

**Middle States Reaccreditation Report
Update on Status for the Board of Managers**

This update on the self-study underway for our decennial reaccreditation review is organized into two major sections. The first section describes the activities of the five self-study Working Groups during the course of the year. The second section contains the recommendations that have emerged from each Working Group. These recommendations will be brought to the entire Community for discussion during the 2009-10 Academic Year.

I. Working Groups: Membership and Process

Middle States Self-Study Working Group on Institutional Vision

Working Group Membership: Co-Chairs: Linda Bell (Provost and Economics), Stephen Emerson (President and Biology), Rob Manning (Mathematics and Faculty Board Representative), Michael Kiefer (Institutional Advancement), Ron Tola (Facilities and Master Planning), Cathy Koshland (Co-Chair, Board of Managers), Barry Zubrow (Co-Chair, Board of Managers), Howard Lutnick (Co-Vice Chairman, Board of Managers), Chris Norton (Co-Vice Chairman, Board of Managers)

The Process to Date

This Working Group is charged with analysis of Standard 1 (Mission and Goals), Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), and Standard 3 (Institutional Resources), as well as touching more indirectly all of the standards of the other working groups. The operational format of this group is to use the recommendations of each of the working groups to craft a vision statement and analysis that is fully consistent with our Institutional mission and reflective of the progress and innovation we expect to result from the Comprehensive Self-Study. The Committee has been actively engaged in (1) a Comprehensive Master Planning Process, (2) an Academic Strategic Planning Process, (3) a Budgetary Planning Process in response to the economic and financial crisis, and (4) a dialogue within the Committee and throughout the Community regarding Institutional Goals, Educational Mission, and the Definition of Priorities, against the backdrop of our Institutional Resources. The Committee was constituted as a sub-group of the Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Managers and Middle States activity was discussed and strategized at each of the Board of Managers meetings throughout the year (October, December, February, April). At the April meeting, the Vision Working Group will discuss the recommendations presented by each of the other Working Groups and will meet via teleconference this summer to develop a more complete articulation of our Special Emphasis Theme of Institutional Vision as resonant with the recommendations that have emerged from the self-study process.

Middle States Working Group on Governance, Policies, and Procedures

Working Group Membership: Curtis Greene (Chair), Linda Gerstein (History), Kaye Edwards (Independent College Programs and Corporation), Steve Finley (English), Dick

Wynn (Finance and Administration), Greg Kannerstein (Dean of the College), Chris Mills (Communication), Joanne Brown (Staff Association), Will Harrison (Student), Gabriel Schwartz (Student), Anjan Chatterjee (Board of Managers and Corporation).

The Process to Date

The working group met biweekly throughout the year to systematically review issues surrounding Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance), Standard 5 (Administration), and Standard 6 (Integrity). Initial reports were directed toward describing the College's governance structure in precise terms, identifying how it is articulated in written documents, and assessing those documents for accuracy. A preliminary "structural overview" in outline form was generated in February and shared with the Board and other constituencies. Community discussion included a presentation at Faculty Meeting and a follow-up brown-bag lunch, and a joint meeting was also held with a working group considering Faculty Meeting procedures and practices. The working group has focused its attention on issues such as archiving, record-keeping, and communication, as these affect the operation of committees. A faculty survey concerning the honor code will be administered in the coming months, and the faculty will review materials such as catalogs and web pages that express the college's institutional identity.

Middle States Working Group on Student Life

Working Group Membership: Chair: Maud McInerney (English), Marilou Allen (8th Dimension), Tom Lloyd (Music), Fran Blase (Chemistry), Aurelia Gomez-Unamuno (Spanish), Rick Webb (Counseling and Psychological Services), Wendy Smith (Athletics), Steve Watter (Deans Office), Jess Lord (Admissions), Isabel Clark (Student), Carlos Rodriguez-Vidal (Board of Managers).

