

WESLEYAN
UNIVERSITY



SELF STUDY REPORT

TO

THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION
OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

AUGUST 15, 2012

Contents

- Institutional Characteristics** v
- Preface** 1
 - Introduction** 1
 - Wesleyan University Committees on the Standards for Accreditation 1
 - Wesleyan University Committees on Reaccreditation 2
 - Institutional Overview** 2
 - Commission’s 2007 Recommendations 3
 - Coherence and Student performance (1 and 2) 3
 - Planned Investments (3) 4
 - Financial aid 4
 - Additional faculty 4
 - Diversity 4
 - Student services 5
 - Campus computing 5
 - Fund raising 6
 - Usdan (4) 6
 - Conclusion** 6
- Standard One: Mission and Purpose** 9
 - Description 9
 - Appraisal 10
 - Projection 10
 - Institutional Effectiveness 11
- Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation** 13
 - Planning** 13
 - Description 13
 - Appraisal 14
 - Projection 15
 - Institutional Effectiveness 15
 - Evaluation** 15
 - Description 15
 - Appraisal 16
 - Projection 16
 - Institutional Effectiveness 16
- Standard Three: University Organization and Governance** 17
 - BOARD OF TRUSTEES** 17
 - Description 17
 - Appraisal 17
 - Projection 18
 - ADMINISTRATION** 18
 - Description 18
 - Appraisal 19
 - Projection 19
 - FACULTY** 20
 - Description 20
 - Appraisal 22
 - Projection 23
 - STUDENTS** 23
 - Description 23
 - Appraisal 24
 - Projection 25
 - Institutional Effectiveness** 25

Standard Four: The Academic Program	27
Overview	27
Description	27
Undergraduate Program	27
Undergraduate Majors	28
Certificates	28
Graduate Program	29
Appraisal	29
Graduate Program	29
M.A. and Ph.D. Degree Programs	29
B.A./M.A. Program	30
Continuing Studies	30
Undergraduate Program	31
Teaching and Learning	31
Curricular Coherence	32
Faculty Advising and Course Selection	34
Integrity in the Award of Academic Credit	35
New Programs	35
College of the Environment	36
Allbritton Center for the Study of Public Life	36
Internships	37
Summer Session	37
Study Abroad	37
Service Learning	37
Certificates	38
Writing	38
First Year Initiative Seminars	39
Senior Capstone Initiatives	39
Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes	40
Athletics	41
Arts and Community Programs	42
Center for the Arts	42
Davison Art Center	42
Green Street Arts Center	42
Center for Prison Education	42
Projection	43
Institutional Effectiveness	43
Standard Five: Faculty	47
Description	47
Hiring and Retention	47
Teaching and Advising	48
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity	48
Technology in Teaching and Research	49
Service	49
Evaluation of Faculty	49
Faculty compensation	50
Appraisal	50
Hiring and Retention	50
Teaching and Advising	50
Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity	51
Technology in Teaching and Research	51
Service	51
Evaluation of Faculty	52
Evaluation of Teaching	52
Fostering and Supporting Teaching Excellence	53
Faculty compensation	54
Projection	54
Institutional Effectiveness	54

Standard Six: Students	55
Overview	55
Description	55
Admissions and Financial Aid	55
Student Services	55
Appraisal	56
Admissions and Financial Aid	56
Graduation and Retention	57
Student Services	57
Residential Life	57
Usdan University Center	58
New Student Orientation	59
International Students	59
Class Deans	59
Student Academic Support	59
Health Services: Counseling Center	60
Wesleyan Career Center	60
Physical Education and Athletics	61
Civic Engagement	62
Study Abroad	62
Alcohol and Other Drugs	63
Honor Board, Student Judicial Board, and Graduate Judicial Board	63
Campus Climate and Diversity	64
Graduate Students	64
Projection	65
Institutional Effectiveness	66
Standard Seven: Library and Other Information Resources	69
Description	69
Library	69
Information Technology Services	69
Appraisal	71
Library	71
Information Technology Services	74
Projection	78
Library	78
Information Technology Services	79
Institutional Effectiveness	79
Library	79
Information Technology Services	80
Standard Eight: Physical and Technological Resources	81
Overview	81
Description	81
The Facilities Departments	81
Appraisal	82
Facilities Planning	82
Classrooms	82
Sciences	83
Major Maintenance	83
Americans with Disability Act (ADA)	83
Sustainability and Energy Conservation	84
Utility Infrastructure	85
Real Estate Portfolio Management	85
Environmental Health and Safety	85
Facilities Management Performance	86
Projection	87
Institutional Effectiveness	87

Standard Nine: Financial Resources	89
Description	89
Appraisal	90
Managing Debt	90
Endowment Management	90
Financial Aid and Affordability	91
Projection	91
Institutional Effectiveness	92
Standard Ten: Public Disclosure	93
Overview	93
Description	93
Print Publications	93
The Web	93
Other Media	94
Appraisal	94
Print Publications	94
The Web	95
Other Media	95
Projection	96
Institutional Effectiveness	96
Standard Eleven: Integrity	97
Description	97
Appraisal	97
Projection	98
Institutional Effectiveness	98
Appendix	99
Affirmation of Compliance with Federal Requirements of Title IV	99
E and S forms on Student Achievement and Success	100
Most Recent Financial Statements	117
Auditor's Management Letter	151
List of Supporting Documents	152

Institutional Characteristics Form Revised September 2009

This form is to be completed and placed at the beginning of the self-study report:

Date: **July 17, 2012**

1. Corporate name of institution: **Wesleyan University**
2. Date institution was chartered or authorized: **May 26, 1831**
3. Date institution enrolled first students in degree programs: **1831**
4. Date institution awarded first degrees: **1833**
5. Type of control:

<u>Public</u>	<u>Private</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> State	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Independent, not-for-profit
<input type="checkbox"/> City	<input type="checkbox"/> Religious Group (Name of Church) _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: (Specify) _____
6. By what agency is the institution legally authorized to provide a program of education beyond high school, and what degrees is it authorized to grant? **The General Assembly of Connecticut; Bachelor's, Master's, and Doctorate**
7. Level of postsecondary offering (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than one year of work	<input type="checkbox"/> First professional degree
<input type="checkbox"/> At least one but less than two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Master's and/or work beyond the first professional degree
<input type="checkbox"/> Diploma or certificate programs of at least two but less than four years	<input type="checkbox"/> Work beyond the master's level but not at the doctoral level (e.g., Specialist in Education)
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate degree granting program of at least two years	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A doctor of philosophy or equivalent degree
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Four- or five-year baccalaureate degree granting program	<input type="checkbox"/> Other doctoral programs _____
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____
8. Type of undergraduate programs (check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Occupational training at the crafts/clerical level (certificate or diploma)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Liberal arts and general
<input type="checkbox"/> Occupational training at the technical or semi-professional level (degree)	<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher preparatory
<input type="checkbox"/> Two-year programs designed for full transfer to a baccalaureate degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Professional
	<input type="checkbox"/> Other _____

9. The calendar system at the institution is:

Semester Quarter Trimester Other _____

10. What constitutes the credit hour load for a full-time equivalent (FTE) student each semester?

- a) Undergraduate ___16_ credit hours
- b) Graduate ___12__ credit hours
- c) Professional _____ credit hours

11. Student population:

a) Degree-seeking students:

	Undergraduate	Graduate	Total
Full-time student headcount	2879	197	3076
Part-time student headcount	3	123	126
FTE	2880	238	3118

b) Number of students (headcount) in non-credit, short-term courses: _____

12. List all programs accredited by a nationally recognized, specialized accrediting agency.

Program	Agency	Accredited since	Last Reviewed	Next Review

13. Off-campus Locations. List all instructional locations other than the main campus. For each site, indicate whether the location offers full-degree programs or 50% or more of one or more degree programs. Record the full-time equivalent enrollment (FTE) for the most recent year. Add more rows as needed.

