



Periodic Review Report

**Presented by:
Swarthmore College
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania**

May 30, 2014

Rebecca S. Chopp, President

**Most recent decennial evaluation team's visit:
March 29, 2009 through April 1, 2009**

Prepared for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education

Swarthmore College - Middle States 2014 Periodic Review Report

Section 1: Executive Summary.....	1
Section 2: Institution’s Responses to the Previous Evaluation	3
A. Introduction	3
B. Knowledge	7
C. Mission.....	17
D. Admissions, Access, and Affordability	22
E. Alumni Engagement and Development	24
F. Resources.....	24
G. Other areas	27
H. Conclusion	27
Section 3: Current status - Major challenges and/or current opportunities	28
A. Initiatives.....	28
B. Challenges	29
Section 5: Assessment of Institutional effectiveness and student learning, progress and processes	42
A. Assessment of the Academic Program	42
B. Assessment in the Administrative Areas - Institutional Effectiveness	48
Section 6: Evidence of linkages between institutional planning and budgeting.....	50
A. Strategic Planning.....	50
B. Annual Planning, Budgeting and Assessment.....	51
C. Other Institutional and Financial Planning Linkages.....	52
Appendix A - Middle States Periodic Review Report Steering Committee Members.....	54
Appendix B - Institute for the Liberal Arts.....	55
Appendix C - Diversity and Inclusion Implementation Update.....	57
Appendix D - Financial Projection	58
Appendix E - Strategic Directions Phase 1: Timeline	59
Appendix F – Strategic Directions: Enrollment, Faculty, and Course Load Projections.....	60
Appendix G - Historic Enrollment Information.....	61
Appendix H - DRAFT Institutional Goals for Student Learning.....	62

Materials provided in addition to appendices: Financial Reports (which include audited financial statements and management letters) and IPEDS financial information for 2010-11, 2011-12, and 2012-13; College Catalog; Strategic Directions for Swarthmore College; Campus Master Plan final report; Assessment Plan; and (separately) Verification of Compliance with Accreditation-Relevant Federal Regulations.

Section 1: Executive Summary

Swarthmore is a private, non-sectarian, selective College, offering a liberal arts and engineering curriculum, and open to all regardless of financial need. The College is small by deliberate policy, with a current enrollment of approximately 1,550 students. A student/faculty ratio of 8:1 facilitates students having close, meaningful engagement with their professors.

Swarthmore combined its last self-study with a planning process, spanning 2007-2009. The economic downturn and a presidential transition suspended much of this planning. In 2010, President Rebecca Chopp reinitiated the planning process, informed by our previous work, but looking afresh at the future of higher education and liberal arts colleges, as well as Swarthmore's role in addressing the challenges and opportunities that lay ahead. That process resulted in *Strategic Directions* in 2011¹, a blueprint that articulates our values, considers our current environment, sets a series of specific recommendations for the future, and identifies the commitments to institutional infrastructure that will guide our ongoing work to realize our goals.

The College is now beginning to take up each of these recommended initiatives, with many key priorities already being implemented. The College has begun a process of planned modest growth in the size of the student body. This transition will involve revising our accounting of teaching to reflect and encourage the ways that faculty support student learning outside of the classroom. Other key initiatives from the planning process include a diversity and inclusion plan, a campus master plan, a Center for Innovation and Leadership (building on existing structures and drawing together alumni and students to build students' leadership skills), a sustainability committee, and an Institute for the Liberal Arts (with the promotion and support of faculty development among its objectives)².

The evaluation team report from Swarthmore's 2009 Middle States self-study was quite positive, with many helpful suggestions and one recommendation, concerning our work on assessment of student learning. The College has been working to strengthen and build our assessment processes. We reviewed and modified our Assessment Plan, including requiring departments to explicitly articulate their goals for student learning, and engage in an annual cycle of assessment of student learning that includes direct assessment. We enhanced our infrastructure to better support this work. Led by the Academic Assessment Committee, the College began to articulate our institutional-level goals for student learning, a process that has involved many drafts and discussions. We are now finalizing these goals, an essential step in addressing the recommendation of our evaluation team. These goal statements will allow us to better integrate and assess student learning across the range of their experiences. Our review processes of academic departments and programs remain comprehensive and strong.

¹ *Strategic Directions for Swarthmore College*, December 2011.

² The College recently received a generous gift to endow the Institute, and at that time it was renamed the Frank Aydelotte Foundation for the Advancement of the Liberal Arts, in honor of the College's seventh president, founder of the Honors Program, and advocate for the centrality of the liberal arts in education.

The College is facing and addressing a number of challenges at this time. A range of student concerns became heated in the spring of 2013. Most seriously two students, both involved in the national “Know Your IX” organization, filed a complaint with the Department of Education, Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) for violations of the Clery Act and with the Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) for violations of Title IX, around the College’s handling of sexual assault cases. A thorough review of sexual misconduct prevention and Title IX policies and processes was commissioned in spring 2013 and was conducted in 2013-2014, including a review by an independent firm, as well as an internal task force including students, faculty, staff, and members of the Board of Managers. The recommendations from these reviews, many of which the College has already taken steps to address, are described in detail in Section 3 of this report.

The College remains strong financially. The Strategic Planning Steering Committee, working with president’s staff, reviewed the compilation of the costs of the recommended strategic initiatives relative to what the College could reasonably expect to raise in a comprehensive fund drive. Elimination of some recommendations and modification of others were made to keep estimated costs in balance with anticipated new resources. Our implementation is planned in phases, with “pauses” after each phase to allow for adjustments in the event of unfavorable financial circumstances, as well as assessment of progress and re-examination of alignment with our mission and goals.

The College has had a very busy five years since its last self-study. Having completed a strategic planning process that allowed us to reconsider, extend, and prioritize the recommendations we considered during the last self-study, many new initiatives are now underway. We are committed to addressing the recommendation of our evaluation team about assessment of student learning, and through methodical steps that respect our culture and needs, have made real progress. We will continue this work and expect to report on our successes in our 2019 self-study.

Section 2: Institution's Responses to the Previous Evaluation

A. Introduction

Swarthmore College, founded in 1864 by members of the Religious Society of Friends as a co-educational institution, occupies a campus of 426 acres of wooded land in and adjacent to the Borough of Swarthmore in Delaware County, Pennsylvania.

Our core mission is described in the "Objectives and Purposes" section of our College Catalog:

Swarthmore students are expected to prepare themselves for full, balanced lives as individuals and as responsible citizens through exacting intellectual study supplemented by a varied program of sports and other extracurricular activities. The purpose of Swarthmore College is to make its students more valuable human beings and more useful members of society. Although it shares this purpose with other educational institutions, each school, college, and university seeks to realize that purpose in its own way. Swarthmore seeks to help its students realize their full intellectual and personal potential combined with a deep sense of ethical and social concern.³

Our recent 2010-2011 strategic planning effort began with an exercise within our community to articulate our values. We were gratified by the consistency in naming these values that emerged across many groups, including faculty, students, staff, and alumni: respect for the individual, consensus decision-making, simple living, social responsibility and justice, generous giving, and the conducting disputes peacefully. These values provide the foundation for our key principles as an institution:

Our singular commitment to academic rigor and creativity
Our desire to provide access and opportunity for all students, regardless of their financial circumstances
Our diverse and vibrant community of students, faculty, staff, and alumni
Our conviction that applied knowledge should be used to improve the world⁴

They reflect our history and traditions, but also guide our path going forward.

Swarthmore is a private, non-sectarian, selective College, offering a liberal arts and engineering curriculum, and open to all regardless of financial need. The College is small by deliberate policy, with an enrollment of approximately 1,550 students. We are currently planning for modest growth, though we will remain among the smaller liberal arts colleges. A student/faculty ratio of 8:1 ensures that students have close, meaningful engagement with their professors. We feel that this close relationship is important in preparing students to translate the skills and understanding gained at Swarthmore into the mark they want to make on the world.

The College's unusual Honors program uniquely expresses our mission. It features small groups of dedicated and accomplished students working closely with faculty; an emphasis on independent learning; ongoing dialogue between students and their peers, teachers and examiners; and an examination at the end of two years' study by outside scholars. Though about 25%-35% of

³ *Swarthmore College Bulletin 2013-14*, Volume CXI, Number 1. Catalog Issue August 2013.

⁴ *Strategic Directions for Swarthmore College*, December 2011, p. 8.

students participate in the Honors program, the scholarship and preparation required by faculty to work with these students benefits all members of the community.

The Lang Center for Civic and Social Responsibility has a special charge to “prepare and motivate students to understand and engage issues of civic and social concern and...to set their own paths towards shaping a more just and compassionate world.” Through its work, the Center concentrates our attention to experiential learning, community outreach, and civic engagement, qualities supported throughout the College.

Swarthmore’s accreditation was reaffirmed following our 2009 self-study evaluation and accreditation visit. That visit culminated a two-year planning process (reported in our self-study) that was suspended during a presidential transition and the economic downturn. Rebecca Chopp joined the College in 2009 as its 14th president, following the departure of Alfred H. Bloom who had served as President since 1991. In 2010, President Chopp initiated a new comprehensive planning process, which will be described in the next sections.

This Periodic Review has provided an opportunity to reflect on these active years, consider our progress in responding to the suggestions and recommendations from our self-study, ensure that, consistent with the Middle States Standards of Excellence, we are on the right path to accomplish the goals we set for ourselves, and identify new areas of strengths or challenges that will require our attention. A steering committee was appointed in fall 2012 to direct this work. The committee, comprised of faculty, staff, and students, and co-chaired by the associate provost⁵ and the director of institutional research (Appendix A) met through 2012-2013 to review our activities, challenges, and opportunities, and identify the content of this report. The associate provost and IR director worked through the summer and fall of 2013 to articulate the committee’s conclusions in a draft report. In fall 2013, the report was shared and discussed with president’s staff, and in spring 2014 it was shared with the Board of Managers, the Academic Assessment Committee (faculty and students), members of the PRR Steering Committee and the wider community for their comments and input. Based on community input, the PRR was finalized in late spring 2014 and shared again with the community prior to submission to the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Two Planning Efforts

Swarthmore's 2007-2009 planning and self-study was organized around eight themes, each addressed by a working group of faculty, staff, students, and board members. In addition, a Planning Steering Committee and a Middle States Steering Committee oversaw the process to ensure communication across working groups and to focus our attention on both self-study and planning. Part of the work of each of these groups (including the steering committees) was to address the College’s effectiveness in meeting the Middle States Standards of Excellence. Because of the economic downturn and the presidential transition, the planning component of our work was suspended. And so, as noted in the self-study report, the recommendations that were being developed by the working groups at that time were not finalized or prioritized.

⁵ In fall 2013 the College established a second associate provost position. Prior to that time Associate Provost Patricia Reilly worked with the IR Director on assessment activities and on the Periodic Review Report process (as well as other responsibilities). In summer 2013, her title was changed to Associate Provost for Faculty Development, and Richard Wicentowski joined the office as Associate Provost for Educational Programs. Assessment and PRR work is part of the role of the Associate Provost for Educational Programs.

As we completed our self-study in 2009, an Ad Hoc Financial Planning Group of faculty, staff, and Board members, with help from a student advisory panel, was planning for the possibility of a projected \$15 million budget gap. During that summer, this group focused on planning for both cost reductions and revenue generation, setting specific targets.⁶ In July, Rebecca Chopp joined the College as its 14th president, and in 2010 she initiated a comprehensive and inclusive planning process. Though this effort was informed by our previous work, it began anew with a focus on imagining the future of higher education and liberal arts colleges, and Swarthmore's role in addressing the challenges and opportunities that lay ahead. This planning was organized around four working groups, several with subgroups. Like the previous effort, each group included faculty, staff, students, and board members, and many conversations were held with the wider community.

The following chart (next page) shows the relationship between the two planning efforts. The Middle States Standards of Excellence addressed by each of the 2009 working groups are indicated, and the table shows the working groups from the newer planning process that took up topics and concerns from the self-study working groups. In presenting an update of our work in this Periodic Review Report, we will describe how the newer planning process has extended our previous work, and how the issues and ideas raised during the self-study are being addressed by our current strategic initiatives. The work of the ad hoc financial Planning Group also set an important foundation, which affects the implementation of our strategic initiatives, as well as our general approach to planning and resource allocation. The latter will be described more fully in Section 6.

Our evaluation team provided many helpful suggestions in their report, but only one "recommendation." In this section we will also touch on a number of their suggestions. We will note our response to their recommendation in this section, but will report on our progress more fully in Section 5, as it concerns our efforts to assess student learning.

One outcome of our 2010-2011 strategic planning that occurred subsequent to our self-study should be noted here to provide context for some of the institutional responses described below: our decision to continue a slow deliberate growth in the size of the student body. This is affected by a number of issues that arose both in our self-study and subsequent planning, and will in turn affect all aspects of the College, including student experience, faculty workload, staffing, curriculum, services, facilities, development, and resources. Our small size is important to us, and we approach even this modest growth after much discussion and planning. We will still remain among the smallest of the liberal arts colleges. Our size facilitates building strong student-faculty relationships, and fostering community and social responsibility. It can sometimes be a challenge as well. For example, we must be creative in offering the breadth of curriculum that we desire for our students. Creating a diverse student body can require delicate balancing that is difficult to achieve. Our plan is to approach this growth very methodically, with periodic pauses for evaluation and reflection before deciding whether to continue. The increase started with the addition of ten

⁶ "Ad Hoc Financial Planning Group Recommendation to the Swarthmore College Board of Managers," approved by the Swarthmore College Board of Managers, December 5, 2009.

A comparison of 2007-2009 Planning and Self-Study with our 2010-2011 Strategic Planning Effort

2007-2009 Planning "2020" and Middle States Self-Study --- Working Groups	2010-2011 Strategic Planning: <i>Strategic Directions</i>				
	Working Groups				Resource Allocation Planning
	Knowledge	Mission, Values, and Goals	Admissions, Access and Affordability	Alumni Engagement and Development	
Academic Program	Standards 11, 12, 13, 14 <i>(6, 8)</i>				
Faculty and Instructional Staff	Standard 10 <i>(4, 6)</i>				
Leadership in Scholarship, Higher Education, and Society	Standards 1, 11, 13			Standard 1, 13	
Broader Educational Experience		Standard 9 <i>(13)</i>			
Recruitment, Composition of Class, and Financial Aid			Standard 8		
The Broader Swarthmore Community and Philanthropy				Standard 3	Standard 3
Staff					Standard 5 <i>(4, 6)</i>
Resources					Standards 2, 3, 7
<p>The 2007-2009 effort was overseen by two steering committees working together, a Planning Steering Committee and a Middle States Steering Committee. Each working group had responsibility for addressing Middle States Standards of Excellence. (Secondary responsibility is show in italics.) The two steering committees were responsible for addressing Standards 1 (Planning Steering Committee), 4, and 6 (Middle States Steering Committee). The 2012-11 Strategic Planning was overseen by a Planning Council and Planning Steering Committee.</p>					

students in fall 2013's first-year class. We anticipate a total enrollment increase of 200 by 2020-2021.

The result of the 2010-2011 planning was *Strategic Directions*⁷, a blueprint that articulates our values, considers our current environment, sets a series of specific recommendations for the future, and identifies the commitments to institutional infrastructure that will guide our ongoing work to realize our goals. Each of these recommendations is now being taken up by the College through a phase of additional planning or implementation, and several key initiatives are already underway. These will be described at the appropriate points in this section, and a brief overview of each will be provided in Section 3.

The remainder of this section is organized by the Strategic Planning Working Groups that took up the issues related to evaluation team suggestions and self-study tentative recommendations.

B. Knowledge

In the 2010-2011 strategic planning process, a working group designated “the future of Knowledge and the ways in which knowledge is taught and learned” was asked to investigate questions such as:

How should our academic program be designed to address knowledge in the 21st century?
What knowledge and skills do we need to provide our students to enable them to contribute meaningfully to an increasingly global society? How do we best teach the extraordinary students who will come to Swarthmore, richly diverse in their cultural perspectives, learning styles and academic experiences?

The work of this group addressed and extended issues raised by three of the working groups from the 2007-2009 planning and self-study process (“Academic Program,” which addressed Middle States Standards 11, 12, 13, and 14; “Faculty and Instructional Staff,” Standard 10; and “Leadership in Scholarship, Higher Education, and Society,” Standards 1, 11, and 13). It divided its considerable work into four areas: Curriculum of the Future, Competencies, Pedagogy, and Recruitment and Support of a Diverse Faculty, analyzing information from peer institutions, summaries of internal and external data and practice, and many conversations with faculty groups and others, to plan how to maintain our values and strengths as we face future challenges.

