Amherst in the World

Saxton, Martha

Published by Amherst College Press

Saxton, Martha.
Amherst in the World.

For additional information about this book
https://muse.jhu.edu/book/85739
Coeducation

The Unanticipated Revolution

Martha Saxton

[Coeducation] was a revolutionary event in the College’s life in ways that few at the time foresaw.

Cullen Murphy

President Martin, installed in 2011 as the first woman president of Amherst College, arrived when it had weathered more than four decades of coeducation. Her cordial welcome confirms Amherst’s pride in the achievements and willingness to struggle with the challenges produced by men and women learning together.

Martin took the job with the ambition of helping the school’s extraordinarily diverse student body make the very most of the college’s academic, athletic, and social riches. Her administration is working to help identify and clear as many different paths to academic success as the college’s diverse student body might need. This project focuses on much more than coeducation, but its origins lie within the 1975 commitment to opening Amherst to women.

Actively helping faculty and students get the best out of one another consolidates a long-term change in the college’s sense of its responsibilities to its students. At the time that Amherst first admitted women, there was little proactive thinking about what, if anything, women might need to help them learn in a very male-dominated environment. The college was not unique in this, but it had an embedded male, white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) mid-twentieth-century intellectual and social culture that proved frustratingly difficult to change. In describing that culture as WASPy, which many of the people I spoke to do, one must bear in mind that Jews have a long and important history at Amherst. No longer subject to quotas, Jewish students entered the college in increasing numbers in the post-World War II years. Rather than a WASP culture, perhaps a socially and intellectually elite culture, which had recently been WASP is a better way to describe Amherst’s ethos at the time. The keepers of Amherst traditions never doubted that their ways represented the best in US education and fiercely resisted change. Many unhappy women faculty and students in the first fifteen or so years of coeducation suffered with educational methods that worked well with only a small group of largely male, privileged students.
In a broader context, Amherst’s experience with coeducation is both unique and tied to national developments. At this writing, women slightly outnumber men at the college. Nationwide, for many decades, the pool of qualified women applicants for higher education has been larger than the pool of qualified men. Ironically, male educators in the early twentieth century found coeducation in the public schools “defective . . . [because] girls did better than boys.” Worry about boys’ academic performance in the early twentieth century spurred some educators to separate the sexes to protect boys in classes where girls had the edge. Administrators brought sports into the curriculum, hoping to keep boys in school longer. Until the 1960s, educators invoked a “boy problem” with coeducation to explain boys’ relatively poor academic performance compared with that of girls’ and their significantly higher rates of infractions and dropping out. However, coeducation was cheaper and more popular than segregation, so single-sex education remained the exception.

By the 1970s, educators and feminists began taking stock of coeducation’s harmful effects on girls, like lessons from sexist textbooks, teachers’ disproportionate attention to boys, gender discrimination in sports, sex-stereotyped activities, and advice steering female students away from science, math, and generally male-associated professions and activities. In recognition of these findings, Congress passed Title IX (one of the educational amendments of 1972).

With this national conversation in the background, formerly all-men’s schools discussed admitting women. As with public school education, economics rather than principles largely drove decisions. Debts from recent expansion projects in the uncertain financial future of the seventies contributed to administrators’ anxieties. But more immediately worrying to administrators was a nationwide decline in the overall size of the college-applicant pool and the rising number of young men who were applying to coeducational schools. Yale president Kingman Brewster summed it up: being an all-male school was “a real handicap to getting the best men.”

Yale, first among the Ivies, accepted women applicants in 1968. Princeton, which had lost to coeducational schools 39 percent of the men admitted to the class of 1972, went next. Dartmouth stepped late and slowly along the others’ path. Its president, John Kemeny, new in 1968 and faced with the coeducation issue, worried that Dartmouth was “turning out a generation of male chauvinist pigs who would not be able to work with women in the professions.” Dartmouth’s traditional male culture made the transition notably difficult. (The title of Nancy Malkiel’s book *Keep the Damned Women Out* came from a disgruntled Dartmouth alumnus.)

Many trustees at Amherst cherished its masculine ethos. They also worried that the costs of expanding the student body and hiring more faculty would be prohibitive while potentially diluting the quality of an Amherst education. It was not immediately evident that these fears would be baseless. However, one scholar summarized later: “The admission of women to the remaining all-men Ivy League colleges, as well as to such prestigious men’s colleges as Amherst and Williams, maintained or improved these institutions’ finances and academic standings.”

