a sub-committee of the Enrollment Management Advisory Group, was constituted to formulate fresh, compelling, and authentic ways to speak about Bryn Mawr’s distinctive education to prospective students. The task force—whose membership included the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, the Director of Admissions Outreach, the Director of Public Affairs, the Executive Director of Alumnae Association, the Dean of the Undergraduate College, a student representative, and a faculty representative—collaborated with an educational consulting firm and used marketing and enrollment research to distill the College's distinctive qualities, mission, and culture into key messages to share with prospective students and families.

From earlier marketing research we knew that the perception of Bryn Mawr by high school girls was wide-ranging and sometimes inaccurate. Moreover, senior exit interview results were uncovering some disparities between the students' perception of the image the College presented during the admissions process and what they experienced after enrolling. Thus, in order for our new messages to be persuasive, we knew they must be authentic; they would have to resonate across our constituencies and be articulated College-wide. The contemporary Bryn Mawr undergraduate is now depicted as embodying (1) an intense intellectual commitment, (2) a self-directed and purposeful vision of her life, and (3) a desire to make a meaningful contribution to the world. During the message development process, members of the faculty, staff, student, and alumnae bodies were consulted. Groups of high school students (including subgroups of (a) those we knew were interested in the College and (b) those who had not yet expressed interest in the College) were selected in three regions—New York City, the Chicago suburbs, and the San Francisco/Bay Area—to view and respond to our test messages. Data gathered from these sessions enabled us to select the messages and styles that were both authentically “Bryn Mawr” and appealing to high school women.

Because of the clarity with which we articulate our unique mission, the new messages enable us to appeal to potential applicants who are more likely to be genuinely interested in the College. The manner in which the new messages convey our strengths and character to applicants serves to maximize the “fit” between those admitted who choose to enroll and the College itself. In turn, within the next few years, the yield of qualified candidates and their feedback will form the basis for our evaluation of the effectiveness of these new messages, which are displayed in redesigned recruitment materials, including the paper-based “viewbook” and the College’s website.
As we know, the pool of college-bound women who apply to women’s colleges is small and self-selected. The flexibility afforded by having increased our applicant pool by 25% enables us to be more selective in the students we admit, choosing students whom we expect to succeed academically and flourish in the campus community. Although we have met our goal of increasing our applicant pool, we recognize that it is a continual challenge to maintain these numbers, for the “worlds” of admissions and financial aid change all the time.

Recommendations:

• Incorporate undergraduate recruitment messages, as appropriate, College-wide.
• Weave existing recruitment messages throughout the website.
• Incorporate what we learn in the recruitment process into how we communicate and plan aspects of student life.

1.2 2000 Goal #2: Reduce the College’s discount rate to 34%

Two competing factors shape the College’s financial aid budget. On the one hand, we have a commitment to meeting the full demonstrated need of admitted students. On the other hand, we are keenly aware that our discount rate—the percentage of grant aid spent relative to tuition revenue received—has risen an average of one percent per year for the past 10 years. The discount rate peaked in 2003-04 at 43%. Our discount rate is high compared to those of other highly selective private colleges and universities, the COFHE group of institutions with which we compare ourselves. External factors influencing discount rates across institutions include the current state of the national economy, shifts in federal financial aid funding, varying financial aid strategies across institutions, and the socioeconomic diversity within applicant pools. The most salient internal factors for Bryn Mawr include our policy of meeting 100% of demonstrated need; our annual increases in tuition; our commitments to racial, ethnic, socioeconomic and international diversity; and our sense that a comparatively high proportion of our students will continue to demonstrate substantial financial need. Given these external and internal constraints, some of which are unpredictable and uncontrollable, the College has modified its goal from reducing to slowing increases in our discount rate. While the College continues to try to expand its applicant pool to address financial issues, it will also need to begin examining the true costs of its institutional priorities and values as they relate to financial aid. Instead of establishing a new discount rate threshold, the more useful gauge of the impact of financial aid expenditures on institutional budgeting and planning is net tuition revenue (tuition less college grant aid). Thus, the new measure for understanding our progress towards our enrollment and financial aid goals is our ability consistently to
meet our budgeted net tuition revenue targets. The College has moved to reporting net tuition revenue, rather than tuition revenue, in all its budget projection reports and public documents.

**Recommendation:**
- Slow the rate of annual increases in the overall discount rate.

1.3 **2000 Goal #3: Increase the six-year graduation rate to 85%**

In 1998-99, the College commissioned a study of undergraduate attrition, which focused on interviews with students who had withdrawn from Bryn Mawr and with deans at peer colleges, for insights into persistence behavior and retention initiatives. The analysis of student responses pointed to key reasons for choosing not to complete the degree at Bryn Mawr, including a perceived lack of social life, a sense of political correctness, and an intense academic profile that seemed not to value educating “the whole person.”

Over the past five years, Bryn Mawr’s six-year graduation rate has steadily risen from 78% to 85%:

![Six-Year Graduation Rates by Entering Fall Year](image)

The class entering in fall 1997 was the first to achieve the College’s goal of 85% in recent history. Importantly, gains in retention rates are dispersed across racial/ethnic backgrounds:
Class Entering Fall 1997: Six-Year Graduation Rates by Race/Ethnic Group

Historically, we have found that the graduation rates of Blacks and Hispanics reveal great variance, but this is largely due to the small number of each group represented in a cohort. For example, since the Class of 2001 entered, Black or Hispanic students have each comprised only 2-6% of each class. In the class entering in 1997, in particular, only 10 Black and 10 Hispanic students enrolled at the College. This low cohort size affects not only statistical variance but reflects a lack of critical social mass, both of which make it difficult to discern the meaning of the nominal graduation rates.

