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I. Call to Order

II. Announcements
   a. Cornell Distinguished Faculty Awards
   b. Update from the Retention Task Force (Susan Singer)

III. Approval of Minutes

IV. New Business
   a. Resolution Concerning the “Recommended Methodology and Criteria for Selecting Rollins College Peer Benchmarking Institutions”

V. Committee Reports
   a. Executive Committee (Dexter Boniface)
   b. Curriculum Committee (Mario D’Amato)
   c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Eric Smaw)
Call to Order
Faculty President Dexter Boniface called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm.

Approval of the Minutes
Approval of the CLA faculty meeting minutes from November 17, 2016.
Minutes approved by voice vote.

Announcements
Boniface: Thank you to Peg and Grant Cornwell for hosting the faculty holiday party. [Resounding applause.] Behind the scenes Peg and Jillian did the heavy lifting for the party and we want to acknowledge their hard work.

Susan Singer: Announcement of the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award. [Attachment #1] I can’t imagine how difficult this job must have been for the selection committee. All I’ve seen since my arrival to campus a few months ago has further reinforced what an outstanding faculty we have.
Update on the work of the Retention Task Force: This task force was challenged to move the needle on retention rates within 5 years from 83 or 87% to 90% and to get our 4 year graduation rate from 70% to 80%. That’s what institutions with faculty of the caliber of Rollins can achieve. I have the pleasure to be working with Mamta Accapadi and Faye Tydleska to bring together colleagues from across campus. We have also partnered with the Education Advisory Board (EAB), a group that consults with colleges to pull together disaggregated data and figure out where to best invest our resources to make the best and most quick gains in our retention rates. Feb 2-3 we’re going to have EAB on campus and it will be an opportunity to learn more about the tools and the resources that we can avail ourselves of in this process. Their role is to help in information analysis and recommendations, but the execution of the plan is certainly up to all of us and our great colleagues in Student Affairs.

New Business

Resolution concerning the “Recommended Methodology and Criteria for Selecting Rollins College Peer Benchmarking Institutions” [Attachment #2]

Boniface: We bring the following resolution forward on behalf of the Executive Committee. I will offer an overview of the process and provide a brief rationale for why FAC and the EC both endorsed this document unanimously. Grant and Udeth are here for questions and answers. Finally, while this document has gone through faculty governance, it is not of faculty governance.

This work began in the summer and has gone through several iterations. It was brought to Faculty Affairs Committee, who endorsed it, EC then received it, endorsed it, and brought forth a resolution to the faculty to approve the methodology.

When something passes through these committees, it reflects a high level of consensus with both divisional and at-large review.

I would like to offer the following rationale for why I, personally, recommend the adoption of these criteria:

1) It has a clear, explicit method for establishing peer institutions, which makes it a departure from historical practice.

2) The criteria are reasonable. To begin with resources per student and then funnel down to the level of institutions makes sense

3) The list—which is distinct from the methodology—passes the smell test. Does the list seem right? Do the schools seem comparable? In all the deliberations, it has seemed to pass that test, by and large.

Jim McLaughlin moves the resolution. Ashley Kistler seconds.

Resolved, That the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts of Rollins College endorses the circulated criteria establishing a rigorous and data-driven methodology for use in institutional benchmarking; and
**Resolved**, That, once adopted, any changes in the criteria or methodology employed in the establishment of a benchmarking group shall be presented to the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts of Rollins College.

**Socky O’Sullivan:** We’ve done this a number of times in the past. This is a sensible approach for benchmarking. Why did the executive committee not decide to establish a group of aspirational schools? When I looked at the schools on the list, they were nice schools, but I didn’t see any as truly aspirational. I may be wrong on that, but what I always thought in the past is that a list of aspirational schools pushed us to strive for a higher standard on things like fundraising or faculty salaries.

