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PART I
INTRODUCTION
CHAPTER 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Haverford College is a liberal arts College with a distinctive character that prioritizes superior undergraduate education and original research as core vehicles for preparing students for lives of scholarship, service, and community leadership. These values derive from the history of the College as a Quaker institution and as a leader and innovator in undergraduate research. The College’s pervasive and dynamic academic and social Honor Code characterizes a community built on the foundations of mutual respect, trust, and individual and collective responsibility.

More recently, our implicit institutional values have been made explicit through a community-wide curricular assessment and academic strategic planning process that has led to the creation of an ambitious blueprint for building on the College’s academic strengths. The results of this planning process are the reaffirmation of the centrality of scholarship and creativity in the undergraduate curriculum, the recognition of new areas of study mandated by the challenges emerging in the 21st century, and a call to further nurture, cultivate, and expand the opportunities for faculty-student collaboration and student scholarship.

At this moment in College history, under new leadership at the highest levels of College governance and in light of our recent efforts at large-scale institutional planning, we have organized this self-study around the theme of Institutional Vision. Since the last reaccreditation review, the College has appointed a new President (2007), Provost (2007), Vice President for Institutional Advancement (2008), Dean of the College (2009), Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid (2004), and is in the process of creating a new vice presidential post, Chief Information Officer (2009). Involved in each of these appointments was a procedure for critically examining and articulating institution-level goals and aspirations. Our educational vision has been similarly refined by an academic strategic-planning process that has been ongoing in an intensive way since 2005. The process has been focused on the effectiveness of the overall curriculum and the allocation of faculty time across teaching, mentoring, service, and scholarship. The Blueprint for Haverford’s Future, the outcome of the three-year effort, was enthusiastically affirmed by the Faculty and the Board of Managers in the spring of 2008. The College recently completed a Campus Master Planning process, which laid out a vision for the physical manifestation of the College’s near- and long-term goals, and we are currently in the midst of a Comprehensive Campaign planning process that will allow the College to achieve its aspirations for academic enrichment and student life with faculty and facilities that support these goals. The Middle States reaccreditation process is an opportunity to reaffirm the value of these planning processes and to articulate in a comprehensive way our core institutional goals and aspirations.

Leading the self-study effort was the Self-Study Steering Committee, consisting of the Provost and Associate Provost (Self-Study Co-Chairs), the President of the College, the Director of Institutional Research, and the faculty chairs of each of the Working Groups (complete Working Group charges and membership is provided in Chapter 2). Working Groups were broadly representative (comprised of faculty, students, staff, and Board
members) and the process involved frequent formal and informal communication with various campus constituencies throughout the self-study year.

The self-study process was comprehensive in scope and included an assessment component for every Middle States reaccreditation standard. Our focus on assessment was driven by a close examination of our institutional mission and our goals for student learning. This analysis led to a reaffirmation of the College’s core mission, and a recommendation to update and refine our public Statement of Purpose to reflect our current interpretation of Haverford’s ever-evolving mission. The faculty engaged in a process of re-articulating the central goals and aspirations for student learning at Haverford that will form the cornerstone of our efforts in student-learning assessment moving forward.

The report contains a set of implementable recommendations for improvement, based on an honest assessment of our institutional strengths and the challenges we face, and a process for prioritizing plans for action. Recommendations arise out of the analysis contained in the self-study document, and are listed in the concluding chapter (Chapter 18).

Most of the recommendations center around four core themes:

- Enriching academic excellence, primarily through the continued implementation of the Blueprint for Haverford’s Future - our academic strategic plan
- Enhancing our systems of academic and co-curricular support for our students - particularly focusing on underprepared and under-represented students
- Using a foundation of integrated and coordinated information structures (facilitated by the appointment of a CIO) to enhance existing procedures for assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning
- Critically examining our current structures of self-governance and institutional organization

Enriching Academic Excellence

In January 2006, a new faculty committee was created by the Provost of the College in consultation with Academic Council, whose mission was to ask how we could enhance the academic experience of both the students and faculty at Haverford College. This Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE) includes the President, Provost, six members of the faculty (now five), as well as two Student Council liaisons. The work of the committee has focused on examining the effectiveness of the overall curriculum, identifying new approaches to achieving excellence within each discipline, and identifying barriers that hinder students and faculty from achieving their ambitions. Through its deliberations, FCAE has formulated plans for enhancing faculty scholarship, student-faculty collaboration, student intellectual independence, and the identification of key new areas for scholarship. The centerpiece of FCAE’s work is the Blueprint for Haverford’s Future, a plan that describes the recruitment of 27 new tenure-line faculty positions across the departments of the College over the next five to ten years, and a reallocation of faculty time to explicitly support student-faculty collaboration. (See Appendix A for the FCAE plan, entitled “Learning – Discovery – Renewal: A Blueprint for Haverford’s Future.”)
Many of these new faculty positions will take advantage of Haverford’s strong library and vibrant interdepartmental Academic Centers, which include the Hurford Humanities Center (HHC), the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship (CPGC), and the Koshland Integrated Natural Sciences Center (KINSC). Indeed, many additional benefits will accrue by coordinating and more fully integrating the activities of these Centers with the core activities of our Academic Departments. In addition, the strength of Haverford’s academic curriculum will continue to expand through our close collaborations with Bryn Mawr (Bi-Co) and Swarthmore (Tri-Co) Colleges. All three Colleges have newly appointed Presidents who are committed to supporting and expanding on this special consortial relationship in the future.

In support of our ambitious vision for enhancing the academic mission of the College, we must continue to devote substantial resources towards attracting, supporting and retaining the highest quality faculty and students. Providing enhanced access to a Haverford education - for example, our recent replacement of College loans with grants and the institution of a cap on the imputed value of home equity - is crucial to attracting the brightest and most talented undergraduate students and to reducing barriers that preclude some students from choosing a Haverford education. We are steadfast in our commitment to maintaining these generous financial aid policies because it is consistent with our principles and aspirations.

**Enhancing Academic and Co-Curricular Support**

The self-study has pointed to several areas in which support for our students can be enhanced or augmented. A component of our mission is the education of the “whole student”; we as an institution must continue to engage in dialogue to assess our evolving understanding of this phrase. Our key question is as follows: How do we best educate our students who, by virtue of our efforts to increase diversity in recent years, arrive at Haverford with a widely varied set of pre-college experiences? Our student body is now characterized by considerable diversity, not just racially and ethnically, but also in socioeconomic status, geographic region (both internationally and nationally, including urban, suburban, and rural settings), faith traditions, family circumstances, and levels of pre-college academic preparation. Although the primary effect of increasing diversity is to enrich our learning community, the consequences of disparity in pre-college academic preparation need our close and careful attention. More resources and better pre-college programming may be necessary to close the gap in college preparedness and ensure that all of our students leave Haverford equally prepared for exceptional careers of scholarship, leadership, and service.

**Assessment and Information Sharing**

The structures and processes we use as an institution to determine whether we are successful in reaching our goals were critically analyzed as part of the self-study process. While existing assessment tools have served us well over the past years, we now recognize a growing need for a more coordinated effort to best meet the institution’s assessment goals. Effective assessments require ready access to data and information. Facilitating this goal will be the appointment of a new Chief Information Officer, who will lead efforts to build better technological infrastructure and integrated information systems, a long-overdue effort that will facilitate information sharing at all levels of the College.
Our focus on assessment encompasses both the effectiveness of our administrative and academic departments in meeting institutional goals, and the effectiveness of our educational efforts in meeting the faculty’s goals for student learning. The self-study afforded the faculty the opportunity to define and refine the goals and aspirations of a Haverford education, a necessary first step in formulating student-learning goals and objectives. Moving forward, the College must refocus our efforts to coordinate and organize effective assessment mechanisms to ensure that our students achieve these goals. We currently have formal and informal mechanisms for student-learning assessment and the assessment of overall institutional effectiveness, but recognize the clear benefit and need for greater coordination, communication, and dissemination of these assessment practices across the College.

College Administrative Structures and Faculty Self-Governance

The self-study process has enabled us to reexamine multiple aspects of our self-governance and organizational structure. In the process, we have identified key administrative and academic areas in need of examination or improvement. Our structures of faculty self-governance have remained unchanged despite considerable growth in faculty, staff, and students over the past decades, and it is critical to evaluate the ways in which we can improve on our existing structure. In addition to growth, the demands that we have placed on our community members challenge the existing systems of self-governance at the College. This report contains several operational suggestions for improvement of our current structures and recommends a critical examination of other governance and administrative bodies. In light of our ambitious plans over the next several decades it is essential to evaluate the ways in which we can improve on our existing structure and help Haverford College to function more efficiently.
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CHAPTER 2
THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

Haverford College presents this self-study in support of our reaccreditation review by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education. Haverford College values the introspective discussions that have been generated as part of this process and we believe that these conversations will serve us well as we move forward with our ongoing strategic planning efforts. This section outlines the process and contextualizes the special emphasis theme of “Institutional Vision” that will be present throughout the self-study.

2.1 – Timeline

Work on the self-study began during the 2007-2008 academic year, with the drafting and submission of the Self-Study Design document† in June 2008. Faculty and staff members were appointed to five Working Groups, and the Self-Study Steering Committee was convened. Membership on all committees was finalized in Fall 2008, when students were appointed to Working Groups through the Student’s Council committee appointment process. Groups met weekly or biweekly throughout the 2008-2009 academic year. There were several opportunities for community-wide discussion and reflection, which occurred at special meetings of the faculty and students, and there was frequent communication between the Working Groups and relevant campus constituencies. Formal presentations by the Provost were made to the Board of Managers throughout the year, in October 2008, December 2008, January 2009, and April 2009. Working Group reports† were completed in Spring 2009, and were posted to a password-protected website for community feedback. Summer 2009 saw the writing of the first draft of the self-study by the self-study co-chairs based on the Working Group reports, in preparation for revision and community feedback during Fall 2009. A summary of community involvement in the self-study process is included in Appendix B.

2.2 – Steering Committee Membership

A Self-Study Steering Committee (SSSC) was formed, including the President, Provost (Co-Chair of the Middle States Review), Associate Provost (Co-Chair of the Middle States Review), Working Group faculty chairs, and the Director of Institutional Research. In greater detail, the current Steering Committee membership includes: (i) Stephen Emerson ’74, President; (ii) Linda Bell, Provost and John Huford Professor of Economics, Co-Chair; (iii) Wendy Sternberg, Associate Provost and Professor of Psychology, Co-Chair; (iv) Curtis Greene, Professor of Mathematics; (v) Tom Lloyd, Associate Professor of Music (2009-2010); (vi) Maud McInerney, Associate Professor of English (2008-2009); (vii) Jennifer Punt, Professor of Biology; (viii) Catherine Fennell, Director of Institutional Research.

2.3 – Working Group Membership

As outlined in our Design document, this report is organized by four themes and associated standards: (1) Institutional Vision (our Special Emphasis Theme) (Standards 1, 2, 3, 11, †Available in Document Room
12); (2) Core Academic Mission, which includes the Education of the Whole Student/Student Life (Standards 8, 9) and Faculty and Curriculum (Standards 10, 11, 12, 13); (3) Assessment (Standards 7, 14); and (4) Governance, Policies and Procedures (Standards 4, 5, 6). These four themes were the organizing focus of the five working groups as described below. Wendy Sternberg and Linda Bell, as Co-Chairs of the self-study process were ex-officio members of all Working Groups.

Working Group A. Institutional Vision

“Institutional Vision” is our special emphasis theme, and in many ways nearly all of the Middle States Standards relate to this Working Group’s focus. The core Middle States Standards analyzed by this group were Standard 1 (Mission and Goals), Standard 2 (Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal), Standard 3 (Institutional Resources), and responsibility for Standards 11 (Educational Offerings) and 12 (General Education) in collaboration with the Working Group on Faculty and Curriculum. We organized this collaborative responsibility for these standards in particular to reflect the fact that our Institutional Vision revolves in no small part around the Curriculum and Academic Enrichment. The membership of this Working Group includes (i) Stephen Emerson, President (Co-Chair Institutional Vision Working Group); (ii) Linda Bell, Provost and John B. Huford Professor of Economics (Co-Chair Institutional Vision Working Group); (iii) Rob Manning, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Faculty Representative to the Board of Managers; (iv) Laurie Hart, Professor of Anthropology, Faculty Representative, Master Planning Committee; (v) Cathy Kosland, Chair, Board of Managers; (vi) Barry Zubrow, Retired Chair (2009), Board of Managers; (vii) Howard Lutnick, Vice-Chair, Board of Managers; (viii) Chris Norton, Vice-Chair, Board of Managers; (ix) Adam Lewis, ’10

Working Group B. Student Life

This Working Group’s focus is a core component of our “Core Academic Mission” theme and was empowered to examine Middle States Standard 8 (Student Admissions and Retention), and Middle States Standard 9 (Student Support Services), as part of our institution’s commitment to “Education of the Whole Student.” The membership of this Working Group included: (i) Maud McInerney, Associate Professor of English (Chair Student Life Working Group, Academic Year 2008-09); (ii) Tom Lloyd, Associate Professor of Music (Chair Student Life Working Group, Academic Year 2009-10); (iii) Jess Lord, Dean of Admissions; (iv) Steven Watter, Senior Associate Dean for Student Life; (v) Fran Blase, Associate Professor of Chemistry; (vi) Aurelia Gomez Unamuno, Assistant Professor of Spanish; (vii) Wendy Smith, Director of Athletics; (viii) Rick Webb, Director of Counseling and Psychological Services; (ix) Marilou Allen, Director of 8th Dimension, Women’s Center; (x) Carlos Rodriguez-Vidal, Board of Managers; (xi) Isabel Clark ’09.

Working Group C. Faculty and Curriculum

The second component of the “Core Academic Mission” theme concerns our faculty and the academic program. This group’s focus was on Middle States Standard 10 (Faculty), Middle States Standard 11 (Educational Offerings), Middle States Standard 12 (General Education), and Middle States Standard 13 (Related Educational Activities). Faculty and Curriculum Committee membership included: (i) Jenni Punt, Professor of Biology (Chair, Faculty and Curriculum Working Group); (ii) Paul Smith, Professor of History; (iii) Rob Fairman, Associate Professor of Biology; (iv) Richard Freedman, Professor of Music;
(v) Laura McGrane, Assistant Professor of English; (vi) Hunter Rawlings, Board of Managers; (vii) Donna Mancini, Associate Dean; (viii) Ryan Fackler ’11.

Working Group D. Assessment

Assessment is a core element of every Standard, and in recognition of the importance of assessment processes, structures, and resources, we have devoted an entire Working Group to providing a holistic analysis of College-wide assessment practices. The scope of the analysis centered on Middle States Standard 7 (Institutional Effectiveness) and Standard 14 (Assessment of Student Learning), but an additional responsibility of the Committee was to ensure that Assessment was incorporated directly into the analysis of the other Working Groups. This committee had the following membership: (i) Wendy Sternberg, Associate Provost and Professor of Psychology (Co-Chair Assessment Working Group); (ii) Cathy Fennell, Director of Institutional Research (Co-Chair Assessment Working Group); (iii) Terry Newirth, Professor of Chemistry; (iv) Weiwen Miao, Associate Professor of Mathematics; (v) Alison Cook-Sather, Professor of Education and Coordinator, Teaching and Learning Initiative; (vi) Alice Lesnick, Senior Lecturer in Education and Director, Bryn Mawr/Haverford Education Program; (vii) Jeff Tecosky-Feldman, Senior Lecturer in Mathematics; (viii) Phil Bean, Associate Dean; (ix) Laurie Allen, Coordinator for Research, Instruction, and Outreach in the Library; (x) John Mosteller, Assistant Vice President for Academic Resources; (xi) Gilda Koutsourioumbas, Assistant Director of Institutional Research; (xii) Mary Ellen Luongo, Director of Administrative Computing; (xiii) Amy Feifer, Senior Managing Director of Career Development; (xiv) Charles Watanasutisas ’10.

Working Group E. Governance, Policies and Procedures

This Working Group was charged with analyzing operations and governance both internally through administrative structures and committees, and externally in the way it represents these structures and commitments to the outside world. In its deliberations, the committee focused on Middle States Standard 4 (Leadership and Governance), Standard 5 (Administration), and Standard 6 (Integrity). The committee consisted of the following members: (i) Curtis Greene, Professor of Mathematics (Chair Governance, Policies, and Procedures Working Group); (ii) G. Richard Wynn, Vice President for Finance and Administration; (iii) Stephen Finley, Professor of English; (iv) Linda Gerstein, Professor of History, Director of Independent College Programs; (v) Kaye Edwards, Associate Professor of Independent College Programs; (vi) Greg Kannerstein, Dean of the College (through 2008-2009); (vii) Chris Mills, Director of College Communications; (viii) Joanne Brown, President of the Staff Association; (ix) Anjan Chatterjee ’80, Board of Managers and Corporation Advisory Committee; (x) Gabriel Schwartz ’10; (xi) Will Harrison ’10.

2.4 – Introduction to our Special Emphasis Theme

We have defined our special emphasis theme as “Institutional Vision” to reflect recent and ongoing commitments to long-range strategic planning. In particular, the self-study was structured around our recently formulated and adopted Blueprint for Haverford’s Future, which maps a vision for academic excellence that includes a 25% expansion of faculty, new curricular initiatives, deeper student-faculty scholarly collaboration, and a reallocation of faculty time to allow for enhanced scholarly engagement. Given the intensive discussion that accompanied the creation of the Blueprint, and the scrutiny that was given to best-practices and peer-comparisons, we were well positioned to conduct this reaccreditation
The Blueprint arose from an extensive multi-year process of critical inquiry in which each department, including its faculty and students, was challenged to consider how it could offer the sharpest, deepest, and most engaging curriculum in a manner that is consistent with each department’s clearly articulated mission. These goals and standards were then evaluated internally through the Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE) and Educational Policy Committee (EPC), and externally against the curricular standards of peer institutions. Thus, the Blueprint is a vision statement from every department and curricular program regarding academic and scholarly excellence. The special emphasis theme that permeates the self-study, “Institutional Vision”, was chosen because the work of the FCAE cuts across every element of the institution and sets achievable parameters for enhancing academic excellence in measurable ways. Achieving the curricular goals outlined in the Blueprint will require planning at all levels, strong administrative leadership, and successful fundraising efforts to bring new programs, new faculty, new staff, and the infrastructure to support them.
PART II

OUR SPECIAL EMPHASIS THEME:
INSTITUTIONAL VISION
CHAPTER 3
MISSION AND GOALS – STANDARD 1

3.1 – Institutional Identity and Mission

Haverford College offers students the opportunity for education built on the interdependent principles of academic breadth and depth, personal integrity, scholarly collaboration between students and faculty, and commitment to improvement of the human condition.

A Haverford education is aimed at educating students for lives of personal meaning and leadership for this new millennium. Not surprisingly, our mission is firmly based in the history of the College as the first institution of higher education founded in 1833 by the Religious Society of Friends. The power and relevance of Friends education derives from its ability to stimulate and support the intellectual and spiritual search for truth by individuals within community\(^1\). Haverford’s Quaker heritage and the current manifestation of the College’s Quaker character are the elements that hold the greatest potential for distinguishing us from our peers.

Our view of education is built on the shared traditions of the Enlightenment and Quakerism—the search for truth via deep intellectual questioning and investigation among and between members of a community steeped in mutual aspiration, respect, and concern for social justice. Over Haverford’s 175-year history, the specific embodiment of this educational philosophy has evolved in concert with academic and technological advances. Originally, the College was founded to provide a “liberal yet protected” education, which combined ethical and religious education with practical arts. Soon thereafter, the humanities and natural sciences were expanded as individual disciplines developed and matured, and social sciences were added as well.

Over the course of the 20th Century, the College conjoined the “search for truth” with the increasing power of experimentation. Scholarly research became increasingly incorporated, first into the lives of the faculty and then, progressively, into the fabric of its uniquely undergraduate education program. This trajectory is followed to this day, and its power continues to be explored and expanded, witnessed most recently in the \textit{Blueprint}.

Throughout this progression, the fundamental elements of our mission have remained consistent, while evolving to reflect our own self-awareness and our aspirations for our students. At its core, Haverford College is guided by the following statement of purpose, which serves as the articulation of our College Mission:

\footnote{From “A Strategy to Maintain Haverford as a Premier Small Liberal Arts College by Nurturing and Strengthening its Quaker Character” (Corporation Advisory Committee Working Document)\(^1\)}

\footnote{\(\dagger\) Available in Document Room}
Haverford College Statement of Purpose

Haverford College is committed to providing a liberal arts education in the broadest sense. This education, based on a rich academic curriculum at its core, is distinguished by a commitment to excellence and a concern for individual growth. Haverford has chosen to remain small and to foster close student/faculty relationships to achieve these objectives.

The College’s rigorous academic program is flexible in form and content to meet the needs of individual students, and rests on the assumption that the able students who come here will use their capacities fully. Haverford’s faculty is noted for its strength in both scholarship and teaching, and its members expect to transmit to students their enthusiasm and high standards. The faculty members are teaching at an undergraduate college of arts and sciences by choice and they expect to learn, as well as to teach, in this close relationship with undergraduates.

The full resources of the College, in and out of the classroom, are designed to promote the personal and intellectual growth of students. Through an ambitious program of visiting lecturers and cultural activities, a conscious effort to recruit faculty and students representing diverse backgrounds and perspectives, student self-governance and service programs, an athletic program focused on participation and the scholar-athlete, and through day-to-day living in a residential community, the College seeks to broaden and enrich each person’s development. Students are asked to give of themselves, even as they draw new strength from others. We seek to foster the pursuit of excellence and a sense of individual and collective responsibility throughout the entire environment.

Haverford strives to be a college in which integrity, honesty, and concern for others are dominant forces. The College does not have as many formal rules or as much formal supervision as most other colleges; rather it offers an opportunity for students to govern their affairs and conduct themselves with respect and concern for others. Each student is expected to adhere to the Honor Code as it is adopted each year by the Students’ Association.

Haverford College, while a non-sectarian institution, has Quaker origins which inform many aspects of the life of the College. They help to make Haverford the special college that it is, where the excellence of its academic program is deepened by its spiritual, moral, and ethical dimensions. These show most clearly in the

---

2 www.haverford.edu/catalog/purpose.php
close relationship among members of the campus community, in the emphasis on integrity, in the interaction of the individual and the community, and in the College’s concern for the uses to which its students put their expanding knowledge.

Several fundamental elements of our mission are emphasized in the statement of purpose. Of primary importance is academic excellence in the liberal arts. The faculty is committed to providing students with the highest quality educational experience, focused on fostering students’ intellectual creativity, integrity, and confidence. Students are active participants in the creation of new knowledge, through the processes of critical analysis, philosophical inquiry, and scientific discovery. Through the educational opportunities and structures of the College, we seek to promote key attributes of learning, discovery and transformation.

Also evident throughout our mission statement is a focus on the education of the whole student, whereby students’ personal growth is considered as important as their intellectual growth. Haverford students thrive here, both intellectually through their academic pursuits, and personally, through extracurricular activities and a culture of student volunteerism, involvement, and interaction.

Crucial to the intellectual and personal growth of our students is an appropriate emphasis on exposure to diversity of all kinds – diversity of ideas, diversity of cultures, and diversity of perspectives. Students are actively encouraged to view themselves as part of a larger community that extends beyond Haverford, locally, nationally, and globally. These values of individual and collective responsibility stem from our Quaker heritage, which imbues each member of the College community with a sense of integrity, honesty, concern for others, and social justice. These principles are manifest in the College’s strong and dynamic Honor Code, and its commitment to service and student self-governance. Students are encouraged to view themselves as agents of change – as creators of new knowledge and new opportunities in the wider world.

It is our goal that all the academic, capital and administrative resources of the College are organized to model, support and nurture these goals and perspectives. Over the ten years since the last Middle States Self-Study process, the College has continued to evolve in pursuit of these goals. While remaining true to our statement of purpose, the faculty, students, and administration of the College have cultivated new programs of academic enrichment, which have been reviewed, endorsed and supported by the Board of Managers. Through its mission, Haverford College remains focused on providing academic opportunities that inspire student independence and leadership such that, upon graduation, they will be prepared to “let their lives speak.” We are now poised to embark on a community-wide discussion that will allow our mission statement to accurately reflect our current interpretation of the institution’s core values and plans for the future.

3.2 – Educational Goals and Aspirations

The faculty has engaged in thoughtful discussions regarding the factors that make Haverford a unique place of learning, and what it is we are trying to accomplish with our students. Emerging from these discussions is the following set of “Educational Goals and Aspirations” (Appendix C). This set of core educational goals arises from direct faculty
input during the self-study and from department-specific goals and objectives submitted by academic departments during the process†.

The first of these goals is *Mastery and Critique*. Haverford College’s curriculum is designed not only to help students acquire a particular body of knowledge but to develop the capacity to learn, to understand, to make sound and thoughtful judgments, and to balance creativity and analysis. Within each discipline, academic work evolves from the mastery of key concepts through critical analysis to active participation in the construction of scholarship. In all disciplines, students cultivate research skills and the ability to critique and analyze primary texts and to appreciate theoretical rigor. Students master fundamental elements of their chosen disciplines, whether or not they apply this knowledge directly in their future professions.

The second of our goals and aspirations, *Ownership, Contribution, and Accountability*, relates to our vision of student education and scholarship. In all disciplines, students are expected to contribute original ideas for which they are accountable. They learn to present and defend their ideas both orally and in writing. Students are encouraged to interrogate and articulate why they think what they think, both inside and outside the classroom. This intellectual preparation culminates in our academic requirement that each senior produce a piece of independent work in the form of a senior thesis or project.

The third aspiration defines the importance of *Translation and Interpretation*. Students engage in acts of translation, interpretation, and cultural inquiry in every area of their studies. These intellectual habits encourage students to formulate questions, explore areas of difference, and understand their own positions vis-à-vis various forms of history, politics and knowledge. Such practices develop models of reading and analysis that illuminate students’ scholarship and judgments across disciplines and contexts.

In addition to mastering a discipline, all students are required to acquaint themselves with the breadth of intellectual approaches exemplified in the classic divisions of natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. This goal for a Haverford education we term *Breadth and Depth*. As distinctions among the divisions continue to blur, students are encouraged to explore interdisciplinarity through minors and areas of concentration. They must also study a foreign language, acquire quantitative skills, and engage fundamental issues of inequality and social justice.

*Communication and Presentation* is a fifth area that shapes our aspirations for our students. All academic majors require students to communicate and present ideas in modes that are appropriate to the discipline. The primary form of communication is often written prose, but students also learn to express themselves and their original contributions in a variety of presentation forms, including oral presentations, artistic presentations, and creative performance. A College Writing requirement is implemented during the first year, to ensure that all students enter their academic disciplines with basic skills of written argument and persuasion. The College is planning to expand our emphasis on communication and public presentation following the report from the Educational Policy Committee expected December 2009.

† See Assessment Group Phase 1 Departmental Response, available in Document Room.
Our Quaker heritage is expressed in the Haverford motto, *Non doctior, sed meliore doctrina imbutus*. “Not more learned, but imbued with better learning” defines who we are and aspire to be in compelling and important ways. The College encourages students to put learning into action toward greater ethical and moral ends, instilling a deep sense of *Social Responsibility*, our ultimate educational goal. The Quaker principle of egalitarianism turns classrooms into communities where faculty and students learn from each other, and where all voices are heard. In such contexts, students and faculty alike become better thinkers, listeners and speakers, making them partners in the creation of knowledge.

