

OVERVIEW

The past decade has been a period of marked change at Middlebury College. While remaining true to its heritage of two centuries, the College has once again, as it has at previous times in its history, set out on a process of growth and development that will keep it in the forefront of residential liberal arts colleges. This chapter of the self-study report will review the major events and decisions of the past decade that have shaped the institution's nature at the time of this reaccreditation, and will continue to shape Middlebury in the decade ahead.

Ten Year Planning Committee

A 1991-92 Planning Committee, chaired by President McCardell, set out a ten-year plan for the College that identified several important institutional priorities, among them revising the general education component of the B.A. requirements, reviewing the rules for faculty reappointment and tenure, establishing a greater intellectual community outside the classroom, strengthening the professional development and performance evaluation programs for staff, evaluating the need for change in the organization of technology services at Middlebury, increasing the percentage of students on financial aid to 40 percent, and having American students of color make up 10 percent of the graduating class. This Planning Committee also recommended a new mission statement for the College, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees in May 1992. As an aid to the Planning Committee's work, a spreadsheet modeling the College's financial resources and projections was developed in 1991-92 and has been continuously updated, and used as an important planning tool, ever since. A "report card" assessing progress toward meeting the recommendations in the ten-year plan was issued in May 1993, one year after the plan was adopted. An update of this "report card" will be included in the visiting committee's work room.

Although some of the Planning Committee's recommendations, such as reducing the size of the undergraduate student body to 1,900 students, were not adopted, the work of the committee represented the first systematic and institution-wide examination of the College's programs and priorities in several years, and served a very important function in establishing much of the College's agenda in the years following the issuance of the committee's report. In particular, the planning committee suggested some of the ideas that have since been developed, and implemented, for changing the general education requirements for the B.A., revising the rules for faculty reviews and reappointment, and establishing closer connections between the academic and residential life components of the undergraduate College.

The Identification of "Peaks of Excellence"

In September 1994, President McCardell delivered an all-campus address at the start of the academic year, an address that has since become known as the "vision statement." A copy of this address is included as an appendix to this self-study report. In

this address, which reflected the culmination of many months of planning discussion and consultation with the administration, faculty leadership, and the Board of Trustees, the President articulated his vision of Middlebury as “the College of choice” for the very best students, and developed the notion of “peaks,” or areas of special distinction, that would distinguish Middlebury from other residential liberal arts colleges. President McCardell identified these peaks as follows: (1) the pre-eminent program in literary study; (2) cutting edge leadership in language study and pedagogy; (3) a global understanding that radiates from a core linguistic and cultural competency; (4) the environmentally aware campus; and (5) opportunities for students to apply what they learn about the liberal arts to “real world” situations. It is important to note that, while the peaks have often been discussed on campus within a curricular context, the President did not intend that the peaks would be limited to the curriculum and majors. Rather, they were to suffuse the campus and to have an important co-curricular component as well.

Following the President’s vision statement, task forces containing faculty, student, and staff members were appointed to make specific recommendations for developing each of the five peaks identified by President McCardell, as well as “general excellence in the liberal arts,” another defining attribute of the College identified by the President in his September 1994 address. These task forces submitted their reports in 1995-96, and these reports became an important set of principles guiding the decisions of the administration and faculty committees in the years since. (Copies of all of the task force reports and supporting documents will be available in the visiting committee’s workroom.) In particular, the peaks have served as a framework within which decisions were made about the first round of growth appointments to the faculty (see section on growth below) and, through the budget process, for the allocation of financial resources to support new initiatives. Issues of student life were not addressed in the 1994-96 planning process, since the Commons System had just begun. The identification of residential life as a peak came later, in 1997.

Fall 1999 will mark five years since President McCardell’s vision statement. Since 1994, the environmental studies and international studies peaks have become highly articulated, and those two majors are now among the largest at the College. In order to continue to enable broad-based groups to address curricular, co-curricular, and other needs associated with these strengths of Middlebury, peak committees will be reconstituted for the 1999-2000 academic year. In three instances – the International Studies Steering Committee, the Environmental Studies Steering Committee, and the Literature Committee – the needs of the peaks will be evaluated by what have become, over the past five years, regular committees of the faculty. In the other three instances – language pedagogy, general excellence, and real-world experiences – specially appointed committees will be established, with the charge to submit their recommendations to standing committees of the faculty or of the College.

Size of the Undergraduate Student Body

The 1994-95 academic year was marked by extensive discussion of the appropriate size of the Middlebury undergraduate student body. Although the May 1992 Planning Committee report recommended reducing the undergraduate population from the 2,154 of Fall 1991 to 1,900, the committee recognized that its report had to be viewed as a dynamic document, and that the College should be guided by, but not constrained by, its recommendations in the decade ahead.

Still, during the years from 1991-92 through 1994-95, the number of full-time undergraduates fell by 130 students, bringing the size of the student body down to one that could be accommodated within the College's residence hall, classroom, dining, and faculty resources. While this was the major goal of the planned reduction in the student body, we also accepted the conventional wisdom of the early 1990s that the size and quality of the applicant pool would not grow in the decade ahead.

The discussions in 1994-95 emphasized three reasons for expanding the size of the undergraduate student body: (1) the demographic "trough" was passed in 1992: with the "baby boom echo" generation now reaching college age, the number of 18-year-olds was increasing from year to year; (2) the quality of the applicant pool, as measured by standardized test scores and rank in class, had, contrary to the conventional wisdom, continued to increase each year in the early 1990s; and (3) additional students would enable Middlebury to admit a more diverse student body, to hire new faculty in order to add depth and critical mass to many of our academic programs, especially those identified as constituting important components of the peaks of excellence, and to provide resources for expanding and upgrading the College's physical plant.

During these discussions, it was pointed out that the College had undergone periods of growth and change at earlier times in its history. The most recent comparable period was during the 1960s and early 1970s, under the administration of President Armstrong, when the Middlebury student body grew from 1,200 to 1,800. It was during this period that Middlebury moved from a fine regional liberal arts college to an institution with a national and international reputation, added new facilities such as the Science Center and the Johnson Arts building, and increased the size of the faculty by nearly 40 percent, adding an entire generation of young faculty members who, over the next two decades, became the academic leaders of the College.

In May 1995, the Board of Trustees accepted the administration's recommendation that, over the next decade, the Middlebury undergraduate student body should grow, in a planned and managed way, to 2,350 full-time students enrolled on the Middlebury, Vermont campus. This growth of the student body would permit an expansion of the faculty by up to 30 full-time equivalents, keeping the student-faculty ratio constant at 11 to 1. The Board resolution on growth also noted that the College's

physical facilities should be expanded before the enrollment is increased, in order to provide the necessary infrastructure for accommodating the larger student body.

With new residence halls planned to open during the 1997-98 academic year, the expansion of both the student body and the faculty was scheduled to begin in Fall 1997. During the 1995-96 academic year, an extensive process of academic and curricular planning, involving all departments and programs and the academic administration, resulted in decisions on the allocation of the first group of new faculty positions, to begin in the 1997-98, 1998-99, and 1999-2000 academic years. As seen in the materials on faculty growth that are included in the appendix to this report, somewhat more than half of these positions are in fields that can be said to support one or more of the peaks. Just as importantly, most of the new positions are intended to contribute to one or more of the College's interdisciplinary academic programs, as well as the traditional disciplinary majors.

The full-time undergraduate student body will number somewhat over 2,200 students in the 1999-2000 academic year. We intend to hold the size of the student body constant for three academic years, in order to allow time for the construction of new residence halls and the renovation of existing residences. We anticipate that growth will resume again when the necessary infrastructure is in place, with the next wave of new positions being added to the faculty concurrently with the continued expansion of the student body. The next round of planning for growth will give us the opportunity to assess the academic program on the basis of several years of experience following the last round of growth decisions and their impact on the curriculum.

More information on the size and composition of the student body and the faculty since 1994-95 may be found in the appendix to this report.

The Enhanced Commons System

In October 1998, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution endorsing "The Enhanced Residential Plan" as developed by a Residential Life Committee consisting of students, faculty, staff, and members of the administration. As was the case with the peaks and growth, the endorsement of the enhanced Commons System represented the culmination of a multi-year process of planning and program development.

In January 1990, the Board of Trustees received the report of a task force on residential life, that was established as part of the last reaccreditation process, and that focused much of its work on the then all-male fraternities at Middlebury. The Board decided that single-sex social and residential organizations had no place at Middlebury College, and that these organizations had to become co-educational if they were to continue on campus. While most of the attention in 1990 was on the future of the fraternities, another of the task force's recommendations, adopted by the Board, was to begin planning for a so-called "Commons System," that would consist of groupings of residence halls, with faculty and staff associates, that would provide co-curricular

programming in the residence halls. The Commons System got underway in the Fall of 1991, and an evaluation of that system was scheduled to be completed in Spring 1997, after the system had been in place for five years.

At the time of that evaluation, President McCardell proposed a major enhancement of the Commons System to the Board in May 1997. This enhancement was intended to make residential life another peak at Middlebury, and to enhance the educational experience for all Middlebury students by breaking down the barriers between the academic and residential components of life at Middlebury. Specifically, the President proposed three “cornerstone” principles for residential life at Middlebury: continuing student membership in clusters of residence halls, decentralized dining, and faculty leadership living in proximate residences. This system would foster an educational environment in which students would be able to take greater responsibility for their own lives, to have increased interactions with faculty, staff, and students outside of class, to take on more opportunities for leadership as preparation for citizenship, and to learn more from their fellow students by extending the concept of education beyond the time and space bounds of the classroom.

During the 1997-98 academic year, the future of residential life was the major topic of discussion on campus. In countless forums, open meetings, and committee meetings, the Residential Life Committee, the Student Government Association, the Staff Council, the faculty, and the trustees subjected the current Commons System, and the many alternatives to it that had been suggested, to the most searching examination. At the end of the year, the Residential Life Committee submitted to the administration its proposals for an Enhanced Commons System, which included the three cornerstone principles that had been identified the preceding year. The administration presented these proposals, with its endorsement, to the Board, which affirmed the Enhanced Residential Plan in October 1998.

The Fall of 1999 will mark the first year of implementation of the enhanced Commons System. Commons Deans and Faculty Associates will work together as part of a leadership team for each Commons. More than half of the first-year seminars will be offered with a Commons affiliation, with all students in the course housed in the same Commons, and the instructor of the seminar affiliated with the Commons. Facilities planning for the new Commons System continues to move ahead, with the first projects planned being the addition of a dining hall and Commons program space to Ross Commons, and the construction of new residence halls for several Commons, to accommodate the planned increase in the student body and to provide more high-quality on-campus housing for seniors.

Detailed information on Commons-based programming and facilities planning will be available to members of the visiting committee in the workroom.

STANDARD ONE MISSION AND PURPOSES

Description

The following mission statement was adopted by the Middlebury College Board of Trustees in May 1992, and reaffirmed by the Board in May 1999:

The mission of Middlebury College is to educate students in the tradition of the liberal arts. Our academic program, co-curricular activities, and support services exist primarily to serve this purpose. Middlebury College is committed to excellence throughout its liberal arts curriculum: to balance in its academic offerings; to selective development of carefully chosen emerging strengths; and to maintaining conspicuous excellence in those areas of its traditional strengths such as language, literature, and an international perspective, including study abroad.

To fulfill this mission, the College admits students who show evidence of intellectual curiosity, high motivation, and superior academic accomplishment, and who, both individually and collectively, encompass a wide range of interests and talents. The College seeks students who are actively involved and committed to the ideals of community and who are, therefore, prepared to become leaders in society.

To assure that our students achieve their potential the College recognizes and reaffirms its commitment to creating and sustaining an environment conducive to learning: a small, highly selective, coeducational student body that fosters a true community of learning, and a faculty and staff dedicated to excellence and service to the educational needs of students. As a residential college, Middlebury recognizes that education takes place both within and beyond the classroom. The College seeks to maintain a diverse community committed to broadened educational opportunities within an atmosphere of respect for others. All of this takes place in a splendid natural setting with well-maintained buildings and grounds that not only support our academic and co-curricular programs, but also impart a sense of permanence, stability, tradition, and stewardship.

Finally, Middlebury endeavors to maintain a lifelong bond with its alumni and expects its graduates to be thoughtful, ethical leaders able to meet the challenges of informed citizenship. They should be independent thinkers, committed to service, with the courage to follow their convictions and prepared to accept responsibility for their actions. They should be skilled in the use of language to communicate ideas, in both written and oral form, and skilled in the analysis of evidence, in whatever form it may present itself. They should be physically active, mentally disciplined, and

motivated to continue learning. Most important, they should be grounded in an understanding of the western intellectual tradition that has shaped this College, and educated beyond the confines of their immediate experience so as to comprehend cultures, ideas, societies, traditions, and values other than their own.

Appraisal

The mission subcommittee of the reaccreditation steering committee, consisting of John McCardell, Carole Cavanaugh, Ronald Liebowitz, Robert Schine, Allison Stanger, and Charlotte Tate, reviewed the College's present mission statement. The group reached the unanimous conclusion that the May 1992 statement accurately captures the College's present goals.

In general terms, the subcommittee noted the striking correspondence between the mission statement and the strategic vision that the present administration has already made significant steps toward institutionalizing. The peaks of conspicuous excellence, as articulated by President McCardell in his September 1994 speech, "A Vision for Middlebury College" (see appendix to the self-study report), build on the traditional areas of excellence singled out in the mission statement and have been repeatedly enunciated and carefully cultivated. Hiring of new faculty and resource allocation have advanced the peaks agenda without neglecting our curriculum in "non-peak" areas. For example, we will have a spectacular new center for the Sciences (Bicentennial Hall) fully operational in Fall 1999 and work will soon begin on the design of a substantially enlarged and renovated Starr Library. The Enhanced Residential plan is well on its way to implementation, and careful attention has been paid throughout to preserving the beauty and architectural integrity of our campus. Consistent with that goal, we have delivered on our implicit promise of no deferred maintenance.

In order to ensure that our deeds continue to match our words, the reaccreditation steering committee recommended that the Board of Trustees reaffirm the present mission statement. This action was taken by the Board at its May 1999 meeting, when the May 1992 statement was reaffirmed with only one change, the explicit mention of both oral and written expression in the last paragraph. The steering committee also recommends that the mission statement continue to feature prominently in important College publications, such as the handbook, the course catalogue, and the prospectus/viewbook, in both printed and electronic form.

Projection

Looking ahead, the mission subcommittee did not anticipate substantive changes in the mission statement in the immediate future. That said, we are fully aware that major investments in our physical plant (such as Bicentennial Hall) may well generate new areas of conspicuous excellence that will merit explicit recognition further down the road.

STANDARD TWO PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Description

Planning and evaluation are ongoing activities at Middlebury College, and for the past decade, we have worked to incorporate these processes into institutional decision-making. We identified important institutional priorities in the context of our mission statement, the characteristics of our students, faculty, and other resources, and the careful examination of the College's environment. We evaluated our record in implementing and accomplishing these priorities, while considering our resources and constraints, both internal and external. We engaged in both qualitative and quantitative analysis, studying our progress in meeting institutional goals and the trends in indicators such as resource allocations, student enrollment patterns, and characteristics of applicants, students, and alumni to see how well we are accomplishing our goals. Our focus has been on evaluation at the level of institutional programs and priorities, rather than at the level of outcomes research focused on individual students.

Many departments and sectors of the college have planning and evaluation processes - for example, admissions and financial aid, enrollment planning, the allocation of new faculty positions, information technology services, and institutional financial planning. Individual units develop mission statements and goals within the overall institutional mission and plans. Models and projections are used to provide scenarios and options for decision making. Again, planning decisions are systematically reviewed and evaluated.

This reaccreditation process has given us the opportunity to assess the College's progress in meeting the recommendations of the 1991-92 Planning Committee. While some of the recommendations in the Ten Year Plan have been amended by subsequent decisions, particularly the May 1995 decision gradually to increase the size of the student body and the faculty, the May 1992 document continues to serve as a useful road map for the College's priorities, and a means of evaluating our success in meeting these goals. Many of the chapters in this report – in particular, those dealing with the academic program, the faculty, library and information services, and financial resources – refer to assumptions and recommendations in the Ten Year Plan and assess our progress in meeting those recommendations over the past decade. The areas identified for attention in the projections sections of the chapters in this report will likely form the basis of planning activity in the years ahead, as we focus more closely on developing the College's agenda for the period following the conclusion of the Bicentennial campaign.

External review committees have been effectively used for evaluation of academic departments and programs since 1995-96, and a structure for regular reviews of all academic units is in place. The department prepares an extensive self-study, which is discussed with the academic administration and is the basis for the visiting committee review. Once the visiting committee submits its written report, the department or

Standard 2: Planning and Evaluation

program discusses the findings and recommendations with the administration, and a response to these findings and recommendations is prepared by the academic administration. Copies of the departmental self-studies, the review committees' reports, and the departments' and academic administration's responses to them, are available in the visiting committee's workroom.

Appraisal and Projections

Middlebury College is in the midst of many transitions. Some of the transitions relate not only to what is being planned for the future, but also to the organizational and administrative structures that support and implement the College's plans. In July, the position of Executive Vice President for Facilities Planning was created. In addition, a Facilities Planning Group was created along with a Strategic Planning Group. Staffing to support both of these groups is currently being discussed, and should be fully operational by the time of the accreditation visit.

Middlebury established an institutional research office in 1996, thus following through on one of the recommendations of the 1990 NEASC visiting committee. The office serves as a resource for the administration in gathering and analyzing information on the background and consequences of decisions. Since the establishment of the Institutional Research (IR) office, Middlebury actively participates in the data-sharing activities of Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) and other higher education consortia, thus enabling us to benchmark our progress against that of other residential liberal arts colleges. The IR office has also worked with several departments on campus to develop client satisfaction and quality of service delivery surveys. The College was one of the original participants in the UCLA/ACE Freshman Survey and continues to use the surveys of both entering and graduating students carried out by UCLA. We participated in the UCLA faculty survey in 1998-99.

Institutional research is a new function at Middlebury, and the priorities of the office are still under development. However, the important institutional research activities are likely to involve planning, analysis, and evaluation much more than data gathering and reporting.

Issues the college will face in the next ten years:

- *Institutional collection, distribution, and analysis of information and the role of technology in campus-wide decision making*
In the Fall of 1998, a task force was appointed with the principal charge of determining how the College can simplify access to, and use of, institutional data. This broad-based committee, whose effort became known as the MINERVA project, was asked to:
 - (1) evaluate how we currently use information technology at the individual, departmental, and campus-wide levels;

- (2) explore how we might better use information technology to perform administrative functions across campus; and
- (3) determine how the College can simplify access to and use of institutional data.

By the time the visiting committee comes to Middlebury, the report will be complete, and implementation planning under way. The report covers not only systems issues, but also raises training, documentation, and organizational issues. By the end of the year, the College will decide whether to continue to build systems in-house or buy third party vendor software.

- *Size and composition of the student body and the faculty*

Middlebury has an ambitious growth plan, and issues surrounding growth will be continually evaluated. What will be the composition of the student body when it reaches 2,350? What proportion of the student body will continue to study abroad? As the College grows, what will be the proportions of students of color, international students, and students receiving financial aid? Will the academic interests of Middlebury undergraduates change as a result of communications to prospective students emphasizing the peaks, or the opening of new buildings, particularly Bicentennial Hall? How can this information about the composition and interests of the student body be used to help plan the growth of the faculty?
- *Assessment (both student and institutional): How do we assess success? What is the “value added” of a Middlebury education?*

While some colleges and universities have attempted to “test” students as a means of assessment for “value added,” we are using national survey tools, and will be investigating other tools that may be available. For example, the ACE/HERI (American Council on Education/ Higher Education Research Institute) Senior Survey asks students to describe several skills and abilities leaving college as compared to when they first enrolled. In the future, the use of these surveys should be systematic, and the results should be distributed widely and used in the evaluation of programs and services. We will also be exploring ways in which student senior essays and theses, and the extensive amounts of written work required in many courses and majors, can be used more systematically to sum up a student’s work in both the major and general education over the course of an undergraduate career.
- *Comparative/competitive measures should be more extensive and have wider distribution across the College*

As mentioned earlier, the institutional research office is fairly new to the College, and some areas that have been identified for further development of comparative and competitive benchmarks include:

 - admissions information (applicants, acceptance, yields)
 - financial aid data
 - graduation and retention of students
 - student fellowships
 - external grant funding and research

Standard 2: Planning and Evaluation

- graduate school placement
- job placement

In addition, a set of 'indicators' will be developed for both the senior administration and Trustees.

- *Capital planning and new uses of both new and existing space*
With the unprecedented growth that is occurring at the College, what will be the mechanism for planning, evaluating, and communicating the analysis of the uses of new and existing space? Currently, the College is addressing these issues, and by the time the visiting committee comes to campus, there will be a clear facilities and strategic planning model in operation. A facilities planning team is in the process of being established. Responsibility for facilities planning and operational issues are currently being distributed among existing College staff, and new positions are under consideration.
- *What are the standards for establishing benchmarks in the future?*
Will we continue to benchmark ourselves against other institutions that are similar to Middlebury or will we look at other types of institutions (both colleges and other organizations) for benchmarking? Where will new innovations come from in the future? Who will colleges learn from? Will we review our list of competitors on some sort of a regular basis?
- *Assessing the campus climate and implementing the Human Relations Committee recommendations*
The March 1999 report of the Human Relations Committee calls for the development and implementation of a survey "to provide quantitative measures of student experiences and behaviors." Many behavioral questions are asked as part of both the first-year student and senior surveys. In the past, the results of those surveys have not been widely distributed. We will investigate whether or not the existing surveys can provide the data needed for evaluating our efforts in this area. In addition, other recommendations in the Human Relations Committee report will be reviewed and responses incorporated into the institutional research agenda, as appropriate.
- *Extending external reviews to additional departments*
The system of regular external reviews of academic departments and programs has been generally well-received. Both the faculty and the academic administration have found the process of preparing the self-study to be a useful exercise in academic planning, and the reports and recommendations of the visiting committees have provided constructive guidance to the faculty, its committees (in particular, the Educational Affairs Committee), and the administration in making decisions about faculty growth and the allocation of teaching resources. We believe that some departments outside the academic sector, in particular in the student affairs division, could be assisted in similar ways through extending the external review process to those departments. Such reviews would provide the opportunity for feedback from peers to departments that are facing a rapidly changing environment, both in terms of

change on campus and changes in the expectations and backgrounds of Middlebury students.

STANDARD THREE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

Description

Ultimate authority for the governance of Middlebury College rests with **the Board of Trustees**, formally known as “The President and Fellows of Middlebury College.” The Board consists of the President, *ex officio*, and up to 27 Trustees. The Trustees fall into three categories: up to eight Charter Trustees, who are elected by the Board and may serve terms of up to 15 years; six Alumni Trustees, nominated by the Middlebury College Alumni Association and elected by the Board for terms of five years; and Term Trustees elected by the Board for five-year terms. Term Trustees may serve two terms on the Board, and the maximum number of years any Trustee may serve as a voting member is 15. A Trustee who has completed the full 15-year term is eligible for election to emeritus status one year after his or her term on the Board has ended; emeriti may attend and participate in Board meetings, but they do not have voting privileges. The Trustees meet five times a year: a retreat in September in Middlebury; business meetings in Middlebury in October, February, and May; and a business meeting in New York in December.

The Board annually elects one of its members as chair, and one or more members as vice-chair. Other officers of the corporation are the Secretary and Treasurer, neither of whom is a trustee. The principal committees of the Board are Buildings and Grounds, Budget and Finance, Educational Affairs, External Affairs, and Student Affairs. The chairs of these committees, plus the Board chair and vice-chairs, and the chair of the Investment Committee make up the Prudential Committee, which acts as an Executive Committee of the Board. The Prudential Committee usually meets by telephone conference call in those months of the academic year in which the full Board does not meet.

The principal duty of the Board of Trustees is appointment of the President, and the President is responsible to and accountable to the Board. The President is the only officer of the College appointed by the Board. The Board acts on major policy and financial issues, making its decisions in consultation with, and normally on the recommendation of, the President and other members of the administration. The Committee on Conference provides its faculty counterpart an opportunity to meet directly with trustees, and the trustees have open breakfast meetings with students, faculty, and staff at least once a year.

The **President** is responsible for setting the overall strategic direction for Middlebury College. The Executive Vice President and Provost, the Executive Vice President for Facilities Planning, and the Vice President for Administration and Treasurer report to the President and constitute a Strategic Planning Committee that assists the President in setting long-term priorities for the College. Also reporting to the President

Standard 3: Organization and Governance

are the Secretary of the College, the Executive Assistant to the President (who is also Secretary of the Corporation), and the Special Assistant to the President for Minority Affairs.

The **Provost** is the College's chief academic officer and acts for the President in his absence. The Provost serves as *primus inter pares* on the Strategic Planning Committee. The principal areas of the Provost's responsibility are (1) the College's academic programs, which include the undergraduate College, the summer Language Schools, the Schools Abroad, the Bread Loaf School of English, and the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference; (2) admissions and financial aid; (3) information technology services; (4) the student affairs division; (5) programmatic planning for the enhanced residential life initiative; (6) institutional research; and (7) institutional effectiveness. The Provost also oversees the Center for the Arts, the College Museum, and Athletics. The **Executive Vice President for Facilities Planning** has principal responsibility for the College's facilities planning, and serves as liaison with architects, the College's construction manager, and with the town and state governments on permitting and regulatory issues. The **Vice President for Administration and Treasurer** oversees the external affairs division, and is responsible for the financial offices, operations, facilities management, legal affairs, and human resources. As Treasurer, he is the College's chief financial officer and works with the Investment Committee of the Board on managing the College's endowment.

An organization chart is found at the beginning of this report and shows the relationships among the principal administrative officers of the College. These principal officers include the **Vice President for External Affairs** (responsible for development, alumni and parent programs, publications, and public affairs), the **Dean of the Faculty** (responsible for the undergraduate academic program and the Bread Loaf programs), the **Dean of Languages and International Studies** (responsible for the Language Schools and the Schools Abroad), the **Dean of Enrollment Planning** (responsible for admissions and financial aid), the **Dean of Student Affairs** (responsible for the student affairs division), the **Dean of Commons** (responsible for the development of the College's enhanced residential life initiative), and the **Special Assistant to the Provost** (responsible for the academic component of the College's enhanced residential life initiative, plus follow-up work on various projects).

The President's Office includes the **Executive Assistant to the President**, who also serves as Secretary of the Corporation; the **Special Assistant to the President**, who has special responsibilities in the area of minority affairs and works closely with the Admissions Office in this area; and the **Secretary of the College**, who oversees projects, such as reaccreditation, that are of College-wide import, assists the President on special assignments, and has some responsibilities in the academic administration. The Secretary is also currently responsible for oversight of the library.

For more than two decades, many of the members of the Middlebury College administration have been drawn from the ranks of the faculty. Currently, the President,

the Provost, the Secretary of the College, the Dean of the Faculty, the two Associate Deans of the Faculty, and the Associate Dean of the Language Schools are all tenured members of the Middlebury faculty who served as full-time members of the faculty before being appointed to the administration.

Faculty governance takes place both through monthly faculty meetings and a system of faculty committees, some elected, but many appointed. The principal faculty committees, which are elected on an at-large basis by the faculty, are the **Committee on Reappointment**, which makes recommendations on reappointment, promotion, and tenure to the President; the Provost serves as its Secretary; the **Educational Affairs Committee**, which makes recommendations to the Provost, as the President's designate, on continued and new positions on the undergraduate faculty, and recommendations to the faculty as a whole on major academic policy; the Dean of the Faculty serves as its chair and the Secretary of the College serves as an *ex-officio* member to provide continuity and an institutional memory; and the **Faculty Council**, which is responsible for making recommendations to the faculty on matters of faculty governance and the rules of appointment and tenure, serves as a general channel of communication between the faculty and the administration, and places faculty on non-elected College committees. The Dean of the Faculty sits with the Faculty Council, the Provost visits whenever his office needs to discuss issues with the faculty leadership, and the President meets with the Council once a month. The Council has two subcommittees, a **Committee on Conference** that meets with its Trustee counterpart to discuss matters of general faculty and institutional concern; and a **Committee on Finances and Planning** that meets with the administration to discuss matters of resource allocation, capital construction projects, and long-range financial planning.

The Faculty as a whole must approve all proposed changes in major educational policy: requirements for the B.A. degree, and the establishment or elimination of departments, programs, and majors. The Faculty also votes on all proposed changes to the rules of reappointment and tenure, although formally these changes must be adopted by the Board of Trustees after they have been approved by the Faculty. Finally, the Faculty is self-governing when it comes to its own rules and procedures and committee structure; all changes in these areas must be enacted by vote of the Faculty.

The chairs of academic departments and programs in the undergraduate College are appointed by the Dean of the Faculty after consultation with the faculty involved and Associate Deans, typically for three-year terms that are rotated among the tenured members of the department or program. The directors of the summer Language Schools are appointed for renewable terms by the Dean of Languages and International Studies, and the directors of the Bread Loaf School of English and the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference are appointed for renewable terms by the President or his designate.

The non-faculty employees of Middlebury College have a voice in institutional decision-making through the **Staff Council**, an organization made up of representatives elected by the staff. Staff Council appoints staff members to committees with College-

Standard 3: Organization and Governance

wide representatives, and is consulted by the administration on matters such as salary and compensation programs, the staff performance evaluation system, professional development programs for staff, and campus safety, parking, and transportation issues.

The students of Middlebury College participate in campus governance through the **Student Government Association (SGA)** and departmental **Student Advisory Committees (SACs)**. The SGA appoints student members to committees with College-wide representatives, submits proposals and recommendations on the academic program to faculty committees and the academic administration after they have been approved by the SGA general assembly, and has a committee that reviews the College's budget annually and makes recommendations on the comprehensive fee. Through its Executive Committee, the SGA consults regularly with the College administration and meets with the Student Affairs Committee of the Trustees. The departmental SACs are consulted by the faculty in the department when changes in major requirements and other academic policies are being considered. The SACs also interview candidates for positions on the faculty and submit their recommendations on candidates for reappointment and promotion directly to the faculty's Committee on Reappointment.

Appraisal

Bulleted items are the issues outlined by NEASC for Standard 3, *Organization and Governance*

- ***The institution has a system of governance that facilitates the successful accomplishment of its mission and purposes. Through its organizational design and governance structure, the institution creates and sustains an environment that encourages teaching, learning, scholarship, and where appropriate research, and it assures provision of support adequate for the appropriate functioning of each organizational component.***

The College's system of governance—its defined administrative positions, College-wide committees, functionally specific committees and councils, and *ad hoc* committees are all geared toward helping the institution achieve its mission and goals. The current organizational structure (see organizational chart) is different from that of 1990 in recognition of three developments: (1) a major capital campaign, which requires the President to travel extensively for fundraising-related activities, (2) the desire to address the needs of a College that is growing in size and complexity: the student body will be 300-350 greater than it was in 1994, and the faculty will be 30 greater than it was in 1994; and (3) the decision on the part of the Board of Trustees to enhance our residential life system, which will influence how several divisions and offices will operate in the future. The creation of new positions (e.g., Executive Vice President for Facilities Planning, the Dean of Commons, and Associate Deans), and changes in the former Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty positions were done in order to meet these developments.

The Provost and Treasurer work closely with their direct reports to ensure that each component of the College receives the support it needs to contribute successfully to the overall goals of the College. During the past decade, the College restructured its External Affairs division (development, parents and alumni programs, and public affairs), broadened the mission of its Career Services Office, established associate (academic) Deanships for specific areas of our curriculum to improve the development of our faculty and academic programs, provide more informed administrative leadership to our academic programs, and to help meet specific institutional goals (e.g., the development of curricular peaks of excellence).

- ***The Board, administration, staff, and faculty understand and fulfill their respective roles as set forth in the institution's official documents.***

The separate functions of the Board and the administration are clearly understood. Within the College, there are some ambiguities in the area of Student Affairs due largely to the early stages of implementation of the College's enhanced residential life system. The former Dean of Students position has been converted to the Dean of Student Affairs Office and has been joined by the Dean of Commons position. The Dean of Student Affairs Office will oversee those student services that are institution-wide in nature (counseling, health center, health education, registrar, academic support, security), while the Dean of Commons will oversee the new and evolving Commons deaning system. The roles of the Faculty Council and the Community Council are also a subject for reconsideration largely as a result of the growth of the faculty and College, and the issues associated with the major changes in residential life.

Communication between Academic Affairs and Student Affairs will need to become more regular and natural as the enhanced residential system moves from conception to implementation. Similarly, communications across other sectors of the College (e.g., the Financial Offices, External Affairs, Admissions) will need to improve as many College-wide services, which were once highly centralized, become decentralized to meet the needs of our students in their Commons' residential clusters.

The non-teaching staff fulfills its role of supporting the academic program in a number of ways. Over the past decade, the staff has become more involved in what President McCardell has called the "educational experience" we offer our students. The enhanced residential system will provide staff a broader range of opportunities to participate in the life of the College, including roles in campus-wide committees.

- ***The institution's system of governance involves the participation of all appropriate constituencies and includes regular communication among them.***

Communication within and among constituencies of the College is generally carried out both through established structures (the elected and appointed standing committees) and *ad hoc* committees. The Strategic Planning Group meets bi-weekly. It

is to this group that strategic initiatives are first introduced. The principal officers of the College (identified on the second page of this chapter) meet twice a month with the President to discuss strategic initiatives advanced to it from the Strategic Planning Group, policy issues, and to provide updates from their respective areas of the institution. There is also a larger “senior” staff that meets with the President three times a year in order to discuss College-wide issues and to ensure communication flows.

There is one standing “all-College” council, which brings together students, faculty, staff, and administrators, the **Community Council**. The Council has a dual role in the College governance structure. On some issues—those for which it can be held accountable for the consequences of those decisions—the Council makes decisions and then implements those decisions as College policy. On other matters—those in which the Council has an interest, but cannot be held accountable (legally or financially) for the consequences of decisions made, the Council serves as an advisory body to the President and administration. The Council is composed of two faculty, two administrators, two staff members, and eight students.

The effectiveness of the Community Council has been questioned in some quarters during the past decade. Overlap with other committees (e.g., the Residential Life Committee), the unbalanced representation of students, faculty, and staff on the Council, and the way in which the enhanced residential system is sure to influence issues of governance present the College with an opportunity to re-think the status of this committee. It is the one remaining part of a governance structure put in place in the late 1960s and, alone among those other components, has largely gone unchanged.

Because those who attend and work at the College form a tightly knit community, the level of participation in discussion of most issues is consistently high. On most issues, everyone has ample opportunity to express and communicate his or her view. There are invariably complaints following major decisions, but the complaints generally result more from disappointment with a particular decision than from an inability to voice an opinion.

- ***The governing Board is ultimately responsible for the institution’s quality and integrity. The Board has the authority to achieve institutional purposes. Its membership includes representation reflecting the public interest. The Board has a clear understanding of the distinctive mission and purposes of the institution and ensures that they are realized. The Board sets and reviews institutional policies and assures the institution’s fiscal solvency. It appoints and delegates to the chief executive officer responsibility for the implementation and management of these policies. The Board establishes and maintains productive channels of communication among its members and with the institutional community.***

The Board of Trustees maintains fiduciary responsibility for the College and views its major role in the institution’s governance as hiring the College President and the formulating, setting, assessing, and amending of major policies. It affirmed its support

for the College's mission and priorities by approving the College's 1992 Strategic Plan. In addition, the Board passed three major resolutions in support of College initiatives since it adopted the 1992 Plan: in 1994, it expressed its support for the President's "Vision for Middlebury College," which was an articulation of the College's curricular and co-curricular emphases; in 1995, it passed a resolution to increase the size of the student body from 2,050 to 2,350 students; and in October of 1998, it passed resolutions in support of major facilities improvements and a reinvigorated residential life system (see relevant documents in the appendix).

Members of the Board are accessible to the College's administration, faculty, staff, and students through official committee work and planned events on campus during each of the Board's three annual on-campus meetings. There are Board committees that address faculty concerns (the Educational Affairs Committee and the Conference Committee), a committee that addresses student issues (Student Affairs Committee), but no specific committee that addresses non-academic staff concerns. This void will be addressed in the projection section below.

Administrators serve as liaisons to the major Board committees and work closely with the chairs of each committee to set agendas and develop policy proposals that go to the full Board for consideration. The Conference Committee, a four person sub-committee of the elected Faculty Council, meets with its Board equivalent at least once a year (or more often at the request of either the faculty or Board), and the Board chair and College President meet with the Executive Committee of the Staff Council, an elected body, once a year. In addition, students, faculty, and staff who wish direct communication with the Board can have it by attending breakfasts during on-campus Board meetings (October, February, and May) that are set up on a rotating basis. Since 1994, the Board has hosted a retreat at the beginning of the academic year, where trustees and the leadership of the faculty (eight members of the Faculty Council), students (members of the Student Government Association's Executive Committee), staff (members of the Staff Council Executive Committee), and alumni (the President and Vice-President of the Alumni Association) spend two days at the Bread Loaf campus and focus on a major institutional issue or initiative. Taken together, these modes of interaction expose Board members to various perspectives and views within the College community. In this particular area, the 1990s have been very different from preceding decades, when Board-College community interaction was less frequent.

The Board works to achieve a consensus among its members before making a decision. Over the past five years, the major committees of the Board have taken a greater role in those issues that are relevant to their respective charges. Each committee now brings to the full Board recommendations on major decisions. Before 1992, the role of committees was less defined. The entire Board used to discuss and debate issues intended to amend existing policies or introduce new initiatives. The new approach, through which the full Board delegates considerable responsibility to the individual committees, has worked well. In general, the Board's overall role in governance seems

appropriate for a residential liberal arts college, and is well understood by the College community.

- *The institution has a full-time chief executive officer whose full-time or major responsibility is to the institution. The Board delegates to the chief executive officer and, as appropriate, other constituencies the requisite authority and autonomy to manage the institution effectively and to formulate and implement policies compatible with the Board's intentions. These policies are developed in consultation with appropriate constituencies. The chief executive officer and the administration are appropriately responsive to the concerns, needs, and initiatives of faculty, students, other administrators, and staff.*

The President works full-time to lead the institution toward the fulfillment of its goals. Much of his time during the past three years has been dedicated to leading the College's Bicentennial Campaign; he will continue to devote a large amount of energy to that end until 2001. [Note: as a result of the campaign, and the time it will require him to be off campus, the President has delegated significant authority to the Treasurer and Provost to ensure the smooth functioning of the administration while he is away from campus.] The Provost and Treasurer work with the President and with their respective administrative colleagues to ensure that the concerns and needs of individuals and groups are met.

The role of faculty in institutional governance is described later in response to a different bulleted section. Non-faculty (staff) employees have a voice in institutional governance through the Staff Council, and a campus-wide body, the Community Council. The **Community Council** is the sole committee in which all the constituencies of the College community have a voice on non-academic issues at the College. Overlap with other committees (e.g., the Residential Life Committee) and the unbalanced representation of campus constituencies are two reasons why the structure and responsibilities of the Council need to be reviewed.

The **Staff Council** is a body of nine representatives: one member is elected at-large to represent the entire staff, four are elected to represent specific work groups, and four are elected to represent specific campus districts. The Vice President and Treasurer or his designate serves as a non-voting member of the Staff Council. The Council establishes priorities for the staff and implements the planning needed to carry out the staff's goals and objectives. It also appoints staff members to committees with College-wide representation, and is consulted by the administration on matters such as salary and compensation programs, the staff performance evaluation system, professional development programs for staff, and campus safety, parking, and transportation issues. Although the present President and his administration are viewed by staff as being very responsive to its concerns and needs, the continuation of such responsiveness is in question without an institutionally recognized way to ensure communications between the President and staff. Currently, guidelines for annual meetings between the President and

faculty (through Faculty Council) and between the president and students (appearing at Student Government Association meetings) are established and appear in College documents.

The President of the Staff Council is a member of the **Staff Resources Committee** (with the Treasurer, Provost, and Director of Human Resources). The Staff Resources Committee decides which positions among those proposed by supervisors from across the College will be added to the staff as well as any changes to existing positions.

- *Off-campus, continuing education, evening, and week-end programs are clearly integrated and incorporated into the governance system of the institution.*

The College's organizational structure, and therefore its overall governance, is influenced by significant programs that fall outside the undergraduate college: the Language Schools, the Bread Loaf School of English, and the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference. The eight language schools (Arabic, Chinese, German, French, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish), which enroll more than 1,100 students each summer, are overseen by the Dean of Languages and International Studies (DLIS)---a year-round administrator (the current Dean is tenured in the Russian Department). Each language school has a director, appointed for three-year terms (up to three terms). The directors of each school come from universities with significant graduate programs in their respective foreign language. Five of the eight schools offer a masters degree and a doctorate degree, the Doctorate of Modern Languages (DML). The DML differs from the traditional Ph.D. in its emphasis on a combination of scholarly and practical training.

The College operates five schools abroad, which offer programs for both graduate degree candidates from the Language Schools and College undergraduate students, who study abroad as part of their undergraduate degree requirements. The DLIS is responsible for the schools' operations, and each school abroad has a resident director. There is no single model for the directorships of the five schools: in two sites, faculty from the language departments of the undergraduate College rotate into the directorship; in two sites, the directors are Americans who have been hired to be resident directors and oversee the operations of the schools on-site; and at one site the director is a native of the country in which we operate the school. Such differences, themselves, do not necessarily create ambiguities or problems. There has, however, been some confusion over the relationship between the role of the director of each of the five language schools that grant graduate degrees, and the respective director of a school abroad that serves the graduate students.

