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Report to the Faculty on CAP’s Charge 2010-2011

Continuing a multi-year process of indentifying long-term goals of the College, and following on
the work of the Task Force for Balancing Mission and Resources, begun in the fall of 2005, and
of the Curricular Renewal Working Group (2008-2010), CAP was charged with the following
responsibilities for the 2010-2011 academic year:

• Set longer-term academic priorities for the College that transcend the nearer-term
  exigencies of open positions.

• Use this strategic vision of academic priorities to decide how to continue the process of
  reducing the faculty by 5-8 lines to reinvest in faculty compensation.

• Think about new perspectives on both strengthening our core priorities and supporting
  exciting curricular innovations through rearranging existing resources, by collaborating
  across departmental and program lines, and by increasing efficiency in the use of faculty
  time.

• Initiate a campus-wide discussion (both faculty and administration) to think about the
  possibility of getting to a 2-2 teaching load as part of a larger conversation about the
  goals and structure of the major.

• Suggest ways the administration can better support the process of strengthening the
  College’s academic programs.

In this report we describe what we have done this year to address each of these components of
our charge. The report has two parts: (I) a discussion of the Working Model for Balancing
Innovation, Institutional Goals, and Sustainability, which includes explanation of the context and
logic of the model, an outline of the timeline and process through which it was developed, and
the model itself, and (II) a discussion of balancing mission and resources, which includes an
explanation of the reduction in staffing. A separate report will address the position requests
submitted to CAP this year.
I. The Working Model

a) Context and Logic of this Model

CAP began the year by meeting extensively with the faculty to gather ideas about curricular innovations that might allow us to deal with economic pressures in ways that would lead to the continuing development of the overall institution. The Working Model emerged from these faculty discussions: it embodies a wide range of suggestions from every part of the faculty and attempts to unite and balance the varied goals that make up a vibrant institution. We believe that it connects deeply with the reductions in staffing which are also part of CAP’s charge this year: the Working Model is an effort to make the sacrifices meaningful, to frame the sense of individual loss in terms of a greater institutional gain — all the while recognizing the College’s historical strengths.

The upcoming May 13 motion-vote will be about moving to concrete department-by-department discussions of the Working Model’s feasibility and, simultaneously, creating a working group of CAP, CC and Provost that will work with the departments to facilitate cross-departmental and program cooperation and help with curricular and resource implications. We recognize that many adjustments will have to occur before implementation can happen, and that the current model is necessarily a fluid entity that will progress by a series of approximations.

As stated in the introduction to the Working Model, the model’s goal is to create a vibrant intellectual community with opportunities for everyone to share their perspectives and collaborate with one another. The model preserves Bryn Mawr College’s strong disciplinary cores while broadening connections across disciplines to provide more diversified pathways for students. It affords faculty time to have varied intellectual interactions with students in ways that we have heard students and faculty say would be desirable while streamlining the use of College resources.

While CAP engaged with the faulty in considering possible innovative structures, the ideas being developed dovetailed neatly with concerns being discussed elsewhere. For example, the work of the Task Force on Alumnae Engagement and student exit interviews brought up the concern that many of the 80% of graduates that do not go on to obtain a PhD felt underserved by the College in their career paths. One of the proposals in the Working Model could address this concern: if we could make explicit that there are many pathways within and beyond each major, it would more explicitly communicate that the College is welcoming and supportive of careers that are different from the traditional academic track, while still strongly supporting those 20% students who wish to pursue a PhD. Our ability to prepare students for the PhD is quite distinctive and is something that we have learned in our market research is attractive to certain applicants. The model provides an academic experience that has the flexibility to serve both types of students.