While the class entering in 1997 met the goal set forth by the Plan, the six-year graduation rate for the class entering in 1998 is 83%, indicating that we cannot rest laurels of the prior year. We continue to track and evaluate in order to understand the context for each student departure and then to devise remedies to improve student life and to avert future departures. At present, the Registrar records the reasons students cite to their deans as their central motivation for voluntarily withdrawing or taking a leave of absence from the College. The three most commonly recorded general categories are personal, medical (physical or psychological), and transfer to another institution, out of a larger menu of reasons tracked in our database that includes financial, medical, psychological, personal, family, programmatic, social, transfer, and work.

Beginning in spring 2001, all surveys given to students contained a series of questions related to retention. According to standard higher education literature,\textsuperscript{16} rates of student-reported intent to withdraw are the most accurate reflection of actual persistence behavior. On average, roughly 20% of our students claim to have felt a serious desire to withdraw, which is reflected in our actual graduation rates in the 80%-85% range.

As can be readily seen, half of our students consider leaving Bryn Mawr at least somewhat seriously some time in their careers here. Surveys since spring 2002 have included a set of follow-up items, in which students are asked to rate the level to which each listed reason contributed to their desire to leave and to report the steps taken toward withdrawal. This provides a means of distinguishing the more typical frustrations with college life from those that may spur serious withdrawal actions. We find that a sense of not belonging, a concern about the non-academic social aspects of college life, and a change in academic interests are the major factors which lead a student to consider leaving or withdrawing from the College. Such factors as family obligations, financial difficulties, personal medical reasons, and feeling overwhelmed are far less significant. Students who contemplated leaving the College were asked to report which steps, if any, they had taken toward withdrawal. Those who most seriously contemplated departure shared their worries with family (94%), faculty (55%), and deans (43%). Taking concrete steps, 72% solicited materials from other colleges or universities, and 30% applied to another institution. These findings confirmed much of what we learned in the consultant’s study of undergraduate attrition in 1998-99, but they expand what we know about actual steps students take and reasons why students withdraw from the College. Now we are midway in the development of a statistical model which incorporates those characteristics which are predictive of or related to student departure. Our purpose is to refine our understanding of those characteristics or experiences that relate to departure or retention and to identify students (or groups thereof) who may be more likely to withdraw. This information would be the foundation for intervention. Once this model is linked to the model used for admissions yield affinity, we would have a systematic way (1) to link retention issues back to recruitment practices so that we can continually improve the fit between admitted students and the College, and (2) to continue our efforts to improve campus life in ways that may eliminate or reduce negatively-related experiences.

Recommendations:

- Use data gathered by the Office of Institutional Research to inform positive changes in planning student life programming and services.
- Define key points of student dissatisfaction to monitor and address over time.
1.4 2000 Goal #4: Attain a student body of 1,260

An undergraduate enrollment goal of 1,260 was established in 2000, when enrollment was increasing and approaching this level (see the table, below). We had expected that growth to continue into 2001-02, not crest in 2000-01, towards the point at which we would achieve “full enrollment,” which would then afford the College greater financial flexibility. Subsequently an apparent further drop in opening enrollment in fall 2002 prompted serious concerns about the factors we had been using to estimate undergraduate enrollment. To forecast enrollment, which is key to the College’s budgetary planning, we questioned the impact of using a variety of enrollment measures (e.g., fiscal versus headcount enrollment), captured at different points in time (e.g., enrollment during the first week versus five weeks into a semester).
### Standardized Undergraduate Enrollment Figures: Headcounts and Fiscal FTE's\(^{17}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Opening Headcount</th>
<th>Opening Fiscal FTE (rounded)</th>
<th>Average Fiscal FTE (rounded)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1239</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1242</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1283</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>1196</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1260</td>
<td>1225</td>
<td>Projected:1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-Year Average</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The President’s cabinet\(^{18}\) realized the necessity of tracking and projecting enrollment figures in a standardized manner to predict most accurately the average FTE enrollment figures, and asked the Enrollment Management Advisory Group to form an Enrollment Projections Task Force, comprised of the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, Director of Admissions Planning and Operations, Treasurer, Registrar, Director of Institutional Research, and an Associate Dean of the Undergraduate College, to work together to develop a more precise model for predicting total undergraduate enrollment that would be timely enough for planning purposes.

A first step has been to standardize a set of dates on which enrollment figures are finalized for each year and used for enrollment projections for successive years, as demonstrated in the table above. These census or ‘freeze’ dates are synchronized with factors which affect rises and falls in student numbers, that is, course add/drop periods and billing and refund dates for tuition and fees. The standardized enrollment figures are used to establish trends and allow curve-fitting for determining patterns. We believe this approach has the benefit of incorporating the combined impact of any influential variable. It has allowed us to uncover clear patterns in our enrollments that we can now use to narrow the “error gap” between forecast and actual enrollment figures to about 1-2%, which indicates a high degree of reliability for our forecasting model. Statistical models are a starting point, the value of which will be realized with regular use. The efficacy of such models depends on having more “history” and a refined sense of variables. These in turn will foster increasing complexity and accuracy.