Clearly, Haverford College’s “Educational Goals and Aspirations” are resonant with our College Mission Statement, but they also reflect an ever-evolving sense of what is fundamental to the core academic aspirations of the College.

### 3.3 – Leadership and Service

Haverford College prepares, and creates opportunities for, its students to integrate their academic experience with co-curricular activities that expand their vistas beyond the classroom, emboldening them for lives of service and leadership after graduation. Some of these opportunities are made available by faculty who engage students as partners in research, others through opportunities created by the College’s three academic Centers and alumni-supported initiatives of various kinds.

Community service and social justice have historically been emphasized at Haverford College, bespeaking the Quaker roots of the College. The American Friends Service Committee was established at Haverford in 1917, and College faculty, students and administration have been engaged in social justice and human rights movements throughout the last century.

In addition to the scores of courses at Haverford that deal with issues of social justice, there are a variety of co-curricular activities that support these key missions. Nearly 20% of Haverford’s student body participate in fully funded externships sponsored by the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship in areas of reconstruction after revolution, domestic and international programs in public health, the environment, education, and poverty alleviation. Other local programs include Saturday morning mentoring of West Philadelphia high school students in the Mentoring and Student Teaching (MAST) Program, and student visits and externships to Pendle Hill and the American Friends Service Committee. Through the wide array of curricular and co-curricular offerings that focus on issues of social justice and human rights, and through an intensive faculty advising and mentoring process, we model pathways for integrating academic and co-curricular activities in leadership and service.
CHAPTER 4
PLANNING, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, AND INSTITUTIONAL RENEWAL – STANDARD 2

4.1 – Our Planning Process

Regular Planning Activities

The President and Senior Staff commission and organize institution-level planning and assessment activities. The regular planning activities that have been initiated by Senior Staff and have taken place over the past decade are documented in Table 4.1 (Appendix D). This table lists all major initiatives, building projects, fund-raising activities, policy changes, and assessment activities at the College since our last reaccreditation review.

Long-Range Planning

Other institutional structures effectively accomplish the College’s long-term planning activities. The Long Range Strategic Planning Committee (LRSPC), now in its 3rd year, was created by the President as an evolution of the College Planning Committee (CPC)\(^3\). The LRSPC is charged with long-range planning for the College, developing a five, ten, and twenty-year vision for the College including physical buildings, academic programs, strategic resource allocation decisions, institutional advancement and campaign strategy, and all aspects of critical annual decision making. The LRSPC is comprised of the President, the Provost, the VP for Finance and Administration, the VP for Institutional Advancement, the two faculty representatives to the Board of Managers, two student representatives, and eight members of the Board of Managers including its Chair and Co-Vice-Chairs. The membership structure is organized in this manner in order to facilitate evidence-based planning and decision-making in real time using all levels of College leadership.

During its initial years, the LRSPC oversaw a substantial change in the College’s financial aid policy (eliminating loans for grants), the completion of a Campus Master Plan, and the approval and beginning stage implementation of our ambitious plan for academic enrichment. It also managed a serious budget crisis and is currently assisting in the planning of a major Comprehensive Campaign.

The Plan for Academic Enrichment

The Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE), first convened in 2005-2006, was charged with conducting a comprehensive examination of the College’s academic program and envisioning a long-term plan for shaping the curriculum. This assessment

\(^3\) The CPC was established as a recommendation of the last Middle States review (1998); the current review witnesses the strengthening of this recommendation.
required the committee to evaluate the allocation of faculty resources and support and to find ways to develop and grow new academic programs. The *Blueprint for Haverford’s Future* evolved in fulfillment of this mandate.

The FCAE queried the faculty and departments extensively about their curricular goals and ambitions, and worked interactively with each department, the Centers, student representatives, and members of the Board of Managers. As the result of this work, the FCAE committee sought and obtained faculty and Board support for a bold plan to increase the tenure-track faculty by 25 percent, to both deepen our departmental strength and extend the reach of educational offerings. In addition to broadening the faculty, this faculty expansion and the concomitant reallocation of faculty time will allow each department to re-envision and redesign its curriculum to enhance support for vigorous faculty scholarship and student-faculty research collaboration.

The work of FCAE is integral to the college’s academic assessment and planning processes. In formulating the *Blueprint*, FCAE asked all departments and programs to articulate vision statements for their academic programs. On the basis of these statements, a roster of new areas of expertise was developed to diversify the curriculum in ways designed to promote the sharpest, deepest and most compelling academic program. This vision emphasizes collaborative faculty-student research at all stages of the curriculum.

FCAE will continue to oversee the early stage implementation of the *Blueprint* during the 2009-2010 academic year, but will be dissolved or reconfigured moving forward. The charge of FCAE in 2009-10 will be: (1) to bring to the faculty for discussion and action a proposed formal charge for a reconfigured FCAE or an alternative committee structure that will ensure the integrity and oversee the implementation of the *Blueprint*; (2) to finalize the remainder of the five-year phase-in plan (begun in 2009-2010) for the teaching reallocation called for in the *Blueprint*; (3) to lead discussion and make recommendations regarding the role and compensation of department chairs; and (4) to critically assess faculty committee assignments in consultation with Academic Council.

*The Campus Master Plan*

Ensuring adequate physical spaces for realizing our institutional goals was the work of the recently completed Campus Master Planning process. Together with planners from the firm of Venturi, Scott Brown, and Associates, the Campus Master Planning Steering Committee met monthly during 2008 and early 2009 to discuss a ten and twenty-year plan for the physical manifestation of College priorities.

The planning process included extensive discussions with key campus constituencies, site visits to facilities at other institutions (and detailed benchmarking comparisons for planning purposes), and evaluation of existing campus spaces. Throughout the planning process, the Steering Committee provided formal reports to the Board of Managers and to faculty, students, and staff in open meetings. Guiding the discussion was a clear articulation of
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1. Relevant documents, including queries and departmental responses collected during the FCAE process, are located in the Document Room
2. See http://www.haverford.edu/masterplan/ for committee membership and Campus Master Plan documents
immediate space shortcomings (e.g., lack of sufficient student social space) and our emerging priorities, particularly those related to the expansion of academic programs, and the related space needs for an enhanced library, performing and visual arts spaces, arts storage, and administrative and academic office space. The Campus Master Plan† was completed in February 2009 and remains a flexible plan that will enable the College to respond to evolving campus priorities.

4.2 – Resource Allocation

Founded and endowed as an educational institution that operates in perpetuity, Haverford College has an obligation to serve both current and future students. Continuing stewardship in the allocation of our resources encompasses how we focus and utilize our time, manage and support our talent, and dedicate and develop our financial resources to accomplish our educational mission as a whole.

As detailed in Chapter 5, we apply an “equilibrium analysis” approach to our budget planning. This approach presents us with challenges and sometimes requires us to make difficult choices, but we are guided by the clarity of our primary mission to educate a highly qualified and diverse student body in the context of a living Quaker heritage of respect, inclusion, and service in the greater world. The accomplishments of the difficult FY10 budget process described in Chapter 5 illustrate these priorities. Despite a significant reduction in our endowment in the current financial crisis, access to a Haverford education has been maintained through our deliberate resourcing of need-blind admission and our commitment to meeting the full financial need of our students, which we expanded in 2008 with the replacement of loans with College grant funds. At the same time, spending from the endowment was adjusted to balance current needs and protect assets for educating future generations. Despite these spending reductions, the academic program remains fully supported. In the language of equilibrium analysis, two of the four key conditions have been met—operating budgets are balanced and the purchasing power of the endowment has been protected.

An immediate goal of the College is to restore resources as soon as possible to the human and physical assets that make it possible in the short term to guard our primary mission. Moving forward, our academic strategic plan and vision include provision for additional resources through a Comprehensive Campaign (discussed in section 4.3), and an allocation of existing and new funds in strategic ways. These priorities include: (1) increasing the faculty to both broaden and deepen the curriculum for students, and reallocating faculty time to enhance support for faculty scholarship and collaborative student learning; (2) campus construction as articulated in the Campus Master Plan to both address current shortcomings in space and physically support the achievement of the academic plan; and (3) continued investment in access and affordability. Many related resource allocation priorities are articulated within the recommendations of this self-study, and the process of prioritizing, funding, and assigning responsibility for implementation is underway.

† Available in Document Room
4.3 – Campaign Planning—Resource Development

The College is in the exploratory phase of a Comprehensive Campaign to raise funds to support the key strategic plans of the College over the next decade, including (1) Academic enrichment and the expansion of the faculty, (2) New buildings and significant renovations/additions to existing buildings, and (3) Endowment growth.

The Comprehensive Campaign Planning Committee has been formed with oversight for the specifics of the upcoming Comprehensive Capital Campaign. The committee membership consists of the President, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, the Board of Managers Chair and Co-Vice Chairs, and additional Board members.

The Comprehensive Campaign is a logical outgrowth of the planning exercises in which the College has been engaged for the past four years. The most important planning efforts for the purposes of the fundraising campaign have been the work of FCAE and its plan for academic enrichment laid out in the Blueprint, and the work of the Master Planning Steering Committee in creating the Campus Master Plan. Campaign planning is also informed by the work of the Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee of the Board of Managers and by the self-study process we have undertaken as we seek re-accreditation by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

The College’s last major fundraising effort was a successful $200 million campaign that began in 1997 and concluded in 2004. The campaign theme was Educating to Lead, Educating to Serve. The upcoming campaign has a working goal of $300 million. It is hoped that the majority of funds raised in the campaign will be added to the endowment for continuing support of our initiatives.

Preliminary campaign priorities are:

**Academic Expansion ($85,000,000)** – We seek new endowment to expand the curriculum and to re-allocate faculty time in order to invigorate student-faculty collaborations and the enhanced culture of research outlined in the Blueprint for Haverford’s Future. Funds raised for this goal will support endowed professorships, faculty and student research, enhanced exhibitions, faculty start-up funding, library acquisitions, and academic database subscriptions.

**Access and Affordability ($50,000,000)** – Gifts to endowment are sought to fund the College’s enduring commitment to need-blind admission and to need-based financial aid, including our recent commitment to replace loans with grants.

**Unrestricted Endowment ($25,000,000)** – Unrestricted endowment maximizes the College’s ability to seize opportunities that enrich the experience of every student. It enhances the College’s ability to borrow and increases endowment-per-student, the most important gauge of the College’s financial well-being.

**Campus Master Plan ($110,000,000)** – After an extensive master planning process, under the guidance of Venturi, Scott Brown and Associates Architects, the College has prioritized the following new building and major renovation projects: (1) new
dorms to free living room and social spaces for students on campus; (2) a new Multi-Media/Academic Center as the front face of the old Ryan Gym building; (3) a major renovation of Union with new music performance and rehearsal space and a new music library; (4) a renovation of the Whitehead Student Center; (5) Magill Library renovation; (6) a new Fine Arts building; and (7) a new theater.

**Annual Fund ($30,000,000)** – Unrestricted operating support will help us balance annual budgets and further support the vision embedded in the Blueprint and the Campus Master Plan. It is through the Annual Fund that most alumni and parents will participate in the campaign. An explicit goal of the campaign is to grow the Fund from $4 million to $8 million.

In addition to the fundraising priorities listed above, the campaign seeks to expand Haverford’s culture of philanthropy by achieving certain non-financial objectives. These objectives include: (1) growing alumni participation to a sustainable new level; (2) growing parent participation and programming to sustainable new levels; (3) securing an outright campaign gift or pledge from at least 90 percent of alumni; (4) uncovering and nurturing a new generation of donors and volunteer leaders; (5) increasing the number of Jacob P. Jones Society members (those who have made a provision for Haverford in their estate plans); (6) using technology in new ways to engage all graduates and parents; (7) engaging alumni and parents through special interest group/affinity group programs; (8) engaging the most recent generation of alumni more thoughtfully; and (9) using the faculty in the work of Institutional Advancement more regularly and creatively.

The campaign is conceived as an intensification of the work of Institutional Advancement (IA), a division of the College comprised of the following departments: Alumni Relations and Annual Giving; Development; Communications; and Advancement Services. This division is led by the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, who is a member of the Advancement Committee of the Board of Managers and the Campaign Planning Committee. Through an intensification of alumni relations, fundraising, and communications, the College seeks to secure support for priorities by increasing annual gift income to Haverford from the current level of $10 to $20 million to a sustainable $30 million or more. This will require new levels of investment in IA, some of which will be phased into the base budget of the College over the life of the campaign.

The upheaval of world financial markets in late 2008 and early 2009 has caused us to plan this campaign cautiously. The preliminary phase of the campaign may take more time than is currently allocated, and we are perfectly comfortable with the notion of prolonging the preliminary phase. We will not set a campaign goal unless and until we have pacesetting gifts that validate that goal. A preliminary timetable for campaign activity is included in Appendix E.
CHAPTER 5

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES – STANDARD 3

5.1 – Overall Budget Planning and Processes

Regular Budgeting Process

Responsibility for working with the President to develop the annual operating budget rests with the Administrative Advisory Committee (AAC) and the Vice President for Finance and Administration. In addition to the President and Vice President, AAC consists of three faculty members (one of whom acts as Chair), three students, the Provost, Associate Provost, another administrator, and two representatives of the Staff Association. The process by which the budget is prepared is open, with the various representatives reporting on AAC’s deliberations to campus constituencies (e.g., the Chair makes periodic reports at faculty meetings).

The typical budget cycle includes the distribution of budget requests to more than 100 offices/departments in late October, the development of a preliminary budget by AAC that is discussed with the Finance Committee of the Board in December, and approval of the budget for the next fiscal year by the full Board in February. However, the preparation of the FY10 budget occurred under such extraordinary circumstances that several modifications were made.

At the first meeting of AAC every fall, the budget process begins with a review of Haverford’s Budgeting Principles (Appendix F). This helps a committee that often will be working with detailed information to focus on the larger objectives of the annual budget-building process. These principles reflect the “equilibrium analysis” approach that Haverford applies to its budget planning. To be in financial equilibrium, we strive for the elusive but important goal of maintaining four conditions simultaneously: operating budgets must be balanced, human assets developed and nourished, physical assets preserved, and the endowment’s purchasing power protected. An important corollary is that we provide access to a Haverford education to the most highly-qualified students regardless of their ability to pay. The members of the committee each have a responsibility to make sure these competing needs are addressed in ways that promote the mission of the College and to communicate the process and outcome to the constituents whom they represent. As described below, as part of the annual review of Haverford’s financial health, there is an assessment of how well we are meeting these goals each year.

AAC concentrates its attention on a number of major budget parameters, while relying on a decentralized process for developing operating budgets for individual departments (for example, all academic departments submit budget requests to the Provost, who evaluates the requests and makes recommendations for the academic program as a whole to AAC). Among these major parameters are enrollment, student charges, tuition discounting, endowment revenue, and employee compensation (see Table 5.1, Appendix D for a historical summary). Funding for capital renewal and new programmatic initiatives are added to the mix, and AAC faces the challenge of balancing such worthy goals as holding down increases in student charges and spending less from the endowment against the
need to increase spending for educational and support programs. The tradeoffs among these competing demands are based on the best judgments of AAC, the administration, and the Finance Committee of the Board.

The Special Case of FY10 Budget

The preceding overview of the Haverford approach to budgeting describes the processes followed for the past decade and more. However, as world-wide financial conditions deteriorated rapidly in the fall of 2008, it became clear that this traditional approach would not adequately respond to changing economic circumstances. It is instructive to examine how the College’s budgeting and governance processes reacted to this unprecedented crisis. The primary conclusion that we draw from the analysis is that our flat institutional hierarchy, our strength in dialogue, and our culture of direct communication allowed us to weather the immediate crisis while respecting our priorities and remaining true to our core mission.

After rigorous discussions in Senior Staff and consultations with the Board in late October 2008, President Emerson sent a message to all members of the community announcing a series of steps being taken to address the drastic downturn in financial markets (Appendix G.1). While giving the highest priority to maintaining the academic program of the College and continuing financial aid commitments to students, a non-faculty hiring freeze was instituted (searches for faculty positions were continued) and a campus-wide search for efficiencies and expense reductions was launched. This was intended to insure that the FY09 budget would generate a surplus, providing contingency funding that could be applied strategically to assist in the transition to an uncertain future. During early November, the President held open meetings with employees and students at which he discussed “Fiscal Horizons,” expanding on his written message to the community with a PowerPoint presentation detailing revenue and expenditure trends (Appendix G.2). Budget request materials for FY10 were distributed with instructions for all operating units to develop plans to reduce their budgets by 5-10%, using a zero-based approach of evaluating the need for every line item. All budget requests were to be submitted prior to the Thanksgiving holiday, in anticipation of the December 5-6 meeting of the Board. The Vice President for Finance prepared and distributed in advance of this meeting a document, “Financial Issues Facing Haverford College” (Appendix G.3), that identified specific issues for Board consideration.

At the December meeting, the Finance Committee quickly agreed to postpone approval of the FY10 budget until April, allowing additional time to assess the severity of the downturn in the economy. A critical factor was the impact of security markets on the value of the College’s endowment that provides more than 25% of budgeted revenue. The extant spending formula had served the College well for several decades, but it called for a 6% increase in endowment spending in FY10 at a time of rapidly declining asset values. Projections were made of 25%, 30% and 40% drops in the endowment’s market value. After a wide-ranging discussion, the Finance Committee agreed that in this financial climate the budget should be cut sooner rather than later, and endowment spending in FY10 should be considerably less than the $18,750,000 budgeted in FY09, a recommendation that was approved by the full Board the next day. The senior administration and AAC were directed to develop models that would cut the $72.5 million FY09 budget by $4 million, $6 million and $9 million in FY10, reflecting the possible drop of 25%, 30% and 40% in endowment market value. Every facet of Haverford’s expenditure base was to be examined, but wherever possible the academic program and financial aid were to be sheltered from the reductions. Additionally, while Haverford has long cooperated on cost-saving ventures with Bryn Mawr College, and also with five other members of the Shared
Services Consortium, a major effort was started to find ways to collaborate more extensively with Bryn Mawr in a number of administrative areas, both to reduce costs and also enhance services. At this writing (Fall 2009), we are currently pursuing plans for collaboration and administrative mergers in Dining Services and Safety & Security.

Prior to the February Board meeting, the President held another series of open meetings reporting on the progress toward developing these three FY10 budget models (there would be a series of additional open meetings later in the spring to discuss changes being made in the College’s medical insurance program and describing a retirement incentive program offered to all employees 62 and older). At its February meeting, the Finance Committee received an update on efforts to reduce expenditures. There would be no increase in salaries in FY10, other than for employees who were promoted or took on larger responsibilities. Modest spending reductions were proposed for the academic program in both the $4 million and $6 million models, but moving to the $9 million model would necessitate cutbacks in replacement teaching staff and could increase the student/faculty ratio to 9:1. In addition, the policy of eliminating loans from financial aid packages would have to be reexamined. The administration was asked to continue working on reducing the expenditure side of the budget, with a final decision to be made in April. At this February meeting and a subsequent conference call in early March (the timing made necessary by the need to prepare financial aid packages for applicants accepted for the fall of 2009), the Board agreed to increase student charges by 4.1% in FY10.

At the April Finance Committee meeting, the President provided an overview of a proposed FY10 budget that reduced expenditures by slightly more than $6 million, or 8.4% (Appendix G.4). In planning for a recession of uncertain length, the College would operate on a “pay as you go” basis, avoiding deficit spending and preserving endowment principal. As compensation represents roughly two-thirds of the budget, considerable attention was directed to reducing staff, primarily through attrition and a retirement incentive program, but also with a modest reduction in force. Health insurance costs were reduced by shifting the base plan supported by the College to one that offers high quality coverage at substantially lower cost, but with somewhat more managed care. In addition, the College’s contribution to retirement for each employee was reduced from 12% to 10%. The Renewals and Replacements (R&R) capital budget was cut by more than 40%. The administration intends to give high priority to restoring the 2% cut in the retirement contribution and the R&R budget as rapidly as funding permits. [For additional details on expenditure reductions in the FY10 budget, see Appendix G.5, Proposed 2009-10 Operating Budget, and Appendix G.6, the PowerPoint presentation made by the Vice President for Finance to the full Board on April 25, 2009.]

This $6 million model reduced endowment spending 30% in FY10 compared to FY09 ($12,980,000, down from $18,750,000), a percentage reduction roughly in line with the decline in the market value of the endowment on June 30, 2009. This budget largely spared the academic program, and also the Admissions and Institutional Advancement operations at a time when they are crucial to the recruitment and fund-raising activities of the College. Making the additional cuts necessary to reach the $9 million model would have reduced numerous administrative services to below base-line levels, and required that both financial aid and educational programs be trimmed back, actions that were not recommended by AAC and the senior administrative staff. The Board agreed and approved this budget, an action that the President reported to the campus community in a message distributed the following Monday (Appendix G.7).
5.2 – Accountability and Assessment

Assessing the FY10 Budget

It would be an overstatement to declare the process of constructing the FY10 budget a “success”, given the unpleasantness of reducing staff and cutting operating budgets for the first time in years. But the budget changes were accomplished in such a way that the College remained true to its primary mission—educating a highly-qualified and diverse student body—and also its culture, by engaging the campus community in the discussion. Some of our budgeting goals were better realized than others. The FY10 budget is balanced. Access to a Haverford education has been maintained. Spending from the endowment has been adjusted to reflect security market realities. Given the declining cost of living as measured by the Consumer Price Index, Haverford’s employees will not suffer unduly from the lack of an increase in salary levels, but the reduction in retirement contribution is of concern. Campus facilities can survive the reduced budget for major capital renewals and replacements, but only in the short term. Most critically, the heart of the enterprise, the academic program, has emerged relatively unscathed.

While the most difficult budget cutting may be behind us, the next few years present significant challenges. Spending from the endowment is unlikely to increase rapidly, Institutional Advancement faces a difficult fund-raising environment, and the families providing our major source of revenue, tuition, are suffering from the deep economic recession. Our budget models for the next five years suggest a slow recovery (Appendix H), with aspirations and needs that can only be met as new resources are acquired—pay as we go. But we start the journey in a generally strong financial position.

Ongoing Assessment of the Financial Health of the College

In addition to periodic reports/assessments on specific financial topics (e.g., see Appendix I for an annual update on Debt Management Policies, and Appendix J for a quarterly review of the endowment), an overview of the financial health of the college is provided to, and discussed with, the Finance Committee annually at its fall meeting (Appendix K, The Financial Health of Haverford College; see also Appendix L, [audited] 2008-09 Financial Statements). This report focuses on longitudinal trends internal to Haverford and comparative historical information across a sample of peer institutions, and is divided into three primary sections. The first covers various operating measures that relate to budget parameters and equilibrium analysis—enrollment, demand, pricing, discounting, salaries, and endowment. Additional analyses of some of these operating budget measures appear in Appendix G.6. The second part of this assessment turns to ratio analysis, describing the relationships among the assets, liabilities, and fund balances of the balance sheet and in turn their relationship to annual operations—liquidity, expendable and non-expendable resources relative to the budget, and debt relative to income, endowment and expendables. The final section compares a number of Haverford’s ratios to those of eight peer institutions—resources to debt, resources to operations, debt to operations and resources per student. The time series for most of this information extends to at least 25 years, and often five decades, the latter to help current generations understand better the lingering effects from an earlier period of financial distress experienced by the College (roughly 1967

† Audited financial statements for FY08 and FY07 are available in the Document Room.
to 1975). We hope that at mid-21st century, Haverfordians will not look back on the current period as creating a similar legacy.

In brief summary, Haverford enjoys a number of strengths as it looks toward that uncertain future. Demand for a Haverford education remains extremely strong among the very best students in the country. Our financial aid policies welcome a diverse student body regardless of need, and enrollment is at an all-time high (historical and projected enrollment† is included in Table 5.2 of Appendix D). The College has enjoyed balanced budgets for each of the past thirty years, and will again in FY10; our operations are in equilibrium. On the other hand, as with all of higher education, we have suffered a significant reduction in our resource base. While our operations may be in equilibrium, our aspirations are to enhance our educational programs. To that end, we are planning a comprehensive campaign that will have three major goals— to expand our faculty and instructional offerings, to ensure continued access for all students, and to construct key new facilities to support the academic and social lives of the Haverford community.

†Enrollment Projection Model is available in the Document Room.
CHAPTER 6
EDUCATIONAL VISION

Detailed analyses of Standards 11 and 12 appear elsewhere in this document (Chapters 10 and 11), however general discussions of Educational Offerings and General Education are included here to highlight the centrality of the curriculum in fulfilling our core academic mission, and the relationship of the fundamental elements of these Standards to our Special Emphasis theme of “Institutional Vision”.

6.1 – Standard 11: Educational Offerings

As described above, as part of a unique initiative inspired by our recognition of the central importance of faculty and student collaborative scholarship in our educational mission, Haverford College has undergone an unusually comprehensive self-evaluation of our educational offerings and curricular goals over the last few years, spearheaded by the Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE). These discussions have engaged several governing bodies on campus, including the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), the group that oversees College curriculum, the former College Planning Committee (CPC), the Board of Managers, and academic departments (faculty and students). This intense self-evaluation resulted in an ambitious proposal, the Blueprint for Haverford’s Future, to enhance scholarship on campus, which was approved by the Board in Spring 2008.

The proposal is designed to expand current curricular initiatives and develop new curricular ambitions through (1) the addition of 27 faculty in areas that both bring new scholarship on campus and strengthen current priorities; (2) a careful reconfiguration of teaching loads (reducing teaching load from a five course to a four course load) and leave opportunities so that faculty can be continually engaged in scholarship and further support the development of student scholars; (3) department-specific commitments to curricula that take advantage of these opportunities to further enhance student scholarship at both the introductory and upper-levels; (4) an emphasis on deep and original student scholarship throughout the curriculum that culminates in the senior level project; and (5) the exploration of interdisciplinary possibilities that might result in increased opportunities for cooperation among departments and divisions.

Components of the Blueprint are connected to our key goals for student learning as articulated in our statement of Educational Goals and Aspirations (Appendix C), particularly “Mastery and Critique,” “Depth of Inquiry,” “Translation and Interpretation,” and “Ownership, Contribution and Accountability.”

6.2 – Standard 12: General Education

What do we mean when we speak of “the education of the whole student?” Over the last decade in particular, the word “integrated” has become a key convention of our discussions, programs and construction projects. Additional emphases and resources have been dedicated to integrating scientific instruction and inquiry via the Koshland Integrated Natural Sciences Center (KINSC). The Douglas B. Gardner Integrated Athletics Center (GIAC) demonstrates our recognition of the essential interaction between the
physical and intellectual manifestation of “person.” In addition to the KINSC, the Hurford Humanities Center (HHC) and the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship (CPGC) deliberately facilitate connections among curriculum, scholarship, and praxis, and serve as incubators for interdisciplinary initiatives. The fundraising campaign (1997-2004) that provided resources for many of these initiatives was appropriately themed, “Educating to Lead, Educating to Serve.” Thus, through our curriculum, programs, and Centers, Haverford is committed to preparing students intellectually and practically for lives of learning, leadership, and service.

