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This is the Annual Report of the President of the College to the Board of Trustees, the ninth I have had the honor to present.

This year I write on three connected matters. First, there are the achievements in Bowdoin’s academic domain during the tenure of Dean Charles Beitz, who is stepping down as dean for academic affairs after eight years. Second, I suggest some of the extraordinary forces that are driving Bowdoin’s curriculum, a review of which has been underway for the past two years. Finally, I set down a statement of Bowdoin’s mission approved by the Board of Trustees at its May meeting. It is a synoptic document that includes the curriculum but places it broadly in the array of complex goals of a distinguished college entering a new millennium. This document, formally required by Bowdoin’s accrediting agency, the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, has provided a useful occasion to reflect upon what Bowdoin does, why it does so, and what the College stands for.

I. The Deanship for the past eight years.

Chuck Beitz, who will be returning as Professor of Government after a year of research, leaves behind a remarkable record of growth and an imprint of quality upon the academic program. In his eight years, 40 percent of our tenurable faculty have been hired – 48 percent of them women. Since 1991 the size of the faculty has increased from 129 to approximately 150, and 23 percent of these new faculty are of color, American and foreign-born, contributing wonderfully to our vitality and interest, as well as our excellence. Faculty salaries are in the top third of our comparison group of leading American colleges, and Bowdoin’s ratio of students to faculty is just above 10.5 to 1, a full 1.0 lower than eight years ago.

During Chuck’s time, the College has virtually rebuilt its academic plant, and he and various faculty building committees have devoted hundreds of hours to selecting and working with architects to ensure that highly specialized spaces, with staggering per-square-foot costs, meet the needs of sophisticated users, as well as Bowdoin’s aesthetic and construction standards. Druckenmiller Hall is entirely new, while Cleaveland Hall is totally renovated, and together they now house biology, chemistry, biochemistry, geology, and environmental studies. Searles, completely renovated, will receive the departments of mathematics, computer science and physics late this summer. The terrestrial and seawater labs at the Coastal Studies Center are new. Memorial Hall and the new Wish Experimental Theater, which will entirely change the nature of theater and dance at Bowdoin, will be finished by spring, 2000. Most of Bowdoin’s classrooms are new or have been upgraded since 1991.

Chuck also leaves behind planning committees that have defined programs and selected architects for two other vital renovations: the Walker Art Building, which needs climate control and modernized space; and the great scheme to insert a recital and concert hall in the old Curtis Pool. The Library, with all of its administrative interlopers relocated save the president and academic dean, will begin its vitally needed modernization program in the coming year.
II. The Curriculum and its Drivers.

Chuck also leaves a progress report on the Bowdoin academic curriculum, produced under his chairmanship by the Committee on Curriculum and Educational Policy (CEP), a body of faculty, students and administrators that has labored two years on this project. Bowdoin last re-examined its curriculum in 1982. The principal purpose then was to re-install a few of the general education requirements that had been washed away in the turbulence of the early 1970s. These “distribution requirements” imposed modest obligations on students to experience some serious exposure to the major fields of knowledge – science and math, the social sciences and the arts and humanities – as well as to delve more deeply into a major field of study.

The curriculum, of course, is not the only or even the major way a college’s academic program changes. The forces of scientific and social-scientific discovery, and changing political and social events and theories, exert constant pressures on disciplinary departments. What is studied today in Bowdoin’s department of biology, or of sociology and anthropology, or history would be recognizable to a graduate of say, twenty-five years ago. But these fields have evolved vastly in twenty-five years, because of the accretions of the findings of billions of dollars of scientific research and of tens of thousands of Ph.D. theses and scholarly monographs. Notwithstanding, the curriculum matters, and our review has examined Bowdoin’s curriculum back to 1900, examined the curricula of several major colleges and universities, and solicited the observations of scholarly, administrative and business visitors. The interim report lays out a set of questions that Professor Craig McEwen, Bowdoin’s new academic dean, and next year’s CEP will seek to answer.

Apart from committee deliberations, deans, wisdom, and faculty ideas and practice, I believe that several major forces have been driving the curriculum since World War II and will continue to do so. These changes are dramatic, and virtually every serious college is dealing with them and their costs. But they also are at the heart of what makes an undergraduate education at Bowdoin far richer, more textured experience than it has ever been. I would suggest seven drivers of today’s curriculum – or, more broadly, the academic experience of Bowdoin students.

1. The juxtaposition of two statistics:
   - 4 percent of our entering first-year students last fall thought that the B.A. degree would be their final degree; that is, 96 percent assumed that graduate school was ahead.
   - Each fall we give our first-years a rather basic math test, an adaptation of the test Harvard uses to assess quantitative reasoning, to let them – and us – know if they’re ready for scientific and social scientific study. More than a third fail the test.

   What this means is that we have an intellectually precocious and ambitious student body, but many students arrive with serious deficiencies in their academic preparation for higher education. The deficiencies – which exist in writing and scientific background as well as math – have several reasons: diverse, inadequate high school preparation; foreign, non-English origins; phobias and disinclinations; and some learning disabilities. But if students are merely allowed to struggle, they both underperform their native capacities and drag down classroom standards for other students. And standards are in fact rising. (Ask any biology professor about what it takes to be a successful biology student these days.)
What do we do? Colleges shrink from the word “remedial;” but we, like other serious places, have introduced professionally-led, student-run tutoring programs in math and writing. Our alumna Linda Baldwin has endowed the future of this work in the Baldwin Center for Learning and Teaching, which will not just coach and remedy. It will research and work with faculty on the elusive business of understanding, and teaching to, different student ways of learning. The purpose is to ensure that the quality of a Bowdoin education is under constant examination, as well as to see that all Bowdoin students have a clear opportunity to master essential skills. But securing the basics is not cheap: it requires people and spaces and takes them, and time, away from other activities.

2. The natural sciences. In 1974, twenty-five years ago, 13 percent of Bowdoin’s students graduated as science majors. This May, 28 percent of our graduates were science majors – more than twice as many as in 1974 – and if we add math and computer science, more than 30 percent of our current students major in computational and natural sciences. Biology is an example of the change. It is now the second largest major, after government. The numbers of our biology students are very large, inundating even a department that is 60 percent larger than it was when I came to Bowdoin as president. Whereas a biology major aspired 25 years ago to medicine or to a research career, that biology major now looks forward to law, public policy, bio-technology and investment banking. Biology is becoming the “liberal art” of the twentieth century.

Science is so important in the world that every student must take a full year of science at Bowdoin. At least as important, every Bowdoin science major going on to graduate school takes with him or her a broad liberal arts background of history, art, government and philosophy. Science, undeniably central to our mission, is driving both our curriculum and our costs. I know of no serious college that has not made a multi-million dollar commitment to science facilities and instrumentation and its computing infrastructure in the past decade. As you know, Bowdoin’s capital commitment, funded by the last campaign, was $42 million.

3. Technology. Twenty-five years ago technology meant the heating plant, or aspects of what went on in the sciences. Now, information technology permeates every corner of the campus and suffuses our lives. The College presents itself to the world through its Web site, and it’s an open question how long we’ll have a “hard-copy” catalogue and viewbook. Our library gives everyone access to vast databases and other libraries and has a common catalogue with Bates and Colby and on-line access to that of the University of Maine. Students communicate with each other, their parents and the world by e-mail and the Internet. We are debating seriously whether a laptop computer is not such a basic educational resource that every student must have one with obvious consequences for financial aid.

Not including the costs of hard wiring, fiber optics, switches and various hardware, the computing center alone has a budget of $2.5 million a year. The figure has quadrupled in the last eight years, and has doubled as a portion of the budget. The College is in the midst of a vast software conversion to create a common institutional database. Six years ago, twelve staff members were employed in the area of information technology; the figure is now above thirty.
4. Study Away. Until fairly recently, college was four years of study spent in the same place. About half of this year’s graduating seniors, however, had spent up to a year studying away from Bowdoin. A decade ago, only 75 percent of those studying away went abroad; this year, over 90 percent of our students away from campus studied in other countries. This is true of many good colleges, less true of universities.

A little of this study away is semi-serious, “rest and recuperation” from Bowdoin winters. But most of it is not, and Bowdoin now has an Office of Off-Campus Study that monitors, debriefs students, and exercises quality control over foreign study; the College has a number of departments in which foreign study is simply assumed to be a part of the major, such as the language departments, Asian Studies, and anthropology. Students are permitted to take their Bowdoin financial aid with them to finance their foreign study.

When half the junior class is abroad, there are some deleterious effects on the upper class portions of the curriculum. But the extraordinary personal growth that students experience abroad, and the broadening of their vision, create powerful, offsetting educational value. Some of the best academic honors projects, and a number of graduate school programs and fellowships, arise from this foreign experience. Finally, given the exceptional lack of interest and knowledge about foreign countries and foreign affairs in America, with its vast international responsibilities, facilitating foreign study is now clearly a basic responsibility for any college that sets out to train the future leadership of the society.

