

## **Curricular Renewal At Bryn Mawr College: Introduction**

### ***The Origin, Charge, and Composition of the Curricular Renewal Work Group***

In spring semester 2008, the Task Force on Balancing Mission and Resources, chaired by President Nancy Vickers and including members from the Board of Trustees, the senior administration, and the faculty members of the Committee On Academic Priorities (CAP), identified the need for a comprehensive curricular review for the undergraduate college. Though individual aspects of the curriculum had changed in the meantime, a curricular review of this scope had not taken place since 1981. This review was motivated in part by the College's interest in "right sizing" its programs to the College's resources, as well as ensuring that the course of our growth and contraction matched the primary mission and goals of the College. In addition, the Faculty's Curriculum Committee was reexamining its charge with the idea of broadening its vision to include the entire curriculum (in addition to reacting to "local level" requests for course additions or changes to major requirements). As such, CAP and the Curriculum Committee, in consultation with Provost Kim Cassidy, jointly established a Curricular Renewal Working Group (CRWG) to undertake a review of the entire curriculum. The membership of CRWG was chosen to reflect the different parts of the curriculum as well as a range of years spent at the College. The CRWG consisted of two undergraduate students; two administrators (Provost Cassidy and Karen Tidmarsh, dean of the undergraduate college); eight faculty, one from each of the six following curricular groups: natural sciences (Tamara Davis), social sciences (Michael Rock), humanities (Radcliffe Edmonds), foreign languages (Rosi Song), arts (Linda Caruso-Haviland), and social work (Cynthia Bisman), plus two members from the sponsoring faculty committees, Ignacio Gallup-Diaz from Curriculum and Stephen Salkever from CAP. Gallup-Diaz and Salkever served as co-chairs of CRWG for 2008-09, with Edmonds replacing Gallup-Diaz as co-chair during 2009-10 when the latter was on sabbatical.

### ***The Process of Curricular Renewal***

The CRWG began its work in summer of 2008 and operated on two levels: one concerned with general questions about liberal arts education, the other concerned with particular curricular revisions. At the general level, the committee considered questions about the educational goals of a liberal arts college for women in the next 15 years. (For example, "What should they be?" "Are they viable in today's world?") To address these questions, the CRWG conducted several community conversations on this topic (a Trustee meeting in fall 2007 and 2008, a faculty forum in December 2008, an email query to Faculty in February 2008, and a meeting of Senior Administrative Staff in Fall 2008). The group also read extensively on the goals of liberal education and on recent debates about the viability of the small liberal arts college model. Guided by these broader discussions, the CRWG considered a number of particular curricular revisions, including: globalization of the curriculum, general education requirements, teaching of foreign languages, the teaching of writing, quantitative literacy, etc. Each topic was discussed at length, so that each could be related to the larger goals of the curriculum and the College as a whole. Once the framework for the specific topic was set, the CRWG commissioned a sub-working group on that particular topic. The sub-group comprised a few members of the CRWG and a large number of area experts (faculty and sometimes staff) who were brought together to develop particular curricular recommendations. For example, the sub-working group to review the teaching of foreign languages included two members of the CRWG and a faculty member from each of our language departments.

At several points during the sub-working group's work, the group brought a draft of curricular changes to the entire Faculty for input and discussion (this occurred during regular faculty meetings or in special faculty forums). Once the sub-working group worked out the curricular recommendations, they were fed back to the full CRWG. The CRWG revised them to fit with the larger institutional goals and then sent them through the typical governance structures for further discussion and adoption. Recommendations relevant to curricular change were sent to the Curriculum Committee and those relevant to resources were sent to CAP. In this way, the CRWG aimed to bring as many faculty as possible into the renewal process, to make effective use of existing faculty expertise and interest, and to use the normal committee structure for enacting change. Curricular changes were developed in an incremental, evolutionary fashion. Proposals for change were not presented all at once, as in the previous effort at basic curricular change, but were presented over the two-year period in the form of discrete, implemented curricular innovations within the broader, mission-directed effort.

### ***The Framework of Curricular Renewal : Basic Educational Goals***

An early outcome of the CRWG's work was the translation of the College's mission statement into the following set of goals for a Bryn Mawr education in the next 15 years. Goals of a Bryn Mawr Education:

1. Promote a life of intense intellectual engagement, including the recognition, in theory and in practice, that we need to be acquainted with a variety of approaches to inquiry for understanding the world and our place in it.
2. Promote the ability to think critically, that is, to reflect on the presuppositions and implications of our own arguments and commitments and those of others.
3. Increase students' skills in areas that are fundamentally important to their ability to take advantage of a Bryn Mawr education and to make the best use of their knowledge in their life beyond. In particular, we want to train women who can communicate effectively and are quantitatively literate.
4. Enhance students' breadth of knowledge and their life-long capacity to learn new things on their own.
5. Give students the opportunity to acquire a certain depth of disciplinary knowledge in at least one particular area of contemporary scholarship in the arts and sciences.
6. Prepare students to be active citizens in an increasingly global context, one in which the opportunities to overcome geographical and cultural boundaries are greater than at any other time in history.
7. Educate women who are prepared to transform and improve human life in their own communities and throughout the world.

These goals were formulated through conversations with Trustees, Staff, Students and Faculty and have evolved as the CRWG and its sub-working groups have conducted their work. While these goals are drawn from our sense of the purposes already implicit in the practice of liberal education at Bryn Mawr, we note that they align very closely with the "Essential Learning Outcomes" identified by the Association of American College and Universities initiative, "Liberal Education and America's Promise". They also align nicely with AAC&U's research on what skills employers value in their new hires.

## The Content of Curricular Renewal

The Curricular Renewal Work Group has set in motion a number of initiatives that are in the process of transforming the curriculum at the college. Some of these have taken the form of changes to the curricular rules of the faculty, while others are pilot programs testing out new ideas for curricular and co-curricular changes. The CRWG recommended changes in the Distributional Requirements, the Language Requirement, and the Quantitative Requirement to the Committee on the Undergraduate Curriculum, and the Curriculum Committee brought proposals that were then approved by the whole faculty. The CRWG also recommended the formation of pilot programs for a new model of Writing Intensive Courses and a new model of advising for undergraduate students, and it encouraged the formation of a group to explore interdisciplinary teaching, which has resulted in the Kaleidoscope pilot program. The CRWG also formed subgroups to consider ways, both curricular and co-curricular, to encourage global education and leadership at Bryn Mawr. All of these initiatives were undertaken as practical steps towards the ideals articulated as the goals for the Bryn Mawr liberal arts education.