**Boniface:** Yes, it was part of our conversation.

**Grant Cornwell:** Thank you for your consideration of this methodology. If you look at the list, with Rollins at the median, actually it is a list of aspirants, where the schools at the top are schools we would like to be more like. What I don’t find any utility in is a list of schools where what they do might be delightful, but it is of no utility because we don’t have the resources to mimic those schools. If you look at *US News and World Report* rankings, which the public believes it’s a ranking of quality, but it’s really a measure of institutional wealth and resources they can bring to bear to solve problems. If we focus on the question of total resources per student, we spend about $26K per student. If we added Williams to the list—a school we all certainly admire—they spend $70K per year to educate every student. I am hard headed about why we do benchmarking: we ask whether we are doing things similarly or differently to schools that are fundamentally like us in their ability to bring resources to problems.

We should also remember that this list will change each year. It’s about focusing on the method, not a popularity contest among the schools. As we get better, we will shift up the list and we’ll always have aspirants, which will be those at the top of the list.

**Joan Davison:** I would note that some schools on the list don’t have graduate or continuing ed programs. What is not listed here is institutions which do not have undergrad business programs; there are seven schools that have no business programs whatsoever. My concern about that is if we use this list to think about resources per student and (considering the recent Chronicle article) and total resources on faculty compensation, schools with large business programs will command more resources toward faculty salaries.

**Boniface:** The discussion we had about this question is that we let the methodology drive the list without applying too many fine grain criteria. Once we start picking apart these schools and exactly how they spend the money, we will find that they are complex, as we are complex. Maybe they don’t have a business program, but do they have engineering, nursing, or robust computer science programs? What do you have to spend on your mission? That is something that all schools will have to confront. We believe that not making “do you have a specific program?” an ex ante criteria was reasonable.

**Rich Morris:** Why did we land on this range of student population?

**Udeth Lugo:** We are 3200 students, so it’s reasonable to go down to 1800 and up to 5000. It’s a simple reason. If we were to change the range, it would increase the number of institutions, but the question of core resources wouldn’t change.

**Carol Lauer:** We also found through these discussions that smaller schools have different issues in terms of administrative overhead. There are economies of scale when
you get to 1800, but schools of 1000 will function in different ways.

**Margaret McLaren:** I like the idea of starting with resources per student. I was convinced by what Grant said about some places being aspirational. I personally know many of the colleges of the list and I appreciate both the approach and the list itself. Call the question.

Don Rogers seconds call of the question. Question called by unanimous consent. Resolution passes by 92%

**Committee Reports**

**Executive Committee, Dexter Boniface**

**Boniface:** I wanted to offer an update about an issue that came before this body regarding FYRST grants. Following that discussion, the Executive Committee requested and reviewed a lot of data regarding the funding pool and awards for the past 10 years. I have also communicated the faculty’s concerns to the dean and the provost. One issue of note: our faculty has expanded by about 12% over the past 5 years. The award amount of the grant has also increased in that time, suggesting that it will be harder each year to meet demand. When we looked at the figures, they revealed starkly the recent history of Rollins that we have been overspending the allocation to this account, sometimes at the level of double the allocation. The Provost reviewed these numbers with us and expressed concern about this pattern of failing to balance budgets. There has also been a question raised about the potential to generate salary savings from full-year sabbaticals without replacement. In my own department, one of our colleagues is on sabbatical, we did not replace him; this creates potential for savings. Jenny, Karla, and Susan did their best to find data about this. The finding is that this potential savings is nonexistent. It is possible to generate savings, but only if there is no replacement of that individual. Over history, that has not been the case. Rollins has become more strict, but we still spent $272,984 in replacement costs for sabbatical leaves between AY11-12 and AY16-17. FYRST does not pay for itself, unfortunately. The potential may be there, but we would have to be much more strict and deliberate about replacement.

What we’re recommending is that professional development funds keep pace with the growth of the faculty and with inflation. At the same time we recognize and recommend to the FAC that they develop more robust criteria for FYRST grants regarding what kinds of proposals merit funding. We should have high institutional expectations and recommend a robust set of criteria. The other grants under consideration by FAC have clear and explicit criteria, and the FYRSTs should be in line with those standards.