The Process to Date

The committee met either weekly or bi-weekly to analyze and review College practice with respect to Standard 8 (Student Admissions and Retention) and Standard 9 (Student Support Services). In its analysis of Standard 8, the working group reviewed (1) internal documents from admissions ("Qualities we seek", "Admission Process Overview"), (2) admissions website materials (3) internal and public documents from the Writing Program and Writing Center describing support offered to under-prepared students, (4) HSSI program description and results, (5) data gleaned from the longitudinal survey of students over the past 30 years maintained by the Deans' Office and analyzed by the Provost's office and (6) senior exit surveys. The Committee has also solicited input from various student groups. To assess Student Support Services (Standard 9), the committee has reviewed the functions of (1) The Dean's Office, responsible for student life on campus, (2) general support services (housing, dining, health services, career development, counseling and psychological services, disabilities services, women's center, etc.), (3) athletics, (4) academic support services (tutoring, pre-professional advising, help centers such as the Writing Center, Math Question Center, Chemistry Question Center, Biology Question Center, Language Learning Center, etc.), and (5) other institutions and organizations that have a profound effect upon the culture of student life at Haverford (the three Centers, Honor Council, Customs, etc.)

Middle States Working Group on Faculty and Curriculum

Working Group Membership: Chair: Jenni Punt (Biology), Paul Smith (History, Former Director of the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship), Laura McGrane (English), Richard Freedman (Music, Former Director of Hurford Humanities Center), Rob Fairman (Biology, Director of Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center), Hunter Rawlings (Board of Managers), Donna Mancini (Dean, Study Abroad), Ryan Fackler (Student).

The Process to Date

Over the last two semesters, this group has met bi-weekly and engaged in a series of conversations about four interrelated standards from the Middle States charge—The Faculty (Standard 10), Educational Offerings (Standard 11), General Education (Standard 12), and Related Educational Programs (Standard 13). The group has discussed the standards in detail, and identified other related questions that are relevant to the ongoing analysis of these standards. The group has worked with other other Working Groups and faculty colleagues with special insight on particular questions, and assembled supporting documentation about processes, trends, and patterns. The working group's discussions and analyses are on-going, and broader faculty feedback will be sought in order to assemble the final working group report. The committee consulted various documents related to curricular and faculty matters including the FCAE Blueprint, departmental documents collected during the FCAE process, EPC documents, database and analysis of alumni outcomes from Institutional Advancement, and other relevant materials.

Middle States Working Group on Assessment

Working Group Membership Co-Chairs: Wendy Sternberg (Associate Provost and Psychology) and Catherine Fennell (Institutional Research), Laurie Allen (Library Information Resources), Phil Bean (Deans Office), Alison Cook-Sather (Education), Amy Feifer (Career Development Office), Gilda Koutsouroumbas (Institutional Research), Mary Ellen Luongo (Administrative Computing), Maxine Markfield (Research Analyst, Provost's Office), Weiwen Miao (Mathematics), John Mosteller (Institutional Advancement), Terry Newirth (Chemistry), Jeff Tecosky-Feldman (Mathematics), Charles Watanasutisis (Student).

The Process to Date

The Working Group on Assessment is charged with documenting and articulating an integrated approach to Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness (Standard 7) and Assessment of Student Learning (Standard 14). The group has met biweekly throughout the year to discuss current practices and strategies for improvement with respect to both Assessment standards. To facilitate its work, the committee solicited information from each academic and administrative department and governance structure, through a set of questionnaires designed to assess institutional effectiveness. These surveys queried each department on its departmental mission and its relation to the College mission, and on current assessment practices and procedures for linking assessment to planning. The survey responses were read by the entire committee and analyzed for identifying unifying themes and for summarizing strengths, challenges, and interrelationships of administrative departments across reporting lines. To address the Student Learning Outcomes standard, the Committee worked with the faculty and academic administration to define the Educational Goals and Aspirations of the Haverford curriculum. As part of the Assessment surveys, the academic departments were asked to address discipline-specific assessment of student learning. The working group summarized each department's approach to its senior capstone experience, as these projects represent the culminating summative assessment of each department's curriculum.