### ***Language Requirement:***

The language departments play a critical role in the College's goal to prepare global citizens through both the teaching of language and their upper-level offerings in literature, theory and culture. Bryn Mawr has had a long history of distinguished accomplishment in the teaching of languages, literature and culture, and it has, which includes a detailed statement of these goals. traditionally been a focus of the College via a substantial language requirement. Bryn Mawr offers more languages than most colleges of its size, a strength we emphasize. Furthermore, curricula in our language departments are dynamic and innovative, incorporating areas at the forefront of emerging trends in the field—areas such as Francophone studies, cultural studies, interdisciplinary connections, and film studies. Each language we teach thus provides a unique opportunity for that department to contribute to the broader aims of liberal education at the College. Our continued focus on the languages represents an important step toward making Bryn Mawr a leader in global education. Nationally, 75% of entering freshmen expect to major in something that has an international component. Our breadth in the languages, combined with our renewed commitment to making the languages a central contributor to the education of our students as global citizens, could make Bryn Mawr relatively unique for a college of its size. One problem with the current requirement (in which students are required to take one language through the intermediate level or show equivalent proficiency through a placement test) is that, because students can place out of it, 15 – 20% of our national students do not experience another culture via language while at Bryn Mawr. While students who are educated and live in the US may be proficient in a language other than English, it is unlikely that their US secondary school experience provided the rich cultural education that is an integral part of Bryn Mawr's pedagogical approach to language and literature. So in this sense, the current requirement does not meet our goal of increasing cultural understanding. At the same time, requiring students to take languages through the intermediate level forces many students into the language that they began in high school (since they are anxious to meet the requirement quickly). We want to encourage students to be more thoughtful in their selection of language study and perhaps try languages that were not available to them in high school and that fit with their plan of study. In addition, particularly in the hard to learn languages, the current requirement to continue through the intermediate level often does not meet the goal of proficiency.

Given this analysis, the CRWG recommended to the Curriculum Committee that we change the nature of the language requirement from a language proficiency requirement to a cultural competency requirement. The recommendation was refined by the Curriculum Committee and brought to the faculty for a vote in fall 2009 (see appendix). The new requirement will be in effect for the Class of 2015. The new requirement stipulates that all students will take one-year of a foreign language-based course, no matter what their level of language competence. In keeping with new recommendations by the Modern Language Association and consistent with the way we already teach languages, all language classes, even those at the beginning level, will approach the teaching of language from a cultural perspective as well as a “skills perspective”.

Importantly, in the new model, students cannot place out of the requirement. Students who come to Bryn Mawr with language proficiency must either place up (and take literature or culture courses within the language departments) or begin a new language at the elementary level. According to the Registrar’s data, this will put an additional 30 students (or 60 course enrollments) into language courses. The new model would thus deepen our language requirement by reaching a new group of students and giving them the global perspective one can get only by looking at the world (literature, film, manuscripts, material culture) through another language. While reducing the language requirement to one year of study may seem to weaken our goal of language proficiency, we will accompany this change with other innovations that further strengthen our teaching of language. In reducing our requirement to one-year, we do not suggest that one-year of language instruction makes students proficient in the language. Because language proficiency is such an important part of becoming a global citizen, we will continue to encourage beginning language students to study languages to an advanced level. Surveys of current students suggest that most of them will, in fact, continue their language study without a formal requirement to do so.

The CRWG also recommended several ways to further accelerate language learning during or after the academic year. The CRWG does not recommend a “one size fits all” option for all languages. Instead, it suggests that each department determine which of these program recommendations make sense for them to develop. Some possibilities are:

- Study abroad for one semester in the sophomore year as a way to develop language proficiency so that students will be ready for more advanced study when they return. This option would enhance participation in advanced electives in the junior and senior years.
- Offer summer language institutes (intensive programs) at Bryn Mawr modeled on, or in conjunction with, our highly successful Russian Summer Language Institute.
- Consider ways of modifying where students can enter the language teaching sequence and how different sections are paced.
- Offer intensive language study during non-traditional terms (May term, January term, August term).
- Offer some courses with a Praxis component providing students the opportunity to use new languages in a community setting as they work with their community partner.

Given the role that languages play in creating global understanding, the CRWG recommended establishing even deeper connections between the languages and other disciplines (e.g., a History major might take courses in German literature and culture). This recommendation is consistent with the MLA recommendation that the languages create synergies across the liberal arts curriculum. In addition, the CRWG recommended that the College require students to better integrate the study of languages into their overall plan for education at the College. The language departments are currently considering all of these recommendations. We will assess these changes to the language requirement in a number of ways. First, we will track changes in the number of majors in the

language departments, as well as enrollments in the upper-level courses. We will continue to monitor students' performance on proficiency exams at the end of the language learning sequence. We will also use data from the senior exit interviews to see if student satisfaction with the study of languages has changed. In fact, we could include a target question regarding this issue as part of the interview protocol.

### ***Quantitative and Mathematical Reasoning Requirement:***

Bryn Mawr prides itself on its success in graduating a high percentage of women who major in math and who go on to quantitatively demanding careers. Yet, at many of our faculty curricular discussions, faculty members who teach courses that require quantitative skills or quantitative literacy expressed frustration at how unprepared some students are for their classes. These faculty members are forced to either push on (knowing that some students will be left behind, or even fail) or spend an inordinate amount of time teaching quantitative literacy skills, thus losing the rigor of courses for our better-prepared students. The concern that some proportion of our students struggle with quantitative literacy is supported by data from both the COFHE Senior Survey and the NSSE 2008 data and by the Deans, who report that many students get into academic trouble because they lack the quantitative skills their coursework requires. Ensuring basic quantitative literacy would better prepare all students to take advantage of other academic offerings at the College, particularly in areas such as economics, psychology, sociology, chemistry, physics, biology and geology. In addition, educating students for civic responsibility necessitates a certain amount of quantitative facility that not all of our students appear to be getting.

The CRWG considered how best to support and develop students who enter the College with poor quantitative literacy skills, looking for effective ways to identify these students early on in their careers and to provide them with the education that they need via coursework and other forms of enrichment. Students should be able to avail themselves of all avenues in the curriculum and to emerge from the College ready to be informed participants in a society that increasingly relies on quantitative information. While the idea of a quantitative literacy requirement is appealing to many faculty members, it is important to develop a program that is of the highest quality, that fits Bryn Mawr's needs, and has sufficient resources. The Quantitative subgroup and the Curriculum Committee engaged in many conversations throughout the 2009- 10 academic year with a variety of concerned faculty to develop the proposal for the program. Under the plan proposed by the Curriculum Committee and adopted by the faculty in spring 2010 (see appendix), we would have two components to the quantitative requirement, a basic quantitative literacy piece and an advanced work component in either mathematical reasoning or quantitative analysis. One advantage of the new requirement is that the advanced work component (the Q course) could be even more rigorous than the current Q courses, since there would be no need for the remedial quantitative literacy work. The CRWG recommends that the Curriculum Committee form a working group that can continue the work of the Q subgroup in developing the most appropriate diagnostic instrument for entering students, in developing the quantitative literacy course (QSEM?) that would best address problems of the students who need it, and in setting the standards for the new Q courses.