A second area that requires some clarity involves the role of the Dean of Languages and International Studies in the undergraduate College. This position, redefined two years ago, was formerly the Vice President of Languages and the Director of the Language Schools (VPL/DLS). This administrative position does not now, nor did

it when it was the VPL/DLS, oversee the foreign language departments in the undergraduate curriculum. Oversight rests with the undergraduate College's Dean of the Faculty. This division of responsibility is in itself not a problem. However, if the College wishes to pursue a more integrated approach to its summer and regular academic year language programs, and develop its "foreign language pedagogy" peak of excellence, it might make sense to reconsider these present divisions of responsibilities. In addition, with the creation of the new international studies major, a large major that builds on four years of foreign language study, the DLIS added this interdisciplinary major to its (the former VPL) portfolio. Two important reasons for placing International Studies (IS) under the DLIS are because (1) foreign language study represents the foundation for the major (four years of study) and (2) the DLIS is responsible for off-campus study and our schools abroad, and the IS major, the largest on campus, requires a semester or year abroad.

The Bread Loaf School of English (BLSE) is a graduate program in English literature that operates in the summer and in four locations: Ripton, Vermont; Oxford, England; Rowe, New Mexico; and Juneau, Alaska. The Dean of the Faculty at Middlebury has administrative responsibility for BLSE. The School of English, similar to each of the eight language schools, has a director who serves a three-year (renewable) term, is not from the undergraduate College, and teaches in a large graduate program. Although reporting lines are clear, the current administrative division between our graduate degree awarding programs (the summer Language Schools and the Bread Loaf School of English) needs to be reassessed.

The Bread Loaf Writers' Conference, started in 1926, is a two-week program that provides writers, at all levels of artistic development, the opportunity to come together to talk about the craft of writing. The Dean of the Faculty has administrative oversight for the Writers' Conference. The conference is convened, faculty hired, and students admitted by a director who serves a three-year, (renewable) term. (NB: the current director is from outside the College; however, the past director was a member of the Middlebury College faculty).

- ***The faculty assures the academic integrity of the institution's educational programs. Within the context of the institution's system of governance, the faculty is accorded the right and exercises its responsibility to provide a substantive voice in matters of educational programs, faculty personnel, and other aspects of institutional policy that relate to its areas of responsibility and expertise.***

Faculty play a significant role in several aspects of institutional governance. In addition to serving on *ad hoc* committees appointed by the President or Provost, there are three major elected faculty committees that reflect faculty roles in institutional governance.

Curricular oversight is the responsibility of the faculty. Through the at-large elected Educational Affairs Committee (EAC), a committee of five tenured faculty, the faculty makes decisions concerning new curricular initiatives and majors, changes in academic programs, amending requirements for the College's majors, and other general educational policy. The EAC also makes recommendations on staffing increments and replacements to the Provost. The Dean of the Faculty and the Secretary of the College are *ex officio* members of the Committee.

Reviews for reappointment and promotion of faculty are the responsibility of the faculty. The Committee on Reappointment (COR), a three-member elected committee of Full Professors, carries out faculty reviews according to rules developed and amended by the faculty. Tenured colleagues provide their own assessment of candidates (in their department or interdisciplinary program) who are under review. The department chair summarizes the letters from his or her department. The COR makes a recommendation to the President, who has ultimate decision-making authority in promotion and reappointment decisions. With plans to increase the size of the faculty by 30 positions over a ten-year period, an issue of workload has emerged that warrants some discussion. The College's review process, unlike most other colleges, requires three formal reviews before promotion. The faculty needs to assess the costs and benefits of three reviews in light of the workload for the COR and on faculty colleagues involved in the review, along with the remarkably explicit codification of our procedures that, while adding to this workload, have not appreciably diminished either the level of anxiety of colleagues under review or the likelihood of appeal of a negative decision.

Faculty have the opportunity to provide input into financial and long-range planning issues through the **Finance and Planning Committee (FAP)**, one of two subcommittees of the **Faculty Council**. The subcommittee is mandated, each year, to host an open meeting for the faculty with the Treasurer, at which a presentation and then discussion of the finances of the College takes place. The other subcommittee is the **Conference Committee**, which serves as a liaison to the Board of Trustees and brings issues of general concern from the faculty to the Board at least once a year. The Faculty Council is an elected committee of five tenured and three untenured colleagues. The committee's role historically has been to serve as the liaison between the faculty and administration and as a group with which the President consults on issues of importance (e.g., personnel issues, administrative appointments, and salary policy issues).

As the College has grown in size and complexity, some colleagues have questioned whether the Council needs to play a more active (as opposed to a reactive) role in institutional governance. Several colleagues question whether the current and long-time method of faculty governance—the monthly faculty meeting—remains the most effective way to conduct faculty business or provide input into institutional governance as it was when the faculty was half the current size. Proposals born out of a committee's full year of work are often given too little time, with unwieldy discussion on the faculty floor before a vote is taken. In addition, as new initiatives have been explored and pursued as part of the College's decision to grow, the faculty has begun to discuss the

impact of “committee burden.” The Faculty Council has placed these items on its agenda for discussion in the 1999-2000 academic year. The roles of the Council’s two subcommittees will also be reviewed.

- *The system of governance makes provisions for consideration of student views and judgments in those matters in which students have a direct and reasonable interest.*

Middlebury students participate in campus governance largely through the **Student Government Association (SGA)** and departmental **Student Advisory Committees (SACs)**. The SGA appoints student members to College-wide committees. It submits proposals and recommendations on the academic program to faculty committees and the academic administration after they have been approved by the SGA General Assembly. There is a student **Educational Affairs Committee**, which meets monthly with its faculty counterpart (the EAC) to discuss general and specific curricular issues and concerns. As a result of an administrative initiative begun in 1992, the SGA also appoints a **Student Comprehensive Fee Committee**, which works annually with the Treasurer. The committee reviews the College’s budget in great detail and makes recommendations to the Administration on the following year’s comprehensive fee, including how to achieve a balanced budget if there are new initiatives the committee wishes to see engaged. The **Community Council** is the all-College committee through which student views are articulated.

Through its Executive Committee, the SGA consults regularly with the College administration and meets with the **Student Affairs Committee** of the Board of Trustees. There is an annual SGA dinner and meeting afterward with the President’s staff, where broad policy issues are discussed and where students can bring agenda items they wish the administration to engage and consider. Specific subcommittees of the SGA meet throughout the year with members of the administration in order to convey student views and to propose policy revisions. Students play an active role in enforcing the College’s academic Honor Code and other conduct policies. There are three committees, the **Judicial Council**, the **Community Judicial Board**, and the **Judicial Review Board**. The Judicial Council, a council of eight students, hears and determines cases of alleged cheating on examinations. Four of the student members of the Judicial Council also sit on the Community Judicial Board, along with two faculty members, one member of the staff, and one member from the Dean of Student Affairs office. The Community Judicial Board hears and determines all cases of alleged conduct violations by students. The Judicial Review Board, a board of five, including two students, has jurisdiction to hear and determine all cases of alleged plagiarism, and it also serves as the appeals body from decisions of the Community Judicial Board.

Departmental SACs, elected by students in each major, are consulted by the faculty in the department when changes in major requirements and other academic policies are being considered. The SACs also interview candidates for faculty positions

in their departments, and submit their recommendations on faculty candidates for reappointment and promotion directly to the faculty's Committee on Reappointment.

- *The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its system of governance using the results for its improvement.*

The College evaluates parts of its system of governance often and has made some significant changes during the past eight years. A general discussion of governance was aided by two Pew Round Tables. These facilitated discussions sought to bring together students, staff, faculty, and administrators in order to engage members of the community in questions related to institutional culture, the College's agenda, and how to address external and internal pressures for change.

Since the Round Table, the committee structure of the Board of Trustees underwent review, which led to a change in how the Board and its constituent committees function. Formerly independent and appointed faculty committees that were charged with curricular policy and resource allocation have been merged into a single, elected committee (EAC) that, for the first time, allows curricular decisions to be considered within the context of their resource implications. The rules for reappointment and promotion, and the roles individuals play in the process, were fully engaged and re-written by a faculty committee. Students reviewed and amended how they choose their representatives to their Student Government Association.

Several members of the community have proposed in the past year that we begin a review of the roles of the Faculty Council and Community Council. These bodies were created more than 30 years ago and should be tested to see whether they meet the needs of today's College. The recent passage of the enhanced residential life initiative by the Board of Trustees will necessitate a full review of many of our existing governing structures.

Projections

- Review the administrative structure with an eye to attaining major College goals (the enhanced residential life initiative, growth of the student body and faculty, advancing the facilities plan, attaining peaks of excellence, and accommodating new initiatives).
- Evaluate existing communications among College offices and consider ways to share information more effectively, especially in times of profound change.
- Consider how current and future "roles" at the College are likely to change as a result of the new residential system, and amend the College's official documents as needed.

Standard 3: Organization and Governance

-Consider whether the Community Council is the most effective way to bring together constituencies from across the campus to engage, address, and resolve major College issues.

-Consider an effective and integrated process through which members of the College community can provide input into the College planning and budgeting processes.

-Consider how to institutionalize Board-staff communications on non-academic issues

-Plan for the College's post-Campaign administrative structure with particular attention given to the undergraduate college, the graduate programs (Language Schools and Bread Loaf School of English), the Center for Educational Technology, the Geonomics Center for International Studies, and the College's goals vis-à-vis its peaks of excellence.

-Consider a regular meeting (e.g., once a semester) between the President and the Staff Council (the Faculty Council meets with the President once a month; the President meets with the Executive Committee of the Staff Council every May).

-Reconsider the composition of and the charge to the Staff Resources Committee.

-Clarify the relationship between the administration of the summer Language Schools and the administration of our schools abroad.

-Weigh the benefits (and drawbacks) of shifting responsibility for the undergraduate foreign language programs to the office of the Dean of Languages and International Studies.

-Consider creating the position of Associate Dean of Foreign Languages to parallel the existing associate dean positions (one for natural and social sciences, and the other for literature, arts, the humanities, and languages).

-Assess, after five years (2001-2002), the effectiveness of the Educational Affairs Committee.

-Assess the costs and benefits of our current faculty review process in light of the projected increase in the number of reviews during the next decade.

-Consider the costs and benefits of moving away from faculty governance through the Faculty Council and toward a Faculty Senate.

-Consider the costs and benefits of maintaining a single faculty committee to address both planning issues (FAP) and general issues of faculty concern (Conference Committee).

-Consider the representative structure of the SGA as a result of the enhanced residential initiative.

- Consider an annual SGA-hosted retreat at which students could hear faculty and staff views on issues of interest to students.
- Consider a follow-up to the all-campus Round Tables in order to address emerging governance issues as the College grows and decentralizes many student services.
- Consider ways (e.g., technology) to engage a larger proportion of faculty and staff in discussion of major College issues.

STANDARD FOUR PROGRAMS AND INSTRUCTION

Undergraduate Curriculum

Description

Middlebury College awards one undergraduate degree: the Bachelor of Arts. The B.A. curriculum is designed to assure that each student's education includes both breadth in the tradition of the liberal arts and in-depth study in a major. The faculty's goals for liberal education at Middlebury have been articulated in the catalog (p. 10):

We have as an ideal the kind of person a Middlebury education should help to make: a person who can think logically; who can write and speak with accuracy, clarity, style, and an individual voice; who can appreciate the visual and performing arts and participate in their creation; who can reason with numbers and symbols and apply rigorous techniques of analysis in seeking answers; who can read – critically and imaginatively; who can make intelligent value judgments; who has an informed sense of the varied, eventful path humanity has taken to reach the present; who is aware that the frontiers of understanding and knowledge are always shifting and expanding; who understands the principles and methods of the natural sciences and knows what it is to experience the excitement of scientific discovery; who has a sense of the interaction between people and society in the United States and in other countries; who has an understanding of the relations between humans and the environment; who is mindful of the responsibilities present generations have to future generations and of the need for long-term thinking; who can understand, read, and speak a foreign language and thereby has the access to foreign cultures that only proficiency can bring; who knows how to discipline the body, as well as the mind.

As noted in the chapter on organization and governance, the Middlebury College faculty is a self-governing body on matters of curriculum. Generally, proposals for major educational policy are brought to the faculty floor by the Educational Affairs Committee, referred to divisions and other faculty groupings for discussion, brought back to the faculty floor for debate and a vote and, if approved, are implemented by the departments, programs, and other constituent units of the faculty, with oversight by both the academic administration and the Curriculum Committee. Following this process, the faculty approved the degree requirements that are now in place between 1992 and 1994.

A candidate for a B.A. degree at Middlebury College must complete the following College-wide requirements:

1. *A first-year seminar*, a course with an enrollment of no more than 15 students, that is designed to explore an area of intellectual inquiry from a perspective that attempts to make connections among a number of traditional academic disciplines. The seminars are intensive writing courses, and the instructors of the seminars serve as the academic advisers for their students until they declare a major. Beginning in 1998-99, some of the seminars have been affiliated with the residential Commons; all the students who registered for a particular seminar are housed in the same Commons.

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

2. A *second writing-intensive course*, that must be completed by the end of the student's sophomore year. More than 50 writing-intensive courses are offered every year, in departments and programs all across the curriculum.

3. A *distribution requirement*, consisting of at least one course in seven of the following eight categories: literature, the arts, historical studies, philosophical and religious studies, physical and life sciences, deductive reasoning and analytical processes, social analysis, and foreign languages. The categories that students most frequently omit, under the seven-out-of-eight category scheme, are the foreign language and deductive reasoning distributions.

4. A *cultures and civilizations requirement*, consisting of at least one course focusing on some aspect of the cultures and civilizations of the United States, one course on the cultures and civilizations of Europe, and one course on cultures and civilizations other than those of Europe and the United States.

5. A non-credit *physical education requirement*, which may be satisfied either through participation in two seasons of "lifetime sports," or through participation in varsity and junior varsity intercollegiate sports (no more than one of the two required physical education units may be earned in a single sport).

In addition to completing these College-wide degree requirements, a B.A. candidate must complete a major consisting of at least 10 courses. Students are required to select their major by the end of their third semester. At the time they declare their major(s), students choose a faculty adviser in the major. Middlebury offers 37 academic majors, in 27 departments and 6 programs (some departments offer more than one major). An independent scholar option is available for students whose interests cannot be accommodated in the established academic organizations. The appendix to this report contains complete information on majors and enrollments at Middlebury College for the past three years. In 1998-99, the largest majors were economics, English, environmental studies, international studies, and psychology, and the departments with the highest enrollments were economics, English, history, political science, and psychology.

Fewer than 40 percent of Middlebury College seniors graduate with a major in a single academic discipline. Approximately 30 percent of the students major in one of the interdisciplinary majors (international studies, environmental studies, literary studies, molecular biology and biochemistry, and women's and gender studies), and approximately one-third of Middlebury students do a double or joint major. A double major requires the student to complete the full requirements of both majors. A joint major requires the completion of at least 14 courses from two majors, with some type of integrative senior project.

Thus, there has been a conspicuous shift toward interdisciplinary majors. interdisciplinary majors seem to allow students more of an opportunity to focus a major on their own interests. The majors in both international studies and environmental studies consist of a core curriculum and a focus which in the environmental studies field

is disciplinary and in the international studies major is regional. Funding from the Ford Foundation has supported curriculum innovation in the international studies major, the results of which are the interdisciplinary and cross-regional senior seminars in IS. In Fall Term 1998, for instance, the topic of one of these seminars was Development and Democracy taught by an economist and a political scientist.

Students who wish to do so may complete a minor, consisting of at least five courses, as another way of obtaining curricular breadth. About one-fifth of Middlebury seniors choose to declare a minor. Minors are offered in all of the departments, some of the interdisciplinary programs, and in other areas of the curriculum (e.g., Jewish Studies and African-American Studies) where a minor has been organized by the faculty.

Middlebury's academic calendar is of the two-semester plus short term variety. Students take four courses in the 12-week fall semester, one course in the 4-week winter term, and four courses in the 12-week spring semester. About two-thirds of Middlebury students are enrolled during January in a course that they select from the Winter Term catalog. When Winter Term was started in 1969, the courses were intended to be thematic and/or experimental, but in recent years, the Winter Term courses have become more "conventional," if not less specialized. Between 20 and 30 of the courses offered during Winter Term are taught by persons hired only for the Winter Term, who do not hold regular appointment to the Middlebury College faculty. The proposals submitted by those who would like to be visiting faculty during January are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, as is the case with all Middlebury courses. The one-third of the students who are not enrolled in a course selected from the catalog during January are enrolled in continuing intensive language courses (required of all students in first-year languages), senior comprehensive examinations, independent senior work, or internships and independent projects. More details on Winter Term are available in materials in the committee's workroom.

Although Middlebury does not have a College-wide senior work requirement, some majors require all their seniors to take a comprehensive examination, write a thesis or essay, or both. Other seniors choose to write a thesis or undertake other independent senior work even though they are not required to do so by their departments. In recent years, nearly two-thirds of Middlebury graduates completed an independent senior project that was at least one semester long. Students who wish to receive departmental honors at Commencement must complete independent senior work.

Appraisal

Breadth: General Education

The Distribution Requirements and the Culture and Civilizations Requirements

The current requirements were instituted in 1993-94 after a succession of faculty debates and votes that redefined the College's concept of "distribution" and added a "Cultures and Civilizations" requirement ensuring that the college career of each Middlebury student would include the study of non-Western cultures. The prior system

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

of distribution requirements had defined curricular breadth as a composite of knowledge of the disciplines organized by divisions. The present system defines breadth as the ability to work with a wide range of modes of knowing. Simultaneously, the change in distribution requirements represented a swing of the curricular pendulum away from the conception of “Foundations Courses” which had designated a limited number of courses in each division as courses that acquainted students with “fundamentals,” as the name implies. The new distribution requirements allow students freedom to choose, in each of the eight categories, among a large number of courses that have been deemed suitable by the Curriculum Committee for the fulfillment of these requirements.

The Cultures and Civilizations requirements were intended to ensure that students would reach beyond the cultures of Europe and the United States to study the cultures of “other” geographical areas. This policy seems to have borne fruit: a number of courses in the religions, cultures, and history of South Asia and East Asia are well enrolled, apparently in some measure due to the College’s requirement. The recent report of the Human Relations Committee calls upon the College to examine how the curriculum responds to the need to teach about human difference, or “diversity.” Of the triad of the Cultures and Civilizations requirement—Europe, the United States, and “other” geographical areas—the category of “other” has acquired more than the geographical connotation of its original intent. The faculty will have to clarify its purpose in the months ahead.

During the last two years there has been renewed discussion of the liberal arts and general education. The 1995 report of the Task Force on “General Excellence in the Liberal Arts” argued for a curriculum in which students would integrate diverse fields of study by making connections across the disciplines. These discussions have resumed, informally in a Faculty Reading Group under the auspices of the Dean of the Faculty, and more formally in an *ad hoc* Committee on the Curriculum. This committee was charged by the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) with examining the sophomore experience and proposing a program to enhance the way in which the curriculum cultivates intellectual breadth. The result is a proposal for an experimental “Sophomore Integrated Studies Program,” that would substitute a coherently designed sequence of courses taught by a faculty team for at least part of the requirements for breadth that students otherwise fulfill by choosing among the myriad courses approved for fulfilling the requirements for Distribution and Culture and Civilizations. The Integrated Studies Program, which will be implemented on an experimental basis starting in 2001-2002, represents one possible response to a concern that there may not be sufficient connectedness and coherence in the College’s endeavors to educate for breadth.

Finally, it should be noted that fewer than 40 percent of Middlebury students now major in a traditional single disciplinary major. About 30 percent of students major in an interdisciplinary program, and another 30 percent complete a double or joint major. It is uncertain how these trends affect the balance between general education and the major and/or whether the increase in double and joint majors should be a cause for concern.

The First-Year Seminar Program: Goals and Achievements

The First-Year Seminars, launched in 1988 with the support of a grant from the Pew Educational Trust, are “thematic courses with an intensive writing component that approach an area of intellectual inquiry from a perspective which attempts to make connections among a number of the traditional disciplines.” A First-Year Seminar is required of all entering students. In a review of the program conducted by an external committee in the 1997-98 academic year, the advising component of the program, under which the instructor of the First-Year Seminar serves as the student’s academic adviser until he or she selects a major, was singled out as the most unambiguous success of the program.

There are several aspects of the program that require attention. First, it has been noted that the First-Year Seminars do not consistently meet the expectations for intense instruction in writing. Second, the College has set about to integrate instruction in oral expression into the First-Year Seminar program, an effort consistent with renewed emphasis on rhetoric in American higher education in general. Third, the Curriculum Committee should, as the competent body, be asked to scrutinize proposals for First-Year Seminars to determine whether they do indeed fulfil the Faculty’s mandate to introduce students to the liberal arts, using a single theme as a vehicle for revealing the interconnectedness of disciplines and encouraging students to broaden their education in the years that follow.

The College Writing Requirement

Under the College Writing requirement students must, before the end of the sophomore year, complete another course, beyond the First-Year Seminar, that is designated as “writing intensive,” involving frequent writing and instruction in the writing process. In response to a review of the Writing Program, carried out in 1997-98 by the same visiting committee as for the First-Year Seminar program, the College has initiated discussion on the question whether this second writing course should be discipline-based or division-based. Thus, courses in expository technical writing would be offered for science majors, and analogous courses in other divisions, attuned to the conventions of the relevant disciplines.

General Education and the Residential College

Middlebury College is in the midst of a reorganization of its residential life system. The goal is to intertwine the educational mission of the College with the structure of residential life and the co-curricular programs the College offers. The Commons System will provide a venue for education inside and outside the classroom in ways that faculty and students cannot yet envision. Some courses—specifically First-Year Seminars—are already based in Commons. Other academic and co-curricular programs can achieve the aim of bringing students face to face with areas of human endeavor that were alien or unknown to them, and thus contribute to broadening Middlebury students. The Commons System is a work in progress, but belongs in any account of Middlebury College’s efforts in general education.

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

The Major

The Question of Institution-wide Standards

A major consists of a minimum of 10 courses. College policy limits the number of courses in the regular term which a student may take in his or her major to 16. There are no other institution-wide standards for major requirements. The College should probably confront the question whether there should be a lower upper limit on the number of courses that *a department may require for the major*. One ought to be concerned about the effects of very demanding majors on the curricular balance students are then able to achieve between breadth and depth in their education.

A further question to consider is whether there ought to be a college wide policy on senior work. The number of students undertaking such projects has grown significantly in recent years. Currently, between 60 and 70 percent of students in each graduating class complete a senior thesis, essay, or project. If the faculty were to decide to require such work in all majors, such a decision might also require adding to the size of the faculty, or making other alterations in the curriculum that would free up faculty to advise senior theses and projects.

Interdisciplinary Majors and Departments

Departmental majors are well established at Middlebury, reflecting a strong departmental culture in which major programs are formulated, proposed to the appropriate committee, and refined over the years. Now, the interdisciplinary majors, particularly international studies, international politics and economics, and environmental studies, are attracting students in such numbers that the role of the affected departments at the College is changing. As the international studies major grows, a decline is noticeable in the number of majors in other areas such as history and political science, if not always a decline in enrollments, when courses in these departments serve the interdisciplinary majors. At the same time, these and other departments find themselves in the role of providing essential upper level courses for the interdisciplinary majors. (Geography is an example.) The long-term effects of this curricular shift are not yet foreseeable.

Assessment of the Undergraduate Academic Program

Before 1996, Middlebury had, from time to time, conducted reviews of broad areas of the academic program, inviting a committee of evaluators from peer institutions. One such committee examined the study of literature at Middlebury. Another committee focused on the Division of Natural Sciences. However, in 1996, the academic administration launched a program of narrower, regular reviews of individual departments and programs, seeking to review three programs each year, so that in the course of a decade, all departments may be covered. The reviews are carried out by a visiting committee consisting normally of three colleagues in pertinent fields drawn usually, but not exclusively, from four-year liberal arts colleges. Prior to the committee's campus visit, the department under review conducts a self-study. The academic administration, in consultation with the department, draws up a charge letter focusing the

review on specific issues, prepares documentation including the *vitae* of faculty, their syllabi, and enrollment statistics, and makes all of this materials available to the committee a month before its campus visit. The documentation for each review and the reports of the visiting committees are available in the workroom.

A list of the reviews conducted thus far follows:

1995-96

Economics Department & Christian A. Johnson Chair in Economics: April 14-16, 1996

1996-97

Sociology/Anthropology: March 9-11, 1997

Spanish: March 26-28, 1997

Chemistry: April 30-May 2, 1997

1997-98

Religion: October 13-15, 1997

First-Year Seminar & Writing Program: March 9-11, 1998

1998-99

Women's Studies: October 26-28, 1998

English: March 28-31, 1999

Russian: April 14-16, 1999

The academic administration has accepted several significant recommendations advanced by visiting committees. These include the addition of an anthropologist with an area specialty in Africa to the Department of Sociology/Anthropology. Following the Spanish review, we hired a new, tenured department chair, and stabilized the department through the appointment of three other scholars to tenure track positions. The visiting committee on Religion recommended innovations to the curriculum, which resulted in a new introductory course to Western religions the following year.

The Peaks of Excellence

In 1994, the President designated certain areas as “peaks”: literary study, language study and pedagogy, international study and global understanding, study of the environment, and opportunities for students to apply what they learn about the liberal arts to “real world” situations. All of these peaks require more attention, some more than others.

The international studies peak is experiencing some growth pains. It will need monitoring to ensure that demand does not quickly overtake resources available, and to ensure that the College may anticipate the effects of this growth on collaborating departments and offices. Several faculty positions have been reconfigured or added to serve the needs of this peak.

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

The environmental studies peak is prominent on account of the popularity of the major. Several faculty positions have been added or reconfigured to strengthen course offerings in environmental studies.

The foreign language pedagogy peak and the literature peak, on the other hand, are not yet well developed and are in need of a coherent strategy. The Literature Committee and administration should work together to improve the organization of literature courses and programs at Middlebury, guided by a vision of a common purpose under the aegis of the Literature Program. Likewise, the foreign language departments must seek ways to achieve conspicuous prominence in the field of language pedagogy. Closer collaboration between the undergraduate language departments and the Center for Educational Technology may be one path.

The peak of real world experience is still in the developmental stage. Several departments and offices—the Career Services Office, the Office of Fellowships and Scholarships, the Office of Off-Campus Study and others—will all need to collaborate in the next several years in order to bring this peak to its apex.

Projections: Questions for Consideration

- How can instruction in *both* oral and written expression be incorporated into the curriculum? (In addition, what is the proper goal of the second required writing-intensive course, discipline-specific or further general instruction in writing?) Should a policy of “Writing Across the Curriculum” mean that all faculty are expected to teach writing, or should there be a program to train faculty in the pedagogy of writing?
- Should the curriculum devoted to “general education” strive for “coherence” and connectedness in its structure, or leave those aims to the discretion of the student assisted by a functioning program of academic advising?
- Has the College achieved a satisfactory balance between the major and general education, particularly in light of the high number of double and joint majors?
- How will the academic program and the Commons System collaborate and integrate their efforts to make the campus as a whole an instrument of general education in the liberal arts?
- The College must assess the effect of the interdisciplinary majors on other areas of the curriculum.

Decision Making and Educational Policy

Description

All matters of educational policy are voted by the faculty. Legislation on major educational policy must be referred for discussion in the academic divisions before

coming up for a vote. Any member of the faculty may in theory propose new educational policy. In practice, two faculty committees normally will propose changes or innovations in educational policy: 1) the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC), elected by the faculty; 2) the Curriculum Committee (CC), technically a sub-committee of EAC. Finally, the Academic Affairs (AA) group, which consists of appointed administrators, concerns itself with matters of educational policy as well; academic administrators chair the major faculty committees on educational policy, thus ensuring a liaison between the administrative and the faculty groups. In this section, the relationship among the three groups is described and evaluated.

Appraisal

Educational Affairs Committee

In the spring of 1997, the faculty voted to establish the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC). The EAC began its work the following autumn. Members of the EAC include five tenured faculty elected at-large and two *ex-officio* administrators, designated by the President or Provost, one or both of whom serve as chair or co-chair. At present the Dean of the Faculty serves as chair and the Secretary of the College, who has served on the EAC and its predecessor committees for more than a decade, serves as an *ex-officio* member. All major educational policy and most faculty staffing matters come before the EAC for a recommendation. Major educational policy recommendations are brought to the faculty for a vote. Recommendations on staffing are forwarded to the Provost, who acts on behalf of the President, for decision. In the first two years of the existence of the EAC, the relationship between the committee and the Provost has evolved such that the Provost consults the EAC in any case where disagreement emerges and he is inclined to overturn or reject an EAC recommendation.

The EAC replaced two committees that dealt separately with educational policy and staffing issues. The Educational Council consisted of elected non-tenured and tenured faculty, representative of academic divisions throughout the college. It initiated new educational policy issues or acted on proposals from faculty, and brought recommendations to the faculty for a vote. The Teaching Resources Committee (TRC) consisted of the appointed chairs of the 6 academic divisions, and various administrators, one of whom acted as chair of the committee. The TRC acted on staffing proposals from departments and programs, and passed its recommendations to the president or designate for final approval. The Educational Council and TRC rarely met one another, so neither committee was fully aware of what the other was doing. As a result, some educational policy was enacted without any knowledge of the availability of staffing to carry out programs. Conversely, some staffing decisions were made in the absence of an overall view of educational policy, in particular new initiatives coming from the Educational Council. The new committee, the EAC, was given purview over both educational policy and staffing matters to ensure better integration of program and resources. The student/faculty ratio of 11-to-1 adopted by the Board of Trustees governs the size of the teaching faculty and thus dictates the limit of faculty size within which the EAC works.

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

There seems to be a consensus that the EAC functions much better than did the Educational Council and Teaching Resources Committee in isolation from one another.

Curriculum Committee

The Curriculum Committee (CC) is an appointed committee consisting of the Associate Dean of Faculty (chair), six faculty members representing the six divisions and three students. The Curriculum Committee reviews proposals for new courses and oversees the administration of Winter Term, First-Year Seminars, distribution requirements and changes in requirements for majors and minors. It reports to the Educational Affairs Committee.

The relationship between the Curriculum Committee and the EAC is evolving. Most of the time the CC acts independently. However, in instances where changes in educational policy are involved, it consults with the EAC. It is sometimes unclear what does or does not constitute educational policy.

Academic Affairs Group

The Academic Affairs Group (AA) consists of the President, the Provost, the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Languages and International Studies, the Associate Deans of Faculty, the Dean of Student Affairs, and the Secretary of the College. This group meets weekly to deliberate on matters of institution-wide academic policies, practices, and programs.

Projections and Suggestions

- The Educational Affairs Committee seems to work well, uniting under the aegis of one committee deliberations on educational policy and faculty resources. In particular, at-large rather than divisional representation should be continued.
- Members of the EAC should have little other administrative responsibility. In particular, EAC members should not be chairs of departments, if at all possible.
- In its deliberations, the EAC should be mindful not only of faculty size, but also of the implications of its recommendations on faculty positions and programs for facilities needs.
- The EAC should meet with the Curriculum Committee each year to discuss jurisdictional issues and the long-term agenda.

Intellectual Community

Description

An intellectual community nurtures and in turn is nurtured by the life of the mind. In the liberal arts college, a thriving intellectual community fosters formal and informal connections between the content of courses and the content of the interactions that take place beyond the walls of the classroom. The atmosphere within and without the classroom rewards the sharing of ideas and stimulates their expression. The intellectual life of a liberal arts college replenishes itself in ongoing opportunities for the exchange of knowledge through transactions between its curricular and co-curricular spheres.

Middlebury College supports co-curricular endeavors and events led by faculty, students, and both in collaboration. Events include yearly and special symposia, lecture series, round-tables, art exhibitions, invited speakers, artists, and lecturers, film series, music, dance, and theater performances. The College's Bicentennial celebration, which culminates in November 2000, will include an 18-month long series of special programs and events.

Among our many **endowed lectures, symposia, and series** there are prominent examples. *The Nicholas R. Clifford Symposium* is the major opening symposium of the academic year. The 1998 symposium was on "The Liberal Arts in the 21st Century," and the 1999 symposium on "What Is Life?" was held in conjunction with the dedication of Bicentennial Hall, the College's new multi-disciplinary science facility. *The Hirschfield Film Endowment* supports lectures and presentations by film and video artists, scholars, and industry professionals. The *Quint Lectureship* and the *Silberman* endowment sponsor guest lecturers and panels in Jewish studies. The *Abernethy Lecture* began in 1928 and was expanded into a series program in 1976. Robert Frost, Archibald MacLeish, W. H. Auden, Bernard Malamud, John Irving, and John Updike, among others, have delivered the Abernethy Lecture address. The Fulton lectureship brings distinguished visitors from any sector of public life or academia, while the Van de Velde lecture sponsors an address and campus visit by a distinguished journalist or figure in public affairs.

Special symposia and series are presented in conjunction with courses. The Bernini Symposium and the Takacs String Quartet performance of the entire Beethoven quartets for strings are recent examples of co-curricular events that have inspired coordination with courses, lectures, and projects. Special lectures by individuals of national prominence draw large crowds and their content is often discussed in classes. A recent example of these special events was a talk by Chief Justice William Rehnquist.

Student-led symposia give students the opportunity to organize a major event, promote issues and problems of particular importance to them, and take the initiative in designing co-curricular learning. Student-led symposia at Middlebury include the Sub-Saharan Africa Symposium, the Environmental Quality Symposium, the Peace

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

Symposium, International Students Organization Symposium, and the Latin American and Caribbean Alliance Symposium.

For about 80 years Middlebury College has offered a **Concert Series**: performances of music, theater, and dance presented yearly to the college and town communities. The series has presented major artists including Yo-Yo Ma, Murray Perahia, Emanuel Ax, the Emerson String Quartet, the Alvin Ailey Dance Theater, Urban Bushwomen, the Acting Company, and the National Theatre of the Deaf in the acclaimed Concert Hall in the Center for the Arts. The performing arts series endorses the College as a place where evidence of civilization is gathered, preserved, considered, and taught. The Concert series and performing arts cultivate within us the habit of beholding the world thoughtfully.

The **Middlebury College Museum of Art** is an integral educational and cultural component of the College and the surrounding community. The Museum's collection of several thousand objects ranges from antiquities through contemporary art and photography. Changing exhibitions highlight the achievements of cultures and artists not represented in the Museum collection. An annual exhibition features works by the College's graduating studio art majors. In conjunction with special exhibitions and the College curriculum, the Museum sponsors programs and events including lectures, gallery talks, and films. The education program, run by the Museum with student and community volunteers, serves primary and secondary schools in the Museum's vicinity.

Middlebury's summer programs (**the Language Schools and the Bread Loaf School of English**) are replete with lectures, films, performances, and culture-specific events. The high quality of these academic programs is secured by the abounding co-curricular schedule that supports intensive learning in graduate-degree and non-degree courses. On the main campus, films and events are "in language" but are open to all. The College and surrounding community are doubly enriched by a year-long calendar of events that in the summer take on a special international flair.

Appraisal

Middlebury College suffers from an embarrassment of riches in co-curricular events. The opportunities for intellectual and cultural stimulation outside the classroom are abundant and ongoing. If there are complaints to be heard, they are that there are too many programs to attend and some are not well publicized. In addition, there is a concern that students are often under-represented at lectures and performances. A number of factors have all been cited as reasons for student under-representation: time pressure from course commitments, conflicts with athletic schedules, inconsistent publicity, and lectures geared toward narrow disciplinary issues rather than broader themes with more general appeal.

The new Commons residential life initiative seeks to integrate learning with programmed activities that coordinate with the curriculum or enhance learning in less

formal ways. The Commons idea came into being partly to answer a concern that the intellectual life of students was not fully integrated into daily interactions on campus.

Projections

Intellectual community under the new Commons residential-life system is a work in progress. The College should consider:

- affording more opportunities for general education curricula that permeate barriers between classroom and other areas of student life;
- scheduling events within the smaller and more accessible venues Commons provide;
- how to enhance and encourage more Commons-based First-Year seminars;
- a weekly or bi-monthly “non-scheduled hour” for special College-wide events;
- ways to encourage different “local” intellectual communities as reflections of the emerging cultures of different Commons;
- ways that these diverse Commons communities can contribute to the global intellectual interests of the College.

Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid

Description

Admission to Middlebury College is highly selective. Each applicant’s folder is read independently by at least two members of the Admissions staff and assessed on an individual basis. Candidates for admission are judged on the basis of high school grades, standardized test scores, a sample of written work, letters of recommendation from their teachers, participation in community and secondary school activities, leadership, and personal qualities. There is a traditional conception of the “admissions profile” of a Middlebury student: solid academic ability, but well-rounded, often with a record of achievement in extra-curricular activities, athletics, or student leadership. A statistical summary of recent admissions cohorts may be found in the appendix to this report.

As is the case at many selective liberal arts colleges, the number of early decision applications to Middlebury has been increasing in recent years. Approximately 40 percent of the September first-year class is now admitted under early decision. The remaining places in the September first-year class are filled through the regular admissions decision process. About 100 first-year students begin their studies at the beginning of the spring semester. These students, known as “Febs,” fill vacancies in the student body caused by students who graduate at midyear or who study abroad for the spring term only. The February admissions program was started in the 1970s as a way of balancing the enrollment between the fall and spring terms, because at that time more

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

students who studied abroad were away in the spring than in the fall. A small number of transfer students – usually about fifteen in the fall and five in the spring – is admitted from other colleges into the sophomore and junior classes.

All applicants to Middlebury College are eligible to apply for financial aid, and all continuing students may apply for aid, even if they did not receive aid in the preceding year. The goal of the College's financial aid program is to insure that all qualified students are able to attend Middlebury College regardless of their and their family's financial resources. Like most of the institutions with which we compete most closely for admitted students, Middlebury's financial aid policies are "need-based." That is, Middlebury is committed to meeting the full assessed financial need of all undergraduate students to the full extent that resources permit. In practice, this policy has meant in recent years that all admitted students with an assessed need are offered a combination of grants, loans, and work sufficient to fully close the gap between the student's family contribution, as determined by the office of financial aid, and the cost of attendance at Middlebury College. Financial aid policies are applied equally to all Middlebury undergraduates, both U.S. citizens and international students. The College seeks an enrollment of international students equal to 10 percent of the student body, even as it bears the higher cost of aid to international students, who do not qualify for federal student aid or subsidized loans.

For several years, it has been a stated goal to budget for 40 percent of the student body to receive financial aid in the form of grants. In recent years, the actual number has been closer to 38 percent. The smaller percentage of students receiving grant aid is influenced by the increase in the number of students accepted under early decision, a generally more affluent pool.

Appraisal

The financial aid policies have succeeded in increasing the number of international students on campus and in enhancing the diversity of the student body. The College has made further significant commitments of financial aid to bring a group of students of diverse background to Middlebury under the Posse program, starting in 1999-2000.

Projections: Questions for Consideration

- The College should reexamine its "admissions profile" from time to time to ensure a recruitment and admissions policy attuned to the institution's long-range goals for academic excellence.
- In the area of financial aid, the College's goal is a financial aid policy that results in a comparable yield of matriculants from every economic class of applicants. The financial aid policies of the 80s and 90s that have eroded the ability of middle class families to finance their children's education at private liberal arts institutions should be rectified. (New policies on the exclusion of

home equity or other assets have begun to address this concern.) The present trend has created a barbell (i.e. a bimodal distribution): the “yield” rate is highest for those receiving the highest amount of aid and for those receiving no aid. For those in the middle, the yield is less. The goal of financial aid policies should be to achieve a comparable “yield” on offers of admission at all economic levels. Progress was made in this area in the 1998-99 admissions cycle.

- Financial aid should also continue to be considered the critical instrument for achieving an internationally, economically, and racially diverse student body.
- The national context is changing: financial aid policies at many of the colleges with which our applicant pool overlaps now consider merit in financial aid decisions, and many other liberal arts colleges are following suit. Merit aid is, according to Michael Schoenfeld, the Dean of Enrollment Planning, the “jaws of the vise” that will squeeze the financial aid offices in the years to come and require a policy decision by the College.
- The College should consider the future of the practice of admitting approximately 100 new students in February (“Febs”), since these students now primarily replace each other, rather than help even out enrollment between Fall and Spring semesters.

Graduate Program - Master of Science

Description

The M.S. in Biology at Middlebury College is a small program, a remnant of a time when science departments at Middlebury offered Master's degrees in order to have additional laboratory instructors. The program can support up to two Master's students at a time. Students are required to complete a research thesis, take additional course work both within and outside of Biology, and serve as laboratory instructors in undergraduate courses for which they are qualified. Historically the program has served two audiences: (a) those who seek a Master's degree but who for logistical reasons cannot attend a school elsewhere, and (b) those who seek entry into a Ph.D. or M.D. program but want to supplement their academic record with a research-oriented M.S. before applying to an advanced degree program. The Biology Department does not actively seek applicants, and has graduated only three students in the last 10 years. Two of the three fit the first category, still live in the Middlebury area, and work in fields related to their graduate degrees. The third student went on to a Ph.D. program at the University of California at Berkeley.