	Full degree	50%-99%	FTE
A. In-state Locations			
B. Out-of-state Locations			



-
15. Degrees and certificates offered 50% or more electronically: For each degree or Title IV-eligible certificate, indicate the level (certificate, associate's, baccalaureate, master's, professional, doctoral), the percentage of credits that may be completed on-line, and the FTE of matriculated students for the most recent year. Enter more rows as needed.

Name of program	Degree level	% on-line	FTE

16. Instruction offered through contractual relationships: For each contractual relationship through which instruction is offered for a Title IV-eligible degree or certificate, indicate the name of the contractor, the location of instruction, the program name, and degree or certificate, and the number of credits that may be completed through the contractual relationship. Enter more rows as needed.


Name of contractor	Location	Name of program	Degree or certificate	# of credits


17. List by name and title the chief administrative officers of the institution. (Use the table on the following page.)




Vacant Position-10467


18. Supply a table of organization for the institution. While the organization of any institution will depend on its purpose, size and scope of operation, institutional organization usually includes four areas. Although every institution may not have a major administrative division for these areas, the following outline may be helpful in charting and describing the overall administrative organization:






18 a) Organization of academic affairs, showing a line of responsibility to president for each department, school division, library, admissions office, and other units assigned to this area;






18 b) Organization of student affairs, including health services, student government, intercollegiate activities, and other units assigned to this area;



18 c) Organization of finances and business management, including plant operations and maintenance, non-academic personnel administration, IT, auxiliary enterprises, and other units assigned to this area;



18 d) Organization of institutional advancement, including fund development, public relations, alumni office and other units assigned to this area.

19. Record briefly the central elements in the history of the institution:

Named for John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, Wesleyan University is among the oldest of the originally Methodist institutions of higher education in the United States. Wesleyan was chartered in 1831 by Methodist leaders and Middletown, CT, citizens. In the first decades following its founding, Wesleyan sought to place modern languages, literature, and natural sciences on an equal footing with the classics. Since the 1860s, Wesleyan's faculty has focused on original research and publication in addition to teaching. In 1870, Wesleyan constructed one of the first American college buildings dedicated wholly to scientific study. The earliest Wesleyan students were all male and from 1872 to 1912, a limited number of women were admitted. During the 1960s, Wesleyan began actively to recruit students of color. By 1968, women were again admitted as exchange or transfer students and in 1970, female students were again admitted to the freshman class. A dramatic expansion in the size of the student body followed, and gender parity was achieved within several years. Wesleyan became fully independent of the Methodist church in 1937. Beginning in the 1940s and continuing into the 1960s, interdisciplinary study began to flourish, leading to Wesleyan's ongoing excellence in this area. The Graduate Liberal Studies Program, founded in 1953, is the oldest liberal studies program and the first grantor of the MALS (master of liberal studies) and CAS (certificate of advanced studies) degrees. In this same period, the undergraduate interdisciplinary programs, the College of Letters, College of Social Studies, and Wesleyan's model program in ethnomusicology were inaugurated. Doctoral programs in the sciences and ethnomusicology were instituted in the early 1960s. Wesleyan's programs and facilities expanded in the 1970s with the establishment of The Center for African American Studies and The Center for the Arts. The Mansfield Freeman Center for East Asian Studies was established in 1987, The Center for the Americas was inaugurated in 1998, and The Center for Film Studies opened in 2004. An addition of the Freeman Athletic Center opened in 2005. Also in 2005, the 5-year Wesleyan Campaign came to a close, raising more than \$281 million for student aid, faculty and academic excellence, and campus renewal. Fall 2007 marked the opening of the Suzanne Lemberg Usdan University Center and the adjacent renovated Fayerweather building, and in 2012, the new home for the College of Letters, the Art and Art History Department, and the Wesleyan Career Center opened. Michael S. Roth became Wesleyan's 16th president in 2007. He has undertaken a number of initiatives that have energized the curriculum and increased grant support for Wesleyan undergraduates who receive financial aid. Applications for admission have increased substantially over the last five years.

Function or Office	Name	Exact Title	Year of Appointment
Chair Board of Trustees	Joshua S. Boger	Chair of the Board	2009
President/CEO	Michael S. Roth	President	2007
Executive Vice President			

Chief Academic Officer	Robert Rosenthal	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	2010
Deans of Schools and Colleges (insert rows as needed)	Andrew Curran	Dean of the Arts & Humanities	2011
Deans of Schools and Colleges (insert rows as needed)	D. Gary Shaw	Dean of the Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Programs	2010
Deans of Schools and Colleges (insert rows as needed)	Ishita Mukerji	Dean of the Natural Sciences and Mathematics	2012
Chief Financial Officer	John Meerts	Vice President for Finance and Administration	2006
Chief Student Services Officer	Michael Whaley	Vice President for Student Affairs	2008
Planning	Charles Salas	Director of Strategic Initiatives	2009
Institutional Research	Michael Whitcomb	Director of Institutional Research	2006
Assessment	N/A		
Development	Barbara-Jan Wilson	Vice President for University Relations	1999
Library	Patricia Tully	University Librarian	2010
Chief Information Officer	David Baird	Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer	2012
Continuing Education	Sheryl Culotta	Director of Continuing Studies and Graduate Liberal Studies Program	2010
Grants/Research			
Admissions	Nancy Hargrave Meislahn	Dean of Admission and Financial Aid	2000
Registrar	Anna van der Burg	Registrar	2000
Financial Aid	John Gudvangen	Director of Financial Aid	2011
Public Relations	William Holder	Director of University Communications	2010

Alumni Association	John Driscoll	Alumni Director	1982
Other - Chief Diversity Officer	Sonja Mañjon	Vice President for Institutional Partnerships and Chief Diversity Officer	2008

"DATA FIRST" FORMS
GENERAL INFORMATION

Institution Name: Wesleyan University

OPE ID: U 00142400

Financial Results for Year Ending:		Annual Audit	
		Certified: Yes/No	Qualified Unqualified
Most Recent Year	U 06/30	Yes	Unqualified
1 Year Prior	U 2011	Yes	Unqualified
2 Years Prior	U 2010	Yes	Unqualified
	U 2009	Yes	Unqualified

Budget / Plans

Current Year	2012
Next Year	2013

Contact Person: U Michael Whitcomb

Title: Director of Institutional Research

Telephone No: 860.685.5340

E-mail address: mwhitcomb@wesleyan.edu

Preface

Introduction

Wesleyan University was first accredited by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) in 1929 and was last reviewed in 2002. Since fall of 2010, the University has been engaged anew in the process of self-study, addressing the Commission's Standards of Accreditation. This report is the result of this process but not its end. The self-study and upcoming evaluations should be of great interest to University stakeholders – and vital to University leadership as it judges the effectiveness of past actions and considers its plans for the future.

