Standard 5 • Faculty

The institution develops a faculty that is suited to the fulfillment of the institution’s mission. Faculty qualifications, numbers, and performance are sufficient to accomplish the institution's mission and purposes. Faculty competently offer the institution's academic programs and fulfill those tasks appropriately assigned them.

Overview

Across the rich variety of Middlebury’s campuses and programs, one can find a consistent and recognizable strength in the faculties’ focus on intense engagement with and commitment to their students and the academic program.

UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE

Faculty Profile

Description

The Middlebury College undergraduate faculty is comprised of highly motivated and accomplished teachers and scholars who are deeply committed to the mission of the liberal arts and who support that mission in the spirit of genuine reflection and continuous improvement. Recognizing the central importance of intense student-faculty interactions to its mission, the College has managed to protect its 9:1 student/faculty ratio in the face of recent economic pressure. Most faculty are tenured or on tenure-track appointments (75.2% in 2010-11), with non-tenure-track positions existing for both practical and pedagogical reasons. The vast majority (93.4% in 2010-11) of the faculty hold terminal degrees in their fields. The faculty is 58% male and 42% female. Faculty of color represent 10%. The College also hires an additional 25-35 short-term instructors during our four-week winter term who bring a wide array of professional experience and fresh perspectives to our students.

In addition to our intensive teaching and scholarship portfolios, regular faculty members are highly engaged in faculty governance, ranging from time-consuming committee work to lively discussions on the faculty floor about how best to accomplish the College’s mission. Throughout the academic year, the combination of a low student/faculty ratio and a high percentage of tenure-track faculty allows the faculty to deliver a strong liberal arts curriculum and engage closely with students both in and out of the classroom.

During the late 1990s, the College significantly expanded the student body and, correspondingly, the faculty. The College’s internal FTE count (a more precise measure of teaching resources than the Common Data Set count) was 181.5 FTE in 1994-95, 220.66 in 2005-6, and has reached 230 for 2009-10. During this period, expansion positions were allocated with an eye towards strategic foci that built upon Middlebury’s already established strengths. There was also a deliberate increase in interdisciplinary in the faculty recruits.
Middlebury’s procedure for approving faculty positions, in place since 1997, begins with the elected faculty Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) which includes the provost as a non-voting member. The EAC studies position proposals submitted by departments and programs and makes staffing recommendations to the president based on both College-wide and department-specific curricular needs. Because the EAC is also charged with curricular oversight, the process is set up to balance competing needs and give faculty members a voice in these conversations. The EAC has also worked with the president, provost, dean of the faculty, and chief diversity officer to ensure a commitment to diversity in positions that will yield the greatest results for supporting curriculum diversity initiatives and producing the most diverse pool for searches.

The growth in the faculty put some strain on the faculty review system, with a larger number of faculty coming up for reappointment and tenure each year. In response both to this strain and to recommendations from the last reaccreditation review, significant changes were made to the review structure. Under the new system established in 2002, promotional reviews and contract renewals are overseen by separate committees. Additionally, in response to a sense of the junior faculty being “over-reviewed,” in 2001 a new review schedule was voted in to include only one pre-tenure review in the third year, rather than reviews in both the second and fourth years. A “professional consultation” with the chair and a senior member of the department was put in place to ensure that colleagues received performance feedback by no later than the second year.

Review procedures at all levels are codified in the faculty handbook. The appropriate review committee conducts classroom visitations, assesses student course response forms, and reviews letters addressing teaching, scholarship, and institutional service from senior faculty in the candidate’s department or program. For tenure reviews, outside letters assessing research are also solicited by the review committee. Periodically, the faculty considers modifications to the review system. For example, letters from program directors are now included for candidates who contribute to interdisciplinary programs, and the faculty recently voted to solicit outside letters for the full professor review as well as to extend the upper range of the time frame of the review to ten years after tenure.

Middlebury’s hiring procedure for regular faculty is detailed in the chair’s handbook and follows standard and rigorous norms while allowing for discipline-specific variation. Middlebury offers competitive starting salaries and appropriate start-up funds for tenure-track faculty in all disciplines, especially but not exclusively in the sciences. The College is deeply committed to diversifying the faculty and has recently made more attempts to integrate this goal in our hiring processes. Term appointments currently have the same starting salary as tenure-track faculty. There are salary premiums for certain disciplines. Hiring decisions for winter term rest with the curriculum committee and are based primarily on the quality of the course proposals and how well they fit with curricular goals.

**Appraisal**

Although Middlebury’s academic reputation is a successful driver of the recruitment and retention of high quality faculty, the College does face specific challenges in this area. Our rural location makes spousal/partner employment a particularly difficult issue, both in terms of recruitment and retention. Additionally, data indicate that the lack of spousal employment opportunities is a greater issue for the retention of women than men: more women than men
leave the College voluntarily, and more cite the lack of spousal opportunities as a reason. In response to concerns about spousal employment, the administration has adopted a policy of considering spouses/partners as “internal” candidates for staff positions and has increased the on-campus advertisement of such positions. Additionally, some of our term and part-time faculty contracts are awarded to spouses/partners. The College has also received a grant from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for increasing career flexibility, and some of this grant is being used to create spousal employment opportunities. The president has prioritized the College’s support for economic growth in the region, emphasizing that improved spousal employment opportunities will be a likely benefit of this effort.