II. Emerging Recommendations

Institutional Vision

The recommendations of the Institutional Vision Committee reflect the goals, priorities, and recommendations of each of the Middle-States Working Groups in articulating mission, resource allocation and planning. This is an evolving process as the working groups develop more fully articulated recommendations in response to each of the accreditation standards. Specific preliminary recommendations of the Institutional Vision working group include:

- Institutional Mission

The College should conduct a periodic review of the “College’s Statement of Purpose” to ensure that evolving priorities are accurately reflected in the College’s public documents and discourse. These conversations should start with the President and Senior Staff but must engage the entire Community including Faculty, Staff, Students, Board of Managers, Corporation, and Alumni.

- Resource Allocation

College resources and budget allocation decisions should be reviewed using a “zero-based budgeting approach” and benchmarking standards on a periodic basis to supplement annual budgeting processes and procedures. Realignment of budget should reflect institutional needs and recommendations as evaluated by the various Middle States working groups and as described in the Self-Study document and the subsequent Periodic Review Report and should reflect long-range strategic planning goals and priorities.

- Standardization of Policy and Procedure

Consonant with Mission and Goals and the Recommendations of the Assessment and Governance, Policy, and Procedures Working Groups, the College should seek to standardize policy and procedures, which should be periodically reviewed and updated for consistency, clarity, and transparency. Areas in need of periodic evaluation include (1) Human Resources regarding hiring, performance review, salary structures, and terminations and reductions in force, (2) alumni-record keeping and student-outcomes measures and data-bases, (3) cross-departmental coordination of information sharing and reporting, (4) annual reports of important Governance Structures, and (5) articulation, review and oversight of Center activities and budgets.

- Enhancing Diversity and Access

Consistent with the College’s “Statement of Purpose” and the Student Life working group the College must resource and support in all functions (Admissions, Financial Aid, Advising, Institutional Advancement, Faculty, Student Life) a vibrant and diverse Community. Particular attention should be placed on student outcomes and faculty and student recruitment and retention.

- Priorities for the Capital Campaign

The priorities for the Capital Campaign must realistically reflect the goals and aspirations of the College including setting a timeline for the implementation of the FCAE Blueprint and for the new building articulated in the Master Plan. This must be a coordinated and well communicated effort between Institutional Advancement and the President, Provost, Board of Managers, and relevant campus constituencies.

- Implementation of the FCAE Blueprint

The FCAE Blueprint is the articulation of the Community's vision for academic excellence, student-faculty collaboration, scholarly engagement inside and outside of the classroom, interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary training, and for creating the deepest and most engaging curriculum and educational experience for our students. College leadership must prioritize and oversee the implementation of this plan in a timeframe which is realistic, responsible, and consistent with the broad goals and visions of the Blueprint, and with the specific recommendations of the Faculty and Curriculum working group.

- Implementation of the Master Plan and New Architecture for the College

The Campus Master Plan was recently completed and approved by the Board of Managers after full Community consultation and engagement. It is the physical manifestation of our educational aspirations as a Community and was inspired by our educational vision. The Master Plan was designed to be flexible and responsive to changing priorities and goals as articulated by College leadership.

- Enhancing the Arts

The work of the Provost's Ad-hoc Arts Planning Committee should be referenced in the development of a concrete short- and medium-term plan to expand and enhance the visual and performing arts.

Governance, Policies and Procedures

Recommendations from the Governance, Policies, and Procedures group focus on improvements to organizational structure and transparency. They include:

- Governance Documents

Three important committees are not described in any of the governance documents: the Corporation Advisory Committee, the Long Range Strategic Planning Committee (LRSPC), and the Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE). All three are active and influential committees, but are relatively new and their precise role in decision-making is not well understood by the community. This needs to be rectified by modifying descriptive documents as appropriate (Corporation Bylaws, Board Operating Procedures, Faculty Handbook) to include a description of these committees. This is a matter of some urgency.