Curriculum

In spite of our small size, the College supports a broad curriculum of humanities, social sciences, sciences and engineering, offering about 700 course sections each year. In the spring of their sophomore year, students apply for a major, choosing among 34 departmental and interdisciplinary majors as well as 16 pre-designed “special majors”. (Students may design their own special majors in addition to these, with the support of faculty members.) Most of our departments also offer both Honors and “Course” (non-Honors) minors. In addition there are 14 interdisciplinary minors. A capstone or culminating experience is required in each major, and may take the form of a seminar, thesis, exam, or some combination of these. The experience we desire for our students requires a

⁷ *Strategic Directions for Swarthmore College* December 2011.

great deal of individual student-faculty and student-staff contact, which we accomplish through a low student-faculty ratio, curricular structures that ensure close interactions, strong support services, and many co-curricular and extra-curricular opportunities for students in both leadership and participant roles.

An integral part of our academic program is the Swarthmore Honors Program, which is modeled on the tutorial system at Oxford, and is the only undergraduate program of its kind in the United States. Students who elect to participate work closely with faculty and engage in a demanding program in preparation for examination by outside scholars at the end of two years' study. Between a quarter and a third of students participate in the Honors Program each year. Non-Honors ("Course") majors benefit from the program as well, not only because many Honors seminars are open to Course students, but also because of the level of scholarship required of faculty to prepare students who will be evaluated by respected colleagues from across the nation. The College conducted a decennial review of the Honors program in 2012, which will be described in Section 5.

Many other structures provide opportunities for student learning. About 40% of our students elect to study abroad for a semester or a year, and are supported in that endeavor by our Off-Campus Study office. Assisted and guided by our Career Services office, students explore career directions, which may include participating in internship or externship programs. Our Physical Education and Athletics Department works with students participating in 22 intercollegiate teams, executes our physical education requirement, provides intramural programming, and assists with club sport opportunities (the latter are student run). Students may seek support from our Writing Center for both writing and oral presentations. Our system of libraries provides not only information resources, but programs and outreach to support development of research skills and information literacy.

This range of opportunities has the potential to reinforce, extend, and tie together learning across many settings, but it also can be overwhelming. The 2009 evaluation team made a suggestion concerning the integration of student learning between academic and other opportunities:

The CEP and faculty departments may want to continue to explore the degree to which faculty and academic departments explicitly lead students through the curriculum to the opportunities provided by the Lang Center and parallel leadership initiatives, and to explore barriers to this kind of integration of student learning" (Evaluation team Report, 23).

We feel that "integration of student learning" is a key phrase in this insightful suggestion, and something we value and strive for. The College provides encouragement and opportunities for students to develop and apply what they learn across situations, and our commitment to high impact learning experiences such as research, leadership and mentoring opportunities, and service learning, reflects this value. Though we provide a number of these opportunities across the College, we are only beginning to approach them more systematically.

One of the ways the College committed to this conceptual understanding of a liberal arts educational experience was the creation of the Lang Center for Civic and Social Responsibility in

2001, with a mission “to create, organize, administer and evaluate activities that link rigorous intellectual training to the motivation and preparation of students to take leadership in shaping a more just and humane world.” The Lang Center accomplishes its mission through a range of programming and activities.

The College’s continuing commitment to the integration of academic and other learning opportunities was reaffirmed in its recent *Strategic Directions*, with its first recommendation: to foster a curriculum of intellectual rigor and creativity. This recommendation had five parts, one of which was to pursue high-impact learning and problem-solving pedagogical practices (*Recommendation 1, Strategic Directions*). Other kinds of high impact and integrative learning experiences include our promotion of interdisciplinary work, the global dimensions apparent in many areas of the curriculum, research and other advanced independent work, the College’s First-Year Seminars, common intellectual experiences (i.e. core requirements), writing-intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects (such as study groups within a course, team assignments and writing, cooperative projects and research), Community-Based Learning (CBL), internships, and capstone courses and projects.

Another part of Recommendation 1 that reflects our concern for integrated learning is to “[s]trengthen the infrastructure and mechanisms for helping students navigate the curriculum, discover opportunities, and manage their choices.” We need to provide better mapping of our curriculum to help identify the courses that offer particular experiences (e.g. writing intensive, CBL), and the many resources that provide scaffolding for them. A working group of faculty members, librarians, and academic technologists have been working on a database this academic year, beginning with gathering input from various stakeholders, and developing tools and workflows to create a prototype. They will begin entering syllabus data over the summer to test it.

One of the recommendations that came from the work of the 2010-2011 strategic planning’s “Alumni Engagement and Development” working group was the development of a Center for Innovation and Leadership for students. The goal of this center is to “provide opportunities for Swarthmore students to develop the abilities to lead and inspire, to listen and learn in ways that meet the challenges of our time, and to reflect the values of our community.” It will accomplish this through programming that links students with alumni across all fields, partnering with our Career Services Office, and coordinating with academic departments and the dean’s office in these efforts. For example, the Center co-sponsored the first annual “Swat-Tank” in 2013, a yearlong innovation competition for students, designed to be a learning experience, and bringing students and alumni together.

Faculty

Our students’ curricular experiences are directly supported by 173 tenured and tenure-track faculty positions, as well as about 70 full- and part-time leave replacements and temporary faculty each year. In addition to their focus on instruction, faculty members are expected to engage in an active program of research and scholarship. The academic program is also supported by 70 academic staff members, such as drill instructors, lab instructors, and coaches.

Our evaluation team had several additional suggestions for us to consider with regard to faculty, including reducing their service burden, increasing transparency in the tenure and promotion processes, and continuing our efforts to recruit and hire underrepresented faculty and instructional staff.

Because of the strong role of our faculty in our governance structure and our small size, it is a challenge for the College to reduce their high degree of service. We have made a few changes in the past two years to try to address this problem. We have merged the faculty representatives serving on the Advisory Councils to the Deans of Admissions and Students and have decreased the number of faculty representatives on some selected committees. In addition to representing their divisions in meetings with provost, division chairs now also serve as the faculty members of the Academic Assessment Committee. They also have traditionally comprised the faculty component of the Curriculum Committee. However, we currently have a number of new ad hoc committees that are key in implementing our strategic initiatives, and it is essential that faculty have a strong voice in this work. During this time we are also asking all faculty members to increase their engagement with assessment. Especially at this early stage for some departments, this is an added pressure on their time. The provost is trying to avoid appointing associate professors as department chairs, but because of our small size, this is sometimes unavoidable. We see our faculty members' service as leadership that is essential to the success of the College, and continue to struggle to establish balance. Our Committee on Faculty Procedures (COFP) is mindful of this concern as committee assignments are made, though it will remain a problem for the foreseeable future. It is possible that our planned growth, which will result in some additional faculty lines, may help with this problem as the burden for service is spread among more people, but this will take time.

The Committee on Promotion and Tenure (CPT) began addressing the consistency of our procedures in spring 2013. At the same time, the associate provost began a review of the consistency and explicitness of statements about promotion to full professor. She and the provost met with the associate professor cohort to discuss their observations and ask for recommendations. One of the changes to come from this work is that department chairs must meet with associate professors at the beginning of the fourth year after tenure to create a four-year plan of preparation for promotion review. A meeting with the department and the associate professor is held so that all are aware of the plan. This report is then shared with the provost, and annual updates on progress are prepared after that. In addition to these more formal changes, faculty working groups are now held for associate professors, as we have for junior faculty, providing an opportunity to present papers and other work for feedback, and share progress. We are just now implementing these changes.

Improving diversity across all of our populations remains a high priority, and is one of the key initiatives that emerged in our strategic planning subsequent to our self-study. This initiative will be discussed more fully in the next section. We very actively participate in a number of collaborative initiatives with other institutions, such as the Consortium for Faculty Diversity (CFD) and the Consortium for High Achievement and Success (CHAS) in order to learn more about best practices and what others have done to support faculty and student diversity. Internally, we have planned and held a number of workshops and talks directed at faculty on topics such as improving

faculty diversity (fall 2011), communication (spring 2012), mentoring (spring 2013), and others. These are presented by invited experts and often include multiple activities and opportunities throughout the day. Beginning in 2011, the associate provost for faculty development in partnership with the equal opportunity office meets with departments conducting searches to explain the latest opportunities for recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty. (This information is available year-round to the College community on the Equal Opportunity website.) Our new associate dean of diversity, inclusion, and community development, now participates in these meetings as well. Currently the associate provost for faculty development works as a member of the Diversity and Inclusion implementation committee.

One of the themes that emerged in our own recommendations from our self-study was improving our support of faculty in general. These themes were echoed and established as priorities in our 2010-2011 strategic planning effort, and we are making some progress:

- We have increased our support for senior faculty approaching retirement through increased and targeted advertising of the financial counseling that is available to them. We have recently developed guidelines for three years of part-time teaching as a bridge to retirement; there is an early retirement plan in the Faculty Handbook.
- An unresolved question is whether and (if so) in what form the College should support child care. This is a perennial question, brought to the fore again recently as a locally available facility stopped providing infant care. With the potential for hiring new faculty, who may have young families, this will require further discussion.
- Travel support (maximum annual travel reimbursement to attend meetings has increased to \$1,750, and is expected to reach \$2,000 in 2014-15, with inflationary increases thereafter.
- Research support (maximum per approved request) has increased to \$1,400, and is expected to reach \$1,650 in 2014-15, with inflationary increases thereafter.

The Lang Center continues to support the faculty and curriculum through a variety of means, including professorships and curriculum grants for community-oriented learning courses, and encourages widespread discussion of ways this integration can be more fully realized. For instance, on April 7, 2014, approximately a dozen faculty convened to discuss community-based learning, with a focus on working with community partners, following a panel with faculty members who have used CBL pedagogy in their classes

Another initiative that is an outcome of *Strategic Directions*, the Institute for the Liberal Arts, has multiple objectives, both internally and externally focused. One of its objectives is designed to promote and support faculty development: "To foster curricular, pedagogical, and scholarly innovation and to disseminate the results of this activity." The Institute is partnering with the provost's office in this shared enterprise. It aims to support scholarly experimentation on the part of faculty by providing them the support they need to engage with topics of interest as they emerge.

Some of its pilot programming has already revealed great interest and potential for this work. For example, in 2012-2013, the College held a "Visualizing Media Futures" symposium that brought faculty, students, and alumni together with innovators, educators, artists, and media professionals to explore digital media at the intersection of science and technology, art and design, humanities and the public sphere. An interdisciplinary team of faculty from three departments conducted research on the Federal Reserve's anticipation of the 2008 financial crisis and, from each perspective, presented their findings to the faculty. In fall 2013, the Institute for the Liberal Arts hosted the College's first-ever full faculty retreat, attended by 70 faculty members even though it was held on a Saturday. Participants reflected upon how we have handled change at the College over the years, what resources we have as a community to deal with change, and what academic disciplines tell us about making change. Also in fall 2013, a Faculty Seminar – intended to provide a space where ideas, questions, and analysis about a topic can be explored, tested, challenged, and refined by a small interdisciplinary group of faculty – focused on the topics of poverty and inequality. See Appendix B for a summary of Institute activities in 2012-13 and 2013-14.

Our 2009 self-study identified the need to think more broadly about the range of work that faculty do in mentoring students in support of our curriculum. Faculty members spend an increasingly large portion of their time in one-on-one work with students. The College highly values these close relationships and the learning that results from them, but our structures need to better support this value. This continues to be a focus, and our thinking was developed further in our 2010-2011 strategic planning effort.

Since 1986, our teaching workload for faculty members has been five courses per year. Faculty members must also meet high expectations for research and scholarship. This work directly benefits students, as faculty members remain highly engaged and current in their disciplines. This knowledge and passion is shared with students in the classroom and out. Furthermore, faculty members often include students in their research and scholarship, giving them highly responsible first-hand experiences that might be reserved for graduate students at other institutions. As noted earlier, we also value and want to promote the inclusion of Community Based Learning opportunities and other kinds of high impact learning experiences in our courses, which requires a much greater time commitment from faculty than the traditional course offering.

In order to accomplish all this, we have been exploring a re-envisioning of the course load, moving gradually from our current five courses each year to a four-course load. This plan is intended to recognize the ways in which faculty members are already significantly teaching and researching actively with students outside regular classroom settings and to further more interactions of this kind. We are targeting the 2020-2021 academic year to complete the transition, if our planned intermediate reviews of our progress convince us that it remains a wise path. We are currently engaged in the phased implementation of the four-course load, with approximately 25% of the faculty teaching four courses in 2013-2014. That percentage will step up in future years.

The phased implementation of the four course teaching load affects everything we do, and we are considering carefully how best to bring about this shift while largely maintaining the current curriculum and class sizes. Among the curriculum-related proposals that are under discussion are:

decreasing the number of first year seminar (FYS) offerings by prohibiting students from taking more than one (while ensuring that enough FYS are available to enable every student to take one without undue restrictions on choice); reducing course releases for administrative service, such as serving as division chair or the coordinator of an interdisciplinary program (in order to 'recover' more courses), and changing the accounting for 'under-enrolled' classes (fewer than three in a seminar, fewer than five in a course) to count them as .5 teaching credit. We expect that the gradual implementation of a reduced teaching load plus the 'course recovery' accounting strategies will allow us to maintain our commitment to interdisciplinary teaching.

A further concern in this change is how to maintain the availability of faculty members to teach in interdisciplinary programs when the faculty are housed in departments and have departmental teaching obligations. One of our recommendations from our self-study was to consider allocating tenure lines to interdisciplinary programs (such lines have traditionally only been allocated to departments), with appropriate ways of considering contributions to programs as well as departments during reviews for tenure and promotion. This recommendation is now being implemented. The Council on Educational Policy (CEP) now welcomes proposals for tenure lines from interdisciplinary programs, and extensively discusses expectations about interdisciplinary program teaching when considering and approving lines in departments. In other cases, CEP works with departments, sometimes formally, to allocate a new faculty member's time between a department and an interdisciplinary program (e.g. 60% in a department; 40% in a program) and to make sure that informal negotiations take place so that expectations among a departmental home, a program, and a faculty member are clear.

A related suggestion from our evaluation team was to find ways to better integrate the curriculum across departments. We have discussed ways of approaching this, ranging from hiring new faculty with interdisciplinary training, formalized team-teaching of certain courses, and promoting more awareness of course offerings outside the department. One possibility is for the Division chairs to take the lead in organizing Division-level conversations about the curriculum.

The integration of the curriculum is being addressed in part in the hiring process, and the CEP is working to ensure that faculty members remain available to interdisciplinary programs (as discussed above). Division-level conversations about the curriculum are not yet taking place. For now, the focus is on position allocation and the efforts of the provost and the CEP to solve accounting problems and to remind departments of the importance of contributing to programs.

A second related, but also distinct, issue concerns the supervision of student research by faculty members during the summer. This has become a normal expectation for students in the natural sciences who are interested in graduate school, and summer research opportunities are sought by larger numbers of students each year, both in the natural sciences and now in the social sciences and humanities as well. Faculty summer research supervision is currently uncompensated, yet it has become a considerable commitment that fundamentally shapes the way many faculty members (and students) do their work. We need to address the issues about faculty compensation for summer research with students and how to account for this teaching, and we need to consider how

best to make more research opportunities available to more students across the curriculum as a whole.

Library

An area of focus by our evaluation team was our library, and they provided a number of suggestions in their team report. The College's libraries encompasses McCabe, which is the central library; Underhill Music and Dance Library; Cornell Science Library; and two major research collections and several smaller collections. Our evaluation team report included many helpful suggestions with regard to our libraries. The library conducts its own periodic self-studies, most recently in 2007. It engages in an active schedule of assessment and evaluation activities, including the annual collection and analysis of many internal metrics reflecting service, equipment, and facility usage, peer comparisons of key library indicators, staffing studies, and feedback collected through focus groups and surveys to reflect user needs and satisfaction. It also assesses student learning through tools such as the Research Practices Survey.

The College Librarian prepared a 5-year staff plan in 2010 looking at emerging staff needs, particularly the need for a range of professionals. The plan was updated in 2012, informed by the goals of the library, the student learning outcomes that it has articulated, and numerous evaluations that it has conducted on the needs and satisfaction of faculty, staff, and students.

Based upon extensive discussions with most academic departments, and informed by the Association of College and Research Library's standards, the library has developed a single set of student learning outcomes for research skills or "information literacy." Library staff anticipates continuing to work with the faculty and the Academic Assessment Committee on refining those outcome statements and determining the ways in which they can be integrated into the curriculum. Much groundwork has already been undertaken for this integration. For example, the library has studied the challenges faced by students writing theses and capstone essays for History and Sociology/Anthropology in the hope of improving the College's information literacy programs. The Humanities Librarian has worked with several courses in an "embedded model" in which students gain experiences working with primary sources.