### ***Writing Program:***

Goal 3 states that Bryn Mawr graduates should be strong and effective communicators, both in oral presentation and in writing. In meetings of the Board of Trustees and of the President's Advisory Council, alumnae talked about the important role the College played in helping them

develop this skill and how important it had been to them in their current successful positions. Faculty in most departments identified communication as an important educational goal at our faculty retreats, but also expressed concern that we were not meeting this goal (as did some students who presented their concerns at a faculty meeting). Results of the COFHE senior survey data suggest that Bryn Mawr seniors on average feel that their writing has grown stronger over their time at the College. In fact, Bryn Mawr's average score for this item was comparable to women at COFHE women's colleges and higher than the average woman's rating at the COFHE co-ed colleges. While this data is encouraging, our faculty evaluation of this area and some qualitative and anecdotal feedback from alumnae and potential employers made us want to revise the curriculum to do even better. Given the importance of this goal and the opinion that we could do better, we sought to improve this area of the curriculum, and most of our attention focused on the three levels of the writing curriculum: the freshman writing seminars, the senior capstone experience, and the courses in between these end points that also concentrate on writing (see appendix).

### *Freshman Writing Seminars:*

The College requires that all first semester students take a College Seminar. The purpose of these seminars is to teach students critical thinking about broad intellectual questions within and/or across disciplines through close reading and interpretation of substantial written, visual and material texts, as well as to provide instruction and practice in writing as a flexible tool of inquiry and interpretation. In spring 2008, an external committee composed of directors of writing programs reviewed the College Seminar Program. The review produced several recommendations relevant to curricular change. The team concluded that the College Seminar program was very strong overall, but that it would benefit from some revision and renewal. Specifically, the visiting committee recommended that the College:

- more clearly articulate the program's goals;
- adopt a broader view of what kinds of courses might constitute a College Seminar;
- increase its commitment to the program through more resources and a commitment on the part of the continuing faculty to teach in it;
- develop a better mechanism for assessing when students need additional instruction in writing after the course is over; and
- rename the program to signal to both the internal and external community that the program had been reinvigorated.

As per the external committee's recommendation, the CRWG reevaluated the goals for the College Seminar program and articulated them anew. In April 2009, at a General Faculty meeting, the Faculty affirmed the CRWG's proposed goals for the seminar. We also renamed the program the "Emily Balch Seminars". In moving forward the ultimate target is to have 90% of the Balch Seminars taught by continuing faculty (CNTTs, tenure track and tenured faculty). All departments have committed to teaching in the program on a regular basis. During the 2009 academic year (prior to the renewal of the program), 39% of seminars were taught by continuing faculty in 8 different departments. In the 2010 academic year, 68% of the seminars are being taught by continuing faculty members from 14 different departments. The success of this curricular change will also be measured by evaluating students' writing skills at the end of the Balch seminars using a rubric developed by the Balch seminar instructors. This assessment will be used to steer individual students to their next writing course, as well as for program improvement and professional development opportunities for faculty.

### *Writing Intensive Courses:*

The external review committee felt that the College Seminar program was an excellent start to teaching students to be critical thinkers and better writers, but that a single course for this purpose was not enough. They recommended that the College institute a requirement for a “WI” course—a writing intensive course within each major designed to teach discipline-specific writing. One reason we are considering such a requirement (along with a senior capstone requirement—see below) is that, while writing skills are addressed in the Emily Balch seminars, many perceive a need to refine these skills further within the major. The CRWG specified the following goals for writing intensive courses in the discipline: to give students instruction and practice in writing as tool of inquiry and critical thinking; and, to orient students to the practices of research and writing in their own discipline. Given the complex and unique staffing resources and curriculum structure in each department, the CRWG decided against creating a “WI” requirement at this juncture. Instead, they articulated a clear set of goals for writing intensive courses. The CRWG recommends that the Curriculum Committee and CAP form a working group to help all departments try to meet these goals, either by creating writing intensive courses or by better incorporating the goals of these courses throughout their disciplinary curriculum. This year, pilot writing intensive courses have been instituted in several departments, and the pilot program, supported through a grant from the Engelhardt foundation, will be continued next year with the support of the Provost’s Office. At the end of the following year, we will revisit the question of a writing requirement to see whether we want to institute a formal requirement, or allow multiple pathways for departments to continue to improve students’ writing.

### *Writing in the Senior Capstone:*

The final recommendation of the external review was to complete students’ training in being effective communicators by having all students complete a senior capstone experience. Currently there is variability across departments on the question of whether a capstone experience is required within the academic major. The Faculty and deans identified this as problematic because not all students get the benefits of working one-on-one with a faculty member on their writing, thinking and research skills. The CRWG recommends that all majors require a capstone experience, one that challenges students to integrate and synthesize knowledge they have gained throughout their career at Bryn Mawr. Once we have intensified the teaching of writing beyond the Balch seminars, we will evaluate these changes by asking departments to assess the writing of students in the major at the end of the senior year (perhaps as part of the capstone evaluation). We will also look for changes in students’ perception of their writing improvement via the NESSE and COFHE senior survey. In addition, we will continue to collect qualitative feedback from alumnae and employers of Bryn Mawr graduates.

### ***Distributional Requirements***

Our former distribution requirements attempt to meet Goal 1 by requiring students to take two courses in each of the three divisions: Humanities (one of which may be in the performing or studio arts), Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences and Mathematics (one must be in a science course with a lab component). Faculty and deans who have had significant experience with the curriculum and with student advising reported to the CRWG that students meet these requirements in a very menu-like, non-reflective way. In addition, the move toward greater interdisciplinarity that has occurred in the past twenty years means that some courses, while listed in one division, actually teach material that better fits in a different division, e.g., a course in political science that approaches

the field from its roots in philosophy. The deans also report that some students navigate the requirements so as to avoid certain approaches to inquiry completely, for example, a social science student who takes particular humanities courses to avoid doing close reading and analysis of texts. Thus the CRWG concluded that our general education requirements were falling short of uniformly meeting our goal of training our students in multiple habits of mind. In response, the CRWG produced several new models of general education requirements and brought them to a faculty meeting in April 2009. Based on faculty feedback, the CRWG chose one model to pursue and revised that model to reflect the input they received. The CRWG submitted this model to the Curriculum Committee in the fall 2009. The Curriculum Committee then brought a refined version of this model to the General Faculty for discussion on several occasions, and the faculty approved the new set of requirements at the end of the spring of 2010. The conversations throughout the process were vigorous and raised issues about such things as the role of content versus method in giving students breadth, the importance of exposing students to the natural sciences, and the need for students to sample fields that they did not have access to in high school.