Appraisal and Projection

The Biology Department has great ambivalence about the Master's Program at Middlebury. It serves its students well enough, but because it is so small, and because

Middlebury does not offer any graduate courses, the program is not of very high quality. Whenever someone approaches the department with an interest in the program, he or she is encouraged to apply elsewhere. The program has been retained only because the students who have enrolled have been well served by it, and neither the college nor the department seems to suffer from it. There seems little reason to make changes in an innocuous, but occasionally helpful program.

The Language Schools

Description

The eight Middlebury College language schools - the Schools of Arabic, Chinese, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian, and Spanish - offer summer programs in these languages at several levels. Undergraduate courses are offered in all eight languages. Graduate courses leading to the degrees of Master of Arts and Doctor of Modern Languages are offered in the Schools of French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. The Language Schools emphasize both spoken and written language skills, and stress the importance of integrating cultural understanding with the study of language. Advanced undergraduate and graduate courses are offered in culture and civilization, literature, linguistics, the arts, and the social sciences.

Admission to the Language Schools is conducted by each school, and is a process completely separate from admission to the undergraduate program at Middlebury College. All students take placement tests at the beginning of the summer, and they are placed in the level of study that is appropriate to their language proficiency. A unique feature of the Middlebury Language Schools is the “language pledge,” a formal commitment to speak the language of study as the only means of communication for the entire session. (Students in the beginning language courses take a modified and progressively more rigorous pledge.) Because students in the Language Schools take their meals together by school and participate in programs of cultural, social, and athletic activities organized by school, they develop their language skills rapidly, and assimilate the cultural perspective associated with the language they are studying.

The M.A. in French, German, Italian, Russian, or Spanish may be earned either during a series of summer sessions on the Vermont campus, or by a combination of summer study and study at one of the Middlebury Schools Abroad (see below). The Doctor of Modern Languages (D.M.L.) degree is designed to prepare teacher-scholars in two modern languages, providing them with the skills and resources they need to develop as teachers of language, literature, and culture. The D.M.L. curriculum incorporates pedagogical and cultural studies, and requires the completion of a dissertation.

Statistical material on trends in Language School enrollments may be found in the appendix to this report. Language School enrollments, which had been declining for several years, have increased for the last three summers, particularly at the undergraduate level. The Language Schools have substantially increased their recruiting and marketing

activities since 1997, and the tuition for the summer session was held constant in 1998 and 1999.

Appraisal

The relationship between the Language Schools and the undergraduate College has undergone significant changes in the last decade. Until 1994, each of the Language Schools had a Dean who was a member of the undergraduate college academic-year language faculty and who reported to the Vice President for Foreign Languages and Director of the Language Schools. Deans had responsibility for the admissions process for summer and Schools Abroad and were year-round liaisons with their Schools. In 1993, the eight Deans were replaced by a single full-time Dean and by the Director of Off-Campus Study who now oversees undergraduate admission to the Middlebury Schools Abroad. The official connection between departments and Schools was ended. In 1998 the administrative structure was again changed. Currently the Dean of Languages and International Studies (DLIS), the Associate Dean of the Language Schools, and the Director of Off-Campus Study oversee Language Schools and Schools Abroad programs and operations. The relationship between language departments and the DLIS, and the responsibilities of the Associate Dean of the Language Schools, have yet to be fully defined.

The Language Schools are committed to the highest standards in all programs despite unpredictable enrollment patterns in some Schools. Language study is particularly sensitive to international economic and political developments, but strong curricula must be prepared to weather changes and transitions in the popularity or marketability of languages and language skills. Language learning at Middlebury is an intellectual enterprise that seeks to avoid the fads and trends of the global marketplace. We are nonetheless committed to preparing our students for real-world demands in the areas where they will use their language training. Publications, recruiting, and financial aid take on greater importance as factors in managing enrollments and maintaining quality.

Each year we award approximately 150 Master of Arts degrees to students who earn their degrees studying at the Vermont campus or at Middlebury and at one of our Schools Abroad. In 1999, Middlebury awarded M.A. degrees to 54 students in French, 6 in German, 16 in Italian, 1 in Russian, and 78 in Spanish. In 1999, Middlebury awarded 7 Doctor of Modern Languages Degrees; 5 in French and 2 in Russian.

Not surprisingly, most communication from prospective students is now electronic. Students can access application materials on the web and there has been discussion about submitting applications electronically. Some Language School systems have not caught up with these changes; we expect greater emphasis in the years ahead on better use of electronic processes in administration, admissions, financial aid, enrollment, registration, and record-keeping.

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

Technological advances in the delivery of instructional materials are gaining importance in the Language Schools curriculum. The addition of an Information Technology Services (ITS) staff member dedicated to the support of language instruction in 1998 promoted new projects in many Schools. Material in the School of Arabic and in the Japanese School is being digitized for delivery to students over the Web and on CDs; our goal is to have introductory materials in all languages digitized in the near future. The Chinese School administers its placement test electronically and other Schools are developing similar testing instruments with the Middlebury Center for Educational Technology. The Language Schools administration recently decided to replace two-thirds of the Language Laboratory facility with a laboratory dedicated to faculty development of language instructional material. This laboratory will be used by summer and academic-year language faculty. Coordination with the Center for Educational Technology will further encourage development of computer-based instructional material and testing instruments. Technology also allows serious consideration of the possibility of expanding the Master of Arts program to offer a teaching degree in the less commonly taught languages (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese, Russian).

Projection

The College and Language Schools administration should consider:

- consolidation of some Language Schools operations and processes through better use of electronic technology;
- a strategy to move forward on the decision to integrate LS registration with the College MARS (Middlebury Automated Registration System).
- coordination with the Center for Educational Technology on LS projects;
- placement tests for all Schools on the Web for self-administration before arrival at Middlebury;
- a Master of Arts degree in the less-commonly-taught languages in a program that combines on-campus instruction and mentored distance learning.
- consider adding other languages such as Portuguese, Hebrew, Hindi, or Korean after extensive research and planning.

The Middlebury College Schools Abroad

Description

The Language Schools operate schools in five European countries during the academic year. Administrative responsibility for the Schools Abroad rests with the Dean of Languages and International Studies and, for the graduate component of the program, with the Director of each Language School. Middlebury has programs in France (Paris), Germany (Mainz), Italy (Florence), Russia (Moscow, Voronezh, Yaroslavl, and Irkutsk),

and Spain (Madrid, Segovia, Getafe, and Logroño). A priority for the Language Schools in the last year has been integration of the several elements of Middlebury's language program - the undergraduate language departments, the summer Language School, and the School Abroad – for each of the languages offered at the College. Undergraduates at the Schools Abroad are encouraged, when appropriate, to take courses through direct enrollment in local universities rather than in free-standing courses offered at the Middlebury School. Students in the Schools Abroad, both undergraduates and graduates, are expected to abide by the spirit of the language pledge and to function as much as possible in the language of their host country.

Somewhat more than half of Middlebury undergraduates study abroad. About 40 percent of these students are enrolled in one of the Middlebury Schools Abroad. The remaining undergraduates are enrolled in programs that have been approved by a faculty committee. Students studying in a country where the language is taught at Middlebury must enroll in programs where the instruction is in the foreign language, and those studying in countries whose languages are not taught at Middlebury are expected to begin study of that language as part of their academic program abroad. In 1998-99, 342 Middlebury undergraduates studied abroad. These students studied in more than 30 host countries but most were enrolled in Middlebury programs in Spain, France, Italy, Germany, and Russia, or in affiliated or approved programs in the United Kingdom, China, Japan, and Latin America.

As of August 1999, 120 students were projected to be enrolled in Language Schools Master of Arts degree programs abroad in 1999-2000: 40 students in France, 6 in Germany, 18 in Italy, 5 in Russia, and 51 in Spain.

Appraisal

Middlebury continues its commitment to study abroad as an important option for students in a variety of majors and a required component of Language and International Studies majors. Course offerings in Middlebury Schools Abroad have expanded in a number of fields, especially in the social sciences in response to the curricular needs of international studies students. Coordination among the departments and programs that participate in international studies is increasingly important as students take courses abroad outside the traditional fields of language, literature, and culture. Granting of credit in interdisciplinary majors such as international studies can be problematic when disciplinary department chairs are called upon to evaluate courses in languages in which they have no expertise.

The recent Starr Foundation grant to the Schools Abroad gives Middlebury the opportunity to expand existing programs and to design new ones. Special emphasis will be placed on enhancing offerings in international studies, environmental studies, Latin American Studies, and East Asian Studies.

Projection

- Consider expansion of Middlebury programs abroad in satellite campuses that provide options for undergraduates in cities and regions where English is less commonly spoken.
- Consider establishing programs in China, Japan, and Latin America in line with the terms of the Starr Foundation grant.
- Consider a system for granting credit for courses abroad in the international studies major that is consistent with the goals of the major and easily understood by faculty advisors.
- Consider better coordination between the Off-Campus Study Office and language departments in advising students for study abroad in Middlebury programs. Clarify the responsibilities of language department faculty and Schools Abroad administration.

Bread Loaf School of English

Description

The Bread Loaf School of English (BLSE) offers a six-week summer session of graduate courses in English and American literature, writing and the teaching of writing, and theatre arts. The faculty are drawn from colleges and universities throughout the United States (including Middlebury College) and the United Kingdom. Students may elect to enroll in the Bread Loaf School as either non-degree students in continuing graduate education, or as candidates for the M.A. or the M.Litt. degrees. Admission to the Bread Loaf School is conducted by the school itself, and is based on college transcripts, faculty letters of recommendation, and a writing sample. The Bread Loaf M.A. requires the equivalent of ten courses, and the M.Litt., a second master's degree, has the M.A. as a prerequisite and is awarded after a period of concentrated and specialized study of literature and passage of a written and oral comprehensive examination. Statistical material on trends in Bread Loaf enrollments is available in the appendix to this report.

The Bread Loaf School of English offers courses in four locations. The oldest (since 1920) and largest Bread Loaf program is at the "home" campus, Middlebury College's Bread Loaf Mountain Campus in Ripton, Vermont. Bread Loaf Schools are also located at Lincoln College, Oxford (Bread Loaf is the only tenant of Lincoln College during the six weeks of the summer session); in New Mexico at the Native American Preparatory School in Rowe, New Mexico, near Santa Fe (again, Bread Loaf is the only tenant of NAPS during the summer session); and in Alaska at the University of Alaska-Southeast, in Juneau. Bread Loaf students may enroll in any one of the four campuses, although candidates for the M.A. and M.Litt. degrees must spend at least one summer in residence in Vermont.

The largest single category of students at the Bread Loaf School of English is made up of secondary school English teachers, comprising about 80 percent of Bread Loaf's more than 400 students. Some elementary and community college teachers attend as well. Students can take courses leading to an M.A. or M.Litt. degree, or they can attend in non-degree status. BLSE also accepts a small number of undergraduates each summer in its undergraduate honors program.

Thanks to generous grant support from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Foundation, the Educational Foundation of America, and the Annenberg Foundation, Bread Loaf has been able to award full fellowships for approximately 50 rural teachers each summer. The participants in the Bread Loaf rural teachers' programs also plan and carry out collaborative follow-up projects, often involving their students, using the electronic communications resources of BLRTN (Bread Loaf Rural Teacher Network).

Expansion

At the time of the last reaccreditation review, BLSE offered programs serving approximately 320 students at only two locations: at the home campus in Vermont, and at Lincoln College, Oxford. In addition to literary studies, Bread Loaf offered an extraordinary program in theater in Vermont that made innovative use, both on stage and in the classroom, of its resident Acting Ensemble; it had started its own computer network, BreadNet, and was beginning to explore its possibilities as a tool for teachers; and Bread Loaf had identified rural public school teachers as a special constituency and with the help of several grants had begun to recruit and support such teachers in its practitioner-oriented Program in Writing.

In the past decade, under Director James Maddox, BLSE has expanded to four campuses, the student body has grown by over 100 students, and the number of courses taught has increased from 49 to 67. The Bread Loaf program has grown in a number of directions:

In 1991, BLSE established a campus at St. John's College in Santa Fe, New Mexico, in part to expand the student body and in part to attract a wider geographical range of students. In 1995, the program moved to the Native American Preparatory School, 35 miles outside Santa Fe. The program in New Mexico offers courses similar to those offered in Vermont and at Oxford, but with an appropriate emphasis upon Native American literature, American Hispanic literature, and writing of the Southwest. Bread Loaf/New Mexico enrolls approximately 70 students each summer.

Since 1992, when Alaska was named one of five target states for the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest grant for rural teachers, BLSE has attracted a strong cohort of teachers from that state and has become a significant presence in Alaskan education. In 1997 and 1998, in partnership with the University of Alaska Southeast, Bread Loaf held three-week summer writing institutes on the UAS campus. Because of the institutes' success, a fourth full Bread Loaf summer program was established at the UAS campus in Juneau beginning in summer 1999. The Alaska program takes advantage of Juneau's

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

unique location, and several courses had a focus on the literature and landscape of the Pacific Northwest and on indigenous cultures.

Special Projects

Program in Theater

In 1996, Bread Loaf began an exciting collaboration with Trinity Repertory Company in Providence, Rhode Island, bringing major playwrights to the Vermont campus to develop new works for the American stage. Typically the writers are in residence for at least a week, developing and revising their work while members of the Bread Loaf Acting Ensemble join visiting actors and a professional director to rehearse the plays.

BreadNet

BreadNet, created in 1984, now operates from Middlebury College and has become one of the most effective small networks for teachers in the nation. BLSE teachers and their students are able to stay in touch with each other, maintain their spirit of mutual support and collaboration, and engage in content-rich classroom exchanges throughout the academic year. There are now some 700 active members of BreadNet, several hundred of them logging on at least once a week, many of them at least once a day.

Bread Loaf Rural Teacher Network

Since 1992, two multi-million dollar grants from the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund and several other major grants have made possible the creation of the Bread Loaf Rural Teacher Network. This network has supported more than 170 teachers over the past seven years and has made possible significant educational outreach activities in schools across the United States. These teachers have been drawn largely from eight target states: Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Mississippi, New Mexico, South Carolina, and Vermont. While at BLSE, these teachers take two rigorous academic courses each summer and receive intensive telecommunications training. When they return to their schools, they are prepared to carry out cross-school, content-rich telecommunications exchanges in projects carefully planned during the BLSE summers.

National Endowment for the Humanities Grants

BLSE hosted National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Institutes in theater in the summers of 1989, 1992, 1994, and 1996. During each of those summers, the grant provided 20 fellowships for teachers whose students have little access to professional theater because of geographical location or financial constraints. These teachers attended BLSE/Vermont, taking two courses in directing, acting, and literary interpretation, and worked with theater professionals on summer productions. The fellowships also included academic-year visits to the Fellows' schools by members of BLSE's Acting Ensemble.

Last year BLSE received a three-year grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) to support literature-based partnerships between BLSE faculty and the classrooms of middle and high school teachers. Twelve different teachers each summer take two courses at the campus of their choice. Through the participation of other Bread Loaf teachers and their classes, the impact of the grant extends to approximately 100 schools.

Appraisal

Not everything has changed. The home campus in Vermont continues to offer unparalleled opportunities for students to work with some of the best teachers and scholars in the U.S. and enjoy a rich intellectual community life during the summer session. Anecdotal evidence suggests that the quality of our applicants has, if anything, improved over the past several years. Bread Loaf attracts applicants with degrees from top colleges and universities and teachers who are recognized leaders in their schools and often in their states.

The Oxford program, after a temporary dip in enrollments during the Gulf War, routinely fills early in the spring, and our program is considered by Oxford faculty to have the greatest integrity and highest academic standards of all of the many American summer programs at Oxford. Enrollments are steady in New Mexico, and we were encouraged by enrollments in Alaska in its first summer. The addition of the New Mexico and Alaska campuses, along with the careful selection of target states for the rural teacher fellowships and the intensive recruitment done in those states by Bread Loaf staff, has had the hoped-for effect of increasing geographical and racial diversity at BLSE. In 1989, some 55 per cent of our students came from the New England and mid-Atlantic states; today, nearly 55 per cent of Bread Loaf students come from outside New England and the mid-Atlantic states, with nearly all 50 states (and about a dozen other countries) represented.

BLSE Director, James Maddox, set as his major goal the recruitment of more minority students when he took over as director in 1989. The rural teacher fellowships have brought a number of Native American students from New Mexico, Arizona, and Alaska; in addition, significant numbers of Hispanic and African American students have been recruited. In its outreach programs, especially its work in rural schools, BLSE has become a major presence in schools teaching significant numbers of minority children, especially Native American, Native Alaskan, and Mexican-American.

BLSE has as well worked successfully to increase the diversity of its faculty; in 1999, for example, there are five African American professors on the Bread Loaf faculty.

The BLSE curriculum at the three American campuses has changed markedly over the past decade to reflect this greater diversity.

Projection

In the next decade, the BLSE will be undertaking a number of initiatives:

Standard 4: Programs and Instruction

- seeking funding to sustain and extend the rural teacher network beyond the scope allowed by its current funding.
- seeking to form a network of urban teachers, especially inner-city teachers, that would adapt to its own uses the lessons learned in our rural network.
- working more closely with Middlebury College undergraduates in their Teacher Education Program; a partnership would obviously be of benefit to the College and to BLSE.
- working, in the immediate future, to step up its offerings in technology (CD-ROM production, multi-media authoring, etc.), taking advantage of its experience in the use of technology in the classroom.

BLSE has recently begun working with state Departments of Education in Alaska, Kentucky, Ohio, and South Carolina as partners in giving teachers from those states intensive professional development in the BLSE programs and plans to expand these partnerships to Departments of Education in other states in the immediate future.

Because the past decade has been a time of considerable growth for BLSE, there are at present no plans for new campuses. However, we would remain open to considering the issue of expansion, in the context of careful planning and overall institutional priorities, at an appropriate time in the decade ahead.

Bread Loaf Writers' Conference

The Bread Loaf Writers' Conference meets at the Bread Loaf campus for two weeks in August. This non-credit program offers lectures, discussions, workshops, and private consultations in fiction, nonfiction, and poetry. The faculty is made up of leading writers who both offer lectures and presentations and provide students individual critiques on their work. Admission to this community of writers is by portfolio.

The Writers' Conference has undergone considerable change in the past decade. A new director, not a member of the Middlebury academic year faculty, was appointed in 1995, succeeding a Middlebury College faculty member who had directed the program for more than twenty years. In recent years, the program has become less hierarchical, with more emphasis on teaching and interaction between the invited writers and the student participants. The Bakeless Literary Publication Prizes have been established to recognize first-time writers. Administered by the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference and funded through the generous gift of an anonymous Middlebury alumna, the Bakeless Fund also supports the publication of the winning manuscripts by Middlebury College through the University Press of New England.

STANDARD FIVE FACULTY

Description

Authorization of Positions and Recruiting

The process of filling a vacancy on the Middlebury College faculty begins when the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) considers a department's, or a department's and a program's, request that a faculty position be authorized. The EAC must consider requests for not only new positions, but also continued positions. Positions vacated by retirements, resignations, denials of reappointment, or any other reason must be reauthorized by the EAC before they can be filled. In making its recommendations on faculty positions, the EAC takes into account curricular needs at the College-wide, program, and departmental levels. The EAC's recommendations are submitted to the Provost, who acts as the President's designate in deciding whether or not to authorize or reauthorize a faculty position. In making these decisions, the Provost consults regularly with the Dean of the Faculty, who serves as chair of the EAC.

Middlebury College has established an 11-to-1 student-faculty ratio as the policy guideline to be followed in determining the overall size of the faculty. Complete information on the size, composition, and demographics of the faculty may be found in the appendices to this report. Copies of the *curriculum vitae* of members of the undergraduate teaching faculty may be found in the visiting committee's workroom.

Once a tenure-track faculty position has been authorized, it will nearly always be filled by a national search. (The exception is when a person already on the faculty, who was initially appointed to a term position following a national search, is determined by the department to be the strongest candidate for a regular position, and that determination is concurred in by the Dean of the Faculty and the Provost.) In some departments, all members on regular appointment constitute the search committee; in larger departments, a subset of the members will act as the search committee. All search committees include at least one member from outside the department, appointed by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the EAC. The appointment of outside members is designed to bring a College-wide perspective to faculty appointments, and, in some instances, to make sure that the interests of a program whose curriculum is supported by the appointment will be reflected in the hiring process.

Prior to inviting candidates for on-campus visits, the department will submit four to six dossiers to the academic administration for review. In some instances, these dossiers will be the result of preliminary interviews with candidates at an academic conference or convention. The dossiers are reviewed by the Dean of the Faculty and the Associate Dean with responsibility for the recruiting department, and, following a process of consultation between the Dean and the department chair, two or three candidates are

Standard 5: Faculty

invited to Middlebury for campus visits. During the visit, the candidate will meet with members of the department, other faculty with interests in the area to be filled, members of the academic administration, and the department's Student Advisory Committee (SAC). The candidate will always give a public presentation and, in some instances, will also teach a class. Following the conclusion of the campus visits, the department chair will canvass those who were involved in the recruiting process and will submit a recommendation to the Dean of the Faculty, which the Dean will discuss with the chair. All appointments must be authorized by the Dean and/or the Provost.

Initial appointments to the Middlebury faculty are made to departments. In recent years, a number of positions have been approved with the understanding that the new position will provide the department with teaching resources necessary to support an interdisciplinary program or College-wide curricular requirement, and, in one instance, an initial appointment has been made jointly to two departments. After a faculty member receives tenure, he or she may submit a proposal to the academic administration and the EAC for a change in appointment status, to include appointment to a program or a division in addition to or instead of a department. These proposals are developed and considered in consultation with all of the academic entities involved in the former and proposed appointments.

Reviews and Reappointment

Persons appointed to tenure-track positions on the Middlebury faculty will normally be reviewed three times in their first seven years on the faculty: a first review in the second year, a second review in the fourth year, and a tenure review in the seventh year. All reviews are carried out by the Committee on Reappointment (COR), a committee of three full professors elected at-large by the entire faculty. The Provost sits with the COR as its secretary, and the committee makes its recommendations to the President. Should the President advance a tenure recommendation made by the COR, the Board of Trustees must approve that recommendation in order for tenure to be awarded.

The complete procedures for faculty reviews are stated in the Handbook. In all reviews, the department chair submits a letter to the COR presenting the views of all the tenured members of the department on the person who is being reviewed. Each tenured member of the department, and those faculty outside the department whose views the COR wishes to solicit, will be asked to submit a letter of recommendation to the COR. In all reviews, the COR will also consider the teaching evaluation forms from the candidate's courses, and the recommendation of the departmental Student Advisory Committee (SAC).

The criteria for the reviews do change over the course of the pre-tenure period, although excellence in teaching is a *sine qua non* for passage of all reviews. The first review, in the second year, concentrates on promise and performance as a teacher. The second review, in the fourth year, adds to the evaluation of teaching an expectation of developing scholarly or artistic achievement. At the time of the tenure review, in the

spring of the seventh year, candidates are expected to demonstrate “exceptional quality as teachers” and to show evidence that they are “scholars or artists of significant achievement as recognized by the broader academic community beyond Middlebury.” Although teaching and scholarship are the principal concerns in the tenure review, candidates for tenure are expected to show a record of service to the departmental and College curricula, and to the broader life of the College. The department chair will observe the candidate’s teaching in all reviews, and at least two members of the COR will observe the candidate’s teaching in second and tenure reviews. In conducting second and tenure reviews, the COR will solicit letters from at least three current students and three recent alumni who have taken courses with the faculty member under review. The COR will also solicit an outside evaluation of scholarship in tenure reviews.

All materials submitted to the Committee on Reappointment as a part of a faculty member’s review are confidential, with two exceptions. First, letters from members of the Middlebury faculty are made available to candidates in cases where reappointment is denied. Second, the departmental letter written by the chair, which summarizes the department’s position but does not attribute views to any member of the department, will be made available to the candidate at the time it is submitted to the COR.

On occasion, a faculty member hired from outside Middlebury College will be considered for tenure at the time of appointment. In these circumstances, the COR will review the person’s candidacy and make a recommendation to the President regarding the award of tenure at the time of appointment.

A faculty member who is not reappointed may appeal the decision on the basis of either procedural errors or violations of academic freedom. An Appeal Committee, consisting of three of the five members of an elected Appeals Council, will determine whether there are grounds for an appeal. If the Appeal Committee determines that there are grounds for appeal on the basis of procedural errors, it will direct the relevant parties to repeat those aspects of the review, correcting the procedural errors, at which point the COR will reconsider its recommendation. If the Appeal Committee determines that there are grounds for appeal on the basis of violations of academic freedom, the case will be heard by a committee of the Board of Trustees according to procedures specified in the Handbook.

Reviews of tenured faculty members are carried out by the Committee on Senior Faculty Reviews (CSFR), a body of three full professors elected by the faculty at-large. Five years after the award of tenure, an Associate Professor will be reviewed for promotion to full Professor. The CSFR makes its recommendation on promotion on the basis of an evaluation of the candidate’s teaching, scholarship, and administrative and other College service. If an Associate Professor is not promoted, he or she will be reviewed again three years later. The CSFR also conducts a review of full Professors ten years after promotion, and every ten years thereafter. These ten-year reviews, which are carried out in consultation with the faculty member being reviewed, are designed to give the faculty member the opportunity to reflect on his or her record of teaching, scholarship,

and service over the past decade and to formulate plans for continued professional development.

Leaves and Faculty Development

Middlebury College has a generous program to support faculty research and professional development. In 1994-95, the former leave program, under which faculty members had to compete for a limited number of leaves, was replaced with a “regular” leave program, under which faculty are eligible for leave on a fixed cycle. The regular leave program is intended to allow departments and programs better to plan their course offerings. Generally, a faculty member is eligible for a full-year leave after five years of full-time teaching, and a one-semester plus Winter Term leave after four years of full-time teaching. If the faculty member makes a good faith effort, as determined by the Dean of the Faculty, to solicit support from outside funding agencies for his or her leave project(s), salary during a full-year leave is at 80 per cent, and salary during a semester plus Winter Term leave is at 100 per cent. A very large majority of the faculty choose to take a full-year leave after five years of teaching rather than a partial year leave on a more frequent schedule.

The Faculty Professional Development Fund (FPDF), administered by the Dean of the Faculty and the Associate Deans, provides support to faculty members for the costs of attending academic conferences and other research-related expenditures. Other professional development programs supported by the College include the faculty seminar for first-year faculty members, offered during Winter Term; the Ada Howe Kent Fellowship program, which awards grants, awarded on a competitive basis, for faculty to pursue course development and other curricular innovations during the summer; the Undergraduate Collaborative Research Fund, which awards grants to faculty members who are involving students extensively in their research; and the Salzburg Seminars, an international program of conferences, to which Middlebury is annually permitted to send five faculty as Presidential Fellows.

Some faculty development activities are supported by outside funds. Probably the best recent example of such a program is the Davis Fellowship Program, funded by the S.W. Davis Educational Foundation, which provides support for course development involving the integration of technology into course materials. By the time the three-year Davis grant came to an end in 1998-99, nearly 40 faculty had participated in a Winter Term course on enhancing teaching using technology, the results of which have been many retooled courses that incorporate technology as an essential part of the educational process. The Ford Foundation has recently announced support for an important faculty development initiative in support of the International Studies (IS) program, particularly involving the launching of cross-disciplinary team-taught seminars for IS senior majors.

The College has adopted a number of policies, stated in the Handbook, on faculty research. Many of these policies are the results of requirements established by federal granting agencies that fund faculty research. For example, research involving human

subjects must be approved in advance by the Human Subjects Research Committee, and research involving animals must be approved in advance by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. A policy for reporting and dealing with possible misconduct in research (e.g. falsification, fabrication, or plagiarism) has been established and is included in the Handbook.

Academic Freedom, Faculty Grievances, and Discipline

Middlebury College's statement on academic freedom and tenure is found in the Handbook. The statement emphasizes the importance of freedom in teaching and research for the benefit of students as well as faculty members, and notes that academic freedom carries with it responsibilities as well as rights.

As noted above, faculty who are not reappointed may appeal that decision through a procedure set forth in the Handbook. Other faculty grievances may be taken up with the Dean of the Faculty, one of the Associate Deans, or the department chair.

Normally, sanctions against faculty members who violate College policies would be imposed by the Provost and/or the Dean of the Faculty. Should termination of a faculty member's appointment be under consideration, the matter is referred to the Committee on Reappointment and, should the COR concur in the administration's recommendation for termination for cause, to the Board of Trustees. The procedures to be followed in termination cases are presented in detail in the Handbook. A faculty member may not be removed for cause on grounds of teaching ineffectiveness unless the department initiates the matter by recommending to the Provost that termination proceedings be commenced.

Teaching Loads

Teaching loads are established by the academic administration in consultation with the Educational Affairs Committee. The teaching load guidelines now in place were established in May 1992. They speak in terms of "instructional units" rather than courses. Each faculty member on full-time appointment is expected to teach five instructional units over Fall and Spring terms in a given academic year. While most courses count for one instructional unit, in some circumstances (a lecture course with 50 or more students and discussion sections, a language course that meets 6 or more hours per week, or a science course with laboratory that meets for 6 or more hours per week) a single course may count for two instructional units. Because of these double-counted courses, most faculty members at Middlebury teach four courses a year, one of which is a two instructional unit course. The academic administration and the Educational Affairs Committee are now reviewing the teaching load guidelines, to see whether Middlebury's teaching load may be brought closer to a real 2-2 load in the Fall and Spring terms. Faculty are currently expected to teach during Winter Terms in alternate years, or, more precisely, in three of the five Winter Terms between regularly scheduled leaves.

Appraisal

The 1990 Middlebury College Self-Study and NEASC's response, in the form of the latter's Visiting Committee Report, as well as the 1992 Middlebury College Ten-Year Plan and the College's 1995 Interim Report to NEASC, have all engaged issues related to, and made suggestions regarding, the College's faculty. A survey of these matters seemed in order and that has been done in some detail in an appendix, to be found at the back of this report, a reading of which will provide a comprehensive survey of key recommendations made over the past ten years and also what has been accomplished in response.

The following Appraisal and Projection section summarizes those issues, evaluates the progress in dealing with each, and makes further recommendations. The appendix contains the supporting data for the following Appraisal and Projection section.

All of the available evidence -- grants received, prizes, publications, student evaluations of teaching, alumni and parent surveys -- indicates that Middlebury College has an exceptional faculty and that it continues to be able to attract excellent new faculty.

With the decision to add thirty new faculty as the College grows, there seems ample evidence that the percentage of young faculty will increase and that the tenure complement of the faculty will decrease over the next ten years.

The College has made excellent progress in recruiting female faculty over the past ten years, and a significant number have been promoted, tenured, and appointed to administrative positions. This effort must be sustained. There does seem to be evidence that some women faculty members leave voluntarily in the early years of their employment, and some of these may leave because of issues related to familial leave and spousal employment. To the extent that these departures may be because of such issues, the recent approval of a new parental leave policy should help with retention.

While the College has not had as much success in attracting faculty of color, the number of such faculty has increased slightly, and there has been a significant improvement in the appointment of faculty of color to administrative positions at the College. Middlebury's rural location in a predominantly white state, and the College's distance from any major metropolitan area, have been serious hindrances to recruitment of such faculty. In the Fall of 1998, the President of the College appointed a Human Relations Committee to examine issues of diversity at the College; their report, released in March 1999, makes several specific recommendations for recruiting faculty of color, and these deserve the attention of the community and the administration. Of particular importance are those recommendations that support: 1) increasing the pool of qualified minority candidates; 2) increasing Winter Term faculty of color; and 3) courting "faculty members from underrepresented groups who are eminent in their field to teach here for a term or year as a Scholar in Residence."

One of the Committee's recommendations suggests developing a program with the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE), and this has already been accomplished. Middlebury College has become a sustainer campus for NEBHE. In the faculty area, NEBHE will provide assistance with recruiting and retaining minority faculty. NEBHE also has a program for scholars-in-residence in which a Ph.D. candidate in a humanities or social science field becomes a visiting scholar at a host college while writing the dissertation. By hosting some of these ABD scholars-in-residence, we could attract some of them to stay at Middlebury after they finish their Ph.D.

Diversity includes, of course, not only hiring and retaining faculty of color but also gay and lesbian faculty as well as faculty from other underrepresented groups.

The College is making an effort to create an environment that is supportive of diversity and as free of prejudice as possible. To this end the College has become a chapter affiliate of the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI) with the aim of conducting ongoing training of faculty and staff in diversity awareness and the reduction of prejudice. NCBI workshops were held on campus in June, 1998, and January and July 1999. Over 100 faculty, staff, and students have participated in these workshops.

The changes in the rules for reappointment and tenure implemented in the past decade seem to have been a success, particularly those aspects that require consultations with junior faculty as they proceed through the review process. Nevertheless there is some anxiety among junior faculty over the review process. No doubt the continuing desire to improve the quality of the faculty has made it more difficult to pass each review. Standards for teaching have always been high at Middlebury, and the standards for scholarship and research have risen in recent years. Some junior faculty continue to express desires for more clarity about review standards, for more mentoring by departmental chairs and senior colleagues, and also for the creation of several ombudspersons who would serve as resources for junior faculty.

Faculty development is crucial to individual faculty members and to the institution, and the College has made important strides in providing more and more ways to support faculty in their efforts to develop their skills and to produce scholarship and research. The recent decision to change the teaching schedule so that each faculty member teaches only every other Winter Term will no doubt free up more time for faculty to pursue their scholarship and research. A number of other new faculty development initiatives have been taken, more funds have been allocated for faculty development, and the new leave program virtually guarantees a leave at regular intervals. In 1998-99, the faculty received over \$800,000 in funding through College programs in support of faculty development. The increased emphasis on scholarship and research has not lessened the importance of teaching, and the College has also made some moves toward rewarding excellence in teaching.

Several steps have been taken over the past ten years to involve the faculty more in the planning of budgets and buildings, and many of these have been very successful.

Standard 5: Faculty

If anything, there are more opportunities to be involved in planning than faculty have time to utilize.

Given the amount of advising, non-teaching duties, and "teaching outside the classroom" required of Middlebury faculty, the College continues to limit the number of part-time and term (non-tenure track) appointments. The percentage of these appointments has been reduced even further in recent years by the institution of a formal leave policy and the creation of permanent leave replacement positions for many departments. Leaves can then be replaced internally without having to make term appointments to replace faculty while they are on leave. The administration and the Educational Affairs Committee (EAC) work closely with departments in trying to reduce the number of term appointments, generally hiring only those who can fill some specific need in the curriculum, those who are needed to handle temporary increases in enrollments, and those who will replace faculty on leave.

The number of faculty who serve as chairs of departments and programs is quite large, as is the number of faculty who serve on committees. On the one hand, these numbers are very positive, for they reflect the faculty's desire to give service to the College by being directly involved in the planning and managing of the institution. On the other hand, having so many faculty with administrative and committee responsibilities limits the time that they can give to teaching, scholarship, and research, which are crucial to the intellectual growth of the faculty, as well as to the quality of the institution.

One of the main reasons that so many faculty are serving in administrative roles is that there has been a proliferation of new programs over the past ten years, which is certainly healthy for the institution, although sometimes there are conflicts between the authority of the department and that of the program. In many respects, these programs help to strengthen the liberal arts mission of the College because they are interdisciplinary and cut across departmental lines. On the other hand, it is also true that some faculty and students can become so involved in, and dedicated to, their programs -- which is also true of departments -- that they have contact with only a few parts of the College.

As the College develops the Commons System, no doubt there will be even more pressure on faculty to give service to the institution. Yet most faculty believe in the importance of integrating the academic and residential life of the College, as the new Commons System is designed to do. Most of the academic year 1997-98 was spent in discussions and debates about this new Commons System, with the faculty repeatedly voicing its opinions and having a say in the development of this new residential plan for the College. What remains to be seen is how active the faculty will be in participating in this effort to integrate the academic and residential aspects of the College.

Projections

As the size and diversity of the faculty increases, more effort will need to be made to hold on to the sense of community that has been characteristic of Middlebury College. Inherent in this feeling of community is a sense of shared purpose, which is vital to the College's mission and to its identity. In the years ahead, the College will need to be even more vigilant about holding onto its liberal arts mission and not dissolving into dozens of separate areas with no vision of the whole. The College has recently begun supporting joint appointments of faculty, that is, appointing individual faculty to more than one department and program. The College should continue this initiative as well as to strengthen other recent efforts to make sure that new faculty are hired with interests and expertise that cross traditional departmental and curricular lines, and that such faculty are committed to offering courses outside their departments and programs, e.g., First-Year Seminars and College Writing courses. The Commons System should be understood not only as a way to integrate academic and residential life, but also as a way to expand academic and social exchanges among the faculty. Discussions need to take place about ways to use the Commons System as a way to foster interaction among the faculty. Buildings renovated and built to support the Commons System might have spaces specifically designed as faculty lounges, or cafés like Rehearsals in the Center for the Arts, and these might be located in such a way that they invite faculty from various disciplines to gather together.

The role of family issues in recruitment and retention needs to be addressed in a formal way. Assuming that there will be more and more applications from two-career couples, the College's ability to attract and keep the very best faculty will, in the years ahead, be increasingly dependent upon the way it addresses the needs of spouses who seek employment, as well as other family issues. One of these issues, affecting staff as well as faculty, is the perceived shortage of high-quality day-care spaces in the community, as well as the hours of day-care facilities, which often close before faculty meetings, lectures, and other late afternoon activities have ended.

Just as spousal employment will be a major issue over the next ten years, so too will be that of increasing the diversity of the faculty -- in terms of race and sexual orientation. Even with some new initiatives taken by the college, such as the involvement with NEBHE, there still need to be continuing discussions about the ways that the College might recruit minority faculty. But recruitment is only part of the challenge. While the College cannot change its location, it can support and initiate efforts to make the institution particularly hospitable and supportive of minority faculty, part of which includes educating the campus community about issues of diversity.

New emphasis should be given to the policy that departments can have increments if they find qualified minority faculty. Departments should be encouraged to make such appointments, not only in the context of recruiting for specific positions but also through contacts made at professional meetings, by soliciting graduate schools for the names of their minority students, etc.

Standard 5: Faculty

While on the one hand it is enviable that so many faculty are directly involved in administering departments and programs, as well as serving on committees, on the other hand it would seem counter-productive to require so much administrative and committee work of faculty, when their primary duties are teaching, scholarship, and research. When all the expectations for faculty service are combined, the result is an overwhelming demand on faculty time which, while positive in the short run for the College, can only mean long term the diminution of the quality of the faculty with respect to teaching, scholarship, and research. The College needs to address the demands being made on faculty time and to find ways to balance these various expectations. That could mean, at the very least, reducing the bureaucratic details required of chairs, or even consolidating some of the programs and departments into larger administrative units that are managed by faculty who have some released time for these duties. The danger in that approach, of course, is that it might lead to the creation of a class of faculty who are primarily administrators, but this likelihood can be lessened by restricting the time period that faculty can serve in such positions.

Another way to reduce the administrative and committee responsibilities for faculty would be to give over more authority to a larger central administration. Faculty resist this approach, particularly a faculty at a school like Middlebury where the ethos has been for faculty to be "hands-on" in the managing of the institution, but with the expansion in the size of the faculty, with the proliferation of programs, and with all the building projects planned for the future, the time may have come when the College -- and its faculty -- can no longer afford so much faculty involvement, at least not of the whole faculty. Despite the administration's willingness to involve faculty in planning finances and buildings, the present system for doing this needs to be rethought; it may be necessary to create a Planning Committee that is separate from the Faculty Council, since neither the Faculty Council nor the full faculty has the time to be involved in all the planning issues that face the College over the next decade.

As an alternative, or even a complement, to a new Planning Committee and a larger central administration, the faculty might consider creating a Faculty Senate. The monthly meetings of the full faculty have become too large for full discussions of all the issues that face the faculty. A smaller body, like a Faculty Senate, could assume responsibility for faculty governance, and there could be fewer meetings of the full faculty.

While junior-senior faculty relations have improved over the past ten years, and while some of the problems that still exist are inherent in a system where one group is judging the other group, nevertheless the academic administration can help the situation by fostering the role of the department chair in promoting faculty development, mentoring young faculty, and involving younger faculty more in departmental policy-making and implementation. Plans are under way to offer more workshops for chairs, such as the one this past year dealing with legal issues, and some of these workshops will deal with these topics, e.g., mentoring young faculty, the role of young faculty in department activities,

etc. The situation for junior faculty might also be aided by reducing the number of reappointment reviews from three to two, and this prospect merits discussion. Lessening the number of reviews might open up more possibility for junior faculty to invite senior colleagues to visit classes, read evaluations, and otherwise mentor. Reducing the number of reviews, while at the same time taking initiatives to help junior faculty improve teaching skills, would lead to a better balance between evaluation and nurturing of younger faculty. Within this context, there also needs to be discussion about a more formal mentoring system with, perhaps, the appointment of several ombudspersons for young faculty. While the College has in place a number of important ways to evaluate teaching, there are not as many initiatives to improve teaching effectiveness, nor to reward it, and these problems should be the basis for further discussion. It would be helpful, too, to find ways to encourage and evaluate teaching outside the traditional classroom.