This self-study has undergone several phases (in many respects, of course, self-study here never stops), but with regards to preparing the report no phases were more important than the early ones, when the Standards Committees created a bullet lists of topics posted for community feedback and then turned those into first drafts. Do we know who we are? Are we really who we think we are? How effective are we? These were questions faced by the various committees with varying degrees of directness. Early drafts tended to focus more upon description than appraisal; the process of having new eyes constantly reviewing the drafts led to a general acknowledgement that future drafts needed to look deeper, to spend less time on description and more on analysis and appraisal (which is exactly what NEASC had advised from the beginning). The first drafts were posted online for comment in December 2011 and edited for submission to the Board in February. A draft revised by members of the Steering Committee was then posted for more community feedback and then submitted in early April to NEASC. The final report was prepared on the basis of further comments from the Wesleyan community and from NEASC.

Participants on the Standards Committees included faculty, staff, and in some cases, students.

Wesleyan University Committees on the Standards for Accreditation

1. MISSION AND PURPOSE

Co-chairs Rob Rosenthal and Carol Wood

2. PLANNING AND EVALUATION

Planning co-chairs Andrew Szegedy-Maszak and Charles Salas

Evaluation co-chairs Michael Whitcomb and Sonia Mañjon

3. ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

Co-chairs Tom Morgan and Marianne Calnen

4. THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Co-chairs Joyce Jacobsen and Karen Anderson

5. FACULTY

Co-chairs Rob Rosenthal and Gil Skillman

6. STUDENTS

Co-chairs Louise Brown and Rick Culliton

7. LIBRARY AND OTHER INFORMATION RESOURCES

Co-chairs Patricia Tully and Jolee West

8. PHYSICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Co-chairs Joyce Topshe and Karen Warren

9. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Co-chairs Nate Peters and Marc Eisner

10. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Co-chairs Jill Morawski and Bill Holder

11. INTEGRITY

Co-chairs Joe Rouse and David Winakor

Wesleyan University Committees on Reaccreditation

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

- Chair** Michael Roth, President
Vice-chair Rob Rosenthal, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Member John Meerts, Vice President for Finance and Administration

STEERING COMMITTEE

- Co-chair** Rob Rosenthal, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Co-chair Ellen Nerenberg, Vice Chair of Faculty
Members Gil Skillman, Chair of the Faculty
Joe Bruno, Professor of Chemistry
Peter Patton, Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences
Sonia Mañjon, Vice President for Strategic Initiatives
Marianne Calnen, Secretary of the University
and Special Assistant to the President for Board and Campus Relations
Charles Salas, Director of Strategic Initiatives
Bill Holder, Director of Communications
Michael Whitcomb, Director of Institutional Research
Karen Anderson, Associate Provost

CHAIRS COMMITTEE

- Chair** Karen Anderson, Associate Provost
Members All chairs of Standards Committees

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- Co-chair** Gemma Ebstein, Associate Vice President for External Relations
Co-chair Tula Telfair, Professor of Art

DATA COMMITTEE

- Chair** Michael Whitcomb, Director of Institutional Research
Members Anna van der Burg
Pat Tully
Steve Machuga
Ann Goodwin
Nate Peters

Institutional Overview

Wesleyan University, founded in 1831, strives to offer its undergraduates a liberal arts education characterized by boldness, rigor, and practical idealism. Faculty, staff, and students all contribute to a campus atmosphere in which scholarly and artistic achievement is celebrated, differences are welcomed, and intellectual risk-taking is encouraged. The academic community is marked by a high degree of flexibility, combining a strong commitment to disciplinary study with interest in the non-traditional and cross-disciplinary. The presence in a close-knit setting of scholars at all stages of development—including graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, and a steady stream of short- and longterm visitors—offers undergraduate students a distinctive opportunity to engage in purposeful intellectual discourse and to direct their interests and talents toward the exploration of new ideas and the achievement of defined goals. Wesleyan has long sought to guide but not prescribe the undergraduate experience, in the belief that ownership of one's own educational journey is the best preparation for the future. Co-curricular activities are part of that journey. Dedicated faculty coaches encourage scholar-athletes to develop

their skills and themselves and to benefit from the lessons learned from perseverance and teamwork. The arts are treated here as powerful ways of seeing and knowing the world, and the culture that students make themselves has a vibrancy that energizes the Wesleyan experience for all University stakeholders.

There is much at Wesleyan to be proud of, but, as President Roth has said, complacency is our enemy. The reaccreditation process has helped us to take stock of who we are, who we want to be, and in some areas the gap between the two.

Commission's 2007 Recommendations

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education (letter from Judith Gordon of October 26, 2007) after consideration of Wesleyan's fifth-year interim report recommended that our 2012 self-study give particular emphasis to the following:

1. Strengthening the decisions students make regarding courses so that they achieve a more coherent education
2. utilizing a variety of measures of institutional effectiveness, particularly direct measures of student performance
3. assessing the impact of the institution's planned major investments in financial aid, additional faculty, diversity, student services, campus computing, and fund raising
4. evaluating the success of the new Usdan Center in serving as a focal point of activity for the campus community.

We agree that these bear crucially on Wesleyan's well-being, and we deemed it appropriate to respond directly here in the Preface:

COHERENCE AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE (1 AND 2)

The fact that curricular coherence and assessment of learning outcomes are fundamental to what we do has not always meant that they have received the kinds of attention that they deserve, and it may be fairly said that the self-study itself has brought these issues to the fore with added urgency.

The question of learning outcomes has been discussed in recent years at faculty meetings and amongst staff, especially in Academic Affairs, and amongst other Wesleyan stakeholders as well – including the Board of Trustees.ⁱ It is a difficult question, and if Wesleyan was seen ten years ago as potentially in the forefront of liberal arts colleges in addressing it, the results are disappointing. What we do that's actually useful is rather standard. In addition to routine grading of student performance, we conduct student surveys asking for self-assessment. COFHE's Enrolled Student Survey is a student engagement survey, which also asks for self-assessment of learning activities. This self-assessment, however, does not so much measure learning outcomes as it does students' perceptions of what they think they have gained from their time at Wesleyan. COFHE's Senior Survey is primarily a survey about satisfaction, future plans, and paying for college, but it too gauges students' perceptions of gains. University Relations regularly surveys alumniⁱⁱ and parents on their attitude and experiences and occasionally hires outside firms to do focus groups. Faculty perceptions of improved student capabilities are also investigated, if selectively: see, for instance, [creativity report](#). The distinction between perceptions and learning outcomes is obviously important. In 2009 a study was made of how departments assess the performance and learning outcomes of their majors, and beginning this year each department includes in its annual report a section on assessment of student learning outcomes; the Provost and Academic Deans review these reports and follow up with departments where necessary.