A Haverford education combines strong disciplinary foundations with interdisciplinary foci and access. Several College-wide requirements are structured to enhance and broaden the education of the whole student. For instance, all students are required to participate in a Freshman Writing seminar, which is taught in small classes by writing pedagogues and tenure-track faculty. All students must demonstrate moderate proficiency in a foreign language, an essential feature of our commitment to developing students with a deeper cultural understanding of the global world. Distributional requirements are designed to expose Haverford students to curriculum in all three divisions, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences. The integration of curriculum, scholarship, and praxis, facilitated through the Hurford Humanities Center, the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship, and the Koshland Integrated Natural Sciences Center, provide rich opportunities for students to broaden their learning experiences, gain strong interpretative and analytic training, and develop into agents who will lead communities of change in the larger world. Finally, all students at Haverford must participate in a club or varsity sport, or must meet a physical education requirement.

While these College-wide requirements speak broadly to our educational goals of breadth and communication, the importance of translation and interpretation is particularly evident in our efforts to connect the local with the global and the individual with the broader community as our students prepare for lives of leadership and service.

6.3 – Assessment of Our Educational Vision

Each of these efforts to educate the whole student comes under periodic review. Major requirements are determined by departments, and are periodically reviewed by the Provost’s Office, External Visiting Committees, and the Educational Policy Committee. College-wide requirements, Concentrations and Programs are also routinely evaluated by the Educational Policy Committee. The FCAE led the most recent review of departmental programs and initiatives, leading to the Blueprint for Haverford’s Future and the recent re-articulation of departmental vision.

Curricular issues of importance are addressed by EPC each year. Currently, our EPC is developing proposals to enhance the quality and structure of our Writing Program. It is also initiating an assessment of our distribution requirements to determine whether they may be restructured to enhance student exposure to different modes of inquiry, analysis, and reasoning as essential components of academic breadth.

Our commitment to the assessment of our curriculum and student learning outcomes is described throughout the self-study and in particular in Chapters 13 and 14.
PART III
CORE ACADEMIC MISSION I:
EDUCATION OF THE WHOLE STUDENT
CHAPTER 7

STUDENT ADMISSIONS AND RETENTION – STANDARD 8

7.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

In keeping with its Quaker heritage and strong commitment to social justice, Haverford practices need-blind admission and has a financial aid policy committed to meeting the full demonstrated need of all its students. In 2008, the College modified its financial aid program to eliminate student loans, replacing them with grants. The goal of this change was “to make Haverford accessible to the most talented and deserving students regardless of economic circumstances”, and to liberate our graduates from substantial amounts of debt at graduation, which pressures them against making career choices that might best embody their goals. A competitive financial aid policy, strong academic departments and curriculum, accomplished faculty, state of the art facilities, and an inclusive community that welcomes and embraces diversity all help Haverford to attract the most talented student body both nationally and internationally. The high quality of our students is the most important component to the success of our College and academic strategic plan.

7.2 – Description and Analysis

The key goal of our Admissions process is to attract and enroll a diverse and academically talented student body that perpetuates and advances the mission of the College. In 2006, the faculty of Haverford College approved a set of admissions criteria, drafted by the Committee on Admission that defines the qualities that best match students to Haverford’s unique institutional mission. These “qualities we seek” are: (1) academic distinction, passion and potential for further growth; (2) broad interests and evidence of intellectual curiosity and creativity; (3) distinction and leadership in pursuits outside the classroom; (4) contribution to the diversity of the college community; and (5) a commitment to student self-governance, open-mindedness and personal responsibility, as reflected in Haverford’s Honor Code and sense of community.

Applications to Haverford are read by at least two admission officers. Each reader records their evaluation of the application by completing a cover sheet, which includes the reporting of specific information from the application (high school curriculum and grades, test scores, activities, quotes from recommendations, etc.) as well as the reader’s own assessments (primarily expressed in prose commentary). Each reader also gives numerical ratings to the candidate in eight categories: academic achievement, intellectual curiosity, potential, personal statement, communication, extracurricular, personal, and initiative. Finally, each reader gives an overall academic score and an overall personal score, which inform the deliberations of the committee, but do not, on their face, determine admissions decisions.

Once all applications have been read, the cover sheets are reviewed by the Dean of Admission to familiarize the Dean with the overall applicant pool. Based on the assessment of the two readers and with agreement from the Dean, a decision to deny
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admission or waitlist may be internally rendered at this time; 40-45% of applications will have a decision made at this stage of the process. The remaining applications are discussed by all eight admissions officers (including the Dean). The group operates under a modified consensus model, in which the standard is not for all individuals to agree with each decision, per se, but rather that every admissions officer has the opportunity to advocate his or her point of view. The Dean of Admission acts as the “clerk”, determining the sense of the meeting in order to make final decisions, and ensuring that these decisions are made in the context of the College’s mission and policies.

The Haverford admission process consists of two programs – Early Decision (ED) and Regular Decision (RD). Students who apply through ED make the commitment to attend Haverford if admitted. Typically around 110 students, or approximately one-third of an entering class, are admitted through ED. ED applicants who are not admitted typically have their applications denied, however a small number have their admission decision deferred to the RD process. Students admitted through RD are not obligated to attend Haverford and have until the first of May to notify the College of their decision.

As part of the effort to strengthen outreach to talented low-income students, Haverford began partnering with the QuestBridge scholars program starting with the Class of 2013. Haverford’s involvement with QuestBridge occurs on two levels. The first is through their National College Match program connecting high-achieving low-income students with admission and full four-year scholarships to 26 partner colleges. For the Class of 2013, Haverford matched a total of 8 students through this program. The second level of participation occurs with students who do not match with any college through the initial stage. These students are able to use their QuestBridge application to apply directly to Haverford. Both aspects of our participation with QuestBridge helped us to significantly deepen and diversify the applicant pool – reaching out to a large number of students that may not have applied to Haverford otherwise. For example, of the eight matched scholars in the Class of 2013, six are the first from their high schools to attend Haverford and four are the first from their high schools ever to apply.

Given the high quality students that apply, are admitted, and matriculate at Haverford (Appendix D, Table 7.1: Admission Demand; and Table 7.2: Academic Profile of Entering Students), our retention rate, both for first year (typically 98%) and returning students is quite high (see Table 7.3, Appendix D). Our four-year graduation rate for the class of 2009 was 91.9%. These retention rates compare favorably to those of our peer institutions (Table 7.4, Appendix D), and indicate that our admissions process is effective in attracting students whose capabilities and ambitions are aligned with Haverford’s expectations and core values. For example, upon acceptance of our offer of admission, we ask students for their commitment to attend Haverford by signing an endorsement of the Haverford Honor Code in lieu of an admission deposit. Once enrolled, for those students at risk for attrition, the Committee on Student Standing and Programs (CSSP) provides guidance and support to facilitate the retention of all students, and help each student reach his or her full potential.

Due to our high retention rates from year to year, we admit very few transfer students as upperclassmen each year (Appendix M, Transfer Credit Policies and Criteria). Our admit rate for transfer students is typically around 10%, with no more than a handful of students
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6 www.questbridge.org
enrolling as transfers in a given year over the past decade (Table 7.5, Appendix D). Essentially, the same admissions standards applied to first year students are used in admissions decisions for transfer students, with certain stipulations. For example, difficulty of the workload at the previous institution, the reasons for transferring, and the requirement that at least half the undergraduate coursework must be completed at Haverford are considered. Once at Haverford, transfer students are acclimated to campus life with the support of peer Student Resource Persons, often experienced transfer students themselves. For all students wishing to include credit towards the Haverford degree for courses taken elsewhere, the Registrar has published guidelines for transfer credits and the criteria for evaluation of courses.

In recent years, the Office of Admission has simultaneously raised academic standards for admission (the class accepted for Fall 2009 admission was judged to be #2 in the nation in selectivity by US News and World Report), and has increased the diversity of the student population (Table 7.6, Appendix D). Importantly, the four-year graduation rates of black students (90.9% in the class of 2009) and Latino students (85.7% in the class of 2009) are high and roughly comparable with the overall rates, signaling that Haverford’s efforts at lifting academic admissions standards while increasing diversity have achieved this goal with thoughtful oversight and planning. Despite the relatively narrow differences in graduation rates from the most recent class, larger disparities are evidenced when considered in aggregate over the past decade (Table 7.7, Appendix D), although over the same class years, the six-year graduation rates are more comparable across racial groups (Table 7.8, Appendix D). The positive results from this year may or may not signal a positive trend attributable to recent changes in financial aid and more rigorous recruitment efforts.

Despite the positive indication from the most recent graduation rate data, our success in educating students of color is qualified by differences in performance indicators at various levels that persist over time. An analysis of the longitudinal database provided by the Dean’s Office reveals that Black and Latino students lag behind white and Asian students in several performance areas -- in mean GPA, and in departmental honors upon graduation. Our admitted students of color also have lower SAT scores, and lower academic program ratings, both of which predict some of the difference in performance. While the “achievement gap” is not unique to Haverford, Haverford is deeply committed to exploring new approaches to closing the achievement gap. By virtue of our institutional size and mission, we are obliged to “educate the whole student” in seeking diversity in a community that is small and personal. Furthermore, Haverford’s particular commitment to social justice impels us to do all we can to better serve our students of color. We strive to educate all our students to thrive and succeed and must evaluate and develop our student support services to meet the needs of all matriculating students accordingly.

Assessment of Admissions

There are a number of quantitative and qualitative methods that are used for measuring the success of Admissions operations. Several basic admissions statistics are monitored, such as the number of applications received, the admit rate, yield on admitted students (Table 7.10, Appendix D).
7.1, Appendix D), and academic profile statistics (SAT scores, the academic rigor of the high school program, rank in graduating class, etc.; Table 7.2, Appendix D). These data are useful for assessing our success in competing with institutional peers for students and for evaluating the breadth and depth of the applicant pool. These data are supplemented by a more detailed analysis that includes a breakdown of admissions data by subgroup (ethnicity, gender, athletics recruits, campus visit status, geography, etc.) to obtain a more textured understanding of our processes and admissions trends. External survey tools, such as the Admitted Student Questionnaire offered by the College Board, are used to better understand the reasons why non-matriculating students enroll elsewhere, and internal tools help to better calibrate the admissions processes.

Significant effort is also put into following students and their experiences once at Haverford. This tracking allows the Office of Admission to measure the success of the original admissions assessment, and thereby helps to refine future admissions assessment methods. In comparing results to expectations we can gauge the predictive value of the assumptions and premises on which we base admissions decisions. The Provost's Office is currently in the process of developing a large database that will link a range of admission statistical information with Haverford academic performance data to support these assessment efforts. In addition, the Committee on Admission and the Student Admission Advisory Council engage with the Office of Admission for the purpose of providing independent admissions oversight.

The Haverford Senior Exit Interviews† and the national senior survey assessments‡ in which Haverford participates provide an important source of assessment for a variety of practices. While the survey results are confidential, the vast majority of Haverford seniors responded affirmatively when asked on senior survey instruments if they would “choose Haverford again,” suggesting an extraordinarily high level of satisfaction among Haverford students (Table 7.9, Appendix D). Since these surveys contain information relevant to assessing the satisfaction of our students and our success in achieving goals resonant with our mission, the present analysis suggests that the data from these surveys be redacted and distributed to faculty, staff, students and committees for which they are relevant.

The Senior Exit Interviews conducted by the Dean’s Office have helped the College in curricular planning. For example, these interviews exposed the weakness of student commitment to the Social Justice “requirement” (as opposed to the strength of student commitment to the idea, and indeed the practice, of social justice). Information from the Senior Exit surveys should be disseminated more widely and discussed more thoroughly. Indeed, we strongly recommend that communication channels in general be made clearer to help faculty advisors best support the students in their classes and their advisees.

†Available in Document Room
CHAPTER 8
STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES – STANDARD 9

8.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

Our student support services are critical in enabling students to participate as active scholars and achieve their full academic potential. We outline below a description and analysis of several critical student support services. We have highlighted those areas that express Haverford’s mission and values most clearly, and our analysis focuses on issues that we must consider as we move forward with the implementation of the Institutional Vision articulated in the Blueprint.

8.2 – Description and Analysis

Office of the Dean of the College

The Dean’s Office coordinates many academic support and student services at Haverford and is generally responsible for student life on campus. The functions and structure of the Dean’s Office serve a unique bridging function between the curricular and co-curricular, a model that allows its staff to devote all of its energies to promoting the growth and development of the “whole student.”

The Deans are a primary resource to students who are experiencing personal or academic difficulty or who need advice regarding the pursuit of their academic objectives. They implement and interpret academic regulations and work in collaboration with faculty and others to enhance student potential and success. Several of the Deans are also responsible for supervising special student services, including study abroad, fellowships and honors, student government, multicultural affairs, housing, student activities, peer tutoring, the customs program, athletics, and pre-professional advising.

The Dean for First-Year Students provides guidance and advice to all freshmen; after the first year, every student is assigned a Dean who will be an important resource during his/her time at Haverford. Deans are available to advise individual students on any issue related to their Haverford experience. Deans serve a variety of roles including those of counselor, mentor, and advocate. The Deans’ primary objective is to promote the academic and personal success of every Haverford student.

Academic Support Services

As described in the Student Handbook†, Haverford provides a broad range of academic support services, some overseen by the Dean’s Office, some by individual departments. These include Academic Advising, Discipline-Specific Support, Pre-Professional Advising, and the Multi-Cultural Scholars Program.

†Available in Document Room
(i) Academic Advising

Each incoming student is assigned an academic advisor, who is a member of the regular faculty, and a student Upper Class Advisor (UCA). Normally, students first meet with these advisors during orientation week their freshman year, and regularly during the academic year to discuss course selection and other academic issues. Faculty advisors work closely with advisees to construct academic action plans for achieving the advisee’s goals and ensuring the completion of distributional and other requirements. Upper Class Advisors play the role of peer-mentor, helping first-year students navigate the academic requirements and select appropriate professors and courses. Faculty advisors must approve student course selections each semester. During the second semester of the sophomore year, students must declare a major. At this time, a new advisor from the major department is selected who takes responsibility for guiding the student through the major.

Since advising is paramount to achieving our vision, the advising function is scrutinized regularly for revision and improvement. The training of new faculty advisors has been the focus of much discussion. Junior faculty members are often still learning the requirements of their own departments and may be unprepared to advise first-year students generally. The College is considering delaying the responsibility of freshman advising until faculty are successfully reappointed.

The College is also experimenting with ways to improve freshman advising. An advising questionnaire is administered to students prior to their arrival on campus as a tool to better match student academic interests to faculty with relevant expertise.

Another area that has been scrutinized is the support for sophomores during the pre-major declaration period. The Dean’s and Provost’s Offices have put into place new programs focused specifically on supporting sophomores including a new website for sophomores that provides a list of resources focused on the sophomore year\(^8\). The College has also established a network of departmental peer advisors (junior or senior majors selected by their departments) to field questions about the major. Finally, all sophomores are invited to pre-major declaration departmental information sessions and to meetings with the peer-mentors.

(ii) Academic Support within the Disciplines

Several departments require placement examinations of first-year students prior to the start of classes. The results are used to ensure an adequate match between a student’s proficiency in the subject and the assignment of the appropriate class level. Several departments offer small intensive sections for students who require extensive support, as described in Chapter 12.

Certain departments have organized help centers to provide support and enrichment related to class material, such as the Chemistry Question Center, the Biology Question Center, the Math Question Center, and the Physics Clinic. These Centers are staffed by a combination of faculty and peer-mentors. Other

\(^8\) http://www.haverford.edu/deans/sophomoreyear/
departments offer Guided Learning Groups, which are student-run weekly discussion sections intended to clarify class material. For students enrolled in foreign language classes, the Language Learning Center supports the use of technology in teaching and learning foreign languages. The Language Learning Center has a digitized version of the audiovisual materials from the textbooks used in different language courses, including Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish, and students can listen to the text as it is spoken correctly.

Students in need of extra coursework support can seek peer tutoring through the Dean’s Office. All students can request use of the tutoring service, but often students are advised to seek tutoring from their professors. Tutoring services are free to students, and peer tutors are paid for their services through the Dean’s Office.

(iii) The Writing Center

The Writing Center at Haverford College is available to all Haverford students regardless of discipline or major. The Writing Center uses trained peer tutors and affiliated faculty members, often in combination, to assist students with a variety of writing needs. The mission of the Center is to "cultivate a culture of writing at Haverford that includes conversation with and feedback from peers—whether in the classroom, the dorm, or the Writing Center—as an integral part of the writing process." The Writing Center helps support students in their writing across the disciplines in a variety of ways, and is particularly effective at assisting students who arrive at Haverford as weak writers to develop skills in rhetoric and composition. Based on enhanced efforts in recruiting and de-stigmatizing use of Writing Center tutors, the Center has recently seen a marked increase in visits to the Writing Center—from 161 appointments in 2004-2005 to 792 in 2008-2009; given current patterns of use this semester, we expect to record 1,200 appointments this year.

(iv) The Library

The Library provides instruction on information retrieval, evaluation of scholarly literature, and assistance to students in all stages of their research. Library collections, both primary and secondary, support research needs while also serving independent reading interests. The Library supports a variety of co-curricular activities, such as lectures and exhibits, and serves as an important focal point for student study, work on computers, or socialization.

(v) Pre-Professional Advising

The College employs non-faculty advisors to support students with the ambition to pursue careers in health or law. The pre-health advisor serves Haverford students and alumni who are interested in the health professions, including medicine, osteopathy, public health, dentistry, nursing, podiatry, physical therapy and more.

9http://www.haverford.edu/writingcenter/
The advisor provides guidance and support to the students as they plan their pre health curriculum and extra curricular activities. Students receive advice about their academic schedules in order to fulfill admissions' prerequisites for medical schools and other programs in the health sciences, to plan for summer and extracurricular activities, and to strategize for when and how they will apply to medical or other health professions schools.

Haverford’s acceptance rate to medical schools is substantially higher than national acceptance rates and compares favorably to those of peer institutions and Ivy League schools. Haverford students are currently attending leading medical schools throughout the country. This group includes Johns Hopkins, Yale, UC San Francisco, Harvard, Penn, Cornell, Vanderbilt, Einstein, Mt. Sinai, University of Chicago, NYU, Columbia, University of Pittsburgh, Penn State, Emory, Dartmouth, Rochester, Case Western, Jefferson, Temple, Drexel, Georgetown, UMDNJ, Robert Wood Johnson, Oregon Health Sciences University, and the Universities of Florida, Arkansas, Cincinnati, Miami and Puerto Rico. Haverford’s recent graduates are also represented at osteopathic (PCOM) and dental schools (Temple, NYU), and at Ph.D. programs in biomedical science and public health.

The Pre-Law Advising office provides advice and guidance for students considering a career in the law. The Pre-Law advisor maintains a small but comprehensive website. Although some students apply to law school outside of the advising structure of the College, our records indicate a high rate of acceptance at prestigious law schools among our recent classes, including Harvard, University of Pennsylvania, Columbia, Michigan, Stanford, Duke, NYU, and Georgetown. (See Table 8.1, Appendix D for recent medical school and law school admission rates.)

(vi) Multicultural Scholars Program

The Multicultural Scholars Program (MSP) was founded in 1980 to provide support for minority students majoring in the Natural Sciences. Owing in large part to the program’s success, support for multicultural students in the Humanities and Social Sciences was added in 1988. MSP is led by a faculty member and the Freshman Dean. Student coordinators lead workshops for freshman MSP students that cover subjects such as time management, graduate applications and study skills. Other important aspects of the MSP include a buddy program, peer tutoring, and opportunities for work-study positions in labs, and other summer research placements.

Despite the set of academic support activities described above, Haverford lags behind many peer institutions that have more extensive and professionally staffed tutoring services. Our reliance on an extensive peer support network may result in students who most need these resources also being the most reluctant to use them; struggling students may be embarrassed about seeking help from peers. As a result, the College should consider employing more professionals, outside the faculty, who are dedicated to offering tutoring, skills development, study group management, and general counseling to students who are in academic difficulty.

http://www.haverford.edu/deans/prelaw/
Resonant with our vision of students as independent scholars is a realization that student support services will need to be strengthened in critical ways. The faculty has endorsed the view, contained in the Blueprint, that scholarly mentorship extends beyond the classroom and is deeper than the senior thesis experience. Our principle of inclusion dictates that our educational requirements apply to all students, suggesting that for some students the requirements of a Haverford education will be more challenging than before. To assist all students in achieving their scholarly potential, we must add resources to advising, mentoring, and preparing students for the rigors of an enhanced curriculum and research focus, and we must expend added emphasis on those students who arrive at Haverford less well prepared.

**General Support Services**

Numerous varied support services exist to help students in their academic, residential, personal, and professional development. These services are provided through Academic Computing, the Career Development Office, Counseling and Psychological Services, Health Services, the Housing Office, Dining Services, Safety and Security, the Office of Disabilities Services, Facilities Management, the Women’s Center, and the Student Activities Office.

The primary focus of the Academic Computing Center (ACC) is to support faculty and students in the use of computers and related technology for instruction and research at Haverford. The most visible aspect of the ACC for most students is the Helpdesk, which troubleshoots all computer problems on a walk-in basis during normal business hours. Designated computer-knowledgeable students (Residential Computing Consultants) live in each of the main dorms to help students resolve computing problems.

The Career Development Office (CDO) offers a wide array of programs and services appropriate to support current student and alumni in their job searches, and advises them on a range of employment related issues such as interview strategies, resume writing, and career counseling. The CDO maintains alumni records that can be useful in creating networks to assist students and alumni in job match. The CDO is a Bi-College office, with locations at both Haverford and Bryn Mawr.

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) provides students with counseling on personal and school-related matters. CAPS also provides consultation to faculty and other student services personnel about broad issues concerning psychological development and educational policy, or difficulty with individual students. Counseling services at CAPS are not time-limited, allowing each student the opportunity to develop a mature relationship with the counselor that is more likely to be successful in resolution of difficult personal matters.

All first year Haverford students are required to be on the meal plan, and to eat at a single large dining hall. Dining Services (DS) at Haverford seeks student input in designing special chef nights, local dinners, and special events. DS relies heavily on communication with students through Go-Boards, emails, and regular meetings with student organizations.

Facilities Management (FM) is responsible for the maintenance and cleaning of all buildings and grounds that students use and provides support services for almost all student initiated activities. The College’s arboretum is a uniquely Haverford enhancement that provides an
environment conducive to the wide variety of educational and recreational activities in which our students participate. FM collaborates with the students in designing recycling, “Go-Green” and other sustainability efforts as a reflection of the institution’s goals to support student self-governance and initiatives.

Health Services is accredited by the Pennsylvania Department of Health to provide primary care for Haverford College students. During the academic year, Health Services operates Monday through Friday, with on-call registered nurse consultation for after hours and weekends. Full-time staff include a family nurse practitioner director, a registered nurse, and an administrative assistant. Part time and per-diem staff include a physician available by phone and on site for eight hours per week, a women’s health coordinator (16 hours per week), a family nurse practitioner (20 hours per week), nurses, orthopedic physician consultants (two hours every other week), a substance abuse educator (eight hours per week), a nutritionist (four hours per week), and a massage therapist (four hours per week). Health Services oversees the Student Health Advisory Committee, and Eating Issues & Body Image Council, plans the bi-annual American Red Cross blood drives, and organizes numerous Health/Wellness Lectures and the annual Student Health Fair.

The Office of Disabilities Services (ODS) was formally added to the student services division of the College in September 1997. Its part-time Coordinator oversees the administration of the College’s policy and procedures regarding students’ needs for accommodations for disabilities. The ODS reviews student requests for special accommodation, and issues documentation of such accommodation.

Safety and Security works within the College’s model of student self-governance and consensus to meet the security needs of our student population. Safety and Security works with the students to provide a range of support services that rely on the respect of its staff and knowledge that all interactions will be met with a prompt and professional response. Safety and Security is a 24/7 contact for emergencies and resource referrals.

The Student Activities (SA) Office serves as a resource to students, clubs and organizations, and faculty and staff members in organizing campus-wide student-run educational and social events. The goal of SA is to offer resources and services to support a rich, vibrant and fulfilling out-of-classroom culture that supports the overarching educational mission of Haverford College. Several aspects of these student social activities are enriched by the Bi-College relationship between Haverford and Bryn Mawr. The College newspaper, the Bi-Co News is one such example of collaborative extracurricular pursuits.

The Women’s Center is a safe space on campus that is open to both women and men to provide students with a network of support, resources, and information on topics of interest and concern to women. The Women’s Center organizes events related to issues of gender, women’s rights, sexuality, and sex and well-being. The Director of the Women’s Center oversees student assistants who are trained as sexual assault/rape advisors and staff the 24 hour Sexual Assault/Rape Hotline. These assistants are trained by Haverford College Psychological Services, Health Services, and Safety and Security; Women Against Rape of Delaware County; Haverford Township and Lower Merion Township Police; Haverford Mercy Hospital; and Bryn Mawr Hospital.
Co-Curricular Institutions

(i) The Academic Centers

Haverford’s three academic Centers provide a variety of internship and scholarly opportunities and programs that enrich student life. See Appendix N for the available annual report for Centers (note that the first annual report for the KINSC will be produced in 2010).

The Center for Peace and Global Citizenship (CPGC) is one of the most visible expressions of Haverford’s commitment to peace and social justice. According to the Center’s mission statement,

The Center for Peace and Global Citizenship advances Haverford’s long-standing commitment to peace and social justice through research, education and action. The CPGC integrates innovative scholarship and responsible civic engagement around contemporary issues of global significance. With its commitment to knowledge as the foundation for effective action, the Center embodies Haverford’s scholarly and ethical mission as a premier liberal arts college.11

The Center’s programming encourages a strong connection between academic work and experiential learning. The Center extends both scholarship and civic engagement beyond the classroom, most obviously by offering internships, both international and domestic, in 17 countries and nine states; participation in such internships has become a prominent feature of student life at Haverford. The CPGC also sponsors Haverford House, which houses six graduating seniors each year who work in various roles in local service organizations, including most recently: Community Legal Services; Parkway Northwest High School for Peace and Social Justice; Lourdes Health System Center for Public Health; Scribe Video Center; Philadelphia Legal Assistance; and the Philadelphia GROW Project. In addition, the CPGC café provides a much-valued communal space for students and faculty alike.

The John B. Hurford ’60 Humanities Center (HHC) also provides co-curricular programming that enriches the student academic experience. According to its mission statement, the Center

…seeks to enhance the intellectual and cultural life at Haverford by fostering challenging exchange among faculty, students, and diverse communities of writers, artists, performers, thinkers, activists, and innovators. The Center sponsors programs that promote relationships between classic humanistic study and contemporary intellectual, artistic, and ethical currents in the wider public world.12

The programs include the Student Arts Fund, Dialogue on Arts, student-run Seminars and Reading Groups, student research assistantships and summer internships in Philadelphia, all funded by the Center.