The models and processes now in place to understand and project enrollment require us to redefine our goal of “full enrollment.” We know that the foundation we have built to sort out enrollment figures

---

\(^{17}\) Opening headcount and opening fiscal FTE are as of September 15; the average fiscal FTE is based on the counts of December 15 and May 15.

\(^{18}\) See Appendix 4.
requires further probing into the qualitative effects of enrollment size on residential life and on academic planning. We are revising the language of our original goal of “increasing enrollment” to reflect a more inclusive goal. Our new goal is that we must now link headcount and FTE enrollment figures, net tuition revenue, and our goals for the quality of student life and improve all three simultaneously. For example, while we are aiming to increase our overall undergraduate enrollment marginally, we are also working to lower our discount rate. Once our goals are synchronized, the change in net tuition revenue will provide us with a useful metric to understand our overall success in enrollment management.

Recommendations:

- Use a common set of enrollment figures, with standardized dates and formats, in College planning and policy-making.
- Restate the enrollment goal as balancing average FTE enrollment, quality of student life, and net tuition revenue.

2. Quality of Student Life

The Plan identified those areas of student life to which we needed to devote attention, including the enrichment of student body diversity, improvement of cultural and social life, strengthening of the athletics program, and developing better connections between academic life, the wider community, and the working world.

2.1 Enrich the Diversity of the Student Body

Before discussing initiatives which support the healthy diversity of the community, we note that there have been many changes in the leadership of the Office for Institutional Diversity over the last few years, prompted by the departures of a Director and then an Acting Director, followed by the death of a subsequent Acting Director. These individuals served as the College's EEOC officer and the diversity advocate for all constituencies. At present, having taken the opportunity to review the scope and structure of the Office, we are seeking to fill a newly-defined position of Director of Intercultural Affairs. This individual will be primarily responsible for working with students, will report to the Dean of the Undergraduate College, and will be responsible for developing programs and activities that promote diversity and dialogue on campus. The Director will manage the Multicultural Center, develop and coordinate orientation programs, organize some cultural events, guide student cultural groups, and provide informal advising to all students interested in diversity issues. She/he will supervise a program assistant and student interns and is expected to work closely with the Admissions Office’s Director of
Multicultural Recruitment. As part of a diversity leadership group that will include liaisons for the staff and the faculty, the Director will also provide strategic advice directly to the President. This group will seek to make the campus community inclusive and supportive of all students, faculty, and staff.

2.1.1 Socioeconomic Diversity: The Posse Program

In 2001, Bryn Mawr decided to join the Posse Foundation Program, to recruit students with excellent leadership ability and academic potential who attend socioeconomically disadvantaged high schools in areas where they might otherwise be overlooked in the college admissions process. We work with Posse Boston and find that many wonderful students who would never have considered Bryn Mawr, nor been on our screen for recruitment, are enrolled and thriving. Their retention rate and predicted graduation rate is comparable to other students. Our decision to sign a five-year contract with Posse was based on the desires to enlarge our definition of diversity to address socioeconomic status more directly and to expand our understanding of success paths at Bryn Mawr and similar highly selective institutions. Initially, we worried about having sufficient supports in place for students who had high potential and motivation but may still be at-risk academically. The Posse Foundation was unique in offering an effective pre-structured support system. Posse Scholars come to campus as an already bonded support group with significant leadership and study skills training. Their regular group and individual meetings with a faculty or staff mentor ensure that problems are identified quickly.

We currently have 32 Posse Scholars in three classes. They are serving the Bryn Mawr community in a variety of leadership roles, including a class president, SGA secretary, co-head of the freshman orientation program, and president of a student cultural group. The Scholars organize an annual “Posse Plus” retreat that brings together faculty, staff, and students to discuss common concerns on the Bryn Mawr campus. Over 100 members of the Bryn Mawr community attended a retreat focused on “Using Your Voice” this year.

2.1.2 Cultural Pluralism: The Multicultural Center

When the Middle States Association Evaluation Team visited the College in spring 1999, women of color reported that the lack of student space and the absence of a multicultural center served as sources of stress in the community. Four years later, we opened a new multicultural center, the first of five houses comprising a student village, called Cambrian Row (see below). A Multicultural Advisory Board was established to advise the Director of Institutional Diversity about programming and use of the space. Because of its location at the western edge of the campus, the center concept did face some initial resistance among students. Initially, usage was low; now most of the cultural groups hold weekly

---

19 See http://www.possefoundation.org/index.cfm
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meetings there, and the space has become a place of productivity, brainstorming, studying, discussion, debate, and play.

However, space and programs alone do not foster the necessary accompanying discussions regarding diversity. Bryn Mawr's commitment to building a diverse, multicultural community is crucial to the College's educational mission. Differences between people can be a source of educational enrichment, satisfaction, and pride. But, depending on the person and the community, differences can also be the grounds for misunderstanding, discomfort, pain, or oppression. For this and other reasons, people are often reluctant to risk acknowledging and talking openly about differences, hence the following.