- Student Representation on Committees

We recommend that the process of appointment of students to committees be revisited by a committee of faculty, administrators, and students, exploring ways to insure that appointments are made in a timely manner and committees routinely have their full complement of student representatives. Specific ways should be found to improve the communication between committees and Students' Council, which is responsible for making appointments. Since many committees begin their work immediately in September, the possibility of making appointments at the end of the preceding year should be considered. It would be helpful to develop explicit written guidelines to help orient new representatives and help them understand their roles on committees. These descriptions might vary considerably from committee to committee. Finally, there should be clarification about exactly which committees should have student representatives, and who appoints them.

- Faculty Governance

The status of FCAE and its relationship to EPC needs to be clarified. This might involve eliminating FCAE, or merging its function into EPC, or partitioning EPC into two committees. The last two options as well as any new long-term role of FCAE would require faculty discussion and approval. The issue of student representation is an important detail that needs to be clarified.

The faculty should consider whether it wants to add a top-level "faculty council", or "provost's council" to enhance the perspective and agenda-setting capability of its most important committees, and improve communication among them.

The faculty should continue or even intensify its discussions about the structure and operation of faculty meeting. Concerns have been expressed about whether a full range of faculty voices can be adequately expressed during these meetings, and whether there is adequate time available for thorough and effective discussion of major issues. A partial solution may be to improve mechanisms for communication "offline", including circulating agenda-related documents in advance of the meeting. Another may be to extend the official definition of "faculty meeting" to include a routine expectation of continuation beyond 6 p.m. or to the following week, or of holding extra ad hoc faculty meetings.

- External Reviews

External reviews of both academic and administrative departments should be standardized for timing and process. Certain other aspects need to be clarified, for example: in the case of academic department reviews, who besides the President and Provost sees the reports, and how are they archived for future use and reference? Finally, the structure of these reviews needs to be assessed. For example, does the policy of joint reviews of Bryn Mawr and Haverford academic departments detract from the value of those reviews?

- Archiving, Record-keeping, Transparency

The maintenance of minutes by some committees is haphazard at best, and the community is ill-informed about the results of past deliberations and the progress of current ones. Archiving issues are a concern generally; the college does not maintain its "institutional history" in a modern, systematic way. There are opportunities for considerable improvement, many of which may be facilitated by the appointment of a new CIO. However, there are costs in both money and time: the college needs to consider how much effort it wishes to devote to record-keeping, and how transparent it wishes certain operations to become. For example: should major faculty committees produce annual reports and post them online?

- Senior Staff

The Senior Administrative Staff plays a central role in our governance, functioning in essence as the President's "cabinet". It is partially defined in the Board Operating Procedures document, which lists the five senior officers of the College (President, Provost, VP for Finance, VP for Advancement, and Dean of the College). The list has been expanded currently to include the Director of Admissions, and the Director of Communications attends meetings but is not a member of Senior Staff. The expected appointment of a CIO will add one more member to Senior staff. The current composition of Senior Staff is reflected in organizational charts appearing in the Factbook, and there is a page on the College website listing all members with a description of their responsibilities. However, there does not appear to be any description of how Senior Staff operates procedurally. It would be useful to have such a description, and make it available to the Community. Clearly, decisions made by Senior Staff are made in tandem with the President, and the President is responsible for those decisions. Less clear is the deliberative role played by Senior Staff (e.g., weighing options), and communication with other deliberative bodies (e.g., faculty committees) when important policy decisions are being made. The way a President uses Senior Staff will inevitably be a personal decision reflecting his/her management style. It is not wise to codify this too rigidly. Nonetheless, we feel that additional discussion and clarification of the issue would be healthy.

- Performance Reviews

It was noted that some areas of the college do rigorous and regular employee performance reviews, and others do not. The college should consider whether a more uniform policy of performance reviews of employees needs to be established.