The younger faculty, of course, are not the only ones who need nurturing, and discussions need to take place about aiding faculty more after they have received tenure. This discussion would certainly include criteria for promotion to full professor, which now seems almost automatic, as well as other ways in which post-tenure faculty are evaluated and assisted in their work as teachers and scholars. Currently there are reviews of senior faculty at ten year intervals, but this length of time seems excessive. While the College has improved the resources for faculty development, more will need to be done in the future. Improving and maintaining the quality of the faculty, particularly by emphasizing teaching, scholarship, and research, will require a corresponding increase in the allocation of resources for faculty development. In considering this task, too, it is important to recognize that after ten years, i.e., beginning around 2009, there will be an appreciable jump in the number of older faculty. The spurt in the size of the faculty during the 1980's has meant that 33 per cent of the faculty are now in the age range of 35 to 45. During the years between 2009 and 2019, that group of faculty will be moving into their 50s and 60s. The College can not afford to wait until 2009 in order to promote ways for this segment of the faculty to continue to grow and develop as teachers and scholars. The College is currently examining its early retirement system to make sure that there is sufficient incentive for some of these faculty to choose this option. Like the recent efforts to provide emeriti faculty with carrels and research funds, incentives to encourage retirement should include not only financial ones but also ways in which emeriti faculty can be kept involved in the life of the mind and of the College. Recent changes in the retirement program, whereby faculty can withdraw some of their retirement funds while teaching part-time (Associate Status) for a fixed period, should make it easier for senior faculty to make the transition from full-time teaching to retirement. It is assumed that more faculty will retire at an earlier age as a result of this change in the retirement program.

Recommendations

-Having reviewed a number of studies and reports, and having suggested a number of different topics that deserve careful consideration, we want to highlight

Standard 5: Faculty

what we think are the most important concerns for the faculty. These areas deserve the most immediate attention:

-Publicize the policy that allows faculty to switch part or all of their appointments to other departments and programs; revisit the program with an eye toward simplifying the procedures. Reconsider the College Professor program in order to make it a more effective mechanism for faculty to cross traditional departmental and curricular lines.

-Consider a policy for joint appointments of faculty couples who want to share a tenured position. Consider eliminating classes for an hour in the middle of the day in order for this time to be used for committee meetings and other events that conflict with late afternoon familial responsibilities. Consider whether or not the College should support an on-campus day-care facility, to be open to the children of all faculty and staff employees.

-Consider new initiatives for increasing the diversity of the faculty. Consider ways to support the retention of minority faculty. Elaborate, clarify, and publicize the policy that departments can have increments to hire minority faculty.

-Consider the role of physical facilities in enhancing community on campus, among both the faculty itself and faculty, staff, and students. As explained in more detail in the chapter on Physical Resources, consider establishing a number of meeting and gathering spaces, both in the Commons and in central locations.

-Consider a policy for restricting the number of committees -- standing, ad hoc, search, etc. -- on which any one faculty member can serve. Consider ways to reduce administrative and committee assignments for junior faculty. Consider eliminating the Faculty Council and creating an elected Faculty Senate that would have subcommittees dealing with planning, financing, academic facilities, etc.

-Consider ways to consolidate academic programs and departments under chairs -- or deans of divisions, as was once discussed -- who would have released time from their teaching. Consider eliminating as much as possible administrative and committee obligations for faculty during the summer, when faculty members are expected to carry out research.

-Consider formulating clear guidelines for chairs to follow in mentoring junior faculty, as well as for involving them in departmental decisions regarding curriculum and recruitment. Consider reducing the number of pre-tenure reviews from three to two, while at the same time using this reduction as a way to promote more mentoring by senior faculty of their junior colleagues. Consider other ways of rewarding and promoting excellence in teaching. Consider developing guidelines and definitions for what constitutes service to the College, including

teaching outside the classroom. Consider the appointment of faculty ombudspersons who would serve as resources for junior faculty.

-Consider additional faculty development initiatives over the next ten years for those who will be in their 50s and 60s after 2009. Consider ways to make more attractive the possibility of retirement at age 65, and earlier, particularly with initiatives that support continued faculty involvement in the life of the College and in their intellectual pursuits and interests.

STANDARD SIX STUDENT SERVICES

Introduction and Overview

Description

As a residential liberal arts college, Middlebury offers its students many opportunities for education and personal development outside the classroom. An extensive set of co-curricular, advising, and other student services are offered, based on the philosophy that every interaction at the College presents an opportunity to educate. The enhanced Commons System now being implemented is designed to further these opportunities, through establishing closer connections between academic and co-curricular programs, decentralizing dining and the student dean function, and providing for more effective student self-governance through continuing membership in Commons units.

Many offices at Middlebury provide services to students. These offices include the Dean of Student Affairs, the Dean of Commons, Student Activities, Career Services, the Department of Athletics, Campus Security, Academic Support, the Chaplain's Office, Dean of Advising, Health and Wellness Education, the Health Center, and Counseling and Human Relations. The chief student affairs officer is the Dean of Student Affairs, who reports to the Provost. The Dean of Commons and the Director of Athletics also report to the Provost. The directors of the other student affairs offices, and the director of undergraduate records, report to the Dean of Student Affairs. (See organization chart at the beginning of the report.) Although some of these offices, particularly the Health Center and Career Services, provide support for the Language Schools and Bread Loaf programs as well as the undergraduates, the focus of this chapter of the self-study will be on services for undergraduate students.

The student affairs sector has expanded considerably over the past decade. As at other residential liberal arts colleges, students and their parents demand more services – health and counseling, athletic and recreational, more amenities in residence halls and dining halls, and career preparation, to name just a few. At the same time, we face complaints, sometimes from those same students and their parents, about rising fees and the expense of a year at Middlebury.

Appraisal and Projections

Student Affairs at Middlebury College is in a time of tremendous transition. With residential life named as a "peak" for the future, the staff has been challenged and encouraged to develop plans and visions for providing a new and improved community for student learners. The challenges posed by increased enrollment, as well as the increased needs of students who are attending college, have required that we plan for the college of the twenty-first century. Appropriate resource allocation is necessary for the

increased student population. We now have a unique opportunity to assess what we are doing, reaffirm our priorities, and refocus our services and programs.

Student Dean Responsibilities

Description

Beginning in the Fall of 1999, student dean responsibilities have been divided between a central office, the Dean of Student Affairs, and Commons Deans, one located in each of the five Commons. The principal function of the Dean of Student Affairs Office is to lead the transition of student services from a centralized to a decentralized system, with emphasis on providing excellent services throughout the transition. The Dean of Student Affairs oversees campus-wide student issues and the departments listed in the preceding section. Those student services provided directly by the Dean of Student Affairs Office include international student advising, off-campus and special student advising, orientation for first-year and transfer students, undergraduate records, transcripts, and Commencement. This office also oversees all judicial matters involving students.

The Dean of Commons Office, also centralized, oversees the daily operations of the five Commons, including the Office of Residential Life. Each of the Commons has a Dean, a student affairs professional who works closely with the Faculty Associate of the Commons, the Commons Residential Advisers (recent graduates of Middlebury who serve one- or two-year terms as residential life staff living in the Commons), and the Commons Council and other student leaders. Daily deaning responsibilities are handled by the Commons Deans, including academic issues, deans' loans, and first-line response to emergencies.

The Dean of Commons Office is responsible for overseeing the development of and support for the enhanced Commons System. Principal functions include working with the facilities planning group to plan residence hall, dining, study, office, and other spaces for the enhanced residential system; overseeing residential operations, including room draw, and other programs of the residence halls; and working (through the Special Assistant to the Provost, a tenured faculty member who is part of the Dean of the Commons Office) on the development of academic initiatives related to the Commons.

Appraisal and Projection

Many of the functions that, until Fall 1999, had been provided centrally by the office of the Dean of Students have been distributed to the Commons Deans beginning with the 1999-2000 academic year. The Dean of Student Affairs Office will continue to deliver those services that will remain centralized, such as advising for international students and the registrar function. During this period of transition, both the Commons Deans and the Dean of Student Affairs offices will need to provide consistent and equitable treatment of students, in an environment in which students will expect that the

high standards of service that have characterized student affairs at Middlebury will be maintained. Our challenge will be to make sure that current standards are uniformly upheld and that all students are treated fairly. Beyond that, some of the current approaches need to be re-examined in order to ensure that students are being taught the skills they need to negotiate their college career, rather than continue the occasional practice of "doing for," rather than "teaching to do." The balance between decentralized autonomy and centralized service needs to be determined, in part through the experience of the first years under the new system. Likewise, as the student body grows in the years ahead, the demands of a larger residential student population need to be assessed in light of the expectations that are placed on the deans for evening and weekend emergency response.

Advising and Registration

Description

Academic advising is centered on the First-Year Seminar Program until students declare a major in their sophomore year and obtain an adviser in their major. The Commons Deans and Associates play a liaison role with the faculty teaching First-Year Seminars, who are their students' academic advisers for the first two or three semesters. Commons-based First-Year Seminars were first offered in the 1998-99 academic year. In the Fall of 1999, two-thirds of the seminars will have a Commons affiliation, with all students in each of these seminars housed in the same Commons.

The Dean of Advising works with the Dean of Student Affairs Office, the Commons Deans, and the Director of the First-Year Seminar Program to prepare the faculty teaching first-year seminars for their advising responsibilities. He teaches a first year seminar annually. The Dean of Advising serves as academic adviser for those first and second year students whose advisors are on leave or have left the faculty. The Dean of Advising also assumes other duties related to the Commons transition.

The Office of Undergraduate Records, housed in the Dean of Student Affairs office, serves as the registrar for the Undergraduate College. (A separate office, organizationally part of the Language Schools, functions as the registrar for the Language Schools, Schools Abroad, and Bread Loaf School of English.) The undergraduate records office has responsibility for academic records, transfer of credit, and issuance of transcripts to B.A. graduates. The registrar's office will remain a centralized function in the new organization. Since the Fall of 1996, course registration has been conducted on the Web using MARS (Middlebury Automated Registration System), replacing the arena-based registration that had been used at Middlebury since the 1960s. Middlebury College has a written policy, stated in the Handbook, regarding the privacy of students' academic and personal records. The Office of Undergraduate Records works closely with the Office of Off-Campus Study on matters involving the transfer of credit from approved programs of off-campus study, the overwhelming majority of which are study abroad programs for all or part of the junior year.

Appraisal and Projection

The Dean of Advising currently has over 100 students for whom he is responsible. The frenetic time prior to registration is when much of the advising takes place. The dean is constructing a plan to assist in the decentralization of services. He projects that he will work with each Commons team about advising issues. Decentralized deaning will provide an opportunity to rethink how we meet the needs of students whose advisors are away. These students' academic advising needs could perhaps be handled through the Commons Deans, which will free the up Dean of Advising to work more closely with the faculty and staff in his advisor training role. A refocus of these responsibilities needs to be undertaken in the future.

The Office of Undergraduate Records is also developing a plan to support the decentralization of student deans. A system has been implemented to allow community members to identify students from the computer directory database by Commons. This will enhance the ease with which the community can refer information to the appropriate Commons Dean office. The MARS registration system has been a big improvement in providing registration opportunities for students, both those on-campus and those studying abroad, despite concerns of some members of the community that it has depersonalized our advising of students.

Services for an Increasingly Diverse Student Body

Description

Within the past ten years, Middlebury has dramatically improved its efforts to recruit and retain students of color and international students. We need to continue to make progress in these areas and to continue to increase our retention and graduation rates for these students, as well as to continue to provide a high level of services to them.

Middlebury has increased its commitment to meeting the needs of international students. We are currently providing a much higher level of assistance for them than in the past. As the number of international students at Middlebury has increased to approximately 10 percent of the student body, services for international students have been an increasing focus for the student deans. These responsibilities will continue to reside in the central Dean of Student Affairs Office. One Associate Dean has principal responsibility for advising international students on immigration and other status matters as well as enhancing their transition to Middlebury College.

A consequence of the increase in international students has been additional requests from these students to provide services for them on a year-round basis. For example, many international students do not travel home during their four years at Middlebury and, due to immigration issues, are not able to work off-campus. This increases the need for College facilities such as residence halls and dining halls to remain

open during breaks to accommodate their needs. The College needs to determine if it will indeed be open year-round and therefore provide full-year services to undergraduate students, or if those services are to be provided on a 10-month basis, with international students expected to leave the campus during the summer.

The Office of the Chaplain has also faced the issues of diversity and the growing presence on campus of students from a wide variety of religious traditions and backgrounds.

Appraisal and Projection

As we continue our efforts to diversify the campus, we need to continue to assess the appropriate level of assistance for international students, students of color, students with disabilities, lesbian and gay students, and other students who have not seen themselves as belonging to the traditional Middlebury mainstream. A college-wide committee on Human Relations presented a comprehensive report to the President in late March 1999, a copy of which is included in the workroom. The recommendations of the committee will be considered carefully in 1999-2000, because they cut across so many aspects of the College's program – academic affairs, residential life, student activities, the dining halls, and athletics, to name only a few.

The chaplain has identified several areas that need attention. They include how to recognize and acknowledge the importance of the Protestant tradition in the history of Middlebury College, while welcoming the diverse religious practices of our current student body. In particular, how may the College maintain the tradition and history of our public academic ceremonies, such as Convocation and Baccalaureate, while recognizing our diversity? We also face issues of how to meet the needs for worship and prayer space raised by a large number of religious bodies on campus. Should the traditional Christian chapel serve the needs of these constituencies, or would an interfaith center in a different location serve the purpose better? An all-campus committee headed by the chaplain is currently reviewing these issues.

Academic Support

Description

The services of the Office of Academic Support are available to all students. This office works with academic departments to offer peer-tutoring services in a wide range of disciplines. It also offers skill development sessions on topics such as time management, study skills, and academic planning, oriented particularly towards first- and second-year students and those with academic deficiencies. A value of the office is cultural sensitivity, and the Director keeps a focus on strategies that will be effective in supporting the success of students of color. The office is responsible for the pre-enrollment program, a three-week program in late August and early September that is designed for students whom the Admissions Office has determined would benefit from an extended

experiential orientation to the College's academic environment, institutional culture, and geographical setting. Attention is given to study skills, and writing and mathematical preparation, as well as the development of leadership qualities and a supportive peer group. Academic support also works intensively, during the academic year, with students who have been placed on warning and academic probation, in an attempt to help these students avoid being suspended or dismissed from Middlebury for academic failure. Finally, academic support has a close working relationship with the Americans for Disabilities Act Office, and the two offices together develop individualized support programs for students who have been identified as having physical and/or learning disabilities.

Appraisal and Projection

The Office of Academic Support is currently developing a model for decentralizing its support of students, and enhancing the opportunities for student success in a manner that is consistent with the decentralized provision of student services. In a recent informal review of data on students who attended the pre-enrollment sessions, there appears to be a positive correlation between academic success and attendance in the program, for students seen to be at risk. There is a need for a more systematic review of the pre-enrollment program, with the goal of determining whether increasing the size of the program could enhance the retention and graduation rates of the students whom it has traditionally served. The Office of Academic Support will also need to consider how best to provide its services to the students in the Posse program, who will have undergone a semester-long program of academic support in New York City before arriving at Middlebury.

Residential Life

Description

Residential life at Middlebury will be undergoing substantial changes in the years ahead, as the enhanced Commons System is implemented. We are moving toward a system in which first-year students are assigned to a Commons at matriculation, and will be expected to remain members of that Commons throughout the remainder of their career. Commons residences housing students from all four classes will replace a system of residential life that includes residence halls housing only first-year students. In order to make the continuing Commons attractive to students, the three large first-year student dormitories (Battell, Stewart, and Allen), where the rooms are now almost all doubles, will need to be renovated in a such a way that there is a higher proportion of singles.

In recent years, increasing numbers of seniors have been granted permission to live off-campus, to the point where 125 full-time seniors will be living off-campus in the Fall of 1999. Over the next few years, we would like to reduce the number of full-time students living off-campus to approximately 60. In order to accomplish this goal, the

College will have to construct new or renovated housing that is attractive to seniors, including suites, living areas, and cooking facilities.

There is a successful system of students serving as advisers in our residence halls. The Office of Residential Life, in consultation with the student deans, selects these students on the basis of a competitive interview process. Junior counselors (JCs) live in the first-year student halls. Each residence hall has at least one resident assistant (RA), a student who is responsible for liaison with the Residential Life office, maintaining adherence to College policies in the hall, and liaison with the Facilities Management Department. Each Commons has two Commons Residential Advisers (CRA), recent graduates appointed for a one- or two-year term who work closely with the faculty associate for their Commons, the Commons Dean, and the Commons Council on co-curricular programming.

In 1990, the Middlebury College Board of Trustees decided to eliminate the all-male fraternities that were then present on the campus and to replace them with co-educational residential social houses. There were five residential fraternities, and one non-residential fraternity, in 1990. Currently, there are five co-educational residential social houses, and one non-residential social house, only three of them descendants of the former fraternities. During the past ten years, two social houses have been indefinitely suspended for disciplinary reasons.

Appraisal and Projection

The College began a systematic program of residence hall renovation in the mid-1980s. Over the past 15 years, all of the residence halls have been renovated, with the exception of the three first-year dorms mentioned above and Forest Hall, a large dormitory housing mostly seniors. These four buildings will be renovated as part of the development of the new Commons System. Additional housing for 150 to 200 students will also be provided on campus over the next decade, in order to accommodate the planned growth in the student body. An increase in beds on campus will also provide us housing for students while residence hall renovations are under way. Finally, the new housing will also permit us to reduce the number of seniors living off-campus in the town of Middlebury.

Student residential leaders are serving the college well in their important roles. They undergo a week's training at the start of the academic year, including meetings with the Deans and Commons Associates, discussions with security and custodial staff, and NCBI training on diversity and cultural difference. The student staff report that this training has helped increase their sensitivity and provide them with information about available resources.

The new Commons System will create a need to reassess the staffing levels for the residence halls and to reconfigure some of the student support roles. A current challenge for the residential life staff is meeting the needs of the present generation of students, as

the student enrollment has increased to the point where we are operating at full capacity, with almost no empty rooms available for responding to crisis and problem situations. Although every attempt has been made to hold enrollment to reasonable levels, the unpredictable nature of some students' study abroad and leave plans, as well as a reduction in the number of seniors seeking part-time or "special student" status, have made the college subject to some inconsistent levels of enrollment. This has resulted in crowding on campus, and the need to increase the numbers of students living off-campus, or be housed in on-campus lounges and other temporary housing accommodations. These issues require careful cooperation across sectors - with input from residential life, the financial offices, and admissions, in order to stabilize enrollment and reduce the feeling some students have that they are being "packed in."

The role of the social houses and academic interest houses is being reviewed in light of the new Commons System. The presence of the social houses at Middlebury poses continuing challenges, ranging from their integration into the Commons System, issues surrounding rush and pledging activities, and the inability of some houses to attract enough members to fill all the beds in the building to which they have been assigned. Issues surrounding the social houses took up the most time during faculty consideration of the enhanced Commons System. While the tendency to make sweeping generalizations on this subject should be avoided, many faculty see the social houses as incompatible with the College's mission, while many students would like the social houses to remain as a source of alternative social programming and leadership opportunities.

Student Activities

Description

More than 100 student clubs and organizations are present on the Middlebury campus. These groups range in focus from academic and cultural organizations, to club sports and outdoor activities, community service, media and publications, programming boards, religious groups, student governing boards and committees, special interest groups, and visual and performing arts groups. The Student Government Association (SGA) has a process by which new groups can seek to be approved as recognized student organizations. Recognized organizations are eligible for funding from the SGA, through its Finance Committee that administers the mandatory Student Activities Fee (\$190 per student in 1999-00). The Student Activities Office provides administrative support for these student organizations and also provides support for the McCullough Student Center, the Student Employment Program, and the Volunteer Services program, the latter an area in which Middlebury students have especially distinguished themselves in recent years. The Student Activities Office also oversees all-campus programming, activities, and events, such as Winter Carnival, May Days, Septemberfest, and large concerts and events. The goal of the programming board is to provide programs that appeal to the increasingly diverse student population. Additional services overseen by Student Activities include the Bicentennial Literacy Project, student leadership and development programs including

a workshop series on "emerging leaders," pre-orientation trips and late-night and alcohol-free social programming. The Student Activities Office also oversees the Campus Compact, a volunteer network for the state of Vermont. The addition of the Grille in the student center has provided new opportunities for programming for the campus and social interaction for the community.

Appraisal and Projection

The rural location of Middlebury places many demands on the College to provide opportunities for students to have a rich and rewarding extracurricular life. The College's offerings of activities and events are extensive. There is definitely a culture among students that they can present and organize successful events week after week throughout the academic year. How to manage all of these activities and opportunities is a challenge. The Student Affairs staff and the Student Center Planning Committee will need to define the role of the "Mid-Town" Student Center, while still fostering a rich and significant life in the Commons.

Health and Safety Services

Description

The Campus Security Department has many functions: maintaining a safe and secure environment on campus; enforcement of student disciplinary regulations, particularly those involving alcohol consumption at parties and in public spaces in the residence halls; and parking enforcement. In recent years, the students have asked that the resources devoted to safety and security be increased, and the College has responded. Emergency telephones have been installed in all campus parking lots, and the staffing of the security department has been increased so there are two people on patrol on nearly all shifts. The issue of locking the outside residence hall doors remains, since the undergraduates have been strongly opposed to a locked-door policy during the academic year. The residence hall doors are locked at night during the summer Language Schools.

The Student Health Center is open 24 hours a day during the academic year. The center is staffed by registered nurses at all times, with a physician and a nurse practitioner available for consultation during regular weekday hours. The College has a long-standing relationship with the Porter Medical Center, and students whose medical needs cannot be met at the Health Center are treated at Porter.

The Counseling and Human Relations Center has a staff of two full-time and one part-time professionals who offer short-term counseling, crisis intervention, a range of educational mental health programs, and referrals to other professional therapists in the community. In addition to private consultations, they sponsor group work, train residential staff, and serve a consultant role to students and staff. They have a consulting relationship with the Addison County Counseling Services in town, and the College contracts psychiatric hours through that service. The counseling center also employs the

services of a part-time nutritionist who works with students on eating issues.

The Office of Health and Wellness Education is primarily engaged in educational and prevention efforts, but also employs intervention strategies in response to individuals and groups who are engaging in self-defeating and unhealthy behaviors. The Office of Health and Wellness Education actively promotes the health and well-being of our student body through health education programs including: training for student residence hall staff leaders; campus-wide presentations on topics such as eating disorders, substance abuse, rape, sexual harassment, and sexual health; small group discussions; workshops; academic courses, and one-on-one meetings with students. In addition, the Director of Health Education provides consultation to other staff and faculty on campus regarding substance abuse, eating disorders, etc. The Office of Health Education is staffed by one full-time Director, who also conducts institutional research on topics such as alcohol abuse and incidence of eating disorders in our student population. Prevention programs aimed at reducing negative outcomes from drinking are showing positive results. One example of an educational effort this past year was an Alcohol Symposium, held in the Fall of 1998, which was attended by many students, faculty, and staff on campus. This symposium included a series of lectures, panel discussions, and presentations on a wide range of topics related to alcohol.

Appraisal and Projection

Issues associated with alcohol and drug use and abuse continue to be actively addressed by Middlebury College. We have undertaken many new initiatives within the past few years, including an all-campus alcohol symposium with national experts in the Fall of 1998 and a June 1999 conference with secondary school administrators and parents focusing on joint school-college efforts to address student binge drinking. The Director of Health Education has surveyed the student body twice within the past five years to assess students' level of alcohol use and consequences of this use for individuals in the community. As a result of this effort, many initiatives have been undertaken, including forging collaborative relationships with officials in the town, communicating with students more frequently and directly about these issues through orientation, correspondence, information in student newspapers, and increased conversations. Substance-free housing options have increased. The development and the inclusion of mandatory educational sessions in disciplinary situations involving drug and alcohol issues have also been instituted. New initiatives focused on changing student culture, and therefore affecting the drinking norms, are showing some initial successes. A team of student affairs staff meets frequently to plan initiatives. This is an area in which the college has made some significant gains, including the demonstration of reduction in negative outcomes resulting from alcohol use, such as drunken driving and high-risk sexual behaviors. But this is also an area which will require long-term attention and a continued team approach.

The Health Center is faced with some key questions for the immediate future. We have increased the number of students in the student population, and they have increased medical needs. We need to make an assessment about the appropriate number of beds to

have for a student population of 2,350. We also need to address the strain on staff, as demands increase for services.

The Counseling Center has seen an increase in the number of students who are entering college with psychological and psychiatric needs. This has meant an increase in the needs for both service and emergency response. The center is currently reviewing its staffing needs and devising a comprehensive plan for alignment with the Commons and providing services that respond to the increasing demands of students.

The Office of Health and Wellness Education continues to face increased student demand in terms of health education and wellness programming and services. This has put a significant amount of stress on this one-person office, and the Director is currently reviewing staffing needs. The Director has also forged an alliance with several departments on campus, including the Athletic Department, and is also providing training and services to faculty as well. The Director has been working with the Athletic Department and the residential life staff to develop programs on wellness which are inter-departmental and thus increase the educational level on campus.

Career Services

Description

The Career Services Office (CSO) has energetically established many new programs in the past two years, with the Web playing an increasingly important part in CSO's delivery of services to students, both on- and off-campus. While the bulk of the office's resources are devoted to seniors and recent graduates, the office's programming has focused recently on initiating contact and providing resources for first-years, sophomores, and juniors. Career Services administers the College's growing internship program, which now sees more than 160 students doing for-credit Winter Term internships each January. The office also administers the Ronald H. Brown Internship program, which offers a stipend to a limited number of juniors completing a summer internship. The Career Services Office plays an important role in one of the peaks - real world experiences in the liberal arts - and has established a close working relationship with the Geonomics Center for International Studies, the international studies program, and the environmental studies program to support internships and post-baccalaureate opportunities in those peaks. The staff has traveled nationally and internationally to develop a strong network of internship, employment, and mentoring opportunities. They have also cultivated a worldwide alumni network called MiddNet.

Appraisal and Projection

The Career Services Office has seen significant growth and change in its staff over the past few years. Throughout this period of development, the staff has continued to provide excellent service to students. Progress made within this area has been noteworthy. The CSO calendar, job postings, and recruiting information were made

available online in August 1998. The entire "employers recruiting students" process will be online by September 1999. Students are also able to access a Web-based alumni directory, which searches the database based on a number of factors including major, occupation, and geographic area, and with the implementation of "Version 2.0," students will be able to search for alumni and parents by employer, class range, graduate school, language school, and other criteria. The number of internship postings (housed on InternCenter, CSO's online internship database) has increased tremendously, from a start of 1,500 listings to now over 10,000 listings. Further growth and expansion of the internship program is currently in progress. Lastly, the majority of the staff of the Career Services Office has turned over in the past year. We are nearing the end of the process of recruiting a new staff team to provide continually high-level career services for students and alumni.

Athletics

Description

Middlebury has an active intercollegiate athletics program. Competition is offered in 16 women's sports and 14 men's sports. A total of 871 students -- 466 men and 405 women -- were members of intercollegiate teams in the 1998-99 academic year. Of this total group, 101 (79 two-sport and 22 three-sport) are students who participated in more than one intercollegiate team. Middlebury College also has an active club sport program with a number of competitive programs including men's and women's rowing, men's and women's rugby, men's and women's ultimate Frisbee, men's and women's sailing, and cricket. Approximately 330 students participated in these clubs. Additionally, there is an active intramural program with 25 different activities, which include men's, women's, and coed teams. Finally, all students are required to demonstrate proficiency in two lifetime sports, wellness, or other activity as part of degree requirements. The College's athletic facilities have been extensively expanded and modernized over the past decade, with construction of a new fitness center, natatorium, football/lacrosse stadium, and ice arena. Student athletes are not only successful on the playing fields, but also in the classroom.

Appraisal and Projection

The Athletic Department enjoys tremendous support from students, parents, and alumni. Probably the most pressing issue in athletics is one being faced by all the colleges in NESCAC (New England Small College Athletic Conference): the extent to which teams from these institutions may participate in post-season play. This is an issue that is being debated by the NESCAC presidents, and students at the NESCAC colleges have formed an alliance to discuss this issue as well. The Athletic Department has fully complied with the gender equity issues that need to be addressed. It is projected that in the future, it may be advisable to add one full-time coach to the athletic staff. The department has increased its racial diversity, and the athletic director has worked with staff to develop an appreciation for diversity. The Athletic Master Plan has laid out in a

comprehensive manner the long-term plan for the development of the facilities. One decision to be made in the future is to determine whether to upgrade and/or replace the Fletcher Field House. Another issue to address will be the need for the expansion of field space.

The Athletic Department has also initiated discussions as to whether its programs should incorporate a more systematic emphasis on wellness--a direction that the department has already started to follow. The Director of Athletics has worked in close collaboration with the Director of Health Education and Wellness to offer a greater focus on these issues. An informal committee is working on a proposal for refocusing the physical education requirement to one that encourages lifetime health and fitness. Other issues which need to be addressed in the future include funding for spring sports trips, the transportation and vans for away games, and with the "aging" of the staff, the need for rejuvenation and professional development. Finally, the intertwining of the intramural program with the new Commons System is a priority for the near term.

STANDARD SEVEN LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Description

Library

The Middlebury College Libraries consist of four units. By far the largest is the main library, Starr Library. The central section of Starr Library was constructed in 1900, and additions were opened in 1927, 1960, and 1979. There are two branch libraries on the main campus, the Music Library in the Center for the Arts and the Science Library in Bicentennial Hall. The Davison Library on the Bread Loaf campus operates only during the summer, during the sessions of the Bread Loaf School of English and the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference.

The collections of the Middlebury College Libraries are designed to support the College's undergraduate liberal arts program, plus the summer graduate programs in foreign languages and English literature. Since more than 60 percent of Middlebury undergraduates now write a senior thesis or essay, a substantial portion of the library's collection and human resources are devoted to supporting seniors in their independent projects.

The College Librarian is a voting member of the faculty, and reports to the Secretary of the College. Curriculum vitae of the librarians may be found in the visiting committee's workroom, along with copies of the library's annual report for recent years.

The following paragraphs summarize major developments in the Middlebury College Libraries over the past decade:

Facilities Planning. The 1992 Ten-Year Planning Committee recognized that Starr Library would need to be expanded and renovated within the next decade. A Library Planning Committee was appointed in Spring 1995 to begin exploring the issues associated with the Starr project. That committee submitted its report in September 1995. (A copy of the report is in the visiting committee's workroom). The committee was reconstituted and expanded in September 1997, and submitted a preliminary program for the expansion and renovation of Starr to the Board of Trustees in December 1998. In May 1999, the Board of Trustees engaged the architectural firm of Gwathmey Siegel and Associates to develop a detailed program and design for the Starr Library renovation and expansion. The Starr project should be completed by June 2003. During the construction period, the library will be moved to the old Science Center, which will be renovated into a temporary facility known as the "Storrs Avenue Library." The new Music Library in the Center for the Arts opened in October 1992. The Bicentennial Hall Library, a new science branch, opened in September 1999.

Standard 7: Library and Information Resources

Acquisitions. The budgets for the acquisition of books, periodicals, and on-line resources have been the fastest-growing budgets in the academic area during the 1990s, having increased by 102 per cent from fiscal year 1989 to fiscal year 1999. Even in spite of this growth, the materials acquisition budget has not kept pace with journal subscription cost increases. Thus, over the past decade, there has been a shift in acquisitions resources, of about 4 per cent, from books to journals. Journals now represent 54 per cent of the acquisitions budgets for the Middlebury libraries. While this percentage is below that of most research libraries, and some liberal arts college libraries, we continue to be concerned about journal price escalation. The disciplines under the most subscription cost pressure are the natural sciences, mathematics, psychology, and economics, where many journals are published by for-profit firms, rather than by learned societies. Development of the collection depends on a partnership of faculty and librarians. Thus, the collection is uneven across the curriculum, because of some areas in which faculty have been less active in making selections for acquisitions.

Additional acquisitions funds have been provided since 1997 for “peak” areas where new faculty positions have been added, especially in international studies and environmental studies. There has also been a reallocation of funds during the past decade in order to permit electronic access to on-line journals and reference sources such as Lexis-Nexis, JSTOR, and Project Muse. We have been able to reduce the fees for some of these services through shared licensing with other libraries in Vermont, or with other libraries in the “Oberlin Group” consortium of liberal arts colleges.

Education of the community about library resources. There has been a marked expansion in reference, bibliographical instruction, library instruction on electronic resources, and use of the Web for library purposes during the 1990s. This is related to the growth in senior theses and essays, first-year seminars, and other courses with collaborative writing and research assignments. Web-based subject guides are now available for all disciplines. The reference librarians have been assigned to work with faculty in particular areas of the curriculum. Within the past year, appointments have been made to the positions of Foreign Languages and International Studies Librarian, and Science Librarian. Over the past decade extensive collaboration has developed between the instructional technology staff in Information Technology Services (ITS) and the reference library staff.

Library technology. New hardware for the library central system was purchased in August 1996. Our software vendor, DRA, continues to maintain and enhance the system. Most library services are now available in Web-based format. We have provided improvements in patron records and electronic access to those records. New technology-based services have included networked interlibrary loans, and adoption of new network access to the On-Line Computer Library Center (OCLC) for interlibrary loan and cataloging purposes. Desktop computing equipment in the library has been regularly upgraded for staff and patron use. Starr Library now has two computer-equipped classrooms, there are a dozen public workstations in the Music Library, and there is a

computer classroom in the new Science Library in Bicentennial Hall. The expanded and renovated Starr Library will have several new computer classrooms.

Computing Services

The organization of computing services at Middlebury College has undergone considerable change during the decade since the last reaccreditation. In 1990, there were separate departments of Administrative Data Processing (reporting to the Treasurer) and Academic Computing (reporting to the Vice President for Academic Affairs). Although both departments were located in the same building, they had little communication with each other, and worked together on few projects. Technical standards for central systems, desktop systems, e-mail, and networking differed considerably between the two organizations.

A Task Force on Information Technology, made up of senior administrators, was appointed by President McCardell in 1993 to study the organization of the College's information technology services. This task force submitted its report in February 1994 (a copy is available in the visiting committee's workroom); its principal recommendation was that a Chief Information Officer be recruited. This position was filled in October 1994, and existed, under various titles, until June 1997. It was replaced with an Acting Director of Information Technology Services, who has become a regular Director. The main differences between the two positions are that the CIO/VPIT had responsibility for the Library as well as ITS, and reported to the President, while the Director of ITS reports to the Provost. A Trustee Technology Subcommittee (a subcommittee of the Board's Educational Affairs Committee) was established in 1995-96.

A campus-wide Information Technology Services organization was established on July 1, 1995. ITS subsumed the formerly separate Academic Computing and Administrative Data Processing organizations, and also included Media Services (previously part of the Language Schools), Telephone Services (previously part of the business offices), and the Scheduling Office (previously part of Facilities Management). When the Center for Educational Technology was established in 1997, ITS assumed support for summer Language Schools programs, and eventually the Schools Abroad, which for the previous 4 years had been handled by dedicated staff in the Language Schools.

Shortly after the establishment of ITS, a single person was designated to have oversight and planning responsibility for all campus-wide networking connecting campus buildings. The establishment of campus-wide networking standards enabled the campus-wide network to be extended to all academic and administrative buildings by Fall 1996, with fiber linking all buildings on campus, and upgraded internal wiring installed to all offices, classrooms, and residence hall rooms. The network has sufficient expansion capability for the foreseeable future, although more attention needs to be paid to building in redundancy and capability for disaster recovery. The fiber

network that has been installed has sufficient capacity for video transmission over fiber and higher speed transmission to offices, classrooms, and dormitory rooms. However, significant upgrades of network electronics will be required for high speed data and video transmission. Planning for appropriate resource allocation over a multi-year period needs to be ongoing in order to insure that we continue to be able to take advantage of the resources of our network infrastructure for both academic and administrative purposes.

Another challenge facing the new ITS was the implementation of a uniform system of e-mail to serve all campus groups. This has largely been accomplished for faculty and staff on the Vermont campus, although the support of e-mail for Bread Loaf and the Schools Abroad is more complex, in part because not all of the Schools Abroad have an Internet connection. However, largely by design, students are not on the same e-mail system as faculty and staff. Electronic transmission of documents is not seamless across desktop computers. This last problem should be remedied by 2000, when all desktop computers will be able to use the latest versions of office software.

A Computing and Network Services unit was established within ITS in Spring 1997. The goal of this unit was to reorganize computer services to achieve full coordination of all desktop budgeting, purchasing, software, maintenance, support, education, and training for both Windows and Macintosh computers. These goals have largely been accomplished. While Middlebury continues to support both Windows and Macintosh computers on the desktop, a far higher proportion of desktop machines run on Windows today than was the case a decade ago. As older Macs have come due for replacement, there has been a general transition from Macs to PCs in both administrative and academic departments. We remain willing to support Macs in areas such as the Language Schools, and for faculty with specialized needs.

The following paragraphs identify some of the major issues facing information services at Middlebury:

User support and training. There has been a substantial increase in the ITS staff devoted to user education and training in the 1990s. There are now dedicated Computing Services staff for training, for documentation, and for the help desk. An Instructional Technology unit has been created within ITS to provide direct support to faculty in using technology in the curriculum; positions exist for Sciences and Languages, with a goal of adding staff for Humanities/Arts/Literature and Social Sciences. However, the pace of technological change has accelerated, requiring many users to expend more effort to keep up with change. Some faculty and staff users are more comfortable than others with self-education. ITS is considering models for distributed computing support across campus; this will likely require redefinition of staffing responsibilities in a number of college departments over time.

Budgeting for equipment replacement. The College provides computing equipment to all members of the faculty and administrative staff who demonstrate a

need for such equipment. Existing equipment being replaced by newer equipment is sometimes used for this purpose. Budget adjustments in recent years have enabled the replacement cycle to be reduced from five years to between three and four years. The shorter cycle is appropriate for replacing rapidly changing desktop computing equipment. Continuing a relatively short replacement cycle will require multi-year budget planning to ensure that appropriate resources are available for regular computer replacements.

Upgrading classrooms to include instructional technology equipment. Many new classrooms and labs including computers were opened in the 1990s: 3 Interactive Learning Centers in Sunderland, upgraded Munroe 214, Science Center 401, Ballou computer science lab in Warner, Library computer classrooms, Voter Hall classrooms, GIS and cartography labs in Warner, Old Chapel seminar rooms, mini-labs in Geonomics and Gifford, and classrooms with computers and projection equipment in Warner and Twilight, and many technologically-equipped and technologically-capable classrooms in Bicentennial Hall. However, the demand for technology-equipped rooms may soon outstrip resources, and ITS needs to participate actively in academic facilities planning.

Incorporating a user perspective into technology planning. The Ten-Year Planning Committee recommended in May 1992 that the Computer Committee be reorganized to include all campus-wide computing groups and a number of students. The committee was reorganized in 1992-93 along the lines recommended in May 1992. A revised mission statement for the committee (available in the workroom) was adopted in May 1996. Since the creation of Information Technology Services in 1995, this committee became advisory only, with no decision-making or budget-prioritizing functions. Starting in Fall 1999, the former Computer Committee and Library Committee have been folded in to a single Information Services Committee. The charge for this committee is available in the workroom. In spite of these changes in organizational form, the challenge of ensuring community input into major technology decisions remains. Users tend not to come to open meetings, but they complain when decisions are announced with which they disagree. Planning takes place either internally, through ITS reviews, or through specialized task forces appointed by the administration. ITS itself was in "maintenance mode" from June 1997 through early 1999 due to its being led by an acting director. With this directorship having been regularized, technology planning for a longer time horizon will become more systematic and the definition and role of advisory and policy groups will be recast.

Administrative Information Systems review. The most pressing issue involving central computing systems at Middlebury is providing enhanced access to administrative information resources for decision support as well as transaction processing. Most, but not all, administrative systems at the College are "home-grown" programs developed by Middlebury staff to run on the College's AS/400 administrative computer. Software from third-party vendors is used in External Affairs to support the Bicentennial Campaign, and for some other specialized applications. A task force on

administrative computing (Project MINERVA) was appointed in the Fall of 1998 to review the College's approach to administrative computing and to recommend whether changes in that approach – particularly moving from a “build” to a “buy” philosophy – should be implemented. A copy of the first report of the MINERVA task force is included in the visiting committee's workroom. Following on this report, a more systematic evaluation of the “build” and “buy” options will be undertaken in the 1999-2000 academic year.

Appraisal and Projections

We have identified the following issues in the library and information services area as ones that should be priorities for further study, evaluation, and action in the years ahead:

1. Establishing a more systematic planning process, covering programmatic, budgetary, and staffing issues, for both library and information services. Substantial attention has been devoted to planning new library spaces in recent years, and this attention has necessarily involved programmatic as well as physical resource issues. The library and the academic administration should consider ways in which the library can be “kept in the loop” more closely, so that the library is able to keep pace with the expansion and enhancement of the College's academic programs, primarily in the undergraduate program, but in the Language School and Bread Loaf programs as well.