In January 1968, in the wake of Yale’s admission of women, Amherst’s president Calvin Plimpton met with the presidents of Vassar, Williams, Smith, and Wesleyan to dis-
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In the fall of 1969, Plimpton’s Long-Range Planning Committee endorsed coeducation. The board voted it down. To delay things, they and newly appointed president John William “Bill” Ward (1971–1979) mounted the Select Committee to study the matter further. The committee included the first woman hired as a professor at Amherst, Rose Olver (1962). (She recalled that the experience on that Committee made a feminist out of her.) It also included Ellen Ryerson in American studies. Between them, they constituted 50 percent of the women on a faculty of 135.

In November 1972, the Select Committee made its report in favor of coeducation to the board and president at the Century Club. The Century, perhaps the most exclusive club in New York City, excluded women until the Supreme Court forced it to admit them in 1988. The women serving on the Select Committee had to wait in a little lobby inside the entrance to the club, as Olver remembered, being “smuggled up” in the service elevator when it was time to make their presentation. The board rejected the Select Committee’s recommendation despite agreeing in January 1973 to the principle that “a place of learning is built upon qualities of mind and imagination. Sex, religion, ethnic origin, and race do not enter into it. . . . There is no principled reason against the inclusion of women in an environment of learning.”

After an election bringing some new and younger members on the board, it agreed in 1975, not unanimously, to admit women. (As one member said, “A good deal of the trustees feel that they have been pressured into this co-ed idea.”) It announced its decision with a toneless description of the numbers of women who would enter and when. Bill Ward, who had been ambivalent about coeducation, echoed the flat statement. He said for some time afterward, he “felt no pleasure, either with the decision or with the fact it finally had been made. . . . I was simply empty.” Perhaps he did not really consider it a victory. In professor Kim Townsend’s study of Ward, he displayed little sympathy with the women’s liberation movement and did not think an increased presence of women in public life would necessarily improve it, but instead make it more impersonal and contractual. Townsend calls this view possibly “prescient.”

These drawn-out and often acrimonious deliberations occurred during the social and political movements of the 1960s and ’70s, as many institutions, including Amherst, were slowly diversifying their undergraduate bodies. Amherst faculty committees and administration, particularly after Martin Luther King Jr.’s murder and the terrible summer that followed, shared the urgency felt by black students in bringing “meaningful change” to the college. Simultaneously, the brutal war in Vietnam produced protests at Amherst and across the country. At the same time, students were protesting colleges’ paternalistic behavior toward them and demanding more social and academic freedom.

However, feminism did not power the shift to coeducation, which was notable for its rocky implementation at most schools. As Nancy Malkiel, a scholar of coeducation, observes, “powerful men” took the decision to admit women, not women who were demanding their rights. As a result, “women and their needs were largely left out of the equation.” In these vertiginous times, the Amherst College Council (January 6, 1969) had the task of developing new regulations for women visiting men at the college, to reflect changing
attitudes about both sexual activity and student autonomy. President Plimpton's references to rules regarding “entertaining ladies” suggests how much ground the College Council had to cover to arrive at a vocabulary—much less a consensus—on the conduct of undergraduate men and women.

The council, astonishingly, seems to have been the only group in the college formally grappling with changing social and sexual attitudes, and it was surprised to find it time-consuming and laborious: “No subject has demanded as much time and thought . . . over the last three years as the question of what is the institutional context for women visitors to Amherst . . . an issue which many thought of peripheral concern to a liberal education.” Professor and alumnus Frederick L. Hoxie, along with his classmate Robert Fein, met with the distinguished alumnus John J. McCloy at the University Club in New York City to discuss coeducation. Hoxie admits that the conversations were naïve but probably “unprecedented. . . . At least McCloy thought so.” If so, it underlines Malkiel’s point that this educational transformation was made from the top down.

The council reported on two prevailing and equally unhelpful views: one, that premarital sex was immoral and should not happen or be facilitated; the other, that sex should be treated as a teaching opportunity. Professor Theodore Greene, articulating an impressive, not to say cosmic, ambition, wrote that the college should adopt “those procedures [in the college residences] which lead . . . toward a . . . serious discussion of the relations between the sexes and to clarify and question and develop appropriate moral standards for coming generations.”

The expectation at several campuses was that women would have, as James Fairchild, Oberlin’s president, had argued a century earlier, a “civilizing influence” on men. Professor Olver remembered being pained to hear clichéd responses to the Select Committee’s report, such as, “The presence of women would . . . tame the savage beasts in [the] dining hall, dorms, fraternities.”