The new model replaces the current divisional requirement with the requirement that each student must take at least one course in each of four approaches to inquiry (see appendix).

- 1. Scientific Investigation (SI):** understanding the natural world by testing hypotheses against observational evidence.
- 2. Critical Interpretation (CI):** critically interpreting works, such as texts, objects, artistic creations and performances, through a process of close-reading.
- 3. Cross-Cultural Analysis (CC):** analyzing the variety of societal systems and patterns of behavior across space.
- 4. Inquiry into the Past (IP):** inquiring into the development and transformation of human experience over time.

We believe it is central to our mission to expose students to a variety of approaches to inquiry and to promote the idea that liberal education must be more than a strong training in one discipline. Under this new requirement, all appropriate courses at the College will be identified as providing an introductory experience in one or two of the four approaches. Courses taken to satisfy the requirement would not only employ the relevant approach, but would also thematize and articulate it, stressing the need for awareness of the process as well as mastery of the content. That is, courses will satisfy the requirement if and only if they teach the problems and possibilities that arise in the practice of these approaches.

### ***An Enhanced System of Faculty Advising for First and Second Year Students***

The changes in the distributional and language requirements put more responsibility on students to make good choices in selecting their courses, as opposed to what we fear is the present tendency to check off boxes without much reflection. Reducing the number of courses required to meet the distributional requirement from 6 to 4, and reducing the number of courses to meet the language requirement from 4 to 2, means a substantial reduction in the number of required general education courses and a corresponding increase in the opportunity for thoughtful curricular choice. Because



another goal of the new requirements is for students to have a deeper understanding of the goals, purposes and meanings of a liberal education, CRWG proposes that faculty become more directly involved with first and second year student advising to help students navigate the distributional requirement. As a first step toward this goal, the College will begin a two-year pilot program, as described below, in 2010/11.

One of the important outcomes of early advising is for students to develop or refine their understanding of the meaning and value of a liberal education. As liberal arts colleges become more rare, and as we continue to attract first generation college students, it is important that we help our students contemplate what a Bryn Mawr education is all about, and how it prepares them for life and work. We know that first and second year students spend much of their time in larger classes. They crave more faculty attention, and at the end of the freshmen year they express less satisfaction with their faculty interactions than do students at many of our peer institutions. A stronger bond with faculty earlier on may thus help with student satisfaction and retention. Helping students understand the value of the liberal arts may be time well spent for their life-long relationship with the College as well. In addition, if we choose to adopt new distribution requirements, it is likely that the requirements will be less menu-like than our current set. Students will need additional help in understanding how to navigate these requirements if they are to get the full benefit of the Bryn Mawr experience. These kinds of conversations take time, and must occur over time.

Because the faculty recognize the importance of advising to the students' academic experience, we are proposing that we complement the existing student advising system by formally expanding the role that faculty play. The current advising system using academic deans as primary advisers is successful and has been given high marks by students. Yet, unlike other liberal arts colleges, the Bryn Mawr faculty has relatively little to do with the formal advising system of first and second year students, particularly concerning course selection. We have heard from the students that they value their relationship with their dean, and view it (importantly) as different from their relationship with faculty. The proposed revision to advising assumes that the student-dean relationship will continue largely in its current form, but will be enhanced by supplemental faculty advising. The new system allows faculty and other academic administrators to advise small numbers of students about their course selection, and to help students develop an articulate sense of what their education is about and how it relates to their emerging sense of their life after college. This advising will supplement the work that the deans already do with the 275+ students in the deans' advising load. Having a larger group involved in this element of advising with a small number of students per adviser will create additional time and space for examination by the student of the meaning of her education.

#### Dean/Faculty Responsibilities:

Under the new model, Deans would continue to have primary responsibility for:

- advising students on meeting graduation requirements
- approving students' course selection
- helping students understand the purposes, opportunities, choices and responsibilities of a Bryn Mawr education
- encouraging students to develop their own perspectives and voices
- interpreting, referring to and coordinating college services for students
- supporting students who get into trouble (academic, social or emotional)

Faculty would play an important role in helping students understand the purpose and value of a liberal arts education as well as our new distribution requirements. Strong faculty advising could help student better understand:

- what our approaches to inquiry are
- within an approach, how to choose a course that fits a student's interest
- how a student's strengths and weaknesses articulate with their experience and interest in their courses
- how these courses fit with students' general education goals and later plans to acquire depth in their major.
- more broadly how to make sense of and value their academic experiences at BMC, particularly as it they relate to their choice of career.

Specific attention will be given to breadth and the encouragement to try some new things, and the advisor will make use of an advising grid to map the student's coursework. (For the grid and the schedule of advising, see the appendix.)

Currently a small group of faculty helps advise incoming freshmen with course selection before classes start in the fall. The faculty advising relationship typically does not extend beyond this one half-hour session. The enhanced advising model proposal was constructed based on conversations with a student focus group about what students would find helpful, deans' input, and advising practices gathered from peer institutions with successful programs.

#### Dean/Faculty Coordination:

The advising sessions for faculty consist of talking with students about their goals, plans, meaning of a liberal arts education, etc. These conversations will be held **in the context of discussing course selection** for the upcoming semester so that it is not an abstract conversation. Students will leave these sessions with a tentative list of course choices, or a set of questions to discuss with their dean. The faculty member (via notes in the student's e-file, or via a phone call to the dean) will flag and pass along to the deans issues that have come up in the course of the faculty member's conversation. The deans will have an additional conversation with their advisees to work through choices, finalize and/or confirm choices (depending on the progress students make in the faculty advising session), and to discuss the role of the courses in the student's overall academic course plan. All students will still see their dean for course advising and selection.

(See timeline in the appendix to see the advising experience from the faculty and student perspective, along with ideas for structuring each advising session.)

#### Pilot Program:

A faculty advising system such as the one described here is resource intensive in an institution where faculty already spend a lot of time with their students. Before we invest significant faculty and institutional resources into a program like this one, it is essential to try it on a small scale, carefully assessing its effectiveness with our students and faculty. If it proves to be effective, we can justify the "expense" and/or trade it off with other forms of faculty service that may be less beneficial to students. In other words, we should not recommend this advising system until we "prove" its effectiveness.