Student Life

The student life Working Group suggests the following recommendations to enhance our ability to attract, retain, and support a diverse and accomplished student body:

- Addressing the "Achievement Gap"

While Haverford's overall retention and graduation results are admirable, analysis of the longitudinal database shows that the achievement gap between African American and Latino students and their white counterparts remains real. The Committee on Student Life recommends that the College make a genuine and systematic investment in helping students from under-represented backgrounds succeed. This should include a

conversation about the ethics of admitting underprepared students and a review of successful programs at other institutions. The College should also consider reinvigorating and emphasizing its relationship with historically black institutions (Spelman/Morehouse); semesters “abroad” at such institutions have had enormous positive effect at some of our peer institutions.

- Sophomore Support

We applaud the recent efforts of the Dean’s Office to put in place a network of support systems for sophomores; this is a recent initiative but we expect the results to be positive. We encourage more conversation among the faculty about the responsibilities of advising, and some sort of system of rewards to encourage better and more engaged faculty advising.

- Senior Exit Interviews

The recently re-instated senior exit interviews permit additional assessment of the relationship between attributes of admitted students and Haverford’s mission and programs. Overall, the exit interviews have provided a better understanding of both student expectations for their Haverford experience and the broad range of ways their Haverford experiences have impacted them. These interviews are shared between the Deans’ Office and Admissions, but we recommend that they also be shared (in redacted form) with the faculty.

- Communication with Admissions

In general, communication between the Dean’s Office and Admissions has improved greatly in recent years; communication between these offices and the Provost’s office, and between these offices and the faculty should also be improved.

- Academic Support

Haverford lags behind its peers when it comes to providing academic support services. We acknowledge the usefulness of peer tutors, but also recognize (partly due to student input) that peer tutoring at a small institution has inevitable social drawbacks. The Writing Center has, in the past two or three years, instituted practices that we think might profitably be imitated by other academic support services: “adult”, professional tutors in addition to peer tutors, good outreach to faculty, workshops related to various writing concerns and facilitated by faculty, etc. We encourage the formation of a central location for Academic Support Services, where the Writing Center and other help services could be located; at other institutions, such Centers often include Career Development and other offices as well.

We recommend further conversation about how to support heritage language speakers (mostly but not exclusively speakers of Spanish).

- Role of Centers in Student Life

We acknowledge the positive effect of the Humanities Center on the development of the Arts on Campus, and encourage continued support for these initiatives.

We note also the upsurge of interest in internships, etc. run by the CPGC and the Humanities Center; we encourage further consideration of the curricular impact of these programs.

Faculty and Curriculum

The recommendations of the Working Group on Faculty and Curriculum reflect the careful analysis of the academic program during the self-study year, and the academic strategic plan that has been ongoing since 2006. Specific recommendations include:

- **Hiring Process for Faculty**

The faculty as a whole (with guidance from Academic Council to formulate language) should consider changes in representation on faculty hiring committees — including models that (1) enhance departmental voice at various stages of the process and (2) enhance the quality of participation of student representatives. FCAE will offer one model for restructuring search committee representation (spring, 2009). We recommend that Academic Council, perhaps in consultation with Educational Policy Committee and FCAE, help to formulate a plan.

We should include in our efforts the development of clear and intentional guidelines for hiring and supporting interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary faculty members, so that expectations can be appropriately met during reappointment and tenure. In implementing the FCAE blueprint's recommendations for hiring in new areas, EPC will need to work closely with the Provost in developing procedures to support such appointments. Centers will also be an important consultative resource.

- **Academic Council**

Particularly as we move forward to implement the plans for expansion of faculty under FCAE proposals, we will need some mechanism for measuring and evaluating the work load of Academic Council as it reviews hires and personnel case decisions. At what point will this work exceed the capacity of a single Academic Council? Council and the Faculty need to consider the implications on workload carefully and in advance of the full implementation of the Blueprint plan.

- **Review of Interim Faculty and Post-Doctoral Fellows**

The Associate Provost has recently been involved in developing better models for review of interim faculty. These models need to be evaluated and adopted by faculty and Council. The Hurford and Koshland Centers have developed strong models for mentorship of post-doctoral fellows that may be useful in this endeavor. That said interim faculty positions pose slightly different challenges because they are de-centralized in various departments.