Internationalization, then, is driving us, and overseas study in coming years will continue to be a major way in which small colleges offer broadening, individually tailored learning opportunities beyond their own campuses.

5. The Arts. As our interim curriculum review states, “Until the 1970s, the arts – theater, dance, music, the visual arts – were, for the most part, regarded as extra-curricular activities; the predominant view on the faculty was that these activities lacked the degree and kind of intellectual rigor expected in academic pursuit.”

No good college thinks that today. The arts, in both their critical historical mode, and in their practical, studio manifestation, are seen as a normal expression of a vital academic program. More pragmatically, no college not located in a major city can expect to hold the interest of sophisticated students and faculty if music, theater and dance are not a part of campus life. The arts are different: they are non-linear, their ways of thought are creative and spontaneous, not analytical or synoptic. It is now conventional wisdom that, not just understanding the vision of
the artist, but experiencing in the studio the ways of thinking, imagining and representing of the artist, is a part of the liberal arts experience. Seeing its value, we ask ourselves how we ever could have thought otherwise.

But this means new departments at Bowdoin, of film and dance. It means reinforced existing programs of theater and music and studio art, and, expensively, it means theater space – the Wish Theater as well as musical practice and performing space, and painting, print and photography studio space, all of which are either under construction, or in prospect, at Bowdoin.

Leading the charge in all this are our students. A group of them have just raised the money to start an on-campus cable television station, and I hear they are plotting a merger of the Orient and WBOR, to form a new entity, the Bowdoin Media Group!

6. Interdisciplinary Programs. The basic academic unit with which we're all familiar is the department: economics, English, biology, and so forth. But the world has complex realities – China, the black experience, gender, the environment – that don't yield themselves to the analytical framework of a single discipline. As a result, academic institutions have created the "interdisciplinary program": an array of existing departments, whose members share a common intellectual interest in a problem or intellectual domain. Twenty-five years ago, Bowdoin had one such program: African American studies. We now have seven: Africana studies, Asian studies, biochemistry, environmental studies, Latin-American studies, neuroscience, and women's studies.

There will be more of these programs. They are hard to operate and direct; they are somewhat unstable, since faculty members are tied to and tenured in their academic departments, rather than within the programs. But they are the way of the world. Fascinating and vitally important scientific and social realities are tugging the disciplines into new shapes. Twice as many of our students graduated with interdisciplinary majors this year as was the case six years ago. But many of these new fields require faculty and student research in the field, even abroad. This too becomes a fresh budget charge, and one we must absorb.

7. Interdisciplinary Learning. Finally there is the most dramatic change of all, I believe, for those of us who sat several decades ago in financially efficient, modular classrooms of 20 or 30 students, listening to splendid, beautifully prepared lectures: individualized learning. The lecture has virtually ceased to be a credible means of instruction. The large lecture hall tends to be disdained, as used and necessary as it occasionally is; college is increasingly a place in which technology, overseas study, individual bent, and personal initiative enable a student to create a highly personalized, individually designed educational experience. One thing is relatively constant at Bowdoin: 32 percent of our classes had enrollments of under 11 in 1989-90; 28 percent had enrollments under 11 in 1997-98. Technology, interestingly, is going to increase the capacity for individual student lines of inquiry, as a faculty member serves as the impresario and director of inquiry, while students refine questions, select aspects of them, and search out data and images in the new limitless electronic universe of information. Independent study, honors projects and self-designed majors are the vehicles for these activities and attract our most successful students.

We do not yet know the full costs of this enhanced system of student tutorial – a new version of perhaps the oldest form of instruction the
world knows. But students with high energy and a desire for guidance in finding their own ways into subject fields and mastering their methods of inquiry are going to require high levels of faculty accessibility, ultimately determining our numbers of faculty and high-level educational technologists.

There are, of course, other major changes beyond the academic area: the increased professionalization and tougher training regimes in the coaching of athletics; the more complex objectives, legal requirements, and social standards governing student behavior and residential life; and the omnipresent pressure of state and federal codes and statutes that govern both behavior and building standards, each with a price tag ignored by the originating legislature state or federal.

But the net of all this is wonderfully exciting stuff: a rich, dense environment in which student minds have truly limitless opportunities.

III. The Mission of Bowdoin.

What then, with all this intellectual tumult, and the unending pressure and opportunity to expand the experience of students, is the core mission of the College? In drafting the statement that follows, which the Trustees gracefully approved — or did not object to — in their May meeting, I drew on my experience at Bowdoin these past nine years: countless conversations with students and faculty; dance, music, theater and athletic events witnessed; judicial board appeals presided over; trustees listened to; also the experience of hundreds of committee meetings, white water canoeing with the Outing Club and meetings with alumni groups and parents; and intense discussions with architects, accountants, lawyers and occasionally, judges. I was influenced by the weight of several thousand walks and bike rides across the Bowdoin campus in rain, snow and sun; in winter, spring and fall — and also, I confess, by climbing Katahdin and sailing a small boat for eight summers in Maine’s unequalled waters. I also gratefully acknowledge the suggestions of faculty, trustees, students and administrative colleagues.

The statement is not a marketing document; it is a rather lumpy mix of description, prescription, and aspiration. Most emphatically it is in no way a replacement of William DeWitt Hyde’s “Offer of the College,” which remains as relevant, economical and as valuable as ever, nearly 100 years after it was written. But I hope it does not do damage to the grandeur, and the sacred trust, that constitutes the mission of Bowdoin.

ROBERT H. EDWARDS
President of Bowdoin College
The Mission of Bowdoin

It is the mission of the College to engage students of uncommon promise in an intense full-time education of their minds, exploration of their creative faculties and development of their social and leadership abilities, in a four-year course of study and residence that concludes with a baccalaureate degree in the liberal arts.

Two guiding ideas suffuse Bowdoin’s mission. The first, from the College of the 18th and 19th centuries, defines education in terms of a social vision. “Literary institutions are founded and endowed for the common good, and not for the private advantage of those who resort to them...but that their mental powers may be cultivated and improved for the benefit of society” (President Joseph McKeen’s inaugural address, 1802); “To lose yourself in generous enthusiasms and cooperate with others for common ends: this is the offer of the College” (President William DeWitt Hyde, 1903). The second idea stresses the formation of a complete individual for a world in flux: there is an intrinsic value in a liberal arts education of breadth and depth, beyond the acquisition of specific knowledge, that will enable a thinking person, “to be at home in all lands and all ages” (President Hyde).

At the root of this mission is selection. First, and regardless of their wealth, Bowdoin selects men and women of varied gifts, diverse social, geographic and racial backgrounds, and exceptional qualities of mind and character. Developed in association with one another, these gifts will enable them to become leaders in many fields of endeavor. Second, it recruits faculty members of high intellectual ability and scholarly accomplishment who have a passion for education—both of undergraduates and of themselves, as life-long creators and pursuers of knowledge.

The College pursues its mission in five domains:

1. Intellectual and Academic. The great mission of the College is to instill in students the love, the ways and the habit of learning.

   General education in liberal arts. The academic disciplines are specialized modes of inquiry through which human beings perceive and intellectually engage the world. Both their power and their limits have led the College to make a long-standing commitment to general education. Specialist faculty cause non-specialist students to become critically acquainted with the perspectives and methods of disciplines in three general divisions of learning: the natural sciences, the humanities and the arts and the social sciences. The College also sustains programs of interdisciplinary study, to reveal complicated realities not disclosed by any single discipline. It requires study outside the perspectives of Europe and the West; and it encourages study abroad to foster students’ international awareness and linguistic mastery.
The Mission of Bowdoin

The major field of study and independent work. Bowdoin places particular emphasis on the academic major, a concentrated engagement with the method and content of an academic discipline, in which advanced students take increasing intellectual responsibility for their own education. The College provides opportunities for honors projects and independent study, enabling students to engage in research and writing under the guidance of faculty mentors. The arrangement of teaching responsibilities of Bowdoin faculty presupposes professional duties not only of original scholarship and creative work but also of supervision of advanced student projects.

Essential skills. The unevenness of American secondary education, the diversity of student backgrounds and the demands of college-level work and effective citizenship all require that the College enable students to master essential quantitative and writing skills and skills of oral communication, with the guidance of faculty, other professionals and qualified student peers.

The College believes that technology is not education, but that it is changing both education and society; and that it must be embraced by pedagogy and research and made easily and dependably available to students, faculty and staff.

2. Social and Residential. Bowdoin students are selected from a large pool of applicants for their intellectual ability, seriousness of purpose and personal qualities. By design, they differ widely in their backgrounds and talents — be they artistic, athletic, scientific or otherwise. To enable such students to learn from each other, and to make lasting friendships, the College is dedicated to creating a rewarding and congenial residence life, open to all students, which, with communal dining, is at the core of the mission of a residential college. Bowdoin's system is based on residence halls linked to restored, medium-sized, self-governing former fraternity houses.

The College devotes the talent of staff and faculty, and of students themselves, to the creation of opportunities for student growth and leadership in these residential contexts, reinforced by many volunteer programs and activities, student-run campus organizations and opportunities to plan careers.