The Library has been very proactive in this work, both on-campus and off. It hosted a workshop in spring 2013 with several other peer institutions to explore how faculty and librarians might work together to assess students' research skills and knowledge. A good example of this type of strong collaboration between the teaching faculty and librarians is "The Poetry Project: Research and Development," taught during the fall 2013 semester. In this case, the humanities librarian worked with the faculty member to develop the course. She developed a guide to resources with which students would engage throughout the course that introduces students to research in different genres, such as historical newspapers, correspondence or genealogical sources. Awareness and appreciation for these sorts of possibilities is not uniform across departments.

The College's largest library, McCabe, as a physical space is at a challenging crossroads. Technological developments mean that more resources are available online. In the past, accessing these would have required a visit to the library. This evolution affects some disciplines more than

others, resulting in uneven usage by different areas, which can be an impediment to community. The current space is of poor quality and inadequate. There are space needs for the general and special collections. More space is needed for staff to provide services and programming for the community. There are needs for storage, and for additional and better study spaces, particularly for group and collaborative work. The outer appearance of McCabe Library is fortress-like and uninviting. At the same time, without a student center at the College, the library is often a center of student activity, and has the potential to serve as a nexus of social and intellectual life. Thus, its space is an important part of our evolving Campus Master Plan. (The Campus Master Plan is discussed in Section 3.)

Some of the changes imagined in the Campus Master Plan are an expansion of and reconfiguration of space in McCabe. A reading room could be built on the south side of the library, and some open group space could be housed on the north side. In addition, high-density storage may be added. The needs of the Peace Collection and Friends Historical Library will be taken into account. There is on-going discussion on what other kinds of spaces should be housed in the library, such as the Institute for the Liberal Arts or the Media Center.

While the College works to more fully develop its vision of the future of libraries at Swarthmore, and explore creative configurations of the libraries to meet new and changing demands, work to address immediate needs is ongoing. McCabe Library's current classroom space was renovated in summer 2013. Cornell Science Library's main floor is scheduled to be renovated in 2015-16, though plans are not yet complete for how it will provide group study spaces, seminar rooms, and technology spaces. There is funding during the same fiscal year that will allow for relocating the bound journal collection in McCabe and repurposing the vacated stack space for other programming.

The libraries have embraced technology as a part of the future. We have invested in purchasing digitized primary sources and the library is providing leadership to digitize parts of the College's archives. Swarthmore participates in a three-year grant-funded digital humanities initiative with Bryn Mawr and Haverford. The libraries and IT organizations on all three campuses have convened a task force (now a formal committee) of those who are in positions that support digital humanities/scholarship projects. That group met twice over the spring and summer and is developing a database of expertise in digital scholarship technologies.

One of the libraries' important resources is the relationship with the Tri-College (Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore Colleges) consortium, in which the colleges share an expansive list of both physical and electronic resources. Such a relationship can present challenges, and our 2009 self-study noted challenges inherent in the Tri-College collaboration. While those challenges continue to exist, there has been a commitment on the part of the library directors to acknowledge thorny issues and work to resolve them. Changes in personnel on all three campuses as well as changes in how we support library IT have allowed us to move forward productively and with a renewed cooperative spirit.

The libraries and ITS jointly sponsor the Swarthmore Projects for Educational Exploration and

Development (SPEED) program, designed to enhance student learning and produce educational products that can be used in Swarthmore classrooms and beyond. This successful program, now completing its second year, allows students to develop faculty projects with assistance and coordination from ITS specialists over the summer.

Information Technology Services

Since our self-study, Information Technology Services has undertaken a number of initiatives in addition to the SPEED program to enhance the academic program and support faculty research, including:

- Completed a project to add built-in computers in all centrally managed classrooms on campus
- Converted from Blackboard to Moodle (retaining all necessary functions, but eliminating a costly software contract by implementing an open source alternative)
- Joined XSEDE, a cloud-based supercomputing resource for higher education, allowing faculty and students to use more than 300,000 CPU hours annually for scientific research
- Redesigned and remodeled the Language Resource Center
- Redesigned one of the College's two main computer classrooms, and relocated it in the McCabe Library.
- Purchased and rolled out a Lynda.com subscription for all faculty, staff, and students to greatly expand professional development and technology skill development training options

To improve efficiency of campus administration, ITS has:

- Implemented an identity and access management system
- Implemented document imaging to facilitate a fully digital admissions process, and began implementing document imaging of donor records and correspondence with Development
- Implemented e-billing
- Redeveloped the entire College website and replaced an out-of-date content management system

Last, to enhance the capabilities for access to networked resources, ITS has:

- Updated all core routers and wireless network
- Added cellular signal boosting in campus buildings
- More than tripled Internet bandwidth (up to 500 mb/sec.)
- Revamped guest wireless access
- Implemented a new storage core
- Implemented desktop virtualization to run virtual lab computers in any of our classrooms.
- Joined and implemented "Eduroam", a networking technology that allows scholars from institutions worldwide to log onto the campus networks of hundreds of other institutions of higher education using their home institution's login credentials.

Assessment of the Academic Program and Student Learning

In response to recommendations from our last Middle States Periodic Review Report in 2004, Swarthmore's faculty developed an Assessment Plan for student learning and implemented it beginning in 2006. The key components of the plan were reinstating regular external reviews of departments, introducing a more systematic approach to conducting course evaluations, and instituting requirements for assessment of student learning within departments, including annual reporting.

The 2009 evaluation team made a recommendation about assessment:

Despite the considerable gains made since the last self-study and periodic five-year review, the team recommends that Swarthmore institutionalize a comprehensive assessment plan of student learning outcomes in a manner that is consistent with its values and pedagogic goals. We further recommend that such assessment plans be coordinated and integrated with assessment processes to be developed by the dean of students and the Lang Center.

In working to address their concern and in striving to meet Middle States Standards 7 and 14, we recognized shortcomings in our processes that would make it difficult to effect the changes the team identified. Therefore, with a new leadership team in the provost's office in 2011, and supported by Institutional Research (IR), we redoubled our efforts to improve our assessment work.

As will be described fully in Section 5, we have been very actively working to improve our processes and activities directed at assessment of student learning. This work includes a review and revision of our Academic Assessment Plan; clarifying and strengthening our requirements for departmental assessment of student learning; increasing support for faculty members to better understand how to conduct meaningful, effective, and efficient assessment; providing routine feedback to departments about their assessment activities; articulating institutional level goals for student learning; and using these institutional level goals to integrate assessment outside of academic departments, such as student support services, the Lang Center, Athletics, Library, Writing Center, Off Campus Studies, and other areas.

We have also been working to improve our assessment work in administrative areas – “institutional effectiveness.” Each member of President's Staff has articulated goals for his or her division, and is promoting more systematic and appropriate approaches to assessment in the offices and departments reporting to them. This will also be discussed in Section 5.

A commitment to Assessment was affirmed by the Strategic Planning effort. Each of our strategic initiatives will require ongoing assessment.

C. Mission

The charge to the 2010-2011 strategic planning working group considering “the evolving mission, values, and goals of a Swarthmore College education” asked that they identify the academic, extracurricular, and communal experiences and opportunities needed to meet our goal of educating

students with intellectual rigor, in a diverse and inclusive learning environment, that prepares them for fulfilling roles in the world. This group extended the analyses begun by the self-study working group that looked at “The Broader Educational Experience,” which focused on Middle States Standard 9.

Supporting Students

Student support services are provided primarily through the Dean of Students division, which includes academic advising and support, career services, counseling and psychological services, international student advising, multicultural affairs, religious and spiritual life, residential life, and student activities. Since the 2009 self-study was completed we have a new leader for the division, Elizabeth Braun, Dean of Students. Based on the work and planning for the self-study and beyond, there have been a number of changes to the area since 2009 to enable it to better achieve its mission of providing the services to enable students to achieve the College’s goals for them.

A Class Dean model was developed and fully staffed in 2012-2013. This model is designed both to reduce the numbers of students experiencing academic and other difficulties, and to help students navigate the support systems available to them. We have recently developed an electronic “Send Concerns” system that allows faculty and other staff to notify deans about academic and other concerns for students, allowing for quick and appropriate responses to student problems and needs. In fall 2013, 106 faculty members took advantage of this system to alert Dean’s staff of issues such as missed assignments, class attendance, and low grades. First-year students were overrepresented in these concerns, allowing Dean’s staff to reach out to these students early and help resolve problems.

Students at Swarthmore do not select majors or minors until the end of their sophomore year, a process that can be both exciting and stressful. We’ve implemented a number of changes to the “Sophomore Plan Process” to provide better support during this time, such as improved advising, and adding opportunities to come together with questions and for help (e.g. “Chocolates and Choosing”). We have also made changes to enable students to make better use of the process as a moment of both reflection and planning. We have added the “Sophomore Plan II”, which encompasses students’ non-academic goals and requires them to identify the resources and steps needed to attain those goals. The data that are collected as a part of this process will help us to understand what types of skills students are interested in obtaining and this in turn will inform the development of new programs and expansions of existing programs.

A Health and Wellness Coordinator was hired in fall 2011, and newly renovated and expanded space for Worth Health Center and Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) became available in fall 2012. In addition to these changes we have also revised the CAPS staffing model to increase the number of full time professional staff and decrease a growing reliance on interns or contract counselors. This has improved the opportunity for continuity of care for students and helped address the continued increase in students seeking CAPS services. We have also done some reorganizing within the Health Center staff to better meet student needs and are continuing to move towards a prevention-based model. Along with our focus on Health and Wellness, a “Smoke free Campus Plan” is under discussion. Beginning in the fall of 2010, all campus residence halls

prohibit smoking inside the building and inside individual student rooms. No one may smoke within 25 feet of any residence hall door. This was approved by both the Dean's Advisory Council and the Housing Committee.

Within the academic advising and support section of the Dean's division, the Office of Learning Resources has collaborated with faculty and staff to offer a range of academic workshops for students. These workshops cover topics such as reading strategically across different academic disciplines, participating effectively in class, combating procrastination, and managing perfectionism.

Since our last self-study we have been reviewing a number of policies, as well as our communication of policies to students, faculty, and staff. In the fall of 2013 we launched a new student handbook website to help make all college policies and services more easily accessible and searchable. Revised policies, resources, and procedures with regard to sexual misconduct were implemented in fall 2011, partly in response to the Department of Education Office of Civil Rights' "Dear Colleague" letter, including designating a Title IX coordinator, conducting training for staff and students, and assigning a staff member to serve as a primary investigator for complaints. A more thorough review of sexual misconduct prevention and Title IX policies and processes was commissioned in spring 2013 and is being conducted in 2013-2014. (These activities will be described more fully in Section 3, as the College is facing particular challenges with regard to this topic.) The Dean's Advisory Council (DAC) is also conducting a review of our alcohol and drug policies and party policies this year.

Two of our committee structures designed to deal with students having problems are the Committee on Academic Requirements (CAR) and the College Judiciary System (CJC). As we've assessed the work of both CAR and the CJC, we have focused on improving consistency, clear communication of expectations, and the coordination of ongoing support. The CAR system was reviewed and revised in fall 2011. In addition to reviewing students' academic records for action in January and June, the CAR reviews the records of select students in early December in order to provide earlier support to students who are likely to be required to withdraw. Further, January's CAR meeting now takes place after grades are in to the Registrar, enabling more informed CAR decisions. In 2013 a first annual committee report was produced, which will allow us to analyze data that can inform improvements in academic services. A review of College Judiciary System is being conducted in 2013-2014.

The evaluation team commended our student peer mentor programs in which advanced students apply their learning in ways that benefit both their own leadership development and the learning of younger students. There are a number of these programs that are either housed in the Dean's division, or that the Dean's division relies on frequently. The evaluation team suggested that we think "more broadly about how to capture the learning experienced by student mentors in various contexts," and we have begun including this in our assessment processes.

Dean's Division Peer Mentors:

- Student Academic Mentors (SAMs) and Resident Assistants (RAs) are assessed regularly and findings are used in hiring and training. In 2013-2014, the assessments will be revised, drawing upon the learning goals of both the College and the Dean's Division (in development).
- Career Services has developed a rubric linked to developing learning goals for assessing Career Peer Advisors (CPAs) that includes goal setting and self-assessment.
- Tri-College Summer Institute assessment focused on developing learning goals.

Non-Dean's Division Peer Mentors (Departments and Writing Associates Program)

- Writing Associates are regularly assessed and these assessments are used in hiring and training.
- Department-based peer mentors are assessed regularly and these assessments are used in hiring and training (formal programs in Biology, Computer Science, Engineering, and Mathematics and Statistics).
- The Dean's Division hosted a series of meetings during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 years in order for coordinators of peer mentor programs to share their assessment practices with one another.

Assessment of the Science Associate (SA) programs in Biology and Mathematics and Statistics was a significant part of our 2010-2012 HHMI grant, and the activities (and assessment) continue beyond the conclusion of the grant. Findings from that research confirmed the value of these programs to both the student leaders and students receiving their assistance. We continue to monitor the effectiveness of the programs to ensure that the benefits outweigh costs.

A number of the dean's office's current assessment activities are focused on academic success and understanding what factors may affect students' ability to "thrive" at Swarthmore. To that end they are looking at existing institutional data and survey results, and are also hosting some informal focus groups. This work will inform a more general campus climate study, for which planning began spring 2014.

The 2009 evaluation team also suggested:

The Dean of Students should encourage regular conversations among staff of the importance of assessment, broadly conceived. As the college explores possible structures for its assessment of student learning, and what it means to produce a 'comprehensive assessment plan,' the team encourages an expansive view of student learning commensurate with Swarthmore's ambitious mission. The Dean of Students has a critical role to play here, in collaboration with faculty, and should consider strengthening the department's own assessment processes, perhaps including periodic departmental self-studies followed by external reviews, akin to those in academic departments.

From 2011 through 2013, regular Dean's Division retreats and meetings were convened to develop division learning goals consistent with the College's mission and overall learning goals for students.

During the 2013-2014 year the Dean's Division is partnering with the developing Center for Innovation and Leadership to explore common goals, develop programs, and share assessment practices.

Our draft Institutional-level Goals for Student learning are now being considered in revising goals and assessments, including but not limited to Dean's Division Peer Mentors (SAMs, RAs, CAs, CPAs) and annual reports from: Health Sciences Advising; Committee on Academic Requirements; Fellowships and Prizes; Learning Disabilities and Support; and Sophomore Plan.

The dean's office has just completed a multi-year internal self-study of Residential Life and Student Activities, focusing on dining, athletics, and residential issues, and including an extensive review of staffing models and services offered at peer institutions. Among the changes that have resulted from this effort is a merging of Residential Life and Student Activities into an Office of Student Engagement, a structure that will allow for enhanced and better integrated support of students. The Dean of Students division has proposed beginning a cycle of regular departmental external reviews beginning in 2015-2016. As we confirm our learning goals, these plans will be finalized in conjunction with the planning and implementation of The Center for Innovation and Leadership and The Diversity and Inclusion Implementation Plan. The anticipated timing was also based upon the hiring of an Associate Dean for Diversity, Inclusion, and Community Development for 2013-2014, which has been done.

Social Responsibility

Responsible citizenship is identified in our mission statement, which explicitly states, "Swarthmore seeks to help its students realize their full intellectual and personal potential combined with a deep sense of ethical and social concern." A general commitment to ethical intelligence informs all of our work, even beyond high-impact learning and service learning. We believe that one of the many benefits of this focus is that it can help integrate students' thinking about ways in which their fields connect.

One of our own recommendations from our self-study was to improve the collaboration and coordination across the College in social responsibility efforts, including staff as well as faculty and students, so that we may learn from one another and create continuity of engagement with our partners. Some of the ways in which we are attempting to do this are:

- A "Day of Service" organized in 2012 for First Year Orientation Week took each first-year student plus faculty and staff to 15 local sites and provided an estimated \$30,000 of service.
- Collaborations and student/faculty/staff engagement, especially in efforts with the College Access Center of Delaware County, the Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program, and the Chester Children's Chorus, for example.
- Lang Center Curriculum grants totaling \$20,000 annually are available and distributed in \$5,000 increments to individual faculty members for course development and course releases.

One of the recommendations that we considered in our self-study to better promote student engagement was to increase financial support for student initiatives via summer internships as well as grants so that transformative experiences can be available to more students, more often. This goal is included in the *Strategic Directions'* intention to create additional funds and opportunities for "high impact learning experiences." An ad hoc committee is currently looking at summer programs, and considering how we might incorporate them into an integrated tracking system. There has been a small increase to the Summer Social Action Award full-internship funding. A new program, Summer Internship Support, was created to offer partial support to students with summer internships related to social justice. We have also added a "Swarthmore Future Entrepreneurs Program" in which paid internships are offered at local start up companies, so that students will gain experience working for a start up while gaining insight into the entrepreneurial world.

D. Admissions, Access, and Affordability

The 2010-2011 strategic planning working group "Admissions, Access, and Affordability" explored questions of recruitment of students, ability to thrive, composition of the class, and how our aid and tuition policies support our goals. Their work extended from the self-study working group that looked at "Recruitment and Composition of Class," and focused on Middle States Standard 8.