Planning for Information Technology Services has, in recent years, been driven primarily by budget and technological considerations, rather than programmatic needs. Now that a regular director of ITS is in place, a mechanism should be developed for forward-looking programmatic planning, most likely on a moving three-year cycle, that will enable anticipation of technological changes and their impact on the College's program, as well as developing links between ITS and innovative departments in both the academic and administrative areas. This programmatic planning should be linked to the development of a multi-year budget plan for the replacement and upgrade of desktop, classroom, and central systems, as well as the College's network and technological electronics and other infrastructure.

Both the Library Planning Committee and the Administrative Computing Review Committee (MINERVA project) have been broadly-based committees. These committees have served a valuable function in providing a forum in which discussions of library and information services issues can take place across departmental lines. We should consider ways in which these committees could continue their work, in a modified way, after the specific tasks for which they were originally appointed have been completed.

2. Supporting technology as a catalyst of innovation for both faculty and staff. The College must consider how best to support innovations in pedagogy, involving the incorporation of technology into redesigned courses, as the external funding that has supported much of this activity in recent years becomes less available. We must also

consider how best to provide training and support for faculty, students, and staff in the use of technology to support digital and multimedia applications. The programs in support of innovation need to be developed in the context of the evolution of staff positions in the Library and ITS that will necessarily take place in the years ahead. The College should consider establishing explicit expectations for training in the use of technology for all staff positions at the institution, so that members of the College staff may continue developing their skill sets.

3. *Addressing needs for ITS and other technology space on campus.* Many Library space needs will have been addressed over the decade since the Ten-Year Plan was issued in May 1992: new branch libraries (Music and Science), and a substantially enlarged and renovated Starr. ITS is operating in basically the same space today that it occupied 15 years ago, even though there has been a substantial expansion in demand for its services from faculty, staff, and students. Long-term space needs for technology services need to be addressed as part of the College's overall facilities plan. Even if computing services are provided in a more distributed fashion, the three floors of Voter Hall now occupied by ITS will not provide sufficient space for the campus' long-term technology needs. Mechanisms need to be established for more systematic space and program planning for technology services, and ITS needs to be more intensively involved in planning for academic space. Consideration should also be given to accelerating the pace of building new electronic classrooms, and renovating existing classrooms for such purposes, since faculty demand for high-quality, technologically-equipped teaching spaces exceeds the supply of such rooms.

4. *Increasing and enhancing communication and dialogue between the Library and ITS.* Integration of the Library and ITS into a single organization is neither necessary or appropriate for Middlebury at this time in the College's development. Neither organization is now facing a crisis, and both have very full agendas. The attention of the Library needs to be devoted to building planning and keeping pace with, if not anticipating, curricular growth and development. ITS, after coping with near-term Year 2000 issues, must devote its attention to issues such as refining computing support (especially for those student services departments that will be moving to a decentralized Commons environment), a possible substantial redesign of administrative information systems, and enhancement of the College's instructional technology program.

The communication that has developed between the Library and ITS in recent years should be supported and enhanced. It may be useful to establish a "summit-level" campus-wide technology and information planning group, including members of the senior administration who can be advocates for technology throughout the institution, to facilitate and follow up on these conversations. This group could be derived from the existing Library Planning and MINERVA committees. "Lateral communications" between the library and ITS should be encouraged, so that staff may learn from one another. One of the results of this greater emphasis on communications will be a recognition that Middlebury's library and technology organizations are not so much "islands" separate from each other, but "bubbles" that touch one another. To continue the

Standard 7: Library and Information Resources

analogy, the administration must be vigilant that the “bubbles” are not pressed so hard that they burst.

STANDARD EIGHT PHYSICAL RESOURCES

Description

The physical plant at Middlebury College has undergone substantial expansion and renovation over the past ten years, with even more growth and renovations of space planned for the next decade. New buildings opened since 1990 include the Center for the Arts, four new residential houses on the western ridge of campus, and three additions to the athletic complex - the fitness center, the natatorium, and the ice rink (Kenyon Arena). Major renovations completed since 1990 include the McCullough Student Center and Grille (actually two separate projects, one completed in 1991, the second in 1998), Old Chapel (the College's principal administrative building), and renovated office spaces for the External Affairs departments and the Dean of Students Office. A major campus infrastructure project completed in the past decade involved the extension of a fiber-optic data network to all campus buildings, so that all offices, many classrooms, and all student residence hall rooms are now connected to the campus network and the Internet.

As of Fall 1999, several important construction projects are recently completed or in the planning stage. The largest academic building ever built by Middlebury College, Bicentennial Hall, our new interdisciplinary science center, opened for classes in September 1999. The old Science Center will be converted to a temporary library during the 1999-2000 academic year so that Starr Library may be vacated for an expansion and renovation project that will entail increasing the size of the library by approximately 75 per cent and making it a much more technologically-enhanced building. Substantial renovations to College dining facilities will be undertaken in order to support the decentralized dining that is an essential feature of the enhanced Commons System. Additional renovations to the residence halls will be required to support programmatic elements of the Commons System such as a decentralized system of Commons Deans and Commons-based reading rooms and classrooms, with housing for faculty associates being constructed for some of the Commons. New or renovated space near McCullough Student Center will be used to support the relocation of those student activities and student services that should be provided in a central campus "downtown" that will be anchored by McCullough and the renovated and expanded Starr Library. As the student population grows over the next decade, additional residence hall space will be added to accommodate the additional students, and to enable a reduction in the number of seniors living off-campus. Further renovations to the athletic complex, particularly involving the Fletcher Field House, are planned for the years ahead as funding for those projects is obtained.

The College administration has developed a multi-year facilities planning process in conjunction with the planned growth in the size of the institution and the transition to the enhanced Commons System. An important part of this process was the engagement of Wallace, Floyd and Associates, a Boston architectural firm with long experience in

Standard 8: Physical Resources

campus planning, as the College's executive architects. Wallace, Floyd developed a campus master plan and a set of guidelines for individual building projects, and these guidelines are used by architects in siting and designing individual capital projects. Copies of the master plan and guidelines are available in the visiting committee's workroom.

A long-term plan for the construction and renovation of space is reviewed, revised, and presented to the Trustees annually, and the Board reviews the financial assumptions underlying this plan. Major new construction and renovation projects are reviewed by either the full Board or its Buildings and Grounds committee at several steps in the process: the completion of a program for the project, the hiring of an architect, and the completion of design.

An Office of Facilities Planning, headed by an executive vice president, was established in the Summer of 1999. In addition to the executive vice president, this office includes the director of academic facilities planning and the director of institutional research and analysis. This office works closely with the Board of Trustees, the academic administration and faculty, the student affairs administration, the financial offices, and the College's construction managers to enable earlier and more consistent integration of both programmatic and financial considerations in the planning and construction of new and renovated space on campus. The Office of Facilities Planning is also responsible for liaison with the town and state governments on permitting and other regulatory issues associated with the College's many building projects.

Other administrative offices established in the past decade that have an impact on the College's physical resources include the Safety Office, the ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Office, and the Environmental Coordinator. These offices have insured, among other things, that the College's design and operation of spaces complies with applicable legal requirements and that facilities operations are carried out with an emphasis on conservation, resource recovery, and recycling.

The total amount of square feet on the Middlebury campus has increased from 1,340,000 in 1989-1990 to 1,660,000 in 1999-2000. The average annual cost of maintaining and operating this space over the past decade has been \$4.86 per square foot. During this period we have installed new computer-controlled energy management systems, have renovated buildings with an eye to energy efficiency, and have increased productivity in custodial and other facilities management operations.

Issues of parking and pedestrian and vehicular circulation continue to be the subject of much lively discussion and debate on campus. The master plan calls for a significant step toward a "pedestrian campus" to be made by removing traffic and parking from Old Chapel Road, which is currently the central artery of the campus for both vehicles and pedestrians. Although the campus has continued to expand on the periphery, with buildings such as Bicentennial Hall, the western ridge residences, and the new ice arena, there is currently no agreement in the community on the need for a campus

transportation system, to reduce the number of individual vehicle trips taken from one location on campus to another.

In addition to the main campus in Middlebury, Vermont, the College also has major facilities in the Green Mountains, 12 to 15 miles east of the town of Middlebury. The Bread Loaf School of English and the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference meet at the Bread Loaf Mountain Campus in Ripton, Vermont from mid-June through mid-August, with the Bread Loaf facility being used in the spring and fall as housing for parents, alumni, and friends at Commencement, Reunions, Fall Family Weekends, and Homecoming, and for conferences on those weekends when no College events are scheduled. Bread Loaf is the home of the College's cross-country skiing center in the winter. The Middlebury College Snow Bowl, located in Hancock, Vermont, just a few miles from Bread Loaf, provides facilities for recreational and competitive skiing to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and members of the Middlebury and Addison County community.

Middlebury's Schools Abroad and non-Vermont Bread Loaf programs are housed in rented facilities, some of which include classrooms (in those programs in which instruction is provided on-site), others of which include only office space (in those programs in which students enroll directly in a local university). The College owns apartments in Paris and Mainz for the use of the directors of the Schools in France and Germany.

Appraisal and Projection

In October 1998, the Middlebury College Board of Trustees adopted "Phase I" of the College's facilities plan and the enhanced residential life system, thus creating a new framework for physical resources development at Middlebury College—the Enhanced Residential Plan. The major goal of the new system is to create a more seamless educational environment for our students—a residential system that supports more completely the academic, social, and intellectual development of students. It is with this educational philosophy in mind that all physical resources planning and development now take place at Middlebury College.

The physical resources subcommittee of the reaccreditation steering committee reviewed Middlebury College's Ten-Year Planning Document of May 8, 1992, and concluded that we have made significant progress toward fulfilling the recommendations outlined in the Space, Grounds, and Physical Facilities section of that document. Further, we believe that the 1992 principles and goals remain valid, and that the College should continue to develop and implement systems that uphold these principles and target these goals.

In light of the Enhanced Residential Plan and the Ten-Year Planning Document, the physical resources subcommittee concluded that Middlebury College should give particular consideration to the following issues.

Physical resources planning. Due to a great number of current and upcoming major construction projects, the College should increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the building and development process that includes an appropriate hierarchical system for the effective operation of review and feedback loops. In the Fall of 1998, the College administration created the Project Review Committee to provide guidance to the facilities development process. The committee's role is to create a standard of environmental quality for the College that it considers with each new and renovation project. For each major project in the facilities plan, the administration will appoint *ad hoc* committees that will help guide the planning process; the composition of these committees is to be broadly representative. It is our hope that this new planning and review process will create a more effective method than previously existed to reach a very important goal defined in The Ten-Year Planning Document: "To ensure that future users of new or renovated facilities and the space around them are involved and actively consulted at all stages of planning, design, and construction." The establishment of the new Facilities Planning office in the Summer of 1999 will also help in the attainment of this goal.

Construction impact on students. The commitment to enhance the College's infrastructure should not be carried out at the expense of current students' educational experience. In planning and carrying out construction, we should fully consider and attempt to minimize disruptions experienced by all Middlebury students—both those who study during the academic year and those who attend the summer language schools.

Preserving campus ambiance and community. Although there exists a strong interest in reducing motorized vehicular traffic on campus, the College is faced with a potential conflict arising from competing goals. The campus master plan calls for (1) an expansion of the campus footprint in order to increase square footage, (2) a reduction in vehicular traffic, and (3) maintenance of "green" space. Recent experience has shown that as the campus grows in size, vehicular traffic increases, and the aesthetic and functional value of "green" space is diluted. As a result, the institution's defining ambiance has been threatened.

A further challenge to campus ambiance is created by technological developments in communication. These new technologies enable individuals to work, conduct research, communicate and even renew library books electronically—without having to leave their offices or rooms. As a result, we run the risk of each person becoming increasingly isolated. Therefore, the College should consider creating by design more places where people can meet and interact directly instead of electronically in order to secure the sense of community the College has long cherished. These goals are particularly important in the design of the new Commons, the "Mid-Town" campus center, and the expanded and renovated Starr Library.

In light of the goals of the Enhanced Residential Plan, we should consider designing spaces and links, or travel-ways, throughout campus with the intention of creating interaction, exchange, intersection, and integration rather than separation and

isolation. Further, to move toward the “pedestrian campus” defined in the master plan, building construction and/or remodeling should attempt to encourage pedestrian over vehicular access through the deliberate design of systems associated with new construction and renovation on campus. Further, we should not limit our transportation options to foot and car, but also consider the potential for a wide variety of alternative forms of transportation on campus (e.g. tunnel system, bicycles, gondolas, parking garage, remote parking, shuttle bus).

Beauty of place is an important quality of the Middlebury College experience. As we expand, attention should be given to maintaining beauty in both natural and man-made areas on campus. The College should consider adopting guidelines for construction that promote and highlight the campus’s traditional architecture, natural beauty, and communal spirit. Structures should be built on a scale that is welcoming rather than overpowering. New construction should cultivate a respect for beauty and history, and venture to inspire our students to carry this respect with them through life.

In 1994, the Board of Trustees mandated the Committee on Art in Public Places at Middlebury College. A copy of the 1998 CAPP Report and Mandate is in the visiting committee’s workroom. We should consider reviewing and evaluating whether the strategic objectives and goals of this program are being fully considered and met in regard to all physical resources and public places at Middlebury.

Space usage. Middlebury College should consider maximizing its sophisticated physical resources by identifying what percentage of academic and co-curricular space is currently utilized. Where excess space capacity exists, we should determine how it might best be used. We should cultivate an institutional culture that encourages multiple uses rather than a single use for designated spaces. Finally, we should promote the use of existing systems designed to increase efficiency of space usage, such as the World Wide Web reservation system, through system refinement and user education.

Space needs. In light of Middlebury’s move toward “college as university,” we should consider developing and enhancing the College’s facilities for conference and co-curricular activities, including those offered by the Center for Educational Technology. Based on interest and financial considerations, we should refine and develop facilities to accommodate enhanced programs that cater to non-credit education programs, such as an expanded Alumni College and family-oriented programs.

Gathering spaces. As recommended by the faculty subcommittee of the reaccreditation steering committee, we should consider expanding the hours and services of the Redfield Proctor Room so that it becomes a faculty and staff gathering place with coffee and snacks available throughout the day. We should also consider creating cafés, or coffee houses, within each Commons that would be sites for staff, students, and faculty to gather and meet. Finally, we should consider creating several meeting rooms in the new “MiddTown” campus center that are closely connected to facilities such as the Juice Bar and the Grille.

Environmental philosophy and programs. Consideration should be given to drafting a formal statement of Middlebury's philosophy of ecological and environmental sensitivity for presentation to the Board of Trustees and potential adoption by the Board as College policy. We should also consider how to enhance the College's focus on alternative, environment-friendly procedures by implementing additional programs once positive cost-benefit analyses have been carried out.

Campus master plan. In order to increase the efficiency of our physical plant, the College should consider enhancing the campus master plan to include landscaping and service infrastructure. As resources permit, we should consider investing in developing an electronic geographic information system (GIS) that includes the entire campus infrastructure.

Land holdings. We should consider assessing and evaluating Middlebury College's large land holdings in order to determine how they are managed as related directly or indirectly to the institution's mission and develop a plan of action to manage these land holdings.

Bread Loaf campus. We should consider examining whether the Bread Loaf campus adequately satisfies its current institutional mission. As the site has the potential to be used for other College programs, we should consider exploring expanded uses for the Bread Loaf campus and quantify the opportunities.

STANDARD NINE FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Description

Middlebury College continues to be financially sound and strong. Summary financial statements may be found in the appendices to this report, on CIHE forms 1 (Statement of Financial Position), 2 (Statement of Unrestricted Revenues and Expenses), 3 (Supplemental Data), 4 (Statement of Unrestricted Operating Revenues and Expenses), and 5 (Statement of Capital Cash Flows). The College has a multi-year financial plan that allows planning for both operating budgets and capital projects. A copy of the most recent version of this plan will be available in the visiting committee's workroom.

The budget of Middlebury College is approved annually by the Board of Trustees, usually at the May meeting. Middlebury charges a single undergraduate comprehensive fee that covers all the costs of a Middlebury education. There are no separate charges for room, board, and tuition, and with the exception of a Student Activities fee used to support extra-curricular activities open to all students and administered by a student committee, there are no additional charges for services such as Internet access, on-campus parking, or Orientation Week. The undergraduate comprehensive fee is usually set by the board at the February meeting, and the fees for the following summer's Language School and Bread Loaf programs are set in the fall.

The most important sources of revenues for Middlebury College are student fees, paid by approximately 2,200 undergraduates during the academic year, nearly 1,600 students in the summer Language School and Bread Loaf programs, and approximately 250 students in the Middlebury College Schools Abroad. From 1991-1992 through 1999-2000, each year's increase in the undergraduate comprehensive fee has been lower, in percentage terms, than the previous year's increase. Tuition for the summer Language Schools was held constant in the 1998 and 1999 sessions.

The College also receives revenues from gifts, grants, auxiliary enterprises, and endowment income. As of June 30, 1999, the endowment stood at \$612,972,000, of which \$47,105,000 is held in trusts or other deferred gifts. In order to smooth out the effects of changes in the valuation of the endowment, the spending rate is determined by a moving average of the average market value in the preceding twelve quarters. Although the Board of Trustees has established the maximum endowment spending rate at 5 per cent, the actual spending rate in recent years has been closer to 4 per cent. Decisions about the allocation of the College's endowment and investment strategies are made by the Investment Committee of the Board, which meets monthly. While the Investment Committee manages some funds itself, most of the endowment is managed by professional firms, whose performance is monitored closely by the committee. Copies of recent reports from the Investment Committee to the full Board are available in the visiting committee's workroom.

Standard 9: Financial Resources

Salaries and benefits, and financial aid, make up the largest categories on the spending side of the budget. College policy, established by the Board of Trustees, is that, to the extent that resources permit, average faculty salaries for each rank should be in the middle of the top third of salaries at 21 comparable liberal arts colleges. Salaries for staff positions are compared to either the Vermont market or the 21-college market, and benchmarks are established at the 80th percentiles of those markets. Salaries of individual staff members with sustained good performance over a four-year period are adjusted upward to the benchmark levels if those salaries, as increased each year through merit adjustments, are below the benchmark levels. Additional information on comparative faculty salaries and compensation, and the staff wage and salary program, is available in the visiting committee's workroom.

Middlebury's undergraduate financial aid policy, as stated in the prospectus and the catalog, is that all aid is awarded on the basis of assessed financial need and that the College is committed to meeting the fully assessed need of all admitted students to the full extent that resources permit. Rapid year-on-year increases in financial aid expenditures in the mid-1990s have become much more moderate in recent years.

The College is in the midst of a major capital campaign. The Bicentennial Campaign has a goal of \$200,000,000, to be raised by June 30, 2001. As of June 30, 1999, the campaign total stood at \$137,800,000. Funds raised in the campaign will be used to support the College's academic programs, facilities projects, and, particularly, endowment funds, especially those funds supporting professorships and financial aid. Copies of campaign materials and reports of funds raised to date are available in the visiting committee's workroom.

Middlebury's bonded debt stood at \$187,683,000 as of June 30, 1999. The College issues tax-exempt bonds through the Vermont Educational and Health Buildings Financing Agency, the proceeds of which are used to finance facility construction and renovation. A portion of the endowment is set aside to generate the funds needed for debt service on the bonds.

Since the College's last reaccreditation, an annual, independent, external audit has been performed for all intervening years and all opinions rendered have been without qualification. Each year the Audit Committee of the Board of Trustees has reviewed the audited financial statements and then distributed them to the entire Board. Copies of the most recent audited financial statements are available in the visiting committee's workroom.

Appraisal and Projection

The College is financially stable with sufficient resources to ensure educational objectives and institutional goals are adequately supported. The allocation of College financial resources takes place in both the multi-year planning model as well as the annual budget process. Although this process has worked well in the past, we recognize

that the College is going through a “growth spurt” and therefore institutional budgeting has recently received more attention. To prevent unwanted outcomes, the administration recognizes that a process that reconciles the multi-year planning model and annual operating budget needs to be established. In addition, consideration should be given to providing more education to the campus community to deepen the understanding of how the College’s financial structure works. This should help the campus community comprehend resource choices.

The College’s financial resources are controlled and allocated in accordance with both its mission and purposes. The five basic financial principles listed below as well as the recognition of “peak” priorities guide both the development of fees as well as the resource allocation process.

- Students are charged a comprehensive fee to support the residential college experience.
- Each student generation pays its fair share.
- Expenditures on the physical plant are at a level that prolongs the life of the asset and avoids deferred maintenance.
- The budget is balanced, including the appropriate level of funding for maintenance and modernization.
- The management of and spending from the endowment ensures long-term maintenance of purchasing power.

Although these five principles have served the College well in the past, consideration should be given to reviewing and amending them where appropriate. Consideration should also be given to establishing an ongoing financial planning communication methodology with the faculty’s Finance and Planning subcommittee, the Middlebury College Staff Council, and the Student Government Association to provide input on prioritization of goals that have a financial consequence.

After a preliminary review of budget goals and subsequent Board approval of the comprehensive fee, both senior management and all departments participate in constructing the next year’s budget. Although the process may vary slightly from year to year, departments normally enter their budgets into the administrative management system and seek approval from their respective senior budget administrator. In addition to input from both departments and senior management, students also participate in the budget process through the Comprehensive Fee Committee. This subcommittee of the Student Government Association is given access to the financial planning model and any staff members they desire to develop their own recommendation on the comprehensive fee. This recommendation is then presented to the Student Affairs Committee and the Board of Trustees. This process helps the Board, senior administration, and the students align their priorities.

Although past experience and the College’s audited financial statements indicate the College has been financially responsible and prudent, there is room for improvement.

Standard 9: Financial Resources

Cumbersome processes, inadequate tools, and the loss of key personnel created a delay in providing fiscal year end financial statements for June 30, 1998. Departments duplicate financial activity by maintaining shadow systems to help them determine their current budget status. These shadow systems evolved due to limitations in tracking encumbrances and processes which delay the input of financial information in the administrative computing system. These concerns have prompted the administration to review and implement actions required to produce timely financial statements as well as to undertake a review of administrative software.

In areas related to fund-raising, the College does have written policies pertaining to gift acceptance and solicitation and External Affairs does maintain comprehensive files on donor correspondence, including intent of donor gifts and any restrictions. Budget administrators have requested improved access to donor related accounts to ensure that fiduciary responsibilities to donors are fulfilled and the senior administration has expressed an interest in improving the budgeting of restricted gift and endowment accounts. Consideration should be given to reviewing the communication process among external affairs and academic and financial affairs in order to improve the budgeting of restricted gift and endowment accounts.

In the years ahead, we must constantly monitor our ability to fund change. This is an activity in which we engage regularly, at both the administration and the Board level. (Materials from a September 1999 Board of Trustees retreat devoted to this topic, attended by administration, faculty, staff, and student leaders, may be found in the committee's workroom.) The critical issue is how best to match resources and aspirations. While tracking endowment per student, funding depreciation adequately, and maintaining a prudent approach to spending are all essential, these are not the reasons students choose Middlebury, and the Board seeks to establish the appropriate balance between these management objectives and the commitment to move Middlebury to the next competitive level, a commitment that will require expenditures beyond the norm.

STANDARD TEN PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Description

The principal publications in which information about Middlebury College is presented to members of the College community (students, faculty, and staff) and to prospective students are the prospectus, the catalog, and the handbook. Production of these publications is overseen by the Publications Office, a department within the External Affairs division. Editorial responsibility for these publications is shared between the Publications Office and other offices and departments of the College. All of these publications are available in electronic format on the College's Web site. The Web site also presents additional information about the College and its programs that is not contained in the printed publications.

The prospectus is issued annually, in the spring. The principal audience for this publication is prospective students and their families. It presents an overview of Middlebury's academic program and contains information about co-curricular programs, residential life, admissions requirements, the costs of a Middlebury education, and financial aid. The text and photographs for the prospectus are compiled, assembled, and edited by the Publications Office, in consultation with the Admissions Office and the academic administration. A copy of the current prospectus is available in the visiting committee's workroom.

The general catalog is published annually. The general catalog contains descriptions for all courses offered in the current academic year, information about degree requirements and other academic regulations, a list of the Middlebury College faculty with their departmental affiliations and degrees, and the names of administrative officers and the members of the Board of Trustees. The catalog also contains the titles of those courses that are part of the curriculum, but that will not be offered in the current academic year. The title of a course is removed from the catalog if the course was last offered more than two years previously and is not included in the current year's curriculum.

Production of the general catalog is the responsibility of the Publications Office. Catalog copy for individual departments and programs is prepared by department chairs and reviewed by the Associate Dean of the Faculty who serves as chair of the Curriculum Committee. The Associate Dean is also responsible for those sections of the catalog dealing with general academic requirements and College policies. The list of faculty at the end of the catalog is prepared for publication, and maintained by, the Assistant to the Dean of the Faculty.

Until the 1998-99 edition, the general catalog for the following academic year was published in April, so students could use it in registering for the following Fall's courses. An April publication date meant a January closing date. Since many departments do not finish recruiting their new faculty by January, and since course scheduling materials are

not due until March, the general catalog published in April presented a less-than-complete picture of the College's academic program. Extensive supplements and Web-based updates to the catalog were thus required. Beginning with the 1999-2000 general catalog, that publication has been issued in the summer, with a spring closing date, so that it more accurately reflects the courses actually to be taught and the names of the faculty who will teach them. A course booklet will continue to be issued in April for students to use in registering for Fall courses, but this booklet will be supplanted by the catalog to be published the following summer. A copy of the current general catalog is available in the visiting committee's workroom.

The Middlebury College handbook is published annually, at the beginning of the academic year. This publication contains all policies of general applicability at Middlebury College, including academic requirements and regulations, student disciplinary codes, financial information and policies for students and their families, the rules of the faculty and its committees, organizational documents for the Student Government Association and the Staff Council, the rules of appointment and promotion for faculty members, and general policies governing all employees of Middlebury College, both staff and faculty.

The organization of this publication again represents a change in publications policy. Prior to 1998-99, separate faculty and student handbooks were issued annually, while there was an employee handbook that was updated periodically through loose-leaf inserts. The administration decided that, for 1998-99 and beyond, all policies of general applicability should be included in a single handbook distributed to all members of the College community and reissued in an updated version every year. The purpose of this change was eliminate confusion as to which version of which handbook was most current, and to avoid redundancy and conflicts among faculty, staff, and student handbooks.

Production of the handbook is the responsibility of the Publications Office. The Secretary of the College serves as "managing editor" for the handbook, and is responsible for insuring the completeness and accuracy of the publication. The Secretary consults with the College's legal counsel as appropriate in preparing, reviewing, and updating handbook materials. Changes to academic policies of general applicability require the approval of the faculty in one of the monthly faculty meetings, while changes to the rules of appointment and promotion require the approval of both the faculty and the Board of Trustees. A copy of the current Middlebury College handbook is available in the visiting team's workroom.

The prospectus, catalog, and handbook referred to above cover the program offered in the undergraduate College. Separate publications describe the programs offered by the Language Schools, Schools Abroad, and Bread Loaf programs, and those programs have their own handbooks as well. Copies of all of these publications are available in the visiting committee's workroom.

Other publications issued on a regular basis include the annual President's Report, which contains highlights of the previous year's accomplishments and activities at the College; a Parents' Guide providing parents with basic information about College programs and policies and a list of people to call with questions about those programs and policies; and the Middlebury College magazine, published four times a year. Copies of all of these publications are also available in the visiting committee's workroom.

Advertisements soliciting public comment as part of the reaccreditation process were placed in the *Addison Independent*, the weekly newspaper of Addison County, and the Middlebury College magazine, mailed to all parents and alumni, in the summer of 1999, as required by the Commission's policies. This notice was also placed in *The Middlebury Campus*, the student newspaper, in September 1999. Copies of these notices are included in the workroom.

Appraisal and Projection

Probably the biggest challenge faced by the College in the area of public disclosure is the increasing reliance on electronic publications by prospective and currently-enrolled students, as well as the general public seeking information about Middlebury and its programs. We must make sure that our Web site is consistent with the printed publications and, more importantly, consider how best to take advantage of the potential of the Web for communicating information to both on-campus and off-campus audiences.

Recruitment for a manager of campus Web development is currently underway. We expect that the manager of Web development will, early in his or her tenure, undertake a systematic review of the College's presentation of itself and its programs on the World Wide Web and through other electronic publications to make sure that we take the best advantage of the Web in terms of a timely, accurate, well-organized, and appealing presentation.

In Chapter Four of this report, the steering committee recommends that we consider reexamining the College's "admissions profile" from time to time to ensure a recruitment and admissions policy attuned to the institution's long-range goals for academic excellence. It is important that the prospectus and other admissions publications present a message that is consistent with the overall strategic goals for the admissions effort. Similarly, the Language School prospectus and other recruitment publications should be revised as necessary as part of the ongoing strategic planning process for the Language Schools.

Finally, we should consider ways in which the College community, both on- and off-campus, may continue to be kept informed on a regular basis about major planning initiatives underway and policy decisions taken at Middlebury. This will require a combination of open meetings, written materials, and postings on the Web. The internal communication process used for the recent revision of the pension program, and the

Standard 10: Public Disclosure

“Major Initiatives” page on the Web, could both serve as models for such information dissemination.

STANDARD ELEVEN INTEGRITY

Description

Middlebury College derives its formal powers from a charter granted by the Vermont Legislature and signed by the Governor on November 1, 1800. The charter is written in general terms, authorizing the President and Fellows of Middlebury College to exercise plenary authority in all matters “for the good and benefit of the College.” Until 1913, when the Vermont Constitution was amended, all changes in charters granted by the Legislature had to be approved by the Legislature, as special laws. Since 1913, eleemosynary institutions not under the control of the state have been able to change their charters without having to obtain legislative consent. A transcription of the text of the Middlebury College charter is included in the appendices to this report.

The policies of Middlebury College encompassed by the standard on integrity are included in the College Handbook, which is published annually in the fall. Publication of the Handbook is overseen by the Secretary of the College, with the Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Student Affairs, and the Director of Human Resources having primary responsibility for the sections dealing with faculty, student, and staff affairs, respectively. The officers responsible for preparation of the Handbook consult with the College’s legal counsel on a regular basis in revising the publication.

Policies relating to the following matters are found in the Handbook. A marked-up copy of the Handbook referencing these policies is available in the workroom.

- Academic freedom for faculty members
- Faculty discipline and procedure for termination for cause
- Procedures in cases of alleged misconduct in faculty research
- Student rights and freedoms in the classroom
- Freedom of inquiry and expression – student organizations and publications
- Student grievances regarding grades
- Student records policy (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act)
- Academic disciplinary policies
- Community standards
- Student judicial boards and procedures
- Employee rights
- Employee grievance procedures
- Non-discrimination statement
- Procedures in cases of alleged harassment and/or discrimination
- Americans with Disabilities Act policy
- Human subjects policy

Appraisal and Projections

Social Honor Code – Agreement to Respect Community. In the Spring of 1998, the student body, with a majority of over 70 percent, passed the “Agreement to Respect Community (ARC).” The ARC stated, “I, _____, commit to promoting a culture of consideration and respect for the individual and collective dignity of the College Community by assuming ownership of my words and actions, and weighing their inevitable impact on others.”

The intention of the statement, as it was originally construed, was to require incoming students, beginning with the Class of 2003, actively to accept Middlebury College’s non-academic rules and policies, in the same way they must act affirmatively to accept the College’s Honor Code and other academic disciplinary policies. The acceptance and signing of the statement would have been a mandatory part of matriculation at Middlebury College. The aim of ARC was to promote further awareness of previously established rules, not to create a new system of punitive policies. ARC would not have changed the current judicial process. Rather, it aimed to make people aware of the established rules and judicial proceedings.

In the Fall of 1998, the Student Government Association asked the Faculty Council to bring a resolution before the full Faculty endorsing ARC and requiring faculty members to sign the statement beginning in the Fall of 1999. After extensive discussion, including consultation with the SGA, the Faculty Council decided not to advance this resolution. A principal concern of the Council was that a mandatory oath should not be required as a condition of employment at Middlebury College. Later in the Fall of 1998, a student referendum rescinded the ARC statement, and signing it is not a requirement of matriculation.

Although ARC has been rescinded, there continues to be interest in a “social honor code” among both members of the SGA and some members of the faculty. Perhaps the Enhanced Commons System will provide a new vehicle for considering ways in which students may take more responsibility and accountability for matters relating to their behavior in a residential community.

New Student Judicial Process. A new system for hearing cases in which students are charged with disciplinary violations on non-academic matters goes in to effect in the Fall of 1999. These cases will now be heard by a Community Judicial Board consisting of members from the student body, the faculty, the staff, and the Dean of Student Affairs Office. The Community Judicial Board will replace the previous student judicial process, in which students charged with violating the College’s non-academic policies had a choice of having their cases heard by a panel of deans or by the Student Judicial Council.

The new system is intended to bring more consistency to the student judicial process, and to eliminate the previous practice of “forum shopping.” Precedents established in the first year of the new system will be especially important, and the board

will have to pay particular attention to the longer-term consequences of its decisions. Because service on this board may be time-consuming, the issue of demands on faculty and staff time that has been mentioned in other chapters of this report is raised by its establishment. If the faculty and staff seats on the board end up being rotated among a number of members and alternates, mechanisms for insuring consistency in decisions and penalties will need to be put in to place and monitored.

The Student Judicial Council will continue to maintain original jurisdiction over charges of Honor Code violations by students. The Judicial Review Board (JRB) will maintain original jurisdiction in plagiarism cases, and appellate jurisdiction from decisions of the Student Judicial Council and Community Judicial Board. The chair of the Judicial Review Board has asked the Faculty Council and Community Council to consider a revision of the JRB's jurisdiction, to give it original authority to hear all cases of alleged academic dishonesty by students, not only plagiarism cases. The JRB believes that the current Handbook language does not adequately cover other forms of academic dishonesty, such as submitting materials with an admissions application that turn out not to be a student's own work, or allegations of misconduct in laboratory research such as falsification of data.

Training on Legal Issues for Faculty and Staff. The Dean of the Faculty, working in conjunction with the College's attorneys, has presented a workshop on legal issues for faculty department chairs, focusing particularly on matters related to faculty recruitment and reviews. The Human Resources Office has also presented workshops on legal issues for supervisors, again working with College counsel to organize these sessions. Copies of the materials from these workshops are available in the visiting committee's workroom. These workshops are considered to have been very successful, and consideration should be given to expanding them to include an annual session on legal issues for deans, vice presidents, and other senior officers of the College.

NEASC Forms

NEASC Form 100
Annual Report

Year

1998

State

Department

Name

Address

City

State

Zip

Organization

Address

City

State

Zip

Phone

Fax

E-mail

Organization

Address

City

State

Zip

Phone

Fax

E-mail

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

Comments

CIHE DATA FORMS
GENERAL INFORMATION

Institution Name: Middlebury College

FICE Code: ? 3691

Carnegie Classification: ? Baccalaureate I

Financial Results for Year Ending: ? June 30
 ? 1999
 ? 1998
 ? 1997

Budget / Plans
 Current Year 2000
 Next Year 2001

Contact Person: ? Eric L. Davis
 Title: Secretary of the College
 Telephone No: 802-443-5871
 E-mail address: ericd@middlebury.edu

Certified:
 Yes Qualified
 No Unqualified
 Yes Unqualified
 Yes Unqualified

*WHEN ENTERING FINANCIAL DATA ON SUBSEQUENT FORMS,
 PLEASE ROUND TO THE NEAREST THOUSAND

Note: Audited financial statements had not been completed at the time this form was prepared. The audited statements will be provided to the visiting team at Middlebury in October.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION

Middlebury College

	Audited:	2 Years	1 Year	Most Recent	Percent Change	
		Prior 1997 Yes	Prior 1998 Yes	Year 1999 No	1998 1997	1999 1998
ASSETS						
Cash & Short Term Investments	??	13,897	18,511	18,310	33.2%	-1.1%
? Accounts Receivable, Net		2,918	2,467	3,266	-15.5%	32.4%
? Contributions Receivable, Net		16,226	26,301	39,413	62.1%	49.9%
? Inventory & Prepaid Expenses		7,099	6,801	7,283	-4.2%	7.1%
? Long-Term Investments		545,504	618,399	614,513	13.4%	-0.6%
? Loans to Students		11,756	12,529	13,677	6.6%	9.2%
? Funds held under Bond Agreement		46,049	22,806	38,691	-50.5%	69.7%
? Land, Building & Equipment, Net		133,305	170,149	211,755	27.6%	24.5%
? Other Assets		16,834	20,156	24,010	19.7%	19.1%
Total Assets		793,588	898,119	970,918	13.2%	8.1%
LIABILITIES						
? Accounts Payable & Accrued Liabilities		7,392	13,666	12,684	84.9%	-7.2%
? Deferred Revenue & Refundable Advances		8,829	8,714	9,985	-1.3%	14.6%
? Annuity & Life Income Obligations		15,854	16,829	18,440	6.1%	9.6%
? Amounts Held on Behalf of Others		1,493	2,767	1,893	85.3%	-31.6%
? Long Term Debt		129,977	128,904	185,711	-0.8%	44.1%
? Refundable Gov't Advances		9,209	9,755	10,254	5.9%	5.1%
? Other Long-Term Liabilities		1,490	1,528	1,528	2.6%	0.0%
Total Liabilities		174,244	182,163	240,495	4.5%	32.0%
NET ASSETS						
Unrestricted						
? Avail for Operations, Plant & Other Trustee Designated Purposes		22,185	26,237	27,542	18.3%	5.0%
? Accum. Gains & Losses (associated with Permanent Endowment)		-	-	-	-	-
? Designated for Long-Term Investments		427,859	482,929	457,677	12.9%	-5.2%
? Net Investment in Plant		49,377	64,051	64,735	29.7%	1.1%
Total Unrestricted Net Assets		499,421	573,217	549,954	14.8%	-4.1%
Temporarily Restricted						
? Available for Operations		26,453	36,937	62,915	39.6%	70.3%
? Accum. Gains & Losses		-	-	-	-	-
? Designated for Long-Term Investments		6,737	6,088	-	-9.6%	-100.0%
Total Temporarily Restricted Net Assets		33,190	43,025	62,915	29.6%	46.2%
? Permanently Restricted Net Assets						
Total Permanently Restricted Net Assets		86,733	99,714	117,554	15.0%	17.9%
Total Net Assets		619,344	715,956	730,423	15.6%	2.0%
TOTAL LIABILITIES & NET ASSETS		793,588	898,119	970,918	13.2%	8.1%

STATEMENT OF UNRESTRICTED REVENUES AND EXPENSES

?

Middlebury College

	2 Years Prior 1997 Yes	1 Year Prior 1998 Yes	Most Recent Year 1999 No	Current Year Budget 2000
Audited:				
FROM OPERATIONS				
Revenue				
? Tuition & Fees	67,879	72,973	78,934	81,328
Less: Financial Aid	14,735	15,764	15,360	17,000
Net Tuition & Fees Revenue	53,144	57,209	63,574	64,328
? Gov't Appropriations	-	-	-	-
? Contributions used in Operations (1)	5,505	7,731	3,722	8,177
? Endowment Income used in Operations	16,648	16,707	18,907	20,718
? Federal & State Student Aid	-	-	-	-
? Gov't & Private Sponsored Research	5,861	2,417	2,358	2,095
? Other Income	3,411	3,783	4,882	1,574
? Auxiliary Enterprises	8,962	8,567	9,198	9,737
? Sales & Services of Educ. Activities	-	-	-	-
? Independent Operations	-	-	-	-
Total Revenues	93,531	96,414	102,641	106,629
Net Assets Released from Restrictions	3,893	2,112	6,522	-
Total Revenues & Net Assets Released	97,424	98,526	109,163	106,629
Expenses				
? Instruction	27,459	29,280	32,201	29,448
? Research	7,445	2,196	2,335	2,095
? Public Service	-	-	-	-
? Academic Services	9,000	10,534	11,941	11,359
? Student Services	10,509	11,677	13,822	9,671
? Institutional Support	18,824	19,433	21,488	19,274
? Other Expenses	327	220	217	5,346
Total Education & General Expenses	73,564	73,340	82,004	77,193
? Auxiliary Enterprises	22,595	22,431	25,460	20,153
? Independent Operations	-	-	-	-
Total Expenses	96,159	95,771	107,464	97,346
Increase (Decrease) in Net Assets from Operations	1,265	2,755	1,699	9,283
NON OPERATING				
? Gifts, Bequests & Contributions not used in Operations	-	-	-	-
? Restricted Equipment Purchases	-	-	-	-
? Reinvested Gains & Losses & Income from Investments	106,090	70,050	(24,541)	-
? Gains & Losses on Disposal of Property	-	-	-	-
? Other revenues and expenses, Net	-	991	(421)	-
Increase (Decrease) in Net Assets from NonOperating Activity	106,090	71,041	(24,962)	-
Increase (Decrease) in Unrestricted Net Assets	107,355	73,796	(23,263)	-

Footnote:

(1) Includes receivables of:

 Check This Box if you have allocated a portion of Institutional Expenditures to other expense lines.