3. Athletic. Intercollegiate athletic competition against colleges with shared academic values, and other non-varsity sports, can foster self-control, poise, leadership, good health and good humor. Bowdoin encourages student participation in professionally coached varsity and club programs, as well as intramural sports, and in an outing club program that enables students to explore and test themselves in Maine's rivers and forests and on its seacoast and islands.

4. Esthetic and Environmental. The College is dedicated to constructing and preserving buildings and campus spaces of the highest quality, believing that their beauty and serenity shape campus intellectual and esthetic life and inform the sensibilities of students who as graduates will influence the quality of spaces and buildings in their towns, businesses and homes. A quadrangle of oaks and pines ringed with historic architecture, and containing two museums with major collections of art and Arctic craft, deepens a Bowdoin student’s sense of place, history and civilization.

As a liberal arts college in Maine, Bowdoin assumes a particular responsibility to use nature as a resource for teaching and engaging students—notably to help them obtain a broad sense of the natural environment, local and global, and the effects and the role of human beings regarding it.
The Mission of Bowdoin

5. Ethical. Implicit in and explicit to its mission is the College's commitment to creating a moral environment, free of fear and intimidation, and where differences can flourish. Faculty and students require honesty in academic work. Coaches instruct that fatigue and frustration are no excuse for personal fouls. Deans and proctors set standards of probity and decency and enforce them, with student participation, in College procedures. Yet, recognizing that life will present graduates with ambiguities that call for certainty less than for balance and judgement, Bowdoin makes few decisions for students, academically or socially—perhaps fewer than do many other residential colleges. It does so believing that students grow morally and sharpen personal identity by exercising free individual choice among varied alternatives, curricular and social. But the College also causes these decisions to occur in a context of density and variety—of ideas, artistic expression, and exposure to other cultures and other races—so that personal identity will not become an illusion of centrality.

Bowdoin College seeks to be a fair, encouraging employer of all those who serve the institution, providing opportunities for professional development, promotion and personal growth, and recognizing the value of each individual's contribution to its educational mission.

From its history of more than 200 years and its inheritance of buildings and endowment that are the gifts of Bowdoin alumni there derives a corollary. If the College is to pursue its educational purposes in perpetuity, its mission is also a provident and prudential one. Succeeding generations of members of the College must carry the costs of their own enjoyment of its benefits; as alumni they remain a part of Bowdoin, assuming responsibility for renewing the endowments and buildings that will keep Bowdoin a vital, growing educational force for future generations of students and faculty.

Finally, Bowdoin's intellectual mission is informed by the humbling and cautionary lesson of the 20th century: that intellect and cultivation, unless informed by a basic sense of decency, of tolerance and mercy, are ultimately destructive of both the person and society. The purpose of a Bowdoin education—the mission of the College—is therefore to assist a student to deepen and broaden intellectual capacities that are also attributes of maturity and wisdom: self-knowledge, intellectual honesty, clarity of thought, depth of knowledge, an independent capacity to learn, mental courage, self discipline, tolerance of and interest in differences of culture and belief, and a willingness to serve the common good and subordinate self to higher goals.
This is the eighth annual report that I have had the privilege to submit as Bowdoin’s Dean for Academic Affairs. And it is the last — by the time this is published, I will have passed the dean’s baton to Professor of Sociology Craig A. McEwen, who begins his term on July 1. (Yes, there is a dean’s baton: it is a Class of 1875 walking stick, its elaborate scrimshaw head festooned with black and white ribbon.) This report on developments of the year is, therefore, also a chance to take stock of a decade of uncommon growth and change in the academic life of the College.

Faculty

This year we recruited to fill seventeen tenurable positions — by far the largest number ever — and succeeded in making appointments to fourteen of these. This is an excellent and diverse group who will add strength to the College in subjects ranging from environmental physics to neuropsychology, from urban sociology to the social anthropology of Latin America, and from theater to African-American literature. Thirteen of the fourteen were our top choice candidates. Faculty recruitment is not a passive game: it requires initiative and persistence to identify and attract first rate people, and the department chairs and search committee members who conducted this year’s searches, and associate dean Allen Wells, who oversaw the entire effort, deserve great credit for our success.

Looking back over eight years, the rate of change in the composition of the faculty has been remarkable. More than 50 people — 40% of those now holding tenured and tenurable positions — have come to Bowdoin since 1991. About half are men and half women; more than one-fifth are persons of color. The impact on the institution of such a large number of new colleagues is visible in many ways, not least in contributing to a lively and stimulating faculty culture that helps, in turn, to make the College more attractive for successive cohorts of new recruits.

Why so many new appointments? To some extent, of course, we have simply been filling vacancies arising from retirements, resignations, and non-reappointments. But nearly half of these appointments have been made to new positions established in connection with the expansion of student enrollment in 1994-98, and more recently, as a result of the Trustee initiative to shift resources toward the academic program. As the chart on page 12 shows, today we are about 20 full-time-equivalent positions larger than eight years ago. Our ratios are consequently more favorable since 1991, the student/faculty ratio has fallen from 11.5/1 to around 10.5/1 and average class size has declined almost annually. But numbers do not tell the whole story: because the new positions have been invested disproportionately in disciplines of high student interest (e.g., biology, government, Spanish, and sociology) and in areas where offerings were dangerously thin (e.g., Africana Studies and Asian Studies), the curriculum is noticeably more accessible and has grown substantially deeper and more interesting. This is not to say that we have reached an optimum — our ratios are still marginally higher, and our absolute size is still significantly smaller, than the norms for the colleges with which we compete for students and faculty — but there is no question that the investments in faculty of these years have yielded an educationally stronger and more competitive program.
The development and nurturance of a strong and effective faculty only begins with recruitment. So I note with particular satisfaction that during the last several years faculty salaries have been restored to their competitive targets and entry-level salaries now compare well with those at peer institutions. The gap in employee benefits appears to have narrowed significantly. Start-up research grants, which are especially vital in the natural sciences, have been generous—a fact for which we owe special thanks to the friends of Stan Druckenmiller ’75, who established a fund in Stan’s honor for this purpose. This year, funds available to support research leaves beyond the standard sabbatical program were nearly doubled, and funds for small research grants and for travel to meetings of learned societies were increased. One can always wish for more, of course—particularly in the area of research support, we are hardly “there” yet. But I suspect there has never been a comparable period of time in the College’s modern history when standards of faculty support have improved so substantially.

Curriculum

Curriculum review. The Curriculum and Educational Policy Committee (CEP) concluded the first phase of the curriculum review which it began the previous year by presenting a long and detailed report to the faculty in May. The report is based on extensive consultations with faculty members, analysis of several years of information about student course choices, and examination of curricular change at a

---

**Strengthen the Curriculum**

from Report to the Faculty from the CEP, May 1999

**Highlights of Recommendations.** Rethink general education. Emphasize essential learning skills such as writing, quantitative reasoning, and information skills. Replace the distribution requirement with one aiming to foster critical understanding of a well-defined array of modes of inquiry. Continue to encourage study of a foreign culture and disciplined exploration of problems of social justice. Expect much, if not all, general education to occur during a student’s first two years of college.

**Strengthen the major and the senior year.** Ensure, in appropriate ways, that students assume an increasing share of the responsibility for their own learning as they progress through the major, and that they are brought into critical contact with contemporary research in the field. Imagine distinctive types of senior-year experiences, either within the major or possibly beyond, with opportunities for reasonably independent (and possibly collaborative) learning.

**Enhance the international dimensions of the curriculum.** Continue to include foreign study in general education, perhaps limited to non-western societies. Integrate off-campus study with the on-campus program, typically though not exclusively through the major. Encourage, if not require, competence in a modern language other than English. Develop ties with universities in other societies and enable faculty members as well as students to study, and possibly teach, there. Cultivate greater curricular depth in at least one foreign area other than Asia—perhaps Latin America, where the college already has a commitment to a minor.

**Encourage interdisciplinary learning and teaching.** Stabilize existing programs by clarifying expectations for departmental contributions of teaching and by providing additional resources. Encourage and enable faculty members to teach interdisciplinary subjects, including by team-teaching, beyond the boundaries of existing programs. Involve students (perhaps as seniors) in forms of study in which the insights of various disciplines can be brought to bear on common problems.
Third, the committee recognized that the organization of the curriculum is also important for the growth and renewal of the faculty. Most faculty members spend the largest share of their professional time either teaching or preparing to teach. So we looked for ways to provide faculty members with opportunities to teach at advanced levels of their own disciplines, where the intersection of teaching and scholarship is most likely to take place, as well as to experiment, possibly in collaboration with others, with new and unfamiliar subjects.

The Committee noted that action on several of its recommendations will require a commitment of new resources by the College (for example, to promote innovation in courses, particularly in the area of general education, enhancement of departmental programs, improved instruction in learning skills). The report is, in part, an agenda for the investment of additional resources in teaching – a gesture whose significance may be less clear to readers elsewhere than to those of us on campus, where the retrenchment of the earlier years of the decade may have excessively dampened the will to think boldly about improving the educational program.