11 http://www.haverford.edu/CPGC/
12 http://www.haverford.edu/HHC/
The Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center (KINSC) provides laboratory and instructional space for the sciences and also contributes co-curricular programs that enhance the student experience. The Center funds student travel for scholarly research and conference presentations, and provides funding for student summer research externships and academically-oriented service projects. Projects still under development include symposia covering topics in interdisciplinary areas such as environmental studies, public health, and science and society. The KINSC is also the home of the Mentoring and Student Teaching program (MAST), an outreach program that provides laboratory experience and writing tutorials for 40-50 Philadelphia area high school and middle school students who come from backgrounds traditionally underrepresented in the sciences. This program offers Haverford student-tutors the opportunity to prepare course curricula, devise and teach scientific labs, and work one-on-one with students. One of the KINSC’s most visible, if least quantifiable, contributions to the quality of student life at Haverford is simply the space it offers students for study and social interaction: the Science Library, Zubrow Commons, many small seminar rooms, all of them well lit and comfortable.

(ii) The Customs Program

The Customs Program is a student-run orientation program that takes place during the five days prior to the start of every academic year. Customs seeks to provide the support and resources that many entering students need to make a smooth transition from high school to college. After Customs week, orientation activities continue with students participating in discussions, off-campus trips, and training in student-self governance. Each Customs Group (approximately 12-16 freshman students) is supported by 6-9 upper-class students of which 2-4 live on the residential hall (including the UCA assigned to the Customs Group, discussed above).

Extra-Curricular Activities

Extra-curricular activities complement the academic program and contribute to the development of the “whole student.”

(i) Athletics Program

Haverford College’s Athletic Department is committed to the belief that physical education is an integral component of each student’s “liberal arts education in the broadest sense.” The department offers a wide range of athletic opportunities for men and women, including Intercollegiate Varsity Teams (23), Competitive Club Teams (~8), Intramural Programs, Instructional Classes, and Recreational Activities. Athletics strives to enable our student-athletes to achieve excellence in their athletic pursuits as a complement to their rigorous academic program. Approximately 40% of the student body participates in Varsity Athletics and an additional 30% participates in Clubs and/or Intramural sports.

13 http://www.haverford.edu/KINSC/
(ii) Honor Council

Haverford’s Honor Code is among the oldest in the country and one of the few with a social dimension (see Appendix O). The Code is fully governed by the students through their Honor Council, the judiciary body that hears cases regarding academic and social violations of the Code. Members of Honor Council are elected, through Students’ Council, by the student body. The Honor Council, through the open portion of their weekly meetings, works to educate the community about the Code. Confidential portions of these meetings discuss violations of the Honor Code and preparations for upcoming trials. Trials are held when, after careful review by Honor Council, a member of the community is suspected of violating the Honor Code. A jury, consisting of members of Honor Council and randomly selected students, adjudicates and proposes resolutions in a confidential process. In special cases, the Dean’s Office in conjunction with Honor Council Co-Chairs may decide to have the case heard before a Dean’s Panel. In order to help inform the student body and community of Honor Council’s activities, “abstracts” are released that relay the substance of the trial while preserving confidentiality. A copy of each abstract is stored in Magill Library, as well as on the Council’s website, for a period of up to ten years.

(iii) Students’ Council

Students’ Council is the center of student government at Haverford, composed of officers and representatives elected from and by the Students’ Association. As stated in the Constitution, the role of Students’ Council is to complete the business of student government, work closely with administration and faculty, empower and support student leaders and initiatives, take a proactive and forward-looking approach to identifying issues of concern to students, and develop effective policy. These mandates are met through open meeting of the Students’ Council, Plenary, and reports from the Clearness Committee, formed to “evaluate the quality of student life.” The Secretaries of Students’ Council are responsible for recording and releasing all SC minutes (within one week of the meeting’s occurrence) as well as maintaining Students’ Council’s website and the events calendar.

Plenary is an event held on Haverford’s campus each semester in which any student can propose a change in either the Constitution or the Honor Code, or suggest campus-wide changes pertinent to student life at Haverford to be voted on by the student body.

(iv) Eighth Dimension

Eighth Dimension is Haverford’s community service office. It was founded in 1978 by a group of students, professors and administrators to integrate experiential learning into Haverford’s curricula and culture. The name "Eighth Dimension" referred to the seven other academic "dimensions" of a Haverford liberal arts education (natural science, quantitative analysis, social and behavioral sciences, laboratory, history, literature, and field/artistic experience). The Eighth Dimension not only emphasizes the continued
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14 http://www.haverford.edu/studentlife/honorcode.php
15 http://www.haverford.edu/organizations/sc
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belief of the vitality of public service at Haverford (and the College's Quaker values), it also represents the tradition of collaboration among students, faculty, and administration. The mission of Eighth Dimension is to: (1) provide opportunities for students to become involved in the larger community; (2) ensure that a well-rounded education extends beyond the classroom; (3) support and facilitate student-run projects in community service; (4) provide needed services to the greater Philadelphia area and beyond; (5) increase the awareness of the need for community service; and (6) promote education through service and encouraging service learning.

(v) Arts Activities

Students at Haverford have demonstrated a growing interest in music, theater, dance, creative writing and the visual arts, both curricular and extra-curricular. The College now lists itself as having more student-led singing groups (8) per capita than any other college or university, and the former campus security building has been converted into a fine arts activity center. Arts programs are bi-college in nature, with music and fine arts faculties residing at Haverford while theater and dance reside at Bryn Mawr. This collaboration results in a more vibrant and varied arts scene than either campus could sustain by itself. Extra-curricular arts opportunities are enhanced by new programs through the Hurford Humanities Center (see above). Enhanced student interest in the arts has put some strain on already inadequate arts and music facilities. These deficits are fully addressed and prioritized in the Campus Master Plan and building priorities embedded in the Comprehensive Campaign.

The extra-curricular and co-curricular activities described above enrich our students’ lives in myriad ways. As we move forward, we must continue to devote attention to advising students on how best to balance the competing demands of curricular and co-curricular activities. “Education of the whole student” means encouraging students to integrate their intellectual and personal development in all aspects of life at Haverford. However, students who struggle academically may need particularly strong mentorship and guidance to balance extra/co-curricular pursuits without presenting a hindrance to their academic development and success.

Religious Life on Campus

The role of religion and spiritual life at Haverford is frequently discussed and debated, as on other academic campuses. Catholic, Protestant, Muslim, and Jewish student religious affiliation groups are supported on campus via coordination with outside agencies (e.g., Hillel) by the Dean’s Office. In recent years, an easily accessible list of campus and community religious resources was made available to prospective and current students, highlighting the opportunities for students to engage with religious and spiritual affairs. Quaker students at Haverford organize meetings, service activities and social events (open to Quakers and non-Quakers alike) through their own student group, Quaker Community (QuaC). The College supports its Quaker students and connections to its Quaker heritage through a full-time Quaker student coordinator and a faculty liaison for Quaker affairs. These individuals facilitate opportunities for our Quaker and non-Quaker students to interact with outside service agencies, such as the American Friends Service Committee.

Religious life at Haverford is a topic warranting further campus-wide discussion, as it speaks to our mission in terms of both the diversity of the student body and international
engagement, and the importance of religious issues in current world affairs. Furthermore, our commitment to the development of the whole student heightens the importance of fostering a community that embraces and supports a variety of religious traditions, in light of the prominent role that religion and spirituality play in the lives of many of our students. Therefore, we recommend that the Dean's office, with the help of interested students and faculty, undertake an evaluation of the current state of religious and spiritual life on campus to ensure that the atmosphere regarding student spirituality meets the needs of our increasingly diversified student body.
PART IV
CORE ACADEMIC MISSION II:
FACULTY AND CURRICULUM
CHAPTER 9

FACULTY – STANDARD 10

9.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

The appointment, review, and retention of highly qualified faculty members are each central to our Institutional Vision, which emphasizes excellence in scholarship and teaching. Our faculty members are experts in their individual fields of research, and are creators of knowledge that they “profess” in the classroom and laboratory. Faculty members are also gifted teachers, dedicated to the undergraduate learning experience at all levels of the curriculum.

Our procedures for appointing and reviewing faculty are rigorous and thorough. Given the high standards we place on teaching and scholarship, we are generous in our financial and institutional support of faculty at all stages of the career life-cycle. As we look ahead to the implementation of the recommendations articulated in the FCAE Blueprint, we see many signal strengths and opportunities while continuing to be mindful of the challenges of change.

9.2 – Description and Analysis

Characteristics of our Faculty

Haverford College employs 121 full-time regular faculty members;17 99 of these faculty members are tenure-line (68% tenured). Among our 138 total faculty, 73.5 are men, 64.5 are women (one married couple shares a tenure-line appointment), and 34 are faculty of color. Of our tenure-track faculty, 100% have a PhD or the equivalent highest degree in the Arts, whereas 97% of all full-time faculty members have attained the PhD, and the comparable figure for all faculty members is 94% (Table 9.1, Appendix D, Faculty Statistics).

The success of our academic program relies on the continued retention and enrichment of our faculty. Our faculty members are recognized as experts in their field, and we include among our ranks a member of the National Academy of Sciences, recipients of Guggenheim Fellowships, and several national teaching awards. Currently, faculty members are named as Principal Investigators on grants totaling over $8M (>3M annualized total) from the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the National Endowment for the Humanities, in addition to several private foundations and organizations (Table 9.2, Appendix D, Data on Faculty Grants).

Recent administrative leadership has been focused on devoting adequate College resources to appropriately recruit, support, and retain the highest quality faculty. A careful study of compensation at Haverford and peer institutions indicated that Haverford had fallen behind its peers in this regard. As a result of this investigation, the President and Provost announced, in December 2007, a one-time correction in faculty salary that resulted in an average 10% salary increase that applied also to starting salaries. In 2007, the

17 AAUP headcount: http://www.haverford.edu/ir/pdf/p30_Faculty.Stats.pdf
Provost also increased the operational budget for faculty research support to enable more faculty members to take advantage of this important resource, and increased support to faculty members who hold endowed professorships.

One aspect of faculty life that is unique to Haverford is the residential nature of our campus. Fully two-thirds of Haverford faculty members live in on-campus housing. Our faculty housing units range from modest apartments to spacious single-family houses, often of a size and character that would be unaffordable for faculty members in the suburban neighborhoods that border our campus. Vacant faculty housing units are assigned by seniority, but faculty may occupy the unit for the entirety of their Haverford careers. Our approach to faculty housing is an extremely attractive benefit that contributes to our faculty members’ ability to manage their work-life balance. The College also offers a mortgage program that encourages faculty members wishing to live off-campus to purchase homes within a 4-mile radius of campus, at below market borrowing rates. These housing policies are reflective of the value the College places on community—our faculty members are not only colleagues, but they are also neighbors.

On-campus housing is substantially subsidized relative to the local market. The College has determined that the current model of faculty housing does not, however, provide sufficient resources to enable the continued maintenance and upkeep of these housing units (many of which are over 100 years old). The College is committed to continuing the residential nature of our campus for faculty, and is currently exploring innovative ideas that may permit faculty members to own (rather than rent) their faculty housing units. We are looking to successful models of faculty housing ownership at other residential colleges and are mindful of providing a variety of opportunities appropriate for all faculty members. The Administrative Advisory Committee recently conducted a survey of faculty members regarding faculty housing and will use the results of the survey to inform decision-making processes on this issue in 2009-10.

**Hiring Process for Faculty**

As described in the Faculty Handbook†, search committees at Haverford are designed to include a wide range of expertise, both from within the host department and from at least two other departments, including the Committee Chair (who by custom at Haverford is from outside the hiring department). The Provost and the Affirmative Action Officer also participate in committee deliberations. Two student representatives, majors in the home department, take an especially active role in the hiring process at Haverford, as full participants in the process. Such involvement by students reflects the strong voice that students have in shaping their educational experience, although the preparation of students for their role on search committees has recently come under some scrutiny by the faculty. While the representation of different disciplinary voices makes for search committees that are extremely deliberative and thorough, the current structure diminishes by definition the importance of departments and disciplinary expertise, and is worthy of discussion. Key questions and concerns include (1) the adequacy of departmental representation and voice in the search process; (2) the benefits and costs of non-departmental faculty participation on search teams; and (3) the preparation of students for their role on search committees.
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The FCAE Blueprint includes the establishment of several interdisciplinary programs, and hiring faculty in these areas is new to our process. We have successfully navigated these challenges in our new faculty appointments in Environmental Science and Peace, Justice, & Human Rights. The hiring committees for each of these searches were truly interdisciplinary, and involved broad representation across divisions and disciplines. We will build on these experiences in establishing methods for hiring faculty in non-traditional disciplines moving forward with the Blueprint, so that expectations can be appropriately articulated and met during reappointment and tenure.

The Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) is the Board Committee that oversees the academic and curricular program of the College. The Committee is co-chaired by the Provost and a Board member, and includes the two elected faculty representatives to the Board of Managers and several Board members. The Committee is charged with oversight of appointments, personnel decisions, and curriculum. The Provost is expected to report to the Committee at each Board meeting on curricular and other academic initiatives for consultation and feedback. The EAC played a pivotal advisory and support role in advancing the FCAE Blueprint. Given the responsibilities of this important Committee, participation of faculty is critical and faculty membership should be evaluated for adequacy. For example, it may be valuable to have the Education Policy Committee (EPC) Chair as a permanent member of the Committee (instead of the current practice where the Chair participates at the invitation of the Provost).

Review and Mentorship of Faculty Members

The Academic Council is Haverford’s most important deliberative body, charged with the review of tenure-line and other long-term Haverford faculty. It is the only committee for which the faculty elects membership, and in voting for representatives (regular and alternates in cases of departmental overlap) the faculty seeks out colleagues with the judgment and experience to evaluate the merits of tenure-track and continuing faculty for appointment, reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The guidelines and procedures for this work are set out clearly in our Faculty Handbook. Members of the faculty have confidence in the integrity and fairness of their representatives on Academic Council, for such values are explicit parts of Haverford’s culture. Nevertheless, particularly as we move forward to implement the plans for expansion of faculty under the FCAE Blueprint, we will need a mechanism for measuring and evaluating the work load of Academic Council as it reviews hires and personnel case decisions. There will no doubt come a point at which the workload will exceed the capacity of a single deliberative body. Council and the faculty will need to consider the implications of faculty expansion on the workload of elected Council members carefully, and in advance of the full implementation of the Blueprint plan.

Although Haverford makes use of adjunct faculty in a limited way, and primarily for the purposes of sabbatical leave replacement, interim appointments are warranted and may extend beyond a single year. The Associate Provost has recently revised the process for review of interim faculty, by charging the members of Alternate Council to review the teaching records of faculty members who have been on full-time interim status for four semesters, and whose departments wish to reappoint them for a third year.

The Hurford Humanities Center and the Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center have developed strong models for mentorship of the expanding range of post-doctoral fellows who now join the College for two or more years. For example, a grant awarded to the
KINSC by the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI) supports hiring local post-doctoral research fellows to teach 1-2 classes in the sciences. One particularly effective mode of mentoring occurs when a faculty member co-teaches a junior-level laboratory course with a post-doctoral fellow. The strength of this model lies in its synergy: the post-doc offers critical expertise in new and relevant areas of study while the Haverford faculty member directly shares his or her experience of teaching undergraduates. Such models of mentorship might be usefully incorporated into other disciplines.

Research Support for Faculty

The College is committed to the promotion of faculty research and creative projects. The Junior Faculty Leave (one full-year leave after three years of teaching and successful reappointment) and the improved sabbatical leave policy (one semester leave at full-pay after six semesters of teaching) are examples of this commitment. Each year, the Provost’s Office allocates substantial resources to support faculty research and to provide stipends to support full time student research assistants during the summer months. Faculty members may request up to $6000 annually to support their research (in addition to the summer stipends provided to students). Each full-time faculty member is also entitled to up to $2000 for travel to scholarly meetings for presenting their research or for professional development. Additional funds are made available to enable students to travel with faculty to participate in such professional meetings or to travel to off-site research settings. The purpose and design of these programs are clearly set out in the Faculty Handbook and on the Provost’s Office website.¹⁸

In addition, the 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. The Center Directors have agreed, in conversation with the Provost, to pay particular attention to supporting the interdisciplinary hires proposed by the FCAE Blueprint. Specifically, the Centers will provide resources to faculty discussion groups that will support these new interdisciplinary curricular arenas. Institutional Advancement has also recognized the importance of increasing administrative support for faculty grant applications, and has staffed the position of “Sponsored Research Officer”. 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. Haverford is at the vanguard of liberal arts institutions in this respect.

The FCAE Blueprint imagines changes in our teaching configuration that would allow faculty to devote greater time to scholarship and to think more intentionally about new curricular innovations and scholarly collaborations with students. The Blueprint specifies that faculty may elect one of two options in pursuit of these goals: first, they can elect to teach a four-course teaching load and be subject to the existing sabbatical policy; or second, they can elect to remain at a five-course load but with an enhanced sabbatical schedule (a full-year of leave after six semesters of teaching). These proposals are designed to create opportunities within the curriculum for faculty to pursue research projects, teach materials directly related to their individual research interests, and collaborate with students on scholarly endeavors. The Blueprint recognizes that successful research collaborations between students and faculty depend directly on the ability of

¹⁸ www.haverford.edu/provost
faculty members to maintain an active research profile and grow in their scholarly activities. The proposal, therefore, helps faculty members to achieve true integration among teaching and research, as befitting their role as scholars at a first-rate undergraduate institution. The reallocation of faculty time, conceived in the FCAE plan, is being implemented on a five-year phase-in cycle beginning in 2009-10. (Appendix D, Table 9.3)

**Faculty Committee Service**

Our faculty members contribute to the life of the College beyond their role as teachers and scholars. An institution that places a strong weight on self-governance requires its faculty to serve in various capacities and to be involved in many aspects of College administration. Invariably, faculty members spend a significant amount of time working on committees. These practices are particularly time-consuming at Haverford owing to our small size—faculty members are asked to take on multiple service responsibilities each year. Our faculty-time survey reveals that members of the faculty consider committee assignments to be a burdensome time-commitment, and promoting efficiency in committee structure is an objective of restructuring faculty time. As a result of this survey, in 2007 the FCAE advanced a proposal to reduce and restructure committee assignments. This proposal was reviewed and adopted in the faculty, and resulted in a roughly 15% reduction in committee appointments. One of the agenda items for FCAE during 2009-10 is to continue the review of existing committee membership and structure, and make recommendations for the further reconfiguration of existing committees.

In addition to committee service, our system of rotating chairs and the small size of many departments (including some with a single tenure-track faculty member), requires some faculty to assume departmental leadership responsibilities for a substantial portion of their post-tenure careers. Indeed, newly-tenured faculty members are often appointed departmental chair in the year following their post-tenure leave, and this practice may be, at least in part, causally associated with the stalling of academic careers post-tenure. Our AAUP counts confirm that there is a relatively high proportion of Associate Professor faculty that do not advance to the Full Professor rank, and this issue is under serious discussion among College academic leadership.

**Library and Information Technology**

The four Haverford libraries provide resources and services that support the liberal arts curriculum. Magill Library houses the majority of the collections in the social sciences and humanities, including rare books, manuscripts, and fine art, as well as the College Archives. Branch libraries in the Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center for biology, chemistry, computer science, mathematics and physics; the Observatory for astronomy; and Union Building for music serve the needs of students and faculty in those departments.

The collections include 573,676 cataloged items. In addition, the Library owns over 350,000 electronic books, 300,000 manuscripts, 95,000 microforms, 12,000 audio-visual materials (DVDs, videotapes, LPs, and CDs), and 3,250 photographs. The Library houses one of the premier collections of Quaker material in the world, which draws hundreds of scholars from around the country and the world each year, several of whom spend
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significant amounts of time with the collection. The Quaker Collection consists of 35,000 printed volumes and 2,400 linear feet of manuscripts, as well as numerous photographs, artworks, artifacts, furniture, films, videos, sound recordings, and digital files. Timely availability of scholarly materials is enhanced by access to the library collections at Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges, which comprise 1.8 million volumes. Inter-campus borrowing is initiated through Tripod, the shared online catalog, and materials are delivered via a daily courier service. Access to resources beyond the Tri-College community is facilitated by Haverford’s membership in the Pennsylvania Academic Library Consortium (PALCI), a federation of 76 academic libraries in the greater Pennsylvania area.

The Library supports a diverse array of digitization projects that enhance the teaching, learning, and research mission of the College. The Library provides a scanning service for faculty wishing to place reserve readings on Blackboard, the College’s course management system. Approximately 50 instructors utilize this service each semester, receiving on average 2,500 pages of digitized material for student use. The Library provides a similar service for faculty wishing to use digital images in the classroom. Since 2005, the Library has produced over 4,000 digital images for classroom presentation and student study. The Library’s Special Collections has digitized over 25,000 of its many unique items. These digital objects are used by local and external researchers, and serve as high-quality preservation surrogates for these often frail or rare materials. Since 2002, the Library has collected, cataloged, and provided access to senior theses, a voluntary submission initiative that has grown to include over 500 electronic papers. This collection, which serves Haverford’s thesis writers as well as scholars worldwide, is one of only a handful of such initiatives among peer institutions. More recently, the Library has created a digital audio collection of 22 oral histories, most of which were originally recorded on cassette tape over a decade ago. The histories, told by longstanding members of the Haverford community, provide primary accounts of the College’s evolution. In partnership with the Office of Disability Services, the Library creates electronic texts for students with special needs. To date, over 100 student textbooks and hundreds of Blackboard articles have been processed, allowing students with visual impairments the ability to use screen reading software to listen to their assigned readings.

Faculty research and teaching depend heavily on library collections, expert librarians, and resources for a broad range of information technology. In many ways we enjoy strengths beyond our own institution, especially through the combined collections and integrated electronic indexing system of the Haverford, Bryn Mawr, and Swarthmore College Libraries. Our proximity to the University of Pennsylvania’s rich research collections has also been among our strengths.

Although our professional library staff is well regarded by faculty, communication between librarians and faculty could be better exploited to support faculty in their teaching and scholarly activities. Librarians and faculty members are encouraged to work together to bring library resources into the classroom, to enhance faculty utilization of library resources (both print and electronic), and to develop a vision for better infrastructure support (e.g., technology rich seminar rooms for faculty/student/librarian collaboration) in planning for the upcoming Comprehensive Campaign.
A recent external review of College Information Resources† recommends (1) hiring a Chief Information Officer (CIO) who will be a member of the President’s senior staff; and (2) improving the integration of information resources within the College and across the bi-College and Tri-College consortia. The analysis of the visiting team revealed several deficiencies in the academic support services area in general and in faculty support in particular. Haverford has very limited support for faculty efforts to use current technology in teaching or research, and faculty members have learned to limit their expectations accordingly. The visiting team report recommended that the College create an academic technology team. It is anticipated that the new CIO in collaboration with the Head Librarian will develop such a team, comprised of programmers, developers, and library content area experts to support research and instruction. This team would work with faculty on the use of technology in pedagogy, provide instruction where needed in labs, teach students to fully utilize new tools and techniques, and assist faculty in grant-applications for technology projects. The report also suggests enhanced access to technology in classroom and other instructional spaces as the proliferation of technology use grows. The academic support role of the Language Learning Center could be better integrated with general academic technology support since this is a resource that is highly valued but under-utilized outside of the languages.

Administrative Support for Faculty

In recent years the faculty and administration and the FCAE have discussed various ideas for compensating departmental chairs, perhaps through teaching reductions or stipends. No less important is the need for enhanced administrative support beyond the clerical help normally provided by our administrative assistants. Such support could enable Chairs and other faculty leaders to delegate responsibility 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, mentor junior colleagues, visit classes, sponsor activities with students, forge connections with related disciplines, and in general, enhance research and teaching.

Pedagogy and the Curriculum

Whereas professors are regularly evaluated by students in course evaluations, and by their department chairs in annual letters, there are relatively few formal opportunities for faculty members to develop pedagogical skills. Such intentional pedagogical conversations are crucial to ensuring the most effective student experience of the curriculum, and various models for such work are being developed and implemented across the Bi-College (Haverford and Bryn Mawr) community.

Conversations are at present underway to improve pedagogical mentorship for introductory and advanced courses, writing courses, technological innovation, research methods, and team-taught courses. The current Writing Program conducts regular pedagogical seminars for its instructors. The Humanities Center and KINSC (funded by the HHMI grant) offer various opportunities for faculty to (1) develop supplementary or team-taught courses; (2) renovate or innovate courses; and (3) gather with other faculty in working groups to talk about issues in pedagogy (e.g., Visual Culture across the curriculum). The Library offers

---

† Available in Document Room
instruction in research skills, works with faculty on assignments utilizing primary material, and provides support for the use of digital materials in the classroom. In addition, Academic Computing offers basic technological workshops and the Language Learning Center offers informal pedagogical support to faculty.

The most successful and formalized approach to pedagogy is the Bi-College “Teaching and Learning Initiative” (TLI), supported by a grant from the Mellon Foundation and additional funds from Bryn Mawr and Haverford Colleges. As part of this vast initiative, the TLI runs an interdisciplinary seminar each semester with faculty members across ranks, colleges, and divisions to discuss various aspects of teaching and classroom instruction. Perhaps most innovative is the opportunity for faculty to be partnered with trained student consultants who attend the professor’s classes and provide regular pedagogical feedback. All newly hired Haverford professors participate in the TLI seminar and are given a course release to do so. Continuing faculty members at all ranks can apply to participate and receive a stipend if invited to join the seminar.
CHAPTER 10
EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS – STANDARD 11

10.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

Our most distinctive approach to academic excellence is our commitment to cultivating intellectual independence among our students. This effort begins early in the curriculum with an emphasis on intellectually intense classroom, studio, and laboratory experiences, and culminates in a senior thesis or project that extends beyond the classroom to original artistic and scholarly work. The senior thesis experience influences and shapes all levels of our curriculum, and seeks to progressively expose students to material and analytical approaches that will allow them to master, critique and contribute to their chosen fields of knowledge\(^\dagger\). This emphasis on critical inquiry constitutes the core component of our educational philosophy and resonates strongly with our academic goals and aspirations.

10.2 – Description and Analysis

The Life-Cycle of the Student Scholar

The Blueprint developed by the Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE), and the processes that led to its enthusiastic endorsement by the Board of Managers in April 2008, highlighted the importance of modeling and creating opportunities for student scholarship throughout the curriculum. In this endeavor, the College and each department have engaged in a critique of the senior research program and departmental curricula to better understand how to nurture, cultivate, and enhance opportunities for faculty-student collaboration and student scholarship.

The structure, requirements, and preparation for the senior experience have been rigorously reviewed. Key features of this exploration are briefly summarized in Table 10.1 in Appendix D. Our analysis reveals a College-wide commitment to the senior thesis as a capstone experience and shows that each department has its own distinct approach to developing students as scholars and preparing students for the senior thesis experience. A recent student survey, undertaken as part of the self-study, reveals that students strongly support the utility and quality of the culminating senior thesis experience\(^\dagger\).

Efforts led by the FCAE and Educational Policy Committee (EPC) in the last several years have focused on ways to enhance student exposure to scholarly activity at early stages in the curriculum. For example, in response to the FCAE initiative, multiple departments were inspired to modify their introductory curricula (e.g. Philosophy, Economics, Political Science) in order to realign course priorities to better prepare students for original scholarship. As another example, natural science departments hope to develop a Chemistry and Physics combined introductory course and have discussed the possibility of a two year multi-disciplinary introductory sequence that would allow students to more

\(^\dagger\) A compilation of thesis abstracts is normally on display in the Admissions Office, and is also available in the Document Room
rapidly achieve a level of competence in multiple disciplines.