In judging the coherence of student's curricular choices and measuring their performance, the University has been complacent in relying upon the existence, though not the efficacy, of its list of [Essential Capabilities](#). The

unproblematic list, in which the University placed considerable hope in the last accreditation report, is (in its current version) as follows:

- Writing
- Speaking
- Interpretation
- Quantitative Reasoning
- Logical Reasoning
- Design-Create-Realize
- Ethical Reasoning
- Intercultural Literacy
- Information Literacy
- Effective Citizenship

Different courses have been designated as promoting different capabilities, but, as we discuss in Standard 4, most students and faculty do not view the Essential Capabilities as particularly useful for helping students achieve coherence in course choices or with regards to assessment of student performance. (The Essential Capabilities Survey has this year been discontinued.ⁱⁱⁱ) The realization that we must do more in these regards has led us to focus upon the role of faculty advising in guiding students to make coherent choices in charting their own curricular plan. This is now a priority in Academic Affairs.

PLANNED INVESTMENTS (3)

The economic downturn quickly forced us to revisit our investments in financial aid, additional faculty, diversity, student services, campus computing, and fund raising:

Financial aid

The University is just now changing its financial aid policy as part of a new effort to achieve “sustainable affordability.” For years, Wesleyan has raised tuition well above inflation and increased financial aid at an even greater rate. The percentage of the tuition charges that goes to financial aid has risen steadily, and this is not sustainable without drawing down more from the endowment or increasing student loans. We remain committed to meeting the full financial need of admitted students without increasing their indebtedness, and to truly honor this commitment, we expect in future to give some consideration to the capacity of some applicants to pay, as we do now with transfer and international students. We will read all applications without regard for the ability to pay, and we will be need-blind for as many students as possible. Currently we project this to be about 90% of each class (depending on the level of need). As we raise more funds for the endowment, we will be able to build a more generous and sustainable financial aid program.

Additional faculty

Wesleyan has had a modest increase in faculty since the last accreditation process. In 2002 we reported 242 full-time tenured and track faculty to the AAUP, and in 2011 the number was 253 – a gain of 11. Similarly, the total number of all instructional faculty (including part-timers and visitors) increased from 348 in 2002 to 375 in 2011. Much of both increases has come since 2005.

Diversity

The investment in diversity at Wesleyan has long been a priority and remains so. (See, for instance, the President’s recent blog Why We Value Diversity.) In 2008 President Roth established the Office of Diversity and Institutional Partnerships and hired a new Chief Diversity Officer; two years later he announced the

launch of Making Excellence Inclusive (MEI), an initiative meant to assist our community in identifying ways to further institutional diversity and inclusion.

Looking back ten years to the last accreditation process, statistics indicate that the goal of increasing diversity (with respect to minority representation) has met with variable success:

	% MINORITY	
	2002	2011
Faculty ¹	13	19
Degree-seeking undergrads ¹	22	30
All undergrads (degree- and non-degree-seeking) ¹	22	29
All students (including grad and non-degree) ¹	20	28
Staff ²	14 ³	16
¹ Source: <i>The Common Data Set</i>		
² Source: <i>IPEDS Enrollment</i>		
³ Data are from 2003		

With respect to faculty of color, the gains have increased recently. From 2003 to 2008, the percentage of all faculty who were classified as minorities hovered around 16%, but in 2010 that increased to 21% (77/372). (When looking only at full, associate, and assistant professors, that percentage drops to 18% (45/250); still, the number 45 comprises the net addition of six faculty of color in just one year.) In 2011 the Board of Trustees Campus Affairs Committee launched the MEI working group, which has focused on issues surrounding faculty diversity – including recruiting, retention, tenure, quality of life, and pipeline of PhDs.

With respect to gender diversity in the faculty, in 2002 some 35% of the faculty were female; in 2011 it was 42%. These modest gains are likely to be extended as faculty are promoted since women currently comprise 70% of assistant professors.

The gains in faculty diversity^{iv} do not mean that everyone is satisfied with the results – especially with regards to retention and recruitment of faculty of color – and diversity of staff remains an issue.^v

With respect to student diversity, the story is somewhat different thanks to the low-income and reduced debt initiatives of 2007 and our success in having more/broader international representation in the last several classes. As indicated in the [Class 2012 Profile](#), the percentage of first-year students of color (including international) rose from 32% in 2007 to 41% in 2011. Student diversity at Wesleyan is also reflected in over 40 student groups dedicated to ethnic, religious, disability, and gender identity.

Student services

The major investments in Student Life over the past 10 years have been in Residential Life and the Usdan Center. Since our last accreditation, we have renovated Clark Hall and constructed Bennet Hall as well as the Fauver Apartments. These facilities have centralized our housing stock and greatly improved the residential experience of our students. By their design, they facilitate a more cohesive residential community. These buildings are in high demand, and students enjoy the amenities as well as the community atmosphere. The largest investment in community building has been the construction of the Usdan Center (see below).

Campus computing

The major investment in this area was in 2010 when at a cost of \$2M the financial system was enhanced. The investment had to be made because the older system was no longer going to be supported. While the University has clearly benefitted from the new system's built-in controls, the views of users are mixed because their work has changed and in some ways the system is less flexible.

Since 2008, however, ITS (like many areas in the University) has suffered budget cuts: over \$600K (8%) from a \$7.6M operating budget (or over \$8M with capital). Fortunately there have been few ill effects. A new CIO arrived in August.

Fund raising

In 2006 the plan was to invest an additional \$3M annually in University Relations, but that amount was never fully spent, and today the UR budget is back more or less to where it was then. (In 2006, the UR budget was \$8M, in 2009 it was \$10.4M, in 2011 it was \$7.8M.) We are currently in the quiet phase of a new capital campaign, and our fund-raising efforts have yielded more than \$250 million in gifts and pledges in the last several years. This amount equals the entire goal of the last campaign.

USDAN (4)

The Usdan Center has become the vibrant living room of our campus, a place where faculty, staff, and students all interact. It is most important for students, of course. A survey conducted in 2010 showed that 89% of students were satisfied with the Center, nearly all saw it as a safe welcoming place ideal for socializing and offering a variety of services, and three-quarters agreed that Usdan promotes a sense of community on campus and found it an enjoyable place to spend time. Thanks to Usdan, satisfaction with dining has improved dramatically.

Conclusion

The preparation of this report has taught many much about the Wesleyan of today. The challenges before us are fundamental and include: providing more effective advising and mentoring, assessing what students have learned (as opposed to what we've taught) and then using that to assess the curriculum within each department, maintaining a student culture that is safe and educational without disrupting student creativity and vibrancy, and balancing the long-term building of the endowment with the needs of the students, faculty, and staff today.