The CEP’s principal task in the coming year will be to consult broadly with colleagues about the direction suggested in the 1999 report, and then to frame specific recommendations to be considered by the faculty in the spring of 2000.

Skills. As the president notes in his report, one of the most visible educational trends of the last decade has been the evolution of a more concentrated and deliberate approach to the teaching of essential learning and communications skills – writing, quantitative reasoning, individual and collaborative study skills, time management, and so forth. The Writing Project (established in 1994) and Quantitative Skills Programs (1996) are reflections of this. We took another large step last year when, with support from Linda Baldwin ’73, we organized and recruited a director for a new learning and teaching skills office. The Baldwin Center for Learning and Teaching opens officially in September, in the

variety of other institutions. The report makes suggestions for change in four major areas – general education, the major and the senior year, international studies, and interdisciplinary programs.

These suggestions are all situated in a historical view of the evolution of the Bowdoin curriculum and in an appreciation of its various contemporary strengths.

I shall not discuss the Committee’s suggestions in detail (they are summarized in the sidebar). Instead, I’d simply note three themes that pervade the document.

First, the committee tried to take a developmental view of the curriculum to think of college as a four-year progression during which students develop a range of capacities by advancing through increasingly sophisticated levels and modes of study. Rather than regard the curriculum in abstraction, we tried to see it as a series of pathways that guide students’ intellectual growth and maturation.

Second, based on the testimony of students, faculty members, and graduates, the committee identified several aspects of Bowdoin’s educational program which are conspicuously successful. This is particularly true of the major: our best major programs, which involve students in intensive, advanced work, often in close collaboration with a faculty member, would be exemplary in any institution in the country. We sought ways to learn from and generalize these successes.

Since 1991, the student/faculty ratio has fallen from 11.5/1 to around 10.5/1.
newly-renovated Searles Science Building, under the guidance of its new director, Elizabeth Barnhart, formerly director of the learning center at Southwestern University in Texas.

Technology

Yet another area of significant change this decade, about which I've commented in previous reports, involves the application of information technology to teaching and learning. Eight years ago, the campus network was still incomplete, there was no such thing as the Web, and technologies like interactive multimedia, streaming video, and asynchronous conferencing were regarded as exotic ideas. Today, we are competitive with our peers in most areas - the network is finished, there is widespread access to computing resources, the library is fully online - and in some respects we are well ahead.

The principal need in the academic area of the College is to identify and develop applications of information technology that will make teaching and learning more effective without diminishing the close human relationships that distinguish us from most of modern higher education. This responsibility falls to our Educational Technology Task Force (ETTF), established almost three years ago as an interdisciplinary "SWAT team" and co-managed by Sherrie Bergman, the College librarian, and Carey Phillips, professor of biology. This past year, the ETTF has been transformed into a separate department (a part of the library) with a dedicated staff of its own. It is led by a new director, Peter Schilling, who joined us last spring from the College Board. We think of the Task Force as essentially a research and development initiative-it encourages and supports faculty members in technology-intensive experiments in teaching. The importance of this can't be overstated: it requires a deliberate push, and a good deal of specialist support, to press our technological possibilities to new levels of imagination. Without that, there is a danger that the Web could amount to no more than the most expensive way yet devised to publish a course syllabus; we are determined not to settle for that here.

Class size and other faculty policies

Finally, I note that this year the faculty enacted legislation designed to reduce average class size by authorizing lower enrollment limits for certain courses, when pedagogically justified. At the same time, the faculty established a minimum course enrollment below which a course may not be offered unless it is essential for the curriculum. These measures will help to achieve a better match between courses offered and student interests. The legislation is one of a number of measures adopted by the faculty in recent years - also including new policies for faculty governance, evaluation for tenure and promotion, allocation of teaching duties, efficient use of the class schedule, and review of vacancies in faculty positions - representing an affirmation of collective responsibility and acceptance of common institutional standards for the quality and conduct of the educational program. In a college which has often felt itself to be excessively decentralized, these steps are constructive indeed.

"It takes a deliberate push, and a good deal of specialist support, to press our technological possibilities to new levels of imagination."
Museum of Art

In last year’s report I introduced Katy Kline, our new director of the Bowdoin College Museum of Art. Katy arrived in October from the List Arts Center at MIT, which she directed for over a decade. A graduate of Oberlin, she has an international reputation as a curator of contemporary art, reflected most recently in her appointment as co-organizer of the United States Pavilion at the 1999 Venice Biennale, which opened in June to rave reviews.

Katy and her exceptional staff have been working diligently to identify and understand the central challenges facing the museum in the years ahead—enhancement of the exhibition program, intensification of links with the faculty, and development of a more focused strategy for acquisitions of art by purchase and gift. No challenge, however, is as daunting as that of planning and financing the renovations required to introduce modern climate control technology into our historic McKim, Mead and White building, a project that brings with it the necessity for substantial alterations to make the building accessible to those with physical disabilities and to rationalize the organization of interior space on the lower level for galleries, staff operations, and storage of art.

Katy and her colleagues have taken up these challenges with enthusiasm and determination, beginning with the planning of the renovations. Preliminary architectural studies have been completed and cost estimates for the project have been developed. The most pressing task now is to raise the additional capital funds required for the portions of the project that go beyond climate control itself, for which funding was raised in the New Century Campaign. We are the trustees of a great building and one of the most distinguished college art collections in the United States, and there is simply no decent alternative to completing this task.

Classrooms, Labs, and Offices

We broke ground for Druckenmiller Hall in winter 1996, and since that time there has been hardly a day when the sound of construction could not be heard somewhere on the campus. Druckenmiller and the renovated Cleaveland Hall opened in September 1997. The new Coastal Studies Center, combining a terrestrial ecology lab, a marine biological lab, and a farmhouse/seminar center, came into service in 1998. As I write, construction is underway on the renovation of the Searles Science Building (for computer science, math, and physics) and on a comprehensive renovation and expansion of Memorial Hall (including a totally rebuilt Pickard Theater, a new, experimental “black box” theater, and studio, rehearsal and office space for Theater and Dance). Searles will be back in operation by the time this is published and Memorial should be completed by spring, 2000. Altogether, these projects represent an investment of more than $40 million in the physical infrastructure of the academic program, and the most concentrated period of construction in
the history of the College – all of it, remarkably, financed by capital gifts from alumni/ae and friends.

With so many large projects in motion, it would be easy to overlook an array of smaller, though hardly unimportant, renovation projects. In the last five years, thanks to the initiative of former associate dean Susan Kaplan and the continuing efforts of assistant dean Kathleen O'Connor, a comprehensive effort has been made to improve classrooms and seminar rooms; surfaces have been renewed, new lighting installed, new chairs and desks acquired. The Smith Auditorium in Sills Hall has been rebuilt, thanks to a gift from Marvin H. Green, Jr. '57, and its technology brought up to date, for film and video programs. Offices, practice rooms, and rehearsal spaces in Gibson Hall, the music building, have been renovated and sound-proofed. More than twenty new offices have been provided for members of the faculty and instructional support staff.

Planning continues for several other projects. In addition to the renovation of the Walker Art Building, we are designing a music recital hall to be constructed within the shell of the Curtis Pool building; new space for the Psychology Department, including up-to-date laboratories; and renovations of the Hawthorne-Longfellow Library to improve existing space and to expand the library into the “administration side” of the building. On the current schedule, work on the library project should begin by spring, and on the museum, the following year. The Curtis Pool and Psychology projects will be scheduled for construction when funding has been identified.

### A Partial List of Major Grants and Awards for

- **Pamela Ballinger** - Sociology and Anthropology
- **Rachel Beune** - Geology
- **Ronald Christensen** - Chemist
- **Rachel Connelly and Deborah DeGraff** - Economics
- **Patsy D. Dickinson** - Biology
- **Edward S. Gilfillan, III** - Environmental Studies
- **Anne Henschaw** - Arctic Museum
- **John Holt** - Religion
- **R. Wells Johnson** - Mathematics
- **Zorina Khan** - Economics
- **Daniel Kaylo** - Psychology
- **Peter Lea** - Geology
- **Genevieve LeMoine** - Arctic Museum
- **Barry Logan** - Biology
- **Suzanne B. Lovett** - Psychology
- **Larry D. Lutchmansingh** - Art
- **Carey Phillips** - Biology
- **Elliott Schwartz** - Music
- **Allen Tucker** - Computer Science
- **Jean Yarbrough** - Government
- **Enrique Yepes** - Romance Languages

National Endowment for the Humanities
National Science Foundation
American Chemical Society Petroleum Research Fund
Rockefeller Foundation; Russell Sage Foundation
National Institutes of Health; Bowdoin College Porter Fellowship
Bowdoin College Faculty Leave Supplement Award
National Science Foundation
National Endowment for the Humanities Fulbright Fellowship; Bowdoin College Kenan Fellowship
Bowdoin College Faculty Leave Supplement Award
Bowdoin College Porter Fellowship
National Science Foundation
National Council of Undergraduate Research/Lancy
National Science Foundation
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Bowdoin College Faculty Leave Supplement Award
Bowdoin College Faculty Leave Supplement Award
National Science Foundation Davis and Paller Foundations
Bye Fellowship (residency), Churchill College, Cambridge
Erskine Fellowship (visiting), University of Canterbury, New Zealand
Bowdoin College Kenan Fellowship
Bowdoin College Kenan Fellowship
People

This year I must report the retirements of two senior colleagues – Charles A. Grobe, Jr., Professor of Mathematics, and Melinda Small, Professor of Psychology. Together, they have contributed more than 60 years of distinguished service to the College.