For Fall 2010 we propose:

- 10-15 faculty volunteer to participate in the pilot program along with a few administrators/deans and staff with academic credentials. Faculty need to be available for the full 3 semesters.
- Students (about 100) would be recruited via random assignment to participate in the enhanced advising program, but we might make an effort to recruit students and an additional group of students who are a retention risk.
- Faculty advise 5 students (as described) for Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2012.
- Faculty and students work together to develop this model and alter it in response to feedback to discover “best practices”
- Faculty will be compensated \$1,500 for the first year, and \$500 for the second year.
- Success of the program will be assessed using interviews with students and faculty, surveys of student experience (pre-, during and post- advising), student satisfaction ratings and retention rates. A comparison group who participates in our current advising system will also be followed.

We will need collaboration among members of the faculty, deans and professional staff in training, educating and mentoring faculty advisers.

We would also hope to have in place a system that allows for an electronic advising file to be created for each student. Such a file would contain advising notes and writings from the faculty member, the dean and the student. Ideally, these files would also be automatically populated by the students’ courses and other registration activity.

### ***Departmental Curricula:***

Goal 5 emphasizes depth within the major, and Bryn Mawr has been very successful in producing scholars with the depth of knowledge in a major required for graduate study. As evidence for this, in most fields of study, Bryn Mawr is among the top ten colleges and universities in the percentage of students who go on to pursue the Ph.D. The COFHE senior survey data also strongly support this claim, as it is an outcome where Bryn Mawr distinguishes itself among most of its peers. While Bryn Mawr has certainly been successful in training students for depth of knowledge in the major, the CRWG thought it important to re-examine the major and its role in the curriculum. To this end, the CRWG asked all departments to answer a series of questions about the major. These questions asked departments to reflect on how they provide depth and breadth to their majors, and, importantly, how their major program and course offerings contribute to the broader general education goals of the College. (See appendix for questions and departmental responses.)

Results of these queries produced many themes. First, departments are central and effective organizers of their curriculum. They have articulated goals for their department’s offerings that balance the training of majors who want to go on to do graduate study and those who plan to pursue other career trajectories. These departmental goals operate at the level of individual courses but are also integrated throughout the major. In general, majors have two central goals: to give students depth in a particular field of study, and to have students gain experience as “practitioners” of their discipline, i.e., doing original research the way a chemist would, or conducting textual analysis the way a classicist would. Consistent with trends in how knowledge is being conceived of and generated in the world today, many departments also actively practice interdisciplinarity or multi-disciplinarity by forging connections to other departments or by allowing courses beyond the department to count towards the major.

### *Course levels and trajectories:*

In response to questions about the categorization of course levels and the trajectory through the major, some common patterns emerged. Most departments see 100 level courses as introductions to content and methodologies in the field. 200 level courses were generally described as exposure to a broader range of contexts or sub-topics, and students were expected to show increased development of interpretive, analytic, critical skills and approaches whether or not a prerequisite was necessary for entry into the course. 200 level courses were also frequently described as providing adequate exposure to the breadth of the field while allowing students some freedom and flexibility to explore. 300 level courses generally demanded increased focus, research experiences, indications of ability to synthesize materials or exhibit novel or original thought, interpretation, or application of ideas and argument.

Although these levels were clear enough, many departments noted some problems with the double-edged nature of the 200 level courses, since they often are 1) serving as the introduction or as the only courses in the field for non-majors and for those who have taken no preparatory courses while, 2) at the same time, having to provide additional depth and breadth for majors and minors who have already had some exposure to both content and approaches.

Moreover, there is less consistency than might be expected with respect to entry prerequisites. For example, Math, Physics, and Economics have very specific trajectories based on increasing competence through the levels that make reference to national standard curricula, but not all departments have such specified paths. In the languages, competency is required before moving into upper levels in the language acquisition courses, but departments vary as to whether or not prerequisites are required for entry into upper level cultural courses.

All departments have a variety of ways of making the requirements and pre-requisites transparent to their majors, but many had no response to how they might make such information available to non-majors beyond the course catalog. The CRWG recommends that all departments work on ways of making such information available to all students before registration.

### *Senior Capstone:*

The CRWG was particularly interested in the varieties of senior capstone experience departments offer. The many departments that have a capstone experience were quite articulate about its value to the major and to the full development of a student's depth of knowledge. Indeed, the senior capstone is emerging as one of the unique experiences Bryn Mawr, because of its size and low Student-to-Faculty ratio, can offer, and around 78% of all students currently take advantage of this opportunity. But since this experience is not universal for all departments, the CRWG asked those departments without a senior capstone experience how they might structure their curricula to include one. For those that do have one, it asked how they might strengthen the experience.

The senior capstone experiences offered by departments were either a senior seminar, and independent research project, or both. The senior seminar assembled the senior majors (or some part thereof) for advanced work in the discipline (or sub-field), providing a broader and/or deeper look into the methods and issues within the field. The thesis or other independent research project provided the student with the opportunity to expand and demonstrate her proficiency within the field through the independent work, guided by a faculty mentor. All departments had some form of senior capstone work, but some departments made this opportunity available only to a limited number of students or provided different options for the majors.

Many factors shaped each department's choice of what kind of senior experience to offer and whether that experience was available to all students, but the most significant was the faculty resources required to staff the program. Another consideration was the ability of all students to do independent thesis work. Some departments felt it was inappropriate for students who were not intending to go to graduate school to be required to engage in independent research, while others felt that the pedagogical benefits of independent work went beyond preparation for graduate school and provided an important piece of the liberal arts education.

Overall, the CRWG recommends that the senior capstone be a central and required part of the Bryn Mawr experience for all graduating students. Given the constraints of staffing and varying student abilities, the CRWG encourages all departments to consider alternative modes of capstone experience, considering carefully the pedagogical aims of the capstone experience and ways in which the experience, be it a seminar, an independent research project, or a traditional thesis, contribute to those aims. The CRWG recommends that Curriculum Committee facilitate conversations among departments about best practices in the senior capstone experience, bringing together departments with similar structures and disciplines.

### *Teaching Load:*

CRWG asked departments to consider the impact of a transition from a 3/2 teaching load each year to a 2/2 load. Most departments were interested in the possibility of reducing the teaching load, and many responded that the transition might be feasible even without additional staffing. Several potential problems, however, were identified within the responses. First, there was a split between departments that found the idea of the transition feasible and those that did not. The two most significant factors in this split were the size of the department and the presence of a graduate program. Most departments with graduate programs and some small departments without graduate programs responded that their resources would not permit the shift to a 2/2 teaching load without additional staffing to sustain their curriculum. Another factor that emerged was the different ways in which departments counted senior work, independent studies, and other such service (such as department chair). One suggestion was that the shift to a 2/2 load be achieved by no longer counting independent senior work as a course, but such a solution would not be effective for all departments. Nevertheless, since most departments thought that a reduction in teaching load would improve the ability of the department to attract and retain faculty who were interested in an active research program, CRWG recommends that CAP and Curriculum investigate the possibilities further, with due attention to the existing disparities in the way the load is currently computed in different departments as well as to the differing impact on departments of different size and scope.