- **Research Opportunities for Faculty.**

The College already has made a substantial commitment to the promotion of faculty research and creative projects via the Junior Faculty Leave and the improved sabbatical

leave policy for continuing faculty. The Academic Centers have in recent years mounted a number of initiatives that support faculty research projects through seminars, visiting scholars, research assistants, exploratory trips, and general research funds (CPGC and KINSC). The growing cadre of post-doctoral fellowships now supported by various grants and endowments likewise puts continuing faculty in touch with new ideas and methods that will invigorate our profile as researchers.

The FCAE blueprint imagines changes in our teaching load that would allow faculty to think more intentionally about new curricular innovations and scholarly collaborations with students. The proposed initiative will possibly make each faculty member responsible for fewer total courses in hopes of creating opportunities within the curriculum for faculty to pursue research projects, teach materials directly related to their individual research interests, and collaborate with students in a variety of ways. We continue to model the various ways research and imaginative collaborations will figure in the teaching responsibilities of those involved in, for example, language pedagogy, or in the creative arts, and in some other specialties. As part of this review, we will also reconsider the ways in which supervision of student senior work is measured in the calculation of faculty teaching loads as they would be transformed under the FCAE blueprint. FCAE has begun to approach this conversation with EPC.

- Library and Information Technology

A much-needed major review of information technology services is underway at the College. Key recommendations that have emerged from the external consulting panel include (1) hiring a CIO who reports directly to the President and (2) improving integration of information technology resources with Bryn Mawr. It is also recommended that improvements be made to the ability of the library and the CIO to support the curriculum. A more focused plan for interaction between the CIO and the Head Librarian through conversation with departments, ACC, the CIO Search process and with leadership from the President, Provost and other members of Senior Staff is necessary.

- Administrative Support for Faculty

Enhanced administrative assistant support is recommended for departmental chairs and faculty leaders of Centers and Committees. Such support could enable chairs and other faculty leaders to delegate responsibility and initiative for a greater range of tasks (building management; enrollment statistics; correspondence with alumni from departmental programs; active maintenance of web pages; and other creative projects). These faculty leaders would then have more time to support faculty development and curricular events—mentoring junior colleagues, visiting classes, sponsoring activities with students, forging connections with related disciplines, and generally enhancing research and teaching.

- Enhancements to the Educational Policy Committee

The Working Group recommends a streamlining of EPC course review responsibilities, by delegating first level review to divisional committee representatives or Department Chairs, or to even consider a separate governing body to handle more mechanistic aspects of the curriculum. In order to effectively manage the business of EPC, the College should consider increasing faculty representation and lengthening the term of service for continuity across year. It is recommended that senior administrators regularly

attend meetings to enhance communication, ensure a focus on key College business, and to facilitate coordination with other College bodies. Consistent with the recommendations of the other working groups, EPC should formalize procedures for archiving EPC materials and passing information to the next Chair. It is also recommended that EPC review and address the broad curricular issues that relate to our developing emphases on student scholarship, interdisciplinarity, and the implementation of the FCAE Blueprint. It is recommended that EPC lead departments in discussions of the distribution requirements, interdisciplinary programs, general education requirements, and the emphasis (curricular or co-curricular) on Social Justice. EPC should continue to evaluate how the curriculum facilitates opportunities for students to develop research skills and oral skills throughout their four years at the departmental and College-wide levels. EPC should also continue its efforts in evaluating how course enrollments affect quality and quantity of introductory courses, reviewing the status of the current first-year writing program and its ability to serve students of various skill levels while maintaining intellectual rigor.