Similarly, discussions of recent surveys of student and alumni views of their Bryn Mawr experience have raised some issues that the Working Model could address. We know that our ratings on student-faculty interaction and supportive campus environment are average or below average compared to our peer institutions. More importantly, our student retention and graduation rates quantifiably lag behind those of the same peer institutions. Not all of this is
related to academics — there is certainly work to be done on the College’s social environment —
nevertheless, the problem is not only social. After all, Bryn Mawr has always prided itself on the
fact that the academic culture of the College is dominant. Indeed, the academic culture and social
culture are often one and the same. Further, while it may be difficult for the faculty to impact a
student’s social life, the same cannot be said for that student’s academic experience. The 2/2+
course load is therefore intended to provide opportunities for further enriching intellectual
interactions between students and the faculty. Part of the + will also involve faculty advising of
freshmen and sophomores so that students are immediately building relationships with faculty
and faculty are helping students to shape their experience in meaningful ways. This mentoring
structure also hopes to help students to take ownership of their education. Developing varied
senior experiences for all students (again, structured so as to be part of the +) will provide them
rich intellectual one-on-one experiences, and will serve as meaningful and memorable
culminations of their Bryn Mawr careers.

We should note that the ideas articulated in the Working Model (and the curricular innovations
that we are already piloting) are attracting attention from the outside world. The Mellon
Foundation and the Gates Foundation are providing support for piloting some of these types of
efforts. The Mellon Foundation recently awarded the College one million dollars for curricular
innovation. The foundation was particularly interested in our curricular pilots coming from the
recent curricular renewal; that grant will support, among other things, our 360 degree pilot, our
advising pilot, our half credit courses (quarter courses), our development of writing intensive
courses, and other innovations. The grant also includes support for TriCo initiatives such as our
very successful efforts to create a single, TriCo concentration in Environmental Studies and our
work within the TriCo to develop expertise among faculty and students in the Digital
Humanities.

The Gates Foundation, through its highly visible Next Generation Learning Challenge program,
awarded the College $250,000 to see whether online open courseware modules can be used to
enhance learning in a small liberal arts college environment. We have 35 liberal arts college
partners in this grant who will be following our lead. We are the only college of our type to
receive a grant from this program and one of 30 institutions out of more than 600 applicants to
receive such a grant. This money will be particularly useful in supporting the College’s
investment in the STEM fields. It also may be another way to support our diverse student body
by helping in the process of acclimating students to the rigors of the College and more broadly,
an American academic context.

The very strong message that we should take from these grants is that foundations that have their
eyes on higher education think that we are on the right track, and they see us as leaders, not
followers. They see us as setting the course for the best institutions in our peer group in a
landscape of higher education that is very quickly changing. We believe that if we can move the
Working Model forward, there will be additional opportunities to attract monies as we make it
clear the kind of curricular innovation that is taking place at the College.
b) Timeline and Process

To make clear how the Working Model evolved, the following is a summary of CAP’s engagement with the faculty in this process:

- August 2010: Two members of CAP met twice with 6 members of the faculty at large to conceptualize and plan a retreat
- September 2010: CAP planned the retreat and contacted every continuing and tenure-track faculty member to schedule one-on-one meetings to be conducted after the retreat
- September 29th and October 1st, 2010: CAP held the retreat, at which 111 faculty participated on the first day; 90, the second day
- October 2010: Each member of CAP met one on one with 20-25 faculty members, with the result that over 95% of the faculty contributed to the process
- November 10th, 2010: CAP held a special meeting to provide an overview of what we had heard at the retreat and in one-on-one meetings and asked faculty to identify two or three areas on which they would like CAP to focus
- February 2011: CAP formed five faculty working groups to develop the areas identified for further emphasis (these areas ended up being the main components of the working model)
- March 2nd, 2011: CAP held a special faculty meeting in order to elicit feedback and suggestions
- April 6th, 2011: CAP held a special meeting to respond to requests for additional information, specifically, a clearer framing of the Working Model and modeling of 2/2+
- May 10th and 11th, 2011: CAP will hold two special meetings to give faculty a chance to talk about how the working model responds to the set of challenges facing the College

CAP wishes to thank the members of the faculty for the extensive time and attention invested in helping to conceptualize and refine the model. The process of working as a community to imagine and map a way into the future was exciting, enlightening, and at times challenging. We believe it could provide direction and purpose for the future of the College. This jointly achieved institutional perspective that led to the Working Model was applauded by the Board of Trustees at the April 2011 meeting, and we hope to keep moving forward as we consider how each part of the model can be worked out on at the institutional, departmental, programmatic, and individual levels.