Meanwhile, the uncivilized behavior of some Amherst men persisted despite students having set their own rules for women visitors. The College Council admonished students to “go out of their way to see to it that the personal integrity and sensibilities of visitors, in particular women guests, are respected.” Soon after a fall 1973 board of trustees’ meeting with students to discuss coeducation, an infamous article called “Sleazing” appeared in the Amherst Student, which set out guidelines for extorting commitment-free sex from local college women. Its authors argued that Amherst was already as coeducational as was necessary: “I mean, when was the last time a Holyoke broad made a significant contribution in your English class?” asked the protagonist.

Preparation for admitting women students meant hiring women faculty as well as living up to Title IX requirements. Although Rose Olver would be a welcoming and helpful presence for the twenty-seven junior faculty women whom Amherst hired between 1973 and 1978, the majority did not stay long.

Marguerite Waller, hired from Yale in 1974, remembered being told by a male student (the only kind there were in 1974) that his father had paid a lot of money to go to Amherst, and he did not expect his son to have a female professor. Young women faculty, some of whom looked younger than they were, had to work hard to be taken seriously and endured
hostility and disrespect from their colleagues, no less their students. Perhaps more significantly, in the long term, tenured Amherst men hired women in specialties new to the college, but often decided later that their initially intriguing fields, like Brazilian film, had no enduring value. Waller had studied critical theory, which actively repelled her new colleagues in the English department. Waller remembers a senior member of her department stating in a department meeting that he didn’t see that what she taught contributed anything to anyone’s general education.28

The English department, which arguably dominated the college’s intellectual life and tone at the time, was composed mainly of men from Harvard, committed to rewarding professors who possessed “quality of mind,” a hard-to-define and rare intellectual distinction whose ambiguity made evaluations and tenure decisions opaque. These professors made no secret of disliking critical theory and scholarship about gender—intellectual pursuits that, on other campuses, “[were transforming] the subjects studied there.”29

Hoping to support struggling women faculty, the college, under president Julian Gibbs, hired anthropologist Mary Catherine Bateson as dean of faculty. Dean Bateson, who had just returned from revolutionary Iran, arrived at Amherst as five young women professors publicly announced that they would not stand for tenure. Some believed that they would not be judged fairly. As Kate Hartford remembered, “We’d seen another slightly more senior colleague rejected . . . largely, it appeared . . . because they couldn’t accept the feminism in her scholarship.” But Hartford herself left because she “found the College irredeemably racist, sexist, and elitist.”30

Mary Catherine Bateson thought that Amherst’s senior male faculty had replicated sexist stereotypes by hiring a cohort of very young, untenured women faculty, and that the setup was ripe for “bullying and patronizing.” Hiring many women of similar age also meant that they came up for tenure at the same time and inevitably were pitted against each other. Among her recommendations was to bring two senior, tenured women to campus to have some strong female voices in decision-making roles.31 She also recommended the appointment of “additional women to the board” and the “abolition of fraternities.” The board adopted these proposals. Bateson wrote later that she thought that she “brought Amherst to a turning point in its treatment of women.”32

New women faculty at all levels found the prevailing Amherst classroom style distressing. As Olver described it, she would deliver a lecture and then “engag[e] in hand to hand mental combat with the students.” She noted that if students liked you, you were seen as insufficiently rigorous. (She later abandoned this kind of pedagogy with relief, but it served her well as the only woman on the Amherst faculty for some years.33) Cullen Murphy, of the class of 1974 and chairman of the board of trustees, reflected that “a lot of male students at Amherst would have been . . . learning from, this [style of teaching and coaching from men] all their lives.” He thinks it served “that particular group of male students . . . creating a bit of a boot-camp atmosphere.”34

The 1984 "Report on the Conditions of Work for Faculty Women at Amherst College" that Bateson had initiated set out to account for the fact that up until then, “more women faculty have left than remain.”35 The report stated that women found men’s ways of teaching “abrasive, competitive and conflictual, showy, brash, sarcastic, rough and challenging.”
Younger women who did not teach this way got poor evaluations. In addition to their classroom discomfort, junior women were forced to postpone their own research to serve in disproportionate numbers on committees. They found themselves expected, as women, to spend hours nurturing a stressed and unhappy student body, while male teachers were seen as the ones providing intellectual guidance. Few senior faculty members were interested in, or capable of, mentoring the research of women faculty members. Finally, the college still assumed one-career families and operated like a paternalistic family, rather than an equitable institution. Women faculty were expected to get tenure before getting pregnant; women who commuted faced discrimination; generally, college expectations for women faculty overlapped broadly with the traditional roles of faculty spouses.