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN NET ASSETS

Middlebury College	2 Years Prior 1997	1 Year Prior 1998	Most Recent Year 1999
Audited:	Yes	Yes	No
? Increase (Decr) in Unrestricted Net Assets	107,355	73,796	(23,263)
Changes in Temporarily Restricted Net Assets:			
? Contributions (1)	19,684	10,302	16,075
? Reinvested Endowment Income & Gains	-	-	7,369
Net Assets Released from Restrictions	(3,893)	(2,112)	(6,522)
? Other	3,949	1,645	2,968
Increase in Temporarily Restricted Net Assets	<u>19,740</u>	<u>9,835</u>	<u>19,890</u>
Changes in Permanently Restricted Net Assets:			
? Contributions (2)	2,819	6,642	11,366
? Reinvested Endowment Income & Gains	2,696	3,711	3,674
? Other	908	2,628	2,800
Increase in Permanently Restricted Net Assets	<u>6,423</u>	<u>12,981</u>	<u>17,840</u>
Increase (Decrease) in Total Net Assets	<u><u>133,518</u></u>	<u><u>96,612</u></u>	<u><u>14,467</u></u>
Net Net Assets at Beginning of Year	485,826	619,344	715,956
Net Net Assets at End of Year	619,344	715,956	730,423

Footnote:

(1) Includes receivables of:	<u>14,726</u>	<u>21,060</u>	<u>30,538</u>
(2) Includes receivables of:	<u>1,500</u>	<u>5,241</u>	<u>8,875</u>

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Middlebury College

	2 Years Prior 1997	1 Year Prior 1998	Most Recent Year 1999	Current Year Budget 2000
SECTION 1: FINANCIAL AID				
Source of Funds:				
a) Unrestricted Institutional	11,005	11,561	10,422	12,384
b) Federal, State & Private Grants	380	517	437	484
c) Restricted Endowment Funds	3,350	3,686	4,501	4,132
TOTAL	14,735	15,764	15,360	17,000
% Discount of Tuition & Fees	21.7%	21.6%	19.5%	20.9%
% Unrestricted Discount	16.2%	15.8%	13.2%	15.2%

SECTION 2: CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVABLE (most recent year)

	Unrestricted	Temporarily Restricted	Permanently Restricted	Total
less than 1 year	0	3,305	1,408	4,713
1 year or greater	0	34,089	8,689	42,778
less: allowance	0	624	181	805
less: discount to present value	0	6,232	1,041	7,273
Total Contributions Receivable	0	30,538	8,875	39,413

SECTION 3: ENDOWMENT INCOME USED IN OPERATIONS (most recent year)

	Formula:	Most Recent Yr. Amount 1999
Please check source of funding:		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Spending Policy	Maximum of average mkt. value of previous 12 qtr. of endowment not restricted by management.	0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interest & Dividends Only		3,965
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unrealized Gains & Losses		14,942
Total Endowment income Used in Operations		18,907

SECTION 4: INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT COST ADJUSTMENTS (most recent year)

Cost reported on CIHE Form 2	21,488
Add: costs previously allocated:	
Auxiliary Services	0
Independent Operations	0
Sales & Services of Educ. Activities	0
Other	0
Total Institutional Support Costs	21,488
% of Total Revenues & Net Assets Released from Restrictions	19.7%

SECTION 5: FACILITY COST ALLOCATIONS (most recent year)

Breakout costs allocated to all lines on CIHE Form 2-1.	2 Years Prior 1997	1 Year Prior 1998	Most Recent Year 1999	Current Year 2000
Operations & Maintenance	4,074	4,950	4,822	5,420
Depreciation & Amortization	6,718	6,694	7,968	8,764
Interest Expense	4,064	3,533	4,527	5,652
Total Facility Costs	14,856	15,177	17,317	19,836
Percent of Total Revenues & Net Assets Released from Restrictions				
Operations & Maintenance	4.2%	5.0%	4.4%	5.1%
Depreciation & Amortization	6.9%	6.8%	7.3%	8.2%
Interest Expense	4.2%	3.6%	4.1%	5.3%
Total Facility Costs	15.2%	15.4%	15.9%	18.6%

STATEMENT OF UNRESTRICTED OPERATING REVENUES AND EXPENSES

Middlebury College	Most Recent Year 1999	Most Recent Budget 1999	Current Year Budget 2000	Next Year Forward 2001	Two Years Forward 2002
FROM OPERATIONS					
Revenue					
Tuition & Fees	78,934	76,748	81,328	84,581	87,964
Less: Financial Aid	15,360	17,000	17,000	19,100	21,200
Net Tuition & Fees Revenue	63,574	59,748	64,328	65,481	66,764
Gov't Appropriations	0	-	0	-	-
Contributions used in Operations (1)	3,722	7,505	8,177	9,860	8,850
Endowment Income used in Operations	18,907	18,580	20,718	21,843	23,265
Federal & State Student Aid	0	-	0	-	-
Gov't & Private Sponsored Research	2,358	3,525	2,095	3,000	3,000
Other Income	4,882	1,442	1,574	1,660	1,740
Auxiliary Enterprises	9,198	9,496	9,737	10,199	10,688
Sales & Services of Educ. Activities	0	-	0	-	-
Independent Operations	0	-	0	-	-
Total Revenues	102,641	100,296	106,629	112,043	114,307
Net Assets Released from Restrictions	6,522	-	0	-	-
Total Revenues & Net Assets Released	109,163	100,296	106,629	112,043	114,307
Expenses					
Instruction	32,201	27,801	29,448	-	-
Research	2,335	3,525	2,095	3,000	3,000
Public Service	0	-	0	-	-
Academic Services	11,941	10,308	11,359	-	-
Student Services	13,822	8,942	9,671	-	-
Institutional Support	21,488	17,096	19,274	-	-
Other Expense	217	12,857	5,346	109,911	114,589
Total Education & General Expenses	82,004	80,529	77,193	112,911	117,589
Auxiliary Enterprises	25,460	19,857	20,153	-	-
Independent Operations	0	-	0	-	-
Total Expenses	107,464	100,386	97,346	112,911	117,589
Increase (Decrease) in Net Assets from Operations	1,699	(90)	9,283	(868)	(3,282)

Footnote:

(1) Includes receivables of:

Tuition and Mandatory Fee Charges
Tuition and Fee Discount

\$ 30,475	\$ 30,475	\$ 31,600		
22%	22%	19%	21%	

STATEMENT OF CAPITAL CASH FLOWS

Middlebury College	2 Years Prior 1997	1 Year Prior 1998	Most Recent Year 1999	Current Year Budget 2000	Next Year Forward 2001
? SOURCES OF FUNDS:					
Cash flow from Depreciation	7,025	7,168	8,440	9,815	
Cash from Gifts/Grants	15,252	14,600	-	-	
Debt Proceeds	-	-	60,000	-	
Other	312,858	303,486	-	-	
Total Sources	335,135	325,254	68,440	9,815	-
? USES OF FUNDS					
Renovation & Maintenance					
Space Alterations					
New Construction					
Equipment & Furnishings					
? Purchase of:					
Investment	164,889	163,228			
Property & Equipment	17,603	42,801			
Other	145,445	115,313			
Total Uses	327,937	321,342	-	-	-
NET CAPITAL CASH FLOW	7,198	3,912	68,440	9,815	-
INDEBTEDNESS ON PHYSICAL PLANT					
Beginning Balance on Principal	130,731	129,699	128,706	187,683	185,590
Additional Principal Borrowed	-	-	60,000	-	-
Principal Payments Made During Year	1,032	993	1,023	2,093	2,070
Extraordinary Balloon Pymts / Refinancing	-	-	-	-	-
Ending Balance on Principal	129,699	128,706	187,683	185,590	183,520
Interest Payments Made During Year	6,337	6,497	7,601	9,490	9,388
Accumulated Depreciation	55,604	62,200	69,991	79,771	89,996
Maximum expected annual debt service obligation (principal & interest) on all outstanding debt (exclude balloon payments expected to be refinanced from external funds)					
	Year:	2000	Amount:	11,583	

STUDENT ADMISSIONS DATA

(Fall Term)

Credit Seeking Students Only - Including Continuing Education

Middlebury College	2 Years Prior 1996	1 Year Prior 1997	Most Recent Year 1998	Current Year 1999
Freshmen - Undergraduate	?			
Completed Applications	?	4,585	4,738	4,434
Applications Accepted	?	1,320	1,364	1,348
Applicants Enrolled	?	519	565	567
% Accepted of Applied		28.8%	28.8%	30.4%
% Enrolled of Accepted		39.3%	41.4%	42.1%
Percent Change Year over Year				
Completed Applications		-	3.3%	-6.4%
Applications Accepted		-	3.3%	-1.2%
Applicants Enrolled		-	8.9%	0.4%
Early Decision Applications		594	630	602
Early Decision Acceptances		168	179	214
Percent of Class Accepted Early		32.4%	31.7%	37.7%
Aptitude Indicator: (Define Below)	?			
Mid 50% range for those submitting SAT I	1340-1420	1350-1430	1350-1430	1370-1460
Class rank: first decile / second decile	70% / 15%	66% / 21%	72% / 18%	73% / 19%
Transfers - Undergraduate	?			
Completed Applications		185	226	235
Applications Accepted		33	38	28
Applications Enrolled		12	15	12
% Accepted of Applied		17.8%	16.8%	11.9%
% Enrolled of Accepted		36.4%	39.5%	42.9%
Master's Degree	?			
Completed Applications				
Applications Accepted				
Applications Enrolled				
% Accepted of Applied		-	-	-
% Enrolled of Accepted		-	-	-
First Professional Degree - All Programs	?			
Completed Applications				
Applications Accepted				
Applications Enrolled				
% Accepted of Applied		-	-	-
% Enrolled of Accepted		-	-	-
Doctoral Degree	?			
Completed Applications				
Applications Accepted				
Applications Enrolled				
% Accepted of Applied		-	-	-
% Enrolled of Accepted		-	-	-

STUDENT ENROLLMENT DATA

(Fall Term)

Credit Seeking Students Only - Including Continuing Education

Middlebury College		2 Years	1 Year	Most Recent	Current
		Prior	Prior	Year	Year
		1996	1997	1998	1999
UNDERGRADUATE					
First Year	Full-Time Headcount	?	519	569	567
	Part-Time Headcount	?			
	Total Headcount		519	569	567
	Total FTE	?	519.0	569.0	567.0
Second Year	Full-Time Headcount		626	566	628
	Part-Time Headcount				
	Total Headcount		626	566	628
	Total FTE		626.0	566.0	628.0
Third Year	Full-Time Headcount		372	410	393
	Part-Time Headcount				
	Total Headcount		372	410	393
	Total FTE		372.0	410.0	393.0
Fourth Year	Full-Time Headcount		567	569	632
	Part-Time Headcount		34	25	21
	Total Headcount		601	594	653
	Total FTE		584.0	581.5	642.5
Unclassified	Full-Time Headcount	?	13	17	13
	Part-Time Headcount		17	20	19
	Total Headcount		30	37	32
	Total FTE		21.5	27.0	22.5
Total Undergraduate Students					
Full-Time Headcount			2,097	2,131	2,233
Part-Time Headcount			51	45	40
Total Headcount			2,148	2,176	2,273
Total FTE			2,122.5	2,153.5	2,253.0
% Change FTE Undergraduate			-	1.5%	4.6%
GRADUATE					
Full-Time Headcount		?			
Part-Time Headcount		?			
Total Headcount					
Total FTE		?			
% Change FTE Graduate					
GRAND TOTAL					
Grand Total Headcount			2,148	2,176	2,273
Grand Total FTE			2,122.5	2,153.5	2,253.0
% Change Grand Total FTE			-	1.5%	4.6%
UNDERGRADUATE RETENTION RATES					
First Yr Stdts Returning for Second Yr			93%	91%	93%
6 Year Graduation Rate			88%	89%	87%

FACULTY PROFILE, PART 1

?

Middlebury College

		2 Years Prior 1996		1 Years Prior 1997		Most Recent Year 1998		Current Year 1999	
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Number of Faculty (Male/Female)									
Professor	Male	66	14	70	12	68	13	68	13
	Female	12	3	14	2	15	-	17	1
Associate	Male	19	-	17	2	12	3	14	1
	Female	10	-	11	-	11	3	9	3
Assistant	Male	37	4	34	3	43	4	43	7
	Female	32	5	37	4	38	6	36	8
Instructor	Male	2	4	4	3	4	-	13	-
	Female	12	-	9	1	6	1	7	3
Other	Male	4	7	3	7	3	9	3	11
	Female	5	8	8	5	6	11	7	7
Total	Male	128	29	128	27	130	29	141	32
	Female	71	16	79	12	76	21	76	22
Total Faculty									
Professor		78	17	84	14	83	13	85	14
Associate		29	-	28	2	23	6	23	4
Assistant		69	9	71	7	81	10	79	15
Instructor		14	4	13	4	10	1	20	3
Other		9	15	11	12	9	20	10	18
Total		199	45	207	39	206	50	217	54
Age (Minimum/Maximum/Mean)									
Professor	Minimum	41	40	40	41	40	42	41	43
	Maximum	70	72	69	67	68	73	69	75
	Mean	56	56	55	54	54	58	53	59
Associate	Minimum	33	-	34	47	35	38	36	39
	Maximum	57	-	58	47	53	49	50	50
	Mean	45	-	46	47	44	44	42	44
Assistant	Minimum	29	34	27	33	30	41	29	35
	Maximum	48	52	49	53	50	54	52	59
	Mean	39	43	38	43	40	48	39	47
Instructor	Minimum	30	34	31	31	28	47	31	33
	Maximum	48	47	49	48	42	47	43	48
	Mean	39	41	40	40	35	47	37	39
Other	Minimum	40	27	34	28	35	30	53	26
	Maximum	63	71	70	58	71	60	72	57
	Mean	52	49	53	43	53	45	63	42
Years at this Institution (Minimum/Maximum/Median)									
Professor	Minimum	14	1	1	1	2	1	3	1
	Maximum	36	34	35	35	37	24	38	25
	Median	25	18	18	18	20	13	20	23
Associate	Minimum	7	-	7	1	1	1	2	1
	Maximum	13	-	13	13	14	10	14	11
	Median	10	-	10	7	8	6	8	6
Assistant	Minimum	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	Maximum	8	16	9	17	8	18	11	19
	Median	5	9	5	9	5	10	6	10
Instructor	Minimum	1	4	1	1	1	3	1	2
	Maximum	6	7	7	8	6	3	7	4
	Median	4	6	4	5	4	3	4	3
Other	Minimum	11	1	2	1	6	1	15	1
	Maximum	30	34	31	21	32	13	25	16
	Median	21	18	17	11	19	7	20	9

FACULTY PROFILE, PART 2

Middlebury College

	2 Years Prior 1996		1 Years Prior 1997		Most Recent Year 1998		Current Year 1999	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Highest Degree Earned: Doctorate	?							
Professor	79	8	82	10	80	13	82	13
Associate	29	-	26	2	22	4	21	4
Assistant	69	5	70	4	80	7	79	9
Instructor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	3	1	2	1	1	1	-
Total	177	16	179	18	183	25	183	26

Highest Degree Earned: Masters								
Professor	6	1	5	-	4	-	4	-
Associate	1	-	2	-	2	-	2	-
Assistant	1	3	2	2	3	2	2	3
Instructor	15	2	12	4	7	1	19	2
Other	4	12	7	9	5	14	7	13
Total	27	18	28	15	21	17	34	18

Highest Degree Earned: Bachelor's								
Professor	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Associate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Instructor	-	1	1	-	2	-	1	-
Other	2	3	2	3	2	4	2	3
Total	2	5	3	4	4	4	3	3

Highest Degree Earned: Professional License								
Professor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Associate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Instructor	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Other	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
Total	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	3

Teaching Load, fall term in credit hrs		?							
Professor	Minimum	see teaching load gudelines at end of data forms							
	Maximum								
	Median								
Associate	Minimum								
	Maximum								
	Median								
Assistant	Minimum								
	Maximum								
	Median								
Instructor	Minimum								
	Maximum								
	Median								
Other	Minimum								
	Maximum								
	Median								

FACULTY PROFILE, PART 3

Middlebury College		2 Year Prior 1996	1 Year Prior 1997	Most Recent Year 1998	Current Year 1999
Base Salary for Academic Year		?			
Professor, Full Time	Minimum	54,300	50,000	61,800	65,300
	Maximum	114,000	121,000	128,200	137,800
	Mean	84,150	85,500	95,000	101,550
Professor, Part Time	Minimum	30,000	57,000	66,500	60,000
	Maximum	101,500	75,000	82,000	89,700
	Mean	65,750	66,000	74,250	74,850
Associate, Full Time	Minimum	44,100	49,500	55,500	54,100
	Maximum	61,300	62,500	71,300	76,100
	Mean	52,700	56,000	63,400	65,100
Associate, Part Time	Minimum	-	50,000	59,000	63,000
	Maximum	-	53,000	61,000	75,000
	Mean	-	51,500	60,000	69,000
Assistant, Full Time	Minimum	38,000	39,300	40,500	41,700
	Maximum	52,000	57,800	57,900	62,700
	Mean	45,000	48,550	49,200	52,200
Assistant, Part Time	Minimum	36,000	39,300	37,200	40,500
	Maximum	52,800	57,000	67,700	68,700
	Mean	44,400	48,150	52,450	54,600
Instructor, Full Time	Minimum	38,000	39,300	40,500	41,700
	Maximum	42,200	45,500	48,200	53,000
	Mean	40,100	42,400	44,350	47,350
Instructor, Part Time	Minimum	31,800	37,200	44,100	40,500
	Maximum	39,900	40,500	44,100	43,400
	Mean	35,850	38,850	44,100	41,950
Other, Full Time	Minimum	35,200	37,200	43,700	45,000
	Maximum	55,700	60,200	65,000	66,600
	Mean	45,450	48,700	54,350	55,800
Other, Part Time	Minimum	36,000	37,200	37,200	40,500
	Maximum	65,000	68,000	72,100	75,000
	Mean	50,500	52,600	54,650	57,750
Fringe Benefits		?			
Professor, Full Time	Minimum	16,290	15,000	18,540	19,590
	Maximum	34,200	36,300	38,460	41,340
	Mean	25,245	25,650	28,500	30,465
Professor, Part Time	Minimum	9,000	17,100	19,950	18,000
	Maximum	30,450	22,500	24,600	26,910
	Mean	19,725	19,800	22,275	22,455
Associate, Full Time	Minimum	13,230	14,850	16,650	16,230
	Maximum	18,390	18,750	21,390	22,830
	Mean	15,810	16,800	19,035	19,530
Associate, Part Time	Minimum	-	15,000	17,700	18,900
	Maximum	-	15,900	18,300	22,500
	Mean	-	15,450	18,000	20,700
Assistant, Full Time	Minimum	11,400	11,790	12,150	12,510
	Maximum	15,600	17,340	17,370	18,810
	Mean	13,500	14,565	14,760	15,660
Assistant, Part Time	Minimum	10,800	11,790	11,160	12,150
	Maximum	15,840	17,100	20,310	20,610
	Mean	13,320	14,445	15,735	16,380
Instructor, Full Time	Minimum	11,400	11,790	12,150	12,510
	Maximum	12,660	13,650	14,460	15,900
	Mean	12,030	12,720	13,305	14,205
Instructor, Part Time	Minimum	9,540	11,160	13,230	12,150
	Maximum	11,970	12,150	13,230	13,020
	Mean	10,755	11,655	13,230	12,585
Other, Full Time	Minimum	10,560	11,160	13,110	13,500
	Maximum	16,710	18,060	19,500	19,980
	Mean	13,635	14,610	16,305	16,740
Other, Part Time	Minimum	10,800	11,160	11,160	12,150
	Maximum	19,500	20,400	21,630	22,500
	Mean	15,150	15,780	16,395	17,325

FACULTY PROFILE, PART 4

Middlebury College

	2 Years Prior 1996		1 Years Prior 1997		Most Recent Year 1998		Current Year 1999	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Number of Faculty Appointed ?								
Professor	1	1	2	2	-	1	-	1
Associate	-	-	-	-	2	1	-	1
Assistant	16	1	18	1	19	3	11	4
Instructor	11	1	9	-	8	-	15	-
Other	-	6	-	3	-	8	-	5
Total	28	9	29	6	29	13	26	11
Number of Faculty in Tenured Positions ?								
Professor	77	11	82	9	83	9	85	9
Associate	29	-	28	1	23	3	22	3
Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Instructor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	106	11	110	10	106	12	107	12
Number of Faculty Departing ?								
Professor	1	3	1	-	1	2	1	-
Associate	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1
Assistant	11	2	16	1	12	1	13	4
Instructor	7	1	4	-	2	2	1	-
Other	1	6	-	6	-	6	-	3
Total	20	12	21	7	15	12	16	8
Number of Faculty Retiring ?								
Professor	1	-	4	-	5	-	1	1
Associate	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Instructor	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	1	-	4	-	5	-	1	1

FACULTY PROFILE, PART 5

Middlebury College

	2 Years Prior 1996		1 Years Prior 1997		Most Recent Year 1998		Current Year 1999	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
	Number of Faculty by Department (or comparable academic unit)							
American Literature & Civilization	4	3	6	2	5	3	6	4
Studio Art	4	1	4	1	4	1	4	1
Biology	10	-	9	1	9	1	10	2
Chemistry & Biochemistry	8	-	6	1	7	1	7	1
Chinese	4	1	4	-	5	-	4	1
Classics	4	-	4	-	5	1	5	-
Economics	12	1	12	2	12	3	14	1
English	15	8	15	4	14	5	17	3
French	7	2	10	1	8	2	9	2
Geography	4	2	5	1	5	1	6	2
Geology	5	1	5	1	5	1	4	2
German	5	1	5	-	4	-	3	1
History of Art & Architecture	6	2	6	2	6	2	5	2
History	13	6	14	3	15	3	15	2
Italian	4	1	4	1	7	-	5	2
Japanese	5	-	4	-	4	2	4	1
Mathematics & Computer Science	12	1	14	1	13	2	14	2
Music	5	2	5	-	4	1	5	-
Philosophy	5	1	5	1	5	1	5	3
Physics	6	-	6	-	6	-	6	-
Political Science	11	1	12	2	13	4	12	3
Psychology	10	-	11	-	9	-	10	-
Religion	7	1	7	2	7	1	8	1
Russian	5	-	4	1	4	2	4	3
Sociology & Anthropology	7	1	8	2	8	1	10	-
Spanish	9	1	9	2	10	1	12	2
Teacher Education	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	3
Theatre, Dance & Film/Video	8	4	9	5	8	4	9	6
Writing Program	2	1	3	-	3	3	2	1
All other interdepartmental	-	2	-	2	-	2	1	3
Total	199	45	207	39	206	50	217	54

STUDENT HEADCOUNT BY UNDERGRADUATE MAJOR

Middlebury College	2 Year	1 Year	Most Recent	Current
Fall Term	Prior	Prior	Year	Year
Baccalaureate	1996	1997	1998	1999
?				
American Civilization	29	34	25	29
American Literature	24	31	36	33
Art (Studio)		39	38	36
Art (combined History and Studio)	84			
Biology	78	68	64	63
Biochemistry	19	25	19	24
Chemistry	19	15	10	15
Chinese	12	15	14	18
Classics	9	9	9	3
Classical Studies	10	11	8	10
? Computer Science	27	31	34	36
East Asian Studies	15	10	3	
Economics	151	165	137	131
English	198	192	147	139
? Environmental Studies	154	139	121	98
French	70	67	52	33
Geography	28	31	34	57
Geology	30	22	20	15
German	31	34	30	22
History of Art and Architecture		53	47	42
History	103	85	58	63
Independent Scholar	5	3	1	3
International Major (3 Yr B.A.)	6	10	6	2
International Politics and Economics	86	79	43	63
International Studies	19	70	108	100
Italian	23	27	23	20
Japanese	20	18	16	9
Literary Studies	25	24	18	16
Mathematics	27	27	15	13
Molecular Biology and Biochemistry	26	31	18	15
Music	29	21	17	15
Philosophy	13	14	12	17
Physics	43	37	28	21
Political Science	115	97	86	72
Psychology	146	160	125	112
Religion	22	21	11	11
Russian	13	9	10	9
Russian and East European Studies	13	7	1	
Sociology-Anthropology	79	68	47	45
Spanish	96	87	66	49
Theatre, Dance, Film/Video	74	82	84	80
Women's and Gender Studies	5	3	1	2
Total Undergraduate	1,976	1,971	1,642	1,541

?

STUDENT HEADCOUNT: LANGUAGE SCHOOLS AND BREAD LOAF

Middlebury College	2 Year Prior 1996	1 Year Prior 1997	Most Recent Year 1998	Current Year 1999
Year				
Language School Summer Enrollments				
? Arabic	88	77	77	97
Chinese	93	96	95	105
French				
Undergraduate	84	92	125	111
Graduate	140	113	106	111
German				
Undergraduate	63	89	87	94
Graduate	24	24	26	27
Italian				
Undergraduate	27	33	46	47
Graduate	31	41	41	36
Japanese	82	85	76	77
Russian				
Undergraduate	93	76	103	103
Graduate	24	28	22	29
Spanish				
Undergraduate	84	83	98	99
Graduate	167	191	186	183
Total Undergraduate	614	631	707	733
Total Graduate	386	397	381	386
Total	1,000	1,028	1,088	1,119
School Abroad Enrollments - Fall Term				
? France				
Undergraduate	28	44	30	
Graduate	42	33	33	
Germany				
Undergraduate	9	10	7	
Graduate	4	6	4	
Italy				
Undergraduate	18	23	20	
Graduate	10	17	18	
Russia				
Undergraduate	9	25	33	
Graduate	5	1	4	
Spain				
Undergraduate	32	30	27	
Graduate	51	56	50	
Total Undergraduates	96	132	117	
Total Graduates	112	113	109	
Total	208	245	226	-
Bread Loaf School of English Summer Enrollments				
? Vermont	261	220	236	230
Oxford	68	86	81	67
New Mexico	67	75	71	70
Alaska			40	58
Total	396	381	428	425
? Total Language Schools and Bread Loaf	1,604	1,654	1,742	

Optional Data, Explanations, Ratios Offered by the Institution

Middlebury College

Form 1: Accumulated Gains and Losses are included in Long Term Investments

Form 1: Changes in net assets are currently under review with the auditors and are subject to further revision.

Form 1: Designated for Long Term Investments includes Realized Gains reinvested for long term purposes (\$202,049 in 1997 and \$230,302 in 1998).

Form 1: Temporarily restricted net assets designated for long term investments consist of annuity and life income funds.

Form 1: Temporarily restricted net assets available for operations includes contributions receivable of \$21,060,000 in 1998 and \$14,726,000 in 1997.

Form 1: Temporarily Restricted Assets for long term investment are not available at this time.

Form 2-1: Federal aid not included in financial aid figures are for 1999 \$437,220; for 1998 \$517,020; and for 1997 \$379,501.

Form 2-1: Current budget depreciation is not allocated.

Form 2-2: Changes in net assets are currently under review with the auditors and are subject to further revision.

Form 3: In accordance with FASB contributions are either Temporarily or Permanently Restricted since they cannot be spent until received.

Form 3: Section 5: Facility cost allocations do not include facility costs found in Auxiliary Enterprises.

Form 4: Operations does not include debt service interest.

Form 4: College policy is not to budget Contributions Receivable.

Form 4: In accordance with FASB contributions are either Temporarily or Permanently Restricted since they cannot be spent until received.

Form 4: Tuition and Fees include room and board. It is College policy to charge a comprehensive fee and not break out fee components. This comprehensive fee covers everything and there are no additional fees.

Form 4: Budget '99 depreciation expense of \$8,302 is not allocated. It appears here in Other Expenses.

Form 4: Budgets beyond the current year budget are not available in the financial statement format. Only cross code amounts are used for long range budgeting.

Form 4: Future Comprehensive Fee amounts cannot be disclosed due to Justice Department rulings.

Form 5: Interest payments made during the year include interest that was capitalized.

Form 5: Cash flow amounts are not available at this time.

Form 7: Updated table with Fall 1999 enrollment will be provided to the visiting team at Middlebury in October.

Form 8-1: Minimum number of years at this institution is 1, for faculty whose appointments begin in Fall 1999.

Form 8-2: A copy of the current teaching load guidelines, established in May 1993, follows this sheet.

Form 8-3: Fringe benefits average 30% of salary across all ranks.

Form 9-2: Updated table with Fall 1999 Schools Abroad enrollments will be provided to the visiting team at Middlebury in October.

Form 10: Data reported are for course units, not credit hours. All courses at Middlebury carry one unit of credit. Updated table with Fall 1999 enrollments will be provided to the visiting team at Middlebury in October.

TEACHING LOADS

1. The standard teaching load at Middlebury College is three instructional units in one fall or spring term and two in the other, plus responsibilities in winter term. Often, but not always, one unit corresponds to a course listed in the catalogue. Under certain circumstances a given course may count as two instructional units (see below); most faculty will have one such course per year. The purpose of these guidelines is to move toward clarity and equity with regard to teaching responsibilities at the College, while recognizing appropriate differences among the various areas of our curriculum.

2. A course shall count for two instructional units only when it meets one of the criteria (a-c) below, *and* when the faculty member is simultaneously teaching a second separate course involving an additional preparation. A single course shall become the equivalent of two instructional units when, in the three unit term:

a) it is a large lecture course (50 students or more) with at least two lectures, three weekly discussion sections and a total of at least five instructional hours, all taught by the lecturer; or

b) it is a foreign language course meeting for six hours or more all taught by the same instructor; or

c) it is either a six hour course involving a separate laboratory session that is taught entirely by the same instructor, or a nine or more hour course involving separate laboratory sessions taught by the same instructor with laboratory assistants.

3. A single, double-counted course may serve as the faculty member's entire load in a given semester provided that the faculty member teaches three instructional units in the other semester *and* that the large course falls within one of the following categories of "stand-alone" 2-unit courses:

a) a lecture course of at least 90 students that includes two or three lectures and five discussion sections for which the instructor alone is responsible; or

b) a foreign language course of at least 30 students that meets for at least ten hours per week with the instructor solely responsible for all sections and grading; or

c) a laboratory science course of at least 45 students that includes three lectures and three laboratories for which the instructor is responsible.

4. Departments should distribute teaching loads so that each full-time colleague has a 3-2 or 2-3 Fall-Spring load, as defined above. In special circumstances, however, less balanced loads may be necessary. Such cases must be proposed, through the division chair, to TRC for approval.

5. Supervision of senior theses or independent projects does not count as a course preparation.
6. A faculty member who is not teaching for one semester of an academic year is expected to teach the equivalent of three instructional units during the semester when he or she is not on leave.
7. Each spring term, no later than March 1, department chairs will submit a description of their departmental teaching loads in the coming year to the VPAA and the TRC. A form for each member of the department will indicate classes to be taught, courses proposed for two instructional units, and anticipated enrollment for each course. Department chairs will also submit detailed information about specific instructional responsibilities (contact hours, preparation of syllabus, grading and/or corrections) for all courses that are taught by more than one faculty member.

TRANSCRIPTION OF THE COLLEGE CHARTER

Middlebury College.
State of Vermont

Isaac Tichenor, Esquire; Governor & Commander
In Chief, in, and over the State of Vermont

To all to whom these presents shall come,

Greeting.

Know Ye, that I the said Isaac Tichenor by virtue of authority in me vested, and in pursuance of a certain Act of the Legislature of said State passed this first day of November, in the Year of our Lord, eighteen hundred, entitled, "an Act incorporating and establishing a college at Middlebury in the County of Addison", do by these presents, will, ordain, and grant that there be and hereby is granted, instituted, and established a College in the town of Middlebury in the County of Addison in said State. And that Messieurs Jeremiah Atwater, Nathaniel Chipman, Hiram Ball, Elijah Paine, Gamaliel Painter, Israel Smith, Stephen T. Bradley, Seth Storrs, Stephen Jacob, Daniel Chipman, Lot Hall, Aaron Leland, Gershom C. Lyman, Samuel Miller, Jedidiah P. Buckingham and Darius Mathews, shall be, an incorporate society or body corporate and politic and shall hereafter be called and known by the name of the President and Fellows of Middlebury College – and that by the same name they and their successors shall, and may have perpetual succession; and shall and may be persons capable in law to begin, defend and be defended, answer and be answered unto; and also to have, take, possess, acquire purchase or otherwise receive Lands, tenements, hereditaments, goods, chattels, or estate; to grant, demise, lease, use, manage or improve for the good and benefit of the College according to the tenor of the donations.

And that the President and Fellows, and their successors, shall and may hereafter have a common seal to serve, and use for all causes, matters and affairs of theirs, and their successors, and the same seal to serve, and use for all causes, matters and affairs of theirs, and their successors, and the same seal to alter, break and make anew, as they shall think fit – and I the said Isaac Tichenor, as by these presents further will, ordain, constitute and appoint that the said Jeremiah Atwater be and he hereby is established the present president, and the said Nathaniel Chipman, Hiram Ball, Elijah Paine, Gamaliel Painter, Israel Smith, Stephen T. Bradley, Seth Storrs, Stephen Jacob, Daniel Chipman, Lot Hall, Aaron Leland, Gershom C. Lyman, Samuel Miller, Jedidiah P. Buckingham & Darius Mathews, shall and they are hereby established the present Fellows of the College; and that they and their successors shall continue in their respective places during life, or until they or either of them shall resign, be removed or displaced, as in herein after expressed.

And I the said Isaac Tichenor, do further will, ordain, and grant that there shall be a general Meeting of the President and fellows of the said College, in the said College House, on the first Tuesday of November annually or at any other time and place which they shall see cause to appoint, to consult, advise, and act, in, and about the affairs and business of said College; and that on any special emergency, the President and two of the fellows, or any four of the fellows may appoint a meeting at the said College – Provided, they give notice thereof to the rest by Letters sent, and left with them, or at the places of their respective abodes, ten days before said meeting, and, the President and six Fellows, or in case of the death, absence, or incapacity of the President seven Fellows convened as aforesaid (in which case the oldest Fellow shall preside) shall be deemed a Meeting of the President and Fellows of said College; and that in all the said meeting a major vote of the members present shall be deemed the act of the whole, and when an equi-vote happens, the President shall have a casting vote. That the President and Fellows of the said College, and their successors in any of their meetings assembled as aforesaid, may from time as occasion shall require, elect, and appoint a President or Fellow, and also the same remove from time to time for any

misdemeanor, unfaithfulness, default or incapacity, six of the said Corporation at least concurring therein; and shall have power to appoint a scribe, or register, a treasurer, tutors, professors, steward and butler, and such other officers and servants as are usually appointed in Colleges and Universities as they shall find necessary and think fit to appoint for promoting good Literature and well ordering and managing the affairs of said College; and them or any of them at their discretion to remove – And to prescribe and administer such forms of Oaths, not being contrary to the Constitution and laws of this State or of the United States, as they shall think proper to be administered to all those Officers and Instructors of the said College, or to such and so many of them as they shall think proper for the faithful execution of their respective places Offices and trusts.

And that the said President and Fellows shall have the government, care, and management of the said College and of all matters and affairs thereto belonging, and shall have power from time to time as occasion may require, to make, ordain, and establish all such wholesome and reasonable Laws, rules and ordinances, not repugnant to the Constitution and laws of this State, or the United States, as they shall think fit and proper for the instruction and education of the students, and ordering, governing, ruling and managing the said College, and all matters, affairs, and things thereto belonging; and the same to repeal and alter as they shall think fit, which shall be laid before the Legislature of this State as often as required, and may also be repealed or disallowed by the said Legislature when they shall think proper.

And the said President of said College with the consent of the Fellows shall have power to give and confer all such honors, degrees or licenses as are usually given in Colleges or Universities upon such as they shall think worthy thereof.

And I the said Isaac Tichenor do further will and grant that all the lands and ratable Estate that does or shall belong to the said College not exceeding the Yearly value of Two Thousand dollars lying in this State; and the persons families and estates of the Presidents and Professors, lying and being in the town of Middlebury of the value of one Thousand Dollars, to each of said Officers and the persons of the Tutors, Students, and such and so many of the servants of said College, as give their constant attendance on the business of it, shall be freed and exempted from all rates, taxes, military service, working at Highways, or other such like duties and services.

In testimony whereof I have caused the Public Seal of the State of Vermont to be hereunto affixed. Done at Middlebury the first day of November, in the year of our Lord, one Thousand, eight hundred and of the Independence of the United States the twenty-fifth.

By his Excellency's Command

Isaac Tichenor

Ros. Hopkins Secy of State

Vermont Secretary of States Office November 9, 1802

Recorder Att. Dav.^d Wing Jun^f. Secy

President McCardell's September 1994 Address

September 1, 1994

Dear Members of the Association:

I am pleased to have the opportunity to address you on this important day. The Association has achieved many milestones in the past few years, and I am confident that we will continue to make significant contributions to the field of education in the future.

One of our primary goals is to improve the quality of education for all students. We will continue to support research and development in this area, and we will work to ensure that all students have access to the best possible educational opportunities. We will also continue to work to improve the lives of our members and their families.

I am proud to be your president, and I am committed to serving you and the Association in the best possible way. I look forward to working with you to achieve our common goals and to making a positive impact on the world.

Thank you for your support and for being a part of this great organization. I am confident that we will continue to make a positive impact on the world for many years to come.

I am proud to be your president, and I am committed to serving you and the Association in the best possible way. I look forward to working with you to achieve our common goals and to making a positive impact on the world.

I am proud to be your president, and I am committed to serving you and the Association in the best possible way. I look forward to working with you to achieve our common goals and to making a positive impact on the world.

I am proud to be your president, and I am committed to serving you and the Association in the best possible way. I look forward to working with you to achieve our common goals and to making a positive impact on the world.

A Vision for Middlebury College

John M. McCardell, Fall 1994

In May 1992 the Board of Trustees adopted the College's Ten-Year Planning Document, a product of intensive and extensive campus conversations, which, in enumerating principles, goals, and recommendations, charted a course for the decade of the 1990s.

We have made great progress in effecting the plan. We have begun to master the disciplines of budgeting, enrollment management, and staff size. The percentage of our fee increase for 1994-95 was below the national average for four-year liberal arts colleges. But planning is necessarily dynamic, and a plan, to be meaningful, must be a living document. Thus, this year, under the leadership of Dean Ronald Liebowitz, we will be revisiting, and updating, our plan. We expect a lively campus discussion, leading to closure by the end of the academic year in May.

Our particular successes in planning frame the context for this year's planning exercise, and allow us to think more boldly about our future and to stretch ourselves to cross a new threshold of excellence in pursuit of our vision. That vision consists of three parts, and requires us to answer these questions:

1. Where do we want the College to be in the year 2004?
2. What will be those areas for which the College will be singularly known in that year?
3. What is required of each of us to get there?

First, where do we want the College to be in the year 2004? Middlebury should seek to be nothing less than the college of choice for the very strongest students--*the* college of choice.

More specifically, by that year we should be competing successfully for students against those schools with whom we now have the greatest overlap of applicants and acceptances and the least success in competing for matriculants. In 1994, those institutions are Amherst, Williams, Dartmouth, and Princeton. It is risky, if not unseemly, so boldly and baldly to identify one's competition so specifically. We do so in order to lift our sights and to give us a new and higher standard of measurement for ourselves.

In 1983, the Board of Trustees and the Faculty Council agreed upon a list of 25 schools that would constitute a basis of comparison. In that year, we also agreed that Middlebury's proper place on that list, for faculty salaries mainly but also in other areas, was somewhere between sixth and tenth, or, the second quintile from the top. That was a bold declaration in 1983. It raised our sights and our sense of ourselves. After a decade, we have made extraordinary progress toward that goal, but now it is time to raise our sights higher still. Our progress toward greater excellence must not leave us content or self-satisfied.

The college of choice in the year 2004 will be known for several distinctive, defining, and conspicuous strengths. To be sure, Middlebury must be synonymous with general excellence in the liberal arts. The curriculum must be balanced in its offerings and rigorous in its demands, based upon a carefully designed core program and coherent majors that offer study in depth. Much of this is already in place. But more needs to be done, and that is why a renovation and expansion of the Science Center is at the top of our list of capital projects and why we also recognize that within the next 10 years, we must continue the renovation of our residence halls and teaching spaces (notably the Johnson Building), adapt and expand Starr Library to meet the needs and opportunities (posed by technology) of coming generations of student learners, and complete the Athletic Master Plan. It is also why we must, this year, engage the issue of campus dining and make decisions about whether a renovated Proctor, a new central dining facility, or decentralized dining is the way of the future. All of this is expected of any first-rate liberal arts institution with claims to general excellence.

Furthermore, a Middlebury education must remain accessible to the very best students. This means both that we must continue to seek a strong and diverse student body and that we must provide adequate financial aid to ensure that ability to pay is not a criterion for admission. And, finally, we must hold true to the simple proposition of inclusivity, summarized by the simple rule that all student organizations must be open to all students.

These givens form the base of excellence in the liberal arts and are like the Green Mountains of Vermont: our vertebrae, the source of our strength and the definer of our character, colorful in certain seasons, and the reason some people choose to come here and others choose to stay away.

If general excellence is our Green Mountain chain, there are, within that chain of mountains, certain conspicuous peaks—those that stand out beyond the chain's elevated hills. Among those are Camel's Hump, Mount Mansfield, and, nearer by, the so-called presidential range. These peaks rise above the rest and, on many days, extend above the

clouds. They are what one sees from the greatest distance and what one thinks of first when one hears the name Vermont.

We extend this metaphor of the presidential range to describe that small number of areas for which the College will seek a national reputation and which, if successfully pursued, will make Middlebury the college of choice within the next 10 years.