Although building and sustaining an inclusive community is a major value and goal for the College, diversifying the faculty has been, and remains, a challenge for Middlebury. The College is an Equal Opportunity Employer and complies with all state and federal laws that prohibit discrimination. We are currently implementing an affirmative action plan that addresses diversity issues across the institution. Though we have taken small steps in increasing the representation of underrepresented groups on the faculty, we have not made as much progress as we would have liked since the last reaccreditation.

We do, however, believe that we are poised for success in this area over the next few years. The dean of planning and assessment has been charged with ensuring the implementation of several recommendations coming out of the 2008 Task Force on the Status of Women Report. We have compiled for the first time a mechanism for accurately tracking the gender, ethnic, and racial background of the faculty. Monitoring these data will enable the College to more reliably measure changes in the profile of the faculty in terms of recruitment and retention.

Another reason for our optimism is the recent appointment of a chief diversity officer. This senior administrator is working with the dean of the faculty to develop new protocols and programs to diversify the faculty and support and retain faculty from historically underrepresented groups. In the fall of 2010, these two senior administrators, along with three other teams from similar colleges in New England, traveled to University of California, Berkeley to help showcase the professional opportunities at liberal arts colleges to a diverse pool of graduate students. Middlebury is a major leader in this effort and is currently seeking funding to formalize this initiative. We anticipate that this kind of outreach will lead to a more formal program of exchange between liberal arts colleges like Middlebury and major research institutions like Berkeley. Columbia University recently agreed to become a formal partner on this project. This fall, the College also re-launched the Middlebury dissertation fellowship program. Unlike in the past, the new version of the lapsed program will be administered entirely by Middlebury. Each dissertation fellow will be placed with a host department or program eager to mentor. Each dissertation fellow will also teach one class. We anticipate attracting graduate students who will help diversify our curriculum and our faculty on one-to-two year fellowships, with the possibility that a fellowship might be the gateway to a full-time position. This year we increased our applicant pool to over 140 applicants for one position. We targeted graduate programs, departments around the country and special programs in order to maximize the number of talented candidates from historically underrepresented groups. Most importantly, we engaged our faculty leaders and department chairs and encouraged them to play a major role in the process.
With the support of the president, the provost, and the chief diversity officer, the dean of the faculty, who oversees faculty hiring, is actively working to diversify both the pool of candidates from which the College recruits and the pool of short-listed finalists who interview at the College. Postdoctoral opportunities for the purposes of increasing faculty diversity are being considered by the provost’s office on an ad hoc basis, with one such appointment having been made. Finally, the College has created the Center for the Comparative Study of Race and Ethnicity which addresses issues relevant to diversity in the faculty and in the curriculum through its programming. The president, provost, and dean of the faculty are committed to being creative about opportunities that emerge. For example, we recently converted a three-year term appointment into a tenure track position in international environmental studies in order to recruit a competitive candidate of color. We are clear that this type of leadership, intentional commitment, and innovation is what will ultimately allow us to recruit and retain more faculty members from historically underrepresented groups.

In 1997 the College adopted the goal of achieving and maintaining a fourth-place salary ranking relative to a newly constituted 21-school comparison group. Though the College did make some gains, even reaching this goal in the rank of full professor in 2006-7 and 2007-8, salaries overall fell short of this goal. Currently (as of the 2009-10 academic year), the College ranks 13th, 12th and 9th in salaries, and 11th, 11th and 6th in overall compensation at the assistant, associate, and full professor ranks respectively. Last year, the president instructed an ad hoc committee on faculty compensation to consider how best to specify and achieve goals for faculty compensation, with both internal and external considerations in mind and extensive faculty discussion was solicited. In its report, the committee recommended changes that would, for example, make more explicit connections between individual performance and merit pay increases, and at the same time, attempt to balance internal equity against differences in recruiting markets across disciplines. It recommended greater transparency in the salary-setting process, for both tenure and non-tenure-track positions alike. The committee also proposed the adoption of a different comparison group, though without setting clear goals for our position within this comparison group. At the moment, the committee’s report stands only as recommendations, some of which would require administrative action, with others that would require a faculty vote. The faculty council is leading a series of faculty discussions to explore how best to compare salaries meaningfully, both internally and externally. In particular, the College’s new financial model, under which tuition increases are capped at the growth in the consumer price index plus one percent, has the potential to create additional stresses on future faculty salary pools.

Projections

- The provost will ensure that the faculty council will continue to consider which of the recommendations from the Faculty Compensation Committee will be acted upon and how. We expect some recommendations to be accepted by the end of the 2010-11 academic year, with discussions continuing into next year on other more complex issues such as merit increases and the development of a new means by which to compare salaries and benefits across peer institutions.
- The administration will continue to increase spousal employment opportunities through its policy of considering spouses as internal candidates, targeting external grants such as the
Sloan to support spousal employment opportunities, and supporting economic
development in the region.