**CAP CHARGE 2010-2011**

**A WORKING MODEL FOR BALANCING INNOVATION, INSTITUTIONAL GOALS, AND SUSTAINABILITY**

The overarching goal of this working model is to create a vibrant intellectual community with opportunities for everyone (students and faculty alike) to share their perspectives and collaborate with each other. The model preserves our strong disciplinary cores while broadening connections across disciplines to provide more diversified pathways for students. It affords faculty time to have varied intellectual interactions with students, and it expands opportunities and support for faculty in their
individual and cooperative scholarship and teaching, while at the same time streamlining the use of College resources.

What we are proposing provides an opportunity to realize more fully the goals of a Bryn Mawr education as articulated last year by the CRWG:

1. Promote a life of intense intellectual engagement, including the recognition, in theory and in practice, that we need to be acquainted with a variety of approaches to inquiry for understanding the world and our place in it.

2. Promote the ability to think critically, that is, to reflect on the presuppositions and implications of our own arguments and commitments and those of others.

3. Increase students’ skills in areas that are fundamentally important to their ability to take advantage of a Bryn Mawr education and to make the best use of their knowledge in their life beyond. In particular, we want to train women who can communicate effectively and are quantitatively literate.

4. Enhance students’ breadth of knowledge and their life-long capacity to learn new things on their own.

5. Give students the opportunity to acquire a certain depth of disciplinary knowledge in at least one particular area of contemporary scholarship in the arts and sciences.

6. Prepare students to be active citizens in an increasingly global context, one in which the opportunities to overcome geographical and cultural boundaries are greater than at any other time in history.

7. Educate women who are prepared to transform and improve human life in their own communities and throughout the world.

Specifically, the working model unites goal 5 (disciplinary depth) with goals 1 and 6 (variety of approaches and living in a global world, crossing boundaries) by making much more evident the ways that a disciplinary core connects to other disciplines and to the world around us. The working model also ties goal 4 (learn on their own) to all the other goals, by increasing the sense that students can connect their own distinctive ways of approaching the world to the courses they take and to their majors.

To clarify this model, we highlight four concrete innovations that will achieve the above goals:

1. Opening up of majors
2. Producing an extensive faculty advising program
3. Providing a greater variety of senior capstone experiences and ensuring that every student has one
4. Moving to a 2/2+ model that will allow all of this to happen

Below we list possible ways of accomplishing these innovations. We understand that some of these are already being addressed. Which of the other possibilities might end up being adopted would depend on further conversations with faculty, departments, and the various committees and administrative bodies involved.

1. **Re-envision Majors and Diversify Student Scholarship**

   I. **Develop Majors with Both Strong Disciplinary Cores and Varied Pathways** that allow for our students’ diverse needs and goals. Encourage each department and program with a major to have
a small(er) set of requirements for all students and then multiple options (e.g., a traditional path that prepares students for further graduate work in that discipline; paths that connect the discipline to other disciplines; paths using the discipline to engage topics of current interest; paths that connect to varied possible career choices not necessarily immediately connected to that discipline).

Conceiving of majors this way makes concrete the basic structure of a liberal arts education: a major is a part of the overall academic experience and does not so much lead to one career or one type of final product, but to multiple ways a student can connect to a wide range of fields and issues. This approach also revitalizes the notion of the Bryn Mawr student forging her own way.

