To all faculty

The Committee on Coeducation and Expansion submits the following recommendations for approval by the faculty at its meeting on Feb. 17.

Feb. 16, 1972

Fifth and Final Draft of Recommendations

to President John R. Coleman

from the Committee on Coeducation and Expansion

In the interest of making a clear decision in favor of cooperation rather than coeducation and of advancing the former, the Committee drops its earlier recommendation that Haverford should accept women transfers.

Recommendations

- 1. The student body should be increased to such size as to maintain an average enrollment of 725. While the College remains in its present financial condition, no further expansion should be contemplated.
- 2. Haverford should no longer consider itself a men's college, but rather a college seeking to increase further in its academic and administrative programs and in its social environment the present, substantial level of cooperative coeducation with Bryn Mawr. Every effort should be made in the College publicity to describe ourselves accurately in these respects.
- 3. Haverford should not change its present policy in regard to the admission of women.
- 4. Haverford should make the strongest efforts possible, consistent with maintaining good relations with Bryn Mawr, to increase the reality of the coeducational environment by greater cooperation with Bryn Mawr.
- 5. Since the present Intercollege Cooperation Committee is primarily concerned with academic matters, the President in consultation with the Academic Council should appoint a small committee from the student body, faculty and administration with a clearing house and communication function, hopefully to work with a similar group from Bryn Mawr, in identifying areas in which cooperation should be pursued, in defining with care the level of cooperation which should be sought in each of these areas, in setting up measures by which progress toward these desired levels may be determined, in assigning the

responsibility for the development of cooperation in each area to the appropriate existing or new committees or administrative officers, and in reporting from time to time to the Two College Community on the extent to which cooperation in the various areas has advanced.

The Intercollege Cooperation Committee would continue to serve in the academic area as at present. To make its function clear and to distinquish it from the new committee, its name should be changed to The Intercollege Committee on Academic Cooperation.

6. The Committee on Coeducation and Expansion respectfully requests that it be dismissed.

The Committee on Coeducation and Expansion

William Ambler
Ronald Begley '74
Susan Bell '72
Jonathan Bondy '73
John Davison
Isaac Finkle '73
Louis Green

William Hohenstein Helen Hunter Gregory Kannerstein Florence Levitt '72 James Lyons James C. Wright '74

TO:	Louis Green	-	FROM:_	John	Coleman	·			
	Nicola de la constanta de la c								
RE:	Committee on Coeducation	and	Expansi	on		DATE:_	March 8	<u> 1972</u>	

In advance of the Faculty meeting tomorrow, I want to let you know where I now stand on the final recommendations of your Committee on Coeducation and Expansion. These remarks are read, I hope, within the context of a deep vote of gratitude to you and your Committee for the work which you did. The Committee stands as one of the best examples of a job being done expeditiously and with maximum opportunity for all to feed in their thoughts as your work progresses.

I wish against that background that I could simply accept your report in its totality. As a member of the Faculty, I have no intention of preventing a consensus in favor of its acceptance; I'll state my views, but accept the consensus as the Faculty's view. As President, however, I will transmit the report to the Board as it now stands (assuming that it gets the Faculty's approval tomorrow), but I will do so without attaching my approval to two of the recommendations.

1. I do not think it wise to adopt a recommendation saying, "While the College remains in its present financial condition, no further expansion should be contemplated." My position is quite the opposite: while the College remains in its present financial condition, further expansion must continue to be contemplated.

I tried hard in the Sharpless Auditorium meeting to demonstrate that, even without precise numbers at hand, there is a financial advantage to enlarging the student body provided that we do not expand the faculty proportionately and that we do not seek to house the larger number on campus (or at least not in quarters similar to those we now provide). I believe that case stands; neither then nor since have I heard it rebutted successfully.

I quickly join (or, more accurately, continue to stand with) those who wish we didn't have to think about any more growth. But, as I look at the finances of the College, I do not see how we can responsibly escape the obligation to look again and again at a higher student-faculty ratio, achieved through adding students and not through cutting faculty, as one possible route to keeping ourselves academically and economically strong.

2. I continue to feel that an announced policy of transition to full coeducation, within a framework of extended cooperation with Bryn Mawr, would be wise for Haverford. I see the political impracticality of that at this time in ways that I didn't last autumn, when I seriously underestimated the extent of Bryn Mawr's fears. But I have not heard the arguments for backing off from the recommendation of accepting women transfer students as persuasive ones. Indeed the more I hear about the kind of environment we seek to move towards on campus, the more I find weight in your original recommendation on the transfers.



As I said in my original talk on coeducation last September, this is not a do-or-die issue for me. I'm not about to try preventing others from agreeing on the terms of your report, and I'm personally committed not to taking leadership any more on the subject of coeducation. But I will also stop short of giving support to recommendations that do not seem to me, from my particular perspective, to be best for Haverford in the years immediately ahead.

JRC: an

cc: Bernard Lentz