**Mike Gunter:** Thanks for this update. You mentioned that over the past 5 years there’s been a 12% increase in the faculty. When was the last time the FYRST budget changed?

**Boniface:** I don’t know. My sense is a long time.

**Singer:** In 2007-08 we had $51,909 in the FYRST spending pool. There has been an uptick in the funding pool for FYRSTs to $78,577 for AY17-18. For the Critchfield, Ashforth, Cornell, and Course/Individual Development grants, our pool went from $107,950 to $67,950 in that same period. Money was moved away from that pool in AY15-16. Jenny and I have been investigating where that money went and why.
Tillmann: I wonder if there can be any reconsideration for the people in the pipeline this year. Making the criteria more explicit is a good idea, but it feels like a terrible lottery for the people going on sabbatical next year. I am thinking about these questions in light of the recent Chronicle publication on executive compensation. It’s hard for me to swallow issues of compensation when we now know that Lewis Duncan was paid 1.5 million dollars in 2014. These were years in which we were told there was no money for base increases for faculty; and now we are continuing to bear the consequences of overspending by that same executive. At the Feb Board of Trustees meeting I would hope that this sentiment could be communicated to the Board.

Jenny Cavenaugh: I wanted to follow up and clarify the piece about the Critchfield (etc.) fund. It’s always been budgeted at 67K, but we had 40K in possible discretionary spending from Cornell funds. We did not always exhaust this discretionary pool, but it was there. Two years ago the discretionary Cornell funds were pulled. The dean’s office has made up the difference from rollover in the past 2 years, but I want to clarify that the base amount of the fund hasn’t changed—the supplemental pool did.

Laurel Habgood: While FAC is revisiting guidelines for FYRST, it might be helpful if we could create guidelines for the year-end reports. If the grant is used wisely the first time, that should be taken into consideration for future funding decisions. If it was used poorly, that should be taken into account as well.

Gunter: I’d like to pile onto Laurel’s request and ask FAC to establish a standard similar to our discussion of a benchmarking methodology. Our professional development funds should grow as we do.

Bill Boles: Are all committee meetings open?

Boniface: Yes, excluding FEC candidate and FAC grant deliberations.

Curriculum Committee, Mario D'Amato (chair)

D'Amato:

1) A “New” New Course Proposal has been approved by the Curriculum Committee. Old language about A&S and CPS was removed, questions re. unnecessary info was deleted, and information that would be important to Student Records was added; it is now one form for CLA & Holt.

2) Re. the Strategic Planning Task Force on Majors: we have three recommendations as follows: (1) Deferred, deliberative declaration of major; (2) Envisioning an idealized range of numbers of students in a major; (3) Majors moving beyond the idealized range shall put in place autonomous measures to move towards the idealized range. Re. the first proposal, the Provost and President have assured me that they would work to find a way to address scholarships tied to a specific major. The three proposals are in a general form at this point, but over the break we will work on giving them a specific form (e.g., deferred until when? etc.), after which they’d be brought to the faculty of CLA for approval. I’ll be meeting with the Science Division, and would be happy to meet with any other divisions if requested.

Faculty Affairs Committee, Eric Smaw (chair)
Smaw:
1) We have a few upcoming vacancies on FAC—EC will work to fill these positions.
2) CIEs were completed Sunday evening. Based on preliminary numbers, 68% of students have completed their CIEs. We hope to get to 80-90%. 16% of students completed none of their CIEs; 12% completed some but not all. We used to be higher before we reduced the amount of e-mails students were receiving. Anything you can do to help us get these numbers up is important.
3) FYRSTs—many of the things you’ve talked about in this meeting, we’ve talked about. We’ve had this question on our agenda several times. We’ve updated the application form and I’ve petitioned the Dean’s Office several times about increasing the allocation. I intend to send a formal letter to the Dean to that effect.
4) Now that the methodology for benchmarking has been passed, the subcommittee working to gather data about ourselves and our peers will gather that data over break, organize it, and present it to you in the new year. After that we’ll follow up with conversations about what a compensation philosophy should look like. You can expect the first phase of date report will be factual questions.