In further support of these efforts to cultivate the life-cycle of the student scholar, a team of faculty members participated in a Mellon consortium sponsored assembly at Wellesley College in February 2009, whose theme centered on faculty-student collaboration. The Haverford group attending the assembly devised a project “to recognize faculty efforts to develop scholarly skills at earlier points in the curriculum that prepare students to be independent, rigorous scholars and thereby prepare them for their thesis experience.” The group established an award called the “Life-Cycle of the Student Scholar” award for faculty members “whose curricular assignments and pedagogical models enact such collaborative engagements within the classroom.” Three faculty members received the awards in Spring 2009 and the Provost’s Office has funded a continuation of the program (described in more detail in Chapter 14, Student Learning Assessment)19.

Assessing the success of current and evolving departmental curricular visions to develop the life-cycle of the student scholar will require careful College oversight and ongoing analysis through EPC. Feedback from current and former EPC Chairs confirm that EPC is hampered in its ability to effectively address curricular concerns and ambitions because of the time required for EPC to assess and approve new courses during both fall and spring semesters. There are several potential revisions to EPC that would enable it to address the curricular ambitions of the Blueprint as well as other current and future curricular needs. Restructuring EPC (including extensive faculty discussion regarding the appropriate format for a future EPC) will be a high priority task in the period following the re-accreditation review.

Curricular Innovation

Discussions inspired by FCAE inquiries and the tenure-line faculty appointments in the Blueprint, as well as various Center initiatives, collectively reveal College-wide interest in new curricular programs, including Environmental Studies, Public Health, Islamic Studies, and Visual Culture, and an expanded computational science program (“Scientific Computing”) involving many of the natural and social science departments. Although the Centers offer unique opportunities to explore and nurture curricular ideas, conversations with the Center Directors and FCAE members, as well as our review of 2006-2008 FCAE documents underscore the need to develop robust mechanisms and resources to implement mature curricular programs. Successful curricular initiatives, such as Biochemistry and the Gender & Sexuality program, are a valuable starting point for streamlining faculty and student effort to develop these programs. FCAE produced a preliminary document analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of existing concentrations that may be helpful when considering development of new efforts. FCAE documents that describe faculty experiences in developing non-departmental programs may also be a valuable resource†.

Centers and the Curriculum

The Hurford Humanities Center (HHC), the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship (CPCG), and the Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center (KINSC) are rich resources

19 http://www.haverford.edu/news/stories/27741/38
† Available in Document Room
for curricular and co-curricular programming. Each Center seeks in different but complementary ways to create interdisciplinary, experiential, co-curricular, and curricular opportunities for faculty and students. As the Centers coordinate more closely with each other and the broader college curriculum, key decisions about implementation of new curricular directions will require innovative communication and programming structures.

The Centers have taken the lead in envisioning new College programs, establishing faculty working groups on interdisciplinary issues, offering students internships locally and abroad, and facilitating scholarly activity across the college. At present the Hurford Humanities Center (HHC) most closely exemplifies a model of curricular support, funding faculty seminars, student-run seminars, course development, working groups, visitors, Mellon post-docs, artists-in-residence, and various other initiatives, all of which inflect our curricular activities. The HHC is especially committed to interdisciplinary work, as reflected in its Summer Curricular Institute and Faculty/Student Seminars, and also funds various art initiatives (class visits, Dialogues in the Arts). It is at present transitioning into the Center for the Humanities and Arts, and the fruits and complexities of that transition are yet to be seen.

The CPGC has historically focused more heavily on experiential learning, through funding domestic and international summer internships and course-related travel, but it is increasingly interested in exploring the role of the scholar-activist on campus. To this end, it has recently funded visits and workshops tied to indigenous Latin American and Native American experience, including the semester long appointment of the first Global Leader for Peace scholar, a Guatemalan peace activist. It has also begun to provide funding for Haverford faculty members to attend an annual conference in Salzburg and bring back that experience to the classroom. In addition the Center is considering developing more coursework tied to the theoretical and cultural components of student internships. Under the auspices of the CGPG, numerous courses and seminars, including Social Medicine and Criminal Justice, have been developed.

The KINSC focuses on enhancing faculty/student scholarship but also supports curricular development through the aegis of a grant from the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI), which is administered by this Center. The KINSC provides scholarship grants to faculty and students for collaborative research projects and travel, and HHMI supports post-doctoral fellowships and faculty seminars that directly feed into the curriculum. In addition, all three Centers are working together to jump-start an Environmental Studies program across the College curriculum.

The Centers thus provide a rich and dynamic space for intellectual conversation and curricular innovation. At the same time, it is difficult to pinpoint the mechanisms for transforming Center initiatives into more formal curricular enterprises. Feedback from Center directors suggests that more rigorous and regular interactions between the Centers and the Provost’s Office are crucial to integrating Center activities into the broader College curriculum. Because the Humanities Center and CPGC both offer vital opportunities for students to engage scholarship and experiential learning in various venues, it is imperative that the Centers be supported and engaged in both fiscal and administrative capacities. Perhaps the strongest tri-Center initiative to be launched, the Environmental Studies Program, will prove to be a useful case study in how Center activities can migrate to the core of the College curriculum.
The Arts across the Curriculum

Over the past five years, the College has focused on enhancing the Arts across the curriculum and in co-curricular activities. Various structures and funding grants are in place in the Centers to increase the visibility and viability of Arts across the curriculum.

The Hurford Humanities Center is transitioning into a Center for the Humanities and Arts with the endowed funding for a curator in 2007 and the introduction of multiple programs and funds to support the Arts, including the Tuttle Fund for Visual Culture Across the Curriculum, the 2008 Mellon Curricular Integration of the Arts Creative Residencies Program, a Visual Culture Working Group, and a thriving documentary film program. The Humanities Center has already begun to support Artists in Residency and is putting in place an exciting program for the 2009-10 academic year using Mellon funds.

In order to develop the Arts throughout the curriculum, the College has established multiple working groups to evaluate Arts programs and facilities. The recent (2008) Arts Planning and Program Report (Appendix P), written in conjunction with the consulting firm Wolf Brown, makes a number of recommendations about new faculty hires and facilities. It also lays the groundwork for the development of a comprehensive Center for the Humanities and Arts with the recommendations to (1) promote the incorporation of the arts into relevant aspects of the curriculum in other liberal arts disciplines; (2) provide students with arts related summer study and internship opportunities; (3) coordinate the integration of visual art exhibitions and performing arts events by visiting artists into the curricular and co-curricular life of the campus; (4) insure the development and implementation of a cogent policy for the acquisition, conservation and exhibition of the HC art and photography collection; (5) create a forum in which faculty, students and administrators can reach consensus on policies and procedures relating to the allocation of resources for the arts; (6) build bridges between Haverford’s current departmental offerings in Fine Arts and Music, and cognate disciplines in other areas of the academic curriculum; (7) coordinate access to digital and multi-media equipment and studios to serve the academic needs of faculty and students; and (8) develop and administer curricular activities as might be proposed to and approved by the Educational Policy Committee and the faculty.

With the recent addition of Art History courses to our Independent College Programs, students now have increased opportunities to study art on Haverford’s campus and to visit museums in Philadelphia. In addition, FCAE conversations have shown a cross-curricular interest in Visual Culture that ranges across departments and divisions.

Information Literacy and the Library

The College Library serves crucial functions in establishing and facilitating information literacy among our students. It does so by supporting a variety of student scholarly activities, as articulated in this excerpt from the Library mission statement†:

The Library supports the teaching, coursework, and study related to the College’s curriculum. It focuses on student and faculty research, and in so doing it promotes the creation of and exposure to original scholarship.

† The Library mission statement is clearly articulated in query responses provided to the Assessment Working Group in Fall 2008; copies are in the Document room.
The Library aims to broaden students’ experience, to promote their personal and intellectual growth, and to present access to fields not currently in the College’s curriculum. The Library enhances the resources it provides by engaging in collaborative arrangements, including cooperative agreements for collecting, resource sharing, and other library functions, within the Tri-College Consortium (along with the Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore College Libraries) and with other groups regionally and nationally.

In addition to working with others on campus to support baseline classroom needs such as Blackboard and Course Reserves, the Library, in coordination with faculty, plays a central role in developing our students’ information literacy, essential to their development as scholars. Librarians meet with students at various points in their studies through regular classroom instruction, required meetings outside of class time, and on an informal basis. More formally, freshman writing classes increasingly involve an information literacy component. In these sessions, students learn how to access and use specific scholarly sources – both digital and print – in the social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences. During class instruction, students are introduced to the literature of their major, important associations and publishers, specialized research tools, and major journals. Students learn how to use different kinds of background sources to read for factual information, broad explanations, and connections with important theoreticians. Throughout their studies, students are encouraged to develop fluency with library systems that allow them to access resources appropriate to their research needs. Finally, the library ensures that students have access to materials in the format that is best and most appropriate for their individual needs.

The library is currently in transition, with an acting Head Librarian temporarily in place, as the College coordinates a national search for a Chief Information Officer (CIO). The CIO and Head Librarian positions, their coordination, and the new channels of communication established will profoundly affect the College’s continued development of information literacy in the curriculum. As currently designed, the addition of a CIO to the President’s Senior Staff will imply a new organizational and report structure for Computing and Library, with both Academic and Administrative Computing reporting directly to the CIO (they currently report to the Provost), and the Library continuing to report to the Provost, with a “dotted-line” report to the CIO. This change in organizational structure will require careful monitoring and oversight to ensure that communication lines are fluid among the CIO, Provost, and Head Librarian.

The external review of College Information Resources (CIR) that occurred in Spring 2009 made recommendations for restructuring leadership in this area. Following the appointment of a new CIO, the College will commit to a national search for a Head Librarian. The Head Librarian will need to bring vision, academic rigor, curricular knowledge, and a professional reputation to the College and the position. This person needs to understand traditional librarianship, scholarly endeavor, and emerging technologies, the latter grasped in intellectual and creative, not just functional terms. This leader will help the College to envision the library in the coming decades and its central role as a social, curricular, research, civic and technological space. Because the College has not conducted an external review of the library for over a decade, we are strongly motivated to do so before beginning this search.
Curricular Assessment

A number of recent and ongoing initiatives are advancing our efforts to assess student learning in the College curriculum. An important contribution to that process, accomplished through efforts associated with the Middle States process, was the creation of the “Educational Goals and Aspirations” statement that forms the basis of curricular assessment. A curriculum is only successful if it is able to achieve the goals around which it is structured.

The most important assessment challenge we confront at this time is the effective evaluation of our curricular philosophy – namely that student scholarship culminating in a senior project achieves the intellectual mastery, ownership, and independence that we value. Perhaps the most effective assessment of our educational mission occurs through departmental expectations that students publicly defend their developing thesis project. This defense can take several forms that include public presentations to departments, individual presentations before a faculty panel, and oral exams. Our recommendations include recognition that some departments could enhance this component of the senior thesis experience.

Periodic and ongoing assessment of our curriculum ensures that it remains vibrant and vital and is critical for evaluating the success of our academic programs and our academic strategic plan. Outside reviews of programs and departments, which occur every 10-15 years, are an effective assessment tool. Feedback from outside review teams has resulted in recommendations for faculty support, senior thesis preparation enhancement, and program development – all of which have shaped our ambitions and ability to meet our educational goals. Recently, we have recognized the benefits of bringing outside consulting teams to campus to enhance programs that need development, including Sociology (Fall 2007), Writing (Spring 2009), the Arts (Summer and Fall 2008), Environmental Studies (Spring 2009), and College Information Resources (Spring 2009). The advice gathered has been invaluable and we hope to continue this approach as we develop other programs in the future.

At the department level, periodic assessment of curriculum is the responsibility of EPC, and a regular rotating schedule should be established for review of majors, minors, and concentrations, with appropriate emphasis on departmental demonstration of student learning. Departments are encouraged to meet with graduating seniors at the end of each academic year to discuss strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum. Such exit interviews at the department level could serve an important function for department-level curricular assessment, much as the general senior exit interview process (administered by the Dean’s Office) informs College-wide decision-making. FCAE has proposed that each Department Chair submit a yearly Departmental Activities Report to the Provost that would describe the activities of a past year and departmental plans for future years. This initiative would aid departments in their ongoing curricular assessment efforts.

Our analysis also reveals general satisfaction with the way that each department evaluates student achievement in traditional courses and labs (through numerical/letter and formative assessment of individual performance on exams, papers, and presentations). Department

† A sample of academic external review reports conducted since the last reaccreditation review is available in the Document Room.
Chairs also share student comments with junior faculty yearly. We are generally satisfied with the process of regular evaluation of individual teaching effectiveness via formal solicitation of student feedback with course evaluations that are tailored to individual course goals, but we also recognize that an enhanced course evaluation system could be implemented.

Finally, the College currently collects a great deal of indirect assessment data that may be shared more effectively with faculty in ongoing efforts at curricular and outcomes assessment. For example, information from the HEDS Senior Survey instrument, or the Dean’s Office exit surveys of seniors could provide an added dimension to the information that the faculty receives as part of departmental discussions with their students. Institutional Research and Institutional Advancement distribute questionnaires to alumni that could also provide useful feedback in ongoing evaluations of our curriculum. In addition to greater information sharing, the College can assist in assessment efforts by developing mechanisms to update alumni activities and by creating a central database of student performance and post-graduate activities that can be accessed by faculty and administrators. Although each Department is expected to maintain statistics about student destinations and incorporate these in external review self-studies, these data are non-uniform and difficult to maintain on an ongoing basis. Mechanisms for gathering and maintaining data that take advantage of current technology, like Facebook or LinkedIn, and permit input from multiple cohorts, like Wiki formats, seem particularly useful. Several departments have established dynamic lines of communication with their graduates via their web sites that may serve as prototypes (for example, Chemistry, Psychology, and Biology) for College-wide development.
CHAPTER 11

GENERAL EDUCATION – STANDARD 12

11.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

Haverford College’s statement of purpose is explicit in its promotion of a liberal education characterized by exposure to disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives that include elements of written and oral expression, quantitative reasoning, social responsibility, and intellectual breadth and depth. Recognizing the importance of “educating the whole student” in this way, the Blueprint includes new curricular initiatives and faculty positions that reinvigorate our commitment to these educational goals. Always evolving, our methods of integrating these principles into our curriculum are continually reexamined and reconfigured.

11.2 – Description and Analysis

General Education Requirements

In addition to satisfying a major department’s program requirements and completing the requisite number of credits Haverford students must also successfully complete the following set of curricular requirements:

(i) Distribution requirements

As part of the requirements for graduation, students must take at least three courses (spread over at least two departments) in each of the natural sciences, the social sciences and the humanities. The success and nature of our distribution requirements have been challenged in multiple ways. Several faculty members have suggested that distribution requirements are onerous and hamper our students’ ability to develop depth of understanding in a field outside their major. Suggestions for change have been discussed in only a preliminary fashion, but include the possibility of reducing distribution requirements from three to two per division and/or removing the stipulation that prohibits students from taking all courses in a single department to satisfy this requirement.

There is also support among the faculty for revising distribution requirements to include two levels of academic breadth – exploratory breadth for first and second year students and interdisciplinary breadth that reinforces the major experience for third and fourth year students. Alternatively, some faculty members have suggested the restructuring of distribution requirements to meet a student-specific curricular plan (focused on clusters of relevant courses outside the major discipline) at the time of major declaration. A full discussion of distributional requirements should be led by the Provost and EPC.

(ii) Quantitative requirement

20 www.haverford.edu/catalog/requirements.php
The quantitative requirement mandates students take one course designated as having significant quantitative content. As currently implemented, this requirement places a heavy onus on the Math Department, which is responsible for staffing the majority of these courses. Extending the list of “Q” credit courses to include all quantitative methods courses, some computer science courses, as well as logic courses in the Philosophy department could alleviate pressure on the Math Department while still maintaining the spirit of the requirement. In addition, the language of the requirement, as articulated in the College catalog, might be revised to better reflect the intention of strengthening students’ logical (quantitative and symbolic) skills. A change in name of the requirement (to, perhaps, the “Logical Reasoning Requirement”) may be appropriate, although care must be taken to ensure that the intent of the requirement is not lost in this transition.

(iii) Foreign Language requirement

The foreign language requirement (one full year of foreign language instruction or demonstrated proficiency) has been the topic of many discussions, both through the process led by the FCAE and through analysis undertaken by the Working Group on Faculty and Curriculum. Faculty members who teach language courses express emphatic support for a language requirement at Haverford. This support arises from the conception of language education as a fundamental component of the liberal arts curriculum. Exposure to foreign language study goes beyond an acquisition of proficiency to provide a scholarly understanding of culture and “otherness” that contributes to our tolerance and appreciation for difference, as emphasized by several elements of our curricular program.

Language faculty members also offer a thoughtful critique of the language requirement’s current configuration, arguing that the option to “test out” of a College level experience (for those with native fluency or substantial pre-College training as evidenced by AP examination scores) contributes to the “intellectual impoverishment” of the requirement. They support the Language minor as an ideal forum for students to develop focused interests in language skills and scholarship that complement their major.

Faculty members also feel that languages could be more intentionally integrated into the curriculum in several allied disciplines, including Music, Philosophy, Religion, Anthropology, Political Science, and History – and could be an explicit part of departmental philosophies as well as the curricular vision of students, faculty, and advisors. Language study could be more thoughtfully integrated with international internship experience offered by CPGC, as well as with our vision of the Social Justice component of our students’ education.

Introductory courses

There is a clear relationship among the early curriculum, student scholarship, and the success of our ambitions to prepare students for intellectual independence. Some of these connections are described more fully under Standard 11 (see the Life-Cycle of the Student Scholar). We anticipate that the introductory curriculum will become a major focus of academic self-study in the near future as we work more intentionally to provide students
with the skills to be independent and critical scholars. Appropriate assessment efforts for introductory level courses are of crucial importance.

FCAE documents and discussions with students identify specific concerns about the influence of enrollment pressures on the quality of introductory courses. Course enrollment limits at the introductory level make it difficult for some students to take courses required for them to consider a major. Students have suggested that enrollment pressures were greatest among social science departments. Our preliminary analysis reveals some pressures within social science departments (particularly Psychology), but also indicates enrollment pressures in natural science courses for non-majors as well as in courses taught by specific professors. We recommend that EPC not only evaluate the impact of enrollments on the quality of student and faculty experience, but also the variables that influence enrollment pressures. A re-evaluation of distribution requirements might have a secondary effect on what courses are taken at the introductory level and why/how they are chosen.

*General Education, Oral and Written Communication*

The College is committed to enhancing the opportunities for students to strengthen their oral and written communication skills. We are currently reviewing the Writing Program, which will likely result in fundamental changes in our Freshman Writing seminars. At the same time, we are actively considering ways to incorporate a writing and rhetoric component throughout the curriculum. The emphasis on communication skills is critical to our efforts to develop the Life-Cycle of the Student Scholar and refine our already rigorous student capstone experiences.

The culminating assessment of students’ written and oral skills comes in the form of senior capstone projects, generally scholarly theses that are either presented to the department or examined in a rigorous orals setting, often with multiple professors present. The format of these assessments varies across departments but in all cases, students must demonstrate their ability to speak cogently and persuasively about the project, to synthesize material from the major, and to think critically and originally while fielding questions about the work. In addition to senior work, students also develop oral skills throughout the curriculum in both formal and informal class presentations, conference presentations, course oral exams, and the discussion-based classroom context that defines many lower and upper-division courses. While the College does not at present have a specific “oral” requirement, there is a general recognition that oral communication skills are crucial to both scholarly and life achievement.

Our approach to writing as a requirement is more formally recognized, both in the Writing Program (see Standard 13), and in the vast array of courses that demand regular focus on writing and research skills. EPC’s most recent review of the Writing Program, in concert with the Writing Symposium (2009) that hosted outside experts in the field of Writing pedagogy, has resulted in renewed efforts to introduce writing skills more formally at various stages in the curriculum. The outside experts encouraged the College to think more about two different options for College Writing: “Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC)” and “Writing in the Disciplines (WID),” as it builds on an already strong freshman experience. The crucial outcome of the symposium was a renewed affirmation of a multi-year Writing Program that extends well beyond the Freshman Writing seminar.
In academic year 2009-2010 EPC will continue to explore an enriched Writing Program that will include first-year writing seminars, a set of writing-enriched courses across the curriculum, and a strengthened writing faculty with a well-supported Writing Program Director. EPC will also consider how Writing Program pedagogy might be better integrated in a broader pedagogical enterprise, which might include a Teaching and Learning Initiative. We also recommend that EPC invite faculty and departments across the divisions to engage in conversations about how we formally introduce and enhance writing at various stages of the curriculum.

Social Justice in a Haverford education

Until 2008, Haverford required every student to complete a course designated as “Social Justice” – that is, a course that engaged critically with issues of “prejudice, injustice, and inequality”. Considerable discussion among the faculty, and student sentiment as expressed in senior exit interviews, revealed (1) a low frequency of courses that fulfilled the Social Justice requirement, resulting in undesirably high course enrollments; (2) a reluctance among professors to designate courses as fulfilling Social Justice requirements because of perception that classroom quality is compromised when a course is dominated by those taking it simply as a requirement; (3) an inconsistency in content among Social Justice courses; and (4) uneven departmental responsibility for such courses. Given these considerations the formal Social Justice course requirement was eliminated by EPC and the faculty in the Spring of 2008 (phased out with the class of 2010). However, the commitment to an academic culture that emphasizes social justice remains a vital part of our institutional mission. Campus wide discussions about Social Justice held over the last two years reflect deep concern for how we integrate our sense of social justice into our academic lives. The President, Provost, EPC, and students are currently engaged in developing models that will replace the old Social Justice course requirement with something more substantive and meaningful. The new Social Justice Colloquium Series, which welcomed its inaugural speaker in Spring 2009, is one outcome of these discussions that generated enthusiastic community support.

During the inquiry phase of this self-study, almost every department cited the importance of inspiring students to use their knowledge and training to effect positive change in the worlds they inhabit. A concern for ethics and values is clearly a part of our curricular consciousness across all divisions. How we incorporate this concern into our curricular offerings and structure differs (in mode and effectiveness) by department. Courses in the social sciences and humanities divisions commonly feature content related to social justice concerns. Many of the natural science departments are working on plans to enhance the education of students in the ethical approach to science and publication by including ethical training as part of the summer research program and majors seminars. The environmental studies initiative also presents natural opportunities to include issues of social justice within the curriculum, across division. Finally, the addition of a new tenure-line faculty member in the interdisciplinary field of Peace, Justice, & Human Rights signals the College’s ongoing commitment to issues of social responsibility.
CHAPTER 12

RELATED EDUCATIONAL OFFERINGS – STANDARD 13

12.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

The educational activities discussed in this section serve the core mission of the College by assisting students to flourish in their core academic pursuits while providing opportunities for them to thrive personally through co-curricular activities, volunteerism, and engagement with the wider world beyond the campus. Clearly, a Haverford education is more than what happens in the classroom, and the opportunities for educating the whole student extend to several related educational offerings.

The particular related educational activities we focus on are: (1) bridge programs for underprepared students and the intensive sections of the first-year Writing Program (Basic Skills); (2) the Bi-College Education Certificate Program (Certificate Programs); (3) experiential learning and non-credit learning programs administered by the three Centers, and the Study Abroad Program (Experiential Learning); and (4) Bi-College cross-registration (Contractual Relationships and Affiliated Providers).

12.2 – Description and Analysis

Bridge Programs and Pedagogically-Enhanced Courses and Services

With Haverford’s enhanced commitment to both access and academic excellence comes the responsibility to help all students, including those with less rigorous pre-college preparation, to develop the skills to succeed here. A disproportionate share of our underprepared students comes from underrepresented groups, or are first-generation college students. The key programs that provide support for these students are summarized below.

The College currently offers summer programs of one to five weeks in duration that help prepare students for the challenges of their first year at Haverford. The most important of these programs is the Haverford Summer Science Institute (HSSI)\(^{21}\), an intensive five-week introduction to college-level science that is open by invitation to incoming students who express ambition to pursue a natural science major, but are from groups traditionally underrepresented in the sciences (including first generation college students). HSSI is staffed by tenure-line faculty and is aimed at helping students hone their critical thinking and problem-solving skills, while familiarizing them with a college classroom setting and its expectations. Early indicators suggest that the program has been successful – although assessment is still ongoing. The College is currently considering expanding the HSSI program to include underprepared students with interests in the non-sciences, and to provide a broader curriculum that includes expanded instruction in writing and rhetoric.

The most significant pedagogically-enhanced courses, also offered in the sciences, are the sections of introductory Physics, Chemistry, and Calculus supported by a grant from the

\(^{21}\) http://www.haverford.edu/HSSI/
Howard Hughes Medical Institute\textsuperscript{22}. The Biology department also offers a course that enhances the problem-solving skills of under-prepared students in the core introductory class. These enhanced natural science sections do not address developmental gaps by diluting the material, but rather by intensifying the faculty/student contact hours, and as such, Haverford’s approach is distinctly personal – focused on providing students from all backgrounds with the resources and mentorship to succeed equally.

The enhanced academic programs described above have recently been examined for effectiveness. In May 2008, the Dean’s Office created a large-scale database for a longitudinal analysis of student learning outcomes from 1981 forward. Results suggest that the outcomes for under-represented students are improving. While numbers of under-represented students are still disproportionately distributed in the lowest quartile of GPA, in the last five years these same underrepresented groups achieved proportionate representation in the middle two GPA quartiles. These findings suggest that our bridge programs and enhanced introductory courses may have helped under-prepared students overcome their poor preparation for college-level work in the aggregate.

However, our analysis of the Hughes section of Chemistry 100 shows that under-prepared students could benefit from enhanced pedagogic resources beyond the introductory level. For example, we note a significant decline in grades for students who pursue more advanced Chemistry or related classes following the Hughes section. As a consequence, while the study skills and confidence gained in the enhanced courses may help students succeed in other majors at Haverford, the courses themselves are less effective at overcoming under-preparation within the sciences. Unless we can provide the same kind of close mentorship and one-on-one instruction in the advanced levels of the sciences, we are likely to continue to see a drop-off in performance in science classes among these students. Such an initiative will require careful planning and strategic allocation of resources, and the College is devoted to this goal.

Evidence suggests that enhanced pedagogic support in freshman writing also helps those students who arrive at Haverford with distinct potential but who may lack rigorous high school preparation. As in the sciences, our enhanced writing programs have been limited by insufficient resources to support students beyond the first year, and beyond the most at-risk students. Our primary program aimed at the under-prepared student is the Intensive section of the Freshman Writing Seminar – the WSI course. Based on a pre-enrollment evaluation (through a writing sample), students with weak writing preparation are asked to select the Writing Seminar-Intensive (WSI) class in the fall, and then move on to a regular Writing Seminar in the spring. It is widely recognized that many students, even those who begin college as above average writers, would benefit from extra attention and intentional instruction to improve writing skills both in and beyond the two-semester intensive freshman program. For those students who are less able writers, a continued emphasis on writing is a critical component of success in any academic field or profession. The resources devoted to enhanced writing instruction fall short of the efforts at peer institutions like Swarthmore, Vassar, Occidental, and Bryn Mawr. Currently, the College only staffs 2-3 WSI sections per year, serving at most 30 students (less than 10\% of each incoming class). In addition, few pedagogically-enhanced courses that focus on developing students’ writing and rhetorical skills are offered beyond the freshman year. For this reason we recommend:

\textsuperscript{22} www.haverford.edu/kinsc/hhmi/
(1) the addition of WSI sections to accommodate more students; (2) further writing and rhetoric courses beyond the first year; and (3) an expansion of the writing instructional staff to facilitate the provision of writing workshops and individual tutoring. The Writing Program will be evaluated by EPC in 2009-10, and new funding sources will be allocated to support these recommendations and other redesign, as recommended by EPC.