I am pleased to note five promotions: C. Thomas Settlemire (Biology), to the rank of professor; and James Higginbotham (Classics), Stephen Naculich (Physics), and Scott Schon and Matthew Stuart (both Philosophy), all to the rank of associate professor, with tenure.

We were proud, though not surprised, to learn that Clifton Olds, the Edith Cleaves Barry Professor of the History and Criticism of Art and one of the College’s legendary teachers, was honored by College Art Association with its Distinguished Teaching Award. Two colleagues won Guggenheim Fellowships: Professor of Biology Patsy S. Dickinson and Visiting Assistant Professor of Art Tina Ingraham. John Bisbee, also a visiting member of the Department of Art, won the 1998 Purchase Prize in the Portland Museum of Art Biennial. Anthony Walton, Writer-in-Residence in the Department of English, won the Whiting Foundation’s Writers’ Award for his accomplishments as a poet and non-fiction writer.

Faculty colleagues attained a larger number of research awards than in any earlier year of the decade. The list on page fifteen, is illustrative, though hardly complete.

Envoi

By the time this is published, I shall be off for a year’s sabbatic leave before I return to teaching in the Department of Government. Craig A. McEwen, Daniel B. Fayerweather Professor of Political Economy and Sociology, will have succeeded me as dean for academic affairs. Craig is one of the really exemplary citizens of the College; he will serve in this post with distinction and I wish him well.

Let me take this chance to thank all of the good people who helped make these eight years a time of great professional reward and personal pleasure. I owe a special debt to those with whom I’ve shared this job most closely – Randy Stakeman, Susan Kaplan, and Allen Wells, who served successive terms as associate dean; assistant dean Kathleen O’Connor; Ann Ostwald, assistant to the dean (a title that belies a staggering range of responsibility for the operations of the academic program); and Julie Lemieux and Dodie Martinson, our heroic secretaries. Bob Edwards, a wise and gifted president, has been a great teacher and a good friend. Finally, I am grateful beyond words to my faculty colleagues, who have supported their dean more generously than he deserved and who make this College a wonderful place to teach and learn.

CHARLES R. BEITZ
Dean for Academic Affairs
"The college was serious about its mission of educating the future of America. I like to think I did not waste the college's time. I took advantage of the opportunities to learn from people of different races, economic classes, and regions of the country and the world. When I graduated from Bowdoin, I was a different person than when I entered. I knew my vocation would be to work in the poorest communities this country had to offer – it was my calling when I came, it was my calling when I left. But being at Bowdoin was like being plunged into a brave new world. The people had changed me. I had grown in breadth as well as depth, which can only happen if we intentionally encourage diversity in our nation and on our college campuses. Small liberal arts colleges force the members of their communities to live with and therefore know other kinds of people; for those who come having had limited experience with this, it is an opportunity to grow and learn. I left Bowdoin better prepared to tackle the job I wanted to do."*

As I reflect on the events and conversations of the 1998-99 year at Bowdoin, I am struck by the relevance of Geoffrey Canada’s statement about his experience at this college a generation ago. Today’s college students are often called “apathetic,” but I do not find that to be true of Bowdoin students. During the past year the Bowdoin community wrestled with a number of important issues, issues at the heart of what we aspire to be as a diverse, open, and inclusive community. Those discussions have been productive; they have had an impact on everything from individual attitudes to institutional policies. And they were, for the most part, initiated and led by students.

I have long believed that the power of a small residential liberal arts experience – in addition to the significant academic advantages related to scale – lies in the richness of those moments when students are called to take some initiative, to speak out, and to make a contribution to the community in which they live and act. Doing so, they learn to see themselves as individuals who can make a difference and can lead others. Those who come to understand their own capacity to lead and to learn the value of making their voices heard become graduates who approach the world – in both their public and private spheres of influence – with confidence and optimism. At a place like Bowdoin, in which the experience of learning is linked to the notion of the Common Good, this confidence often comes as well with a sense of obligation, to serve.

Students who have learned well to make their voices heard, to value and to explore differences, led us in these discussions over the course of the year. I outline some of those discussions, and in some cases institutional responses, in this annual report. Like Geoff Canada twenty-five years before them, I believe the students who lead this community to address these issues leave Bowdoin better prepared to tackle the jobs they want to do. I know that the college they leave behind is better for their having been here.

**Issues of Socioeconomic Class**

Last winter, a group of Bowdoin students gathered to discuss their experiences dealing with socioeconomic difference on campus. A transcript of this conversation was published in the

April 16, 1999, Orient. Thanks to the leadership of Joy Cushman '99 (Caribou, Maine), this conversation about socioeconomic class at Bowdoin persisted. These discussions prompted us to consider and reevaluate our financial aid policy and what the Orient termed “…the general culture of privilege at our school.” Students from poor or lower middle class backgrounds spoke of the challenges of trying to participate fully in campus life while working hard to earn money to support their education. These students spoke about the occasional feelings of alienation they experience at Bowdoin. They also spoke about how exposure to new experiences and ways of thinking could sometimes make them feel they had grown apart from families and high school friends, and that the differences were so great that they no longer fit in when they returned home. They spoke of language differences, what sociolinguists call bi-dialecticism – speaking one way on campus and a different way at home. Reading Geoffrey Canada’s article alongside this Orient supplement, one can appreciate the challenges of “…being plunged into a brave new world.”

The publication of the special supplement in the Orient prompted other discussions on campus and among trustees. Some trustees stated that the published discussion about socioeconomic class reflected to a degree their own experiences at Bowdoin as first-generation college students or as students of color. Some noted that one condition that may have changed over time is the level of “conspicuous consumption” among students who are upper middle class or upper class. While financially privileged students have attended Bowdoin in every generation, more now bring to campus cars and other trappings that plainly reflect their status. The relative wealth of students may have seemed less obvious a generation ago. Class-consciousness may be more acute in this era and current economic cycle given the growing divergence between the “haves” and “have-nots” in our society.

How might Bowdoin respond to this? We are as committed as ever to making this experience available to those best able to capitalize on it, irrespective of their ability to pay. Financial aid policies have changed so that outside scholarships and grants are applied against student loan debt. These policy decisions will help to keep Bowdoin accessible to the best and the brightest and to hold our own in an increasingly aggressive competition for those students.

But some of the issues about socioeconomic class are not about financial aid: they are about the climate on campus and tolerance of differences. The process itself of discussing questions of socioeconomic class affects the climate; it makes members of the community more aware of class issues, and this awareness filters through to policy-making and day-to-day interactions.

The campus seems to be more open to discussing issues that matter on an individual and community level than it was when I first arrived. In the spring of 1998, there was a compelling “Conversation on Race at Bowdoin” about which I wrote in this report last year. The tone of this year’s discussions about important community issues was similar to the tone of the spring 1998 discussions about race – honest, self-critical, and optimistic. The issues are deeply personal issues that have implications for the community, which truly aspires to be inclusive. For example, as Maria (only first names were published), one of the participants in the
discussion about socioeconomic class, stated, “I also think that there has been a change since I’ve been here. Four years ago, I was much more reluctant, maybe because I was a freshman or naïve, but I truly believe that there is a difference on campus. There are more individuals, people who aren’t as willing to conform, and that is creating a different type of atmosphere. When I came here four years ago, it was ten times worse than it is now. I don’t know whether it’s because the college has been able to give more financial aid, but I think whatever they’re doing, it’s going in the right direction. No, the problem hasn’t been solved, but it is getting better.”

**Forum on Disabilities**

Another vital issue was discussed openly early in the academic year, when approximately fifty students and faculty participated in a Forum on Disabilities. This group gathered for two hours to discuss personal experiences, institutional policies and accommodations for students with special needs. The forum was effective in raising awareness for faculty, students, and staff and validated the work of the student group FORWARD!, an organization which provided the leadership for the forum to occur. Minutes from the forum were distributed campus-wide via e-mail, and a number of “next steps” have been identified and pursued. For example, in the coming year we will publish a booklet describing the policies and practices of the College in this domain, and the orientation for faculty advisors will include a discussion about learning differences in the classroom. In addition, the new Baldwin Center for Learning and Teaching will be an important tool both for students and for instructors.