Swarthmore College is a highly selective college that offers admission to qualified domestic students without regard to their ability to pay, and provides aid to meet all admitted students' full need, regardless of citizenship. In an effort to seek a variety of students leading to a well-rounded class, the admissions staff carefully considers a number of criteria without a rigid emphasis on any one factor in particular. These criteria include high school record (including strength of curriculum), rank in class, standardized tests, extracurricular commitments, essays, and recommendations. An interview is recommended.

Beginning in 2008-2009 Swarthmore replaced the loan component of our aid packages with grant aid. To support our efforts to create a diverse student body we have been a QuestBridge⁸ partner for the last eight years. About half of our students are aided, and the average financial aid award is over \$38,000 (with our tuition, fees, room, and board at \$57,870 in 2013-2014).

Many of the recommendations that we made for ourselves in our 2009 self-study regarding admissions and financial aid have already been completed, and some new initiatives were targeted in the 2010-2011 strategic planning process.

We recommended migrating from our previous paper-based admissions system to online processing and reading. A new online reading system was developed and implemented in the fall of 2011 with upgrades and improvements made during the 2012-2013 admissions cycle. The new system has led to greater efficiencies in both the processing and reading of applications and has significantly decreased costs in the print budget. We are also realizing space efficiencies as areas previously used for paper files are freed for better work areas.

⁸ QuestBridge is an independent organization that matches under-served, high-ability students with colleges and universities.

We also wished to consider staffing changes, including increases to professional staff. We discontinued 2 FTE support positions, and added a new FTE for international admissions. Our Admissions office is slightly understaffed compared to peer institutions, and will soon experience additional pressures with the anticipated growth in the size of the student body. Should there be more opportunity to increase our staff, we would add another admissions dean to the existing five associate and assistant deans, who share responsibility for oversight of programs (e.g. multicultural or international recruitment) and geographic regions.

Current initiatives are addressing other recommendations and suggestions around diversity, communications and visibility efforts, and enrollment growth. The College is working with an outside consultant to study and better understand perceptions of the College among multiple audiences, including prospective students and their families. Changes to publications and outreach are anticipated in 2014, informed by this work. The Communications Office recently hired an associate director of media communications, with whom the Admissions Office works closely.

Anticipated growth in the size of the College will certainly affect the Admissions office outreach activities, and will impact our financial aid. However, because any growth will be slow and staged, we do not expect major changes in the immediate future.

Our evaluation team made a suggestion that the College consider whether every student admitted to Swarthmore should be capable of succeeding in the most rigorous majors. This is a topic taken up by the 2010-2011 strategic planning's "Access" working group as they considered the attributes important in a student's ability to thrive at Swarthmore. The College does not admit students to the major, and in fact students are encouraged to explore fully before declaring a major at the end of the sophomore year. The effects of differential preparedness that may be evident at the admissions stage may depend on student interests. The Admissions Office recognizes the importance of student readiness for success, but also understands that what is challenging for one student may not be universally so. We believe that students have a variety of talents and preparations, and admission to Swarthmore constitutes a sense that we see a fit for students in some disciplines here at the College and believe that they will find success in those disciplines.

At the same time, we do still wrestle with how to support students who express interest in a discipline for which their current preparation may not adequately prepare them. To address this, the Admissions Office has implemented a more formal reporting structure with the dean's office to notify them of students who may struggle upon arrival. A coding system alerts the dean's office of a range of situations, such as the death of a parent or an academic gap. This information helps the dean's office in assigning advisors and providing outreach. A preliminary analysis to evaluate the value of these codes in predicting outcomes was conducted in fall 2011, and will be updated in fall 2014 after it has been in place for a few years.

There is currently a faculty working group that is exploring the possibility of creating a "summer bridge" program to ensure that first generation students and those from traditionally underrepresented groups receive the necessary academic support to thrive at our academically

challenging institution. This is an idea that has been discussed in the past, but these faculty members recognized the opening provided by campus wide discussions last spring about diversity and inclusion as an ideal opportunity to begin the work of creating a scholarly summer program that would serve as a “bridge” for such students. The goals of the proposed program are to prepare students for the academic rigor of Swarthmore College by providing additional instruction and support, helping students build relationships that will promote academic success and giving students hands on experience with life at a first tier liberal arts college in anticipation of the freshman fall. The Faculty Working Group on the Summer Bridge Program, which has requested recognition as a formal Committee of the Faculty, hopes to complete the design of the program by December 2014. If approved and funds identified, a pilot could be launched as early as June 2015. The College has also expanded the types of supervision and support structures available to students, including advising and academic support in the Dean’s area (as described previously), and in many departments, especially in the sciences.

Last, we recently made an important shift in reporting, moving financial aid from reporting to the vice president and dean of admissions to the vice president for finance. A significant outcome of our 2010-2011 strategic planning is that a new standing Admissions and Financial Aid board committee has been established to review and monitor the effectiveness and sustainability of admissions and financial aid policies moving forward.

E. Alumni Engagement and Development

The fourth working group in our 2010-2011 strategic planning effort was “Alumni Engagement and Development,” and its charge was to discuss ways to “more effectively engage our alumni in lifelong personal relationships with the College, through the encouragement of greater volunteerism, enhanced giving, and participation in new, imaginative learning and cultural experiences,” and to “find new ways to craft a lifelong Swarthmore attachment from the acceptance letter to the 50th reunion and beyond.” This group had two task forces, one on alumni engagement and one on development, and extended the work conducted by two of the working groups in the 2007-2009 planning and self-study effort: “Leadership, Scholarship, and Higher Education” (Middle States Standards 1, 11, and 13), and “The Broader Swarthmore Community and Philanthropy” (Standard 3). Some of the recommendations from this group have been discussed previously (e.g. the Center for Innovation and Leadership), but its work on development relates to our update on the status of our activities with regard to Resources, discussed below.

F. Resources

In our 2007-2009 planning and self-study effort, our resources that support the College’s mission were the focus of three working groups, “Staff” (Standard 5), “Resources” (Standards 2, 3, and 7), and “The Broader Swarthmore Community and Philanthropy” (as noted above, Standard 3). The work of the latter group was addressed by a subgroup of the 2010-2011 strategic planning group, “Alumni Engagement and Development,” which focused on Development. The work of the 2007-2009 “Resources” group was continued by the 2009-2010 ad hoc Financial Planning Group (mentioned in the Introduction), which made recommendations to address the impact of the

economic downturn. The implementation phase of the Strategic Planning process is now underway, and it examines and models the resources needed to realize the recommendations in our Strategic Initiatives through our financial planning process.

Human Resources

The mission of our Human Resources Division is to support a diverse and highly skilled community in order to create a positive workplace that helps the College attract and retain the talent necessary to accomplish its goals. To this end, the College employs over 500 full-time and 200 part-time non-instructional staff, in addition to about 200 full-time and 35 part-time instructional staff, offering them a high quality, comprehensive program of benefits. We encourage robust staff engagement in the life of the College through communication, staff participation in committees and meetings, and inclusion in College events.

One of the recommendations we made for ourselves in our 2009 self-study was to provide better training and support for staff development. We restructured a position in the Human Resources office opened by a retirement, and the newly reconfigured position will support training initiatives as well as employee relations. Also during this period, we have implemented a “Staff Development Workshop” series, which currently is offered semiannually. Daylong programming is developed by a Workshop committee along with Human Resources, and supervisors are explicitly encouraged to promote the opportunities with staff members. Our Information Technology Services has supported development efforts by providing online resources, such as technology training tutorials (e.g. “Lynda.com”), which all members of the community may access at any time.

The other primary recommendation we made in our self-study regarding staff was that we improve diversity recruiting. As described in the previous discussion of faculty diversity, the College continues to enhance its recruitment initiatives that support faculty searches in their efforts to increase the recruitment of underrepresented faculty. This will be discussed further in the next section.

The director of equal opportunity (EO) partnered with the office of human resources and developed a similar program of meeting with hiring managers and administrative search committees to explore ways of employing diversity recruitment methods and efforts, while avoiding discrimination, including reverse discrimination in the search process. Upon online application completion, applicants are given an optional survey to confidentially self-identify their race, ethnicity and gender. The aggregated EO survey data informs us of the race/ethnic/gender diversity in each pool as identified by applicants and is useful in our assessment of our efforts to post positions in ways that reach qualified, diverse pools of applicants. We have only just started to collect this data, and will soon be able to evaluate its usefulness. Our diversity initiatives will be discussed further in the Section 3.

Fiscal Management

In addition to our strong faculty and staff, the College is fortunate to have among its resources adequate facilities, including 59 buildings, 426 acres of gardens, lawns, athletic fields, and natural woodlands; a strong endowment with a market value of \$1.6 billion; and a balanced operating

budget of about \$125 million. Between 40–50% of our budget each year comes from endowment spending, requiring prudent and sustainable practices to protect our future operations.

As part of our 2009 self-study we made recommendations on the broad topics of fiscal management, resource planning and budget flexibility. The self-study process and the focus of the resulting suggestions were influenced by the then-current economic downturn. In hindsight, it is clear that the College's thoughtful and measured response to the downturn was both fiscally responsible and reasonable. Because of the work of the ad hoc Financial Planning Group, necessary but measured reductions were made to the College's budget in response to the declines felt within the endowment. Reductions were structured so that they could be implemented, as needed, in phases to allow the College maximum flexibility. These planned adjustments were shared broadly with the full Board and community through presentations and documents. The phasing approach allowed the College to keep the academic program and financial aid intact and to mitigate the impact of the budget reductions to departments, faculty and staff. There were no lay-offs. As the economic situation improved, it was determined that a portion of the planned phased budget reductions were not necessary. This removed a component of financial uncertainty and allowed the College to resume and refocus its long-term planning efforts with a positive outlook. We feel that our ability to weather the downturn without making any cuts in programs is the strongest evidence that our actions were mission-driven and effective. Our annual budgeting activities will be described more fully in Sections 4 and 6.

In the spring of 2008 the College launched a three-year risk management initiative focused on the areas of contract management and agreements related to the transfer of liability. It is part of the College's risk management responsibilities to identify our risks, reduce or eliminate them where feasible, and to manage those remaining. The initiative was very successful and resulted in a comprehensive set of contracting guidelines, updated release forms and a dedicated campus website for contracting and risk management resources.

The College revised and updated the process followed for its annual renewal of insurance policies. A more formal process was put into place during the spring of 2011, which included the addition of an annual kick-off meeting, an on-line service to share documents and facilitate document retention and updates, and a transition to completing more renewal applications on-line.

An internal working group, focused on purchasing initiatives, was formed during 2012-13 to identify areas of cost savings within the College's budget. To date, the group has recommended two cost saving measures. The group recommended an implementation of e-commerce purchasing software to gain efficiencies and cost savings on departmental purchases, especially in the office supply category. A second recommendation led to the development of an on-line site to consolidate the purchase of staff business cards from a single vendor to obtain bulk discounts.

Another cost savings and "green" initiative was the introduction in December 2011 of electronic billing for student billing of tuition charges, including the ability for students and families to pay their student charges electronically.

Our self-study identified several construction projects of top priority, and these will be described more in Sections 3, 4, and 6.

G. Other areas

There were a few other comments and suggestions from our evaluation team for which we have responses or updates.

With regard to governance, our evaluation team noted our decision-making process. With our culture of consensus-based decision-making, we recognize that our deliberative processes can be slow, but we feel that it is generally balanced and that our inclusiveness is important. We offer the example of our Strategic Planning as a process that was highly consultative and resulted in the identification of strategic directions across all aspects of the College, in just an 18-month process.

Another area noted by our evaluation team was the possibility of expanding what might be viewed as an “insider culture” since our Board includes only Swarthmore alumni. There has been some recognition and discussion of this issue by the Board, and in particular the nominating and governance committee. Subsequent changes to procedures have not yet resulted in non-alumni board members, but have begun to open the door for that possibility.

Furthermore, the Board expressed a desire to cultivate potential donors from beyond the ranks of alumni, people who nonetheless share the College's values. The Development and Alumni Relations division has two initiatives underway. (1) Our grants office is developing a new way of engaging corporate entities that might benefit the College in a variety of ways, including shared expertise, educational and experiential opportunities for students, institutional partnerships, and financial support. (2) Advancement Services staff are looking at historic data to identify who are our current “friends,” i.e. those whose connection to the College is not based on alumni or parent status, and who among them share the College's values to determine what base, if any, exists upon which to build. Advancement Services is also looking at how we can and should capture data on these individuals. As a rule the College has not attempted to gather data beyond basic contact information. Successful cultivation will require far more robust data gathering and analysis.

H. Conclusion

Though we did not prioritize our emerging recommendations from our 2007-2009 planning and self-study effort, our subsequent 2010-2011 strategic planning process has kept us fully focused on identifying areas of concern or opportunity, prioritizing, and planning. Many of these initiatives are well under way, and we feel our progress toward our goals and our adherence to the Middle States Characteristics of Excellence remains very strong.

Section 3: Current status - Major challenges and/or current opportunities

Our 2010-2011 Strategic Planning effort has been mentioned throughout the previous section, as it is through that work that we addressed the recommendations from our self-study and the suggestions and recommendation from our evaluation team. Here we summarize the major initiatives underway as a result of that effort, as they present our current opportunities and address some, but not all, of our current major challenges. Each of these initiatives is supported by a committee of faculty, staff, and students, and each has provided, and continues to provide, multiple opportunities for communication with the community as we set directions and implement our plans.

A. Initiatives

Campus Master Plan

Strategic Directions articulates a number of academic, admissions and access, community-building, and alumni engagement initiatives to be implemented in the coming years. As we plan for these initiatives, it is important to assess our physical campus and the ways in which these new priorities can best be supported through our physical structures and campus layout. This assessment work was accomplished by a steering committee and an advisory committee, supported by external experts, Ayers Saint Gross, a planning and architectural firm.

Our campus master planning process looked carefully at our existing facilities, land use, and layout; engaged all members of our community in public sessions and on the web; and produced a series of recommendations for how the College can optimally utilize existing buildings. It also provided recommendations for the judicious construction of new facilities to meet campus needs. Our process is guided by our enduring commitment to green space and the use of environmentally conscious construction standards.⁹

A number of projects are already underway, and will be described further in Section 4 (with funding information), including Matchbox (fitness/wellness/theater), Dana-Hallowell Infill (residence hall addition), Town Center West (inn and restaurant), and Biology, Engineering, Psychology Project (academic facilities).

Center for Innovation & Leadership

The Center for Innovation and Leadership evolved from the needs identified in *Strategic Directions* for improved opportunities for students to develop their leadership abilities and to find ways to use those skills to impact all areas of their interests. By drawing on the strengths of our alumni, it also helps to make connections between current and past students in ways that can benefit both. While programming in the Center is just beginning, it will build on existing resources and programs already in place, including the Career Services Office, the Program for Socially Responsible

⁹ "Swarthmore College Campus Master Plan" (2013-14).

Leadership, and the Jonathan R. Lax Conference on Entrepreneurship. Additional areas of focus will include alumni mentoring programs and an Alumni Fellows Program focusing on innovation.

Diversity & Inclusion Plan

Strategic Directions identified the need for a Diversity and Inclusion Plan, and a committee of faculty, students, and staff was charged to develop a "diversity, inclusivity, and engagement project that will transform the College into a model workplace and residential learning community in an increasingly complex global world." Campus unrest in the spring of 2013 in response to acts of vandalism and concerns about a lack of diversity (more below) added to our urgency in this work, which was already underway. The committee released a draft report in fall 2013 with specific recommendations for activities that will address needed changes. The community is discussing and refining these recommendations. A "Diversity and Inclusion Implementation Update" was prepared to summarize our activities for the community, and is attached as Appendix C.

Institute for the Liberal Arts

The goal of the Institute for the Liberal Arts is to draw on Swarthmore College's reputation for innovation and tradition and its worldwide network to serve, support, and evolve the role of liberal arts education on the national and international stage. Its three main objectives are

1. To foster curricular, pedagogical, and scholarly innovation and to disseminate the results of this activity.
2. To engage in generative thinking about the future of the liberal arts and higher education.
3. To facilitate conversations between liberal arts institutions and those who live "liberal arts lives."

As noted in an earlier section, the Institute has already been actively piloting a number of programs, which have been received with great enthusiasm.

Sustainability

The Sustainability Committee (SusCom) evolved from the longstanding efforts of a number of environmental groups at the College. Environmental Sustainability is one of the commitments identified in *Strategic Directions*. The purpose of SusCom is to make recommendations to the President and to the College community regarding policies to promote environmental sustainability on campus. The Committee focuses on identifying policies and practices that promote the most efficient and responsible use of College resources; monitoring funds and grants pertaining to environmental sustainability; and coordinating and support campus sustainability initiatives and efforts.