A. **TO DEVELOP SUCH MAJORS, WE SUGGEST A MULTI-PRONGED APPROACH**, which will be facilitated by the Provost’s Office and the Curriculum Committee

1) Have discussions within departments and programs about possible ways to redesign majors to allow for multiple pathways that might better serve the various reasons students have for choosing a major. There could be, for example, a Ph.D. path that requires significant courses in a single department or program, as well as transdisciplinary paths that require fewer courses in the “major” department/programs and instead relies on courses from other departments/programs. (See Appendix I for examples of possible pathways through several of Bryn Mawr’s current majors.)

2) Ask faculty what courses they imagine could be offered by other departments/programs that would contribute to their major (whether as electives or requirements).

3) Ask departments/programs to include in their major requirements courses offered by other departments/programs.

4) Ask departments/programs to create/provide courses that serve other departments/programs designed in consultation with those departments/programs.

5) Develop and/or modify courses (e.g., statistics, critical theory, computational modeling, ethics) so that they serve multiple majors.

6) Develop a “Match.com” type of website that posts the range of faculty intellectual interests and highlights commonalities between individuals. Arrange recurring discussions with faculty who might collaborate across departments/programs and disciplines. Facilitating these discussions may require a coordinator.

7) Following the Curriculum Renewal Working Group (CRWG) recommendation, develop required culminating senior experiences for all students that fit the multiple reasons for being in a major. These capstone experiences could provide multiple ways to make use of the disciplinary expertise developed in a given major. The culminating experience should be integrated for those doing double majors.

8) Reconsider double majors as possible independent majors or “transdisciplinary tracks” within one traditional department.

9) Expand the possibilities for independent majors and change the process by which independent major proposals are evaluated.

B. **ASSESS AND DOCUMENT THE USE OF PATHWAYS WITHIN EACH MAJOR.** We propose a multi-pronged approach to discover how these pathways are being used, and to generate new ones.

1) Identify courses that have been taken in clusters over the last ten years. Clusters within majors might suggest “tracks” within a major and clusters that cross majors might suggest connections between courses in a major and other disciplines. These data could then be used to develop an electronic catalog that will tell someone who clicks on a course, “students who took this course also took these other courses” (similar to what Amazon.com does with product searches). Such a computerized system would also reveal new clusters and pathways as they emerge.

2) Ask faculty what courses other departments and programs might offer that would contribute to their major (whether as electives or requirements).
3) Ask students what courses they could imagine being offered by other departments and programs that would contribute to their major (whether as electives or requirements).

4) Ask alumnae what courses they took at Bryn Mawr that have been most useful in their careers or in their lives.

C. PROVIDE INFORMATION ABOUT MAJOR PATHWAYS, to give advisors and students a sense of the many possibilities that exist for moving through the Bryn Mawr curriculum. This would help advisers and students think about planning a college career in terms beyond “choosing a major.”

1) Ask departments and programs to send the Deans a list of possible major pathways.

2) Ask the Deans to assemble possible major pathways into an advising booklet.

3) Ask departments and programs to include possible pathways in the College catalog.

II. DIVERSIFY STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP

Below are five umbrella recommendations for expanding the types of scholarly work students can do. These are intended to add to not replace existing types of student scholarship. In a separate document are appendices (Appendices II-V), which present organized notes from faculty brainstorming sessions about possible ways to act on these recommendations.

A. EXPAND STUDENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR MULTIPLE MODES OF INTELLECTUAL INQUIRY, to encourage students throughout their years at the College to participate in a variety of research, transdisciplinary projects, 360s, Praxis program options, and other forms of intellectual activity on and off campus.

B. RECOGNIZE AND SUPPORT DIFFERENT WAYS OF PRESENTING INTELLECTUAL WORK, to encourage course work to be presented in multimedia, digital and galleria formats, or as material that can be used in public forums (e.g., opinion pieces, web-based media), and to engage students in generating their own criteria for evaluation of their work.

C. INVITE ALUMNAE TO PARTICIPATE IN AND CONTRIBUTE TO COURSES, to inspire alumnae to stay connected and invested in the College; to encourage and provide opportunities for ongoing dialogue between alumnae and current students.