ⁱ “How does Wesleyan prepare students to succeed in using what they learned in college in their post-collegiate lives? How does the institution know this, and how does it use its knowledge about student success (or lack thereof) after college to improve its programs?” These are the questions President Roth asked the Board to respond to in preparation for its open discussion in January 2012. The area of greatest consensus was what tool to use: the survey and self-reporting. Suggestions for modifications to current assessment techniques included use of comprehensive exams tailored to courses of study, minimum requirements for senior projects, and examination of capstones to see how well students have integrated the skills learned over the previous three years. The skill most emphasized in the responses was writing, but there was also a strong sense that it wasn't just skills students gained but also such characteristics as a belief in informed discourse, insistence upon a passionate connection to things that matter, and self-confidence. One Board member was intrigued by a “proposed test of non-cognitive learning called PIER, which tests a student's growth in perspective, sense of identity, emotional intelligence and resilience,” and mentioned employer surveys as another possibility. Another response pointed to the difficulty of knowing whether “graduates [are] successful because of their education or did the institution simply admit people who were going to be successful because of their talent and ambition?” What does “success” mean? Whose goals do we privilege: those of students, parents, faculty? How does one measure the ability to engage constructively with the world? There was general agreement that the degree to which alumni support the University financially is an important instance of market feedback, as is the desire of students to come here. Ask any department, and it is likely to speak proudly of its most successful graduates. Look at the website and the alumni magazine and you'll see news about the achievements of alumni. But specificity was a problem. It was noted that the development of quantitative measures to make assessments often involves questionable correlations and can be relied on overmuch. As for self-assessment, it was described as both essential and maddeningly inexact. It was noted that we are, of course, assessing ourselves (however rigorously) all the time. Students are graded, teachers and staff evaluated. The discussion ended with a recognition that while Wesleyan does do assessment, more steps need to be taken. Exactly what steps to take remained an open question.

- ii Alumni Survey (last one in 2009, next in 2013). Question 23 asks: “Based on what you know now, how well (5 choices ranging from “very poorly” to “very well”) do you think your undergraduate experience prepared you to:

Write effectively
Communicate well orally
Think analytically and logically
Formulate creative/original ideas and solutions
Acquire new skills and knowledge on your own
Use quantitative tools
Read or speak a foreign language
Gain in-depth knowledge of a field
Understand social problems
Be an effective leader
Work effectively as a member of a team
Be self-confident
Be an active member of your community
Maintain a healthy life style
Relate well to people of different races, nations, and religions
Understand the role of science and technology
Understand the significance of art, music, literature, and drama

In 2009, when the survey was last conducted, the only categories in which fewer than 80% of alums expressed satisfaction were Read or speak a foreign language, healthy life style, and Use quantitative tools. Next survey is planned for 2013.

- iii Students had been asked to assess themselves with regards to the Essential Capabilities when they first arrived. But there were only 4 grades – the first of which, “No ability”, was unsurprisingly seldom marked. As seniors they reviewed their progress and (there being mainly the 3 grades to choose from) there was often no improvement recorded or when there was improvement, there proved to be no actual correlation with the courses taken.

- iv 2011 IPEDS indicates the following:

ALL FULL-TIME FACULTY (339):

- White 76%, Hispanic Latino 4%, Black/African American 4%, Asian 7%, Two or More 2%, Non-resident alien 4%, Unknown 2%
- female 45%, male 55%

FULL-TIME TENURED FACULTY (184):

- White 83%, Hispanic Latino 2%, Black/African American 4%, Asian 5%, Two or More 2%, Non-resident alien 3%, Unknown 0%
- female 32%, male 68%

FULL-TIME TENURE TRACK FACULTY (69):

- White 70%, Hispanic Latino 7%, Black/African American 6%, Asian 10%, Two or More 0%, Non-resident alien 7%, Unknown 0%
- female 70%, male 30%

- v 2011 IPEDS indicates the following:

FULL-TIME STAFF (585):

- White 75%, Hispanic Latino 4%, Native American/Alaskan 1%, Black/African American 7%, Asian 3%, Two or More 2%, Non-resident alien 1%, Unknown 7%
- female 58%, male 42%

Standard 1: Mission and Purposes

Attach a copy of the current mission statement.

Document	URL	Date approved by the governing board
Institutional Mission Statement	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/mission.html	May 2010

Mission Statement published	URL	Print publication
1	http://2020.blogs.wesleyan.edu/	
2		
3		
4		

Related statements	URL	Print Publications
1		
2		
3		

Standard One: Mission and Purpose

Description

In May 2010, Wesleyan University's Board of Trustees approved a formal statement of the school's mission and a planning framework, *Wesleyan 2020*, for carrying this mission forward in the new century. The University's Mission Statement – drafted in 2009 with input from faculty, staff, and students – reads as follows:

Wesleyan University is dedicated to providing an education in the liberal arts that is characterized by boldness, rigor, and practical idealism. At Wesleyan, distinguished scholar-teachers work closely with students, taking advantage of fluidity among disciplines to explore the world with a variety of tools. The University seeks to build a diverse, energetic community of students, faculty, and staff who think critically and creatively and who value independence of mind and generosity of spirit.

The University's purposes are reflected in its “scholar-teacher” model, open curriculum, and admission policy.

Wesleyan's scholar-teacher model is based on the premise that a robust liberal arts education is most effectively provided by instructors who actively contribute to the state of knowledge and practice in their respective fields. This scholarly engagement is understood to promote students' appreciation for intellectual rigor and the processes that yield new insights, ideas, and expressions, while ensuring that academic curricula respond dynamically to new developments in methods and directions of inquiry and performance. Conversely, the model posits that the fresh perspectives provided by close interaction with undergraduates can lead to new avenues of inquiry and expression. To support its faculty's complementary pursuits of scholarly engagement and effective undergraduate teaching, the University provides relatively light teaching loads, a generous sabbatical policy, and a program of grants in support of scholarship and pedagogical innovation. In the sciences, graduate programs facilitate the conduct of high-level laboratory-based research that further bolsters the connection between scholarship and undergraduate education.

Wesleyan's open curriculum replaces traditional curricular “distribution requirements” with “general educational expectations,” allowing students to take an active role in constructing their own academic programs while encouraging them to pursue a suitably broad-based liberal arts education. In making their course selections with the guidance of faculty and peer advisors, students are expected to take at least three courses from at least two different departments in the respective areas of humanities and arts (HA), social and behavioral sciences (SBS), and natural sciences and mathematics (NSM). While fulfilling these expectations is not required for graduation from Wesleyan, some majors and some honors (such as election to Phi Beta Kappa) require their completion.

Finally, the University's admissions and financial aid policies are designed to facilitate access to a Wesleyan education and promote diversity within the student body.ⁱ The University seeks students who have genuine intellectual curiosity, the ability to succeed in a rigorous and well-rounded academic program, and concern for the larger community. Qualities such as a willingness to take intellectual risks, to push boundaries, and to move among remarkably varied communities are particularly sought in the admission process. Once students are accepted for admission, their full financial need is met by the University through a combination of grants, work-study support, and often loans.