Those peaks include the following:

1. *Cutting edge leadership in language study and pedagogy.* Since 1915, the Middlebury Language Schools have earned a reputation as the most demanding and rigorous programs of their kind. Each summer, a distinguished faculty and committed students descend upon our campus, partaking of a unique mode of instruction that has effectively populated the teaching staffs of our nation's best high schools with holders of a Middlebury M.A. Indeed, it is already the case that language instruction and Middlebury College are synonymous.

To broaden and enhance this reputation will require us to become, as we must and shall become, a hothouse of innovative pedagogy. This has already begun, through a generous grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, which supported a conference this past summer for college language teachers, and which will establish Middlebury as the headquarters--the flagship--of a consortium that will develop multimedia instruction in language. This past summer we also launched the Language Schools' Research Fellowship Program, which brings specialists to the summer campus to do research in adult second language acquisition. Before the end of this decade we will be in the business of producing technologically advanced language teaching products, attaching the Middlebury name as the "Good Housekeeping" seal to an entrepreneurial venture that will not only extend that name, but quite possibly create a significant new revenue source that could relieve some of the burden on our fee-paying families.

Middlebury cannot afford and should not attempt to be on the cutting edge of every discipline. But in the development of language teaching courseware, we must be, and we shall be.

2. Though this may seem to be principally a summer venture, its effect must suffuse every sector of the College. Because a second peak in the presidential range we envision is that this College will become singularly known as a place that insists upon, and teaches, *a global understanding that radiates from a core linguistic and cultural competency.*

International studies at Middlebury, as elsewhere, is an area of growing importance. Advanced language study is at the core of each of these programs, which sets our

approach to international studies apart from those at all other liberal arts colleges. Our achievements in language teaching place us in the enviable position of leading other colleges in the development of international curricula. As confirmed in a glowing report prepared this summer under the auspices of the Association of Professional Schools of International Affairs, Middlebury has far more extensive teaching resources in this particular area of the curriculum than peer institutions, but our efforts to date have not been fully focused. We need to make the whole greater than the sum of the parts.

A major goal for the next few years must be to consolidate our efforts in international studies and bring greater coherence to the whole. East Asian studies, Russian and East European studies, American civilization, international politics and economics must cross paths intellectually. To enhance this possibility, we need to continue to develop the Freeman International Center in order to house multimedia facilities and equipment, conference space, and teaching and office space for both language and non-language faculty.

It is time to answer, and to answer in the affirmative, the question of Middlebury programs in Latin America, in Asia, and in the United Kingdom. And it is time to recognize and exploit the opportunities that exist, on campus and in our programs abroad, to study both contemporary and historical topics from a global perspective.

3. One of these topics, perhaps the most challenging, in our own time and in a new century, is the environment. The third peak in the presidential range is, therefore:

The environmentally aware campus. Once again, here is an area in which the College is already demonstrating aspects of conspicuous excellence. Our recycling efforts have received national acclaim, have involved every member of the community, and have saved the College considerable sums of money. These efforts, fostered by a growing interest in student volunteerism, relate directly to our fastest growing major, environmental studies, and lead us to identify as a 10-year goal the establishment of the preeminent undergraduate Environmental Studies Program.

This program must continue to develop its substantial scientific core. Indeed, science should be to environmental studies as language is to international studies: the basis of understanding and the mark of distinction. To this core must be wedded an emphasis on public policy, in political science and economics, in a global as well as domestic setting, taking into account multiple perspectives, including that of business, on environmental issues. Furthermore, as the liberal arts college with the most advanced computer-based environmental analysis facilities through our GIS lab, Middlebury's technological capabilities in this area offer students opportunities for hands-on experience in environmental planning and policy-making.

Our Environmental Studies Program will be rigorous, comprehensive, and global--a curricular peak.

4. The fourth peak in Middlebury's presidential range will be:

The preeminent program in literary study. The name of Middlebury College should become synonymous with the serious and disciplined study of the written word. To say this is, of course, to remind ourselves that our reputation in this field is already well advanced, and also to recognize that many of the ingredients for greater excellence still are already in place:

--The Bread Loaf School of English, with its three campuses in Ripton, Santa Fe, and Oxford, offers graduate instruction of genuine breadth and distinction and is a place where no single critical perspective dominates and none seeks to subvert or supplant another. That in itself is a mark, and promise, of excellence.

--The Bread Loaf Writers' Conference passes to new leadership next year. Under Bob Pack, the Conference earned a well-deserved reputation for collegiality in the hard work of producing and recognizing good writing. Under Michael Collier, additional faces and new voices will be added to the mix.

--The New England Review/Middlebury Series, just reconstituted and now edited by Stephen Donadio, will maintain its commitment to publishing writing of exceptional quality in all genres and draw on the rich literary resources that have always been associated with the Bread Loaf Writers' Conference and the School of English. *The New England Review* will expand its mission to keep its readers aware of emerging developments in other media, as well, in countries all over the world. It will also invite reassessments of current artistic reputations and of imaginative achievements of earlier periods that may have dropped out of contemporary consciousness.

--The existence of separate language departments, in which national literatures are taught in the target languages *and* in translation, and departments of English and American literature carry the College's strength in literature into the undergraduate program. And here there is more work to be done. Professor John McWilliams, chair of the literature division, will head a reexamination of staffing and course offerings in his division, so that, by the year 2004, Middlebury will have no equal in the range, depth, coherence, and quality of its literature offerings, undergraduate as well as graduate.

5. Finally, the fifth peak, and perhaps the most innovative and practical for a liberal arts institution:

Opportunities for students to apply what they learn about the liberal arts to real world situations. Our academic programs, in conjunction with our Career Counseling and Placement Office and the Alumni Association, must seek to expand opportunities for internships, summer jobs, and other varieties of hands-on or firsthand experience. We

need to encourage students to pursue these opportunities as a means of broadening their education.

These five areas will set, and be known to set, Middlebury apart from other liberal arts institutions. They will become the basis for our successful competition for the strongest students. They will make us the college of choice.

Which brings us to the third and final question, What is required of each of us to get there? To achieve these objectives will require the following:

1. A commitment to work of the very highest quality by every member of the college community. We must insist upon not merely adequate, but excellent, performance.
2. A disciplined allocation of human and financial resources. We have demonstrated this discipline over the last three years: bringing enrollments under control, slowing the rate of growth of the comprehensive fee, and carrying out a successful voluntary separation program. We need to continue to scrutinize our operations and encourage everyone in the community to bring forth ideas for managing our affairs more intelligently and efficiently.
3. A commitment to innovation, of which technology must be a significant instrument. "The way we've always done it" must be required to bear the burden of proof. We need to revisit fundamental questions of how students learn best and at least acknowledge the possibility that not all subjects are equally well learned in 12-week terms, three hours a week, with a final exam at the end and mid-terms in the middle. Much is made these days in the popular press of *productivity*. Too often, where higher education is the target, productivity reduces to larger classes and more teaching hours. We disagree. The appropriate definition of productivity is how much, and how well, students are able to learn. The attention we pay to productivity must have this object in view.
4. Increased opportunities for off-campus study.
5. Quality facilities and equipment that support our core academic program and reinforce our commitment to conspicuous excellence in the areas already noted.
6. A commitment to secure vast new resources.
7. A determination of the direction of social and residential life at Middlebury. We recognize that the Commons and House System continues to evolve. It won't do simply to say, "Let it evolve as it will." We must decide, this year, whether residential life should be

a peak in our presidential range--something that sets Middlebury apart from other schools--or another part of that larger range that contributes to liberal arts excellence.

What we have described here is an ambitious agenda. It is the work of a decade, not of a single year. By the year 2004, if we have been successful in the pursuit of this vision, we will have become the college of choice. And we will have done so by risking the comfort and security of the status quo. If we succeed, we will have successfully posed a new, and more subtle, question: No longer will one wonder merely, "What does it mean to go here?" but instead will ask, "What does it mean to have gone here?"

To go here is of course to experience a splendid physical setting, to make lifelong friends, and to spend four years growing socially and intellectually. But that is not enough. The relationship and obligation between student and institution are mutual, and lifelong. That is why "to have gone here" is ultimately what should matter most. To have gone here is to have a lifetime of opportunities, made possible by the very best liberal arts education. Students will more readily make Middlebury their college of choice when they recognize that having attended means even more than simply attending. To have gone here is ultimately what should matter most.

We now take up our tasks for the year, more readily, perhaps, for the vision of the future that can be ours. We must dare to set our feet on lofty places. The next step begins today. There is work to be done. Let's get on with it.

John M. McCardell, President

Trustee Resolutions on Growth and Residential Life

The Board of Trustees of the City of [City Name] has reviewed the [document name] and has resolved to [action].

[Faded text]

The Board of Trustees of the City of [City Name] has reviewed the [document name] and has resolved to [action].

[Faded text]

The Board of Trustees of the City of [City Name] has reviewed the [document name] and has resolved to [action].

[Faded text]

The Board of Trustees of the City of [City Name] has reviewed the [document name] and has resolved to [action].

[Faded text]

Middlebury College Board of Trustees
May 12, 1995

RESOLUTION

The Middlebury College Board of Trustees commits itself and the College to the achievement of a new level of excellence over the next decade.

The Board believes that the critical element in pursuing the excellence we seek is the enhancement of the College's academic distinction, as it has been put forward in the President's Vision Statement. That distinction is based principally upon a quality faculty and quality facilities. With that distinction, greater numbers of the strongest students will be attracted to the College. With that distinction, Middlebury will become the college of choice.

The Board therefore commits itself to a program of carefully planned and managed growth over the next ten years in order to achieve greater excellence and realize the vision the President has placed before us. Within that time frame, the Board envisions and anticipates the following outcomes:

- an expansion of the faculty by up to 30 full-time equivalents;
- an expansion and renewal of the physical plant as outlined in the Facilities Plan to meet the infrastructural requirements of
- a larger enrollment before the enrollment is increased;
- a gradual increase in the size of the student body over the next ten years to an enrollment of 2,350, and the enhancement of the quality of the student body;
- an expansion of the support staff to provide the necessary services for our students and faculty.

To achieve these goals will require the maintenance and nurture of the College's financial strength. To this end, the Board accepts the following financial planning assumptions: continued reduction in the rate of annual increase in the Comprehensive Fee, with the goal of having the Fee track the annual inflation rate; a successful capital campaign, including an increased rate of annual giving, to bring significant new resources to the College; continued management of our endowment so as to maximize total return, and a continued prudent spending rate of endowment earnings.

The Board embarks upon this path with enthusiasm and confidence. Together with the Principles and Goals of the 1992 Planning Document, to which the Board remains committed, we believe that the College has set for itself a bold, ambitious, and attainable agenda. We believe our chosen course the more exciting for its audacity. Middlebury College means to become the "college of choice," and we seek to do so by embracing a vision that marks us as the "college of the future." We have crafted a strategy to achieve that goal. The strategy assumes that managed growth, with appropriate infrastructural accommodations made beforehand, will not simply convey a sense of momentum,

excitement, and improvement, but will result in a stronger and more excellent institution.
We take up our task with purpose and singleness of heart.

17. 11. 1941

The first of the year has been a very busy one for the institution. We have had a number of new students and a number of our old students have returned. The work has been very hard and we have had to work very long hours. But we have done it and we are very proud of what we have accomplished. We have had a number of very good students and we are very glad to have them. We have also had a number of very good teachers and we are very glad to have them. We are very glad to have all of our students and teachers and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution.

We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution.

We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution.

We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution. We are very glad to have the institution and we are very glad to have the institution.

Middlebury College Board of Trustees
October 31, 1998

Resolution

The Board of Trustees has received and considered The Enhanced Residential Plan report submitted by the Residential Life Committee. It has reviewed the proposed Phase One of the Facilities Plan and accompanying financial projections. It has at length discussed all these documents within the Board and also with the Faculty Council, the Staff Council Executive Committee, and the Student Government Association Executive Committee. It has followed with interest the discussions that have taken place on campus over the past year and a half. It has now received the recommendations of the President and administration on how to proceed.

The Board believes that the College community has fulfilled the charge given it in September 1997 "to begin straightway to design and implement ... a residential system comprising continuing membership, decentralized dining, and proximate faculty residences" so as to make "student life one of Middlebury College's 'peaks of excellence.'" The Enhanced Residential Plan puts forward the requisite design of the program. Phase One of the Facilities Plan defines its physical implementation. Taken together, these documents convincingly demonstrate how human commitment and physical space will enhance in significant ways the educational experience of every Middlebury student.

The President and administration have recommended that the College begin to implement the residential initiative by embracing the majority recommendations of the Enhanced Residential Plan concerning dining, faculty proximity, and continuing membership. The Board accepts these recommendations. In so doing, the Board acknowledges the careful, nuanced cases made in the Plan in support of each recommendation, and the fact that role definition (Associates, Deans, etc.) will continue to evolve toward a "team" approach to student life. Faculty and students have spoken in overwhelming support of the three distinguishing features of the proposed residential system. The Board delegates to the administration the task of carrying out these recommendations while remaining attentive to the discussion that shaped and informs them.

The Board also has discussed the issues surrounding the relationship between the house system (social and academic interest houses) and the Commons. It concurs in the belief that the Commons System should be the central plan for residential life. At the same time the Board is aware of the diversity and intensity of opinion concerning the house system and the pace or form in which the eventual relationship between the Commons and house systems might be determined.

As a result, the Board will not presume to resolve a matter that the community needs to continue to debate, and which may be more susceptible of eventual resolution as that debate unfolds. Progress toward resolution may well be advanced by a reconsideration of how such houses are named, what each house contributes to a student's education, how student might balance multiple forms of membership and affiliation, and the degree to which a house system's social mission can or should be distinguished from its educational purpose. The President and administration have recommended that a decision on these issues be deferred for the present and that they be remanded to the Residential Life Committee to offer recommendations to the President and administration about the relationship between the house and Commons systems. The Board concurs.

The Board authorizes the President and administration to proceed with the implementation of Phase One of the Facilities Plan. Implementation will seek to minimize disruption for all members of the community, to ensure that every generation of students realizes an enhancement of its educational experience during its time on campus, and to strengthen the program in every Commons. It will also proceed with a recognition of the need for a campus center as a necessary balance to the Commons residential neighborhoods. Finally, it will address larger issues of campus traffic patterns, both pedestrian and vehicular, and will have as a goal the creation of a pedestrian central campus.

This is a significant moment in the history of Middlebury College, and these decisions seek to be true to that history. With these decisions, the Board of Trustees places itself firmly on the side of those who believe that, come what may in an ever-changing world, the residential liberal arts college will not only survive, but prosper; that its special claims based upon size and scale will make the education it offers distinctive and valued; and that its concern for each human presence in its midst and in its extended family will be a source of hope and a model of purpose.

Material on Student and Faculty Growth

The following information is provided for your information and is not intended to be used as a basis for any action. It is the policy of the Board of Regents to provide information to the public regarding the activities of the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education. This information is provided for your information and is not intended to be used as a basis for any action.

The following information is provided for your information and is not intended to be used as a basis for any action. It is the policy of the Board of Regents to provide information to the public regarding the activities of the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education. This information is provided for your information and is not intended to be used as a basis for any action.

The following information is provided for your information and is not intended to be used as a basis for any action. It is the policy of the Board of Regents to provide information to the public regarding the activities of the Board of Regents and the State Board of Education. This information is provided for your information and is not intended to be used as a basis for any action.

STUDENT ADMISSIONS DATA (Fall Term)

FIRST YEAR STUDENTS

	4 Years <u>Prior</u> 1994	3 Years <u>Prior</u> 1995	2 Years <u>Prior</u> 1996	1 Year <u>Prior</u> 1997	Most Recent <u>Year</u> 1998	Current <u>Year</u> 1999
Completed Applications	3,871	3,818	4,585	4,738	4,434	4,856
Applications Accepted	1,253	1,389	1,320	1,364	1,348	1,264
Applicants Enrolled	505	580	519	565	567	551
% Accepted of Applied	32.4%	36.4%	28.8%	28.8%	30.4%	26.0%
% Enrolled of Accepted	40.3%	41.8%	39.3%	41.4%	42.1%	43.6%
Percent Change Year over Year						
Completed Applications		-1.4%	20.1%	3.3%	-6.4%	9.5%
Applications Accepted		10.9%	-5.0%	3.3%	-1.2%	-6.2%
Applicants Enrolled		14.9%	-10.5%	8.9%	0.4%	-2.8%
Early Decision Applications	334	517	594	630	602	722
Early Decision Acceptances	149	198	168	179	214	232
Percent of Class Accepted Early	29.5%	34.1%	32.4%	31.7%	37.7%	42.1%
American Students of Color in Entering Class	81	87	76	76	90	95
International Students in Entering Class	67	60	50	44	55	65
Aptitude Indicator: (Define Below)						
Mid 50% range for those submitting SAT I	1140-1340	1160-1340	1340-1420	1350-1430	1350-1430	1370-1460
Class rank: first decile / second decile	62% / 20%	65% / 20%	70% / 15%	66% / 21%	72% / 18%	73% / 19%

TRANSFER STUDENTS

Completed Applications	181	203	185	226	235	258
Applications Accepted	31	39	33	38	28	15
Applicants Enrolled	15	17	12	15	12	10
% Accepted of Applied	17.1%	19.2%	17.8%	16.8%	11.9%	5.8%
% Enrolled of Accepted	48.4%	43.6%	36.4%	39.5%	42.9%	66.7%

POSITIONS APPROVED BY TRC IN SPRING 1996

All of these positions have been filled by the Fall of 1999, with the exception of the "College Professorships," which will be used to help staff the Sophomore Integrated Studies Program that will begin in Fall 2001 for a three-year pilot period.

POSITIONS TO BEGIN IN SEPTEMBER 1997

- AL: Women's Literature:* courses on 19th century literature, American women's literature, and literature and fine arts.
- BI: Vertebrate behavioral ecological physiology:* courses on ecology, animal behavior, and animal physiology
- EC/IS: Latin American and developmental economics:* courses on the Latin American economy, development economics in Latin America, and introduction to the world economy (IS core course). Strong language competence in Spanish required.
- EC/IS: IPE/Economics:* courses on the political economy of European integration, political economy of Western Europe, and economic history. Strong language competence in a Western European language required.
- HI/ES: Western U.S. environmental history:* courses on the American West, 19th century American history, and introduction to environmental history (could be an ES core course).
- IT: Language and literature:* courses on Italian language and 19th and 20th century literature and culture.
- MA: Computer Science:* Position to provide continuity in staffing in basic program and to allow more regular sequence of electives.
- PS/IS: East Asian politics:* courses on international politics and East Asian politics. Would provide additional staffing resources for PS 201 (IS Core Course). Strong language competence in Chinese or Japanese required.
- SA: Latin American anthropology:* position in socio-cultural anthropology with a Latin American specialization. Other fields could include development, political or economic anthropology, indigenous peoples of the Americas, Latinos in the US, and environmental or ecological anthropology.

POSITIONS TO BEGIN IN SEPTEMBER 1998

- College Professorship(s):* up to two tenured Middlebury faculty members would be granted "internal leaves" for periods of three to five years to teach courses outside their departments from an integrative and interdisciplinary perspective. These faculty would be replaced within their departments with term appointees.
- HI/IS: World History:* courses on themes and patterns that demonstrate connections between peoples in the past, including an introductory course on global history that would be an IS core course. Position would preferably have a regional specialization in the Mediterranean Basin.

LIT term position: one FTE to replace courses taught by Middlebury faculty participating in new literature program, which would include LT 101 (Reading Literature), 200- and 300-level courses on comparative literature and culture, and 300- and 400-level courses on literary theory.

MA: Calculus: Position to address enrollment pressures on calculus courses (MA 112 and 113) associated with a larger student body.

SA: Comparative sociology: courses on comparative and cross-national sociology, and historical sociology; would expand the international focus of the department and serve as a bridge between sociology and anthropology.

SP/IS: Latin American Studies (non-lit): courses taught in Spanish on Latin American culture and society.

POSITIONS TO BEGIN IN SEPTEMBER 1999

AL/AC with F/V: Modern media: courses on various media forms in the 20th century: film, television, video, radio, or computer technologies, within a broad cultural and historical perspective.

F/V: International cinema studies: courses on critical studies of a foreign language cinema, noteworthy international cinema artists, and film production. Strong competence in a language taught at Middlebury College required.

Humanities division: Asian philosophy: courses on Asian philosophy and religion that will also serve the International Studies major/East Asian Studies track.

POSITION APPROVED, STARTING DATE OPEN

RE/PA with ES: Environmental Ethics: courses in environmental ethics, introduction to philosophical and religious ethics, and applied social ethics.

GROWTH OF THE FACULTY

YEAR	FTE FACULTY	FALL ENROLLMENT	STU-FAC RATIO
1991-92	186.67	2132	11.4
1992-93	177.80	2074	11.7
1993-94	180.50	2016	11.2
1994-95	181.40	2004	11.0
1995-96	183.25	2041	11.1
1996-97	185.80	2074	11.2
1997-98	192.00	2131	11.1
1998-99	193.00	2232	11.6
1999-00 (est.)	203.00	2236	11.0
2000-01 (est.)	200.00	2200	11.0
2001-02 (est.)	200.00	2200	11.0

Following the decision to expand the College in May, 1995, the Teaching Resources Committee (the predecessor of the Educational Affairs Committee) recommended approval of 19 positions, the majority conceived to buttress the College's strengths in areas designated as curricular peaks. This first round of growth is reflected in the increase of the size of the faculty from 185.8 FTE in the 1996-97 academic year to an estimated 203 FTE in the 1999-2000 academic year. Offset by attrition from the faculty due to retirements and resignations, the result has been a net increase of 17 FTE during this period, leaving approximately half of the projected 30 growth positions remaining to be filled as the student body increases to its planned size of 2350 in the years ahead.

The College's policy is to maintain a student-faculty ratio of 11 to 1 as the student body expands in the years ahead. The enrollment model that underlies the financial projections for the next three years assumes that budgeted enrollment will be held constant at 2175 students for those years: 1999-2000, 2000-01, and 2001-02. We intend that the actual full-time enrollment will be slightly reduced by Fall 2001, from the 2236 of Fall 1999 to approximately 2200 students two years later. The student enrollment, and faculty size, will resume growing after additional residence hall rooms have been constructed to accommodate a larger student body.

Appendix to Faculty Chapter

...

...

...

...

...

STANDARD FIVE FACULTY

APPENDIX

Part One: The Ten Year Plan

In 1991-92, the College developed a Ten-Year Plan that contained six recommendations regarding the faculty.

1. Reward Excellence in Teaching

The 1992 Plan recommended that Middlebury “reward excellence in teaching, where teaching is broadly defined and extends beyond classroom lectures and discussion sections.” Middlebury has taken a number of steps to promote excellence in teaching among junior faculty and to reward excellence in teaching for all faculty. Junior faculty are encouraged to take part in a Winter (January) Term course for new faculty during their first (or in some cases their second) year, which emphasizes development of teaching skills and introduction to college resources for teaching. Opportunities to participate in other Winter Term courses (e.g., Environmental Studies faculty are eligible to participate in a Winter Term course on Geographic Information Systems) and faculty development initiatives like the Davis Fellows Program also contribute to the promotion of excellence in teaching.

A number of mechanisms exist to reward excellence in teaching. First, teaching excellence is one criterion considered during hiring decisions, in which candidates are evaluated on the basis of promise as both scholars and teachers. All candidates for new positions give a public lecture, and usually also teach a class, during their on-campus interview. Second, teaching excellence is considered during decisions about annual raises in salary. Third, the first review for reappointment “concentrates on promise and performance as a teacher.” While few faculty would describe the review process as a “reward,” successful passage of the review does, in effect, reward promising teachers. Finally, an endowed teaching award (the Perkins Award) was established by the Perkins family in 1993 to recognize excellent teachers within the Division of Natural Sciences. This award is given yearly to an outstanding professor in mathematics/computer science or laboratory science (the two disciplinary groups alternate years).

The recommendation that the College reward excellence in teaching involves several issues that are not completely resolved. They are: 1) the methods used to assess excellence in teaching within the classroom; 2) the methods used to assess excellence in teaching outside the classroom; and 3) the value of teaching awards to individual faculty. With respect to the first of these, there is the perception among some faculty members (untenured faculty in particular) that an excessive amount of weight is given, especially during review decisions, to student evaluations. These might not, by some measures, be

the best or most objective way of evaluating teaching excellence. This emphasis on student opinion as an evaluating mechanism might discourage, particularly among untenured faculty, implementation of innovative but risky approaches in the classroom. While these problems exist, there has yet to be proposed an acceptable alternative system to the use of student evaluations. In contrast, there is sentiment among senior faculty that informed observation -- and even mentoring -- of junior faculty teaching is difficult without access to student evaluations, and without more classroom visits, which are now restricted to chairs and to members of the Committee on Reappointment, except by invitation of the junior faculty member.

The second unresolved issue is the difficulty of evaluating teaching outside the classroom, which includes "advising students, the guidance of independent projects, and the careful evaluation of student work. . . . Public lectures, presentations, or performances also contribute to teaching." No doubt faculty participation in some Commons System activities will constitute teaching outside the classroom, but clear definitions of this activity do not now exist. The development of standards as to how much teaching outside the classroom should occur, and how the quality of that teaching is defined, may be difficult or undesirable. It might be reasonable, however, to include in the faculty handbook or in the orientation for new faculty a description of what constitutes "teaching outside the classroom" and what the general expectations are in this area.

Finally, another unresolved issue is whether or not teaching awards are an effective means to reward teaching excellence. Currently, the only College teaching award is restricted to faculty in the Division of Natural Sciences. Development of teaching awards for other disciplines might be an effective means to identify outstanding teachers throughout the College, but this needs further discussion.

2. Faculty Professional Development

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College expand the "definition of faculty professional development in order to encourage faculty to take courses, assist in courses outside their specific specializations, or to do whatever is necessary to make them better teachers and scholars."

The College responded by developing a plan whereby faculty could ask to move their appointments from one discipline to another; thus far three faculty have taken advantage of this initiative. The "Faculty Leave Program" (see below) now allows faculty to propose leaves for work other than research, e.g., development of courseware, textbooks, and study at another institution. Discussions have also taken place to expand the program of College Professorships; these are faculty with special appointments who teach across disciplines. These Professors are selected from among the College's faculty but some are outsiders who are brought to campus for a limited time. Faculty professional development has also been aided by a Winter Term seminar for new faculty, discussed above, and also by the creation of a formal faculty reading group. In addition, a

number of new initiatives have been undertaken to support faculty travel and research.
The programs for faculty development at Middlebury College are summarized as follows:

1. Faculty Professional Development Fund (FPDF)
 - \$650 for travel to conference where the faculty member is not on the program
 - \$1500 for travel to conference when on the program
 - Support for research needs
 - examples of covered expenditures: research assistants, books, equipment, society membership fees up to \$150 per year
 - examples of expenditures that are not covered: dissertation research, personal journal subscriptions
 - FPDF is not an entitlement nor does it accumulate from year to year
2. Long Range Faculty Professional Development Program (FPDP)
 - Three to five years in length, five awards per year, \$3-13,000 per award
3. Undergraduate Collaborative Research Fund
 - Twelve to fifteen awarded per year, \$2800 per award
4. Start-Up Funds for New Faculty
 - Negotiated during hiring phase
5. Departmental Budgets
 - Supplies and equipment for research
6. Senior Work Fund
 - About \$300 for each senior thesis student
7. Palen Fund
 - Provides travel grants to science students in order for them to report results or gather data
8. Ada Howe Kent
 - Provides course development and research support for faculty
 - \$600-3000 awards, ten to twelve grants per year
9. Roddy Foundation
 - Provides four \$6000 summer research grants for pre-med students and faculty research advisors
10. Howard Hughes Medical Institute Grant
 - Provides for summer research assistants in sciences and some social sciences
11. Davis Faculty Fellows Program
 - Funds to develop innovative uses of technology for teaching
12. Discretionary Funds
 - Proposals to the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty
13. Salzburg Seminar Grants
 - Five per year
14. Leave Relocation Funds
 - Relocation funds for faculty on leave who must go elsewhere to do their research; support for up to three months
15. Emeriti Funds
 - Travel and research funds for faculty who have retired
16. Endowed Professorships
 - Research funds made available to the faculty who hold chairs whose endowment funds do not generate enough income to support research.

3. Faculty Leave Program

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "continue [its] faculty leave program, and broaden the terms of eligibility to include options beyond specific research/creative projects."

The faculty leave program underwent a major revision in 1994-95, moving from a "competitive" program with a relatively limited number of leaves to a regular program with a one-term leave after four years of teaching, with full salary, and an entire year after five years -- at 80 per cent of salary. The change was made for several reasons: 1) leave proposals were increasingly professional and therefore difficult for others to rank; 2) leaves were likely soon to outstrip the available funding; 3) curricular planning and continuity were impeded because there was no basic regularity to a departmental leave cycle; 4) the teaching load at Middlebury is generally one course more than at many comparable institutions, and so better access to time for research was at a premium if faculty were to meet their scholarly obligations.

The new leave program has functioned successfully and smoothly. Departments have shown great flexibility and collegiality in accommodating to the new schedule. New colleagues are assured of a leave in either their fifth or sixth year, i. e., between the second review and the tenure review. The need to submit proposals earlier means faculty can be more productive once they are actually on leave, and the Grants Office works very effectively with faculty in identifying funding opportunities. The Educational Affairs Committee (EAC), which is charged with oversight of the program, can now devote more time to issues having to do with the curriculum and the allocation of resources for teaching. The faculty members who had reservations about the change have for the most part come to understand the importance of planning, and to appreciate the relative generosity of a five-year cycle with the possibility of up to 80 per cent of a full-year's salary. Financial projections suggest that cost will not be a factor in the maintenance of this regular leave program.

Some concerns remain, however: 1) One of the incentives for regularizing the leave program was to allow for creation of new tenure track-positions to replace "internally" the colleagues on leave, ensuring greater program continuity; that is, many departments were given an increment to serve as a leave replacement position on a permanent basis. While the number of "external" leave replacement appointments over the last several years has been reduced as a result, such replacements nonetheless remain an issue in terms of both continuity, cost, and expenditure of energy. 2) Even when they have an internal leave replacement position, some departments are still reluctant to bracket a specialty when a particular colleague is on leave. 3) Aside from a few requests to prepare textbooks while on leave, it is not clear if the new leave program has encouraged faculty to take leaves that involve "options beyond specific research/creative projects."

4. Greater Ties Between Social and Academic Life

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "establish well-defined ties between the academic side of the College and the new . . . Commons System." That system came into existence in 1991 with the express purpose of "enhanc[ing] academic, cultural, and social life outside of the classroom." The early years of this experiment yielded mixed results. While the faculty heads of each Commons -- the Faculty Associates -- devoted considerable time to the organization of programming that connected academic and residential life, participation levels at Commons-based academic events were not always inspiring. It was true, however, that some students and some faculty members benefited from this opportunity to interact outside the classroom.

After reviewing the results of these early years of the Commons System, and after a year of extensive debate in 1997-98, the College committed itself to an expanded and enhanced Commons System, one that would do a better job of integrating academic life and residential life. Various members of the community devoted considerable time and energy to the plan for this new Commons System, and the efforts, as well as the results, are well documented in "The Enhanced Residential Plan," a booklet which is available to the visiting committee. The plan was based on three cornerstones: decentralized dining, so that students eat in their Commons; continuing membership of students in one Commons; and the proximity of housing for the Faculty Associate who heads the Commons. These cornerstones were endorsed by the faculty, and in October 1998 the Trustees accepted the recommendation of the President that the new plan be implemented.

While the Trustees did agree to move forward with most aspects of the plan for the new Commons System, there were, of course, many faculty issues yet to be resolved, e.g., the exact role of Faculty Associates, as well as the role of other faculty members (Faculty Affiliates) in the new system. No doubt, too, the new Commons system will affect hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions, since service to the College and the community is one of the criteria used in the review process. Involvement in a Commons will no doubt constitute a form of service to the College.

One of the proposals for the new Commons System, which is contained in the "Enhanced Residential Plan," has already been implemented. In the Fall of 1998, half of all First-Year Seminars were linked to a Commons. The students from a particular seminar lived together in the same dorm and participated in seminar-related activities outside the classroom. Approximately two-thirds of the First-Year Seminars will be affiliated with a Commons in 1999-2000.

5. Nature of New Faculty Appointments

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "change the ways in which new appointments are made, by ensuring that in recruiting for new positions, it is made clear

that the broad educational and institutional perspectives appropriate for a liberal arts institution are to be valued over narrow departmental interests."

As a result, much more stress has been placed on hiring faculty who are qualified for, and committed to, the larger liberal arts mission of the institution. This emphasis is realized during the recruitment process by evaluating candidates' dossiers, by having non-departmental members on search committees, and by the kinds of questions asked of candidates during their on-campus interviews. Also, the recent emphasis -- growing out of the expansion of the faculty -- on interdisciplinary programs has provided a focus, and a rationale, for hiring more people with broader interests. In the past, all new assistant professors were appointed only to departments, although some of these positions carried expectations regarding courses to be offered for some interdisciplinary programs. Recently, the College made its first joint appointment, that is, a faculty member was hired with appointment in two different departments. Where appropriate, this practice will continue.

6. Rules of Reappointment and Tenure

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "appoint a special committee to undertake a full review of the rules for reappointment and tenure, and to make necessary recommendations for change so that faculty are reviewed in ways that are consistent with the expectations deriving from [the College's] educational mission." It was felt that, over the years, the rules had been changed in some ways that led to inconsistencies and confusion.

In June of 1993 President McCardell appointed a committee and charged it with the task of reviewing the rules of reappointment and tenure with the purpose of clarifying and simplifying them. The committee worked during the summer and brought to the faculty the proposed changes, most of which were acted on and passed during the 1993-94 academic year. That part of the rules dealing with the appeals process was not acted on until the Fall of 1994.

Aside from clarifying and simplifying the process, the new rules included several significant changes: 1) Service to the College and to the community was added to the list of criteria for reappointment and tenure. 2) During the review process, the departmental chair's letter, which summarizes the views of the tenured faculty, is to be shared with the candidate under review. The candidate thus has an opportunity to respond to the letter before the review decision is made. 3) A number of changes were made to provide -- immediately after the first and also the second review -- more consultations between junior and senior faculty, between junior faculty and the Committee on Reappointment, between junior faculty and departmental chairs, and also between junior faculty and the academic administration. In the past, some of these consultations had taken place annually; it was felt that this gave candidates the feeling of being constantly under review. Placing the consultations immediately after the successful completion of the first and second review lessened the feeling of being constantly under review, as well as making

the consultations more useful to the candidate. The post-review consultations between the candidate and the COR (Committee on Reappointment and Tenure) have met with particular praise. Minutes of these meetings are kept by the Provost and passed along to the chair and to the academic dean for their post-review consultation with the candidate. The minutes do not go into the COR file, however, and are not used at the next review. In addition, the COR holds one open meeting every two years at which time junior faculty can ask questions about the review process and about criteria for evaluation.

Other changes included making on-campus faculty letters confidential, except in the case of failed reviews. Some changes were also made in the scheduling of reviews, so that the COR workload was spread more evenly over the academic year. The options for Associate Status were also restricted. The College's rules allow for faculty members, particularly those approaching retirement, to teach part-time while retaining their status as full members of the faculty. Such part-time faculty are said to be on Associate Status. Permanent Associate Status was eliminated; Associate Status is now limited to terms of three years, and a maximum of six years before age sixty. Associate Status is permitted for up to five years for those over sixty as a transition to retirement.

All these changes in the rules and procedures for reappointment and tenure seem to have been effective, and no major problems have arisen. The new system of consultations seems to have been very helpful to junior faculty as they move through their reviews toward the tenure review. There is some feeling that it may not be necessary to have two reviews prior to the tenure review, and that the class visitations are somewhat disruptive, but otherwise the new rules seem to be clearer and simpler. Reducing to one the number of reviews prior to the tenure review might make it more possible for senior faculty, and chairs, to mentor junior faculty outside the context of specific reappointment reviews. If there were fewer classroom visits for review purposes, there might be more classroom visits to observe and to help junior faculty with their teaching.

Part Two: The 1990 NEASC Visiting Committee Report and the 1995 Interim Report to NEASC

These reports identified several areas related to faculty that deserved further consideration:

1. Faculty Involvement in Planning

Through its various standing committees (Reappointment and Tenure, Educational Affairs, Curriculum, etc.), the faculty is directly involved in planning and implementing curricular affairs at the College, as well as the decisions about hiring, promotion, reappointment, and tenure. Planning for the curriculum and staffing was intensified during the years 1994-96, when the President provided a vision for the College that identified several "peaks," that is, areas in which the College would work to excel. This led to the appointment of task forces identified with these peaks and to the solicitation of mission statements and long range plans from each program and

department. During the same period the College made a commitment to expand its student body by 300 students and to hire approximately 30 new faculty. The mission statements of the various departments and programs, as well as the reports of the task forces, were used to guide the faculty committee that made recommendations about the first group of positions to be added as the faculty grew.

On the other hand, faculty involvement in budget and building projects was relatively non-existent for a number of years, often limited to "smokers," which were informal meetings of the faculty to discuss various topics on the institution's agenda. The other forum for involvement was an elected faculty committee, the Faculty Council, which was charged with being the liaison between the faculty and the College administration. In the early 1980s, as the size of the faculty began to grow, as several buildings began to be renovated -- or planned and built -- and as the faculty became more concerned with salaries and benefits, the Faculty Council created a sub-committee, the Finance and Long Range Planning Committee (FLRP). Initially this group dealt primarily with faculty salaries and benefits; it took the initiative in gathering the data necessary to compare Middlebury salaries and benefits with twenty-five similar colleges. Open meetings were held with the faculty regarding this issue, and in January 1984, the trustees approved a goal of placing salaries and benefits at the middle of the second quintile of the schools with which Middlebury wished to compare itself. FLRP was also the forum for faculty response to the College's budget and to building plans, but it rarely dealt with these matters and, indeed, its effectiveness for faculty involvement in planning was called into question in the late 1980s and early 1990s when the new arts center was built. Many faculty felt the commitment to build the Center for the Arts (CFA) had moved forward without adequate faculty consultation.

As the response to the CFA illustrated, the effectiveness of FLRP as a vehicle for faculty planning was erratic, depending upon the issues raised, who was on the committee, etc. Moreover, in trying to deal with the College budget and with building plans, FLRP had added a heavy load of work to its members, who were already spending many hours as members of Faculty Council. Recognizing these problems, President Light created in May 1991 a separate Long Range Planning Committee, which included five administrators (including the President), two staff members, a student, and three faculty members approved by the Faculty Council. This Committee functioned until May 1992 (with President McCardell serving as chair from September 1991), and with faculty input produced the 1992 Ten-Year Plan, a document that has guided the College's efforts since then.

After 1992, faculty involvement in planning reverted to the Faculty Council and to FLRP. In 1994-95, FLRP reconstituted itself, with a broader charge, as a sub-committee on Finance and Planning (FAP). Its charge was, and is, to serve as the liaison between the administration and the faculty in matters of money (e.g., salaries, benefits, the budget, and fund-raising priorities) and in those building projects related to the faculty (e.g., the library). Where appropriate, FAP calls meetings of the faculty to discuss various

budgetary issues, as well as building plans. It is mandated to call at least one meeting a year to present information on salaries and benefits.

On the one hand, FAP would seem an appropriate vehicle for faculty involvement in planning, but its effectiveness is limited by the amount of work imposed on it at this point in the life of the College, which is undertaking so many new initiatives. The members of FAP already have a heavy workload, since they are also members of Faculty Council. They cannot meet often enough to discuss every item on the College's agenda. As a result, when FAP does find the time to discuss some projects, the work has moved so far along that it is too late for the faculty to have much input. The solution would seem to be the creation of a separate Planning Committee, but many faculty members are loath to create yet another committee. FAP's effectiveness is also limited by the fact that its open meetings are often poorly attended by faculty.

On the whole, Middlebury faculty today have many more opportunities to be involved in College planning. Numerous open meetings were held, for instance, when the College was considering the expansion of the student body. Members of the faculty were on the committee that planned the new library, and its plans and deliberations were available on the College's Web site. Open meetings were held by this group, too. In 1997-98, the faculty held numerous discussions, for instance, about the proposed new Commons System. As a result, the views of the faculty, passed along to the administration and to the trustees, helped shape the new system (the Enhanced Residential Plan). The Academic Facilities Planning office, recently created to oversee the planning of academic facilities, has been an important and useful step, since the head of that office has directly solicited faculty help in developing programs for new academic facilities. Most College faculty feel that their opinions are sought regarding College planning. If anything, the complaint by faculty is that they do not always have adequate time to attend all the meetings that are being held to solicit faculty opinions during a planning process.

2. Faculty and Administration Composition and Diversity

The College currently counts a total teaching faculty of 271, including full and part-time faculty, colleagues on leave or on assignment abroad, and assistants-in-instruction. The full-time equivalents (FTEs) for 1999-2000 number 203, and there are 252 individuals teaching at least one course on campus during Fall 1999.