Jonathan Miller: who’s chairing the committee?
Smaw: I’m co-chairing with Susan Singer. The membership is Udeth Lugo, Matt Hawks, Stacey Dunn, Anne Murdauh, Kathryn Norsworthy, and Sharon Agee.
Fiona Harper: Since we know that we’re still at 67,000 allocated for the total grant pool, how much has already been allocated for the early round of Critchfields, etc?
Smaw: After the fall funding round, we’re under where we normally are at this time. Based on projections, the Critchfield etc. fund should be sufficient, but I will follow up with the dean’s office about the possibility of increasing the pool.
Harper: Is the review blind again?
Smaw: Yes.
Davison: For the past number of years we’ve asked if we should still have CIEs. James Zimmerman was asked to look at them, particularly with regard to gender bias. We’ve had several calls for review of the philosophy behind the reviews. What is the status of these efforts?
Smaw: Yes, there are ongoing conversations about gender bias, both national and locally at Rollins. We’ve been asking, should we be using another model? Another question that’s been raised is about whether the CIEs make sense for co-curricular activity courses. This question was on the agenda of PSC last year, but it was pushed off the agenda in the face of governance reform and now the salary question. We might pursue an ad hoc committee to address this question.
McLaren: I wanted to add that there is also demonstrated racial and ethnic bias—this issue was addressed during the Faculty Day of Scholarship by Julian Chambliss and Vidhu Aggarwal and some members of FEC were present, but I would request a campus-wide colloquium.
Carnahan: I’ve been asked to provide articles regarding bias in evaluation systems, but this is a campus-wide issue. This is particularly an issue for pre-tenure women of color who experience a pattern of bias. When the current system was established, it came with a set of guidelines for statistical interpretation, but I don’t know how widely those guidelines are followed.
Karen Jackson: Student evaluations are often the only universal metric that's used at an institution—what other metrics can be used to minimize the flaws of this one metric?

O'Sullivan: I will say respectfully that's not quite accurate at Rollins. We have visitations, we have published criteria, and we have annual evaluations. Departments are doing a better job recognizing the limits of CIEs with a more holistic process of evaluation.

Susan Libby: There's tremendous variability among departments in how teaching is mentored and evaluated. The English Department is especially assiduous, but not all departments are that way.

Adjournment

Dexter Boniface adjourned the meeting at 1:44 pm.
Winner #1
Our first Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award winner is a professor who challenges our students to understand the complexities of our global society. Students have described this colleague as “phenomenal,” “energetic,” “kind,” “respectful.” Another student comments, “a fantastic professor, and if I were not graduating, I would enroll in every class she taught.” Finally, one student notes: “… the best professor I have had at Rollins. I have taken three courses with her throughout my time at Rollins and she has pushed me and challenged me to grow as an academic. She has taught me how to analyze everything, including this survey (make sure you tell her that.)”

This winner’s scholarly activity embodies this same commitment to our students. A participant in our Student Faculty Collaborative Scholarship program, she and her students examined the topics of “Patriarchy in Islam” as well as the “Political Integration of Minorities in Orlando.” Additionally, this professor has been a prolific author on Muslims in Western politics, Middle East politics, and Islam and politics. Since coming to Rollins, she has published an impressive 15 peer-reviewed journal articles, two books, and four book chapters, in addition to numerous book reviews, newspaper and magazine editorials and articles, and public-speaking engagements in our community and across the world.

Our colleague has an equally impressive record of service to the College. She has served on committees and task forces for important initiatives on campus such as minority leadership, interfaith spaces, the Diversity Advisory Council, the Lucy Cross Center, and mentoring Fulbright applicants as well as directing the Middle East and North African Studies program.

One student sums it up best: “Dr. Tatari is a class act, and Rollins is lucky to have her.

It gives me great pleasure to award the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award to Dr. Eren Tatari.
Our second winner of the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award has been a part of the Rollins community for nearly 20 years.