B. Challenges

Community

Many of the most pressing contemporary challenges confronting Swarthmore are addressed in other sections of this report, including faculty workload; the increasing need for additional psychological and counseling support for students; and the unprecedented pace of change related to technology. In the spring of 2013 there also arose some campus climate issues which ultimately

led to approximately 100 students disrupting a community wide forum hosted by the College's Board of Managers. A summary of the key relevant issues includes:

- A proposal in the fall of 2012 to establish a sorority on campus led to a more general referendum on Greek Life in the spring. The role of Greek life on Swarthmore's campus has been contested since at least the 1920's.
- In the context of an emerging national movement, including increased attention by the Department of Education, a series of articles ran in the electronic daily student-run newspaper about the treatment of survivors of sexual assault. The series raised awareness and concern about College policies and procedures for handling reports of sexual assault. The President announced the hiring of an external consultant to advise the College on policy, procedure and practices and also named an Internal Task Force to review our campus culture and issues relating to sexual misconduct.
- A group of students that has been working for several years to push for the College's divestment in fossil fuels hosted representatives from over seventy schools to discuss the issue and work together.
- Two students, both involved in the national Know your IX organization, filed a complaint with the Department of Education, Office of Federal Student Aid (FSA) for violations of the Clery Act and with the Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) for violations of Title IX, around the College's handling of sexual assault cases.
- Vandalism to the door of the Intercultural Center occurred through the year. The fourth and final act of public urination on the IC door led some students to march through campus in protest and hold an impromptu public meeting calling for more action.
- The student group that had been arguing for the divestment of the College endowment in fossil fuels was invited to meet with the Board of Managers at their May meeting for an open discussion of this topic. At the meeting, the group unexpectedly changed the format to address community concerns including the experience of marginalized students, treatment of sexual assault incidents, and divestment from fossil fuels. Students controlled the format of the meeting. This was viewed by many as a "take-over" of the meeting and protest; the Board of Managers decided to hear the students out.
- Many students in the community felt that the 100 or so students involved in the protests and in the open forum were not representing them although they share, as does the campus as a whole, the commitment to equity, safety and justice.

These incidents and the serious concerns underlying them were the topic of a series of community meetings in late spring. The following two sections outline more fully some of our continuing work.

College Responses to Handling of Sexual Misconduct

In May 2013, President Rebecca Chopp hired Margolis Healy & Associates, an independent firm which specializes in campus safety, security, and regulatory compliance, to begin an independent, thorough review of all of the College's sexual misconduct policies and procedures. Also in May, an internal task force focusing on campus climate was appointed and included students, faculty, staff, and members of the Board of Managers.

The College has taken a number of steps in response to the initial MHA recommendations, including:

- Conducted and recently completed a national search for a dedicated, fulltime Title IX coordinator, who will report directly to the President, meeting our goal to have a coordinator in place by the end of the academic year.
- Appointed as an interim Title IX coordinator a current employee, Patricia Flaherty Fischette, who has a background in law, counseling, and Title IX, and has worked in counseling and psychological services (CAPS) and with health services, to provide counseling and programmatic support to students and the SMARTeam. The Coordinator is responsible for all Title IX compliance, training, and programming and will review investigations. In October, the Coordinator initiated open office hours for campus community members on Tuesday evenings.
- Title IX deputy coordinators were appointed to support the work of the coordinator. These include the associate dean of diversity, inclusion, and community development; the associate provost for academic development, the human resources manager; and the associate athletics director. These deputies will support the Title IX coordinator's oversight of all Title IX complaints and will identify and address any patterns or systemic problems that arise during the review of Title IX complaints.
- Hired a violence prevention educator and advocate to provide guidance through our support and grievance systems for survivors of sexual assault and other forms of sexual harassment and misconduct.
- Hired a grievance advisor and community educator to assist respondents to complaints throughout the grievance process, to ensure a fair and equitable process for both complainants and respondents.
- Issued an Interim Sexual Assault and Harassment Policy and a revised Student Handbook, detailing new hearing procedures, providing detailed explanations of reporting options, discussions of available resources, clear definitions of sexual assault and harassment and explicit timeframes for all major stages of investigations and resolution.
- Undertook a comprehensive inventory of our current education and prevention efforts in order to strengthen and expand programming devoted to sexual misconduct and ensure we are complying with federal mandates and abiding by best practices.

- Separated the roles of drug and alcohol counseling and fraternity advising. We hired an alcohol and other drugs counselor and educator to develop and present educational alcohol and drug prevention programming and provide individual and group counseling to students. This position works within the health center to integrate our prevention and treatment programs more fully into the College's health and wellness resources.
- Charged the task force, in collaboration with the Dean's Advisory Council, with reviewing the role of alcohol and other drugs in creating an environment that can contribute to sexual misconduct and to make recommendations to create a safer social environment.
- Hired an additional investigator in Public Safety, who also provides training for other members of that staff and additional members of the campus community on how to most effectively and sensitively conduct investigations related to sexual misconduct.
- To further improve our implementation of Clery Act requirements, we ensured that all of our campus security authorities (CSAs)—who are staff, faculty, resident assistants (RAs), and others who, by virtue of their position, are likely to hear first-hand reports of sexual misconduct and other crimes—were identified and trained on their responsibilities to promptly report all Clery Act crimes, including sexual assault. The list of CSAs was widely distributed and listed on the website. A comprehensive training program with expanded Title IX training for CSAs, including RAs, began over the summer, and was expanded to include others throughout the year.
- Organized a return visit of the MHA team to campus in September. Over the course of the three-day visit, the MHA team engaged in conversations with the full campus community, including students, faculty and staff and the Task Force on Sexual Misconduct.
- Chartered and formed a Clery Act Compliance Coordinating Committee co-chaired by the director of public safety and the assistant vice president for risk management and legal affairs and the director of equal opportunity. This committee oversees the College's compliance with the Clery Act and coordinates with the Crisis Planning Committee to provide leadership and ensure full compliance in the areas of reporting, policy and procedure development and implementation, annually updating the Campus Security Authority (CSA) list, and providing educational programs.
- Updated the Swarthmore website to ensure that Clery Act provisions are easily accessible, adding an online report form for incidents of criminal activity or sexual misconduct.
- Launched a sexual misconduct resources website providing information and assistance for victims/survivors of sexual misconduct, harassment, and discrimination, as well as details about the College's policies and procedures.

- Conducted a two-day Investigators Training class for responsible administrators of the Title IX investigation process including key investigators, relevant leadership and administrative staff. Participants also included representatives from Bryn Mawr College, Haverford College, Villanova University, Widener University and the Swarthmore Borough Police Department.
- Sponsored both full day and half day Title IX Training sessions providing faculty and staff with an overview of institutional obligations and enforcement, a review of legislative mandates and a discussion of the training, education and prevention requirements of Title IX.

Other ongoing efforts suggested in the January 2014 report include the following initiatives, many of which are already underway:

- Creating a coordinated and integrated primary prevention plan that consists of an ongoing sequence of educational efforts that build upon each other over the course of the year and throughout the student's college career. Developing a training plan that separates education and training that is primarily related to response from prevention-related activities.
- Tasking the Clery Act Coordinating Committee with guiding the implementation of the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination SaVE Act. Reviewing existing efforts and identifying any changes needed; including incorporating bystander intervention training and ensuring that all employees and students receive both initial and ongoing training.
- Assigning responsibility for specific areas of prevention to multiple staff members as well as student peer leader groups. Ensuring that staff members charged with prevention have sufficient time and institutional support to remain current in this rapidly evolving field, e.g., through conferences, training, webinars, library support or research assistance.
- Closely examining staffing in residential life to ensure sufficient capacity to provide prevention programming in the residential setting.
- Expanding consent workshops.
- Reviewing any relevant findings from existing student surveys and using these results to inform prevention efforts. Conducting regular assessments of education and prevention activities and using this information to inform outreach, education, and prevention efforts.
- Ensuring that training for new students and affinity groups includes information about both sexual harassment and sexual violence (and beginning in March, relationship violence and stalking), and discusses where to report such concerns on campus and to law enforcement. Training will specify where to receive confidential assistance and outline available support services. The Title IX Coordinator will review all training programs to ensure they use Office of Civil Rights (OCR) definitions of sexual harassment/sexual violence and are consistent with the Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) and other OCR guidance concerning sexual harassment and

violence. In addition, all training programs will also discuss the College's prohibition on retaliation and how such concerns would be addressed.

- Developing a mechanism for surveying the campus climate and in particular to assessing the changes to Swarthmore's policies, procedures, and reporting options. Results from these surveys will determine the appropriate actions to address climate issues related to sex-based harassment.
- Ensuring the widest possible dissemination of policies and procedures related to sexual misconduct and reporting options. Developing supplemental materials that clearly designate and publicize which offices and/or individuals provide complainant and respondent support functions, the scope of these services, the confidentiality level of each resource and anonymous reporting options. Providing these materials to faculty, staff, and administrators and teaching supportive ways to refer individuals to these support services.
- Providing training to ensure that confidential resources understand the grievance procedures and can answer questions about them for potential complainants.
- Identifying and training all sexual misconduct first responders on appropriate response to initial reports (recognizing the first response is different from investigations).
- Ensuring sexual misconduct investigators receive comprehensive and ongoing training on the role of alcohol and other drugs in sexual assault, the investigatory and adjudication processes, and victim trauma.
- Finalizing the Interim Policy on Sexual Assault and Misconduct for students and revising policies for faculty and staff by this summer.
- Ensuring recurring and appropriate training for all adjudicators and exploring new approaches to our adjudication model.
- Continuing to improve our nonalcoholic social options and working with the SWATeam to support and monitor events at which alcohol is served.
- Continuing to gather relevant data about assault incidents, using new software to track cases more efficiently and analyze them for trends and new opportunities for prevention.

Diversity Concerns

As mentioned above, the creation of a Diversity and Inclusion Plan was an initiative that came from our 2010-2011 strategic planning process. A committee of faculty, staff, and students was appointed to undertake this work in the 2012-2013 academic year, and its importance was underscored by the events of the spring 2013. In September 2013, a draft report recommending specific actions was shared with the College community. While the community discusses the draft report, more immediate actions were undertaken:

- The provost asked the Committee on Faculty Procedures (COFP) to appoint an ad hoc faculty committee to develop guidelines for faculty search procedures on best practices for achieving greater diversity. COFP is reviewing and incorporating best practices from peer institutions. These guidelines will be developed in collaboration with the Equal Opportunity Office and presented to faculty for approval, ideally in spring 2014.
- Human Resources, in collaboration with the Administrative Advisory Council (AAC) and the Staff Advisory Council (SAC), also appointed an ad hoc committee to develop guidelines so that staff searches employ best practices for achieving greater diversity. This committee will further be asked to review the new training programs on hiring currently offered to managers and faculty chairs. Ideally, this committee will conclude its work by this spring.
- As noted previously, the associate provost for faculty development, the equal opportunity director, and the associate dean of diversity, inclusion, and community development continue to meet with all faculty departments conducting searches to lead a discussion of best practices related to recruiting, hiring, and retaining diverse candidates.
- All faculty searches are now using online applications that ensure mandatory collection of equal opportunity (EO) data. This data will help to ensure that search techniques are successfully reaching a diverse pool of qualified candidates in each hiring situation. (Staff searches are already using online applications and collecting EO data.)
- The dean's office, the provost's office, and Human Resources initiated and will oversee a thorough "campus climate" study—beginning with focus groups—to capture attitudes, feelings and perceptions about the campus community—not just individual experiences but also the quality and extent of interactions and relationships between and among various groups and individuals across campus. Planning for this study occurred in 2013-14 and it will be executed in 2014-15.
- The Curriculum Committee began in the fall to investigate a range of curricular initiatives, including but not limited to: 1) A series of required courses focused on living in an intentional community. Similar to the physical education requirement, several of these courses would be required for graduation (though they would not be for academic credit.). 2) Courses such as Intergroup Dialogue that would not be mandatory but would be taken for credit. 3) The creation of a designation like the W (writing courses) for particular courses that directly link to the cultivation of a diverse and inclusive learning environment.
- The president established a diversity and inclusion initiative fund of \$50,000 per year for three years. Faculty, staff, and students apply for funding for projects that support the cultivation of a diverse and inclusive learning environment. We have already had our first round of solicitations and are selecting our first set of recipients. We will evaluate and assess the effectiveness of the fund at the end of this initial period.

- The president will deliver an annual report to the Board and the entire community assessing the College's progress toward the goal of building and supporting a diverse and inclusive learning environment. The first report is scheduled for May 2014 and will include updates on the implementation of the above recommendations.
- The president will require all senior staff members to present goals for their areas that support the cultivation of a diverse and inclusive environment and a plan to assess the implementation of those goals. This means that every area of the college will have clear goals to improve diversity and inclusivity and will be evaluated upon achieving those goals.

Accounting for Faculty Teaching

As we shift the teaching load, we recognize that there is a broader challenge of accounting for all of the ways that faculty interact with, teach, and mentor our students. We encourage and must support faculty efforts to engage in high impact learning experiences, but we must appropriately account for instructional activities in order for the workload to be equitable. As a first step in developing a comprehensive and consistent accounting, we have begun collecting information about current practices across departments. CEP conducted a study in 2012-13 of the way in which departments account for faculty working with students writing theses. At the same time, the chairs in the Natural Sciences and Engineering division looked into the ways that departments define, staff, and credit the teaching of laboratory courses. In both of these instances, we discovered a range of practices. Our thinking about these issues must also include consideration of faculty work in the summer. As noted previously, uncompensated supervision of student research has become routine for many faculty members. This supervision requires a considerable time commitment that often affects their ability to move their own research forward. These challenges will become more pressing as we increase both the number of students and the size of the faculty. This year as it allocates tenure line positions, CEP is continuing to consider the significant enrollment differences across departments, both current and those likely to result from growth. As the current differential accounting practices and the effects of growth become better understood, there will likely be a need to make difficult decisions that will move us towards consistency in accounting for teaching.

Risk Management and Compliance

In the period since the self-study, the College has recognized the importance of instituting a College-wide process to centrally manage many types of risk, which had previously been handled across different areas. The Board of Managers charged the Audit Committee with oversight of this process. The (now called) Audit and Risk Management Committee is responsible for reviewing the College's auditing, accounting, risk management and financial reporting processes, and the system of internal controls. It is concerned with all activities that may impose risk for the College, such as weather emergencies, travel safety of students, faculty, and staff, and financial concerns. As part of this process, a new administrative position was appointed, the assistant vice president (AVP) for risk management & legal affairs and director of equal opportunity, which was a reconfiguration of the role of our director of equal opportunity. This new position has responsibility for evaluating and monitoring institutional risks, managing the general legal affairs of the College, overseeing the equal employment and educational opportunity compliance of the College and assisting with

application and interpretation of the laws that impose obligations on the College. The AVP, working with the Board Committee, has developed a process to identify risks, establish responsibility for management of the risk, and develop planning, communication, and review procedures. A small Institutional Risk and Review Committee internally serves as a sounding board, assisting the AVP in her work in preparation for discussions that will be held with president's staff and the Board committee. The Board Committee discusses an area of risk at each of their meetings.

Another challenge which the College has faced over the last few years is working with the process we use to oversee research with human subjects. The College has a Research Ethics Committee that serves as its Institutional Review Board (IRB). The chair of the IRB is a faculty member, and the position rotates every two years. In addition, there is an IRB administrator position which had seen significant personnel changes prior to 2012. A consequence of this turnover had been inconsistency in interpreting and applying rules, and changes in required forms. As the current committee has tried to inventory and evaluate its practices and ensure full compliance with federal guidelines, faculty, staff, and students have been caught in the increased paperwork and evolving standards. Some students conducting research had to modify or curtail their projects, and faculty and staff researchers encountered unusual delays. The work of ensuring full compliance was an essential step for the committee, and some of the delays caused by the work were unavoidable.

The College has taken several steps to improve this process. It has purchased an agreement with *IRBManager*, software and services to support IRB administration. This software will help us to streamline the application process, allow users to track the progress of an application, provide a way for faculty members to better manage the activities of student researchers, and allow the committee members to more efficiently evaluate submissions. We have also made the decision to apply locally developed review guidelines to some non-federally funded research. While this may initially cause more work for the provost's office and relevant committees as we develop institutional policies, it allows us to reconsider the extent to which different kinds of studies must be reviewed by the full process. It is hoped that we might find efficiencies while retaining the critical role of faculty in mentoring students to carry out research ethically and responsibly.

With all compliance issues, our challenge remains how to implement the changes that we need in a way that is deliberative, inclusive, transparent, and maintains our core commitments to academic rigor and community.