- Educational Assessment and Oversight

It is recommended that EPC formalize mechanisms to periodically evaluate the structure and success of majors, minors, concentrations and interdisciplinary programs, as well as general education requirements and philosophy. The College should centralize and continually update information on graduate destinations through the input of Institutional Advancement, ACC, the CDO, individual faculty members, Admissions, Communications, and alumni contacts. An open source (Wiki-like) format may be particularly useful. The Working Group recommends an enhancement of periodic review of the curriculum at the Department and College levels, including a focus on student learning outcomes. The format of these assessments can include the development of a “Departmental Activities Form”, annual student input at the departmental level, access to senior exit interviews, formalized alumni input into departmental review, and cohesive curricular conversations that reach beyond individual departments

- Formal Discussions about Pedagogy

The College should formalize opportunities to discuss effective pedagogical strategies to supplement those informally inspired by the Writing Program, the Bi-Co pedagogy faculty seminar (currently funded with Mellon money), and Humanities Center Working Groups.

- Contributions of the Centers to the Curriculum

The Centers are encouraged to continue functioning as autonomous entities that complement each other and develop the college’s curricular and co-curricular activities. The College must work to identify the multiple roles Centers can play in developing programs and supporting student and faculty research, and create administrative mechanisms for handing over/sustaining efforts successfully incubated by Centers. (e.g. Environmental Studies, Documentary film and Visual Studies). Center Steering Committee members should be appointed for multi-year terms to enhance continuity. Regularly scheduled meetings should take place between Center Directors and the President and Provost to enhance communication and coordination between Centers and Departmental/College curricular interests. Finally, a clearer sense of the relationship between the HHC and the Arts on campus in our current curriculum and in

future plans for the Arts should be established.

- Support the Development of Arts on Campus: a Multi-Pronged Approach

The group recommends that Bi-Co cooperation be enhanced so that curricular opportunities and facilities in the Arts can be shared and strengthened. Decisions about academic programs should be made before committing to facilities, particularly for space-consuming efforts (theatre, film, digital media – as outlined in the recent arts report). A “College Arts Fund” not dependent on Center funding could provide resources for regular Arts offerings and curricular visits to galleries and performances and should be considered. The College should also identify and support future initiatives like the current \$80K Mellon Exploratory “Arts Across the Curriculum” Grant that will bring artists, performance artists et al. to campus in a variety of venues. EPC should evaluate the role of film in our curriculum. At present, BMC houses the minor in Film Studies and it is possible that the program could be enhanced with more formal curricular Bi-Co involvement.

- Enhance Support for Under-Prepared Students

The Haverford Summer Science Institute, spearheaded by Jeff Tecosky-Feldman (Professor of Mathematics), is a summer bridge program that focuses on preparing underprepared and underrepresented students for the rigors of the Haverford curriculum prior to their first September at the College. Haverford’s summer program is shorter (and less comprehensive) than the best-run peer programs and should be enhanced. We have developed multiple intensive introductory sections in the sciences that support (with some success) the ambitions of under-prepared students and have introduced multiple programs that provide different forms of academic help (faculty and peer mentorship, question centers, guided learning groups, recitations, etc.). It is clear that for some students these efforts are not sufficient. It is crucial that we enhance the training and experience of our under-prepared students. We offer several recommendations to address these problems. (It also should be noted that these concerns are addressed in more depth by the Working Group on Student Life).

- Apply Sustained Effort to Enhance our Writing Program.

Writing is the public face of a community of faculty and student scholars. Our program is currently undergoing a process of re-evaluation through both internal conversations and external consultations. Though successful on many levels, the program is inadequately staffed and under-resourced, especially compared to peer institutions. For example, we provide a single writing course for most students, with a preliminary intensive writing seminar (WS-I) for students with pronounced writing weaknesses. The single WS-I course is insufficient to move weak students up to the level of expectations for their development as young scholars. Many of our peer institutions offer a variety of additional writing courses to both weak and mainstream writers, with an increasing number devising programs of writing support that go beyond the first year.