D. IDENTIFY ALL THE OFFICES/STRUCTURES THAT SUPPORT DIVERSIFIED STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP, to forge better links among the Deans Office, Civic Engagement Office, Summer Research, Praxis Office, etc., and begin conversations about how to streamline these various parts of the College.

E. SUPPORT DIVERSIFIED STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP THROUGH ENHANCED ADVISING, to help students gain a broader sense of the possibilities for moving through the entire curriculum at the College and in the consortium, to use their agency, and to enhance faculty/student intellectual engagement.

2. RE-IMAGINE FACULTY WORKLOAD

We recognize that faculty time and effort are precious commodities. The process of reimagining the curricula of departments and programs will not be trivial, and any gains from this process should be judiciously deployed to achieve the greatest impact, while at the same time affording faculty the time and resources to be productive scholars.
I. RE-IMAGINE WORKLOAD FOR TT FACULTY:

We propose redesigning the workload as an optional 2/2+. This would consist of four courses and a fifth component that allows for alternative forms of faculty/student intellectual engagement.

This re-imagining of TT faculty workload through the creation of a more flexible 5th component is a way to compensate TT faculty for work that is currently uncompensated, to increase faculty and student engagement, and to facilitate enhanced academic advising. It frees up time to engage with students outside of the standard classroom setting and — indirectly, in conjunction with the sabbatical leave policy — creates more opportunities for disciplinary and/or transdisciplinary scholarship. In cases where departments/programs are able to redeploy faculty in such a way that fewer courses need to be taught, faculty will have a choice of engaging with students in one or a combination of the ways described below.

A. Tutorials:

- One possibility for the + is a tutorial model that would afford students a rich intellectual experience and would also have the potential to enhance faculty scholarship. The tutorial program would be sufficiently diverse to ensure that individuals and departments/programs would have some flexibility with respect to the type of activities that would be considered under the rubric of tutorials, but there would also have to be clear criteria for evaluating the tutorial component of each faculty member’s workload. Students would get full- or half-course credit for these options.
  1) Individualized, research-based encounters with students
  2) Faculty-designed or student-designed small-group tutorials either on or off campus
  3) Praxis III based advising
  4) Transdisciplinary collaborations (e.g., two or more professors from different departments/programs working together with a small group of students)

B. Advising:

- We see building on the current pilot advising program, in coordination with the Deans Office, to develop a more robust advising experience for freshmen and sophomores as essential. Those faculty involved in the program could choose to do their advising for a portion or all of their +.
  1) A full + might entail advising a cohort of half first-year students and half second-year students.
  2) Faculty advisors would be responsible for overseeing and approving students’ course plans.
  3) Advising would be frontloaded in the first semester of a students’ freshman year (when retention issues are most pressing) and would involve both individual and group meetings.
  4) Advisors would help each student draft a proposal for her overall major pathway (in preparation for dialogue with major advisors) and would hand off the student to the major advisor.
  5) Advisors would help initiate student conversations with faculty from potential major departments and programs.
  6) We recommend developing a process for assessing the effectiveness of this program, including student assessment of faculty advisors.
  7) We recommend creating a training process and a handbook to help advisors navigate the tri-co curriculum and to understand the new structure of majors.

C. The Classical Model:

- Some faculty may simply decide that they wish to continue teaching a 5th course.

II. RE-IMAGINE WORKLOAD AND COMPENSATION FOR CNTT FACULTY:

The diverse responsibilities of current CNTTs make it difficult to establish a single policy. CAP recognizes that further discussion needs to take place regarding the various roles played by CNNTs.
CAP reaffirms the value of disciplinary and transdisciplinary scholarship. To expand the range of scholarly pursuits to encompass both disciplinary scholarship and transdisciplinary work, there needs to be a cultural shift in the College towards faculty/departmental collaboration. This shift needs to be initiated by changes in the ways in which committees of the first kind (i.e., CAP, Curriculum, and Appointments) evaluate future position requests, future reappointments, and future curricular initiatives.