Since its adoption in May 2010, *Wesleyan 2020* has provided a framework for assessing how Wesleyan has marshaled resources in support of its mission, and in particular for thinking about ways in which the mission can be significantly advanced in the years to come. For example, the University curriculum has been enriched by the launching of the College of the Environment, the Center for the Humanities is being endowed, and students will be given more opportunities for putting their ideals into practice under the auspices of the nascent Patricelli Center for Social Entrepreneurship.ⁱⁱ

Appraisal

Although Wesleyan did not adopt an official statementⁱⁱⁱ of its mission until 2010, the University has never lacked a sense of mission and purpose. In his 1831 inaugural address, Wesleyan's first president, Willbur Fisk, insisted that "education should be directed with reference to two objects, the good of the individual and the good of the world." Fisk argued for two principles that anticipated the University's present-day commitments: a broad, non-traditional curriculum and an emphasis on students playing an active role in their own education.

Wesleyan's 11th president, Victor Butterfield (1943–1967), oversaw the implementation of a bold vision of Wesleyan's future that led to the creation of its first cross-disciplinary colleges and centers, and developed the scholar-teacher model by introducing graduate programs in science and ethnomusicology. In describing Wesleyan's approach to liberal arts education, Butterfield first invoked "practical idealism," a term conjoining seeming contradictories, to describe how students might engage ideas in ways that lead to consequential actions when they take their places in the world.

The present mission statement builds on Butterfield's call for "practical idealism" while recognizing other key institutional values such as intellectual boldness and rigor, student and faculty diversity, independence of mind and generosity of spirit. And in *Wesleyan 2020*, Wesleyan's current president, Michael Roth, reaffirms Wesleyan's commitment to "Butterfield's vision of a university in which professors are expected to advance their fields through research, publication, and performance, and in which teaching regularly stimulates this productivity," as well as to his vision of cross-disciplinary inquiry.

Challenges facing Wesleyan in pursuit of its mission include reconciling: (1) the intellectual independence and focus fostered by Wesleyan's scholar-teacher model with the goal of ensuring that students receive a coherent and comprehensive education in the liberal arts; (2) the need to offer traditional and still vibrant modes of inquiry with the desire to provide new academic offerings that respond to contemporary innovations and concerns; and (3) the resource demands of Wesleyan's admissions and financial aid policies and the scholar-teacher model with the long-term financial sustainability of the University. As will be discussed in subsequent standards, aspects of these challenges were noted in Wesleyan's previous self-study, and some progress has been made in addressing them. For example, with respect to the first challenge, departments and programs were asked to provide statements of how they assessed what students learned in their majors, and a pilot program for evaluating the quality of faculty advising was initiated. With respect to the third challenge, the University has made some progress by cutting costs and increasing revenues so as to make it possible to rely less on annual giving and endowment support to fund current operating expenditures. *Wesleyan 2020* seeks to build on this progress by focusing the University's priorities going forward.

Projection

As Wesleyan's mission statement and the current framework for planning, *Wesleyan 2020*, were launched together in 2010, it is too early to say how the latter has guided and informed the University's implementation of the former. Some important initiatives have been realized, such as the College of the Environment, the Allbritton Center for Public Life, and the Patricelli Center for Social Entrepreneurship. In addition, the University has taken important steps toward increasing the sustainability of its budgetary commitments. But many of the responses to the three challenges noted above are still unfolding and will need to be reassessed from a subsequent vantage point.

Institutional Effectiveness

Over the years Wesleyan had often described its mission and purposes: for instance, in the introduction to President Bennet's 1997 paper *Wesleyan Education for the 21st Century* or implicitly through the list of Essential Capabilities the University has sought to foster. But these did not serve as an official, concise statement designated as Wesleyan's "Mission Statement." The current mission statement may not yet be widely internalized due to its recent adoption, but it is clearly consonant with Wesleyan traditions.

ⁱ Wesleyan changed its need-blind financial aid policy in the spring. For details, see Standard 9.

ⁱⁱ Wesleyan's colleges and academic centers are so much a part of its identity that they deserve some notice in this standard. They feature collaborative interactions among departments and disciplines that allow students and faculty to discover common grounds among formally distinct fields and methods of inquiry and chart new avenues of intellectual exploration that transcend traditional boundaries. The University played a pioneering role in establishing the cross-disciplinary College of Letters and College of Social Studies in the late 1950s, and has recently expanded its roster of colleges-within-the-college by the creation in 2010 of the College of the Environment (COE). The John E. Andrus Center for Public Affairs (typically shortened to the Public Affairs Center or PAC), founded in the mid-1950s, provided a building and a governance structure to house and promote cooperative efforts among the departments of Economics, Government, History, and Sociology, along with the CSS. The PAC was joined in 1959 by the Center for the Humanities, then by the Center for the Arts, and most recently by the Albritton Center for the Study of Public Life.

Other centers established at Wesleyan serve as the academic homes of specific multi-disciplinary majors or programs, such as the Center for African-American Studies, the Center of the Americas, and the Freeman Center for East Asian Studies, or provide platforms for developing specific cross-disciplinary skills and experiences, such as the Quantitative Analysis Center, the Shapiro Creative Writing Center, and the Service Learning Center.

ⁱⁱⁱ While there are no plans to revisit the wording of the Mission statement, changes may be proposed at any time to the President and, if deemed appropriate, implemented by the Board of Trustees.

Standard 2: Planning and Evaluation

PLANS	Year of completion	Effective dates	URL or folder number
Strategic Plans			
Immediately prior strategic plan	2005		http://www.wesleyan.edu/wesleyanplanning/final/Wesleyan_Strategic_Plan.pdf
Current Strategic Plan	May-10		http://2020.blogs.wesleyan.edu/
Next strategic plan			link to draft, if available

Other institution-wide plans

Master plan			http://www.wesleyan.edu/masterplan/
Academic plan			http://2020.blogs.wesleyan.edu/
Financial plan			
Technology plan			
Enrollment plan			
Development plan			

(Add rows for additional institution-wide plans, as needed.)

Plans for major units (e.g., departments, library)

1			
2			
3			
4			

(Add rows for additional plans, as needed.)

EVALUATION

Academic program review

Program review system (colleges and departments). System last updated:
 Program review schedule (e.g., every 5 years)

Goal is 3 dept./programs per year

Sample program review reports (name of unit or program)

Anthropology
Music
Neuroscience & Behavior

(Insert additional rows, as appropriate.)

URL

https://wesfiles.wesleyan.edu/home/mw-hitcomb/For%20reaccred/Anthropology%20External%20Review%20Final%20Report%20%281%29.pdf
https://wesfiles.wesleyan.edu/home/mw-hitcomb/For%20reaccred/Music%20-%20Fall%2007.pdf
https://wesfiles.wesleyan.edu/home/mw-hitcomb/For%20reaccred/Report%20of%20the%20External%20Reviewers%20NS%26B%205-11-11.pdf

System to review other functions and units

Program review schedule (every X years or URL of schedule)

--

Sample program review reports (name of unit or program)

(Insert additional rows, as appropriate.)