- The dean of the faculty and the chief diversity officer will continue efforts to diversify the
  pool of faculty candidates through such means as targeted advertising, and establishing
  an ongoing program of exchange over the next two years between a group of liberal arts
  colleges and University of California, Berkeley; Columbia University; and at least one
  other major university in the future to showcase the opportunities at liberal arts colleges.

- The chief diversity officer will build the dissertation fellowship program: this year the
  program aims to establish one dissertation fellowship with plans to grow the program in
  future years.

- The Office of Planning, Assessment, and Institutional Research will continue to improve
  data related to race and gender as we work on issues of recruitment and retention of
  women and faculty of color.

Teaching and Advising

Description
The College places a high priority on involving faculty in all elements of the institution’s
mission. As a result, all regular faculty are expected to take on a range of teaching and advising
responsibilities, including teaching both introductory and advanced courses; teaching first-year
seminars, with their associated advising responsibilities; serving as students’ academic advisors;
and supervising independent work. The College’s high percentage of tenured and tenure-track
faculty plays a key role in achieving this goal, since the College’s long-term commitment to
faculty through tenure ensures that they can devote themselves to undertaking this wide array of
responsibilities. The review process for faculty reappointment and promotion allows – and
requires – faculty to showcase a wide range of activities in teaching, research, and institutional
service.

The College’s teaching load guidelines, both as currently implemented and under proposed
revisions (discussed below), aim to balance workloads while safeguarding small class sizes and
close faculty involvement with students. The current teaching load is measured in instructional
units (IUs) with a typical course counting as 1 IU. The standard load is 5.5 IUs (either a 3/2 or a
2/3 for the fall/spring semesters, with the additional 0.5 IU representing the commitment to teach
a winter term class every other year). Additional IU credit is granted for larger classes only when
they incorporate smaller components with intense student-faculty interactions. For example, an
additional 1 IU is allocated for discussion sections in large classes, and lab sections count as 0.5
IU each if they meet certain criteria. Generous credit is also given for team-teaching, intensive
seminars, and intensive language courses. Trends in student interests, variations in departments’
and programs’ philosophies concerning the relative importance of student accessibility versus
course rigor, and differing logistical limitations have led to significant variations across
departments and programs in typical class sizes. Course loads are the same for full-time term and
tenure-line positions, with the exception that term faculty teach winter term with a somewhat
higher frequency (two out of every three years rather than three of every five teaching years for
tenure-line faculty).
Coming out of the 2006 strategic plan, the faculty voted in favor of (but has not yet implemented) a requirement for senior independent work. The original plan was for this change to be implemented in conjunction with a shift from a 5.5 IU teaching load to a 4.5 course load. Counting courses rather than IUs would not only bring us more into line with our peer institutions’ counting mechanisms, but would also help us reach other goals. Specifically, the idea was that by introducing more flexibility into the system and by dismantling the current incentive to have large 2 IU classes, some faculty time would be opened up which could be redeployed in the form of supervising senior independent work. Importantly, this change was to occur alongside an increase in the size of the faculty by 25 FTE to accommodate this change in load. With the recession, however, came a recognition that the expected new faculty positions could not be funded in the near future. The EAC has now de-coupled a revision of the teaching load guidelines from the implementation of senior work, and is considering modifications of the teaching load guidelines, to be followed by subsequent assessment of the feasibility of required senior independent work. The process has slowed down as the faculty carefully considers the implications of the proposed guideline changes.

Undergraduate faculty members also take their advising responsibilities seriously: they are available to students for both general education advising and advising within the major, and there are clear expectations of regular office hours for both informal teaching and advising. All first-year students are advised for three semesters by the instructor in their first-year seminar, after which they switch to faculty members in their majors. Seminar teaching and advising duties generally are rotated among full-time faculty, who teach a first-year seminar on average once every 3.5 years. This advising system, in place now for two decades, ensures frequent contact between advisor and advisee (data from a survey of the class of 2010 suggest that most students met with their advisors several times outside of class during their first year).

While the advising load for faculty varies according to the number of majors in a department, in any semester nearly all Middlebury faculty serve as advisors for one or more students. Faculty are supported in their advising roles through such programs as the first-year seminar faculty advisor meetings each August, the distribution of advising materials, and an academic advising website.

Intensive faculty-student interaction is also encouraged through collaborative research opportunities. An undergraduate research office was established in 2006 to encourage and support student research across the curriculum. In both the academic year and the summer, funding is available for projects that will result in collaborative work between faculty and students (Undergraduate Collaborative Research Fund). During the academic year, departments and individual faculty have access to funding (Faculty Research Assistance Fund) from the dean of the faculty for student research assistants. Student research of all forms is showcased at the annual student research symposium every April. In the sciences, students regularly collaborate with faculty to present at professional conferences and co-author papers. Middlebury has recently joined the Council on Undergraduate Research as an enhanced member to encourage faculty-student collaboration on conference presentations, posters and papers. Last year, over 100 students were engaged in summer research supported by external faculty grants.
Faculty members are also encouraged to participate in the residential dimension of the College. For example, entering students are housed in the College’s five residential Commons by first-year seminar, and both they and their seminar instructors become members of a particular Commons. This residential Commons affiliation offers faculty access to support staff, cocurricular event planning, and a small first-year seminar course enrichment budget to help their students bridge the gap between living and learning on a residential liberal arts campus. Additionally, each Commons has a Commons head who is a tenured member of the faculty, has a reduced teaching load, lives in a Commons house, and oversees events that bring together residential and academic life.