Our colleague’s research connects the issues of our time with artistic representations of the past. The recipient’s research on race and the visual representation of otherness is global in its scope, steeped in the past, yet pertinent to our societal struggles today. Awarded a Critchfield Grant for research in the Biblothèque Nationales and Archives Nationales in Paris for ongoing research on the visual and material culture of 18th-century French Caribbean colonialism and slavery, this professor has published on the topics of blacks and blackness in European art; the visual culture of French slavery before, during, and after the French Revolution; and the visual politics of representation in the photographs taken in Abu Ghraib.

This Cornell Award Winner embodies the value of focusing one’s research on projects that have an impact on our local community. For example, co-curation of an exhibition at the Cornell Fine Arts Museum called “The Black Figure in the European Imaginary,” which examines the visual construction of the identities of people of African ancestry by Europeans. You are all invited to see it for yourselves when it opens in January of 2017. Additionally, she conducted research on the controversy surrounding the statue of Ninomiya Kinjiro, removed from Okinawa and given to Rollins College by an alumnus.

This professor teaches a broad variety of courses in multiple disciplines, reflecting her intellectual curiosity and the interdisciplinary nature of her research and intellectual passions. In addition to her regular offerings of art history courses, she teaches in our MLS program, SWAG, and rFLA. Her students describe her as “supportive,” “engaging,” “talented,” “passionate.” One goes on to claim that this professor “… is one of the most educated and knowledgeable professors I have had thus far in my Rollins education. She is understanding with her students and has a great attitude towards teaching.”

It gives me great pleasure to award the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award to Dr. Susan Libby.
Winner #3

Since coming to our campus, our third Cornell awardee has earned a reputation as a dynamic and devoted teacher and scholar. Over the past three summers, she has demonstrated commitment to excellent teaching at the undergraduate level, including serving as a facilitator at the Associated Colleges of the South Teaching & Learning Workshop.

Her students witness and appreciate this dedication to teaching craft. They note that she is “caring, “enthusiastic,” “passionate,” “knowledgeable,” and committed to students’ success. One student adds, “This teacher is extremely respectful . . . comes prepared and excited to teach every day with a smile . . . and . . . enthusiasm that will wake you up and get you focused.”

As with our previous winner, our colleague connects our students with our local community. Students in her courses conducting interviews and observations of many of our faculty and staff’s pre-school children at the Child Development Center. Student evaluations explain how effective the time spent at the CDC was in their learning of the course material. She has also infused many of her courses with community-engagement activities, including developing an rFLA neighborhood class on sports analytics as well as an adolescent development course, both with Community Engagement CE designations.

We celebrate her active research agenda, which includes publishing numerous articles on adolescent psychology, and recently signing a contract for a co-authored book to be released in 2017 by Routledge.

It gives me great pleasure to award the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award to Dr. Alice Davidson.
Recommended Methodology and Criteria for Selecting Rollins College Peer Benchmarking Institutions

November 18, 2016

Introduction. In summer 2016, as a precursor to the College’s current strategic planning process, President Cornwell charged a small group of staff with advanced data research projects that would provide a rigorous analysis of Rollins’ current context and inform the strategic planning process now underway. One of those charges was to examine what would constitute an analytically rigorous benchmarking peer group for Rollins comprising national peers as determined by mission, size, resources and organizational complexity. This document provides a recommended methodology for determining the College’s national peer group and the results of that application.

Definitions and Guiding Principles. Benchmarking — competitive, operational, or strategic — is a process used to compare peers and improve organizations. A robust benchmarking initiative includes defining a peer or comparison group, identifying key metrics for comparison, and finding the best available data to use. The fundamental guiding principles of the Rollins benchmarking methodology are that Rollins should benchmark its policies, practices, and outcomes against institutions that pursue a similar mission and bring to the delivery of that mission similar resources per student.

Recommended Peer Group Selection Methodology.

Criterion #1: The College’s benchmarking peer group should be independent colleges and universities with a similar mission. Within the Carnegie Classifications, Rollins’ benchmarking group should be generated from Private Masters Colleges and Universities (with an arts and sciences focus), and Private Baccalaureate Colleges with an Arts and Sciences Focus.