As the first classes of women students entered the college (transfers in 1975 and first-years in 1976), problems surfaced right away. Many, who had been motivated to be pioneers of change at elite schools, suffered high levels of stress and lowered self-confidence due to hostility to their presence and lack of adequate advanced thought of their needs. Arlene Stein was one of the first one hundred and fifty women admitted to Amherst's class of 1980, entering a college of fifteen hundred. Stein, who now heads the Interdisciplinary Center for Women's Studies at Rutgers, was excited at the prospect of being a trailblazer, but found herself very unhappy and out of place.

It was plain to Stein that most of the men were having a better time than the women because the college reflected them positively, particularly if they were “gentlemen jocks” and fraternity members. The women found no warm reflections of themselves. Years later, she found that most of her women classmates had been miserable like her but had blamed themselves and did not talk about their unhappiness with one another. She coped by excelling at her studies and spending her junior year at Brown. Stein found it impossible to separate class, ethnicity, and gender in understanding her deep discomfort at the college. She felt that the college made no effort to accommodate undergraduates who were not male, privileged, WASP, and athletically inclined. In this, she anticipated President Martin's understanding that more than gender affects how students can thrive and therefore learn. Stein's critique was not unique, but there were, of course, women students in the early years of coeducation who thrived at Amherst. They were likely to be self-confident and able to fit in socially with the dominant culture. As women's athletic facilities improved, Amherst women increasingly enjoyed the egalitarian atmosphere of competitive sports.

However, women students transferred out. In the March 19, 1978, faculty meeting, a professor warned of a “potential exodus” of women seeking to transfer from Amherst. One woman gave as her reason: “To get away from the kind of college Amherst is.” Amherst's “Report to the New England Association of Schools and Colleges” in March 1978 noted that the fraternities manifested a “degrading attitude toward women,” and that there was an “increase in incidents of exhibitionism and voyeurism” requiring heightened security in the dorms.

Many professors and administrators agreed that fraternities posed a threat to women's well-being. Materially, fraternities made it hard for women to find decent housing, thus violating Title IX. The fraternities, which dominated college social life, also dominated $5 million dollars' worth of real estate: the college's best living quarters. In 1980, fraternities
were instructed to admit women, but the fraternities would admit no resident counselors (upper-level students living in dorms who advised other students on problems), and the college was generally in “police mode,” trying to rein in fraternity brothers, with incidents that regularly included “vandalism [and] personal humiliation of students.” Former dean of students Ben Lieber recalled that a young woman student whose mother was helping her move into her room in a fraternity house was confronted with a pornographic mural in the laundry room. Even after the trustees pushed the fraternities off campus, they still dominated college social life. Dean Lieber remembers that for two years, the juniors and seniors most affected by the demise of the campus fraternities behaved “horribly—that it was a pretty awful time.” Meanwhile, it would be ten years before the dorms were renovated with proper bathroom facilities for women.

Peter Pouncey, from Columbia, assumed the presidency in 1982. He had no previous connection with Amherst and no nostalgia for an all-male environment. He had advocated for coeducation at Columbia in 1975. He and his administration and several departments worked to hire women faculty members. In the academic year 1982 to 1983, Amherst had 157 male faculty and thirty-two women. (By comparison, Oberlin had 169 men and forty-seven women, and Smith had 223 men and 147 women.) Between 1983 and 1988, fourteen women were hired who remained and got tenure at the college.

Women faculty, continuing to find few to mentor and support their research, believed that the absence of a women’s and gender studies department implicitly devalued their chosen fields. The women’s and gender studies department came up for discussion and a vote in September 1986. Objections to its formation came from male faculty who did not see it as a legitimate field of study but as the product of “political frustration and political need, connected with the change to coeducation and the changing position of women at the College.” Professor Eve Sedgwick responded to these objections by pointing out that throughout the humanities and social sciences, there was “a flat distaste for unnecessary subordination,” referring to the subordination of women and knowledge pertaining to them. The faculty voted to found women and gender studies (WAGS; later SWAGS).