2.1.3 Sustained Dialogue —a Dialogue Dedicated to Discussing Difference
The College’s commitment to diversity will only be satisfied when community members are able to talk freely about differences and similarities. "Making Sense of Diversity: A Conversation at Bryn Mawr College" is an initiative aimed at moving us closer to this goal. First developed at Princeton, the Sustained Dialogue program trains students to be discussion facilitators. Once trained, the students lead groups of students, faculty, and staff, who have made a commitment to meet weekly for a semester or longer, to discuss issues of difference and to develop action plans for making the community more inclusive. Students find this program attractive because it allows time for the development of trust and the discussion of complicated issues over time, in a small, committed group. A central website supports the initiative, providing a range of resources, online discussion groups, and a calendar of relevant meetings and speakers. Thus all who visit are linked to the ongoing conversations and interactions regarding diversity at Bryn Mawr.20

Recommendations:

- Work towards a greater consensus about what diversity means at Bryn Mawr and how we choose to address its different components on campus and in policy-making.
- Increase the critical mass of students of color and the diversity of the students’ economic backgrounds.

2.2 Student Cultural and Social Life

2.2.1 Spaces for Cultural and Social Life

As noted above, limited social space was a concern of students five years ago. We are making progress in addressing that concern with the opening of the Cambrian Row houses. These former faculty residences, located on Roberts Road and fully renovated, are now the homes for the Multicultural Center, Community Service, Religious Life, the Student Self Government Association, and Student Activities. The renovation project was funded by a trustee (and spouse), who recognized the importance of having dedicated space for student activities. The College has also provided dedicated space for commuting students in Radnor, near the Campus Center, with lockers, a small kitchen, and comfortable seating. The Campus Center itself will soon experience some changes. Students visit this centrally-situated building daily to check their mail but find it a formal, non-welcoming space. The café is poorly designed; quick service is difficult; and the seating is often crowded. Students report that they cannot comfortably meet a friend or professor for a chat over coffee, study, or gather to watch television. One of the architects at the firm, Venturi, Scott-Brown and Associates, who has had many conversations with students and staff, has presented plans to redesign the space and replace its furnishings, to provide an attractive alternative for getting together, when neither a residence hall nor one of the libraries seems appropriate.

Whereas the College has invested $33 million over the past ten years in the renovation of residence halls in order to improve students’ residential life, we realize that a building-by-building approach often overlooks certain special needs. Student interests form and reform over the years, sometimes coalescing into clubs or teams, sometimes expressed individually. In response to student concerns about their lack of input into campus planning, some older planning entities (such as the Committee for Academic Space Planning and the Council on Facilities Priorities Planning) have been phased out and replaced by a Committee on the Utilization, Planning and Prioritization of Space (CUPPS), which is charged with surveying space on campus and allocating it responsibly and responsively.

2.2.2 Student-Initiated Changes for Improved Cultural/Social Life

Through the Student Self-Government Association (SGA), Bryn Mawr undergraduates have continued to play a vital role over the past five years in creating and maintaining a social atmosphere by making several changes that have had a positive impact on the student body. The Student Finance Committee, under the guidance of the SGA Treasurer, allocates more than $274,000 annually to over 85 clubs and organizations, significantly more than what was reported in our 1998 Self-Study. These organizations and clubs represent a cross section of Bryn Mawr College’s diverse student body and include active Republican and Democratic groups, pro-life and pro-choice groups, and the Unpopular Opinions group, which is dedicated to ensuring that every voice is heard on campus on social and political issues. The groups, while seemingly polar opposites, cosponsor several events each year in order to raise awareness about issues that concern them. Several of the more conservative clubs have been very active in recent years, causing controversy at times, but also bringing about an increase in conversations about difference.
Increased diversity in student clubs and organizations has demonstrated the necessity for trained mediators and a willingness to discuss issues of difference in a safe and supportive environment. In addition to sponsoring clubs and organizations, SGA has also played an active role in creating more accessible space for students and promoting larger social and entertainment events on campus. For example, SGA was instrumental in working with administrators to extend the hours of the Canaday Library café, so that students may meet or study late at night. Run by students during limited hours, the café also serves as a venue for a cappella concerts, small bands, poetry slams and movie nights. SGA has also used its funding to bring bands to campus and make possible other student-selected and -managed special events.

In 1999-2000, SGA worked closely with the administration to revise the campus’ party policy to encourage and facilitate party planning for students. While students were initially pleased with the results of the revisions, the policy has once again become the focus of discussions and is undergoing additional revisions this spring by a committee composed of students, staff, and administrators. Students have worked closely with the Director of Student Activities and the Dean’s Office to acquire bus and van transportation to attend arts events in Philadelphia, shop at King of Prussia mall, and explore Philadelphia and the region. Some of these initiatives are bi-college, which we hope will nourish the less than robust social exchange between Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges. All contribute to having a college life which is broader than the campus, its dorms, libraries, labs, and clubs. In addition, SGA, in collaboration with Haverford’s Student Council, has approved spending over $1,000 for a Bi-College Bus Initiative which would offer late night transportation on Friday nights for students who wish to take advantage of Philadelphia’s night life. The hope of SGA and Student Council is that the new bus program will help revitalize a somewhat diminishing social exchange.