### *Beyond the Department:*

In response to questions about how students in a department or major might intersect with other departments or disciplines, an interesting and disturbing split appeared in the way different responses understood the nature of interdisciplinary work.

1. service - provide courses that serve the needs of other departments
2. allied – provide courses within the discipline that other fields may make use of
3. common thread – provide courses that mingle disciplines to examine threads of common interest

The attitude toward interdisciplinary work naturally varied according to which model was imagined. The math department and the modern languages saw themselves in the service model. In general, humanities and social science departments had more common threads, while science departments tended to think more in terms of allied courses. Environmental studies was the notable exception in the sciences and provides perhaps the best model of innovative interdisciplinary work. Many departments expressed interest in expanding interdisciplinary connections, but most seemed unsure how to go about such a process, so the Curriculum Committee might do well to offer up the examples of successful interdisciplinary programs such as Environmental Studies, Classics, or Cities (although Cities never responded to the CRWG's questions).

Cooperation with counterpart departments at Haverford is extremely varied, with some departments, such as Classics or French, working closely together to plan curriculum while others, such as English or Anthropology, expressed little optimism about further coordinating resources with their counterparts absent structural changes. Several departments, however, did express a desire for closer ties with their Haverford counterparts, and such increased cooperation could provide a much more efficient use of faculty resources – a desideratum in the current climate. Many departments noted some underlying structural problems in Bryn Mawr's working relationship with Haverford that hindered the prospects for increasing cooperation. We would recommend that Curriculum Committee expand its efforts to ensure coordination between campuses in the introduction of new courses and in the alteration of curricula, and we would recommend that CAP press severely on those departments who are neglecting (or even refusing) the opportunity to make better use of the college's resources by increasing cooperation.

On the vertical axis, the range of responses was more limited, partly because only some departments have graduate programs. All those departments have worked out ways to integrate undergraduates into their graduate courses and, to a lesser extent, graduate students into the undergraduate classes, although the means differs depending on the discipline. In general, the graduate-level courses provide a way for exceptional and advanced undergraduates to continue their work in the discipline (adding depth), although the possibility for graduate students to enrich their education with undergraduate courses (adding breadth) was less often mentioned.

For departments without graduate programs, very few had thought of ways in which they might contribute to or benefit from the existing graduate programs. Some social science departments, such as Economics, Sociology, and Political Science, have cross-listed courses taught in the GSSWSR and have used GSSWSR faculty to teach departmental undergraduate courses. Departments in the humanities gave mixed responses, ranging from interested (Philosophy) to hostile (English), to the possibility of working with departments in the Graduate Group. These responses were mixed, not only across the departments, but even within departments, as some very productive connections have been made by individual faculty in these departments. We would suggest that the increasing collaborations with GSSWSR be used as a model to help departments in the humanities think of ways in which such collaboration with graduate programs might enrich the experience of students in all these programs. The sub-group on the MA Programs has explored some of these issues further, but CRWG was not able to discuss their report (see appendix).

The idea of interdisciplinary work between graduate programs is well established in the Graduate Group, and the GSEMs that are team-taught by members of different departments provide another model for increasing cooperation between departments. Several of the GSEMs have been team-taught by faculty outside of the Graduate Group. It was surprising not to find mention of similar interdisciplinary work in the graduate programs in the sciences, especially since the idea has been discussed outside of the CRWG's work. The differing models of interdisciplinarity might perhaps explain this absence, since the science programs tend to talk in terms of allied fields rather than shared curricula. Nevertheless, we would recommend that the science departments with

graduate programs investigate developing interdisciplinary and/or team-taught courses along the model of the GSEMs. Such interdisciplinary courses might work well with the social sciences as well, bringing in Psychology and the GSSWSR.

Although the opinion of the CRWG was by no means unanimous with regard to all these possibilities for expanded cooperation, we would recommend that the Curriculum Committee convene some groups of faculty, both from the departments with graduate programs and from other departments, to brainstorm possibilities for increased collaboration. We also suggest that CAP, along with the Provost's office, consider ways to create incentives to encourage such innovation and collaboration.

### ***Kaleidoscope Interdisciplinary Programs:***

In conjunction with the CRWG consideration of interdisciplinary programs, an ad hoc group of faculty explored another approach to interdisciplinarity. In collaboration with the Provost, this group of faculty initiated a flexible interdisciplinary pilot program called Kaleidoscope. The Kaleidoscope program proposes a new arrangement of interdisciplinary and interactive educational experiences for students and faculty. This program builds on a strong institutional history of learning experiences beyond the traditional classroom walls yet situated within a rigorous academic framework. The Kaleidoscope program connects multiple courses, their students and faculty in a single semester through common problems, themes, and experiences for the purposes of research and scholarship. A Kaleidoscope project entails a cluster of courses offered in a single semester that possesses five characteristics:

1. Kaleidoscope offers an interdisciplinary experience for students and faculty. The Kaleidoscope program views interdisciplinarity broadly, allowing each cluster to develop its own explicit definition. What is central is that these faculty members engage problems using different approaches, theories, prior data and methods and that they are explicit about that as they seek intersections across disciplines.
2. Kaleidoscope projects will unify courses and coursework by a focused theme or research question.
3. Kaleidoscope projects will engage students and faculty in active and interactive ways in a non-traditional classroom experience. This could occur through “data gathering” trips, praxis-like community based partnership/learning and/or intensive laboratory activity.
4. Kaleidoscope projects will encourage students and faculty to reflect on these different perspectives in explicit ways. Connections across courses are made explicit, shaped by collaboration among faculty members, and explored reflectively among faculty and fellow students.
5. Kaleidoscope participants will enrich the entire community by sharing their work with the community through such activities as poster sessions, research talks, web postings, panel discussions and/or data sharing.

Both the Kaleidoscope programs and the data they produce will be archived for later use by others. Within three months after the completion of the program, faculty and students in each program will provide a written evaluation of strengths and weaknesses of the experience, with concrete recommendations for future projects. We are proposing to pilot the Kaleidoscope project for the next three years (see appendix for description of the pilot and the first Kaleidoscope). After the

completion of the first projects, this experimental program will be assessed on the basis of internal reports, student evaluations of classes and projects and community discussion to determine if and how it will continue beyond the pilot phase. This review will occur during the 2012-13 academic year.