Meanwhile, coeducation clearly had not civilized some Amherst men. About two hundred women students and faculty occupied President Pouncey’s office in the spring of 1985, to protest, among other things, harassment and assaults on women and gay people and what protestors saw as a perverse and ineffectual disciplinary system that forced students into mediation and almost never punished perpetrators. Women would not report offenses because they saw the mediation process as just further harassment. They asserted that the college accepted men’s drunkenness “as mitigating any action, no matter how . . . destructive.” They charged that three cases of “serious violence” were never even adjudicated, despite the fact that administrators knew about them. Women spoke of “daily catcalls, obscene and abusive signs . . . anonymous phone calls late at night” that most had simply learned to tune out. But women were also withdrawing from seeking public offices on campus, to avoid further harassment.

Pouncey, the College Council, and students failing to get a fair hearing all pushed to reform the disciplinary system. In 1987, the faculty condemned the old system as “deplorable” and created a new one without mandatory mediation. (Despite these remedies, sur-
vivors of assault continued to see that system as a deterrent to reporting and unsupportive of their well-being. Under President Martin, Amanda Vann, and others, it has been revised so that reporting is much more frequent.53

Pouncey tried to put into Amherst’s code of conduct a prohibition on faculty-student sexual relations, but the closest he was able to come was the statement that “many faculty at Amherst College believe that a sexual relationship between a student and a teacher betrays a teacher’s deepest obligations.”54 Some faculty objected that such a prohibition would extinguish the essential “erotic” component of teaching. The college only voted in 2020 to prohibit sexual relationships between faculty and students.

For women students of color, racism intersected with the sexism they encountered. They found themselves working “in the classroom to educate classmates and professors that there were valid views outside that of white mainstream America.” And they engaged with each other “as black students [who] mirrored every societal conflict concerning race, identity, class and gender.”55 Barbara Liggon Smoot (class of 1984) reflected that “dealing with socio/economic/class differences as well as racial/gender differences meant that I had to develop an inner strength to make it through Amherst. Today I can tell you I am one tough cookie!”56

The Pouncey administration, college students, and faculty in the 1980s fought and won some important battles in the service of greater equity on campus. When Tom Gerety and Lisa Raskin took over in 1994, as president and dean of faculty, respectively, Raskin was the first woman in this position who had been at the college since the very early days of coeducation. Although she had made it through her graduate school years as the only woman in the psychology department at Princeton, where porn movies were a common form of entertainment, she “didn’t know she was a woman and different” until she arrived at Amherst. Hired in 1979 at age twenty-five, she was often mistaken for a student. Like Marguerite Waller, Kate Hartford, and other women faculty, she found Amherst debilitating, a social and psychological “pressure cooker.”

But by the time she took up the duties of dean of faculty, turmoil and dissatisfaction among women professors had diminished compared to her early years at Amherst. Male and female assistant professors and associate professors were of equal numbers now. Of the full professors, 95 percent were men, but the growing number of tenured women had begun to alter faculty decision-making. She observed that the college had very strong individual departments and that they changed at uneven rates. During her years, three faculty women sued the college for discrimination in departments that were slow to change: mathematics, biology, and economics.57 They were very happy with their settlements, she recalled, with wry satisfaction.

Younger faculty—not only women—were using less caustic teaching styles. Perhaps as a consequence, students felt empowered to ask faculty for what they needed. As professor Pat O’Hara in the chemistry department remembered, she was “haunted” by the plea of Ashanti Brown and her sister Amani (both class of 1997) to establish a quantitative-skills support center. Many entering students, hoping to be doctors, found themselves unprepared for boot-camp chemistry at Amherst and had to change their career goals. O’Hara was moved by the plea that students did not want to lower Amherst’s standards but wanted
to have the “tools to be able to tackle this . . . rigorous science curriculum.” O’Hara had already begun offering extra courses (on her own time) to alleviate the problem.

The Moss Quantitative Center, which provides institutional support for students, emerged from these students’ activism and the commitment of O’Hara and others. The Quantitative Center joined the Summer Science Program initiated in 1989, to give interested students a leg up when they encountered Amherst’s rigorous science and mathematics offerings.

On the social plane, the hook-up culture joined sexual assault as a problem, but not one susceptible to college regulation. Beth Slovic (class of 1997), a journalist and teacher, steered around it, and many other women—and men—did as well but refrained from openly criticizing it. She now believes that implicit acceptance of hooking up had the effect of enforcing heterosexuality: “I think I may have avoided talking about how I was not hooking up with random guys every weekend as a way to avoid suspicion that I was gay.” Slovic observes in her own classes now that her students are far more comfortable with varieties of sexuality—their own and others’—than her classmates at Amherst were.