**Issues of Sexuality**

Campus events and discussions often follow events current in the national media. The tragic murder of Matthew Shepard in Wyoming last fall caused a sense of outrage nationally and at Bowdoin. On campus, Shepard’s murder prompted two significant events to occur, events that seem have affected the climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered members of the Bowdoin community. Two days following Shepard’s death, the student leaders of B-GLAD (Bisexual, Gay, Lesbian Alliance for Diversity, now called the Gay-Straight Alliance or GSA) organized a forum to reflect on the event and the climate for gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered persons on campus. This forum was followed the next week by a memorial for Shepard held on the steps of the Walker Art Building. A large number of students, faculty, staff, and townspeople participated in these gatherings, and collectively they raised community consciousness of issues of sexuality at Bowdoin.

President Edwards’ statement at the Shepard memorial merits reprinting here:

“Our weapons at Bowdoin... are the powers of reason, imagination, and fairness – the power
to see a fellow student, a fellow faculty member, a fellow worker, as a human being, as a fellow striver for excellence, not a bundle of characteristics...Our weapons are the courage to stand up for those we see persecuted or reviled, and to assert their right to freedom and safety.”

“Breaking the Silence”
Silence is a predictable and normal response of survivors to the trauma of sexual assault. “Breaking the silence” is the phrase used by survivors of sexual assault and harassment when they choose to speak about their experiences. Sexual misconduct – assault and harassment – does occur in this community. We continue to work with vigilance to prevent sexual misconduct at Bowdoin, and we respond swiftly and compassionately when cases are brought forward. We have benefited from excellent leadership of Safe Space, the student organization that leads campus educational efforts about sexual assault and harassment. One of Safe Space’s main contributions during the past year was to organize and sponsor Sexual Assault Awareness Week, which included speakers Jackson Katz and Maria Falzone.

Costume party or cultural stereotyping?
Reflecting on the relevance of Geoffrey Canada’s description of his experience of learning to live with people of different backgrounds at Bowdoin, I think about the healthy and productive debate that ensued from the use of stereotypical imagery to promote a social event on campus in mid-November. Baxter House sponsored a “gangsta party” and printed posters inviting participants to attend wearing "appropriate gangsta attire.” Seeing the posters upset some students, who arranged to meet with the leadership of Baxter House to discuss their concerns about how the images about “gangstas” portray and perpetuate racially based stereotypes. Naiima Horsley-Fauntleroy, a member of the class of 2000 from New Jersey, made a comment typical of those who were concerned, “They aren’t costumes to these people, this is their reality.” There were a number of letters to the Orient arguing on the one hand that the poster perpetuates racial stereotypes and on the other that “this is no big deal” and “Everyone should grow up and calm down.” Members of the Afro-American Society and Baxter House got together to discuss these issues, and the party was changed to one without costumes. In addition, Baxter and the Am subsequently co-sponsored a forum to discuss the role of hip-hop music in popular culture, co-facilitated by Professor Craig McEwen and Dana Thomas ’01.

I was impressed that this dialogue took place among students in a civil and cooperative spirit. One of the distinct advantages and opportunities of a small residential college is that, in general, civility can be sustained in the face of even emotionally charged debates.

The (electronic) limits of civility
The one area in which civility is easily jeopardized at Bowdoin and beyond is in e-mail and Internet communication. We had an experience this spring with a group of first-year students assuming e-mail aliases that enabled them to
mask their identities while they sent other students hateful messages. These messages were not about an issue of importance or current debate; they were simply mean-spirited personal attacks. As it turned out, the identity of some of the senders was revealed by virtue of a fellow student who was able to trace the messages back and identify the senders. Following this flurry of messages and responses, the e-mail aliases for the first-year residence halls were disabled while we took time to discuss what would be an appropriate and civil forum for the first-year class and the college community. When confronted, the students involved acknowledged that they would never say the things they wrote over e-mail or write them in a letter; they perceive that e-mail is a medium that by virtue of its informality is somehow less forceful. As anyone knows who regularly uses e-mail, there is something about the medium of e-mail communication that lends it to less civil and more highly charged statements than one would typically encounter face-to-face or in a “hard copy.” Incivility over e-mail will persist; however, we will continue to stress the importance of civility as we work together to build an open and inclusive community.

Growth and momentum in the College House System

The College House system continued to build momentum as a force in the residential and social experiences of Bowdoin students in its second year of existence. Of note during the past year, student leaders of College Houses and fraternities continued a productive cooperative relationship through the Inter-House Council (IHC). In addition, IHC members met with Brunswick neighbors to hear concerns about noise and parking in the neighborhoods proximate to College Houses and fraternities.

Student leaders responded effectively to neighbors’ concerns about a zoning change permitting renovated fraternities (a “grandfathered” use) to be used as College Houses, and the change in the zoning was allowed.

A milestone event in the evolution of the House System was the development and ratification of the House System Constitution. Developed by a group of House Leaders and ratified by the student government, the Constitution addresses the key governance issues anticipated by the Ad Hoc Implementation Committee and experienced during the first two years of the system’s existence. Issues of representation, elections, and rights and responsibilities of officers have been set forth in this well-written document. The efficacy of the constitution was tested in the spring elections that were held in the houses, including one re-run election due to a procedural impropriety.

A major challenge facing each house as it moves forward is to establish through consistent programs and annual traditions a stronger sense of house identity. Given the diverse membership of each house, house identities will be formed by what they do, rather than who their members are. Another challenge for the House System is to balance the high level and diversity of social programs with programs that will foster greater student-faculty interaction in the houses. There
have been a number of successful events in the past year, and building upon them is a priority for the student House Leaders in the year ahead. The system will grow in the coming year as we add Quinby House, the erstwhile Psi Upsilon fraternity house, as a College House affiliated with Appleton Hall. The house, built in 1906, was designed by celebrated Maine architect John Calvin Stevens, and it has been a rewarding process to work with his grandson, Portland architect Paul Stevens, on the renovation of the building. The house, named in honor of George H. ("Pat") Quinby '23, will be dedicated this fall. Also of note, 238 Maine Street, formerly the Wellness House, formerly ARU, will be dedicated this fall as Helmreich House, in honor of Ernst Helmreich. Helmreich, who died in June of 1997 at the age of 94, was Bowdoin’s Thomas Brackett Reed Professor of History and Political Science Emeritus, a great teacher and historian. He was an advisor for many years to the Thorndike Club, the precursor to ARU.

**Bricks and mortar**

One aspect of campus life this generation of Bowdoin students has come to understand well is bricks and mortar. The campus has been physically transformed during the 1990s, and these additions and improvements have significantly enhanced the quality of students’ academic and residential experiences at Bowdoin. In the area of student life, we opened Howard and Stowe residence halls in 1996, and they have been an excellent addition to our student housing stock. This fall we will open Chamberlain Hall with 129 beds, just west of Coles Tower, adding important capacity for us in our efforts to bring more students back to the center of the campus. Designed by the Boston firm Kallman, McKinnell, and Wood, this building is an exciting new student space with a mix of singles, doubles, and four-person suites on four floors.

As part of this project, Kallmann, McKinnell, and Wood has also designed a new dining hall now under construction just south of Wentworth Hall. This dining hall will open in August 2000, creating an additional 400 dining seats for a total of 840. Wentworth Hall will be renovated as part of this project, becoming the servery for the new facility.

A smaller project that has taken shape over the past year is the creation of a new Craft Center on campus. Thanks to the generosity of an anonymous donor, the Craft Center is being constructed in the Theta barn that the College purchased from the fraternity this summer. The Craft Center, due to open in mid-October, will include
a ceramics studio, a student dark room, and a multipurpose craft space. Non-credit courses will be taught, and a student, faculty, and staff advisory board will oversee the Center.

Athletics
Jeff Ward completed his first year as Bowdoin’s new athletic director with 28 of the 32 varsity teams having winning seasons, four of them under new coaches. Men’s and women’s basketball, men’s and women’s soccer, and women’s lacrosse all went to the NCAA tournament, and women’s ice hockey finished the season ranked fourth in the nation.

One of the more costly changes in the world of collegiate athletics occurred in the game of squash. Bowdoin’s men’s and women’s teams are ranked in the top ten nationally, and we are very proud of their accomplishments and the vitality of the squash program at Bowdoin. However, we faced a problem in that the rules of intercollegiate squash have changed since we built our squash courts. In particular, the dimensions of the court have switched from an American standard to an international standard.

International standard courts are wider, which means that the institutions supporting intercollegiate squash programs are obligated to renovate or build new courts. In Bowdoin’s case, given the structure of the Morrell Gym building, we are not able to widen the squash courts and instead have begun building (thanks to a generous anonymous donation) a new squash building just east of the Farley Field House. Slated to open in January 2000, this will be a terrific new facility – several courts, locker rooms, and the coach’s office.