I. Facilitate Cultural and Structural Changes Across the College
   A. Increase communication amongst standing committees of the first kind regarding areas of institutional policy that cross committee purview – particularly between CAP, Appointments, and Curriculum.
      1) The standing committees need to increase the motivation for each department and program to recognize that it is: first, part of the overall College community; and second, a department or program.
      2) Create incentives that reward departments/programs that open up wider connections across disciplines and generate more diverse paths for student/faculty intellectual pursuits/goals/scholarship.
   B. Continue developing CAP procedures for the approval of positions to reward collaboration among departments/programs/divisions, and interactions at the faculty, curricular, and student levels.
      1) Underscore that all positions that are vacated by retirement revert to the general faculty pool.
      2) Reaffirm that any department or program can apply for a position at any time.
      3) Allow position requests from places other than departments (e.g., Curriculum Committee, transdisciplinary faculty groups).
   C. Discuss changes to the criteria that Appointments uses to evaluate faculty for promotion.
      1) Develop criteria for evaluating the +.
      2) Appointments must recognize the efforts of faculty in their pursuits of disciplinary and transdisciplinary scholarship and teaching in ways that support pedagogical and research risk-taking by faculty.
   D. Ask the Curriculum Committee to facilitate conversations about having courses count for multiple majors.
      1) Come up with more efficient ways of tagging courses so that all departments/programs and advisers know what classes are available in the consortium that are potentially of interest to their students.
      2) Increase faculty dialogue about courses that are relevant outside of one’s department/program.
      3) Create incentives for departments/programs to be more flexible with their course offerings and use of courses outside their department/program.
   E. Create/instill/incentivize the idea of faculty members being a professor of the College first, and then of a particular department and/or program.
   F. Recognize the advocacy role of the Provost’s Office in supporting faculty as they explore disciplinary and transdisciplinary scholarship and teaching. This includes mediating disagreements within and across departments and programs about what constitutes scholarship and curricular possibilities.
   G. Work to increase interdepartmental trust. Faculty should accept that there are scholars outside of their own disciplinary silos that can contribute to the broader education of students in their major. This needs to be reinforced by the workings of all the major committees in terms of hiring practices, faculty evaluation practices, and curricular practices.
H. Address the discrepancies in cross-listing policies
   1) Work with the Registrar to create easier ways (besides cross-listing) to designate courses that allow students to draw from multiple departments/programs.
   2) Regularize the criteria for cross listing courses to create a policy that is in the best interest of students.

II. **Enhance the Visibility of Faculty Scholarship**

III. **Develop Methods and Forums for Interdepartmental Conversations and Planning**
   A. Subsidize themed transdisciplinary seminar series for faculty (potentially with student involvement) as a means to encourage dialogue across departmental and divisional boundaries.
   B. Increase the number of disciplinary and/or transdisciplinary seminars, working groups and reading groups that are organized for and by the faculty.
   C. Designate regular times and spaces for faculty to talk about their scholarship, read and discuss articles, etc.

IV. **Re-envision the Faculty Mentoring Program**
   A. Expand the Provost’s enhanced junior faculty mentoring program to benefit all faculty.
   B. Identify specific responsibilities for faculty mentors.
   C. Strive for greater transparency about the review and promotion process.
   D. Increase communication with faculty throughout their careers about the process of review and promotion.

V. **Affirm the Sabbatical Policy that Supports Research and Contributes to Retention**
   This program is a hallmark of Bryn Mawr’s dedication to its faculty’s pursuits of influential scholarship.

VI. **Encourage Flexible Use of Time**: For example, borrowing a course from one year and then paying it back the following year. This would mean being able to adapt to current departmental/program and College needs as well as professional/personal needs.