Section 4: Enrollment and Financial Data

As noted, this review comes as the College is embarking on the implementation of its strategic plan. Section 6 will describe how that plan was developed and how it integrates with financial planning and budgeting. There has been a significant transition since 2009, when the College was last reviewed. In 2009, the College was coping with the effects of the economic downturn. The Board of Managers had just adopted a five-year budget plan of both permanent and temporary budget measures. Because of prudent financial and investment policies, the College was better positioned than many peer institutions to weather this difficult period. The budget plan focused on the College's priorities and avoided reductions to core programs, preserved financial aid, and did not include any layoffs of faculty or staff. There were some permanent budget reductions, however, and facilities capital spending was reduced significantly for a period of three years.

The College has now recovered from this period. The endowment returned to its pre-downturn level in 2011 and has sustained a positive trajectory since then. Short-term reductions in capital spending have now expired. The College has returned to a more normal new equilibrium. The strategic plan implementation is now underway, and the early stages of a comprehensive campaign are showing good success.

The College's financial position is strong:

- The budget is balanced and includes funds for capital projects (i.e., funding of depreciation)
- Net revenues per student have shown positive growth.
- The endowment recovery has continued. The endowment return was 11.9% in 2012-13. The endowment spending rate is 3.8%, a sustainable level near the low end of the target range.
- Compensation goals for faculty and staff have been met.
- The financial statements show an increase in net assets from operating activities.¹⁰

The College's strong financial position has also been recognized by the rating agencies. Both Moody's and Standard & Poor's reaffirmed their highest ratings (Aaa and AAA, respectively) for the College in 2013.

The following table presents recent enrollments, and key data. Our enrollments have remained steady, and we are only beginning to increase the size of our incoming class on a trajectory to accomplish our planned growth by 2020-21. The credentials of our incoming class, as reflected by SAT scores and high school class rank, remain strong. We continue to attract a large number of applicants, and our matriculants have a desirable geographic spread. About 50-55% of our students each year receive financial aid. Our six-year graduation rates remain very strong, with some small cohort-to-cohort fluctuations. (Historic enrollments are presented in Appendix G.)

¹⁰ "Swarthmore College Financial Report" (2012-13).

Full-Time Fall Student Enrollment

<u>Class</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2011</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2013</u>
Senior	371	375	391	390
Junior	274	282	295	282
Sophomore	381	387	385	372
First Year	388	386	378	388
<u>Other Students</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>4</u>
Total On-Campus	1,419	1,440	1,455	1,436
<u>Students Abroad</u>	<u>90</u>	<u>96</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>88</u>
Total Degree-Seeking	<u>1,509</u>	<u>1,536</u>	<u>1,532</u>	<u>1,524</u>
Non-degree	15	9	20	10
Total enrollment	<u>1,524</u>	<u>1,545</u>	<u>1,552</u>	<u>1,534</u>

Student Applications, Acceptances and Enrollments

Completed Applications	6041	6547	6589	6615
Number of Students Accepted	974	987	935	947
% of Applications	16%	15%	14%	14%
Number of Students Enrolled	388	386	378	388
% of Accepted	40%	39%	40%	41%

Percentage of Enrolled Students in Top 10% of High School Class (of schools that provide rank)	87%	84%	91%	89%
--	-----	-----	-----	-----

Median SAT Scores of Enrolled Class (critical reading and math; excluding writing)	1440	1440	1460	1450
--	------	------	------	------

Student Geographical Distribution

(Percentage first-year students)

Middle Atlantic	39%	41%	35%	37%
New England	13%	11%	10%	11%
Midwest	8%	10%	11%	8%
Southeast	8%	8%	10%	10%
Southwest	6%	2%	3%	5%
Mountain States	2%	2%	2%	2%
Far West	14%	16%	16%	18%
Other	11%	10%	13%	10%

Students Receiving Financial Aid	52%	53%	53%	50%
---	-----	-----	-----	-----

Six Year Graduation Rates

	Cohort	2004	2005	2006	2007
	Grad Year	2010	2011	2012	2013
% Graduating within six years		93%	95%	92%	93%

Financial Projections

Swarthmore College prepares and updates a long-term financial projection annually, as discussed in more detail in Section 6. The most recent projection was prepared in the fall of 2013 and is included as Appendix D to this report. This projection integrates the underlying budget of the College with the first phase of the implementation of the strategic plan (see Appendix E). It results in balanced budget projections. A summary of the key components and assumptions in this budget follows.

Assumptions of Major Strategic Initiatives

The strategic plan, as will be discussed in Section 6, is balanced financially. It includes two new sources of revenues (enrollment and comprehensive campaign) that will pay for the new initiatives. A number of key components of the strategic plan are incorporated in the overall financial projection. The College intends to continue the slow growth in enrollment that has occurred historically, albeit while remaining among the smallest of its peers. Enrollment is projected to increase by 200 students by 2021.

The projection includes the addition of 28 new faculty positions by 2021. The College developed an integrated plan to add enrollment and new faculty positions while reducing the teaching load from 5 to 4 courses (see Appendix F).

The College has embarked on the quiet phase of a comprehensive campaign. While the campaign goal has not yet been finalized in April 2014, the working number is \$400 million, which will be raised over a nine-year period (July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2019). Several significant pledges have been received to date, which will enable the College to undertake a number of the key strategic initiatives. Commitments received thus far (through December 31, 2013) total \$182 million. The public phase of the campaign is expect to begin Fall 2014.

Several new major capital projects are included in the first phase of implementation of the strategic plan. Planning for the projects listed below is underway and consistent with the master plan.

- **Parrish Hall Renovation:** A major renovation of Parrish Hall is near completion. This project restored roofs and installed new heating, air conditioning, and lighting. The project was funded by an anonymous donor.
- **Town Center West:** This development project includes construction of a 40-room inn with meeting space, a restaurant, and a relocated and expanded College store to the town center. A bond issue in 2011 provided funds for the project, and the debt service on that bond issue is incorporated into the projection. The projection also includes the operating costs of the project. The College is in the process of obtaining various zoning and land use approvals. Construction is expected to begin in 2014, with completion in 2016.
- **Matchbox (Fitness/Wellness/Theater Building):** This new 3-story building will be constructed on the footprint of a previously existing building, and addresses multiple

needs identified in *Strategic Directions*. It will provide high-quality activity space including fitness equipment for the campus community, training space for athletes, and a rehearsal space/classroom for the Theater Department. It will be funded through the proceeds of the comprehensive campaign, and through December 31, 2013, we received pledges for two-thirds of its costs. It is scheduled for completion in 2014.

- Residence Hall Addition (Dana-Hallowell Infill Project): Design is underway for a five-story connector building between two existing residence halls, Dana and Hallowell. The addition will provide 70-75 beds along with student activity space and the elements necessary to make the entire complex accessible to persons with disabilities. Proceeds from a 2013 bond issue will be used to finance the project. Debt service on that issue will indirectly be paid for in the budget with revenues from higher enrollment. Occupancy is planned for fall 2015.
- Biology, Engineering, and Psychology Project: A centerpiece of the strategic plan is the construction of new space for the Biology, Engineering, and Psychology Departments. The early phases of this project are underway, and the architectural firm was selected in 2013. A major unrestricted lead gift of \$50 million in the comprehensive campaign will enable the College to undertake this project.

Other major assumptions for key variables that drive the projection are listed below. These assumptions are conservative ones. For example, the College hopes that actual endowment returns will be better. This will provide more money for cost increases, particularly to meet compensation pressures.

- Projected inflation will be 3% per year.
- Increases in student charges and faculty and staff compensation will be guided by inflation, subject to competitive pressures..
- The percentage of students receiving financial aid will increase from 52.5% to 57.5%.
- The investment return on the endowment will be 5% per year through FY2018 and 7% per year thereafter.

The financial projection using the above assumptions is essentially balanced over the period (small negative bottom lines in a few years are not a significant portion of the budget).

Section 5: Assessment of Institutional effectiveness and student learning, progress and processes

A. Assessment of the Academic Program

Though the 2009 evaluation team did not fault our assessment process outright, their recommendation caused us to recognize shortcomings that would make it difficult to effect the changes they identified. Therefore, with a new leadership team in the provost's office in 2011, and supported by Institutional Research (IR), we redoubled our efforts to improve our assessment work. The recommendation from our 2009 evaluation team was:

Despite the considerable gains made since the last self-study and periodic five-year review, the team recommends that Swarthmore institutionalize a comprehensive assessment plan of student learning outcomes in a manner that is consistent with its values and pedagogic goals. We further recommend that such assessment plans be coordinated and integrated with assessment processes to be developed by the dean of students and the Lang Center.

While there is strong consensus around our institutional values, the College had never formally undertaken the task of articulating our goals for student learning outcomes. Furthermore, while our Assessment Plan identified the importance of clarifying goals for student learning as part of academic departments' assessment work, the articulation of these goals had not been formally required, and it became evident in reviewing departments' assessment reports that few departments had taken this crucial first step. We could not begin to address the recommendation or to adequately meet Middle States Standards 7 and 14 without first more formally articulating our goals for student learning, as that is the foundation for integration of assessment work across the College.

In 2011 the provost charged the Academic Assessment Committee (AcadAC) with reviewing our (2006) Assessment Plan, comparing it with current practices at the College, and determining its consistency with expectations of Middle States and other external agencies. Concurrently he required departments to discuss, articulate and, by the end of the academic year, report on their goals and objectives for student learning. To support the departments' work, a series of discussions were held. In fall 2011, the provost, associate provost¹¹, and director of institutional research met with divisional groups of department chairs to explain what was being asked and why. Each meeting also included participants in our Teagle Assessment project (one from within the College and one from one of our Tri-College peers) to share their experiences of articulating goals within their departments.¹² These meetings gave chairs the opportunity to ask question, voice concerns, and share ideas about how to approach the task within their departments.

¹¹ There was only one associate provost at the time this work was developing. As noted earlier, the associate provost for educational programs will focus on assessment.

¹² The Teagle foundation funded a tri-college project, "Beyond the Reaccreditation Self-Study: Bryn Mawr, Haverford, and Swarthmore colleges collaborate to develop best practices for effective and sustainable department-level assessment of student learning," which included three departments from each College. The three-year project has since been extended for another group of three departments from each College.

The College's Assessment website was developed in the fall. It includes documentation of our plan and procedures, and many resources for both academic and administrative departments, including examples, instructional materials, and links to assessment activities at other institutions.

In spring 2012, the associate provost and director of IR met with faculty members in each department to explain what was being asked, answer questions, and help them to get started. At each meeting they shared instructional materials, as well as examples of goal statements for the same department from at least two peer institutions. In cases where the department already had materials that were similar to goal statements (e.g. on their websites or in admissions materials), these were highlighted as a possible starting point. While these meetings revealed some tensions and concerns among faculty about the difficulty of assessment or how it might be used, they generally evolved into energetic discussions about what the departments want for their students. At the end of the academic year, all but two departments provided their goals and objectives for student learning, along with their annual assessment reports. All had given the task their serious thought and effort, and most had been successful in following best practices for structuring the statements in terms of what students will know and be able to do, providing strong foundations for assessment.

Beginning a new annual practice, each department was given specific feedback about its assessment report –including feedback about their goal statements - at the beginning of the following fall semester. The goal of the feedback was to let the departments know whether they were on the right track with regard to best practices, and where their efforts might be strengthened. This feedback was sent to all members of the department. The associate provost and IR director followed up with the few departments needing the most help, as well as the two departments that had not submitted goals.

At the end of spring 2012, AcadAC made recommendations regarding the College's Assessment Plan. The key recommendations were:

- Affirm the provost's request for departments to articulate their goals and objectives for student learning as the requisite first step in conducting assessment.
- Provide resource materials, training, opportunities for discussion, etc. to support faculty in conducting assessment,
- Explicitly require that departmental assessment must include *direct* assessment of student learning.
- Modify the course evaluation process in a number of substantial ways.
- Revise the format of the departmental End-of-Year Assessment reports to more directly reflect the requirements of the Assessment Plan.
- Establish a process to articulate college-wide goals for student learning.
- Review our assessment guidelines again in another five years.

The committee's report was discussed by the full faculty at a regular faculty meeting and, with the exception of the suggestions about modifying our course evaluation requirement, its recommendations were approved by the provost to take effect in 2012-2013. (The provost charged the division chairs with reviewing the course evaluation process in 2012-2013.)

In fall 2012 the provost reminded the entire faculty that each department should select one or more of their goals for student learning to assess during the year (including the use of direct assessment), and that this work should be summarized in the department's End-of-Year Assessment report. During the fall the associate provost and IR director continued their outreach to individual departments, and held a workshop to help departments think about ways to approach the assessment of their goals. From this discussion came the idea of having an "Assessment Liaison" from each department who could be a contact point for the department and would be invited to focused lunch discussions and presentations. During the spring, monthly Assessment Liaison Lunches were held, at which instructional materials were provided and briefly presented, departments shared their activities, and small- and large-group discussions took place. These meetings were generally well-attended and lively, with 15-20 participants at each.

The provost charged the 2012-13 AcadAC with drafting institution-level goals for student learning. While this is the essential step in integrating assessment across areas of the College, as per the evaluation team recommendation, we didn't feel the College would be ready to undertake this step at an institutional level until this point. We hoped that having departments first focus on their own goals would improve their understanding and practice of the process of articulating goals. Because there were a number of recurring themes from the departmental discussions, we also hoped that the articulation of College level goals would be a straightforward task.

The committee began by looking at common themes in the departmental goals for student learning that were developed the previous year. It also examined the Swarthmore College mission and requirements (from the college's Catalog in the "Objectives and Purpose" section and statements in the "Educational Program" section), reviewed notes from the Strategic Planning process, looked at examples of institutional goals for student learning at peer colleges, and considered the work of the American Association for Colleges Universities (AAC&U) in identifying goals for "Liberal Education." Finally, the committee consulted with colleagues in Physical Education and Athletics, the Dean's office, Information and Technology Services, the Lang Center, the Library, Off Campus Studies, and the Writing Center, to ensure that it was considering learning across the student experience.

A draft of institutional learning goals was shared with the full faculty at a dedicated lunch meeting in March 2013, with a faculty member of AcadAC represented at each of six roundtables. The small- and large-group discussions were guided by prepared questions. Following that discussion the committee revised the goal statements again, sharing them with colleagues in the student support areas noted above for further input. Additional feedback came from a discussion of the Committee on Faculty Procedures (COFP). Based on all of this input a final draft was prepared and submitted to the provost at the end of the semester.

A number of other important initiatives were taken during the 2012-13 academic year to improve our assessment activities.

- The associate provost and IR director began meeting with others involved in student learning (e.g. library, Lang Center, student affairs staff, etc.) to help them think about how to articulate goals for student learning, and to provide support and information in academic

assessment practices. Although our institutional-level goals statements were not yet finalized, they were sufficiently clear to allow these areas to begin integrating their ongoing assessment activities.

- The assessment webpage was further developed as common questions arose across groups. Resource materials from the Assessment Liaison workshops and other sources were placed there for all to access.
- The associate provost created a more timely and systematic process to prepare departments and programs for external and program reviews (instituting group meetings, and providing materials much further in advance, etc.).
- A second associate provost position was created, and responsibilities for assessment leadership were clarified in the position description. Concurrent with this change, a limited term position was added to the Institutional Research staff in order to help offset the loss of the IR director's time as she focused on assessment and institutional effectiveness. Our assessment infrastructure, including the need for these two positions, will be evaluated in 2016.
- The College endorsed and participated in the continuation of the Teagle assessment grant (using unspent funds as well as institutional resources), to ensure that another group of faculty members could benefit from the focused experience provided by the project, and will be knowledgeable and available to help with outreach to their colleagues.

The end-of-year-reports provided by the departments in June 2013 reflected a range of success in directly assessing student learning. Most reflected real progress in understanding the tools and use of assessment. Corroborating a finding from our experiences with the Teagle projects, the conversations resulting from working on the projects were as important and valuable as any results from departments' studies. A number of departments discovered that designing a rubric to evaluate an assignment required that faculty members discuss not only their expectations for what students should learn, but also their standards for evaluating work. Each department received feedback about their reports, including suggestions for improving their assessment work. As a result of their work, a number of departments will be adjusting their approaches to assessment, such as refining rubrics or trying a different methodology. For example the Biology department will reconfigure the quizzes that students take as part of their senior comprehensive to provide clearer evidence of learning. Examples of action that impacts student learning that have been undertaken as a result of assessment are our Sociology and Anthropology Department incorporating additional instruction on methodology through all their course offerings, including inviting faculty members to visit classes to discuss research challenges; and our Chemistry department's dedicating a session of instruction to oral presentation for juniors and seniors who will be giving talks as a part of their "Colloquium Preview Program."