Certificate Programs: The Education Certificate Program

The Bryn Mawr-Haverford Education Program offers a curricular opportunity for students to engage critically in scholarly issues of Education. Students may choose a minor track in educational studies, a certification program to teach at the secondary level, or completion of a fifth year to earn the secondary teaching certification. The Program Coordinator for the Bryn Mawr-Haverford Education Program has provided evidence of programmatic compliance with the Middle States Commission’s standards†. Further details on the Education/Certification Program are available on the Program’s website23.

Four aspects of the program warrant highlighting here. First, the Education Program effectively links the standards of the larger education profession to Haverford’s own educational mission by stressing not only the mastery of core competencies, but also service, social justice, and the nurturing of students to be leaders and agents of change. Second, the Education Program is fully integrated into the broader academic life of the College, through both the Teacher Education Committee, which represents the academic departments in the areas in which students are seeking certification, and through the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), which must review and approve all new courses and program changes. Third, the Education Program’s adherence to the highest professional standards is assured by its compliance with the General Standards and Subject Specific Program Guidelines of the Pennsylvania Department of Education, which reviews the teacher certification program every five years. And fourth, the Education Program demonstrates the advantages to be gained by Bi-College collaboration. As observed by the Program Director, “Operating the program as a Bi-College venture is a cost-effective, though sometimes logistically challenging, way to make education courses, a minor in Educational Studies, and secondary teacher certification available to students on both campuses. The advantage to this model is not just financial, however. Through our work with students, faculty, and staff on both campuses and our identity as a Bi-College program, we hope to strengthen the relationship between the Colleges.” This program is one of our most successful Bi-College endeavors.

Experiential Learning

(i) The Centers

Haverford’s non-credit courses and programs for experiential learning are supervised by our three academic Centers – the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship (CPGC), the Hurford Humanities Center (HHC), and the Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center (KINSC). Through the combination of visionary leadership and ample endowments, the three Centers have established internship and seminar programs that significantly extend the boundaries of a Haverford

† Available in Document Room

23 http://www.brynmawr.edu/education
education. These internships and seminars provide students rich opportunities to pursue research and service learning beyond the campus and to come together with other students and faculty to explore topics not directly addressed in our curriculum. The student opportunities provided by the CPGC and HHC are included in their annual reports (Appendix N). KINSC student opportunities are detailed in Appendix Q.

The most expansive of the internship programs is the CPGC sponsored summer internship program. This program sends students to international and domestic internships targeted to issues of social justice such as poverty relief, environmental improvement, human rights, and public health. In Summer 2009, the CPGC sponsored 62 student interns (43 international internships and 19 domestic internships) from diverse majors in all three divisions. These students participated in a wide range of projects such as working on an organic farm in France, grant writing for Amnesty International in Turkey, working in an AIDS orphanage in Guatemala, Micro-finance in India, and Agro-forestry and conservation in Belize. Nineteen countries, plus the US and the South Pacific Ocean, were sites for student internships this summer. Although the internships are oriented towards service learning and do not confer credit, all returned interns are required to take one of two credit-bearing courses to put their experience in academic perspective.

All three Centers administer a rich variety of research internships in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences that provide empirical experiences that prepare students for scholarly work in their regular courses and in their senior research projects. All three Centers mount an array of student-run seminars on such topics as Social Medicine (KINSC and CPGC), Music Sampling and Cultural Appropriation in Hip-Hop (HHC), and the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict (CPGC) that, while drawing on faculty expertise, depend primarily on student initiative and leadership. Overall, the experiential and non-credit learning opportunities made available by the three Centers represent a significant expansion of our curricular horizons, and serve as testimony to the kinds of programs that engaged and imaginative faculty and students can create when they are endowed with ample funds.

(ii) Study Abroad Program

The current international academic program policy was approved by the faculty in 1985 and implemented in the 1985-86 academic year. Monitored by the Dean of Global Affairs and the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), the list of approved programs provides opportunities that both extend and complement the academic offerings of the College. In order to ensure the quality of the programs, an on-site periodic evaluation by a faculty member occurs every few years. The faculty member follows a set of Evaluation Guidelines that were prepared by a sub-committee of EPC with the assistance of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (Philadelphia Office) in July of 1998. During the site visit, the faculty member attends classes and meets with on-site faculty, administrative staff, and students. Students receive transfer credit toward the major and College degree requirements, provided they achieve a minimum grade of C.
Each year approximately 150 juniors (a little less than 50% of the class) take advantage of the opportunity to study abroad for a semester or a year. Sophomores and seniors may also apply. Approximately 10-12% of those that study abroad do so for the entire academic year and over half choose a program with language study. In 2007, 36% of the students who studied abroad were students of color. Consistent with the national trend, more women (65%) than men (35%) study abroad.

The College’s financial aid policy applies to the Study Abroad program. No student has been denied the opportunity to study abroad because of finances. Charged home tuition, students receive full financial aid, including an allowance for airfare, so they can participate in the programs that best meet their academic, rather than financial, needs. Western Europe is the most popular study abroad destination, but recent years have seen an increase in the number of students that travel to South America, Africa and Asia.

Students who study abroad are well represented in honors and scholarship. Approximately 46% of those elected to Phi Beta Kappa have studied abroad and roughly half of students studying abroad receive Departmental Honors. College Honors recipients (magna and summa) are also well represented among those that study abroad. In addition, almost half of our recent Watson and Fulbright winners have studied abroad.

Contractual relationships: Bi-College Cooperation and Cross-registrations

Although Haverford takes pride in the opportunities enabled by our deliberately small size, we enthusiastically embrace the benefits that are afforded by our consortial relationship with Bryn Mawr College (as well as Swarthmore and the University of Pennsylvania). These relationships counteract some of the limitations of small size and are mutually beneficial to all institutions.

Table 12.1 in Appendix D shows total Haverford cross-registration credits per semester to and from Bryn Mawr, Swarthmore, and the University of Pennsylvania for the six years from AY 03-04 to AY 08-09, as aggregated from raw data provided by the Haverford Registrar’s Office. Cross-registrations with Swarthmore and the University of Pennsylvania are relatively rare, owing in part to the distance in commute, differences in academic calendar (Penn), and imperfectly integrated registrar functions between campuses that limit information flow and present a barrier to cross-registration. By contrast, the frequency of cross-registrations between Haverford and Bryn Mawr emphasizes the value of the Bi-College relationship in significantly broadening course offerings. The contractual basis for this relationship was established in 1977, through an agreement by the two colleges to formalize Bi-College cooperation. Since then, the two Colleges have realized economies of scale by establishing Bi-College departments (currently East Asian Studies and German) and programs (Chinese, Comparative Literature, Education, Gender & Sexuality Studies, Hebrew and Judaic Studies, Japanese, Linguistics [Tri-Co], Neural and Behavioral Sciences, Romance Languages, and Theater); by practicing curricular division of labor (for example by maintaining a Growth and Structure of Cities Program at Bryn Mawr and a

† Historical participation in Study Abroad by country is available in the Factbook, located in Document Room.
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Music Department and program at Haverford); and by allowing students to cross-register and major at either campus. Parity between the two College curricula is reinforced by the joint conduct of external reviews of academic departments, which not only assesses counterpart departments by the same criteria but also brings the question of departmental cooperation to the fore. Counterpart academic departments are periodically asked to discuss mutual relations with the Two College Committee on Academic Cooperation (TCCAC), an oversight committee of faculty and senior administrators drawn from both campuses.

Haverford’s student body is the smallest in the consortium, but Bi-College cooperation significantly enhances Haverford’s scholarly resources and intellectual community. As strong as the mutual benefits of Bi-College cooperation are, there is additional room to strengthen the links between the two Colleges. For example, despite the number of cross-registrations and the efforts to create a Tri-Co library, faculty at one institution cannot access student records at another, nor can students gain access to electronic databases, programs, and departments across campus, even in the case of Bi-College courses. Although some of the constraints stem from legal and technological limits imposed by external contractors and vendors, it should be possible for Bi-Co (and even Tri-Co) students to access all the databases utilized in a given course and for Bi-Co faculty to access all necessary administrative files maintained by the counterpart institution. If Bi-College cooperation is to flourish, we should aim for greater cross-campus seamlessness in our digital records. Efforts to coordinate College Information Resources and the Registrar Systems are ongoing.
PART V
ASSESSMENT
CHAPTER 13

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS – STANDARD 7

13.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

For the College to realize its full potential as a leading liberal arts college in the nation, our departments, divisions, services, and decision making processes must function efficiently and effectively, and must be assessed and evaluated on an ongoing basis. In increasingly complex financial and institutional circumstances, such assessment practices should be formalized and resourced appropriately. We are committed to providing new structures, resources, and personnel to lead these efforts.

13.2 – Description and Analysis

There are several unique aspects of our institutional culture that facilitate effective assessment processes. First, our small size allows for effective informal assessments through direct communication among campus constituents. Second, our culture of consensus-based decision-making (particularly within the faculty and through our committee structure) facilitates deliberate discussion about many issues, leading to change in practice and policies. For example, the development of the Blueprint, our academic strategic plan, originally arose from consideration of a plan (now abandoned) to significantly expand the student body. During those conversations, issues emerged that led to a careful process of critically examining the entire curriculum, resulting in the creation of the Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE), which drafted the Blueprint. This example serves to illustrate how our introspective and deliberative culture embraces self-study as a means for assessment and improvement.

Institution Level Assessment

Crucial to productive assessment efforts are administrative structures that provide leadership and data in support of such activities. The Office of Institutional Research (IR) serves this function at Haverford, by leading the College in accreditation-related activities, compiling data and analyses to support planning and policy development, and assisting the College in responding to demands for assessment. IR tracks a diversity of high-level data elements across time, and publishes these important assessment metrics in an annual Factbook†.

The IR Office coordinates the completion of the Common Data Set and numerous guidebook responses for consistency of information within the media, prepares the high-impact US News and World Report submission (analyzing the implications and results), and coordinates institutional responses to roughly a dozen annual HEDS (Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium) surveys for benchmarking purposes. Through HEDS, Haverford has early access to comparative AAUP average faculty compensation data for use in planning and the budget process. IR played a key role in developing a faculty database to

† Available in Document Room
track faculty information and model faculty compensation for budget projection purposes.

As described above, IR focuses on projects with broad or interrelated ("institutional") aspects, or those in a comparative context. Research particular to a specific area of the College is undertaken by the respective administrative department (Registrar, Admissions, Financial Aid, etc.). Following a cohort-based data collection plan (Appendix R), IR administers and/or analyzes selected national surveys (CIRP Entering Student Survey, first year experience survey, senior survey, faculty survey) that support planning and assessment. In service to the wider community, IR also answers ad hoc questions in support of grant proposals and other planning activities. Thus, the Office of Institutional Research is in an ideal position to spearhead more comprehensive assessment activities, particularly with respect to Institutional Effectiveness, but requires more resources in order to expand its functional profile to lead the College’s assessment efforts.

The measurement of Institutional Effectiveness is realized by examination of both institutional departments/programs and assessment of the individuals who are charged with carrying out the institution’s strategies for achieving its goals. (See Figure 13.1 in Appendix D for a schematic diagram of our current and proposed assessment structures, organized in terms of assessment of “program” and assessment of “people” in administrative and academic departments.)

**Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness: Administrative Departments**

Senior members of College leadership (the President and his Senior Staff) carry out large-scale and small-scale assessment projects on a routine basis, and as necessary to achieve key goals (see Chapter 4 for a more thorough discussion of institutional planning). The Haverford Board of Managers works with the President to ensure that the institutional goals for the coming year are achieved. The President, in turn, has oversight of all the reporting lines within the College and works with Senior Staff to set large scale goals within each of the College’s areas. Members of Senior Staff evaluate administrative departments during the annual budget development process, which involves an annual assessment of goal attainment that links resultant planning to resource requests. This process includes staffing, operations and student wage components, as detailed in the sample budget request materials (Appendix S). Requests for new administrative positions, including justification of the need, are reviewed by Senior Staff and the Administrative Advisory Committee (AAC) as part of the budget development process.

In addition to annual assessments of goal attainment and large-scale planning projects, periodic departmental reviews of administrative departments are also conducted. As a recent example, in 2009 the College implemented the Merged Information Resources Services Organizations (MISO)† Survey, conducted by College Information Resources. Haverford participated in the survey in 2007 and re-administered the survey two years later in anticipation of the appointment of a new CIO. Haverford was one of 14 institutions nationwide to participate in the survey. In general, the findings suggest a high level of satisfaction with the provision of library services and an appreciation for the Tri-Co library network. Key areas of improvement are basic technology and infrastructure needs, such as enhanced wireless capacity around campus, public printing, classroom technology and space and lighting. For further examples of assessment activities, Table 13.2 in Appendix D

---

† Available in Document Room
presents our 10-year history of intensive internal and external review of administrative functions†. A listing of earlier reviews and planning exercises is included in the Inventory of Major Documents (Appendix T).

Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness: Academic Departments and Programs

Similar processes are in place to evaluate the effectiveness of the Haverford curriculum, through oversight by the Provost and the Educational Policy Committee and the practice of periodic departmental review. As described in Chapter 10, EPC’s broad charge covers all aspects of the College’s educational policy and curricular offerings. Its primary purpose is to ensure that the fundamental elements of the College’s educational mission are well-articulated as policy and integrated into the curriculum in the best possible way. In addition to reviewing and approving all new or substantially changed courses in the Haverford curriculum, EPC is responsible for assessing components of general educational requirements and departmental curricula. As recent examples, EPC has undertaken analyses of the senior experience, the Writing Program and revisions to the Social Justice requirement.

Internal data and benchmarking against peer institutions help the College in evaluating the overall educational success of the institution. For example, graduation rates and retention statistics are simple measures of the extent to which the College serves our students' intellectual needs, as well as being indicators of the general level of student satisfaction with the opportunities and amenities the College provides. Fluctuations by class, gender, and race are monitored and investigated. Of the cohort of students entering the College between 1998 and 2004, 87.3% graduated in four years and 91.5% graduated by May of 2009 (Table 7.4, Appendix D). These rates are among the highest in the country and compare favorably to graduation rates at peer institutions. Our first-year retention rate is typically 98% (Table 7.3, Appendix D).

At the department level, external review is a valuable tool for assessing the effectiveness of academic departments in achieving their goals. Visiting teams of three recognized experts in the field spend two days in discussions with the faculty and students in the department, and its counterpart at Bryn Mawr (all academic reviews are Bi-College where appropriate). In advance of an external team’s campus visit, the department engages in deliberative self-study and produces a document that incorporates assessments such as destinations of alumni after graduation, benchmarking against aspirational peers, and the outcomes of conversations with majors regarding their experience in the curriculum.

Anonymous course evaluations are also used to provide faculty members (and department Chairs) with feedback regarding the success of the individual courses that comprise each department’s curriculum. There is no common course evaluation mechanism; departments (and in many cases, individual faculty members) are free to design end-of-semester evaluations that match the specific needs of the instructor/course or departmental curriculum. Such feedback provides the instructors with useful information to improve their course structure, content, or approach. Some faculty members also administer a mid-semester course evaluation, to respond in real time to feedback from the students (a practice that might be more uniformly adopted if appropriate administrative support were made available). While this method of gathering information yields useful and specialized information.

† Sample reports associated with these Departmental Reviews are available in Document Room.
input for individual faculty members, it is difficult to abstract from the individualized data and draw common conclusions about the effectiveness of the curriculum overall. The faculty should consider whether a set of standardized questions, appended to (but not replacing) the individual evaluation forms, might provide useful additional information about their teaching effectiveness, and if so, should engage in discussions about the appropriate common assessment questions.

The success of our academic departments in educating our students is evidenced in the outcomes they achieve. In the decade since our last reaccreditation review, impressive numbers of our students have been recognized with prestigious national awards that testify to the success of our students, our academic program, and the Committee on Honors and Fellowships in support of the application and advising process. Among the students recognized with national awards over the last decade are twenty-eight Fulbright Scholars, fourteen Goldwater Scholars, eleven Watson fellows, two Truman Scholars, two Luce Scholars, a George J. Mitchell Scholar, a Winston Churchill Scholar, a Marshall Scholar, a Beinecke Scholar, a Gates-Cambridge Scholar, a Gilman Scholar, as well as ten recipients of NCAA post-graduate awards. The success rate of our students in competition for these prestigious awards is increasing due to the enhanced depth and rigor of our academic programs and the concerted efforts of our Committee on Honors and Fellowships in identifying, encouraging, and advising students through the application and interview process. The Deans Office maintains a website with a comprehensive list of recent Honors and Fellowships recipients.

Built into the Blueprint is an explicit commitment to demonstrating the success of our academic strategic plans. The Board has requested that academic leadership document the successes associated with the restructuring of faculty enabled by the Blueprint. In particular, we must provide evidence that the reallocation of faculty time is accompanied by an enhancement in student-faculty research partnerships and in faculty scholarly productivity. At the end of the first year of the phase-in plan (2009-2010), faculty members who are teaching a reduced load will be asked to provide a self-assessment to the Provost of the value of the time reallocation to their scholarship and work with students. The institution embraces the notion that the Blueprint must continue to evolve in an evidence-based manner.

Further discussion of the assessment of academic programs, and the outcomes of our students, is included in Chapter 14, Assessment of Student Learning.

Assessment of People: Staff, Faculty, and Students

At the highest levels of College governance, the Haverford Board of Managers is evaluated using the assessment tools of its member organization, the Association of Governing Boards. In turn, the Board conducts a yearly evaluation of the President and works with him to ensure that institutional goals for the coming year are achieved. The President evaluates the members of Senior Staff reporting to him, through an annual process of self-evaluation and discussion of goals, strengths, challenges, and plans for the relevant areas of responsibility.

24 http://www.haverford.edu/deans/OAR/scholarships/past.php
Each Vice President is responsible for the annual evaluation of their direct reports, who in turn evaluate the professional (exempt) and staff (non-exempt) employees reporting to them. The results of annual employee evaluations affect merit-based salary increases for employees. Although this process varies by employee classification, a written self-evaluation and discussion of accomplishments, challenges, general performance of duties, and goals for the coming year are typically included in these reviews. A written summary, signed by the employee being evaluated, is retained by Human Resources. However, the completion of employee reviews across administrative departments is uneven, and our evaluation processes need to be assessed more thoroughly for consistency and effectiveness.

On the academic side, faculty members are reviewed by the Provost’s Office through the annual Professional Activities Form (PAF, Appendix U), and by the Academic Council at various points on the tenure-track. Annually, the evaluation of faculty members is based on information provided by students in anonymous course evaluations that are shared with the Provost, and by the faculty members’ self-reports and evaluations of their teaching, their research progress, scholarly publications/exhibitions and grants, and their service to the College (described in the PAF). In the case of junior (untenured) faculty, the department Chair also submits to the Provost an annual evaluation of their colleague’s teaching (based on class visits and feedback solicited from students), research, and service. The primary purpose of the Chair’s annual review is to ensure that the faculty member is accomplishing their goals at an appropriate pace relative to their tenure clock. Tenure and promotion reviews conducted by Academic Council rely most heavily on external review of the faculty member’s research and scholarly progress, and confidential letters to Academic Council by the faculty member’s students and the input of his or her institutional colleagues.

Students’ progress throughout their academic careers is monitored by the Committee on Student Standing and Programs (CSSP), which assesses individual students’ academic performance. In this capacity, CSSP deals with students who are in academic difficulty and those who are working well below potential. It also handles student petitions for academic exceptions, such as independent majors, and accelerated programs. By including representation from the faculty, student body, and the Dean’s Office (including the Dean for Multicultural Affairs), the committee brings multiple points of view to bear on the assessment of a student’s situation. The committee intervenes to aid students in academic difficulty by developing a program to improve the quality of the student’s work, such as instituting special requirements. If improvements do not result from such intervention, the Committee may separate or suspend a student from the College for academic reasons.

Proposed Assessment Structures

Our analysis of various assessment structures indicates that the information needed to conduct appropriate assessment of our institutional effectiveness is often available, but not particularly visible. Furthermore, since assessment efforts are relatively decentralized, departments are often not aware of the assessment activities of other departments facing similar challenges. Better coordination of assessment activities (both at the program and employee level) could benefit multiple departments.

The key operational recommendation designed to address these issues is the establishment of an Institutional Effectiveness (IE) Committee, charged with coordinating institution-level assessment activities and responding to department-level assessment
efforts by providing access to key information. The committee should be broadly representative, perhaps staffed along Vice-Presidential reporting lines. For example, each member of Senior Staff could appoint a committee representative as an “assessment coordinator” for their area. The committee members should be sufficiently senior (Director or Chair level) to be able to exert consistent leadership in assessment efforts across the College. The committee would ideally be led by an Institutional Assessment Coordinator (likely affiliated with Institutional Research with the title Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness). The representative of the Provost would guide the assessment of academic areas and assessment of student learning. The main task of the committee would be to develop, communicate, coordinate, and administratively support and sustain our institutional assessment plan. The committee would also be positioned with an institutional view to monitor the status and accomplishment of the many self-study recommendations that are aimed at improving institutional effectiveness.

It is also clear that Institutional Research will play an important role in developing transparent and accessible information strategies. There is an acute need for additional staffing in Institutional Research, in light of the demand for comprehensive assessment processes. Given the current budget realities, creative approaches will need to be explored in the near term regarding staffing an “assessment specialist” position.
CHAPTER 14

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING – STANDARD 14

14.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

Student learning is our fundamental purpose as an institution of higher education. The College has endorsed the Assessment Statement of the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) in recognition of the importance of assessment efforts, both for effective strategic planning and for accountability to the students who entrust their education to our care. However, the College also recognizes the inherent difficulty of assessing the long-term goals of a Haverford education, in light of the transformative educational experience we endeavor to create. See Appendix V for Haverford’s official Assessment Statement.

As demonstration of our growing culture of evidence, the College has committed to the enhancement of student learning assessment practices at the department level, and is the recipient (together with Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges) of a grant from the Teagle Foundation in support of these efforts. The Teagle funds are being used to seed department-level student-learning assessment projects, with the explicit goal of creating sustainable practices beyond the reaccreditation self-study and periodic departmental review processes. As we move forward with the implementation of the College’s academic strategic plan, we recognize the important caretaker role that faculty members and departments play in articulating clearly their academic plans in terms of student learning objectives and ensuring our students achieve these ambitious goals.

14.2 – Description and Analysis

A first step in successful assessment is the articulation of educational goals and objectives. Each academic department has a mission statement that is consonant with the College mission. However, each Department maintains the academic freedom to produce the curriculum that is best suited to expose students to the breadth and depth of conceptual and theoretical material in the field of study, and the methodological tools that are required to think critically and to produce original work in the discipline.

As described in depth earlier, a Haverford education strives to achieve the following “Educational Goals and Aspirations”, as defined by the Haverford faculty. These goals include:

- Mastery and Critique
- Ownership, Contribution, and Accountability
- Translation and Interpretation
- Breadth and Depth
- Communication and Presentation
- Social Responsibility

25 www.assessmentstatement.org
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Each department has designed a curriculum that translates these overarching goals into assessable objectives. When viewed in aggregate, the curriculum as a whole is designed to educate students both broadly and deeply, while the major provides students with the theoretical, conceptual, and methodological mastery and the skills of critical inquiry within an academic discipline. This training equips students with the ability to perform original scholarly research or creative activity in the senior year. As described in Chapter 10, the faculty strongly believes that successful completion of the senior thesis or project in the student’s chosen discipline represents the most compelling evidence of the achievement of the faculty’s goals for student learning, and by design, incorporates all of the educational goals above.

An examination of the range of thesis experiences offered by academic departments was conducted as a part of the current self-study. The analysis shows that the modal senior capstone experience spans two semesters, for which students earn two course credits in total. About half of the experiences require oral presentation in addition to written work (Table 10.1, Appendix D). Among the core aspirations of the Blueprint is an even greater emphasis on senior thesis and project work. The senior thesis assesses a student’s ability to move beyond traditional classroom learning experiences, and pushes students to apply the skills of a scholar, be they theoretical, methodological, quantitative, qualitative, or creative. When done well, it requires the student to master his or her specific topic, to critique, to translate, and in many cases to expand existing knowledge. By design, the thesis process holds the students accountable for the scholarship they produce and demands of them excellence in written, oral, and/or creative presentation.

The senior thesis is perhaps our most definitive mode of assessment, as it captures the full range of student learning objectives. Our ideal assessment standards are those of our professional disciplines, and we strive to evaluate our thesis work accordingly. The method of assessment of the senior thesis varies by department, but most departments have multiple faculty members evaluating each student’s work. Some (but not all) departments have published grading rubrics, in which they detail the criteria used when evaluating senior thesis work. Faculty members provide extensive oral and written feedback to students during the course of the project, which serves to improve performance overall. It is not unusual for thesis work to appear in the public domain in the form of published work, conference presentations, or exhibitions. Similarly, in many cases thesis work extends beyond the senior year to post-baccalaureate research towards a publication or advanced degree. We celebrate our thesis work by publishing an internal compendium of project descriptions that is widely distributed across campus, and is on display at various locations†.

Achieving this kind of intellectual independence requires the acquisition of a number of critical skills early in the Haverford curriculum. Major programs are often structured hierarchically, allowing early academic training to instill the habits of mind and methodological rigor that prepare students for becoming independent practitioners of their academic discipline. We have recently instituted a project, funded by the Mellon Foundation, for recognizing faculty members’ innovative educational efforts in the pre-senior curriculum that develops the “Life Cycle of the Student Scholar.” The purpose of the project was both to reward faculty members (three $1000 awards were given) for innovative and successful approaches to scholarly training within the discipline and communicate

† Available in Document Room
these effective practices to prospective students and to faculty colleagues to further inspire innovation. Nominations for the “Life Cycle of the Student Scholar” awards were solicited in Spring 2009; faculty members were invited to describe particular assignments that exemplify the efforts of the regular curriculum to enact scholarly engagement prior to the senior year. All of the nominated assignments demonstrated that scholarly training is present in the early stage curriculum across a variety of departments. A key commonality that was present in all of the recognized course assignments was the explicit training in contribution to the scholarly discourse in the discipline. For example, in two of the recognized submissions, students’ work was published in scholarly outlets. In the third, students were encouraged to submit their work to an online information repository, accessible to the public. Thus, a key strategy for demonstrating critical mastery on the way to becoming independent practitioners of their discipline (regardless of career choice) is the training of students to produce work that is appropriate for a disciplinary scholarly audience.