While SGA has accomplished much over the past five years, shifting expectations about student autonomy and responsibility threaten the framework of SGA. In recent discussions with the Trustees about how the College can better serve students, some students spoke about their uneasiness with the amount of responsibility self-government places on them. Students are frustrated by their peers’ poor attendance at SGA meetings, by uncontested elections, by poor turnout at the annual plenary, and by administrative red tape. Students and administrators perceive their responsibility to each other and themselves in different terms. Students desire a redefined sense of autonomy and responsibility, which they hope to achieve by means of discussions between SGA leaders, community members, and pertinent administrators. Even though autonomy may be redefined, students recognize that administrative support for cultural and social life on campus is essential in helping them maintain a balanced yet rigorous academic life. The Office of Student Life is, for example, a source of support for clubs, organizations, and individuals who want to make a difference in social life on campus.
2.2.3 Student Life Office

In 2001-02, a new Director of Student Activities joined the College staff. She has worked with students to create social opportunities both on and off campus. Popular on-campus events have included big screen movies on the campus green, comedians, coffeehouses, and trivia games. Most events attract a crowd of 100-120 people; the coffeehouses, however, were quickly dropped due to low attendance. The Director of Student Activities organizes the annual Fall Frolic, a well-attended event with music and giveaways, where student organizations recruit new members and gauge student interest for events. The Office sponsors a range of popular off-campus excursions, including trips to New York City, touring Eastern State Penitentiary’s Haunted House, apple picking ventures, outlet shopping, and Phillies’ baseball games. The Office is also working more closely with SGA. A 2002-03 revision in the SGA Constitution redefined the student Social Committee Head(s) position to include working with the Director of Student Activities. Although it is too soon to see change, administrators and student leaders remain confident that over time students will understand more clearly the role of the Office and how it can be utilized as a campus resource for students.

2.2.4 Online Calendar of Events

In fall 2002, the College launched a centralized virtual calendar in order to streamline the process of advertising for events on campus and create a comprehensive campus events listing. The calendar, operated with a web interface, has been successful in allowing an alternative means of publicizing events for groups which cannot advertise with posters or websites. Not all groups use the calendar, making it less comprehensive than we had hoped. In order for the calendar to become more successful, we need to evaluate the logistical and cultural challenges involved.

Recommendations:

• Introduce improvements to serve those students who still feel ‘outside’ or different within the campus community, while maintaining the traditional, successful aspects of Bryn Mawr’s student life.
• Create a better balance between student self-governance and administrative organizational responsibility for campus life and for building and supporting student community.
• Encourage the use of the web calendar for posting all on-campus events.

2.3 The Athletics Program

In our last Self-Study, we noted (1) the concern voiced by our student athletes for more coaching staff, necessitated by the wide range of experience and skills represented by potential team members; (2) the
inability to offer a reasonably competitive experience for Bryn Mawr’s teams within the Centennial Conference; and (3) the inconsistency from year to year in the number of students who come out for a sport. Since then, the College has appointed a new Director of Athletics and Physical Education and many new coaches and physical education instructors. They understand and are committed to Bryn Mawr students and to enhancing the profile of the competitive athletic experience. In the last four years, we have moved from sponsoring programs in which students merely participate to one that is truly competitive and supports the scholar-athlete. To improve the competitive quality of varsity sports and to achieve success within the Centennial conference, the Athletics Office has developed a closer relationship with the Admissions Office to support athlete-recruiting efforts. Once enrolled, we find our scholar athletes are organized, productive, and hardworking. No significant differences can be found between athletes and non-athletes in grade performance or participation in extracurricular activities. Athletes are also more likely to major in the sciences than in other disciplines.

To raise awareness of its programs and build new connections across campus constituencies, the Department of Athletics and Physical Education broadened its physical education curriculum, increased recreational opportunities, and began an intramural program in selected sports. These efforts have increased opportunities for students, staff, and faculty to engage in recreational and intramural activities together. In addition, the department sponsors a National Girls’ and Women’s Sports Day event, highlights several games each season for fan support, and works with the Athletic Association on a Student Athlete Appreciation Day, and an end-of-year banquet, to enhance those celebratory moments. Student athletes experience, perhaps to a greater degree than other students, the pressures of schedules which are too busy. They must choose at times between their academic work and their team sport when courses, lectures, workshops or such are scheduled when a team plays. Perceived sometimes as a lack of faculty support, these conflicts are due in part to a compressed course schedule (which offers few evening courses and concentrates offerings in certain time blocks) and a rich array of extra-curricular activities. These time pressures prevent other students from going out to see athletes play, which disappoints the athletes. The department has developed a broad curriculum, focusing on the mind-body connection and on courses that enhance the connection. Non-athletes complete their curricular requirements through physical education offerings. A number of classes are scheduled in the evenings and weekly seminars are offered to meet the scheduling requirements of students. Yet, this is not simply an issue of the course schedule, but rather one of recognizing the importance of activities that enhance and support a student outside of the classroom. Many of our students successfully balance their academic responsibilities and those that are co-and extra-curricular. But we need to think about how to facilitate a “seamless flow” for all students, to enable them to maximize their experience here. Faculty, administrators and students are aware that we have solve to the growing problem of finding balance, of being mentally and physically
able to take full advantage of an intensely rich and rigorous undergraduate education, and of being at a place that understands the value of integrating the various facets which make a full life.

**Recommendations:**

- Seek more ways to incorporate a scholar-athlete model and wellness approaches in student life.
- Enhance athletic, recreational, and fitness facilities.