In fall 2013, the provost reported to the faculty that the division chairs had rejected the changes to the course evaluation process recommended by the 2011-12 AcadAC, and the requirements set

forth in the original 2006 Academic Assessment Plan would continue. There was some confusion about these requirements, as some departments had apparently “drifted” in their interpretation. The provost’s guidance on this matter was sent to department chairs and program coordinators, and posted on the Assessment website. As before, every faculty member must conduct student course evaluations for at least one course each year. Some questions should be common to all of the department’s course or seminar evaluations, consistent with the goals that the department has set for assessment for the year. Results from these questions should be discussed with the chair.

The AcadAC was charged with continuing to review and finalize our “Draft Institutional Goals for Student Learning” in 2013-14. As a first step in this work, the provost requested input from each department and program, as well as other areas supporting student learning, indicating whether their area supported each subgoal. Our intention was to have a better understanding of which of the subgoals were being addressed in the curriculum and where, and so to better understand whether the draft accurately reflected our goals as an institution. This assignment generated a good deal of discussion about whether the draft goals ought to include our values as well as our goals. The AcadAC worked with input from the exercise, and feedback from several discussions with our Academic Assessment Liaisons (representing each department) to create a final draft for discussion with the full faculty in spring 2014. This discussion has just taken place, and the committee is now making what are likely the final changes. Appendix H presents the current draft of institutional goals for student learning. In 2014-15 the Academic Assessment Committee will be charged with planning and directing the assessment of at least one of these institutional-level goals for student learning.

As we work through these important steps, we recognize that there are other tasks that will also need to be attended to, including ensuring that departments have articulated their learning goals for non-majors, either explicitly as a department or through clear course objectives on syllabi. We will also soon want to encourage departments to consider and evaluate their other goals for effectiveness (e.g. goals for faculty scholarship, diversity initiatives, etc.). However, we consider this a second priority to assessment of student learning, and feel that it is wise for departments to continue to focus on that. Lastly, we will want to work with our interdisciplinary programs to ensure that they have articulated and are assessing their goals for student learning.

We are moving at a methodical pace that attempts to balance respect for the culture of our institution, and the needs of our students, faculty, and departments, with bringing our policies and activities more in line with effective practices in assessment of student learning. We’re proud of the progress our faculty has made, and expect that we will be able to both fully address the evaluation team’s recommendation, and report good success across the range of assessment activities in our 2019 self-study.

Academic Program Reviews

Our Assessment Plan requires that all departments undergo an external review every eight to twelve years. By the end of next year each department will have gone through at least one review since the Plan was implemented in 2006. In accordance with guidelines, departments develop a comprehensive self-study, supported by departmental information, institutional data and analysis,

and, usually, customized surveys of their alumni. A team of three evaluators from peer institutions visits and conducts their review over a three-day period. Following the visit, the department is required to prepare a written response to the reviewers' report, describing what was learned, and its plans for addressing concerns. An example of a significant improvement resulting from this process is that the review team for the Art department identified as a concern a lack of mid-level coursework in the Studio Art major. The department restructured its curriculum to build more progression into the major. However, staffing these additional courses was a challenge. The department requested an additional tenure line through our allocation process, and received an additional tenure line this year.

Interdisciplinary programs must be renewed regularly by the Curriculum Committee. Programs can be renewed for up to eight years. If there are concerns about the program, the renewal may be as short as three years. As part of the renewal process, interdisciplinary programs conduct internal reviews. Some programs are not renewed. Recently, the College discontinued its programs in German Studies (2009) and Public Policy (2013) as a result of this process.

At the same time our processes for assessment in departments and programs are evolving, we continue our other evaluative activities. Below are a few examples.

Honors

The decennial evaluation of our Honors Program was conducted in 2012. The evaluation included analyses of historical institutional data on honors participants and outcomes, as well as surveys of graduating students and faculty. The findings were generally very positive. Some analyses showed differential participation by a number of characteristics (off campus study, gender, division). A point of concern revealed in the evaluation was the public display of the level of honors achieved (honors, high honors, and highest honors). A follow-up survey was conducted in fall 2012, and the results were used by the Curriculum Committee in their deliberations on this topic. A change was made so that the level of Honors would appear on the transcript and bulletin, as always, but would no longer appear on the graduation program.

There was a drop in the number of students participating in Honors in the graduating class of 2013 (to 89, from 107 the year before). We have looked at participation rates to see if the drop is pronounced in any demographic (it is not), or any department. Because of our small size, it is difficult to discern whether there is a problem related to any departments, or indeed whether the drop is anything but random fluctuation, and so we will plan to repeat these analyses in 2014. We have also included specific questions about honors in surveys this spring of faculty and graduating seniors.

Science Associates

At the completion of our HHMI Grant for our Science Associates (SA) peer mentoring program in Biology and Mathematics and Statistics, the College submitted a report to HHMI reviewing and evaluating the project and, as noted earlier, we continue to track the retention and graduation of students who had participated in the program while the grant was active (2008-2012). The assessment found that while course grades were not affected by participation in the program,

confidence and interest in the subject areas increased. Early analyses suggested that the likelihood of enrolling in another course in the discipline was not related to participation in the SA-run study groups, later analyses for Biology has shown that the gap in the four-year graduation rate within Biology between underrepresented students and other students vanished after the implementation of the program.

Lang Center

An external review of the Lang Center for Civic and Social Responsibility was conducted from March through June 2012, with assistance from an external consultant. The researcher gathered data via interviews and focus groups from college-wide stakeholders including faculty, staff, students and administration, and subsequently shared feedback about the Center's strengths and issues for consideration. The Center developed strategies to sustain strengths and develop new initiatives.

Some additional assessment activities at the Lang Center include a 10-year retrospective assessment of the Lang Opportunity Scholarship Program by an external research team, resulting in a full report with recommendations (we plan to repeat this practice every 5 years); and a two-year inventory of community engagement across campus that was conducted in, spring 2013.

B. Assessment in the Administrative Areas - Institutional Effectiveness

Parallel to, but somewhat lagging our efforts with the academic areas, we initiated work to systematize assessment in our administrative areas – “institutional effectiveness.” The College has always engaged in special studies and evaluations covering just about every aspect of our administrative activities. The evaluation teams for our 2004 PRR and our previous two self-studies did not offer any criticism or suggestions about this. But our work in providing structure for assessment in our academic program revealed the value in having a more comprehensive approach. In 2011-2012 president's staff met with the institutional research director to discuss the comments of our Evaluation team, the expectations of Middle States, the progress in our academic areas and the Assessment website. We recognized the need to be more systematic about assessment in our administrative areas, and over the course of the next year we began the work of articulating goals within each division, and documenting the existing processes.

We are currently planning assessment workshops for administrative staff, using the Dean's area to pilot the study. Conversations with president's staff has helped us in identifying some gaps in our reviews of areas – e.g. Health services and Dining services, which have now received more attention. The biggest challenge we face is the idiosyncratic approach across divisions. There is much assessment activity going on, but we are still working to systematize and document it. A few examples are described below.

Financial

There is a range of ways to assess our effectiveness in the financial area including: endowment return and investment fee comparisons, bond rating agency reviews, internal prioritization of expenses, the reallocation of resources to the most critical areas, and the study of various peer

surveys. The Business and Investment offices have implemented a cycle to report on their goals and assessments.

Employee Benefits

The College hired a consulting group to review and offer recommendations regarding the College's employee benefits package. The goal of the review was to gain both efficiencies and cost savings. We are still reviewing some of the recommendations from that study for feasibility, but several recommendations have or are in the process of being implemented including the transition to a self-insured dental benefit model and a re-bid of the life and disability benefit policies. The College utilizes peer staffing studies to inform the allocation of staff positions.

Facilities

A presentation to the Finance Committee of the Board in 2012 highlighted our assessment of facilities, working with Sightlines, an agency that partners with colleges and universities to provide independent data and perspective, helping them make decisions about their facilities. Sightlines has compiled the industry's most extensive verified database for higher education facilities, allowing us to benchmark against peers and to validate and measure performance with respect to facilities operations and capital investment.

Swarthmore has worked with Sightlines on an annual basis since 2004. Every year, Sightlines collects and updates Swarthmore's building list, capital project expenditures, total facilities budget and expenditures, energy cost and consumption, maintenance staffing, custodial staffing, and grounds staffing. Sightlines and the Swarthmore facilities department analyze the longitudinal trends and benchmarks them to a comparable peer group. The current peers include Amherst, Bowdoin, Bryn Mawr, Carleton, Davidson, Hamilton, Pomona, Smith, Vassar, Wellesley, Wesleyan, and Williams.

A campus-wide master plan is currently being completed to help inform the implementation of the College's strategic plan and the upcoming comprehensive campaign.

Board of Managers

At the Board level, each Board committee now submits to the chair of the Board an annual plan of what it hopes to accomplish for the academic year and the tentative agendas for each meeting. Committee chairs also submit three-year agendas with topics their committee is likely to address over that period of time. Likewise, beginning in 2012, the president requests annual plans from each president's staff member. At the end of each year, an annual report of progress toward goals is required.

Section 6: Evidence of linkages between institutional planning and budgeting

A. Strategic Planning

Swarthmore College's recent strategic planning effort demonstrates the College's commitment to integrating institutional planning and financial planning, as required by Middle States Standard 2. The Board of Managers adopted *Strategic Directions for Swarthmore College* in December 2011. A key consideration of the adoption of the strategic plan was its financial feasibility. In the months leading up to its presentation to the Board, each preliminary recommendation of the four planning groups was quantified. In the summer of 2011, the Strategic Planning Steering Committee, working with president's staff, reviewed the compilation of the costs of the recommended initiatives relative to what the College could reasonably expect to raise in a comprehensive fund drive. Elimination of some recommendations and modification of others were made to keep estimated costs in balance with anticipated new resources.

At the December 2011 meeting of the Board of Managers, a "Financial Feasibility Illustration" was presented in conjunction with the draft strategic plan. It showed a scenario that included implementation of the initiatives in the strategic plan. These included higher enrollment, additional faculty and implementation of the 4-course faculty course load redefinition, and new facilities. The strategic plan initiatives were divided in categories of how they would be paid for— through the comprehensive campaign, higher enrollment, or the existing budget. The size of a comprehensive campaign necessary to accommodate the implementation of the strategic plan was estimated at \$400 million. The illustration provided reassurance to the Finance Committee and the Board of Managers that the strategic plan was realistic financially. They endorsed the strategic plan, but with provisions for ongoing assessment and adjustment. Initiatives were to be implemented in stages and on a "pay as we go" basis (i.e., as funds were available). The Board also endorsed the plan for a portion of the costs to be funded through substitutions in the existing budget. There was widespread agreement that the College did not want to add financial risk by embarking on significant initiatives in advance of receiving funding.

A more detailed implementation effort was launched in 2012 and continued into 2013. With the overall framework of the strategic plan established, efforts then focused on the detailed year-by-year planning of the implementation of the strategic plan. Projects were prioritized, and the focus turned to "Phase 1", the detailed implementation over the next five years. The outline of an integrated plan to increase enrollment and faculty was developed; its implementation will be gradual and Phase 1 captures the first five years. This phase also includes several facilities and capital needs: Town Center West; Matchbox fitness/wellness/theater building; expansion of residence hall space; the biology, engineering, and psychology project; and possible renovation of Clothier Hall to improve student and dining space. The quiet phase of the comprehensive campaign is underway, and some significant commitments have been received. The phased implementation of the strategic plan is an important component of the College's commitment to financial sustainability. The plan has "pauses" after each phase to allow adjustment in the event financial circumstances are not favorable and to allow assessment of progress and re-examination of priorities.

The progress of the comprehensive campaign and the implementation of the strategic plan has been tempered by recognition of a changed economic climate. As family incomes stagnate, there is growing attention to the value proposition of higher education, particularly for high-priced institutions. In spring 2013, the Board of Managers convened a retreat of Board members from several key committees to discuss how this changed environment should factor into key financial and budget decisions to ensure continued financial sustainability. This was the first retreat of this kind in recent years. Board members representing the Finance, Audit and Risk Management, Investment, Development, Property, and Admissions and Financial Aid Committees met to discuss each committee's perspective, review financial scenarios, and integrate those discussions across committees. The retreat resulted in the adoption of a baseline financial scenario for the future and a plan for the Finance Committee to devote increased time in its annual cycle for discussion of long-term financial scenarios and contingency planning. There was also agreement on the value of periodic retreats in the future. This retreat exemplified the integration of strategic planning with financial planning. It also established a process to assess the implementation of the strategic plan and make necessary adjustments in the future. It also recognized the value of working across committees on these important issues.

B. Annual Planning, Budgeting and Assessment

The strategic plan provides the structure within which the College's annual budgeting process takes place. The Finance Committee of the Board is responsible for the annual operating and capital budgets. Their annual cycle of their meetings shows how the budget process links to general institutional planning.

September: The Finance Committee reviews the results of the prior fiscal year.

December: The Committee focuses on longer-term strategic financial issues. It reviews updated long-term financial projections prepared in conjunction with the strategic plan. It looks at various scenarios to evaluate financial sustainability. The Committee provides guidance on parameters for the detailed budget for the following year.

February: The Committee recommends the operating and capital budgets for the following year to the Board.

May: This meeting is devoted to consideration of significant strategic issues.

The on-campus budget process supports the Board process and takes place within the guidance established by the Finance Committee. It involves the wider campus community. The first step in the process is the update in the fall of the financial and enrollment projections. Trend data and projections are offered by the Budget Office, Financial Aid Office, Investment Office, and Institutional Research Office, and others, and include an enrollment projection and a financial projection, a five-year facilities capital budget, and a five-year technology capital budget. The College Budget Committee, which includes faculty, staff, and student members, begins their work each fall by reviewing this information. Key contributors to the data used in the projections meet with the committee to review the data, discuss assumptions and implications, and answer questions.

Once the projection is approved in December, it becomes the basis on which the detailed budget for the following year and the capital budgets are prepared. A key component of the annual budget process is a list of needs and new projects, currently unfunded that have been requested or are anticipated. Departmental budgets are generally held constant each year, so that requests for additional funding must be made separately. Rather than simply fund or reject requests as they come in, a list of requests throughout the year is maintained for consideration during the budget cycle. At this time they are reviewed and prioritized relative to other needs within the budget. This process allows for the full range of options to be considered together during the budgeting process and ensures that resource allocation is accomplished in a way that best reflects the mission of the College.

After preparation on campus, the capital budgets are considered by the Property Committee of the Board. Then, they and the operating budget are considered by the Finance Committee and the Board of Managers at their February meetings. The assumptions on which the budget is based, including enrollments, endowment spending, compensation targets, student charges, and inflation estimates, are shared widely with the campus community, both on the web site of the Finance and Investment Offices and in the President's various presentations to the faculty, staff, and students each spring.

C. Other Institutional and Financial Planning Linkages

The College would also like to highlight some other projects that have strengthened the institutional and financial planning linkages.

The College has implemented another recommendation of the *Strategic Directions* report that also shows the integration of institutional and financial planning. A new Board Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid was established in 2012. This committee will be responsible for the assessment of the College's admissions and financial aid policies relative to institutional goals and will ensure the financial sustainability of these policies.

As a result of the planning process, the College engaged in a campus master planning effort. Through open forums, focused conversations, presentations, surveys, websites, and updates at meetings and other gatherings, the two-year process was highly inclusive and culminated in a final plan and report presented to the Board in December 2013. This master plan will inform the various facilities initiatives in the strategic plan and ensure their optimal alignment with the College's mission. The master plan also helped provide a structure in which the financial implications of the projects could be addressed.

As mentioned in Section 5, in 2012 the College engaged the firm *Sightlines* to evaluate the effectiveness of a variety of functions in the facilities area. One component of this project was an evaluation of the funding for deferred maintenance. This included analysis of the College's trend in funding over time as well as comparisons with peers. Not surprisingly, the analysis showed that deferred maintenance accumulated during the years in which funding was reduced because of the downturn. However, the analysis then incorporated future funding both from the restored budget

funding as well as the impact of the new campaign-funded renovation projects. When both are considered in the financial projection, capital funding approaches acceptable levels. The College would like to increase capital project funding, if possible. This will depend on endowment returns and other cost pressures.

In late 2012 the College engaged the Yuba consulting group to review the College's debt policies and debt strategy. It outlined the role of debt in the College's capital structure and risk/reward trade-offs related to the amount and structure of debt. The Finance Committee of the Board, as a result, incorporated an annual review of debt policy into its calendar. Financing decisions are an important component of the implementation of the strategic plan. Whereas the College is committed to the "pay as we go" philosophy, there are times when financing may be an attractive alternative or may provide short-term bridge financing.