A concerted effort was made during the 1980s and 1990s to hire more women to the faculty. Ten years ago only 11 women held tenured appointments, representing 12 per cent of all faculty with tenure. In 1999-2000 there are 32 women with tenure, representing 26 per cent of all faculty with tenure. Ten years ago there were seven female full professors, compared to 21 in 1999-2000. Of 78 faculty who currently hold tenure-track appointments but are not tenured, 34 are women and 44 are men. Of the 201 faculty on regular appointment (tenured and tenure-track), 135 are men (67 per cent) and 66 are women (33 per cent).

During the past ten years women have been appointed in increasing numbers to academic administrative positions. Two women have served as Deans of the Faculty, one woman has been Dean of the College, one has been Dean of Students (now Dean of Student Affairs), and one has been Vice President for Languages and Director of the Language Schools. Two women have served as Associate Deans of the Faculty, and one woman currently serves as Associate Dean of the Language Schools. Ten years ago seven women were serving as chairs of departments, divisions, or programs. In 1999-2000, there are twelve women serving as department chairs or program directors.

Since 1991, faculty of color in the full-time faculty have increased from 24 to 30 (now 14 per cent of all full-time faculty) of whom nine have tenure (7 per cent of those faculty with tenure.) During the past ten years, a number of faculty of color have been appointed to administrative positions at the College: a Vice President for Undergraduate Affairs, a Vice President for Languages and Director of the Language Schools, a Special Assistant to the President (for Diversity Issues), the Director of Academic Support, the director of PALANA House, and a College Chaplain. In addition, the College has created the Twilight fellowship program, which provides term appointments and residencies for artists and scholars of color. Since the program was begun, there have been sixteen Twilight Fellows on campus for periods ranging from two days to one month.

While these appointments represent an improvement in the situation, the College has not been as successful as it would like in attracting faculty of color. There is severe competition nationally to hire such faculty, and the College's attempts in this area are limited by its location; that is, it is difficult to attract and retain faculty of color in a rural area and state where there are so few citizens of color. A special recruitment policy does remain in effect that provides for consideration of qualified candidates of color beyond a department complement, i. e., such individuals may be hired irrespective of the availability of a position to be filled. A total of three appointments have been made as a result of this initiative.

3. Junior/Senior Faculty Relations

The 1990 NEASC Visiting Committee Report suggested that steps be taken to "insure that faculty get to know one another better." There was a suggestion that department chairs "try to encourage interaction between junior and senior faculty," particularly by involving junior faculty in "deliberations on hiring of new faculty, course loads, curriculum and leaves." More particularly, the Report said, the College should "consider creating a mentor system that pairs new faculty with senior colleagues from other departments." While no formal mentor system has been created, the College has developed a course for new faculty during Winter Term, discussed above. This course also provides a means for junior faculty members to get to know one another. The creation of a Faculty Club was also suggested by the Visiting Committee; while not a club, or a lounge, a faculty-staff dining room has been created.

Some departments have made strides in involving junior faculty in departmental deliberations, but this varies widely according to individual departments. The same is true for departmental chairs; some are more helpful than others in mentoring junior faculty.

4. Other Issues Concerning the Faculty

Of the 271 faculty in all ranks, 70 people are on term (non-tenure track) appointments of one kind or another. (These numbers do not include visiting Winter Term faculty.) These appointments include both part-time members of the faculty, some of whom serve in ongoing or renewable positions, and faculty on one- to three-year full-time term appointments to replace colleagues on leave or serving in the administration, or to enable a department to offer additional courses to respond to enrollment pressures. This many faculty on part-time and term appointments is higher than the College would like, since faculty here for short periods -- as well as part-time faculty -- reduce continuity and rarely perform any non-teaching duties. The EAC continues to work with departments in exploring how and whether it is possible to convert term positions to tenure-track leave replacement positions, as well as to bracket certain specialized courses so that the faculty who teach those courses would not need to be replaced from the outside while on leave. It should be noted, too, that 36 of the individuals not on tenure-track do in fact hold on-going appointments (e.g., Lecturer), and that these people share in the non-teaching duties of regular faculty as well as teach multiple courses.

The question of term appointments, including part-time appointments, is closely connected with another issue facing the College, that of spousal employment. For the most part, the College has had no difficulty in attracting top candidates for faculty positions. In a few cases, however, the College has not been able to hire a much-desired candidate to whom an offer was made because it could not offer full-time employment to a spouse. No doubt this problem will grow. A small college like Middlebury does not have the flexibility that a large university has in creating positions for spouses. The College has offered part-time employment to some spouses, and that has been helpful in attracting desired candidates, but, of course, such an arrangement does increase the number of part-time faculty. Another issue facing the College is the ability to attract and retain faculty members with spouses who seek employment outside the College. In the past few years, the College's Human Resources office has strengthened its efforts to provide information about employment in the area, even to the point of putting this information on the College's Web page. What seems clear is that the goal of recruiting and retaining excellent faculty is linked to spousal employment issues.

Even when the College is successful in attracting faculty whose spouses need employment, there is some evidence that retaining these faculty is a problem. Of all faculty (not just those with spouses who need employment), who arrive on tenure track, only 52 per cent receive tenure; the other 48 per cent either fail a review (first, second, or tenure) or leave voluntarily. While no objective data is currently available, it seems logical to assume that Middlebury follows the trend of other liberal arts colleges outside of urban areas; that is, many of the faculty who leave voluntarily are either faculty of color or female, or both.

Low retention rates have been cited nationally as one cause of the continuing problem of low representation of women and non-white racial groups in the upper echelons of academic hierarchies. Poor retention of women is generally attributed to conflicts that arise between the careers of spouses/partners and conflicts between family (especially child-rearing) and career. National studies have demonstrated that women are more likely than men to make career sacrifices in the face of conflicts between spousal careers, or between career and other familial responsibilities; therefore issues related to familial leave and spousal employment are probably crucial to increasing the retention of women faculty. In the Spring of 1999, the College instituted a formal policy on parental leaves. A faculty member who either gives birth or adopts a child during a semester in which that faculty member would normally teach will be relieved of teaching duties for the entire semester without loss of salary. (A male faculty whose spouse or domestic partner gives birth or adopts a child during such a semester will also be eligible for the benefits of this policy, if such faculty member will be the child's primary caregiver during that time). The faculty member will be granted six weeks completely off, and will normally be expected to resume non-teaching duties--such as committee work, administrative work, and thesis advising--at the conclusion of that time. (However, a faculty member who wishes to take a full familial leave for twelve weeks would be on unpaid leave for the second six weeks). Additionally, in the event of a birth or adoption that occurs after October 1, the faculty member will be released from teaching for the Fall and Winter Terms. In the event of a birth or adoption that occurs after December 1, the faculty member will be released from teaching during the Winter and Spring Terms. In the event of a birth or adoption during the Winter Term, the faculty member will be released from teaching during the Winter and Spring Terms. A faculty member who gives birth or adopts a child between May 15 and the start of the Fall Term will be released from teaching during the Fall Term. If a faculty member subject to reappointment and review is released from teaching for a familial leave under this policy, that faculty member's review schedule will be postponed by one semester, unless the faculty member requests that the schedule not be so postponed. It is assumed that this new parental leave policy will help retain more female faculty members. The College's domestic partner policy, established in 1997, has also been an important asset for recruitment and retention.

Poor retention of faculty of color is linked to the environment outside and inside the College. While there is nothing that the College can do about its location in Vermont, a rural state that is overwhelmingly white, there are steps that Middlebury can, and has, taken to make the institutional culture more conducive to attracting and retaining a racially diverse faculty. Workshops conducted for staff and faculty by the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI), which were begun in the Spring of 1998, have the potential to effect real change within the campus community, and are an important first step towards increasing the racial diversity within the faculty. In the Spring of 1998, President McCardell appointed a Human Relations Committee to study issues of gender and race on campus -- among students, staff, and faculty -- and to make recommendations

on ways to improve the climate on campus. The committee's report was released in March 1999.

There are a few other ancillary issues to be noted. The current policy of scheduling meetings at 4:15 p.m. creates obstacles for people (male and female) engaged in child-rearing activities and has been identified as an important issue affecting the satisfaction of faculty. In addition, members of minority groups (gender and racial) on the faculty may be given a disproportionate amount of advising, since they might be expected to advise gay and lesbian students, or students of color. These same faculty might also be disproportionately targeted for committee assignments, in the interest of increasing the diversity of decision-making bodies. While these goals are laudable, they may create unfair burdens on these faculty and could conceivably contribute to poor retention.

Another issue regarding the faculty has to do with its potential "graying," that is, an increasing percentage of tenured faculty in the latter stages of their careers. At a small school like Middlebury, there is concern about this potential problem, but it does not appear to be an issue, at least not for the next ten years. The College will add between ten and fifteen incremental positions over the next decade, as both the faculty and the student body continue to grow. Thirty-six faculty will reach normal retirement age between now and 2009, while there are 78 faculty currently in tenure-track, but untenured, positions. Over the past decade, slightly more than half of those appointed to tenure-track positions have gone on to become tenured members of the faculty. Of the incremental positions to be added in the coming decade, only a few of these faculty will have reached their tenure review by 2009. All in all, then, the likelihood is that during the next ten years a larger percentage of the faculty will be in junior faculty ranks, as retirees are replaced by younger faculty members.

An on-going issue for faculty is workload. The College's commitment to teaching, as well as to scholarship and research, places a heavy burden on faculty; this is exacerbated by expectations of service to the College, which includes the faculty's involvement in administrative and committee work. The tradition at Middlebury is to have full-time faculty fill the role of chairs of departments and programs, usually for three-year terms. The proliferation of departments and programs has meant that more and more faculty are serving as chairs of programs with little, if any, release time outside of Winter Term in exchange for their administrative duties. Forty-two faculty are currently serving as chairs and heads of departments, programs, sections, and tracks. Roughly a fourth of the faculty, then, has administrative duties in addition to their teaching, scholarship, and research responsibilities. Additionally, approximately half the faculty on regular appointment serve on elected, appointed, or ad hoc committees in addition to their teaching, scholarship, and research responsibilities. The new Commons System will surely require even more faculty involvement.

Table of Insurance Coverage

[The following table contains extremely faint and illegible text, likely representing a table of insurance coverage details. The content is too light to transcribe accurately.]

GENERAL INSURANCE RECAP

August 1999

Coverage	Company	Deductible	Limit	Comments
Business Auto	Cigna	\$500	\$1,000,000	*
General Liability	United Educators	\$5,000	\$1,000,000	*
Educators Legal Liability	United Educators	\$25,000	\$10,000,000	No excess coverage
Property	Arkwright	\$25,000	Replacement cost	No excess coverage
Business Interruption	Arkwright	\$25,000	5,000,000	No excess coverage
Inland Marine	Cigna	\$1,000	Replacement Cost-	No excess coverage
Foreign Liability	Chubb	\$1,000	\$1,000,000	*
Ski Liability	Pettit Morry	\$1,000	\$1,000,000	*
*Excess Liability	United Educators	\$1,000,000	\$25,000,000	
Workers Compensation	Cigna	-0-	\$1,000,000	No excess coverage

List of Acronyms in the Report

International
Program
of
Education
Association
of
Professors

AA Academic Affairs Group
ABD All But Dissertation
ADA Americans with Disabilities Act
ARC Agreement to Respect Community
BLSE Bread Loaf School of English
BLWC Bread Loaf Writers' Conference
CAPP Committee on Art in Public Places
CC Curriculum Committee
CET Center for Educational Technology
CFA Center for the Arts
CRA Commons Residential Advisers
CSFR Committee on Senior Faculty Reviews
CSO Career Services Office
DLIS Dean of Languages and International Studies
DML Doctorate of Modern Languages
EAC Educational Affairs Committee
FAP Finance and Planning Committee
FLRP Finance and Long Range Planning Committee
FPDF Faculty Professional Development Fund
FTE Full Time Equivalents
FYS First-Year Seminar
HEDS Higher Education Data Sharing
HRC Human Relations Committee
IR Institutional Research
IS International Studies
ITS Information Technology Services
JC Junior Counselors
JRB Judicial Review Board
MARS Middlebury Automated Registration System
NCBI National Coalition Building Institute
NEBHE New England Board of Higher Education
NESCAC New England Small College Athletic Conference
RA Resident Assistant
SAC Student Advisory Committee
SGA Student Government Association
TRC Teaching Resources Committee
WP Writing Program

Handwritten text, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through. The text appears to be organized into several paragraphs or sections, possibly containing a list or a series of notes. Some words are difficult to discern but seem to include terms like "List", "Notes", and "References".

Handwritten text, mostly illegible due to fading and bleed-through. This section continues the notes or list from the upper portion of the page. The handwriting is consistent with the upper section, and the text is arranged in a similar structured manner.

STANDARD FIVE FACULTY

APPENDIX

Part One: The Ten Year Plan

In 1991-92, the College developed a Ten-Year Plan that contained six recommendations regarding the faculty.

1. Reward Excellence in Teaching

The 1992 Plan recommended that Middlebury “reward excellence in teaching, where teaching is broadly defined and extends beyond classroom lectures and discussion sections.” Middlebury has taken a number of steps to promote excellence in teaching among junior faculty and to reward excellence in teaching for all faculty. Junior faculty are encouraged to take part in a Winter (January) Term course for new faculty during their first (or in some cases their second) year, which emphasizes development of teaching skills and introduction to college resources for teaching. Opportunities to participate in other Winter Term courses (e.g., Environmental Studies faculty are eligible to participate in a Winter Term course on Geographic Information Systems) and faculty development initiatives like the Davis Fellows Program also contribute to the promotion of excellence in teaching.

A number of mechanisms exist to reward excellence in teaching. First, teaching excellence is one criterion considered during hiring decisions, in which candidates are evaluated on the basis of promise as both scholars and teachers. All candidates for new positions give a public lecture, and usually also teach a class, during their on-campus interview. Second, teaching excellence is considered during decisions about annual raises in salary. Third, the first review for reappointment “concentrates on promise and performance as a teacher.” While few faculty would describe the review process as a “reward,” successful passage of the review does, in effect, reward promising teachers. Finally, an endowed teaching award (the Perkins Award) was established by the Perkins family in 1993 to recognize excellent teachers within the Division of Natural Sciences. This award is given yearly to an outstanding professor in mathematics/computer science or laboratory science (the two disciplinary groups alternate years).

The recommendation that the College reward excellence in teaching involves several issues that are not completely resolved. They are: 1) the methods used to assess excellence in teaching within the classroom; 2) the methods used to assess excellence in teaching outside the classroom; and 3) the value of teaching awards to individual faculty. With respect to the first of these, there is the perception among some faculty members (untured faculty in particular) that an excessive amount of weight is given, especially during review decisions, to student evaluations. These might not, by some measures, be the best or most objective way of evaluating teaching excellence. This emphasis on student opinion as an evaluating mechanism might discourage, particularly among

untentured faculty, implementation of innovative but risky approaches in the classroom. While these problems exist, there has yet to be proposed an acceptable alternative system to the use of student evaluations. In contrast, there is sentiment among senior faculty that informed observation -- and even mentoring -- of junior faculty teaching is difficult without access to student evaluations, and without more classroom visits, which are now restricted to chairs and to members of the Committee on Reappointment, except by invitation of the junior faculty member.

The second unresolved issue is the difficulty of evaluating teaching outside the classroom, which includes "advising students, the guidance of independent projects, and the careful evaluation of student work. . . . Public lectures, presentations, or performances also contribute to teaching." No doubt faculty participation in some Commons System activities will constitute teaching outside the classroom, but clear definitions of this activity do not now exist. The development of standards as to how much teaching outside the classroom should occur, and how the quality of that teaching is defined, may be difficult or undesirable. It might be reasonable, however, to include in the faculty handbook or in the orientation for new faculty a description of what constitutes "teaching outside the classroom" and what the general expectations are in this area.

Finally, another unresolved issue is whether or not teaching awards are an effective means to reward teaching excellence. Currently, the only College teaching award is restricted to faculty in the Division of Natural Sciences. Development of teaching awards for other disciplines might be an effective means to identify outstanding teachers throughout the College, but this needs further discussion.

2. Faculty Professional Development

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College expand the "definition of faculty professional development in order to encourage faculty to take courses, assist in courses outside their specific specializations, or to do whatever is necessary to make them better teachers and scholars."

The College responded by developing a plan whereby faculty could ask to move their appointments from one discipline to another; thus far three faculty have taken advantage of this initiative. The "Faculty Leave Program" (see below) now allows faculty to propose leaves for work other than research, e.g., development of courseware, textbooks, and study at another institution. Discussions have also taken place to expand the program of College Professorships; these are faculty with special appointments who teach across disciplines. These Professors are selected from among the College's faculty but some are outsiders who are brought to campus for a limited time. Faculty professional development has also been aided by a Winter Term seminar for new faculty, discussed above, and also by the creation of a formal faculty reading group. In addition, a number of new initiatives have been undertaken to support faculty travel and research. The programs for faculty development at Middlebury College are summarized as follows:

1. Faculty Professional Development Fund (FPDF)
 - \$650 for travel to conference where the faculty member is not on the program
 - \$1500 for travel to conference when on the program
 - Support for research needs
 - examples of covered expenditures: research assistants, books, equipment, society membership fees up to \$150 per year
 - examples of expenditures that are not covered: dissertation research, personal journal subscriptions
 - FPDF is not an entitlement nor does it accumulate from year to year
2. Long Range Faculty Professional Development Program (FPDP)
 - Three to five years in length, five awards per year, \$3-13,000 per award
3. Undergraduate Collaborative Research Fund
 - Twelve to fifteen awarded per year, \$2800 per award
4. Start-Up Funds for New Faculty
 - Negotiated during hiring phase
5. Departmental Budgets
 - Supplies and equipment for research
6. Senior Work Fund
 - About \$300 for each senior thesis student
7. Palen Fund
 - Provides travel grants to science students in order for them to report results or gather data
8. Ada Howe Kent
 - Provides course development and research support for faculty
 - \$600-3000 awards, ten to twelve grants per year
9. Roddy Foundation
 - Provides four \$6000 summer research grants for pre-med students and faculty research advisors
10. Howard Hughes Medical Institute Grant
 - Provides for summer research assistants in sciences and some social sciences
11. Davis Faculty Fellows Program
 - Funds to develop innovative uses of technology for teaching
12. Discretionary Funds
 - Proposals to the Provost and the Dean of the Faculty
13. Salzburg Seminar Grants
 - Five per year
14. Leave Relocation Funds
 - Relocation funds for faculty on leave who must go elsewhere to do their research; support for up to three months
15. Emeriti Funds
 - Travel and research funds for faculty who have retired
16. Endowed Professorships
 - Research funds made available to the faculty who hold chairs whose endowment funds do not generate enough income to support research.

3. Faculty Leave Program

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "continue [its] faculty leave program, and broaden the terms of eligibility to include options beyond specific research/creative projects."

The faculty leave program underwent a major revision in 1994-95, moving from a "competitive" program with a relatively limited number of leaves to a regular program with a one-term leave after four years of teaching, with full salary, and an entire year after five years -- at 80 per cent of salary. The change was made for several reasons: 1) leave proposals were increasingly professional and therefore difficult for others to rank; 2) leaves were likely soon to outstrip the available funding; 3) curricular planning and continuity were impeded because there was no basic regularity to a departmental leave cycle; 4) the teaching load at Middlebury is generally one course more than at many comparable institutions, and so better access to time for research was at a premium if faculty were to meet their scholarly obligations.

The new leave program has functioned successfully and smoothly. Departments have shown great flexibility and collegiality in accommodating to the new schedule. New colleagues are assured of a leave in either their fifth or sixth year, i. e., between the second review and the tenure review. The need to submit proposals earlier means faculty can be more productive once they are actually on leave, and the Grants Office works very effectively with faculty in identifying funding opportunities. The Educational Affairs Committee (EAC), which is charged with oversight of the program, can now devote more time to issues having to do with the curriculum and the allocation of resources for teaching. The faculty members who had reservations about the change have for the most part come to understand the importance of planning, and to appreciate the relative generosity of a five-year cycle with the possibility of up to 80 per cent of a full-year's salary. Financial projections suggest that cost will not be a factor in the maintenance of this regular leave program.

Some concerns remain, however: 1) One of the incentives for regularizing the leave program was to allow for creation of new tenure track-positions to replace "internally" the colleagues on leave, ensuring greater program continuity; that is, many departments were given an increment to serve as a leave replacement position on a permanent basis. While the number of "external" leave replacement appointments over the last several years has been reduced as a result, such replacements nonetheless remain an issue in terms of both continuity, cost, and expenditure of energy. 2) Even when they have an internal leave replacement position, some departments are still reluctant to bracket a specialty when a particular colleague is on leave. 3) Aside from a few requests to prepare textbooks while on leave, it is not clear if the new leave program has encouraged faculty to take leaves that involve "options beyond specific research/creative projects."

4. Greater Ties Between Social and Academic Life

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "establish well-defined ties between the academic side of the College and the new . . . Commons System." That system came into existence in 1991 with the express purpose of "enhanc[ing] academic, cultural, and social life outside of the classroom." The early years of this experiment yielded mixed results. While the faculty heads of each Commons -- the Faculty Associates -- devoted considerable time to the organization of programming that connected academic and residential life, participation levels at Commons-based academic events were not always inspiring. It was true, however, that some students and some faculty members benefited from this opportunity to interact outside the classroom.

After reviewing the results of these early years of the Commons System, and after a year of extensive debate in 1997-98, the College committed itself to an expanded and enhanced Commons System, one that would do a better job of integrating academic life and residential life. Various members of the community devoted considerable time and energy to the plan for this new Commons System, and the efforts, as well as the results, are well documented in "The Enhanced Residential Plan," a booklet which is available to the visiting committee. The plan was based on three cornerstones: decentralized dining, so that students eat in their Commons; continuing membership of students in one Commons; and the proximity of housing for the Faculty Associate who heads the Commons. These cornerstones were endorsed by the faculty, and in October 1998 the Trustees accepted the recommendation of the President that the new plan be implemented.

While the Trustees did agree to move forward with most aspects of the plan for the new Commons System, there were, of course, many faculty issues yet to be resolved, e.g., the exact role of Faculty Associates, as well as the role of other faculty members (Faculty Affiliates) in the new system. No doubt, too, the new Commons system will affect hiring, promotion, and tenure decisions, since service to the College and the community is one of the criteria used in the review process. Involvement in a Commons will no doubt constitute a form of service to the College.

One of the proposals for the new Commons System, which is contained in the "Enhanced Residential Plan," has already been implemented. In the Fall of 1998, half of all First-Year Seminars were linked to a Commons. The students from a particular seminar lived together in the same dorm and participated in seminar-related activities outside the classroom. Approximately two-thirds of the First-Year Seminars will be affiliated with a Commons in 1999-2000.

5. Nature of New Faculty Appointments

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "change the ways in which new appointments are made, by ensuring that in recruiting for new positions, it is made clear that the broad educational and institutional perspectives appropriate for a liberal arts institution are to be valued over narrow departmental interests."

As a result, much more stress has been placed on hiring faculty who are qualified for, and committed to, the larger liberal arts mission of the institution. This emphasis is

realized during the recruitment process by evaluating candidates' dossiers, by having non-departmental members on search committees, and by the kinds of questions asked of candidates during their on-campus interviews. Also, the recent emphasis -- growing out of the expansion of the faculty -- on interdisciplinary programs has provided a focus, and a rationale, for hiring more people with broader interests. In the past, all new assistant professors were appointed only to departments, although some of these positions carried expectations regarding courses to be offered for some interdisciplinary programs. Recently, the College made its first joint appointment, that is, a faculty member was hired with appointment in two different departments. Where appropriate, this practice will continue.

6. Rules of Reappointment and Tenure

The 1992 Plan recommended that the College "appoint a special committee to undertake a full review of the rules for reappointment and tenure, and to make necessary recommendations for change so that faculty are reviewed in ways that are consistent with the expectations deriving from [the College's] educational mission." It was felt that, over the years, the rules had been changed in some ways that led to inconsistencies and confusion.

In June of 1993 President McCardell appointed a committee and charged it with the task of reviewing the rules of reappointment and tenure with the purpose of clarifying and simplifying them. The committee worked during the summer and brought to the faculty the proposed changes, most of which were acted on and passed during the 1993-94 academic year. That part of the rules dealing with the appeals process was not acted on until the Fall of 1994.

Aside from clarifying and simplifying the process, the new rules included several significant changes: 1) Service to the College and to the community was added to the list of criteria for reappointment and tenure. 2) During the review process, the departmental chair's letter, which summarizes the views of the tenured faculty, is to be shared with the candidate under review. The candidate thus has an opportunity to respond to the letter before the review decision is made. 3) A number of changes were made to provide -- immediately after the first and also the second review -- more consultations between junior and senior faculty, between junior faculty and the Committee on Reappointment, between junior faculty and departmental chairs, and also between junior faculty and the academic administration. In the past, some of these consultations had taken place annually; it was felt that this gave candidates the feeling of being constantly under review. Placing the consultations immediately after the successful completion of the first and second review lessened the feeling of being constantly under review, as well as making the consultations more useful to the candidate. The post-review consultations between the candidate and the COR (Committee on Reappointment and Tenure) have met with particular praise. Minutes of these meetings are kept by the Provost and passed along to the chair and to the academic dean for their post-review consultation with the candidate. The minutes do not go into the COR file, however, and are not used at the next review. In addition, the COR holds one open meeting every two years at which time junior faculty can ask questions about the review process and about criteria for evaluation.

Other changes included making on-campus faculty letters confidential, except in the case of failed reviews. Some changes were also made in the scheduling of reviews, so that the COR workload was spread more evenly over the academic year. The options for Associate Status were also restricted. The College's rules allow for faculty members, particularly those approaching retirement, to teach part-time while retaining their status as full members of the faculty. Such part-time faculty are said to be on Associate Status. Permanent Associate Status was eliminated; Associate Status is now limited to terms of three years, and a maximum of six years before age sixty. Associate Status is permitted for up to five years for those over sixty as a transition to retirement.

All these changes in the rules and procedures for reappointment and tenure seem to have been effective, and no major problems have arisen. The new system of consultations seems to have been very helpful to junior faculty as they move through their reviews toward the tenure review. There is some feeling that it may not be necessary to have two reviews prior to the tenure review, and that the class visitations are somewhat disruptive, but otherwise the new rules seem to be clearer and simpler. Reducing to one the number of reviews prior to the tenure review might make it more possible for senior faculty, and chairs, to mentor junior faculty outside the context of specific reappointment reviews. If there were fewer classroom visits for review purposes, there might be more classroom visits to observe and to help junior faculty with their teaching.

Part Two: The 1990 NEASC Visiting Committee Report and the 1995 Interim Report to NEASC

These reports identified several areas related to faculty that deserved further consideration:

1. Faculty Involvement in Planning

Through its various standing committees (Reappointment and Tenure, Educational Affairs, Curriculum, etc.), the faculty is directly involved in planning and implementing curricular affairs at the College, as well as the decisions about hiring, promotion, reappointment, and tenure. Planning for the curriculum and staffing was intensified during the years 1994-96, when the President provided a vision for the College that identified several "peaks," that is, areas in which the College would work to excel. This led to the appointment of task forces identified with these peaks and to the solicitation of mission statements and long range plans from each program and department. During the same period the College made a commitment to expand its student body by 300 students and to hire approximately 30 new faculty. The mission statements of the various departments and programs, as well as the reports of the task forces, were used to guide the faculty committee that made recommendations about the first group of positions to be added as the faculty grew.

On the other hand, faculty involvement in budget and building projects was relatively non-existent for a number of years, often limited to "smokers," which were informal meetings of the faculty to discuss various topics on the institution's agenda. The

other forum for involvement was an elected faculty committee, the Faculty Council, which was charged with being the liaison between the faculty and the College administration. In the early 1980s, as the size of the faculty began to grow, as several buildings began to be renovated -- or planned and built -- and as the faculty became more concerned with salaries and benefits, the Faculty Council created a sub-committee, the Finance and Long Range Planning Committee (FLRP). Initially this group dealt primarily with faculty salaries and benefits; it took the initiative in gathering the data necessary to compare Middlebury salaries and benefits with twenty-five similar colleges. Open meetings were held with the faculty regarding this issue, and in January 1984, the trustees approved a goal of placing salaries and benefits at the middle of the second quintile of the schools with which Middlebury wished to compare itself. FLRP was also the forum for faculty response to the College's budget and to building plans, but it rarely dealt with these matters and, indeed, its effectiveness for faculty involvement in planning was called into question in the late 1980s and early 1990s when the new arts center was built. Many faculty felt the commitment to build the Center for the Arts (CFA) had moved forward without adequate faculty consultation.

As the response to the CFA illustrated, the effectiveness of FLRP as a vehicle for faculty planning was erratic, depending upon the issues raised, who was on the committee, etc. Moreover, in trying to deal with the College budget and with building plans, FLRP had added a heavy load of work to its members, who were already spending many hours as members of Faculty Council. Recognizing these problems, President Light created in May 1991 a separate Long Range Planning Committee, which included five administrators (including the President), two staff members, a student, and three faculty members approved by the Faculty Council. This Committee functioned until May 1992 (with President McCardell serving as chair from September 1991), and with faculty input produced the 1992 Ten-Year Plan, a document that has guided the College's efforts since then.

After 1992, faculty involvement in planning reverted to the Faculty Council and to FLRP. In 1994-95, FLRP reconstituted itself, with a broader charge, as a sub-committee on Finance and Planning (FAP). Its charge was, and is, to serve as the liaison between the administration and the faculty in matters of money (e.g., salaries, benefits, the budget, and fund-raising priorities) and in those building projects related to the faculty (e.g., the library). Where appropriate, FAP calls meetings of the faculty to discuss various budgetary issues, as well as building plans. It is mandated to call at least one meeting a year to present information on salaries and benefits.

On the one hand, FAP would seem an appropriate vehicle for faculty involvement in planning, but its effectiveness is limited by the amount of work imposed on it at this point in the life of the College, which is undertaking so many new initiatives. The members of FAP already have a heavy workload, since they are also members of Faculty Council. They cannot meet often enough to discuss every item on the College's agenda. As a result, when FAP does find the time to discuss some projects, the work has moved so far along that it is too late for the faculty to have much input. The solution would seem to be the creation of a separate Planning Committee, but many faculty members are

loath to create yet another committee. FAP's effectiveness is also limited by the fact that its open meetings are often poorly attended by faculty.

On the whole, Middlebury faculty today have many more opportunities to be involved in College planning. Numerous open meetings were held, for instance, when the College was considering the expansion of the student body. Members of the faculty were on the committee that planned the new library, and its plans and deliberations were available on the College's Web site. Open meetings were held by this group, too. In 1997-98, the faculty held numerous discussions, for instance, about the proposed new Commons System. As a result, the views of the faculty, passed along to the administration and to the trustees, helped shape the new system (the Enhanced Residential Plan). The Academic Facilities Planning office, recently created to oversee the planning of academic facilities, has been an important and useful step, since the head of that office has directly solicited faculty help in developing programs for new academic facilities. Most College faculty feel that their opinions are sought regarding College planning. If anything, the complaint by faculty is that they do not always have adequate time to attend all the meetings that are being held to solicit faculty opinions during a planning process.

2. Faculty and Administration Composition and Diversity

The College currently counts a total teaching faculty of 271, including full and part-time faculty, colleagues on leave or on assignment abroad, and assistants-in-instruction. The full-time equivalents (FTEs) for 1999-2000 number 203, and there are 252 individuals teaching at least one course on campus during Fall 1999.

A concerted effort was made during the 1980s and 1990s to hire more women to the faculty. Ten years ago only 11 women held tenured appointments, representing 12 per cent of all faculty with tenure. In 1999-2000 there are 32 women with tenure, representing 26 per cent of all faculty with tenure. Ten years ago there were seven female full professors, compared to 21 in 1999-2000. Of 78 faculty who currently hold tenure-track appointments but are not tenured, 34 are women and 44 are men. Of the 201 faculty on regular appointment (tenured and tenure-track), 135 are men (67 per cent) and 66 are women (33 per cent).

During the past ten years women have been appointed in increasing numbers to academic administrative positions. Two women have served as Deans of the Faculty, one woman has been Dean of the College, one has been Dean of Students (now Dean of Student Affairs), and one has been Vice President for Languages and Director of the Language Schools. Two women have served as Associate Deans of the Faculty, and one woman currently serves as Associate Dean of the Language Schools. Ten years ago seven women were serving as chairs of departments, divisions, or programs. In 1999-2000, there are twelve women serving as department chairs or program directors.

Since 1991, faculty of color in the full-time faculty have increased from 24 to 30 (now 14 per cent of all full-time faculty) of whom nine have tenure (7 per cent of those faculty with tenure.) During the past ten years, a number of faculty of color have been

appointed to administrative positions at the College: a Vice President for Undergraduate Affairs, a Vice President for Languages and Director of the Language Schools, a Special Assistant to the President (for Diversity Issues), the Director of Academic Support, the director of PALANA House, and a College Chaplain. In addition, the College has created the Twilight fellowship program, which provides term appointments and residencies for artists and scholars of color. Since the program was begun, there have been sixteen Twilight Fellows on campus for periods ranging from two days to one month.

While these appointments represent an improvement in the situation, the College has not been as successful as it would like in attracting faculty of color. There is severe competition nationally to hire such faculty, and the College's attempts in this area are limited by its location; that is, it is difficult to attract and retain faculty of color in a rural area and state where there are so few citizens of color. A special recruitment policy does remain in effect that provides for consideration of qualified candidates of color beyond a department complement, i. e., such individuals may be hired irrespective of the availability of a position to be filled. A total of three appointments have been made as a result of this initiative.

3. Junior/Senior Faculty Relations

The 1990 NEASC Visiting Committee Report suggested that steps be taken to "insure that faculty get to know one another better." There was a suggestion that department chairs "try to encourage interaction between junior and senior faculty," particularly by involving junior faculty in "deliberations on hiring of new faculty, course loads, curriculum and leaves." More particularly, the Report said, the College should "consider creating a mentor system that pairs new faculty with senior colleagues from other departments." While no formal mentor system has been created, the College has developed a course for new faculty during Winter Term, discussed above. This course also provides a means for junior faculty members to get to know one another. The creation of a Faculty Club was also suggested by the Visiting Committee; while not a club, or a lounge, a faculty-staff dining room has been created.

Some departments have made strides in involving junior faculty in departmental deliberations, but this varies widely according to individual departments. The same is true for departmental chairs; some are more helpful than others in mentoring junior faculty.

4. Other Issues Concerning the Faculty

Of the 271 faculty in all ranks, 70 people are on term (non-tenure track) appointments of one kind or another. (These numbers do not include visiting Winter Term faculty.) These appointments include both part-time members of the faculty, some of whom serve in ongoing or renewable positions, and faculty on one- to three-year full-time term appointments to replace colleagues on leave or serving in the administration, or to enable a department to offer additional courses to respond to enrollment pressures. This many faculty on part-time and term appointments is higher than the College would like, since faculty here for short periods -- as well as part-time faculty -- reduce

continuity and rarely perform any non-teaching duties. The EAC continues to work with departments in exploring how and whether it is possible to convert term positions to tenure-track leave replacement positions, as well as to bracket certain specialized courses so that the faculty who teach those courses would not need to be replaced from the outside while on leave. It should be noted, too, that 36 of the individuals not on tenure-track do in fact hold on-going appointments (e.g., Lecturer), and that these people share in the non-teaching duties of regular faculty as well as teach multiple courses.

The question of term appointments, including part-time appointments, is closely connected with another issue facing the College, that of spousal employment. For the most part, the College has had no difficulty in attracting top candidates for faculty positions. In a few cases, however, the College has not been able to hire a much-desired candidate to whom an offer was made because it could not offer full-time employment to a spouse. No doubt this problem will grow. A small college like Middlebury does not have the flexibility that a large university has in creating positions for spouses. The College has offered part-time employment to some spouses, and that has been helpful in attracting desired candidates, but, of course, such an arrangement does increase the number of part-time faculty. Another issue facing the College is the ability to attract and retain faculty members with spouses who seek employment outside the College. In the past few years, the College's Human Resources office has strengthened its efforts to provide information about employment in the area, even to the point of putting this information on the College's Web page. What seems clear is that the goal of recruiting and retaining excellent faculty is linked to spousal employment issues.

Even when the College is successful in attracting faculty whose spouses need employment, there is some evidence that retaining these faculty is a problem. Of all faculty (not just those with spouses who need employment), who arrive on tenure track, only 52 per cent receive tenure; the other 48 per cent either fail a review (first, second, or tenure) or leave voluntarily. While no objective data is currently available, it seems logical to assume that Middlebury follows the trend of other liberal arts colleges outside of urban areas; that is, many of the faculty who leave voluntarily are either faculty of color or female, or both.

Low retention rates have been cited nationally as one cause of the continuing problem of low representation of women and non-white racial groups in the upper echelons of academic hierarchies. Poor retention of women is generally attributed to conflicts that arise between the careers of spouses/partners and conflicts between family (especially child-rearing) and career. National studies have demonstrated that women are more likely than men to make career sacrifices in the face of conflicts between spousal careers, or between career and other familial responsibilities; therefore issues related to familial leave and spousal employment are probably crucial to increasing the retention of women faculty. In the Spring of 1999, the College instituted a formal policy on parental leaves. A faculty member who either gives birth or adopts a child during a semester in which that faculty member would normally teach will be relieved of teaching duties for the entire semester without loss of salary. (A male faculty whose spouse or domestic partner gives birth or adopts a child during such a semester will also be eligible for the benefits of this policy, if such faculty member will be the child's primary caregiver during

that time). The faculty member will be granted six weeks completely off, and will normally be expected to resume non-teaching duties--such as committee work, administrative work, and thesis advising—at the conclusion of that time. (However, a faculty member who wishes to take a full familial leave for twelve weeks would be on unpaid leave for the second six weeks). Additionally, in the event of a birth or adoption that occurs after October 1, the faculty member will be released from teaching for the Fall and Winter Terms. In the event of a birth or adoption that occurs after December 1, the faculty member will be released from teaching during the Winter and Spring Terms. In the event of a birth or adoption during the Winter Term, the faculty member will be released from teaching during the Winter and Spring Terms. A faculty member who gives birth or adopts a child between May 15 and the start of the Fall Term will be released from teaching during the Fall Term. If a faculty member subject to reappointment and review is released from teaching for a familial leave under this policy, that faculty member's review schedule will be postponed by one semester, unless the faculty member requests that the schedule not be so postponed. It is assumed that this new parental leave policy will help retain more female faculty members. The College's domestic partner policy, established in 1997, has also been an important asset for recruitment and retention.

Poor retention of faculty of color is linked to the environment outside and inside the College. While there is nothing that the College can do about its location in Vermont, a rural state that is overwhelmingly white, there are steps that Middlebury can, and has, taken to make the institutional culture more conducive to attracting and retaining a racially diverse faculty. Workshops conducted for staff and faculty by the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI), which were begun in the Spring of 1998, have the potential to effect real change within the campus community, and are an important first step towards increasing the racial diversity within the faculty. In the Spring of 1998, President McCardell appointed a Human Relations Committee to study issues of gender and race on campus -- among students, staff, and faculty -- and to make recommendations on ways to improve the climate on campus. The committee's report was released in March 1999.

There are a few other ancillary issues to be noted. The current policy of scheduling meetings at 4:15 p.m. creates obstacles for people (male and female) engaged in child-rearing activities and has been identified as an important issue affecting the satisfaction of faculty. In addition, members of minority groups (gender and racial) on the faculty may be given a disproportionate amount of advising, since they might be expected to advise gay and lesbian students, or students of color. These same faculty might also be disproportionately targeted for committee assignments, in the interest of increasing the diversity of decision-making bodies. While these goals are laudable, they may create unfair burdens on these faculty and could conceivably contribute to poor retention.

Another issue regarding the faculty has to do with its potential "graying," that is, an increasing percentage of tenured faculty in the latter stages of their careers. At a small school like Middlebury, there is concern about this potential problem, but it does not appear to be an issue, at least not for the next ten years. The College will add between ten

and fifteen incremental positions over the next decade, as both the faculty and the student body continue to grow. Thirty-six faculty will reach normal retirement age between now and 2009, while there are 78 faculty currently in tenure-track, but untenured, positions. Over the past decade, slightly more than half of those appointed to tenure-track positions have gone on to become tenured members of the faculty. Of the incremental positions to be added in the coming decade, only a few of these faculty will have reached their tenure review by 2009. All in all, then, the likelihood is that during the next ten years a larger percentage of the faculty will be in junior faculty ranks, as retirees are replaced by younger faculty members.

An on-going issue for faculty is workload. The College's commitment to teaching, as well as to scholarship and research, places a heavy burden on faculty; this is exacerbated by expectations of service to the College, which includes the faculty's involvement in administrative and committee work. The tradition at Middlebury is to have full-time faculty fill the role of chairs of departments and programs, usually for three-year terms. The proliferation of departments and programs has meant that more and more faculty are serving as chairs of programs with little, if any, release time outside of Winter Term in exchange for their administrative duties. Forty-two faculty are currently serving as chairs and heads of departments, programs, sections, and tracks. Roughly a fourth of the faculty, then, has administrative duties in addition to their teaching, scholarship, and research responsibilities. Additionally, approximately half the faculty on regular appointment serve on elected, appointed, or ad hoc committees in addition to their teaching, scholarship, and research responsibilities. The new Commons System will surely require even more faculty involvement.