2.4. Connecting Academic Life with the Wider Community and the Working World

The 1999 Middle States Team recommended: “. . . [although] it might be useful to continue building a variety of [social opportunities for students, it might be effective to do so by integrating them with the academic life of the college.” Some new initiatives have contributed to progress in this area, by complementing the traditional liberal arts education we offer. The best developed initiatives, which we offer as examples, are the Community Service Office, the Praxis Program (see above), the Career Development Office, and college-sponsored internships.

2.4.1 Community Service Office

Since its inception, the Community Service Office has worked with students to reframe civic engagement in the context of a liberal arts education. In recent years, the Office has witnessed increased participation of students and expanding service interests within the diverse student body. With 43% of our undergraduates participating in volunteer work during the academic year (according to the 2003 Enrolled Student Survey), the scope of community service involvement is broad. The Office has undergone many changes over the past three years to address the developing needs of students, including the hiring of a new Director and moving to a new location on campus. A Community Service House, part of Cambrian Row, houses the Office’s professional staff and meets the space needs of volunteers and student interns. Some of the benefits of the new house include larger meeting spaces, office space for student coordinators, an expanded tutoring and service-learning resource library, lockers for students, and a kitchen.

Growing and varying student interest in community service options has resulted in a restructuring of the opportunities for and expansion of the definitions of service work. To provide flexibility to integrate community service work into students’ daily schedules, a student intern coordinates “done in a day” events which facilitate student participation without a weekly or daily commitment. Student interest in activist-oriented service led SGA to approve membership in the United States Student Association in
2003. As a member, Bryn Mawr will be able to host a Grass Roots Organizing Weekend (GROW). The weekend-long program teaches students strategies and skills for building successful organizations and movements. An increase in the number of students who wish to travel off campus to participate in conferences and protests has resulted in collaboration between the Community Service Office, the Director of Student Activities, and the Undergraduate Dean’s Office, which has led to the creation of guidelines and principles to govern a new Civic Engagement Fund. These initiatives encourage students to think beyond the College and to find ways to be involved in the local communities and wider world. The Office also engages faculty and staff in activities, coordinating projects such as the donation of cell phones to women’s shelters and the collection of gifts for local service agencies at the holidays. Because of the many changes and growing student interests, the Community Service Office performed a student needs assessment this spring to assess student interest in community service, to help define service and activism, and to prioritize issues facing student leaders. The results of the needs assessment will help guide the Office in its endeavors.

2.4.2 Career Development Staff, Programs, Services and Space
The Career Development Office (CDO) recently moved to the College’s Campus Center, after being in a series of small offices elsewhere. The new centrally-located space accommodates computer stations for students to do online searches and rooms for recruiters to interview student job applicants. A new position with a focus on the technology that is fundamental to so much of the Office’s work was added to the staff. This year pre-law advising moved to the CDO. Overall, these changes have improved service, access, and efficiency in this crucial area.

2.4.3 Expanded Paid Internship Program and Increased Summer Research Opportunities
The College is striving to provide increased numbers of summer internships for students who wish to gain practical experience to complement their academic interests. Internships are coordinated by the Undergraduate Dean’s Office, in concert with the Career Development Office, Community Service Office, the Centers, and individual academic departments. Before 2001, there were only six or seven small stipends for summer internships outside the College. Since then, funds have been set aside to support student interns at a more substantial level, providing opportunities for many more students, including those who need to have summer earnings to contribute towards the cost of tuition. The number of internships has already been increased to 37 full $3,200 grants, plus a few smaller stipends. Students secure positions that last at least eight to ten weeks in the U.S. or abroad. Their placements must provide positions that include substantial responsibilities and good opportunities to observe the work of an agency.
In the past few years, our students have used their placements to give service and explore career options at the U.S. Mission to the U.N. in Geneva, the Refugee Federation Service Center in Seattle, the Burlington Vermont Times, the Pennsylvania Prison Society, the Alliance of Community Health Plans in Washington, the International Center of Photography in New York, the Wilma Theater in Philadelphia, the North-Bita Hospital in Ghana, and elsewhere. The number of students applying for the internships has grown tremendously; competition for these internships and awards is fierce. As each successive group of summer interns has returned, they have been enthusiastic about their experiences and have urged others to take advantage of the opportunity. Most students make presentations about their research and experiences to the community.

Although 35 College summer research opportunities in the Sciences have been available to students for many years, funding for students in the humanities and social sciences was relatively scarce. We have had a wasting endowment that funded six students in the humanities and social sciences. This will be the last summer of research supported from that fund. Fortunately, the College has just received a $1.5 million endowment for undergraduate research opportunities in the humanities and humanistic social sciences. The first five Hanna Holborn Gray Scholars, named to honor a former board chair of both Bryn Mawr College and The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, will be doing funded research this summer. Over the next two years, that fund will begin to generate enough funding for 17 funded research opportunities in the humanities and social sciences, about three times the number we have had in the past. Added to our students doing funded research in science in the summer, that will mean between 52 and 60 undergraduate students will be able to do funded research each summer. Such opportunities allow students to experience the excitement—as well as the challenges—of full-time academic research, and they often lead them to choose academic careers.
C. FINANCES OF THE COLLEGE, 1998-99 TO THE PRESENT

This section of our report was written by the College’s Treasurer and Chief Financial Officer and it summarizes the significant financial challenges the College has faced over the last five years. It thus explains in a more detailed fashion the constraints on plans and operations which previous sections of the report have adumbrated. It describes the actions we have taken to improve our financial status and our expectations for coming years.