Other significant evaluation reports (Name and URL or Location)

<i>Example: Advising: www.notrealcollege.edu/advising</i>
1
2
3

(Insert additional rows, as appropriate.)

Date
1995

Standard Two: Planning and Evaluation

Planning

Description

In May 2010 the Board of Trustees adopted *Wesleyan 2020* as a framework for strategic planning over the short- and long-term. Drafted by the President and discussed in various fora, it reflects the input of faculty, trustees, staff, alumni, and students. The early sections give a sense of the principles and purposes that have guided the University over the last 50 years and that continue to serve us today. The later sections outline our overarching goals, specific objectives, and the strategies we will use to achieve them. Complementing *Wesleyan 2020* is the Wesleyan Strategy Map (available through the e-portfolio), created by the Board of Trustees to guide it in its deliberations. The map serves the purpose of putting prominent Wesleyan stakeholders “on the same page.”

Select measures from *Wesleyan 2020* (and the Strategy map) have been placed on a dashboard for administrative review and assessment of progress. Cabinet members use *Wesleyan 2020* in making decisions and report to the trustees on their accomplishments within its overarching goals. Human Resources asks all employees to develop their own annual goals within that same rubric. These practices help ensure that administrative energies are focused on institutional priorities and that employees view their efforts as contributing to a shared mission.

Academic Affairs, led by the Provost, is responsible for overseeing the details of academic planning and evaluation within the overarching goals of *Wesleyan 2020*. Specific goals and plans are developed and implemented by the three academic division Deans in concert with other senior administrative staff and department chairs. Regular meetings of the Provost with the Deans allow for the coordination of planning and evaluation efforts. The Provost often convenes committees composed of faculty and staff to study specific issues and make recommendations.

The long-range projection, the University’s ten-year financial forecast, serves as both a short-term and long-term planning tool to help the University maintain financial equilibrium. The planning assumptions reflect the University’s strategic priorities and serve as the primary drivers in the projection. The Executive Budget Committee – consisting of the President, Provost, and the Vice President for Finance and Administration – consults with Cabinet and the Budget Priorities Committee on financial planning. The Budget Priorities Committee, an advisory committee comprising faculty, staff, and students, was created in 2008 to provide input from the University community.

During the planning process, data on our peer schools is gathered and analyzed to help formulate recommendations. For example, student charges are compared to those of peer schools. New money requests are submitted through Cabinet members to the Executive Budget Committee each year. Such requests require justification based on *Wesleyan 2020* and must identify metrics for annual evaluation. Approved initiatives are initially funded as pilot programs, and only those that consistently demonstrate desired outcomes are permanently added into the operating budget.

At the November meeting of the Board, its Finance Committee reviews planning assumptions in the long-range projection, and has a preliminary discussion on student charges with the administration. At the February meeting, the President recommends the proposed student charges to the Board for approval. At the May meeting, the President recommends a balanced annual budget proposal to the Board for approval. The Board periodically establishes working groups to review and update financial policies. A policy on endowment spending was updated and adopted in the spring (see Standard 9 for details). Another, on capital policy, is currently under review.

Appraisal

In his first weeks on campus, President Roth in 2007 invited faculty to make brief proposals for new academic programs or changes to existing ones. More than 50 proposals were reviewed by senior staff, faculty, and student representatives. The administration decided to focus on six major areas: financial aid (especially reducing required loan amounts), curricular reform (especially for the first and last years), internationalization, civic engagement, creative campus, and college of the environment. These were incorporated into *Wesleyan 2020*.

The use of *Wesleyan 2020* in guiding decisions about allocating resources has been especially visible with respect to new programs. For example: the College of the Environment received support primarily because it promised to help energize Wesleyan's distinctive educational experience (goal 1); the Wesleyan Media Project received support primarily because it promised to enhance recognition of the University as an extraordinary institution (goal 2); the Summer Session was launched because it promised increased revenue while remaining consistent with core principles (goal 3). For the President's review of how planning is being implemented more broadly, see Wesleyan 2020 update and archive.

Recent Board meetings have approached long-term planning in the broadest sense by focusing on innovation and changes in the world of liberal arts education. The gist of those discussions has been reported by the President via his blog.

The last accreditation review of "Planning and Evaluation" recommended that we address course-access difficulties and the question of educational outcomes. Having determined that too many classes were being offered in the same time slots, we set guidelines for departments in order to distribute classes more widely across the teaching day. In response to the question of educational outcomes, we are developing department-level assessment plans; for more on our response, see Preface and Standard 4.

With regards to facilities planning, there was an organizational change in 2009 – with the Space Committee and Masterplan Executive Committee reconstituted as a single Facilities Planning Committee. With most masterplan projects completed at the time, it was no longer efficient for a large, overlapping group of senior staff to hold frequent meetings. This was also an opportunity for the membership to expand their focus to include all facilities issues, including an oversight of real estate transactions, ADA projects, and major maintenance annual planning. (See current masterplan.) Even before the economic crisis, plans were dropped for a new University Museum; plans for a new complex in the Life Sciences were also dropped in favor of improvements to the current science facilities.

Through careful management of our resources, the University has achieved a balanced budget for 18 consecutive years. Additionally, the University has set aside a \$4 million one-time reserve to address uncontrollable fluctuations in revenue or expenses. Still, the economic pressures facing the University are substantial. Looking back, a long period of overspending endowment income and failing to put new gifts or other dollars into the endowment left Wesleyan with roughly one-third of the economic capacity (measured by endowment per student, net of debt) of the average school in its peer group. Facing further immediate pressure from reduced endowment returns due to the economic downturn, the University set forth to reduce its spending habitsⁱ and invest more money from the Annual Fund into the endowment.

To maintain excellence and preserve our academic core, spending cuts have been ameliorated somewhat by increased tuition revenue provided by an increase in the size of the student body. In many areas where cuts took place, expectations were not lowered and services and responsibilities were maintained.

The University has almost doubled the percentage of gift income directed to the endowment, and spending from endowment returns has also been reduced by roughly 2%. Endowment management has been addressed, and in August 2010 a new Chief Investment Officer was hired to pursue a long-term plan for endowment growth based on asset allocation, manager selection, disciplined rebalancing, and an equity-orientation.

The need for a sustainable economic model has loomed over planning here for many years, and this past year discussions with faculty, students, staff, alumni, and trustees (discussions reported on this past spring in the President's blog) have led to some changes in budget assumptions. These changes – limiting tuition increases, taking into consideration the ability of some applicants to pay, and promoting a three-year option – will doubtless continue to be discussed.

Projection

Wesleyan's academic program is constantly evolving, with many new possibilities arising; at the same time, there are few extinctions, even though we have options on the books that few students choose. The University will continue to encourage the development of innovative new courses and keep an eye out for areas in which to prune. Active consideration is being given to developing online and blended learning courses, addressing the growing demand for continuing education after the undergraduate years, and expanding the academic calendar.