“What is unique about Bowdoin?”
From time to time, I am asked to respond to surveys, typically from one of the college guides/ranking organizations. I was asked in a survey this summer “What is unique about Bowdoin?” As I reflected on the three years I have been associated with the College, I was struck by the richness of the leadership opportunities our students have and take: leading a group across the Knife Edge on Katahdin in a snow squall; establishing vital new traditions such as the Spring Gala; House and fraternity leaders organizing and running events for scores of other students, including dealing with the administration and the Brunswick community; organizing and leading service initiatives of all sorts; establishing high standards for honesty and decency as members of the Judicial Board; taking the initiative to raise an issue of community concern; having a seat at the table and a voice in all major committees of the College, including trustee committees. I dare say that this range and weight of leadership opportunities is extraordinary even among small liberal arts colleges.

My honest appraisal of what is unique about Bowdoin is based on the accomplishments of students and graduates as leaders. Leadership is unquestionably a Bowdoin trait. Perhaps this is a function of the students we attract. No doubt it has something to do with their interactions with other talented and motivated individuals on campus. It also has to do with this combined sense of obligation and confidence developed in a place where anonymity is not an option, a place where all are expected to serve the Common Good. Whatever the particular alchemy for each student, the lesson of leadership is well learned during four years in Brunswick; ideally, it stays with Bowdoin graduates for a lifetime.

CRAIG W. BRADLEY
Dean of Student Affairs
For this college treasurer, the annual report is both a challenge and a comfort. It is a challenge to summarize the avalanche of numbers that Bowdoin College produces into a reasonable story of the year just ended and some prediction of the years to come. Comfort stems from being able to report, clearly and concretely, on the essence of what business schools call "management control." How closely did the College’s actual finances at year-end mirror our plans at the beginning? Like Winston Churchill, we now "pass with relief from the tossing sea of cause and theory to the firm ground of result and fact."

The facts are that Bowdoin College’s financial situation is stable, and the outlook is positive but precarious. For fiscal year 1998-99 (ending June 30, 1999), the College achieved a sixth consecutive balanced budget on revenues and expenditures of about $76 million. Exhibit 1 shows the growth in revenues, expenses, and students between FY 1990-91 and FY 1998-99, in part due to a planned 10% expansion of the student body to 1550.

Revenues and expenses climbed 48% in eight years, an average annual increase of 6% that fulfilled C. Northcote Parkinson’s dictum that "expenditure rises to meet income." The new budget for 1999-00 is also balanced on revenues and expenditures of about $76 million, or about the same as FY 1998-1999, a year in which the College received an unusually large number of one-time gifts and bequests.

Annual Giving

A wonderful achievement during this same period has been the huge growth in annual giving that balanced the College budget in three of the last five years. It has been, as Marianne Moore once wrote, a "felicitous phenomenon." Annual giving from alumni, parents, and friends during the five years of The New Century Campaign totaled $19.7 million, surpassing its goal by $810,000. Even after the Campaign ended, annual giving continued to soar as evidenced by the results for FY 1998-99:

- The alumni fund set a record for the sixth consecutive year and exceeded the $4 million goal by $575,000. Exhibit 2 illustrates that the fund
grew from $2.9 million in FY 1991-92 to $4.6 million in FY 1998-99, an impressive gain of 54% in seven years. Participation surpassed 53% this year, among the highest for American colleges and universities.
• By increasing 10% in FY 1998-99, the parent’s fund established a new record for the ninth straight year to $495,000. Almost 800 parents contributed an average gift of $630.
• Annual gifts from the Board of Trustees totaled $522,000. Participation was 100%.

Shifting Budget Priorities
As the College began to regain financial stability in FY 1990-91, we strove to ensure that the budget was not only balanced but also that it emphasized the academic program over administrative overhead. Obviously, the women and men who provide the College’s management and support services are essential to this enterprise, but the work of faculty and students constitutes our raison d’etre. Henry Adams reminds us that: “A teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops.” To this end, we shifted spending priorities and protected faculty positions as we cut other staff gradually and painfufully over three years, and reassigned others. In addition, our auditors helped in reclassifying expenses for valid comparisons between Bowdoin and other colleges. An examination of fiscal data from FY 1988-89 through FY 1998-99 suggests how successful we were.

Budget Proportions
The percentage of the educational and general (E&G) budget spent on instruction and research grew over ten years from 29% to 32%. [The E&G budget excludes dining services and other auxiliary enterprises.] Adding the library and other elements of academic support boosts the total percentage for the academic program from 38% in FY 1988-89 to 41% in FY 1998-99. Student services jumped from 12% of E&G to 14%. Financial aid had the most significant escalation from 14% to 19%. Institutional support, including the office expenses of the president and senior staff, accounting, and related administrative functions, plummeted from 21% to 15%.

Cost per Student
What about the cost per Bowdoin student? Between FY 1988-89 and FY 1998-99, total E&G costs per student (not including depreciation) escalated in nominal dollars from $25,255 to $36,293, or 44% as shown in Exhibit 3. The real increase after adjusting for inflation was about 11%. Real, inflation adjusted increases per student for mission-centered functions were instruction and research (30%) and student services (32%). The same dramatic downward trend for institutional support in its share of total E&G was repeated in its cost per student which dropped -1% in nominal dollars and -33% in real dollars. This is a sizeable achievement.
Financial Outlook

Nevertheless, the College has not reached financial equilibrium and problems could lie ahead. Last year’s surplus was slender and insecure. Of the 70 non-faculty positions cut this decade, 68 have been added back. However, a third or more of the replacements can be attributed to the expansion of the student body and many are in different departments, notably computing, student affairs, and development.

Budget Pressures

And, the budget keeps growing. The administration and trustees are discussing how to absorb a gradual increase to the base budget of $4.4 million over five years for new initiatives in the academic program, residential life, athletics, information technology, and maintenance. The budget must also absorb the enormous housing costs of the more than twenty-five percent of the student population that was once served by the fraternities. Funds for the academic program and residential life are increasingly dependent on new gifts because the College’s revenues from student fees and endowment spending are at or near their limits.

Some of these costs have been financed by low interest rate debt. Exhibit 4 shows that since FY 1994-95, the College’s total debt has quadrupled to $55 million and annual debt service tripled to almost $1.3 million. Our upgraded Aa3 bond rating from Moody’s Investors Services in 1997 and independent analysis indicates that our total debt is about right given our financial resources, especially relative to endowment. Nevertheless, further borrowing to meet capital needs will be difficult for two or three years until the budget can afford more debt service.

Aspirations and Resources

The College’s resources do not now match our aspirations or the financial firepower of our principal collegiate rivals. Other elite colleges charge about the same student fees. However, many not only have larger endowments in total and per student but also spend more than we do. In FY 1997-98, our endowment grew 10.5% to $373 million. That year, Bowdoin budgeted from endowment about $6,700 per student compared to $10-$20,000 per student for the most prosperous competitors in our 18-college comparison group that includes Amherst, Swarthmore, Wellesley, and Williams. At the end of FY 1998-99, after moving $12 million to
the operating budget, our $407 million endowment was still worth much less than our main competitors. Yet, Bowdoin College remains a very ambitious place – one that is unwilling to allow financial concerns to diminish its high energy in pursuit of great goals.

Higher Education Environment

Bowdoin’s constricted financial circumstances are best understood by analyzing our industry. Only 17% of college students nationwide now live full-time on campuses and range in age from 18 to 22. Highly selective private colleges and universities like Bowdoin enroll only 2% of the student population. Moody’s Investor Services cites substantial and growing wealth concentration as an increasing risk factor for independent higher education as those institutions which have substantial financial assets separate themselves from those which have less. The twenty wealthiest private universities held over half of the total endowment market value of the 326 institutions surveyed in 1997. In other words, 6% of the institutions possessed 54% of the wealth. Less than a dozen institutions—including Bowdoin—still accept students on a fully need-blind basis, compared to about forty institutions in the early 1980s.

Student Fees

Average tuition prices are almost 500% higher at private colleges and universities than at their public counterparts, even though public tuition has soared 195% in two decades. Exhibit 5 shows that Bowdoin’s 4.3% increase in the student fee for this year was below the estimated average increase among all U.S. private colleges and universities. Yet, our increase was higher than the median 3.8% for the 18-college group. We now rank 7th highest among the 18, up from 10th in FY 1998-99.

George Dehne, a trustee at Allegheny College and a consultant to the Bowdoin admissions office, reports that median family income is higher for students applying to the Bowdoin admissions office, reports that median family income is higher for students applying to the flagship public universities in all fifty states than to comparable private institutions. The costs at independent and public institutions are virtually the same in terms of buildings, utilities, salaries, and other items. The major difference in the tuition and fee prices charged to students and families is the state appropriation that uses tax dollars to offset much of the tuition at public institutions.