**Appraisal**

On the whole, expectations of the wide variety of teaching and advising responsibilities have been effectively integrated into the faculty culture. For example, in most departments, senior faculty are well represented in standard introductory courses, and both junior and senior faculty have opportunities to develop curricular innovations aligned with their professional strengths. Various instructional techniques are employed and developed across the faculty in accord with specific disciplinary needs.

The variations that exist across departments and programs with respect to teaching load distributions allow for efficient deployment of faculty resources in most cases. Both within and across departments and programs, however, it remains an ongoing challenge to equalize workloads given the wide variety of forms that these tasks can take. As discussed in standard four, the current reformulation of teaching load guidelines aims to address such concerns.

A scan of the spring 2011 course schedule reveals that approximately 20% of our course offerings, not including drills and labs, are taught by term faculty. While our history of such moderate reliance on term appointments has been supported in the past by sound rationales (both practical and pedagogical), difficult economic times have resulted in several requests for tenure-track lines being turned down recently and replaced with term appointments. Additionally, because of the extensive variety of term appointments, conditions and responsibilities tend to be less visible than the expectations and conditions of employment for tenure-track faculty. Given the important role the “tenure track” plays in maintaining a committed and fully engaged faculty, coupled with the positive institutional effects of good working conditions for those term appointments we do have, it will be important for the College to maintain transparent and sound policies concerning our reliance on and expectations of term appointments in the future.

Middlebury faculty members have frequent opportunities throughout their careers to have their teaching assessed. In addition to formal reviews for contract renewals and promotion, which involve assessment of student course response forms and classroom visitations, the revised review procedure now mandates a professional consultation before the pre-tenure review. Additionally, there is a post-review consultation after a successful third-year review in which the junior faculty member, the relevant department chair and the dean of the faculty meet to discuss how to ensure continued success. Though such mandated structures are in place to help develop Middlebury faculty as teachers and increase the potential for success at the tenure review, there is of course variation across departments and personalities in terms of how well these procedures
work and the degree to which they are viewed as evaluative versus developmental. The College also supports pedagogical and technological developments through a variety of programs such as the pedagogy roundtables and annual writing retreat sponsored by the center for teaching and learning resources, library and information services workshops on the uses of new pedagogical technologies, and the student media mentors who assist faculty over the summer incorporate new technologies into their upcoming courses.

Our course response forms are quite robust in terms of having high response rates and extensive written comments from students. In 2005, after careful study by faculty committee, they were significantly revised in an attempt to focus the questions more on student learning. There also have been recurring discussions about the inefficiencies of a paper-based system and the merits and drawbacks of moving to an online system, including the potential of an online system to allow us to explore new areas of assessment. For example, with electronic forms we could compare responses for the same course across different offerings with different class sizes, noting if class size affects the learning experience. A pilot project of online response forms was done in 2004, and the faculty council expects to take up the issue again in 2011.

While intense engagement with students and full participation in the College’s teaching mission is precisely what makes the College successful, the full set of faculty responsibilities can become overwhelming for faculty, particularly as research demands on faculty are also on the rise. The tasks of college service tend to fall disproportionately to a subset of the faculty and the recent removal of course releases for EAC service and some Chairs has compounded the difficulties. It is important for the administration to address, especially within the review and compensation processes but in other ways as well, the competing demands on faculty time. Participation in the Harvard COACHE survey is being considered as a way to monitor these issues.

For many years, the College has developed programs to promote a healthy work/life balance among its faculty. In 2009, we received a $200,000 award from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, administered by the American Council on Education, to improve its strong policies on faculty career flexibility. This award has enabled Middlebury to launch new initiatives to make the undergraduate campus more child friendly, to reduce stress, to address spousal/partner employment needs, to leverage opportunities for faculty to advance professional and personal goals within the many units that constitute Middlebury beyond the undergraduate College, and to promote awareness of existing work/life balance programs.

**Projections**

- The EAC will monitor new teaching guidelines over the first three years of their implementation, to ascertain if the guidelines are successful in equalizing teaching loads. Reports summarizing faculty members’ weekly contact hours, numbers of students served, and courses taught will serve as measures of progress toward this goal.
- The provost will monitor and report annually to faculty council and the EAC the relative numbers of term and tenure-track appointments so that trends can be discerned.
- Faculty council will discuss the potential benefits, drawback and challenges of an online system of course response forms, with the goal of bringing to the faculty a proposal for an online system that would minimize drawbacks while allowing us to reap the benefits of such a system. An ad hoc task force that includes both faculty council members and
administrators will be convened this spring to develop a proposal.

- The academic administration will build upon the enhancements made possible through the ACE/Sloan program and continue to explore work/life balance initiatives. In order to monitor progress in this area, the office of planning, assessment, and institutional research will consider the administration of the COACHE faculty survey in 2011-12.

- As the quality and scope of a Middlebury education have expanded, so too have the demands on faculty time. In concert with the ongoing discussions of faculty compensation and teaching loads, the academic administration will concretely define expectations and boundaries for the many competing demands on faculty members' time, and to ensure that resources are appropriately matched to these responsibilities.