1. The College Operating Budget over the Past Five Years

The College has faced significant financial challenges over the past five years, as previous sections of this report have indicated. However, the outlook for the next few years is positive due to the implementation of almost $3 million in budget reductions in the current year, much improved financial markets, and an improvement in the size, quality, and financial need of the College’s applicant pool. In our Self-Study, we offered a generally positive description of the state of the College’s finances but noted several concerns. Looking back, it is clear that we were right to be concerned. As it was, we might have acted on these concerns earlier by taking more stringent preventative action to reduce total College expenditures. In fact, a position freeze that eliminated more than 20 positions by attrition became necessary in 2002-2003, but was insufficient. In 1998 we identified our major concerns as (1) reaching and maintaining a FTE enrollment of 1,210 undergraduate students while decreasing the discount rate and (2) over relying on endowment income, which had increased because of the very strong financial markets in the 1990s.

Appendix 7, a spreadsheet of budget projections from 1998-99, shows small budget surpluses in each of the subsequent five years, while maintaining the endowment spending formula of 5% of a three-year average market value. Appendix 8 contains the current budget projections.

In the 1998-99 budget projections, undergraduate net tuition income for the 2003-04 year was projected to be $21 million, which is $3.5 million more than the actual net tuition revenue. Both enrollment and financial aid expenditures have varied significantly and adversely from the earlier projections. Enrollment was based upon freshman class sizes of between 350 and 360 students. However, in the 2001-02 year the class size was 338, and in the 2002-03 year it was 306. In the current year, the class size is back up to 353. Next year we expect to reach our enrollment goal because of the growth in the applicant pool. We have also found that our fiscal year FTE enrollment has decreased slightly—to about 1,200 FTE students—because of how study abroad interacts with capacity. We now have more students studying abroad in the spring semester, thus reducing the fiscal FTE enrollment for the full year, and we are unable to enroll additional students in the fall semester due to the residential capacity at the College. We have recently changed study abroad policies to reduce the number of students studying abroad in the spring.
semester, thus bringing our effective capacity back up to 1,210 or higher. Financial aid expenditures have varied greatly from the amounts in the 1998-99 budget projections. At that time, it was our goal to reduce the discount rate from 36% to 34% over a five-year period. However, the discount rate has actually increased to 43% in the current year. In fact, the discount rate has increased an average of 1% per year over the past ten years. The rate of increase has now leveled off, and we are now projecting that the discount rate increase will be 0.5% per year. It is clear that the goal of having a discount rate of 34% in the current era is not realistic, and that the goal should be to moderate the annual increases in the discount rate as enrollment size and net tuition revenue are optimized.

In the 1998-99 budget projections, endowment income in the 2003-04 year was projected to be $21.7 million; actual spending was about $3 million more. Of the $3 million, $1 million was due to higher than projected endowment market values, and $2 million was due the need to close the budget deficit, which resulted in increasing the spending formula from 5% to 5.5%. In the late 1990s, the endowment return was significantly higher than the average of 7% assumed in the budget projections: it was 14.1% in 1998-99 and 11.7% in 1999-00. Due to the three-year average spending policy, which also lags by one year (the 2003-04 budget is based on the endowment market value up to June 30, 2002), endowment spending exceeded the amounts projected through the 2003-04 year. However, endowment returns over subsequent down-market years were negative: -4.7% in 2000-01 and -5.1% in 2001-02. The negative returns resulted in the need to reduce projected endowment spending by almost $3 million between 2003-04 and 2005-06. We will offset $1 million of this reduction by lower debt service, but the remainder has had to come from budget reductions.

With the increase in endowment spending and leveling of net tuition income over the past five years, the College budget now is supported by a significantly greater amount of endowment income than by undergraduate tuition revenue. The following table shows net tuition revenue and endowment income as a percentage of total College revenues for the past five years.
### Net tuition revenue and endowment income as a percentage of total College revenues, 1999-2000 through 2003-04

During the next five years, we expect the trend to be reversed, so that endowment income will become smaller and net tuition revenue larger as a percentage of total tuition revenues. Endowment income will continue, however, to be the largest source of revenue for the College. Endowment income will be less over the next few years because of the reduction in market value during fiscal years 2000-01 and 2001-02, and we expect the annual increase in financial aid to moderate. Projected net tuition revenue and endowment income as a percentage of total College revenues over the next five years is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal year</th>
<th>Net UG Tuition Revenue (%)</th>
<th>Endowment Income (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net tuition revenue and endowment income as a percentage of total College revenues, 2003-04 through 2007-08
2. The Budget Reductions

In the 2001-02 year, five-year budget projections began to show deficits, because net tuition revenue was significantly lower than the amount previously projected and the market value of the endowment declined during 2000-01 and 2001-02. The College froze departmental operating budgets after fiscal year 2000-2001 and only filled administrative positions essential to the core mission of the College. By the 2002-03 year, after eliminating 22 positions through attrition, budget projections were still showing deficits of about $3 million peaking in 2005-06 (see Appendix 9). It became clear that drastic action would be necessary to eliminate the projected deficits. During the summer of 2003, the senior administrators in the President's cabinet led a process of careful review of all operating budgets and all positions, in concert with department heads in their areas of responsibility. Each of the senior administrators was asked to prepare a report describing potential budget cut scenarios of 6% and of 12% in compensation costs as well as the operational consequences where these reductions to be made. The senior administrators then reviewed the reports and determined those budget reductions that would be implemented. A total of 53 positions were eliminated, including the 22 vacant positions. The total amount of the budget reductions was almost $3 million, equivalent to 4% of the total College budget net of financial aid. The reductions were made in the beginning of the 2003-04 fiscal year in order to afford generous severance packages and out-placement support for those employees whose positions were eliminated. However, the budget reductions by themselves were not sufficient to balance the budget without increasing the endowment spending percentage to 5.5% from 5.0%.