Appendix A - Middle States Periodic Review Report Steering Committee Members

Jessica Duah Adomako, '13

Diane Anderson
Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
and Associate Professor of Education

Christine Costello
Associate Dean of Admissions

Catherine Crouch
Associate Professor of Physics &
Astronomy and Natural Sciences and
Engineering Division Chair

Dawei (David) Ding, '16

Maurice Eldridge
Vice President for
College and Community Relations
and Executive Assistant to the President

Richard Eldridge
Professor of Philosophy
and Interdisciplinary Programs Chair

Stephen Golub
Professor of Economics
and Social Sciences Division Chair

Jennifer Magee
Associate Director for Student Programs and
Training
Lang Center for Civic and Social
Responsibility

Grace Ledbetter
Associate Professor of Classics and
Philosophy

Eileen Petula
Assistant Vice President and Controller

Patricia Reilly (Co-Chair)*
Associate Provost
and Associate Professor of Art History

Robin Huntington Shores (Co-Chair)
Director of Institutional Research

Robert Weinberg
Professor and Acting Chair of History

Thomas Whitman
Associate Professor of Music
and Humanities Division Chair

** In summer 2013 Richard Wicentowski undertook the continuing work on the Periodic Review Report in place of Patricia Reilly.*

Appendix B - Institute for the Liberal Arts

2012-2013 Activities

Against the Grain: Liberal Arts in the 21st Century -Reflections from Swarthmore College President Rebecca Chopp.

The Future of the Liberal Arts, Two Panel Discussions - Twelve Swarthmore College faculty shared their thoughts on the value of the Liberal Arts and the future of the tradition Swarthmore proudly upholds.

The Humanistic Condition, a talk by Louis Menand - Reflections on the present, recent history, and possible futures of the humanities disciplines.

Second Tuesday Science Café - Organized for all faculty and staff, these presentations are geared for individuals who have no formal science background.

Symposia - organized around Jonathan Haidt's *The Righteous Mind*

A **reading group** - focused on Daniel Kahneman's *Thinking, Fast and Slow*

"**Visualizing Media Futures**" conference.

2013-2014 Activities

Now You See It: Why the Future of Higher Education Demands a Paradigm Shift, a talk by Cathy Davidson - An exploration of how technology and brain science will transform schools and business for the 21st century.

Conversations with Robert George '77 and Cornel West - Seminar-style sessions with students and a special campus-wide collection offered by Princeton professors George and West on what it means for intellectuals to learn from each other despite deep differences of opinion.

Critical Examinations of Community - A four-part discussion series designed to highlight diverse understandings and experiences of the concept of community.

Faculty Retreat - A first-ever event of its kind, the retreat reflected upon how we have handled change at the College over the years, what resources we have as a community to deal with change, as well as anticipated changes in knowledge, student experience, and teaching practices.

Faculty Seminar on Poverty and Inequality - An interdisciplinary faculty seminar on poverty and inequality which provided faculty a space where ideas, questions and analysis about a topic could be explored, tested, challenged and refined.

The Future of the Liberal Arts: A Symposium Celebrating the Sesquicentennial of Swarthmore College - An exploration of the future of liberal arts education in a rapidly changing world and also the role of liberal arts colleges in shaping better citizens and fostering democratic participation. Featuring Swarthmore alumni who are leaders in the liberal arts.

Second Tuesday Science Café - Organized for all faculty and staff, these events are geared for individuals who have no formal science background.

Toni Morrison Reading Group - A faculty-staff reading and discussion group focusing on the works of Toni Morrison in preparation for her campus visit and lecture.

Appendix C - Diversity and Inclusion Implementation Update

Diversity and Inclusion Implementation Update

Institutional

- **Diversity & Inclusion Report**— Seeking and incorporating feedback is ongoing.
 - **Deans Braun & Rodriguez**
- **Diversifying the Faculty**
 - Ad-Hoc Committee: researching and setting best-practices for the recruitment of a diverse faculty body.
 - **Associate Provost, Professor Patricia Reilly**
 - **Assistant Vice President, Sharmaine LaMar**
- **Diversifying the Staff**
 - Ad-Hoc Committee: researching and setting best-practices for the recruitment of a diverse staff.
 - **Human Resources**
- **Faculty and Staff Development**
 - Fall 2013 Workshops included:
 - In Search of Emotional Intelligence- Change for the Better!
 - Our Diverse Learning Community- How Identity Influences Communication
 - More workshops offered this Spring.
 - **Human Resources**
- **Climate Study 2014-15 Timeline**
 - Presented concept to BOM, Faculty, and Staff; Currently vetting proposals.
 - Spring 2014; select campus committee.
 - Summer 2014: Begin interviews and focus groups.
 - Fall 2014; groups continue, survey instrument created.
 - Spring 2015; campus surveyed, results presented.
 - **Dean Rodriguez**

Curricular

- **Faculty Retreat**
 - Faculty gathered in September to discuss interdisciplinary collaborations, increasing experiential educational opportunities, and diversifying pedagogical practices.
 - **Associate Provost, Professor Patricia Reilly**
- **Ad-Hoc Committee: Bridge Program**— Faculty are assessing needs, determining best program design, and considering addition of a summer-bridge program. Committee recently petitioned to become a standing assignment.
 - **Professor Allison Dorsey**
- **Curriculum Committee** deals with immediate questions of the existing curriculum and is currently charged with exploring forms of diversity requirements. **You have 3 student reps on this committee—use them!**
 - **Provost Tom Stephenson**
- **New Academic Success Workshops**
 - Workshops include:
 - Getting Organized; Reading Strategically; Participating Effectively In Class; Perfectionism; Anti-Procrastination.
 - **Dean Derrickson & Ms. Hempling**
- **Understanding the Academic Experience of Students**
 - Using institutional data and informal focus groups to explore inequities in academic experiences.
 - **Deans Rodriguez and Derrickson**
- **Faculty Seminar: Poverty & Inequality**
 - A space where ideas, questions, and analysis about a topic can be explored, tested, challenged, and refined. Ten participants.
 - **Institute for Liberal Arts**

Co-Curricular

- **Committee on Educational Policy** is concerned with long-range, broad matters of curriculum, curricular change, and introduction of new programs. **You have 3 student reps on this committee—use them!**
 - **Provost Tom Stephenson**
- **Defining Community Series**
 - A yearlong series of panels and events on the theme of “community.”
 - **Institute for Liberal Arts**
- **Security and Safety**
 - Using Card Swipes at Parties and Emergency Phone App.
 - **Dir. of Public Safety Mike Hill**
- **First in Family Series**
 - A yearlong series of lunch-time conversations supporting first generation students.
 - **Dean Henry**
- **INITIATIVES IN PROGRESS**
 - Introducing Inter-group Dialogue (IGD™) curriculum to Faculty and Staff (March 2014)
 - Bias Incident Reporting Protocols Committee has been established.
 - Review and Re-envisioning of Orientation Experience.
 - Review and Re-envisioning of Residential Life Experience.
 - Spring 2014: “Craft of Cooperation” workshops for student leaders by **Center for Innovation and Leadership**
 - Fall 2014:
 - Conflict Mediation
 - Bystander Intervention
 - Facilitation Skills
 - Re-institute Tri-Co Social Justice Winter Workshops for faculty, staff, and students (2015)

Appendix D - Financial Projection

SWARTHMORE COLLEGE FINANCIAL PROJECTION (as of Fall 2013)	Approved		Projected		2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
	2013-14	2014-15	2014-15	2014-15								
SUMMARY OF OPERATING BUDGET (\$ in thousands)												
Revenues												
Gross Student Charges	\$86,414	\$89,628	\$89,628	\$89,628	\$94,721	\$100,876	\$107,042	\$112,784	\$118,082	\$122,874	\$127,059	\$131,365
Less: Scholarships	(\$30,015)	(\$31,613)	(\$31,613)	(\$33,467)	(\$33,467)	(\$38,067)	(\$41,377)	(\$43,905)	(\$45,764)	(\$47,438)	(\$48,822)	(\$50,239)
Net Revenues from Students	\$56,399	\$58,015	\$58,015	\$56,154	\$61,254	\$62,808	\$65,665	\$68,879	\$72,319	\$75,435	\$78,237	\$81,126
Endowment Distribution	\$58,694	\$61,682	\$61,682	\$63,414	\$67,241	\$67,241	\$70,102	\$73,627	\$74,516	\$76,282	\$74,701	\$76,484
Gifts in Support of the Budget	\$8,494	\$8,662	\$8,662	\$8,942	\$9,232	\$9,232	\$9,531	\$9,841	\$10,162	\$10,493	\$10,836	\$11,191
Other Revenues	\$4,380	\$3,322	\$3,322	\$3,392	\$3,465	\$3,465	\$3,541	\$3,619	\$3,699	\$3,782	\$3,867	\$3,955
Total Revenues	\$127,967	\$131,681	\$131,681	\$137,001	\$142,747	\$148,839	\$155,966	\$160,695	\$165,993	\$167,642	\$172,757	
Expenses												
Faculty Salaries	\$24,531	\$25,428	\$25,428	\$26,685	\$27,995	\$29,359	\$30,780	\$32,260	\$33,801	\$35,401	\$37,051	\$38,860
Staff Salaries	\$31,536	\$32,574	\$32,574	\$33,848	\$35,169	\$36,539	\$37,959	\$39,432	\$40,959	\$42,537	\$44,167	\$45,843
Benefits	\$20,472	\$21,496	\$21,496	\$22,752	\$24,074	\$25,464	\$26,926	\$28,463	\$29,999	\$31,627	\$33,256	\$34,988
Total Compensation	\$76,539	\$79,498	\$79,498	\$83,286	\$87,238	\$91,362	\$95,666	\$100,155	\$104,839	\$109,641	\$114,441	\$119,291
Departmental Expenses	\$24,649	\$25,047	\$25,047	\$25,929	\$27,090	\$28,407	\$29,854	\$31,354	\$32,908	\$34,517	\$36,184	\$37,919
Utilities	\$2,879	\$2,928	\$2,928	\$3,016	\$3,106	\$3,199	\$3,295	\$3,394	\$3,496	\$3,601	\$3,709	\$3,819
Debt Service	\$13,989	\$15,144	\$15,144	\$15,149	\$15,153	\$15,152	\$16,519	\$16,519	\$15,123	\$15,135	\$11,808	\$11,814
Contingency	\$119	\$121	\$121	\$125	\$128	\$132	\$136	\$140	\$145	\$149	\$153	\$157
Other Adjustments	\$310	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Available for Strategic Planning Initiatives	\$392	\$43	\$43	\$274	\$987	\$1,750	\$2,081	\$2,081	\$1,711	\$492	\$1,245	\$1,282
Capital Allocation	\$9,365	\$8,702	\$8,702	\$8,883	\$8,891	\$9,066	\$9,238	\$9,411	\$9,584	\$9,757	\$9,930	\$10,103
Total Expenses	\$128,242	\$131,483	\$131,483	\$136,661	\$142,594	\$149,069	\$156,389	\$163,711	\$171,033	\$178,355	\$185,677	\$193,000
Unallocated Budget Funds (Overage)	(\$275)	\$198	\$198	\$340	\$152	(\$230)	(\$423)	\$152	(\$160)	\$582	(\$191)	(\$191)

Appendix E - Strategic Directions Phase 1: Timeline

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS TIMELINE

	13/14	14/15	15/16	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21
Increased Enrollment (cumulative)	+10	+30	+60	+100	+140	+170	+190	+200
Additional Faculty (cumulative)	-4	-4	-8	-12	-16	-20	-24	-28
Financing								
None	Complete (Winter 2014)							
None	Matchbox (Fitness / Wellness Center) Start.....Complete (Winter 2014) (Fall 2014)							
2011	Town Center West Start.....Complete (Summer 2014) (Spring 2016)							
2013	Residential Space Dana/Hallowell-75 beds Start.....Complete (Summer 2014) (Fall 2015)							
2016	Science Center II Start.....Complete (Spring 2016) (Spring 2018)							
2016	Clothier Renovation Start.....Complete (Spring 2016) (Winter 2017)							
<i>Phase for Assessment</i>								
2016	Additional 100 beds Start.....Complete (Summer 2016) (Summer 2017)							

Note: Start indicates beginning of construction

Appendix F – Strategic Directions: Enrollment, Faculty, and Course Load Projections

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS: PHASE 1 ENROLLMENT AND FACULTY

	First Year	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Cumulative students added	Students/8	New faculty in place	Cumulative faculty added	Average teaching load target
2012/13									5
2013/14	10	0	0	0	10	1.25			4.75
2014/15	20	10	0	0	30	3.75	4	4	4.75
2015/16	30	20	10	0	60	7.5	4	8	4.75
2016/17	40	30	20	10	100	12.5	4	12	4.5
2017/18	50	40	30	20	140	17.5	4	16	4.5
2018/19	50	50	40	30	170	21.25	4	20	4.25
2019/20	50	50	50	40	190	23.75	4	24	4.25
2020/21	50	50	50	50	200	25	4	28	4

Appendix G - Historic Enrollment Information

Fall	<u>On Campus</u>			<u>Study Abroad</u>	<u>Total</u>		
	<u>Regular</u>	<u>Non-Degree</u>		<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>				
1995	1352	0	3	62	1352	3	1417
1996	1437	0	4	41	1437	4	1482
1997	1369	1	6	62	1370	6	1438
1998	1376	2	9	65	1378	9	1452
1999	1382	13	6	66	1395	6	1467
2000	1346	4	5	73	1350	5	1428
2001	1354	7	12	94	1361	12	1467
2002	1372	2	5	100	1374	5	1479
2003	1416	10	13	61	1426	13	1500
2004	1377	7	8	82	1384	8	1474
2005	1385	11	7	76	1396	7	1479
2006	1364	5	7	108	1369	7	1484
2007	1400	5	6	80	1405	6	1491
2008	1395	1	12	82	1396	12	1490
2009	1422	5	15	83	1427	15	1525
2010	1419	1	14	90	1420	14	1524
2011	1440	0	9	96	1440	9	1545
2012	1455	5	15	77	1460	15	1552
2013	1436	2	8	88	1438	8	1534

Appendix H - DRAFT Institutional Goals for Student Learning

(3/26/14)

Swarthmore College seeks to help its students realize their full intellectual and personal potentials, combined with a deep sense of ethical and social concern. Swarthmore students will be prepared to lead full, balanced, thoughtful lives as individuals and as responsible citizens through exacting intellectual study, supplemented by civic engagement, a varied program of athletics, and other extracurricular activities. Through close mentorship with faculty and staff, and in community with peers, each student can flourish in a variety of areas. One of the central features of a liberal education is for faculty, staff, and students to discuss and revisit the aims and purposes of education itself. Therefore our goals will continue to evolve.

Our institutional goals include four main categories:

- Breadth of Knowledge and Skills
- Depth of Knowledge and Skills
- Ethical Intelligence
- Personal Development and Community Interaction

Breadth of Knowledge and Skills

Students will develop the analytic and expressive skills required to engage in a broad range of intellectual pursuits, and to foster a critical stance toward learning and knowing. They will develop this critical view through understanding the cultural inheritances of the past, the global societies of the present and future, and work in multiple disciplines. Their participation in a liberal education will require and strengthen sustained and deep attentiveness, disciplined and passionate curiosity, imaginativeness and creativity. Skills students will develop include the ability to create and synthesize knowledge; logical argumentation; problem solving; global competence through foreign languages and cultural perspectives; cross-disciplinary thinking; and ethical scholarly practice.

Depth of Knowledge and Skills

Students will demonstrate a depth of knowledge and mastery of skills through the core methodologies and competencies of the majors and minors they undertake. In each field they choose to explore, they will prove themselves adept at both specific and systemic levels. The culminating goal in each case is the intellectual capacity for individual research or production. While disciplines have distinct curricula, there are substantial similarities in the knowledge and skills gained by their students; thus, each student will realize such competencies as close reading and interpretation; quantitative analysis; qualitative analysis; visual and spatial analysis; computational methods; scientific thinking; cogent writing; effective speaking and presentation; digital literacy and technological

sophistication; understanding based in an analysis of multiple perspectives; experimentation; research; artistic production; and performance.

Ethical Intelligence

In connection with its roots in the Society of Friends, the College emphasizes social responsibility and active engagement with both the immediate and wider communities. This engagement requires cultivating an awareness of one's own and others' values and perspectives as well as an understanding of the forces that have shaped them. Through this practice, students will develop such qualities as personal responsibility; interpersonal understanding; intellectual rigor; concern for social justice for our local and global communities; and stewardship of the environment.

Personal Development and Community Interaction

Living in a residential liberal arts college and participating in academic and extra-curricular activities with others from diverse backgrounds promotes personal growth, meaningful relationships and community development. The academic realm features small classes with an emphasis on discussions and group projects. Outside of the academic program, students will have opportunities to participate and take leadership roles in a wide variety of activities including athletics, student government, social action, culture, and recreation. This emphasis on participation and interaction with others is intended to promote understanding of differences; settling conflicts constructively and through non-violent means; resilience, self-reliance, and agency; initiative, innovativeness and entrepreneurship; leadership skills and teamwork; and a balance of pride and humility in accomplishment.