- The academic administration will clarify the status and roles of various categories of non-tenure track faculty (with respect to such issues as teaching load, compensation, committee service, scholarship expectations, voting rights, titles) during the 2011-12 academic year, in concert with the discussions of compensation and teaching load changes.

Scholarship, Research, and Creative Activity

Description
Faculty carry out a wide range of scholarship, research, and creative work. Publications by faculty, which include books and monographs at major presses and articles in leading scholarly journals, range across scholarly and popular non-fiction, fiction, other creative works and performances, and textbooks and other pedagogical materials. Faculty conduct externally-funded research at Middlebury and collaborate with leading institutions and facilities around the world. Creative works by faculty are exhibited and performed at a variety of prominent venues. The College’s long-standing and clearly documented commitment to academic freedom is evidenced by the vast array of faculty work. Faculty accomplishments are celebrated in such venues as authors’ receptions, the faculty lecture series, and various performance events.

In support of research and creative work, the College makes available to faculty a rich pool of funds for professional development activities through a variety of programs. The dean of the faculty office (which has now subsumed the portfolio of the dean for faculty development and research, established in 2004) is responsible for overseeing professional development opportunities. In fiscal year 2008 for example, roughly $1 million was disbursed to faculty. The most widely used of these programs is the Faculty Professional Development Fund (FPDF), which extends a yearly allocation of up to $2,000 to full-time faculty (the allocation is pro-rated by FTE status for other faculty). Though this allocation limit survived reduction during the recession, the allocation amounts have not been raised at all since 2004 (with only nominal increases in the years leading up to 2004, despite increasing travel costs over the years). Roughly 50 senior faculty are beneficiaries of substantial enrichment funds that flow from endowed professorships.

The College supports the faculty pursuit of external grants and fellowships through its sponsored research office. In fiscal year 2010, 38 faculty received 49 grants and fellowships totaling more than $3 million. Research is conducted following established policies and procedures including
ethical considerations. In late 2010 the College funded a second staff position in the sponsored research office in order to support further the grant-seeking efforts of faculty.

The College offers a generous leave policy whereby tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible to apply for a year-long sabbatical after every five years of service. The process of applying is codified in the faculty handbook, and has built-in flexibility in that it specifies procedures for faculty wishing to accelerate, delay, extend, or shorten their scheduled leave. Sabbatical plans and achievements are recorded through application documents and end-of-leave reports submitted by faculty. The funding for these leaves is determined through a graduated system based on a percentage of the faculty member’s regular salary, and is dependent on the faculty member’s demonstrated effort to seek external sources of funding.

Notably, many professional development opportunities, including the faculty leave program, the faculty professional development fund, and Ada Howe Kent grants, have broad mandates that allow not only for research projects, but also for pedagogical projects including the development of courseware, textbooks, new course development, and study at other institutions. Faculty also take advantage of additional funding opportunities relevant to teaching and curricular development such as grants from the Mellon Foundation and the Whiting Foundation and through workshops facilitating environmental sustainability in the curriculum. Faculty professional development in teaching and advising is further aided by a winter term seminar for new tenure-track faculty, the new-faculty fall orientation, a structured mentoring program whereby small groups of new faculty are assigned to small groups of untenured and tenured faculty from different disciplines, formal and informal faculty reading groups funded by the Mellon Foundation, the annual summer pedagogy roundtable series conducted by the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Research (CTLR) in conjunction with the office of the dean of faculty, and the annual faculty retreat on teaching writing conducted by the writing program.

Appraisal
The scholarly achievements of the College faculty are outstanding and scholarly activity is well-supported by the institution through the variety of programs described above. Tracking of these accomplishments has been difficult, however, and could be improved.

Many changes over the last decade (the initial establishment of the dean for faculty development and research, the addition of staff to the sponsored research office) have helped strengthen the range of opportunities made available to faculty. The leadership of the College has strongly supported funding for professional development even during the serious economic downturn of 2008 and has approached college advancement about raising additional money for endowments so that the funding for these programs can be even more secure in the future given that rising costs do continue to challenge the effectiveness of some programs. Following the faculty compensation report, the decision has been made to redirect some funding (portions that amount to salary supplements) from the endowed professorship program to support increases in the salary pool, particularly for the assistant professor rank. The regular leave program compares well with peer programs and is viewed favorably by the faculty, the administration, and the trustees. It was not altered during the recent downturn in the economy (except for eliminating term faculty on long-term contracts), and there are no plans to do so in the future. In order to
continue the legacy of faculty achievement, it will be important to maintain the strength of our professional development programs even in the face of fiscal constraint.

**Projections**

- Beginning in 2012, the provost will annually report data on the resources granted for faculty development to faculty council, as a way of assessing how well such programs are supporting faculty.
- The academic administration needs to continue to seek external funding opportunities (as they have done with the Mellon Foundation) in order to continue offering strong opportunities for professional development.
- Over the next year, the academic administration will evaluate and consider the implementation of mechanisms for tracking scholarly achievement, such as through an integrated online system of reporting activities and academic achievement.