### ***Global Education:***

One of the aims of a Bryn Mawr education (Goal 6) is to prepare students to be global citizens. Indeed, global citizenship comes forward as a key outcome of a liberal education in general, and a Bryn Mawr education in particular. The CRWG has done a significant amount of work on how we might better achieve this goal. First, the CRWG took stock of what we already provide to students in this regard. The committee noted that all social science and humanities departments exhibit scholarly and curricular expertise beyond the United States, and many faculty members study non-Western areas. Many collaborate with research partners in other regions of the world as well. The CRWG spent significant time, with broad faculty input, trying to put into effect the College's general mission statement about achieving global citizenship or internationalization of the curriculum, so that our future plans can best be directed toward fulfilling those goals. To that end the CRWG defined three elements of globalization that the College will target moving forward:

1. The study of other cultures, especially non-Western cultures.
2. Action-oriented, experiential learning about unfamiliar cultures, in this country and abroad.
3. The study of globalization proper, by which we mean the cumulative processes of a worldwide expansion of trade and production, commodity and financial markets, fashions, the media and computer programs, news and communications networks, transportation systems and the flow of migrations, the risks generated by large-scale technology, environmental damage and epidemics as well as organized crime and terrorism.

Educating women for a global world will mean helping to understand these processes and the ways in which they have and will transcend traditional boundaries of nationhood. During the 2009-10 academic year, the sub-working group on curricular globalization, led by the President, explored a host of ways to increase globalization of the curriculum toward these three elements. They explored:

1. the representation of cultural studies and globalization in the curriculum;
2. possibilities for student and faculty exchanges in other regions of the world; the incorporation of international experiences in coursework, either by telepresence in course partnerships with non-US universities or by shorter travel experiences as part of the coursework;
3. the creation of other summer and semester-break internships that allow students to get practical experience working in another country.

The sub-working group also explored the possibility of creating a more formal partnership in a particular region of the world, or with a particular university in another part of the world, to investigate the idea of opening a satellite campus, or a dual-degree program.

### *Globalization Initiatives*



A series of recommendations emerged from the work of the Globalization Sub-committee, as well as from the sub-committee on master's programs, resulting in a number of globalizing initiatives. These are stated below, followed by current status and recommendations for future work.

### Increase the presence and visibility of international study and experience

The subgroup recommended several steps toward this goal. The first is to develop a web presence in this regard, and Jenny Rickard has been working on this project. The subgroup also suggested that the college amend its mission statement to emphasize our commitment to global education, and it recommended that the President and Provost engage the faculty in this work. A possible wording of such a statement would be as follows:

*“The mission of Bryn Mawr College is to prepare students for active citizenship in a global context. The College immerses students in an intellectually rigorous environment to develop global consciousness, reflexivity and capacity for civic engagement globally and domestically. Through curricular and co-curricular components, students have experiences to acquire knowledge, and learn values and skills to provide leadership and service in an interdependent world.”*

The subgroup also made the following suggestions for goals that might be incorporated into such a statement:

- Promote the acquisition of knowledge and discernment about the global condition.
- Provide access to historical context for current conditions as well as multiple lenses through which to think critically and productively about one's role as a global citizen.
- Encourage the acquisition of information, appreciation, and experience about culture other than one's own.
- Help each student deepen her own realization and appreciation of the complex identities that make her who she is.
- Encourage her and give her the knowledge and tools needed to take responsibility for becoming an active global citizen.

The subgroup also thought it important to emphasize women and women's issues in our messages and programs about globalization and internationalization and create a distinctive slogan for our internationalization efforts. The Center for International Studies (CIS) has been considering such an emphasis including re-naming itself the Center for Global Studies: Empowering Women.

### Renew and rethink International Studies, both as a center and as an academic program.

The subgroup considered the role of Center for International Studies at BMC, especially in light of college initiatives to increase the presence and visibility of international studies and the Task Force recommendations on increasing vertical and horizontal linkages. Options discussed included: substituting the word “global” for “international” to signal a contemporary perspective on the range of complex issues; emphasizing women as global leaders to reflect the college mission; possible new names that would more narrowly focus the activities of CIS -- Center for International Studies: Towards Social Justice and Center for Global Studies: Empowering Women. Both of these bring in the Humanities and Social Sciences and could also encompass the natural sciences. They could also relate to the GSSWSR on global issues around ethics and social policy. Some members of the

subgroup recommended changing not merely the name but the current structure of CIS, and CIS has taken several specific steps in response to the subgroup's discussions and recommendations (see appendix).

#### Other Recommendations:

1. Curriculum Committee should work with the administration and relevant faculty to develop a Global Focus and a Global Scholars certificate that would appear on student transcripts. Likewise, the GSSWSR should explore the creation of a certificate for students in International Social Work (See appendix for proposed details of the certificates).
2. Curriculum Committee should do further work and collaborate with GSSWSR to develop Emily Balch Seminars that focus on underrepresented areas of the world.
3. There should be increased collaboration between International Studies Office and the Undergraduate Dean to enhance study abroad with expanded study abroad opportunities.
4. There should be increased collaboration between the Provost, International Studies Office and the Undergraduate Dean to create tighter links among the International Program Office, the Office of Civic Engagement, and the Summer Internship Program Office.
5. The Committee on Academic Priorities and the Committee on Appointments should treat as a priority the goal of hiring of new faculty who teach and do research in non-Western studies, especially in areas that CAP, in consultation with Curriculum Committee, think are currently most needed at Bryn Mawr College. CAP has the authority to consider proposals from departments and also from groups of faculty that may or may not have a formal organizational designation and from the Provost and President. CAP also has the option to generate hiring proposals of its own. Every new staffing proposal in the humanities and social sciences should situate the proposed faculty position in light of this effort. We recognize, however, that there are other important staffing priorities, so this recommendation should not be taken to imply that *every* future search must be guided by the goal of curricular globalization.
6. The faculty and administration should develop additional curricular and co-curricular programming to further enhance language instruction and more fully integrate the study of language into the rest of the global curricular initiatives

#### **Leadership:**

Goal 7 emphasizes the importance of preparing our students to make a positive difference in the lives of others. Bryn Mawr graduates have a strong desire to make a meaningful difference in the world, and historical evidence suggests that a Bryn Mawr education does indeed instill in women the ability to be strong leaders in their life and work. Drew Gilpin Faust '68 was the first woman to become president of Harvard University. Shirley Peterson '63 was the first woman commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service. Ana Maria Lopez '82 is the Medical Director for the University of Arizona. It is clear to the CRWG that these women's education played a key role in their success by instilling in them the intellectual skills, leadership abilities and confidence to excel in areas traditionally closed to women. However, at a time when the value of a liberal education is being questioned—e.g., by those who would make training in a specific field the main objective of higher education—the CRWG thought it appropriate to rethink how a Bryn Mawr education can best prepare students to be change agents and effective citizens in their chosen fields. It is clear that the current curriculum prepares students to think critically, creatively problem solve, communicate effectively, understand complex local and global contexts and so forth. However, recent trends in