Outside of the senior thesis as a form of assessment, students’ mastery of theoretical, conceptual, and methodological knowledge is assessed in the classroom, in the form of both formative and summative assessments. Frequent quizzes, exams, and papers gauge whether students are able to articulate and demonstrate knowledge throughout the semester. In turn, the faculty member provides detailed feedback to help students identify their conceptual difficulties, and understand the faculty member’s standards for demonstrating mastery.

Formative assessments are also used to gauge student learning in a way that allows instructors to modify their teaching methods to ensure the most successful outcomes. These assessments take place “on the fly,” in class, measured by the quality of class discussions and questions asked, and students’ success in carrying out assigned tasks in class, tutorial, and lab. Some departments have formalized such assessments by the use of wireless responding devices, where students can respond in real time (and anonymously) to questions that gauge student understanding. Many departments make use of “breakout sessions” during class time, in which students work together to apply the concepts taught. Success in applying concepts is an important metric of how well students learn them.

Assessing Student Outcomes

Another crucial assessment of student learning is obtained through the examination of the professional activities of our students after leaving Haverford. Certainly, continued participation as scholars in the major discipline is one clear criterion of successful student learning in the undergraduate curriculum. A recent analysis of the scholarly activities of our alumni by IR highlights the number of Haverford students that go on to receive the PhD degree in their field of specialization after leaving Haverford. We reported that 13.6% of our 1990-1999 graduates have earned PhDs (381/2799), ranking our institution 13th of all colleges and universities for students that go on to earn the PhD nationwide (Appendix W). More recently, a National Science Foundation report on the baccalaureate origins of science and engineering doctorates (1997-2006) also ranks us 13th among all colleges and universities in the US, with 9.5% of our graduates in that period earning science/engineering PhDs (Appendix W). In order to help communicate internally the

† The full set of nominated projects and a profile of the 2009 recognized faculty members is available in the Document Room.
scholarly achievements of our recent alumni, we have implemented a speaker series called the “Young Academic Alumni Lecture Series.” Each year, several former students return to Haverford to discuss their scholarly trajectory and ongoing research projects with current students. Since its inception in 2001-2002, the program has brought 27 young academic alumni to Haverford through this program.

Of course progress towards the PhD in the discipline is not the only outcome measure of student learning in the Haverford curriculum. As part of the self-study, academic departments were asked to consider the entire set of alumni activities that would be considered “useful” outcome measures for evaluating the value of their majors during their academic careers at Haverford. In general, faculty members are supportive of a wide range of alumni activities that indicate the success of their educational programs. Not surprisingly, graduate school acceptance rates, the quality of graduate schools attended, and the rate of participation in research and/or analytical professions were highlighted among the useful metrics of educational achievement. Likewise, faculty members value participation in educational and community service settings as indices of educational success. Harder to quantify, but just as important, is the sense that our students leave Haverford to become productive and informed members of society, bringing the values that both attracted them to Haverford, and were reinforced here, into the wider world.

Our biggest challenge in using outcomes data to assess student learning is keeping track of alumni in the years following graduation. Institutional Advancement (IA) maintains an active alumni database; however, this database relies on alumni self-report and the tracking resources of IA, and therefore does not always accurately follow alumni, especially in the first decade following graduation (when both academic and professional moves are frequent and giving potential is more limited). In addition, the database as currently maintained is configured to suit IA purposes, and is therefore not always the most logical tracking for the student learning assessment that academic departments consider meaningful. Indeed, our preliminary analyses of the data reveal inconsistencies and errors which suggest they are of limited use for student learning assessment purposes. Despite the flaws inherent in the database, such outcomes data serve as a starting point for initiating departmental conversations about data methods collection and outcome measures assessment (see Appendix X for the listing of career outcomes from the IA database for 1999-2009). As currently constructed, the career outcomes listed in this data set are admittedly not nearly aligned with department learning goals for all departments. The College recognizes the need for clearer department-specific measures of successful outcomes and is committed to refining data collection methods to serve the functions of academic departments.

One of the recommendations of the self-study is for departments, with the help of central administrative assistance and systems, to establish individual mechanisms for assessing alumni outcomes. A first step in this process could be regular department-level senior exit interviews (in addition to the Senior Exit Interviews conducted by the Dean’s Office) and annual follow-up to ensure accurate longitudinal data that reflects the career choices and paths of our alumni body. Maintenance of contact with alumni builds upon our current culture of close faculty-student contact, and will provide an opportunity for both direct learning assessment (through the activities of alumni) and indirect assessment (through

---

26 http://www.haverford.edu/library/about/young_academic_alumni_lecture_series.php
surveys of the long-term impact of the major program). It will also prove beneficial to involve academic departments in alumni tracking for IA purposes.

Some departments are already establishing alumni communities centered on shared experiences in the major. The Chemistry department, for example, maintains an active alumni section of their departmental web page in which Chemistry alumni can submit narratives of their career paths, and how their outcomes were influenced by their experience in the Chemistry major. The Economics department produces a quarterly newsletter, which documents departmental news and alumni activities, and is being distributed to a growing subscriber network of Economics Department alumni and majors. The Psychology department recently sent surveys to over 500 former psychology majors. Results indicated that alumni were engaged in a wide range of activities that were informed by their training in the department. As illustrated in Table 14.1 (Appendix D), approximately 2/3 of the 221 respondents were engaged in the fields of academic (non-clinical) psychology, clinical psychology or medicine/public health, and education. These outcomes data reinforce the notion that students leave the major with sufficient disciplinary mastery to continue to contribute to the field of psychology in myriad ways, and are able to use their training to make an impact across a variety of fields.

Examples such as those highlighted above illustrate the utility of department-initiated alumni contact for assessing outcomes relative to department goals. However, more concrete and widespread mechanisms for assessment are required. Better data systems and appropriate institutional support could provide further opportunities for faculty to engage more readily in outcomes assessment activities. A more uniform alumni tracking system and support from administrative assistants in maintaining alumni records would facilitate outcomes data assessment in a more systematic and widespread form. Other forms of indirect student learning assessment could be improved, such as encouraging all departments to gather regular feedback from graduating seniors (perhaps through widespread use of departmental exit interviews). Furthermore, course evaluations could be made more comprehensive to be used as both an assessment of student learning relative to faculty goals and an assessment of faculty effectiveness. Administrative leadership must strongly articulate the value of meaningful assessment of student learning and must facilitate its widespread adoption.

27 www.haverford.edu/chem/alumni
28 www.haverford.edu/economics/alumni
CHAPTER 15

LEADERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE – STANDARD 4

15.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

Haverford has an inclusive governance structure that has functioned efficiently over time and has served the College very well. Essentially, the existing structure is designed in a way that reflects the College’s Quaker roots by maintaining a relatively flat hierarchy of decision-making. Given the ambitious new plans for academic enrichment envisioned in the Blueprint, and the strategic planning that is required to see it through, the College’s governance structures and practices must be closely examined to see if they accommodate our evolving vision of excellence.

15.2 – Description and Analysis

Governance Structure

Since its founding in 1833, the Corporation of Haverford College (“the Corporation”) has been the legal entity that owns the College†. The Corporation seeks by advice and example to strengthen and enrich Haverford’s Quaker heritage. It achieves this goal by electing members to the Board of Managers and by direct contact with the Senior Administration through its Advisory Committee.

The Corporation formally elects the 33 members of the Board of Managers (“the Board”), including the 12 members nominated by the Board, the six nominated by the Alumni Association, the President of the College, and the 14 members nominated by the Corporation itself. The Corporation makes any amendments to the bylaws. The Board has fiduciary responsibility for all aspects of the operation and management of the College, and carries out these duties via four substantial meetings each year (October, December, February, April) and through its subcommittee structure. Among these subcommittees are the Nominations and Governance, Long Range Strategic Planning, Educational Affairs, Student Affairs, Faculty and Staff Policies, Finance, Investment, Audit, Advancement, and Property Committees.

The Nominations and Governance Committee of the Board, consisting of no fewer than five Managers that serve no more than five consecutive years on the Committee, appoints, reviews and evaluates members of the Board of Managers. The Committee has general supervision over the composition and involvement of the Board of Managers. Through its effects on Board membership, the Committee directly addresses the needs and priorities of the institution and monitors and works to improve the performance of individual Managers, and the Board as a whole. It is responsible for identifying, cultivating and nominating prospective members of the Board, and it oversees the orientation and committee

† Documents related to the Board and Corporation, including the Corporation Bylaws and the Board of Managers Operating Procedures are available in the Document Room.
assignments of Board members. It reviews the performance of incumbent Managers, particularly those up for reelection, and oversees periodic reviews of the Board’s performance. It nominates annually a slate of officers, committee chairs and committees for the following year, in consultation with the Board Chair, Vice Chair(s) and President of the College. It is also responsible for nominating emeritus Managers and for the annual evaluation of the President.

Board members serve three-year terms and may be appointed for a maximum of four terms or 12 years. As part of our normal appointment procedures, Board members must sign a financial conflict of interest statement before assuming their role as managers.

The President of the College reports directly to the Board and is evaluated annually through the Presidential Compensation Review Subcommittee. Through his Senior Staff (Provost, Dean of the College, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, and the new position of Chief Information Officer), he manages the comprehensive operations of the College and attends to the multiple constituencies of the College (Organizational Chart, Appendix Y). Further description of the role of the Senior Staff in the President’s decision-making processes is included in Chapter 16 (Standard 5 – Administration).

An analysis of our governance structures reveals some minor inconsistencies, as well as the need for clarifications and change that form the basis of specific recommendations. Among these concerns are the existence of several new Board committees that are not properly documented as of yet in our publicly available records. These committees include the Corporation Advisory Committee, the Board Long Range Strategic Planning Committee (LRSPC), the Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE), and to some extent the President’s Senior Staff, which has assumed more of a deliberative role than it has in the past. These committees and governance structures are creative responses to institutional growth and other needs. Nonetheless, better articulation of the roles and responsibilities of these governing structures is essential.

Since our last reaccreditation, the Corporation has engaged in discussion regarding clarification and amendments to its Bylaws. Text describing the Corporation Advisory Committee has been written and discussed by the Corporation, and is expected to be approved at its next yearly meeting in April 2010. Another important bylaw amendment concerning the mandated number of Quakers on the Board of Managers (currently 13) has been discussed and has a similar pending status.

Role of Students in College Governance

In this section, the role of students in College governance is described; the structures of “student self-governance” are described under Standard 9 – Student Support Services (Chapter 8).

Student representatives serve on virtually all Haverford committees (with the exception of Academic Council), including faculty and staff search committees (including Presidential Search Committees), the Long Range Strategic Planning Committee, the Educational Policy Committee, and the Administrative Advisory Committee. All of these committees function by consensus, and opportunities for student input are intrinsic to the process. However, in examining the issue of student participation in governance more closely it has
become apparent that there are certain problems inherent in involving students on important governance committees. First, the appointment process is sometimes deficient in that students are often appointed late in the year after the Committee has already begun its substantive work. In addition, whereas faculty and staff are often able to continue their service on committees for multiple years, students are harder to schedule in this way, and their lack of continuity often hinders their equal participation and their ability to communicate committee deliberations and outcomes to other students.

Despite these limitations, students at Haverford are a vital part of our decision-making processes even outside of committee structures. For example, individual student letters are solicited in promotion and tenure cases, and these letters provide critical insight into the teaching excellence of the faculty. On the curricular front, senior exit interviews expressing dissatisfaction with the Social Justice requirement stimulated a major reevaluation (and eventual elimination) of this requirement by the faculty. In the administrative area, student concerns influenced a recent decision to change the management of HCA (Haverford College Apartments).

**Faculty Governing Committees/Faculty Self-Governance**

The core faculty governance committees of the College are: (1) Academic Council (AC); (2) The Educational Policy Committee (EPC); (3) The Administrative Advisory Committee (AAC); and (4) The Faculty Committee on Academic Enrichment (FCAE). Faculty members also participate in College governance through their two elected faculty representatives to the Board of Managers, who sit on several important Board Committees including the LRSPC, the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC), and the Faculty and Staff Policies Committee.

As described in Chapter 4, the LRSPC has a long-range College-wide perspective and membership across a spectrum of faculty, staff, student, and Board leadership. The role of the faculty representatives on the LRSPC is to communicate faculty objectives and concerns while sharing with faculty developing strategic initiatives. The function of the core faculty committees (AC, AAC, EPC, and FCAE) could be more substantive by improved communication channels among the core faculty committees and with the LRSPC. The role of the faculty representatives to the LRSPC could also be enhanced by a structure communicating on a regular basis with the leadership of these core governing committees. The role of faculty representatives (for example their participation as members of AC) should be reassessed in light of these deeper responsibilities. Faculty governance would be strengthened by improving communication among core faculty committees and the LRSPC. One model for this would be to create a “faculty chairs committee” or “faculty council” that facilitates communication among the key committees.

A pending issue is the future role of the FCAE. The *Blueprint* engaged the College community in developing a long-term curricular vision that extended beyond the capacity of EPC, which deals with everyday curricular oversight. In carrying out the *Blueprint* – formulating the phase-in of the flexible 2:2 teaching load model and prioritizing the new appointments of faculty – FCAE is tasked with activities that are statutorily assigned to EPC. The future of FCAE and its relationship to EPC has been mandated by the faculty as the first agenda item for FCAE in 2009-10.
The major venue for discussion of issues relevant to faculty self-governance is our monthly Faculty Meeting, led by an elected Clerk of the Faculty. Concerns have been expressed about whether a full range of faculty voices can be adequately expressed during faculty meetings, and whether there is sufficient time available for thorough and effective discussion of major issues. The faculty has nominally adopted the “Friends Method of Doing Business” as its decision-making model (Appendix Z). However, it is debatable whether this model describes our process accurately, since adequate time is almost never allotted for all members of the faculty to express themselves on contentious issues. In fact a “time-limited” faculty meeting seems fundamentally inconsistent with the “Friends Method of Doing Business”.

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 continuations to the following week or extra ad hoc meetings, and to have a routine expectation that such meetings will occur if discussion is incomplete. The faculty has tended to resist committing extra time to Faculty Meeting, but a serious commitment to self-governance may require addressing this issue.

Staff Governance

The Staff Association is the voice of all staff members except faculty and senior administrators. All hourly and professional staff are members of the Staff Association, the bylaws of which are found on the college website\(^\text{29}\) and in the staff and administrative professional handbooks\(^\dagger\). Not all members of the staff are active participants in the Staff Association, but the Association is committed to respecting and representing all staff concerns.

The Staff Association Executive Committee provides a means for self-governance consistent with the other constituencies on campus. The Executive Committee consults with senior administrators and the Human Resources Office as a means towards open communication and transparency, and strives to maintain a balanced representation from all departments on campus.

In 2008-2009, the acting Staff Association Executive Committee reviewed the general practices and structure of the Staff Association. The Executive Committee is currently working on a revision of the Staff Association bylaws with the goal of promoting fuller ownership of the group by those that it represents. In the process the Executive Committee is advocating for a move away from the standard Robert's Rules of Order on which its bylaws were previously based and adopting a decision-making by consensus process that is in keeping with the College's Quaker heritage. In discussion with the President, Vice President for Finance and Administration, and Human Resources Director, the Staff Association has advocated for Town Hall style meetings regarding budgetary decisions, concerns, and information. The Staff Association has also been committed to assessment activities through the installation of suggestion boxes around campus, a bulletin board in Magill Library, and a reinstated email address.

\(^\text{29}\) http://www.haverford.edu/staff/bylaws.pdf
\(^\dagger\) Available in Document Room
Transparency

Transparency in governance is essential to committee continuity, and to institutional memory. One important mechanism for transmitting information is clear record keeping in the form of detailed committee agendas and minutes. The maintenance of minutes and other archival records by some governance committees is inconsistent, which may result in the community being poorly informed about the results of past deliberations and the progress of current ones. There are opportunities for considerable improvement, many of which may be facilitated by the appointment of a new CIO. We may wish to model the practices of Bryn Mawr College, where the top academic planning committee (CAP) posts agendas, proposals, and final reports online, as well as an archive of its deliberations for the past eight years.\footnote{http://www.brynmawr.edu/cap/}
CHAPTER 16

ADMINISTRATION – STANDARD 5

16.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional Vision

The President, his Senior Staff, and their direct reports, form the skeletal structure of College senior administration. They lead by inclusion – treating all voices in the community as equal and of value. We value in our President and Senior Staff openness and willingness to consult the community and a commitment to true transparency in decision-making processes. The Provost, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement, the Dean of the College, and the soon to be appointed Chief Information Officer have all been appointed in the last two years since Stephen Emerson assumed the Presidency. These new team members are well-poised to develop and implement the new vision for the College along with their continuing Senior Staff colleagues who enhance decision processes with their experience, understanding of institutional culture, and knowledge of College history.

16.2 – Description and Analysis

The President

Haverford’s current President, Stephen G. Emerson, was selected after an extensive national search that involved search committee representation from the top echelons of the Board of Managers (Board Co-Chairs, Board Vice-Chair, plus additional Board members), members of the Corporation, faculty, Alumni Association, staff, and current students. The Committee was responsible for staging the search, preparing the search materials and documents, and making decisions on recommendations. It was able to come to the Board of Managers with a consensus-driven recommendation advancing the candidacy of Stephen Emerson, which was enthusiastically accepted by the Board of Managers. President Emerson, appointed in July 2007, is a distinguished scholar and a leader in the field of immunology, stem cell biology, and hematology/oncology. The search process was guided by an articulation of a core set of Challenges and Opportunities, drafted by the faculty members on the search committee and discussed with the entire community (Appendix AA). The highest priorities for this search were to appoint a President who had a distinguished academic career and a record of successful leadership, and who could bring to fruition the academic strategic planning process that culminated in the Blueprint.

President Emerson’s vision for a Haverford education and our responsibility in educating global citizens, can perhaps best be captured by these words from his inaugural address:

… the members of the College as a whole, and each of its units, continuously seeks together to ask the most critical questions through the most penetrating and genuine approaches. Depth, not breadth, dialogue, not isolation. The process of Learning at Haverford, therefore, has always been extraordinarily active. This search for truth, as I have characterized it here at the College, implies that the most important truths are not known a priori, and that the goal of education is to engage students and faculty in the process of Discovery.
... for Haverford College and its Community, preparation for lives of service is fundamental. Over the past fifty years, the College has earned a reputation for training educators, statesmen, journalists, public health professionals and physician scientists who ask really new questions, opening up new fields of knowledge and establishing new paradigms of care around the world. Through the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship, students travel around the globe to communities struggling for reconciliation after war and revolution, struggling to develop economically and educationally. And then these students return to the College, informed to ask new questions and acquire new skills that they can then take back out again, into their lives' work after graduation.

The President’s vision for Haverford, like the vision articulated clearly in the Blueprint, characterizes students as collaborators, scholars, and agents of change. These same principles are at the heart of our more recently articulated “Educational Goals and Aspirations” that are the foundation of our assessment efforts.

**The President’s Senior Administrative Staff**

The Senior Staff plays a central role in College governance, functioning essentially as the President’s “cabinet”. This body is partially defined in the Board Operating Procedures document, which lists the five senior officers of the College (President, Provost, Vice President for Finance and Administration, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and Dean of the College). Senior Staff has expanded to include the Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid, 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.

Senior Staff meets weekly throughout the academic year, and periodically during the summer months. It is responsible for both annual operations and longer-range strategic initiatives and guidance. Senior Staff members are expected to communicate with their direct reports and to engage their constituencies in appropriate consultation. Senior Staff advises the President, but key decisions on budget, personnel, operations, planning, and other matters rest with the President. 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 process too rigidly, but additional transparency about how the current Senior Staff functions is suggested.

**College Staff**

Within the overall organizational structure, administrative departments can be characterized by their functions: (1) Direct student support (e.g. Dean’s Office, Admissions); (2) Indirect student support (Institutional Advancement, Human Resources); and (3) Basic human needs (Health Services, Dining Services, Safety and Security). Administrative departments share certain strengths, such as commitment to the institution, a desire to improve effectiveness, a willingness to collaborate and innovate, and a sense of professionalism. A key assessment and planning challenge they face is the need for more effective
mechanisms to analyze the prodigious amount of data that is available. We look to the leadership of the new CIO to assist us in the technological aspects of this challenge.

Two staffing issues should be distinguished: (1) whether the number of positions is adequate; and (2) whether the performance of people in those positions is adequate. With respect to (2), it was noted that some areas of the College do rigorous and regular performance reviews, and others do not. It is strongly recommended that the practice of performance evaluation be made more uniform and consistent across departments; and the results of these reviews need to better inform decision-making regarding employment, promotion, and salary. A step toward greater transparency in our staff compensation policies would be web publication of our job classifications and the associated pay scales. Periodic review of local labor market pay structures should continue to ensure that our staff compensation remains competitive and our staff members feel supported in their professional development. Greater transparency in the pay scales of faculty members broken down by rank is also desirable, for similar reasons. With respect to (1), decisions on staffing are made largely by Senior Staff after review of peer-institutional data and trends, and recommendations for new positions or the elimination of existing positions are reviewed by AAC. In deciding on the adequacy of administrative support in various departments, Senior Staff is guided by comparative data provided by COFHE (Consortium on Financing Higher Education). The recent reduction in force, necessitated by the economic downturn that began in September 2008, drew upon these data in strategic decisions, all of which were discussed thoroughly in Senior Staff and evaluated by AAC.

Establishing a more regular schedule of administrative departmental reviews is another recommendation of the present analysis. Evaluations of more College-wide administrative structures are often, though not systematically, also facilitated by a process of external reviews. For example, in January 2009 the College carried out a comprehensive review of information technology (IT), with input from an outside panel of consultants. As a result of this review, a decision was made to fundamentally change the organization of IT at Haverford, bringing in a new Chief Information Officer (CIO) at a Senior Staff level appointment. Among other things, this new appointment will further unify the Academic and Administrative Computing departments, and as recommended in various places throughout the self-study, be heavily involved in improving access to assessment data for both academic and administrative departments. A CIO search is currently underway (Fall 2009). Information and technology for decision-making is a work in progress at Haverford, and the final result will be greatly influenced by the new CIO (Appendix BB, CIO Job Description).

---

† Additional detail on assessment within administrative departments is presented in the Assessment Working Group report and the supporting materials from administrative departments available in the Document Room.
CHAPTER 17

INTEGRITY – STANDARD 6

17.1 – Relation of the Standard to our Institutional vision

A climate of fairness, ethical practice, and equitable treatment of employees is a fundamental component of the Haverford ethos. The College is nourished and guided in these respects by its Quaker heritage. The notion that “how we act” matters as much as “what we do” permeates our educational vision and aspirations.

17.2 – Description and Analysis

Honor Code

Perhaps the most salient feature of the College’s strict compliance with Standard 6 is our pervasive Honor Code, which applies to both academic and social life on campus. From the College website:

The Honor Code must be ratified each year by students in a college-wide Plenary during which students address current issues or concerns and may make amendments to the Code. The Honor Code appeals to individuals’ needs to confront problems or disagreements, to maintain academic standards, and to uphold the College’s central tenets of honesty, integrity, trust, understanding, and respect. In the academic context, the Code engenders an immediate sense of trust and colleagueship between students and faculty – students often take tests without proctors and schedule times for their own final examinations.

In the social setting, the Honor Code makes possible a climate of trust, concern, and respect, which produces a campus atmosphere conducive to learning and personal development. The College does not have as many formal rules or as much formal supervision of undergraduates as most other colleges; rather, it offers an opportunity for students to govern their affairs and conduct themselves with respect and concern for others. For many, the Code resonates beyond graduation; some alums model their businesses or corporate practices on the Honor Code.

The adjudication and implementation of the Honor Code is fully described in Chapter 8 – Student Support Services (Standard 9).

The Honor Code is a living, evolving document. Honor Council resolves questions, issues, and disputes concerning the Code, and engages in continual discussion on how to most effectively communicate the principles of the Honor Code to the community. Honor Council carries out a series of activities during Customs Week and beyond through Honor Code Orienteers, students chosen particularly for their skill in communicating the operation of the Code to first-year students. The Council also sponsors frequent discussions and mock
trials during the year, at times involving faculty (for example, during "Pizza, Professors and the Code" discussions). It issues summary abstracts after cases are concluded describing the case and the principles on which it was decided (no actual names are used in such abstracts), followed by open discussions of the abstracts. The Co-Chairs of Honor Council meet weekly with the Dean of the College and another member of the Dean’s Office to facilitate discussion between College administration and students on Honor Code issues.

The social dimension of the Code sets it apart from the rigorous Honor Codes present at many other colleges and universities. The clear benefit of the social dimension is the fostering of a community of mutual trust and respect among students, but it also permeates interactions between students and other members of the community, including faculty, staff, and administrators. Honor Council and its leadership are often presented with complex social violations, complicated in some cases by potential legal implications. These considerations can affect the timing of mediations or trials. Also of concern are violations of the principles of the social Honor Code whose trivial nature could trivialize or paralyze the system (for example, library late returns, Dining Center meal theft, etc.). In general, Honor Council makes excellent decisions as to which issues to adjudicate and which issues should be referred to Deans or other administrators.

Student surveys of the Honor Code collected over the past decade, as well as Senior Exit Interviews, indicate general student satisfaction with both the procedures and principles embodied in the Honor Code. We have less data on faculty perceptions of the Code, which affects the academic program in substantial ways (e.g., self-scheduled and take-home exams are common). A faculty survey on this topic is overdue. Questions to be addressed include whether the Code works as advertised, whether violations are handled appropriately, and whether it has affected (positively or negatively) the way classes and departmental curricula are designed.

Institutional Review Board

In compliance with federal regulations governing research involving human subjects, Haverford College has established internal procedures to review any project that includes data collection from human subjects. Our Institutional Review Board (IRB) reviews any human subjects research project conducted on Haverford’s campus (whether or not the participants are Haverford students), or by Haverford faculty members off-site. The membership of the IRB is configured according to requirements stipulated by the federal Office of Human Subjects Research Protection, and the College has sought and obtained a Federal Wide Assurance from the National Institutes of Health to certify the compliance of its IRB with federal regulations. Various federal funding agencies mandate approval of funded research by the institution’s IRB. In the interest of protecting the safety of Haverford students and personnel, it is expected that all research involving human subjects, whether externally funded or not, be reviewed by the IRB.

The IRB must decide to deny approval to any proposal that would be inconsistent with federal regulations governing human subject research. But it may also deny approval based on other ethical concerns or because the proposed research would be detrimental to Haverford College or its community. The complete set of IRB procedures and documents is available on the IRB website.

Conflict Resolution

As described elsewhere, students are largely self-governing, however grievances with the College administration do occur. Regularly scheduled meetings (typically weekly) between administrative and student leadership, including the Students’ Council and Honor Council Co-Chairs, and the editors of the College newspaper facilitate regular communication between the College administration and the student body. Major items of concern (including grievances) are often discussed at these meetings.

Other, more formal, grievance panels are established for issues of sexual or racial harassment. A panel consisting of Deans and faculty (some elected, some appointed) is convened to hear such cases on an as-needed basis.

Integrity of Public Communications

The College produces a wide range of materials that assert an institutional identity. The processes that produce this material are highly collaborative, which reduces the likelihood that the information presented will be dishonest, untruthful, or inaccurate. This collaborative approach resonates with underlying Quaker notions of consensus and community. A complete and thorough inventory and description of all publicly available information about the College is included in Appendix CC, but a few key information sources are highlighted here.