**MONTEREY INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

**Description**

As a professional graduate school, the Monterey Institute attracts and maintains a faculty distinguished by educational achievement, professional engagement, international experience and reputation, cross-disciplinary research, gender and cultural diversity, and a passionate commitment to teaching and to helping students secure professional placements upon graduation.

The Monterey Institute has approximately 75 regular faculty, most of whom are full-time. They are divided about equally between the Graduate School of International Policy and Management (GSIPM) and the Graduate School of Translation, Interpretation and Language Education (GSTILE). The Institute also includes 50-60 adjunct faculty. This number varies dependent upon course enrollments. The faculty is 60 percent male and 40 percent female. Approximately one quarter are from countries outside the U.S. Minorities represent 34 percent.

The Monterey Institute does not have a traditional tenure system, however, full-time faculty receive contracts of up to six years. Generally, faculty find that this offers them sufficient security and accords with the Institute’s commitment to professional engagement in the field. The Monterey Institute expects all faculty members to be excellent teachers and committed mentors. Regular professors are generally active scholars and researchers. Seventy-four percent have PhDs and the rest have Master’s degrees. (N.B. – Faculty appointments are exempted from the doctoral degree requirement in fields, such as Translation and Interpretation, for which a doctorate is not always the terminal degree.) Adjunct faculty members are generally practitioners who contribute particular skills or knowledge, especially on emerging issues. Forty-five percent of adjuncts had PhDs in fall 2009. Many adjunct faculty members are also active scholars. Regular professors of all ranks are evaluated annually and more extensively at time of contract renewal or promotion (either three or six years) on the basis of teaching, research and scholarship, professional stature, and service. Teaching evaluation consists of student end-of-semester surveys, faculty self-evaluation, and review by program chairs and/or deans.
Faculty recruitment for each school is overseen by the dean, working with the provost’s office, the school’s faculty, and a human resources manager who specializes in policies and procedures relating to faculty. Positions are typically advertised in standard venues such as the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, and in appropriate professional publications.

Through the faculty assembly, faculty senate, standing faculty committees on evaluation and academic policies, and other ad hoc committees as appropriate, faculty play a central role in governance of the Monterey Institute. The faculty assembly includes all regular faculty. Visiting faculty, research professors, adjunct faculty and professors emeritae/i are not members of the faculty assembly: they may attend the assembly but are not eligible to vote. The specific mandates of faculty committees are outlined in the faculty handbook.

**Appraisal**

The process of reorganization and integration with Middlebury has meant that Monterey Institute faculty committees have faced an unusually heavy workload, as they have taken on the tasks of clarifying and rationalizing faculty ranks, faculty roles in institutional decision making, and faculty evaluation. The faculty senate revised the faculty handbook in 2010, including procedures for faculty evaluation. In fall 2010, for the first time, program chairs in GSIPM had input into faculty evaluation.

One consequence of the financial crisis that precipitated the Monterey Institute’s affiliation and merger with Middlebury (described more fully in the summer 2010 progress report to NEASC on substantive change) has been that faculty salaries have not been competitive. In 2006, a compensation study was commissioned and the results indicated, as expected, that the Monterey Institute lagged behind the market. In 2007, faculty salaries were increased to 85% of the middle of the range based on then-current market data. Additional increases were awarded in 2008, but the state of the economy since then has meant that progress on this issue has come to a temporary halt. However, the Monterey Institute was able to make some progress in 2009, as part of the academic reorganization process, toward equalizing faculty workloads. Full time faculty generally teach five courses (three or four credits each), or the equivalent, per year. Despite the economic downturn, the Monterey Institute faculty and staff have benefitted from steadily improving health, welfare, and retirement benefits, as parity of benefits has been a priority component of integration with Middlebury.

The Monterey Institute provides faculty with opportunities to be creative and to stay on the cutting edge in preparing students for emerging job opportunities. Faculty of the Graduate School of Translation, Interpretation and Language Education are well-respected professionals in their field and are highly sought as conference speakers, professional translators and interpreters, and consultants on assessment and teacher training. Graduate School of International Policy and Management faculty have a broad and deep range of professional experience in addition to their academic research portfolios. Faculty accomplishments are outlined in more detail in the Database of Faculty Accomplishment. After several years of less than adequate support for faculty development, 2010 saw a 66% increased in funding for faculty development.
**Projections**

- The Monterey Institute provost’s office will continue to work with the institutional advancement office to increase support for faculty development activities.
- By fiscal year 2013, the Monterey Institute’s administration will develop, in collaboration with Middlebury, a strategy for addressing the issue of competitiveness in compensation.
- In fiscal year 2012, the Monterey Institute’s administration will align its salary increase schedule to Middlebury’s fiscal year cycle.
- The Monterey Institute faculty senate will continue to review faculty evaluation procedures, focusing in 2011-12 on the incorporation of peer review.

### OTHER GRADUATE and SPECIAL PROGRAMS

**Description**

In the Language Schools, the Bread Loaf School of English, and the C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad, nearly all faculty members are employed primarily by another university or college. There is also a significant degree of variability in the background of these faculty: some are tenured faculty at other institutions (both in the United States and abroad), others are junior faculty at a wide variety of institutions, while still others are faculty who have distinguished themselves in teaching but do not have a terminal degree.