the work force suggest that companies and institutions are also interested in students who have training in, and experience with, applying their knowledge in the real world. To address these concerns, the CRWG looked at the possibility of the creation of some sort of co-curricular “enterprise leadership” program. Such a co-curricular offering would pull together existing programs such as our leadership training programs and our Praxis program, and combine them with new programs that give students education and experiences that will train them to be effective leaders and citizens. This program would allow students to gain experience translating their academic knowledge into real world settings and at the same time provide them with some training in skills that will help them hit the ground running when they begin their careers. Such a program might include training in budget management, public speaking, leadership, management, grantsmanship and finance as well as experience gained through service learning, summer internships, leadership shadow programs and community service. Importantly, a Bryn Mawr education in this area would draw on the strong context of a liberal arts education and would approach these topics very much from a liberal education perspective. A proposal for this co-curricular certificate program will be ready for discussion in April 2010. The Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) National Leadership Council has identified a set of ten “high-impact educational practices”. In recent work, George Kuh and other NSSE administrators present evidence that these practices carry substantial educational benefits to the students who experience them. Of these ten high impact practices, the existing curriculum, in conjunction with curricular changes under development, includes eight of them. They are: first year seminars, writing intensive courses, collaborative assignments and projects, undergraduate research, diversity/global learning, community-based learning, internships, and capstone experiences. We are therefore confident that Bryn Mawr’s new curriculum will position the College to have the greatest impact on student outcomes and achievement.

## Appraisal and Recommendations

Bryn Mawr’s curriculum has innumerable strengths, and we recommend that the process of curricular renewal be mindful of these assets. These strengths include:

- an opportunity for students to pursue breadth at the level of general education requirements and depth in the major;
- opportunities for intense interaction with faculty through small classes, independent study and independent research;
- opportunities to engage issues of diversity through curricular and co-curricular offerings;
- opportunities for students to translate their academic work to local and global communities via programs such as praxis, internships, and study abroad;
- opportunities for curricular experimentation, growth, pruning and innovation.

The process of curricular renewal has thus far been quite successful. It has engaged the entire campus community, and particularly the Faculty, at the level of mission and goals while working hard to relate the College’s larger educational goals to specific curricular initiatives. Thus, **the most important recommendation we can offer is to maintain the momentum of curricular renewal.** We also recommend that the administration and Faculty take steps as necessary to translate these initiatives into action and implementation and to further refine them through a process of

assessment and revision. Specifically, we recommend continued examination and action on the following areas:

- The faculty and administration should take advantage of the change in the general distribution requirements to better ensure students' exposure to a broader range of approaches to inquiry.
- The faculty and administration should take advantage of the change in the quantitative requirement to include a quantitative literacy component so that all Bryn Mawr students graduate with quantitative skills that will be an asset to their life and work and so they can better take advantage of the College's offerings while they are here. The CRWG recommends that the Curriculum Committee form a working group that can continue the work of the Q subgroup in developing the most appropriate diagnostic instrument for entering students, in developing the quantitative literacy course (QSEM?) that would best address problems of the students who need it, and in setting the standards for the new Q courses.
- The faculty and administration should continue to facilitate the participation of continuing faculty in the Emily Balch seminars.
- The faculty and administration should explore the possibility of a "WI" requirement—a writing intensive course in the major, or, alternatively, making effective written communication skills a more concentrated focus of the major spread across more courses. The CRWG recommends that the Curriculum Committee and CAP form a working group to help all departments try to meet these goals, either by creating writing intensive courses or by better incorporating the goals of these courses throughout their disciplinary curriculum.
- The faculty and administration should continue to strengthen the relationship between the major and the College's general education requirements.
- The CRWG recommends that all majors require a capstone experience with a significant writing component, one that challenges students to integrate and synthesize knowledge they have gained throughout their career at Bryn Mawr. Given the constraints of staffing and varying student abilities, the CRWG encourages all departments to consider alternative modes of capstone experience, considering carefully the pedagogical aims of the capstone experience and ways in which the experience, be it a seminar, an independent research project, or a traditional thesis, contribute to those aims. The CRWG recommends that Curriculum Committee facilitate conversations among departments about best practices in the senior capstone experience, bringing together departments with similar structures and disciplines.
- The CRWG recommends that all departments work on ways of making information about course level expectations and prerequisites available to all students before registration.
- Since many departments thought that a reduction in teaching load would improve the ability of the department to attract and retain faculty who were interested in an active research program, CRWG recommends that CAP and Curriculum investigate the possibilities further, with due attention to the existing disparities in the way the load is currently computed in different departments as well as to the differing impact on departments of different size and scope.

- The CRWG recommends that Curriculum Committee expand its efforts to ensure coordination between campuses in the introduction of new courses and in the alteration of curricula, and we would recommend that CAP press severely on those departments who are neglecting (or even refusing) the opportunity to make better use of the college's resources by increasing cooperation. We recommend that the Curriculum Committee convene some groups of faculty, both from the departments with graduate programs and from other departments, to brainstorm possibilities for increased collaboration. We also suggest that CAP, along with the Provost's office, consider ways to create incentives to encourage such innovation and collaboration.
- The faculty and administration should change the advising system to include even more intentional planning of an intellectual pathway through the requirements and to forge a connection between general education requirements and the disciplines.
- The faculty and administration should develop curriculum and programming to make Bryn Mawr the epicenter of global education for women. Specifically:
  - The faculty and administration should increase the presence and visibility of international study and experience at Bryn Mawr
  - The faculty and administration should renew and rethink International Studies, both as a center and as an academic program.
  - Curriculum Committee should work together with appropriate departments and the administration to develop a Global Focus and a Global Scholars certificate that would appear on student transcripts. Likewise, the GSSWSR should explore the creation of a certificate for students in International Social Work.
  - Curriculum Committee should do further work and collaborate with GSSWSR to develop Emily Balch Seminars that focus on underrepresented areas of the curriculum.
  - There should be increased collaboration between International Studies Office and the Undergraduate Dean to enhance study abroad with expanded study abroad opportunities.
  - There should be increased collaboration between the Provost, International Studies Office and the Undergraduate Dean to create tighter links among the International Program Office, the Office of Civic Engagement, and the Summer Internship Program Office.
  - CAP should recognize the importance of international and global studies in new hires.
- The faculty and administration should develop additional curricular and co-curricular programming to further enhance language instruction and more fully integrate the study of language into the rest of the global curricular initiatives.
- The faculty and administration should develop a co-curricular program or certificate in enterprise leadership. Take advantage of existing programming, e.g., the Non-Profit Executive Leadership Institute (NELI) at the GSSWSR, Dean's Leadership Training, LEAP, and course exchange at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania.
- The faculty and administration should consider making oral communication more of a focus as an institutional goal and provide programming/curriculum to support this aim.