(i) The College Website

The College’s principal outlet for news and information is www.haverford.edu. It is produced by the Office of Communications, which composes original content, links to third party material as appropriate, and collaborates with College departments in the creation and management of their subpages. The current site was designed in 2007 by a third-party firm with guidance from a College committee charged with overseeing the creation of the site. This committee sought input from all campus constituencies.

Given the dynamic nature of the web, the Office of Communications revises the site and its functionality on an ongoing basis as needs emerge and solutions present themselves. Any wholesale redesign of the site will call for the formation of a new committee similar to the one that stewarded the launch of the current site. Operationally, department constituents are given limited access to and control over their content. This practice safeguards both the functional integrity of the pages as well as the brand identity that we seek to preserve across all component pages of the site. However, departments are encouraged to suggest customization of their pages to best suit their needs.

Stories, blog posts and information appear on the site according to a variety of means and strategies. Blog posts are managed by RSS feed and appear according to a “last in, first up” sequence that presents short summaries of the most recent posts. Authored stories are assigned prominence by both the Office of Communications (which manages homepage story selection) and, for departmental pages, designated staff members who have been trained to upload content. It is possible for stories posted by one department to then get “cherry-picked” for use on the main homepage or indeed on
the homepage of any other department that believes that its audience would benefit from seeing the content. This practice frequently occurs in connection with the work of our three academic Centers of cross-disciplinary learning, whereby content that might originate on the homepage of an academic department is also posted on the homepage of a Center that may have participated in the project (or vice-versa).

(ii) The Common Data Set

The Common Data Set (CDS) initiative is a collaborative effort among data providers in the higher education community and publishers as represented by the College Board, Peterson's, and U.S. News & World Report. The combined goal of this collaboration is to improve the quality and accuracy of information provided to all involved in a student's transition into higher education, as well as to reduce the reporting burden on data providers.

Contributed to annually by the Office of Institutional Research, the CDS is a public document and is available via the “About Haverford” tab on our main website. This comprehensive document is enabled by the development of clear, standard data items and definitions in order to determine a specific cohort relevant to each item. Data items and definitions used by the U.S. Department of Education in its higher education surveys often serve as a guide in the continued development of the CDS. Common Data Set items undergo broad review by the CDS Advisory Board as well as by data providers representing secondary schools and two- and four-year colleges. Feedback from those who utilize the CDS is also considered throughout the annual review process.

The CDS is a set of standards and definitions of data items rather than a survey instrument or set of data represented in a database. Each of the higher education surveys conducted by the participating publishers incorporates items from the CDS as well as unique items proprietary to each publisher. Consequently, the publishers' surveys differ in that they utilize varying numbers of items from the CDS.

(iii) Admissions Viewbook

The Haverford Viewbook, our primary student recruitment brochure, is produced quadrennially by the Office of Admission & Financial Aid in consultation with the Office of Communications and the Committee on Admission. The focus, design and text are decided by representatives of the two offices, working together and reviewing one another’s assigned work product. All assertions of fact derive from sources including the Common Data Set as well as reports and accounting produced by the Provost and Registrar. Though the Viewbook has a four-year life cycle, quantities are printed every year, allowing us to make corrections or changes as needed. Such changes are approved by the Dean of Admission & Financial Aid and the Director of Communications in consultation with their respective staff and the Committee on Admission.

† Available in Document Room
(iv) Course information

The hard copy College Catalog† has long been the College’s official compendium of academic requirements and courses. The Catalog is also a way to communicate details about the business aspects of the relationship between students and the College (tuition information, policies regarding transfer credits, etc.) as well as details about institutional management (names of Board members and administrators, etc.).

The Catalog is updated annually by faculty and administrators who manage areas pertinent to the Catalog, and it is distributed on campus and to prospective students. For many years, the Catalog was the principal vehicle for communicating course details and major requirements for the upcoming academic year, and was at one time the only means by which the College conveyed such information. However, the evolution of our website as both a utility and a repository of information has made the Course Catalog largely obsolete, and, in recent years, it has become viewed as an Admissions tool produced for the benefit of prospective students and their families. The College is considering replacing the Catalog with what might be called an “academic guidebook” that summarizes policies and academic requirements and programs in far fewer pages. We believe this to be the more responsible course of action given the carbon footprint of the current course catalog, as well as the vast amount of paper that is consumed in its publication.

Given the dynamic nature of course information – what is being offered, on what days, and by whom – it is not surprising that enrolled students look to the searchable, online version of the Course Catalog when planning their academic schedules. The Online Catalog/Course Guide combines course listings at Haverford, Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore Colleges. Details on the Haverford courses are provided by academic department chairs who log in to a secure website and add, change or delete information as needed. While updated as warranted, the database is refreshed at least annually, in the summer.

(v) Quaker Matters

As an institution founded by Quakers, governed by consensus and informed by Quaker notions of mindfulness and the responsibility of individuals to see their actions in the context of community, Haverford is eager to make known the degree to which Quaker sensibilities are present in its affairs. To that end, these fundamental concepts are promulgated in a variety of ways, including Admissions tours; the College website, where there is a link to Quaker issues from the “About Haverford” tab; and, two brochures (“Quaker Elements” & “Quaker Matters”).†

The “Quaker Elements” brochure was produced under the guidance of former president Tom Tritton with editorial input from concerned members of the campus community and production assistance by the Office of Communications. The “Quaker Matters” brochure is designed for the benefit of current and prospective students seeking to learn more about the ways and means of Quaker activity – both explicit and notional – in

† Available in Document Room
contemporary campus life. It was produced by the Office of Communications with assistance from those students and employees who are concerned with such matters.

Academic Freedom

Academic institutions are pillars of discovery, change and progress. Preserved as such through the principle of Academic Freedom and the promotion of unencumbered inquiry, colleges and universities bear the responsibility for knowledge and its fundamental dissemination. Scholarship, as promoted through inquiry, must know no boundaries, must create new models of innovation, and must lead to discovery. Academic freedom insists on scholarship uninfluenced by prejudice or practicality. Inspired by these principles of Academic Freedom, our College insists upon the deepest and most engaging discourse, and through this discourse effects change.

Therefore, Haverford College is deeply committed to maintaining an environment of Academic Freedom. The College has had, since 1950, a policy regarding Academic Freedom for faculty, as described in the Faculty Handbook:

(a) Teachers in their search for truth are entitled to full freedom in research and in the publication of the results.

(b) Teachers in the exposition of truth are entitled to freedom in the classroom, but should not introduce into their courses material which has no relation to the subject.

(c) The teacher at Haverford is a citizen, a member of a learned profession, and an officer of the College. When writing or speaking as individual members of the community, teachers should be free from censorship or discipline, but their special position imposes special obligations. As persons of learning and as educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge the teaching profession and the College by their utterances. Hence, they should show respect for the opinions of others. When speaking as citizens or as individuals, they should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the College.

A similar policy is also in place for students, dating back to 1964:

Haverford College holds that open-minded and free inquiry is essential to a student's educational development. Thus, the College recognizes the right of all students to engage in discussion, to exchange thought and opinion, and to speak or write freely on any subject. To be complete, this freedom to learn must include the right of inquiry both in and out of the classroom and must be free from any arbitrary rules or actions that would deny students the freedom to make their own choice regarding controversial issues.

Further, the College endeavors to develop in its students the realization that as members of a free society they have not only the right but also the obligation to inform themselves about various problems and issues, and the freedom to formulate and express their positions on these issues.
Finally, the College reaffirms the freedom of assembly as an essential part of the process of discussion, inquiry, and advocacy. Students, therefore, have the right to found new or join existing organizations, on or off campus, which advocate and engage in actions to implement their announced goals.

Student actions such as those here mentioned do not imply approval, disapproval, or sponsorship by the College or its student body; neither do such actions in any way absolve students from their academic responsibilities. Similarly, students are expected to make clear that they are speaking or acting as individuals and not for the College or its student body.

The freedom to learn, to inquire, to speak, to organize, and to act with conviction is held by Haverford College to be a cornerstone of education in a free society.

In all of the ways described here, the College and the members of its collective community are deeply committed to the principles of integrity both in tradition and practice.
PART VII
CONCLUSION
CHAPTER 18

RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION

The analysis contained within the preceding chapters leads to a set of explicit recommendations for improvement. These recommendations are largely centered around four specific themes: (1) Enriching academic excellence; (2) Providing academic and co-curricular support for a student body characterized by greater diversity, especially in preparedness and life circumstances, than in previous years; (3) Improving information systems, data sharing, and transparency, primarily in support of an enhanced effort to sustain assessment practices; and (4) Examining our institutional organization and structures of self-governance. What follows is a detailed description of each of these recommendations, cross-referenced with the chapter containing the supporting analysis.

18.1 – Recommendations Arising from the Self-Study Analysis

Recommendation #1 – Refine the College Mission Statement (Chapter 3)

While much of what we do is still grounded in the present articulation of the mission statement, it is an appropriate time to revisit and refine this proclamation of who we are, to reflect the different emphases resulting from the deliberative work of the faculty that resulted in a re-articulation and reaffirmation of our educational goals and aspirations. Furthermore, several key institutional initiatives have developed since the last articulation of the Mission Statement, notably, the three Academic Centers: the Center for Peace and Global Citizenship, the John B. Hurford ’60 Humanities Center, and the Koshland Integrated Natural Science Center. The mission and goals of each enter are discussed at length in the self-study. The re-drafting of our Mission Statement will be led by the President, in a process of community engagement and reflection.

Recommendation #2 – Adopt Periodic Zero-Based Budgeting (Chapter 4, 13)

Typically, in academic and non-academic departments and divisions, budgets are configured using recommended guidelines for increase. The economic crisis the College faced during the FY10 budget process necessitated that divisions adopt a zero-based budgeting approach to decisions regarding program, resources, and staffing. Based on these experiences, we recommend a periodic zero-based budget exercise among members of Senior Staff and their direct reports as a discipline for maintaining the College’s financial health and ensuring that the allocation of resources is aligned with long-term strategic goals.

The remaining recommendations are organized around the four key themes described above.
Theme 1: Enriching Academic Excellence

In light of the bold proposals for academic enrichment, the self-study highlights specific recommendations for supporting faculty and students in achieving these goals. The following recommendations focus on faculty scholarship and faculty-student research collaborations, the curriculum, the Centers, and the Library.

Recommendation #3 – Enhance Opportunities for Faculty Development at all Stages of the Faculty Career-Cycle (Chapter 9, 14)

It is recommended that the Provost continue to work with relevant College groups to develop programs that address faculty life cycle needs. The faculty should be encouraged to maintain a commitment to improving their teaching and student learning throughout their careers. Similarly, maintaining scholarly momentum is particularly important and challenging at an institution that requires a great deal of service from its faculty. Potential models for chair rotation, appointment, and compensation need to be examined to facilitate scholarly and professional development post-tenure.

Recommendation #4 – Examine Preparedness for, and Structure of, the Senior Thesis Experience (Chapter 8, 10, 14)

In order to more effectively support student engagement in scholarly research, a cornerstone of a Haverford education, we recommend that EPC take the lead in encouraging all departments to consider: (1) enhancing opportunities for students to develop research skills prior to the senior year; (2) enhancing approaches to helping under-prepared students to succeed as independent scholars; (3) formally crediting senior thesis mentorship by faculty; and (4) distributing senior thesis mentorship responsibilities within departments in a manner consistent with departmental goals.

Recommendation #5 – Enhance Development of the Academic Centers (Chapter 10, 12)

Although Centers should have freedom to develop programs consistent with their individual missions, their programming can be better integrated into the curricular and strategic planning of the College, and budgets can be more transparent. The College should continue to identify the multiple roles Centers can play in developing programs and supporting student and faculty research, and create administrative mechanisms for advancing Center initiatives. Regular meetings between the Center Directors and the Provost, and other members of the senior administration where appropriate, are recommended to enhance coordination between Center endeavors and broader curricular activities. Center steering committee members should be appointed to multiple year terms to promote continuity in Center programs and initiatives.

Recommendation #6 – Enhance the Curricular and Co-Curricular Development of the Arts (Chapter 8, 10)

The College should carefully consider the adoption and implementation of the recommendations contained in the Wolf Brown Arts Planning and Programs report. Bi-College cooperation in the Arts should be strengthened so as to fully realize the range of opportunities, curricula and programs offered in the Arts at both Haverford and Bryn Mawr. Strategic resource decisions regarding arts academic programs (such as theater and digital
media) should be made in consultation and synergy with Bryn Mawr. The College should consider the creation of a College Arts Fund, independent from Center funding, that could be used to provide enhanced curricular offerings and co-curricular opportunities in the Arts. The College should continue its efforts in identifying and seeking sources for external funding in the Arts.

Recommendation #7 – Evaluate And Enhance Library Function And Structure (Chapter 10,11)

Several recommendations for the Library relate to the need for an evaluation of function and structure, enhanced resources, and greater coordination between the Library and the curriculum. These recommendations include the prioritization of the search for a Head Librarian, and the targeting of resources to improve the Library physical space. These priorities will help ensure the national reputation of the College in this area, and will maintain and enhance the high level of support for faculty-student scholarship.

Recommendation #8 – Examine College Distribution and Other General Education Requirements (Chapter 11, 14)

The Educational Policy Committee should take leadership in examining key College wide curricular issues, and formulate plans for implementable changes. Several areas have been highlighted for consideration. EPC should evaluate distribution requirements in light of our desire to provide curricular breadth and depth. Other general education requirements should be examined to determine if the requirements, as currently designed and implemented, are achieving our stated educational goals. These include the Quantitative requirement, the Foreign Language requirement (including a critical evaluation of our “testing out” policy), and the structure of our first-year courses (including Freshman Writing), with attention to the quality of the first-year curriculum and the impact of class size on quality and student support. Along these lines, EPC will be recommending to the faculty a comprehensive plan for writing and rhetoric sometime in Fall 2009†, and the College intends to modify its existing programming shortly thereafter. Finally, we recommend that EPC solidify its recommendation to support Social Justice in the curriculum. Restructuring of EPC should enhance its ability to take leadership in considering these curricular issues.

Theme 2: Enhancing Academic and Co-Curricular Support for All Students

The self-study points to several areas in which the institution can provide better support for all of our students. As the College has expanded and deepened its national and international reach, successfully attracting and matriculating students that contribute to a richly diverse student body, we recognize a greater range in pre-College preparation and personal circumstances among our extremely talented students. These recommendations have evolved in response to the goal to support all students that choose to attend Haverford.
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Recommendation #9 – Conduct a Comprehensive Review of Academic Support Services (Chapter 7, 8, 12)

We recommend that the College conduct a comprehensive review of the full range of Academic Support Services with the intention of improving and then resourcing effective practices to help all students, regardless of background, to succeed. In addition, the College should consider a model of academic support services that is more clearly integrated, allowing students to seek help with a variety of academic skills under one umbrella.

We further recommend that academic support services be designed to enhance support for underprepared students. For example, our research to date suggests that enhanced tutoring services, bridge programs, and summer-school preparedness courses might help students from underprepared backgrounds succeed.

Regardless of academic preparation, the College can do more to support the intellectual and personal development of students from underrepresented groups. We should look to recognized successful programs, like the Meyerhof program at UMBC, for enhancement strategies that will work at Haverford, and target resources accordingly. Similarly, the College should consider re-establishing domestic study away programs at historically black Colleges that have been demonstrated to have positive powerful effects on African American students.

Recommendation #10 – Foster Dialogue Regarding Student Spiritual/Religious Life on Campus (Chapter 8)

The Dean’s Office should conduct a study of the ways in which the College can support the student body in overcoming barriers that students might feel in expressing and espousing a wide range of religious views and traditions on campus.

Theme 3: Institutional Support of Assessment Activities

Assessment activities are embedded throughout the self-study analysis and in many of the recommendations currently listed in other “themes”. The recommendations here focus on enhancing institution-level support of assessment, particularly through an improved technological infrastructure and new leadership relating to data and information. The College has been engaged in a process to improve its technological infrastructure to support coordinated and integrated data systems and effective reporting and information sharing. It is envisioned that the upcoming appointment of a CIO will provide leadership for the effort to support assessment activities by ensuring the availability of, and access to, student, alumni and institutional data and information. Such increased transparency and access to information will be helpful in sustaining a culture of evidence.

Recommendation #11 – Establish an Institutional Effectiveness Committee (Chapter 13, 14, 16)

Senior staff should organize, staff, and charge an Institutional Effectiveness Committee, constituted with one representative appointed from each of the Vice-Presidential reporting
lines. At present, there is no central organizational structure to spearhead and oversee assessment activities. Establishing such a committee would address the institutional need for a more visible assessment structure, and will facilitate the clear articulation of our plans for assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning. The committee will assist departments in assessment activities by facilitating effective data acquisition and information sharing. The IE Committee could also play an important role in setting regular schedules of academic and administrative department reviews, and could help to monitor area compliance with annual employee performance evaluations, thereby protecting and ensuring the professional development of our valued employees.

While the IE committee will, by its nature, have an institutional view, the representative of the Provost on this committee will have primary responsibility for leadership in documenting assessment of student learning. These efforts will include working with academic departments in developing discipline-specific activities, and facilitating the sharing of approaches across departments. The Committee would also be positioned with an institutional view to monitor the status and accomplishment of the many self-study recommendations that enhance institutional effectiveness overall.

Recommendation #12 – Share and Communicate Existing Information More Effectively, and Facilitate Data Collection (Chapters 7, 10, 13, 14)

There are several arenas in which information can be shared more effectively. For example, information that can be used for the assessment of admissions and retention, when disseminated in a timely and sensitive fashion (to, for example, the Dean’s Office, the administration, and the faculty) could assist advising, program design, and enhanced student outcomes of various kinds. Similarly, distributing the results of College-administered surveys and interviews involving seniors and alumni to departmental faculty could assist departments in their assessment efforts.

Our present analysis suggests that our efforts at collecting indirect assessment data within departments could be improved, and should be institutionally supported. College-wide efforts might include the formalization of procedures for conducting systematic exit interviews within academic departments, and providing administrative support for effective alumni tracking.

Recommendation #13 – Articulate Standards within Each Academic Department for the Senior Thesis (Chapter 10, 14)

Our key student learning assessment measure, incorporated into each academic department’s curriculum, is the Senior Capstone Experience that functions as a direct summative assessment spanning a number of our educational goals. The faculty affirms that the thesis is among our most important direct assessment tools for evaluating the effectiveness of our undergraduate curriculum in meeting our stated learning goals and objectives. The Educational Policy Committee is therefore encouraged to work with the faculty within each department in the development of a consistent (but discipline-specific) rubric for assessing the Senior Capstone Experience. Such standards will assist students in understanding the expectations and scope of the Senior Capstone project and will ensure that all faculty members in a given department apply consistent criteria.
Recommendation #14 – Discuss and Consider Supplements to Course Evaluations (Chapter 9, 10, 13, 14)

Course evaluations are routinely conducted, but are idiosyncratic and tailored to individual courses, instructors, or departments. Through the use of a standard set of questions (appended to, but not replacing, existing course- or instructor- specific questions), there is an opportunity for course evaluations to provide better data on faculty effectiveness. Course evaluations also have the potential to serve as indirect assessments of student learning, if implemented consistently. Students could provide feedback regarding their perceptions of both having attained the specific learning goals for the particular course, and the faculty member's teaching.

Theme 4: Institutional Organization and Structures of Self-Governance

The governance structures of the College, and our procedures of self-governance (particularly within the faculty) have been largely unchanged for the past several decades, while the size of the faculty has grown considerably. As we embark on a deliberate process of expanding the faculty by 25%, we must carefully consider the consequences of growth for the effectiveness of our existing structures in the future.

Recommendation #15 – Appoint an Ad Hoc Governance Review Committee (Chapter 10, 13, 15)

In light of the faculty governance challenges outlined in this self-study, there are several areas that need to be addressed, and it is recommended that the Provost confer with Academic Council to constitute a group of faculty leaders to consider these issues as part of the annual committee appointment process. The group’s main charge would be to discuss existing informal proposals, and to develop new ideas for addressing our institutional challenges in the areas of organizational structure and faculty self-governance. This Governance Review Committee (GRC) would then transform these ideas into concrete written proposals that could be considered for adoption by the faculty (and other relevant bodies) and incorporated into existing governance documents. The forum for discussion of these issues will likely be the monthly meeting of the faculty. It should be noted that ongoing discussions are currently considering ways that Faculty Meeting may be improved, and it is anticipated that these conversations will continue in the GRC.

The GRC will also be charged with institutionalizing mechanisms for enhancing the transparency of committee work and deliberations. It is strongly recommended that major faculty committees (EPC, AAC, and currently FCAE) should make their agendas available in both written and electronic form, and publish annual reports summarizing both yearly accomplishments and agenda items carried over to the following year. The GRC would evaluate the efficacy of these procedures and act to ensure their implementation.

Other specific issues that were identified as recommendations regarding College governance may fall under the purview of this group, and are outlined below, in the recommendations that follow.
Recommendation #16 – Restructure the Educational Policy Committee, and Clarify the Status of FCAE and its Relationship to EPC (Chapter 10, 15)

EPC is the College’s central committee for curricular oversight and development. The current structure requires modification to facilitate more effective curricular review, oversight, and innovation. The upcoming implementation of the changes in faculty and curriculum outlined in the Blueprint adds urgency to this recommendation, given the somewhat parallel responsibilities shared by EPC and FCAE in recent years. Restructuring of EPC should be considered with the following possible refinements in mind: (1) delegation of new course review responsibilities to either the divisional representatives on EPC or the Provost’s office; (2) splitting EPC into two committees to manage the standard business of curricular review and the more conceptual policy development and implementation (perhaps with a redefined role for FCAE in the process); (3) increasing the terms of faculty representatives on EPC to maintain programmatic continuity and expertise; (4) increasing the number of faculty members on EPC to allow for a partitioning of responsibility and tasks; and (5) developing formal procedures for archiving EPC agendas, minutes, and analysis as a mechanism for assessment, continuity and progress.

Recommendation #17 – Create a Faculty Council to Improve Information Sharing Among Key Faculty Governing Committees (Chapter 15)

In order to coordinate the activities of the major governing committees, a “faculty chairs committee” or “faculty council” could be created, whose purpose would be to facilitate communication and elevate the faculty’s role in setting its own agenda. In one model this committee could consist of the chairs of EPC and AAC, the two elected Board representatives to Academic Council, and the Faculty Clerk (who chairs Faculty Meeting). The Provost would participate fully in meetings, but would not lead them.

Recommendation #18 – Evaluate Faculty Hiring Committees (Chapter 9, 15)

In light of the anticipated faculty expansion, the faculty as a whole should examine their hiring committees and consider the following issues: (1) the balance between College-wide and departmental input in the search process; (2) the preparedness, roles and responsibilities of student representatives; and (3) the approach to attracting and mentoring interdisciplinary candidates. We recommend that Academic Council spearhead the discussions.

Recommendation #19 – Explore Ways to Improve Effectiveness of Student Committee Service (Chapter 15)

We recommend that student leadership critically examine the process of appointment of students to committees to insure that appointments are made in a timely manner and that 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 orient new representatives and help them understand their roles on committees.
Recommendation # 20 – Articulate the Role of Senior Staff (Chapter 16)

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. This listing should be expanded to include a full operational description of the function of each Senior Staff member and the collective work of the team. The website should be prominent and accessible to all members of the community.

Recommendation #21 – Increase Transparency Regarding Staff and Faculty Compensation (Chapter 16)

To assist in the recruitment and retention of the highest quality staff and faculty, our employee job classifications and associated pay scales should be published on the Human Resources website as is often done at peer institutions. Employee salaries should be assessed and pay ranges should reflect market conditions. Faculty salary ranges should be widely accessible.

18.2 – Implementing the Recommendations

The self-study has been enormously useful in allowing the community to articulate the College’s collective strengths and identify areas in which the College can improve. The above section outlines the specific recommendations that have emerged from the self-study. The present section will contextualize the process that will be used in adopting the above recommendations.

Haverford’s unique culture of deliberation and consensus-based decision-making produces change slowly. Substantive change can only occur with widespread community buy-in, given our relatively flat governance hierarchy (which, like many aspects of our governance structure, may be a topic for discussion). This self-study process was deliberately designed to engage a large number of community members, so that the analysis producing the recommendations would be internally directed, rather than externally imposed. Even so, many of the recommendations can only procedurally be implemented following further discussion by the relevant constituency(s).

That said, a subset of the above recommendations can be implemented without further discussion: those that reflect existing priorities, previously discussed in other forums or planning activities, or those that are largely administrative matters of institutional importance. Such administrative matters can be implemented, without full community discussion, by the President in consultation with Senior Staff and/or the Long-Range Strategic Planning Committee, and the Administrative Advisory Committee (AAC) as appropriate (i.e., in matters that affect the budget), or Academic Council (in the case of the Governance Review Committee). Recommendations falling under these categories are likely to be implemented (or show progress toward implementation) by the time of the Periodic Review Report, as listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations reflecting existing priorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the remaining recommendations, some are critically important, but in light of our existing procedures, do not represent action items, per se. Rather, several of the recommendations will constitute agenda items for the College’s key (existing and/or proposed) governance committees, such as the Educational Policy Committee (EPC; existing), and the Governance Review Committee (GRC; proposed). Given the important roles that our governance committees play in managing the College, there is a limit to how quickly major policy issues can be resolved. It should also be noted that our committees and governance structures enact policy change by developing proposals, then bringing them to relevant constituencies for discussion and consensus-building prior to implementation. Recommendations falling into this category are listed below, with the governance committee or structure that will lead the analysis and develop specific proposals for action.

### Recommended agenda items for existing committees/governance structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Enhance Opportunities for Faculty Development</td>
<td>FCAE Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Examine Preparedness for, and Structure of, Senior Capstone Experience</td>
<td>EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Examine Distributional and other General Education Requirements</td>
<td>EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conduct a Comprehensive Review of Student Support Services</td>
<td>Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Establish Departmental Standards for Senior Thesis</td>
<td>EPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Improve Effectiveness of Student Committee Service</td>
<td>Students Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A related set of recommendations consists of agenda items for committees or structures that do not currently exist (but whose establishment is a separate recommendation).

### Recommended agenda items for proposed committees/governance structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Restructure the Educational Policy Committee, and Clarify the Status of FCAE and its Relationship to EPC</td>
<td>GRC (EPC/FCAE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Create a Faculty Council to Improve Information Sharing Among Key Faculty Governing Committees</td>
<td>GRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Evaluate Faculty Hiring Committees</td>
<td>GRC/Academic Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other recommendations are to engage relevant parties in goal-directed discussions. Although it is anticipated that conversations will begin in the next few years, it is unclear whether resolution of such discussions will be accomplished by the time of the Periodic
Review Report. These items are listed below, along with the appropriate leader of such conversations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal-directed discussions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Refine the College Mission Statement                                                   President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Foster Dialogue Regarding Spiritual/Religious Life on Campus                           Deans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Consider Changes to Course Evaluation System                                           Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This set of recommendations, therefore, is wide-ranging, affecting all constituencies of the College. The next several years hold the promise of enriching discussions as we pursue these recommendations and realize this shared institutional vision for our College community and intellectual mission.