II. Balancing Mission and Resources: Reduction in Staffing

The following summarizes the process of reducing the faculty to a size appropriate to the College’s mission and available resources. It was determined that this process would, in practical terms, mean bringing faculty staffing down by 5-8 positions in Arts and Sciences and by 3 positions in Social Work. With respect to the positions in Arts and Sciences, there were a couple of ways in which the reductions could have been distributed. We could, for example, have picked one or two programs and shut them down. Instead, we thought about the breadth of disciplines that the College offers and our historical strengths in particular areas; we could not see anything being done at the College that is not valued and valuable that could therefore painlessly be eliminated. As such, we were forced to choose among areas of current value and importance. In order to make these evaluations, we decided to use, in as consistent a manner as possible, the same criteria that CAP uses for the allocation of positions:
   - number of students served
   - trends in interests of current and prospective students
   - weighted return on specific resources
   - horizontal integration connecting programs to each other
   - strategic directions of the college
Having applied these criteria to all of Bryn Mawr’s departments and programs, we arrived at a list where, despite their benefit to particular areas of the College, resources are nevertheless less utilized in their current configuration than they might be elsewhere. The question we asked in each case was, “What is the relative value of this position and how does it fit in the overall priorities that the College needs to maintain to assure its health well into the future?”

Following this process, we had conversations with affected departments. We first explained our decisions and then invited people to think about creative ways of reimagining their curricula and collaborating with other departments so as to maintain their disciplinary integrity. Or, if they felt that they lacked the critical mass to maintain a major or concentration, to think of other ways the department, program, and its faculty, could continue to effectively feed the curricular strengths of the College.

We want to underscore again that CAP’s choices do not reflect a devaluing of the work of programs whose resources are being reduced. We are aware that people work very hard, that every department and program contributes significantly to the overall mission of the College, and that the faculty at this College is deeply dedicated to the institution, its students, and each other. Rather, these decisions are driven by the concern for maintaining the quality and financial health of the College going forward. This reduction in staffing is a necessary — albeit painful — step.

As part of acknowledging the challenges that individual departments and programs will face going forward and the sacrifices involved, we have tried, wherever possible, to allow for a process of transition. This means that in general we are not cutting resources immediately but rather allowing programs to wait for retirements or departures to reduce staffing. We hope that this will provide an opportunity going forward for the creation of productive collaborations and innovative curricular thinking that will mitigate some of the pain of a planned staffing reduction. It should be noted that in each case we have reached a conclusion on these decisions; the President has been notified of our recommendations and approved them. These decisions have in turn been communicated to the affected departments, who are now moving forward with this reduced staffing as part of their plans for the future.

Once the full complement of adjustments has taken place, we will have achieved 8 reductions in the College of Arts and Science and 3 in the school of Social Work and Social Research. Nevertheless, we anticipate that it will be several years before all these reductions are actually realized. As they occur, faculty salaries will be adjusted accordingly, with the understanding that 5/8ths of each reduction will be returned to the salary pool and the 3/8ths will be reserved for innovation.

Following are the reductions in staffing that have either been previously agreed upon or that CAP has recommended to the President as part of its charge for the 2010-2011 academic year. The President has accepted all of CAP’s current recommendations and will forward them to the Board of Trustees. The 8 positions are:

- Archeology
- Biology (previously decided)
- Classics (previously decided)
- English (previously decided)
We want to note that the Graduate School of Social Work and Social Research proposed a staffing plan that reduces its faculty by 3 positions. GSSWSR should be commended for achieving this difficult goal that allows it to function effectively at 10FTE going into the future.

Finally, while there are no resources returned to the College because of the already significant staffing burdens placed on the Psychology Department, it should be noted that CAP, after much deliberation, chose to recommend that the department not be authorized to proceed with its graduate program. The decision to recommend the closure of the Psychology PhD program is driven by CAP’s charge to prioritize academic resources, and the acknowledgement that the investment in Psychology is and will remain substantially more than the institution can afford at this time. The resources that are thereby gained, particularly with respect to staffing, will be returned to the department in order to bolster the tremendously popular, and largely overextended, undergraduate program.