The Writing Program advanced several recommendations endorsed by EPC (including a recommendation to expand the number of writing intensive courses offered to our entering students). In addition, EPC recently organized a symposium with a panel of external writing scholars and directors that will help us model and advance a revised program. Models of ‘Writing in Disciplines’ and ‘Writing across the Curriculum’ are being

explored. EPC hopes to initiate conversations with the full faculty about future directions for the Writing Program. In the interim we support the following recommendations: (1) Increase the number of WSI courses from two, which serve only 20 students, to three or four; (2) Increase the number of professional staff and reconstitute these positions so that we can provide a greater array of writing workshops and individualized, professional tutoring sessions; (3) Consider emulating our peers in requiring two or more intensive writing courses over the four-year curriculum, perhaps linked to the enhanced research orientation of our disciplinary majors.

- Study Abroad programs

A set of recommendations is evolving with respect to our study abroad programs, which currently send 48% of each junior class abroad for a semester or a year. The College must ensure that Haverford continues to provide a premier study abroad experience. The following recommendations are proposed: (1) Enhance study abroad connections to curriculum by more fully integrating faculty into advising and review process; (2) Support study abroad opportunities for all students, regardless of financial background; (3) Enhance access to International Programs, not only for those economically disadvantaged, but also for students of color, those with disabilities, athletes and science majors; (4) Encourage cooperation between our International Academic Programs and the Centers (CPGC and KINSC) so that students who cannot study abroad may consider summer volunteer opportunities and internships; (5) Reconfigure the position of Dean of Global Affairs so that the incumbent can give full attention to the needs of administering the study abroad program; (6) In addition, enhance the level of administrative support for the program; (7) Consider developing more support for domestic Study Away Programs, particularly those that offer unique educational experiences (including those at Historically Black Colleges, those that focus on Environmental Studies, etc.)

Assessment

The following recommendations of the Assessment Working Group arise from the primary goal of creating a comprehensive assessment plan, addressing both student learning assessment, and assessment of institutional effectiveness. These recommendations include the establishment and institutionalization of various assessment structures.:

- A “Culture of Evidence”

Our biggest obstacle to sustaining effective assessment is in embracing its value. We firmly believe that assessment is valuable and can be accomplished in a way that is meaningful to the institution. Formalizing our structure for assessment and increasing the transparency of our institutional approach are essential to enhancing a culture of evidence. Our proposals are intended to communicate the value of meaningful assessment and coordinate practices that will both illustrate compliance with Middle States assessment expectations and provide an evidence-based mechanism for continual improvement moving forward.

- An Assessment Committee

The critical operational recommendation is to establish an “Assessment Committee,” organized along Vice-Presidential lines for a comprehensive, institutional perspective,

with a focus on best practices across reporting units. The responsibility of the committee will be to oversee development of an Assessment Plan website (with a structure and content designed to increase transparency), to facilitate the transformation of “data” into “information”, and to communicate assessment efforts both internally and externally. Ideally, this committee will be led by an Assessment Coordinator to administratively support and sustain our institutional assessment plan. Given the current budget realities, creative approaches will need to be explored in the near term regarding staffing this position. Some resources also will need to be allocated to establish and tend a recommended centralized, on-line course assessment mechanism, with a feedback loop from the Provost’s Office to academic departments.

- **Academic Department Assessment**

The Assessment Committee would facilitate transparency across academic departments in the sharing of effective student learning assessment practices, and will shepherd the delivery of data that academic departments have identified as being particularly useful in the evaluation of educational outcomes, including currently disperse alumni data. Along with this information, data from our recommended Departmental Exit Surveys will assist academic departments in completing the assessment cycle of curricular planning based on assessment.

- **Institution Level Support of Student Learning Assessment**

Other specific recommendations are to incorporate training about student learning assessment into new faculty orientation, to promote the clear articulation of learning objectives on course syllabi, and to make specific recommendations to the Educational Policy Committee regarding the development of-a consistent rubric for assessing the Senior Capstone experience. A related recommendation for EPC highlights the need for the development of an appropriate mechanism to ensure that from the entry to the major, students incrementally develop the skills essential for the successful accomplishment of the senior capstone experience in all major disciplines.