In the first three-quarters of the current fiscal year, the endowment return was 17%. The market value of the endowment is now $480 million, an historic high. If there are normal returns over the next few years, the increase in endowment market value will make it possible to have balanced budgets and a return to the 5% spending formula. The Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees is considering changing the endowment spending formula to place limits on the amount of unusual annual increases or decreases in endowment spending; the new formula would peg spending to a base year and inflate it annually by 4% (a typical higher education inflation rate of 1.5% above the average CPI of 2.5%). With this new policy, we would anticipate no longer having the large changes in endowment spending, both positive and negative, that we have experienced since the late 1990s.

3. Future Budget Concerns and Recommendations

In the 1998 Self-Study, some budget concerns, other than net tuition revenue and endowment income, were delineated. These concerns prompted four recommendations, which are noted in bold below, and
commented upon, in terms of the present and the future.

Recommendations

- Increase the amount budgeted each year for renewals and replacements (R&R).
  The R&R budget was then much lower than the calculated depreciation and was less, as a percentage of the market value of the plant, than the usual 1.5-2% that is advisable as a general guideline. Because of the budget problems of the past few years, the R&R budget has unfortunately not been increased. If we are not able to increase this budget significantly within the next several years, it is likely that there will be an increase in urgent deferred maintenance problems.

- Monitor rate of tuition increases in comparison to the rate of inflation.
  There was a concern then about the rate of our tuition increases compared with inflation. The Bryn Mawr tuition has increased 4% to 5% annually over the past five years, an amount which is about double the inflation rate. However, our increases have been less than the increases at our peer institutions. The total fees at Bryn Mawr have gone from being above to being below the median of COFHE colleges.

- Monitor rate of increase in technology costs.
  The acceleration in the rate of increase in the technology-related budgets was a serious concern in 1998. Since then the rate of increase has stabilized; however, it is important to monitor these costs, while at the same time, to ensure that Bryn Mawr students, faculty and staff have the technological resources they need.

- Attend to faculty and staff salary improvement goals.
  Another concern in 1998 was faculty and staff salaries. There were significant market adjustments to both faculty and staff salaries in the late 1990s; however, the increases were not greater than those at our peer institutions. Therefore, our faculty salaries have remained below the median of the COFHE colleges. This situation has certainly been exacerbated by having had no salary increases for 2003-04 and only a 2% increase planned for 2004-05. The budget problems of the past few years have made it impossible for the College to improve salaries in the near term.

The College continues to face serious financial challenges. However, there have been major developments this year that provide a positive outlook for College finances. The market value of the endowment is up significantly; the student applicant pool is much improved; painfully substantial but necessary budget reductions have been implemented; and our ambitious capital campaign is on—indeed, slightly ahead of—schedule.
D. THE FUTURE

As we noted at the outset of this report, the periodic review process for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education has given us the occasion to review our progress in meeting the goals we set for ourselves four years ago in our Plan, in refining those goals to meet current challenges, and in redirecting our future work through a series of recommendations. Despite serious financial constraints, we have achieved significant progress, the positive markers of which include:

- improvement in our admissions and retention numbers,
- timely progress in the capital campaign;
- recent significant gifts and grants,
- authorization from the estate of Katherine Hepburn to establish a center in her name and that of her mother that will group multiple Plan-based initiatives within a highly visible (and readily supportable) rubric. Planning for the Katharine Houghton Hepburn (KHH) Center for Women and Public Life is well-advanced.

Our major challenge at this point is to move the community through the current moment of financial constraint and to address the related morale issues experienced by many through better communication and transparent administrative operations. We are confident that the talent and dedication of faculty, students, and staff will enable us to meet this challenge and to continue moving forward in realizing our vision for the future of this distinguished institution.
### E. List of Frequently Used Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A&amp;S</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-College</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Committee on Appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Committee on Academic Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Council on Institutional Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUPPS</td>
<td>Committee on the Utilization, Planning and Prioritization of Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFHE</td>
<td>Consortium on Financing Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSem</td>
<td>College Seminar Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal year (June 1 through May 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographical Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSAS</td>
<td>Graduate School of Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSem</td>
<td>Graduate Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSSWSR</td>
<td>Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>The Plan for a New Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS</td>
<td>Senior Administrative Staff (see Appendix 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study</td>
<td>Self-Study Report for the Middle States Association, December 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGA</td>
<td>Self-Government Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCCAC</td>
<td>Two College Council on Academic Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-College</td>
<td>Bryn Mawr, Haverford and Swarthmore Colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-college consortium</td>
<td>The Libraries of Bryn Mawr, Haverford and Swarthmore Colleges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>