Criterion #2: Rollins’ benchmarking group should have what the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) designates as “core resources per student”** that are similar to those of the College. Five categories of revenue are included in IPEDS “core resources:”

- net tuition and fees per student,
- government grants and contracts per student,
- private gifts, grants, and contracts expended in the operating budget per student,
- investment return,** and
- other core revenues per student.

To account for short-term volatility in some of the above measures, it is recommended that the most recent three-year average of “core resources per student” be used.

* IPEDS uses total headcount enrollment in its calculations of core resources per student, i.e., core resources are used to support all students, not just undergraduates.

** IPEDS uses the total gain in an institution’s investments in a given year; as a result, some years may be negative, others positive. It is proposed that Rollins use 5% of a three-year average endowment market value per student as the measure of “investment return.”
**Criterion #3:** Baccalaureate colleges selected for inclusion in the Rollins benchmarking group should all be highly residential. The masters-level colleges and universities selected for inclusion in the benchmarking group should have highly residential liberal arts/arts and sciences colleges.

**Criterion #4:** Institutions selected for the Rollins benchmarking group should have a total 12-month enrollment headcount (including graduate students) of 1,800-5,000 students.

**Criterion #5:** Institutions selected for the Rollins benchmarking group should be co-educational.

**Criterion #6:** Any list of institutions meeting Criteria #1-5 should be examined carefully for highly consequential idiosyncrasies that would be unhelpful to the benchmarking process, such as unconventional revenue sources.

**Criterion #7:** Rollins should select its benchmarking group from relevant institutions for whom reliable, meaningful data are readily available.

It is recommended that Rollins’ benchmarking group be generated from among Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) Consortium member institutions because of the services and quality of data available. The HEDS consortium comprises 155 private colleges and universities that collaboratively share, analyze, and use data of all kinds — institutional (Common Data Set, AAUP, NACUBO), HEDS surveys, National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) faculty and freshman surveys, and other national surveys — to advance liberal education at private colleges and universities.

**Criterion #8:** It is recommended that Rollins’ benchmarking group include a balanced number of institutions above and below Rollins’ current core resources per student and that the total size of the benchmarking group be 30, including Rollins.

A proposed peer benchmarking group that meets all of the above criteria appears on the following page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Carnegie Classification</th>
<th>Size and Setting</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Selectivity*</th>
<th>Graduate Degree or Certificate Offered</th>
<th>Continuing Adult Education Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Macalester College</td>
<td>St Paul</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2185</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furman University</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>3318</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart William Smith Colleges</td>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2457</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Olaf College</td>
<td>Northfield</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Medium, highly residential</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Lawrence College</td>
<td>Bronxville</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Puget Sound</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2929</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lawrence University</td>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2633</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Wesleyan University</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2028</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodes College</td>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2155</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muhlenberg College</td>
<td>Allentown</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2609</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus College</td>
<td>Saint Peter</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny College</td>
<td>Meadville</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>71.8%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Anselm College</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier College</td>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2585</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollins College</td>
<td>Winter Park</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>3416</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willamette University</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>3220</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant University</td>
<td>Smithfield</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Medium, highly residential</td>
<td>3657</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luther College</td>
<td>Decorah</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2505</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susquehanna University</td>
<td>Selinsgrove</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2332</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerson College</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Medium, highly residential</td>
<td>4972</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke College</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2132</td>
<td>69.3%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hope College</td>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Medium, highly residential</td>
<td>3610</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augustana College</td>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Baccalaureate Colleges</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2569</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagner College</td>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2342</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican University of California</td>
<td>San Rafael</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Small, primarily residential</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eckerd College</td>
<td>Saint Petersburg</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan College</td>
<td>Riverdale</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Medium, highly residential</td>
<td>4030</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>Forest Grove</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Medium, highly residential</td>
<td>4013</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Lutheran University</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Master's Colleges &amp; Universities</td>
<td>Small, highly residential</td>
<td>3830</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Selectivity is determined by dividing the number of students accepted by the number of applicants.*