In 1998, Bowdoin College became one of 100 charter members of Tuition Plan Inc. This prepaid tuition program lowers the risks of tuition inflation and investment return for families and students at private colleges and universities. Members include research universities (Georgetown, Northwestern, Princeton) and baccalaureate colleges (Bryn Mawr, Carleton, Pomona, Wellesley, Williams). Although the consortium is still being negotiated, a factor in Bowdoin joining now, the charter institutions have tentatively agreed on several principles. Future tuition can be purchased for prospective students at a guaranteed rate not less than five
years in advance. TPI member institutions have successfully invested billions of endowment dollars; they will use this expertise to invest prepaid tuition funds to guarantee a future tuition rate at less than 100% of current cost. Initial projections suggest that, for a newborn, guaranteed future tuition could be as little as 55% of current tuition. Prepaid tuition will be transferable to siblings and cousins and useable at non-member and state institutions with a diminution in benefit. Institutions will consider their investment risk in setting future tuition rates and discounts.

**Changing College Paradigms**

President Arthur Levine of Columbia’s Teachers’ College warns that the “ghost of Christmas future” confronts higher education by way of “low productivity, high prices, poor management and poor use of technology.” One of Levine’s ghosts may be for-profit organizations like the University of Phoenix, the largest private university in the U.S. with 70,000 students on 70 campuses that offer flexible, less expensive degree programs, distance learning, night courses, and other “work-study” options. Duke, Stanford, MIT, and over 200 others offer college degrees over the Internet. Another specter is niche colleges that become more efficient by focusing on fewer than 25-30 majors. Bentley College in Massachusetts, always known as a good undergraduate business school, has now trademarked itself as The Information College and is building a $20 million academic technology center.

Well-endowed and highly selective institutions like Bowdoin are not imperiled now, but:

• What happens to revenues and costs – especially financial aid – when the economy slows and the endowment performance slackens?
• What’s the appropriate balance for a small college between “bricks and mortar” construction projects and investments in technology that provide access to Web-based education without needing an extensive physical infrastructure?

I am reminded of a scene from the movie *Titanic* when characters played by Leonardo DiCaprio and Kate Winslet desperately cling to the stern of the sinking ship while other passengers nearer the water perish. Some observers argue that rich colleges will survive longer but are inevitably affected, if not engulfed, by the same financial and social maelstrom threatening other private colleges.

Others, like former university system presidents such as Clark Kerr (California) and Bruce Johnstone (New York), counter that traditional campuses provide a prestige and lifestyle that “new age” institutions cannot match. Kerr foresees technology as more of an add-on than a replacement for contemporary instructional models. Bowdoin College’s budget priorities
must continue to advance our world class strengths in instruction and student services, develop our capacities in academic and administrative computing, and evaluate the state of our industry and the needs of our customers and society.

Small College Collaboration

One alternative paradigm to the independent small college model involves collaboration. Viscount Palmerston’s advice in 1848 that nations have eternal interests rather than eternal allies or enemies applies to higher education today. Do institutions have interests in sharing resources to reduce expenses? Can they form alliances to stage certain programs and services less expensively than doing them alone? The California Claremont Colleges and the 5-College group in Massachusetts of Amherst, Hampshire, Mt. Holyoke, Smith, and the University of Massachusetts are often cited as examples of boosting quality while saving money. Earlier this year, Bowdoin met with Bates and Colby about doing more collaboratively, and I thought to focus on this issue for the 1998-99 Treasurer’s Report.

Colby-Bates-Bowdoin (CBB). Each institution has a problem common to most independent institutions: how to maintain financial equilibrium when pressures to contain fees, spend less from endowment, and start or improve services have never been greater. Rather than relying only on new revenues or traditional retrenchment, we wanted to explore the contributions that new CBB consortia might make. It was also important to emphasize arrangements that would significantly reduce net costs. The term “significant” denotes that staff should not be consumed in researching and implementing something that would not save large dollar amounts when there are already too many demands on their time and energy. “Net” is key because any partnerships would require heavy investments for start-up and ongoing management that should be clearly exceeded by cost savings in the program or service being shared.

The three colleges already share library services, off-campus study sites, and training programs. In 1996, 50 employees from the three colleges received recruitment training. Bowdoin and Colby have used Bath Iron Works for project management and facilitation training. We share course materials and, if openings exist in a training program, extend invitations to the other colleges. We work together; Colby has sent staff to Bowdoin to collaborate on TIAA-CREF retirement plans and Bowdoin employees have gone to Colby to review employee benefits. We participate in new state-sponsored bulk purchasing groups for electricity, fuel oil, and other commodities. This fall, CBB opens teleconferencing facilities on each campus. Other collaborations have been studied but not implemented: self-insured workers’ compensation, one-card security system, travel, and purchasing.

• Cost Savings. Experiences here and elsewhere suggest that consortia are more likely to improve quality and increase service capacity than save money on administrative services. Why?
• **Prior Budget Commitments.** Over 50% of the CBB budgets are spent on employee compensation and another 15% on financial aid rather than on the commodities (supplies, fuel) that consortia typically target for cost savings;

• **Small Size.** Three colleges with 5,000 students and 1,500 employees are not large enough to attract many volume discounts that are not already available to any one college with 1,500 students and 600 employees;

• **Lack of Standardization.** Sharing services (e.g., human resources, accounts payable) require common policies and practices that the colleges have been unsuccessful in achieving due to cultural and programmatic distinctiveness, dissimilar staffing philosophies, varying access to financial resources, and different academic years and computer systems.

• **Staff and Service Reductions.** Even without these differences, the labor intensiveness of our industry suggests that most cost savings in sharing services would be achieved by cutting staff. We should be concerned about consequent reductions in the timeliness and quality of service in colleges charging their customers over $30,000 per year. Some administrative departments are already below their staffing levels of a few years ago because new positions have been reallocated to higher priority areas.

**Future Possibilities.**

Does this mean that cost savings are impossible under any consortia? No. But the above limitations must be considered when exploring new partnerships and setting realistic goals for cost savings. There are at least three models with increasing cost savings but also institutional distress caused by essential standardization. Such standardization would require clear and consistent board and presidential support as the three colleges compromise to an unprecedented degree on priorities, policies, and procedures.

• **Joint Operations.** Model A involves joint operations in specific “back room” activities that are not visible to the average campus customer. Activities like student billing or accounts payable would not be ideal consortium possibilities because each school has its own chart of accounts and relies on incompatible computer systems for processing. Others like shared employee benefits surveys or compensation studies would be prime candidates because they entail no staffing reductions and minimal cross-institutional standardization with modest savings in net costs. Actually, these examples plus the off-campus study program illustrate that sharing a new program or service is often more feasible than retrofitting an existing activity.

• **Selected Standardization.** Model B entails significant standardization within one or two functional areas. It might result in greater opportunities for common outsourcing and bulk discounts because the three colleges would be delivering the same services in the same way. For example, what about bidding the same health benefits program for CBB to achieve more market leverage? I have previously commented that the volume may not be sufficient to attract deep discounts. Furthermore, the major differences in health benefits among the three schools would require us, to varying degrees, to
increase or reduce services or costs in order to achieve compatible programs before going out to bid. Another suggestion is to employ one benefits coordinator for the three colleges with two assistant coordinators on the other campuses, thereby reducing compensation costs. The same arrangement might be considered for security and facilities among others. Besides accepting program standardization, two of the three colleges would have to accept not having the principal official in a functional area resident on campus.

- **General Standardization.** Model C demands significant standardization among all or most functional areas. A problem with Model B’s “cherry picking” of a functional area is that some standardization can only be accomplished across-the-board. For example, we cannot standardize the software in human resources without doing the same to the larger, integrated packages of which the HR system is a part. With widespread compatibility, fewer employees could deliver the same services, volume purchases would be simpler, and other benefits would be gained although institutional distinctiveness and personal service expectations would be even more severely compromised than in Model B.

*CBB academic programs* have less need for standardization and potentially higher cost savings. Consideration has been given to sharing adjunct faculty—less available in rural Maine than in metropolitan areas—cutting redundant, low enrollment programs, and saving faculty slots by offering overload pay for teaching low enrollment majors on other campuses. The 5-College arrangement has reaped most cost savings by sharing courses, faculty, and other academic resources.

**Next Steps**

With **significant net cost savings** as our objective, the president, academic deans, and treasurers are actively encouraging the sharing of academic and administrative services. We want to be successful before a financial catastrophe—the economic equivalent of Titanic’s iceberg—compels collaborations and other emergency responses under the worst possible circumstances. I have been asked to track progress for the three colleges. CBB administrators meet periodically to share information and, where possible, programs. The joint benefits survey idea came from such a meeting among human resources directors and will be implemented to save $15,000 per survey. These talks will be continued and expanded to meetings among officials in safety, facilities, and accounting.

Change is always hard in higher education—as I can personally attest from battle scars as a leader of Bowdoin’s process reengineering efforts earlier in the decade—but the CBB institutions share the same objective to save money or add value through meaningful partnerships.

This is my eighth annual report as treasurer of the College. Financially, I am delighted by our achievements and humbled by our challenges. I am also grateful for the enduring support of the trustees, president, senior colleagues, faculty, administrative and support staff, students, alumni, and friends. My time here has been a continually interesting and daunting adventure—the fiscal equivalent of Disney World’s Space Mountain—and for that I thank you.

KENT JOHN CHABOTAR

*Vice President for Finance and Administration & Treasurer*
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