In the Language Schools, there is a particular emphasis on hiring high quality language teachers at the beginning and intermediate language levels, and directors (almost all of whom are tenured faculty members at their home institution, and often quite prominent in their fields) use a variety of region- and culture-specific hiring practices in recruiting their faculty, including recruitment at national and international conferences, advertising through discipline-specific list-serves, recommendations of the department chairs and directors of C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad and personal contacts. In the case of the Bread Loaf School of English, the emphasis is on hiring outstanding teachers who are also prominent, if not leading, scholars in their fields. Almost all of the faculty are tenured at their home institutions, which routinely include prestigious colleges and universities such as Yale, Stanford, Princeton, Wellesley, and the University of Oxford. The hiring goal is to retain those faculty who have demonstrated excellence in teaching at Bread Loaf and to recruit outstanding new faculty whose research and teaching interests enhance the curricular offerings. The faculty positions in the Language Schools and the Bread Loaf School of English are in many ways more than full time jobs for the six to eight week period that these schools are in session, and new faculty have to be prepared for the 24/7 Middlebury “method” of intensive instruction, regular outside-of-class contact, and participation in co- and extra-curricular activities.

In the C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad, in sites where Middlebury hires our own faculty (as opposed to relying almost exclusively on direct-enrollment at partner universities), faculty are generally hired part-time to teach a single course, or perhaps two. With only a few exceptions, the faculty teaching at the Schools Abroad teach concurrently with other academic appointments and responsibilities. Our directors abroad recruit and train these local faculty, and in some cases also rely on local university partners to provide faculty. By hiring a variety of faculty who are already established locally, we are able to maintain a diverse and flexible curriculum, and at
most schools it would be impractical to hire full-time faculty for both cost and curricular reasons. In addition, at schools where we have direct enrollment options, which include most of our Schools Abroad, students are able to take courses with faculty in a wide variety of disciplines.

When it comes to student advising, there is a great deal of variability in the role that faculty play in our various programs. Advising – both academic and career advising – is most important in our graduate programs in the Language Schools and the Bread Loaf School of English. In all of the Language Schools where we have graduate programs, students are assigned an advisor. There are sometimes issues of continuity if faculty do not return each summer when an individual student enrolls. In such cases, the director of the individual Language School assigns a new advisor as necessary, usually a faculty member with a few years of experience in advising for the Language Schools, to minimize transitional friction. In addition, all of the faculty at the Language Schools are expected to provide advising to all students as necessary. Language School students who spend a year at one of the C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad also receive academic advising, primarily by the director of the school (with assistance from local faculty). At the Bread Loaf School of English, the director and associate director (and where relevant, the directors of the theater and writing programs) serve as academic advisors for all MA and non-degree candidates at all four campuses, with on-site directors at the non-Vermont campuses providing an additional advising for students at their campuses, as needed. The associate director oversees the progress of MLitt candidates and all students working on independent reading projects. Faculty also meet regularly with, and so advise, each of their students in individual conferences throughout the summer.

At the lower language levels, and at the undergraduate level at the C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad, students do not need the same kind of advising as graduate students. In the smaller Language Schools, directors advise, and in the larger programs there are specialized associate director positions to advise in intensive language sequences. In the case of the Schools Abroad, students have academic advisors at their home schools (whether their home school is Middlebury or another institution), and we expect them to rely on those advisors for general academic advising. Site-specific advising on coursework abroad, however, is handled by our directors and staff abroad who are familiar with local faculty and partner institutions.

At both the Language Schools and the Schools Abroad where we have graduate programs, the graduate faculty are selected because of their subject area expertise, with a goal of having balanced curricular offerings, and, as is the case with the Bread Loaf School of English faculty, they are often well-known and widely cited in their fields. In some cases, faculty use their appointment to further their research, for example through linguistic research or in the development of textbooks. That said, because these graduate faculty normally have appointments elsewhere, none of these programs have as a primary goal the furthering of the scholarship of these faculty. Rather, the institution’s goal is to bring faculty with relevant expertise to students who come to these programs with particular aims in mind.

Faculty at all of these programs are evaluated on a regular basis. In the Language Schools and the Bread Loaf School of English, students all fill out a course evaluation for each course and each instructor, and in the Schools Abroad, students fill out course evaluation forms onsite. In addition, undergraduates fill out a study abroad program evaluation after the program is over,
which asks them to evaluate each course individually. Language School and Schools Abroad directors read these evaluations, and provide feedback to relevant faculty, and make decisions about whether to rehire based on these evaluations and their own observations of classes (where relevant) and other feedback. At the Bread Loaf School of English, the director and associate director review the course evaluations and interview all faculty regarding their teaching at the end of the summer, consult with students about particular courses (as needed), review course descriptions, and use these evaluations to provide feedback to faculty and to make decisions about rehiring.