Decades before, Arlene Stein had felt that WASP jockness permeated Amherst culture. Hooking up expressed aspects of that culture. Meanwhile, sports teams replaced fraternities as the centers of social life. Hooking up also capitalized on the way the mythology of sexual freedom had largely been decoupled from women’s liberation. Hook-ups of course are not unique to the college, but without coeducation, their consequences and embarrassments would be invisible on the Amherst campus.

Dean of faculty Greg Call and president Tony Marx presided over the greatest change in the composition of the student body since coeducation. Amherst began welcoming substantially increased numbers of students who were the first in their families to go to college, increased numbers of international students, and ethnically, economically, and geographically diverse students. While the tradition of boot-camp teaching was becoming rare on campus, the varieties of new students hastened its demise. President Martin recalls that in discussions during and after the 2015 Amherst Uprising, when students of color and others supporting them occupied Robert Frost Library, nontraditional students often pointed to the college’s unpreparedness for the very diversity it invited. The criticism recalls the first women students finding only bathrooms with urinals when they arrived, symbolic of the college’s obliviousness to the many changes needed to facilitate coeducation. This history of lack of forethought suggests an ongoing, unspoken conviction that the college did not need to change.

But some professors were prepared. Professor Call of the mathematics department had dreamed of opening the curriculum up to all students for thirty years, believing that proficiency in math would do just that. In 1988, against his colleagues’ judgment, he started a math club. Since leaving the deanship, Call has worked with the mathematics faculty to make the department one of the largest and most welcoming in the college. It now has an unprecedented seventy-five majors, of whom, a majority—thirty-nine—are women. The department has introduced an array of supportive initiatives that have boosted its remarkable expansion. Half the math faculty are women, and the department “is making strides in minority hiring.” Professor Call says the transformation really found traction in the last
ten to fifteen years, when national educational changes helped. Students now all arrive at the college with some calculus, starting out with more familiarity and less fear of math than students two decades prior. Professor Call currently hosts a Math Table (actually, three are needed to accommodate everyone) at Valentine Dining Hall every Monday. “Young and old go every week,” he said, properly delighted with its success.62

Like Professor O’Hara, President Martin understands that students want to succeed on Amherst’s academic terms, but sometimes need support along the way. She encounters alumni who remember with fondness the harsh teaching styles of their professors and wish it had never changed, but she reflects that the college has shifted from reverence for “quality of mind” to an equally demanding insistence on rigor.

President Martin and her colleagues are working with faculty observations and findings in cognitive science to identify and accommodate “learning differences” that go beyond gender, and can be influenced by generation, race, nationality, economic background, and degrees of ableness. On a more intimate level, she keeps open-office hours for students who want to come and talk to her. She offers individual strategies for students to find their way toward classroom comfort and recognition.

Cullen Murphy summarizes coeducation’s role in the dramatic changes that he has observed at Amherst College since graduating in 1974. Amherst had long admitted “untraditional” students, but in small numbers, and those students adapted to Amherst—or not. 63 “The admission of women on a 50–50 basis upended this regime. For the first time, the institution as a whole had to change fundamentally. . . . I think coeducation permanently broke the mold ever after when it came to Amherst’s thinking about everything—to the benefit of everyone.”

Hailing the triumph of coeducation and its absorption into the wider pedagogical project of supporting diverse students, however, may be premature. There has recently been a sharp upturn in applications, and more importantly, yield—or students actually enrolling—at many women’s colleges, including Smith, Mount Holyoke, Bryn Mawr, Barnard, and Agnes Scott. Admissions officers at women’s schools, for the first time, are using the value of single-sex education as a selling point instead of trying to minimize it. Called by journalists the Trump Bump, this development may have to do with the behavior and language of our president and the actions of his administration. It may have something to do with the metoo movement, or the increasing numbers of reports of sexual misconduct in the last several years on campuses across the country.64 In an increasingly competitive world, it may have to do with the persistent findings that women educated with other women in their college years do better academically, and professionally. Whatever the combination of reasons for many women’s growing interests in single-sex education, it seems that the debate about coeducation, abruptly interrupted by the financial and demographic concerns of the 1960s that underlay elite male schools’ transition to coeducation, is resuming.
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