Appraisal
In the programs that hire faculty into short-term full-time appointments (the Language Schools and the Bread Loaf School of English), there is some variability in the teaching load. In the Language Schools, this is justified on the basis of differences in language pedagogy. This is no different than in the undergraduate College, where some languages offer more contact hours, or more contact hours at earlier levels of language. There are pay differentials across different Language Schools where some languages have different pay scales for intensive summer programs (some of which operate abroad); our goal is to provide a competitive salary that will attract the highest quality faculty. Generally speaking, these pay differentials respond to particular hiring markets and international currency exchange fluctuations, and allow Middlebury to remain flexible in what it offers. At the Bread Loaf School of English, faculty teach either one or two courses, depending on the needs of the curriculum and the faculty. Faculty are paid per course. All starting salaries for new faculty are the same, as are percentage salary increases for returning faculty.

Both the Bread Loaf School of English and the Language Schools have been very successful in recruiting and retaining outstanding summer faculty. Because neither the directors nor the faculty are full-time employees of Middlebury College – and because the hiring takes place within a short time frame and the faculty have already been thoroughly vetted by institutions of higher learning – it is neither possible nor necessary to conduct the same sort of expensive, time-consuming searches that are conducted by year-round undergraduate institutions. In the case of the Bread Loaf School of English, the directors consult with Bread Loaf faculty (from a range of major institutions) to form a short list of leading scholars in needed fields of specialization; the director then pursues selected candidates, reviews curricula vitae, websites, consults with department chairs at the candidate’s institution (where possible), and interviews the candidates. Although the Bread Loaf School of English has been very successful in employing informal networks to attract high quality summer faculty, recruiting procedures could be improved to ensure that the best candidates hear about the teaching opportunities. For example, there is no standard practice for advertising positions. In the case of the Language Schools, each Language School director has his or her own method for hiring faculty, relying on previous hires, connections, or interviews with potential faculty who are located abroad. It would be difficult to make these processes uniform; each director of a Language School or a School Abroad is responding to a particular market. For example, in the Language Schools, the market for Arabic instructors is quite competitive, which is not the case for many other languages. Each Language School director also has expertise in his or her particular field, and a top-down imposition of uniform hiring standards would have a negative impact on the administration of all the Language Schools.
In cases where the C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad depend on direct enrollment options, we expect the directors of our programs to learn about local faculty at our partner institutions, and advise our students accordingly. We rely on our local university partners to hire good faculty, and our partners are generally reliable. Our agreements are with excellent universities abroad, and faculty at these universities have their own rigorous systems of evaluation. One effect of the variety of institutions on which we depend for direct enrollment options is that students who take direct-enroll classes are often confronted with very different teaching styles compared to what they are used to, including styles that place more responsibility for learning in the hands of students.

The Bread Loaf School of English does need to do better with respect to evaluating faculty. The directors rely on course evaluations (along with student and faculty interviews and other materials) in providing feedback to faculty and in making rehiring decisions, but currently the student response rate is uneven from course to course and low across the board. To make these evaluations more meaningful to both students and faculty, in 2009 the Bread Loaf faculty starting receiving (anonymous) copies of their evaluations, with some small, but not enough, increase in student response rate.

**Projections**

- The directors for the Language Schools and the Bread Loaf School of English will assess and revise their recruitment policies and practices for hiring faculty over the next two summers to ensure that they are appropriate to their particular program goals.
- Over the next two years, the directors of the Language Schools, Bread Loaf School of English, and the C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad will explore new ways of advertising faculty opportunities to ensure that additional potential faculty learn of these positions.
- By 2011, the Bread Loaf School of English will complete a faculty handbook compiling, clarifying, and augmenting information on policies and expectations which is currently articulated within various letters and memos to faculty.
- The response rate for student evaluations needs to be increased at the Bread Loaf School of English in order to improve faculty evaluation. The director and associate director will explore new ways of circulating or requiring the completion of student evaluations, with the goal of implementing modifications to current practice starting in 2011.
- Over the next two years, the directors of the Language Schools and the vice president for Language Schools, Schools Abroad and graduate programs will work together to outline a typology of compensation policies for the Language Schools in order to better understand the differences across programs and ensure that faculty are being appropriately and equitably compensated. A parallel process will be engaged by the directors of the C.V. Starr Middlebury Schools Abroad, working with the dean of international programs.
- Over the next two years, the directors of the Language Schools and C.V. Starr-Middlebury Schools Abroad that have graduate programs will develop new mechanisms to ensure that continuous advising occurs, especially for Doctor of Modern Languages candidates who complete their degrees over a number of years.
Institutional Effectiveness

The many reports and policy initiatives discussed above make it clear that Middlebury regularly reviews and reflects upon how well it is achieving its goals for its faculty. At the undergraduate College, there have been internal modifications to faculty reviews, governance structures, and compensation policies, all which have involved significant faculty thought and consideration demonstrating our commitment to reflection and responsiveness. Additionally, external department reviews serve as a mechanism for identifying strategies for improvement. At the Monterey Institute, there has been a great deal of activity since the merger with Middlebury in order to assess and improve various policies and procedures. In the other Graduate and Special Programs we continue to put in place more structures that will allow us to continually monitor our progress at achieving our institutional goals. While Middlebury has continued to build an outstanding faculty over the past 10 years, in order to preserve these strengths in the future it will be necessary to continue to examine how practices of faculty recruitment, programs of professional development, and faculty reviews can best support the development of an agile and dynamic faculty, able to lead the way in curricular innovation over the long run across all of its programs and locations.