The University's ongoing commitment to major maintenance has left the campus looking noticeably more attractive. In recent years, facilities planning has concentrated on the central campusⁱⁱ, but there remain important projects (such as deteriorating buildings in the Center for the Arts) that cannot be handled through the major maintenance budget.

Wesleyan 2020 has laid out clear objectives with respect to its economic model. Costs are being contained, and so far the budget has been balanced despite a decreased reliance on annual fund gifts. Endowment performance is improving, and donations to the University reached an all-time high in FY11. The capital campaign, now in a quiet phase, aims to direct \$225M of a \$400M goal into the endowment. However, areas of financial concern for the future include the affordability of our tuition costs and the increasing need for financial aid; staff retention and morale due to restricted compensation; and the ability to maintain endowment growth and strong fundraising income in the current economic context. Changes in budget assumptions made this spring will, if maintained, help with the first of these.

Institutional Effectiveness

Wesleyan 2020 is a flexible tool with a self-evident shelf life. There are a variety of ways in which thoughts on planning can be discussed and communicated, including Cabinet meetings, Senior Staff meetings, faculty meetings, and discussions with students and alumni. Mass emails and the President's blog will likely continue to be important vehicles for disseminating thoughts and reporting progress on planning to the larger community.

Evaluation

Description

Wesleyan collects and uses a wide variety of data to evaluate our progress in meeting our strategic objectives; many of these efforts are conducted by or coordinated through Wesleyan's Office of Institutional Research. Data sources include surveys, internal and external databases, and consortia such as COFHE, HEDS, and AAUP. The Office of Institutional Research also handles most internal and external reporting, including federal and state reporting (e.g., IPEDS, HEOA), guidebooks, and University enrollment projections, and works closely with campus offices such as Admission and Student Affairs to help meet the research and data needs of these departments.

The University also employs decentralized institutional research efforts to gauge the effectiveness of its undertakings, including evaluations conducted by faculty (see Standard 4), by staff within Wesleyan administrative departments (e.g., Admission Reports, collection of alumni data in University Relations, Student Affairs Learning Outcomes initiative), and by ad hoc committees which undertake focused inquiry into campus initiatives, policies,

and issues. In 2010–11, committees studied topics as diverse as the evaluation of teaching, the issue of sexual violence, and the instruction of foreign languages. These decentralized efforts employ both quantitative and qualitative methods (e.g., focus groups) and have memberships appropriate to the scope of the investigation at hand.

Appraisal

In 2002 Wesleyan developed a more formalized process for the external review of academic departments and programs, with the aim of conducting three outside reviews each year – one per divisionⁱⁱⁱ. In the past decade, 23 departments/programs have undergone external review. Final reports are submitted to the Provost, shared with the EPC and the relevant Dean, and then discussed with members of the Department.

In the past few years we have witnessed drastic changes within the University and the landscape of higher education that have increased demands for the dissemination/evaluation of data. We have striven to become more transparent internally; for instance, we now share data (such as senior satisfaction ratings), once reserved mainly for the President’s Cabinet and trustees, with the entire faculty.^{iv} And during the economic crisis of 2008, we became much more open about sharing all budget data with faculty and staff. In fall 2008, the University began constructing institutional data marts to simplify data structures with the aim of streamlining and decentralizing data access and reporting, and it now has begun to report off the new structures. However, the University has also experienced the pains associated with this type of transition and continues to work to improve these systems to meet ever-increasing data needs.

Projection

Wesleyan is committed to improving collection of, access to, and use of data in decision-making, planning, and evaluating progress toward our goals. Efficiencies associated with improved data access and dissemination should enable Institutional Research to spend more time analyzing and employing these data for strategic purposes.

Institutional Effectiveness

The effectiveness of its evaluation activities is monitored closely by the University, but there are areas – notably assessing what students have learned (as opposed to what we’ve taught them) and then using that information to assess the curricular efforts of individual departments – where it has been less effective than desirable.

ⁱ In FY09-10, the University cut the annual budget by approximately \$25M by curtailing staff and faculty compensation; eliminating staff positions largely through attrition and a voluntary separation program; reducing utility costs by investing in renewable energy sources and improving conservation; refinancing debt to decrease annual debt service and move to payments based on a fixed rate; and by freezing the major maintenance budget for three years.

ⁱⁱ The removal of McConaughy Hall and renovations to Allbritton and the old Squash building continued despite difficult economic circumstances because of the centrality of these buildings to the campus.

ⁱⁱⁱ The three divisions are arts and humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences and mathematics.

^{iv} In addition to satisfaction data, we now provide (or are about to provide) teaching evaluation and course grade summaries and now post our Common Data Set, a “factbook” of basic counts and stats (for an example, see wesleyan.edu/ir/data-sets/cds2011-12.pdf). While the whole point of the Common Data Set is public consumption, there had been reluctance to share it internally in the past.

Standard 3: Organization and Governance

Please attach to this form:

- 1) A copy of the institution's organization chart(s).
- 2) A copy of the by-laws, enabling legislation, and/or other appropriate documentation to establish the legal authority of the institution to award degrees in accordance with applicable requirements.

If there is a "related entity," such as a church or religious congregation, a state system, or a corporation, describe and document the relationship with the accredited institution

Name of the related entity	n/a
URL of documentation of relationship	

Governing board

By-laws	URL
Board members' names and affiliations	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/charter-and-bylaws.html#by-laws
	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/trustees.html

Board committees

- | | |
|---|---------------------------|
| ? | a. Campus Affairs |
| | b. Finance |
| | c. Portfolio Subcommittee |
| | d. Audit |
| | e. University Relations |
| | f. Board Governance |

(Insert additional rows as appropriate.)

URL or document name for meeting minutes

<p><u>All are available in the workroom</u></p>

Major institutional committees or governance groups*

- | |
|--|
| a. President's Cabinet |
| b. Wesleyan Student Assembly |
| c. Faculty Executive Committee |
| d. Budget Priorities Committee |
| e. Compensation and Benefits Committee |
| f. Budget Working Group |

(Insert additional rows as appropriate.)

URL or document name for meeting minutes

http://wsa.wesleyan.edu/ga/minutes/

*Include faculty, staff, and student groups

Standard 3: Organization and Governance (Locations and Modalities)

Campuses, Branches, Locations, and Modalities currently in operation (See definitions, below)

(Insert additional rows as appropriate.)

	City	State or Country	Date Initiated
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px 5px; margin-right: 5px;">u</div> <div style="margin-right: 5px;">u</div> <div style="margin-right: 5px;">u</div> <div style="margin-right: 5px;">u</div> </div> Main campus	Middletown	CT	1831
Other principal campuses			
Branch campuses			
Other instructional locations			
Distance Learning, e-learning			
First on-line course			
First program 50% or more on-line			
First program 100% on-line			
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px 5px; margin-right: 5px;">u</div> </div> Distance Learning, other			Date Initiated
Modality			
<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="background-color: red; color: white; padding: 2px 5px; margin-right: 5px;">u</div> </div> Correspondence Education			Date Initiated

Definitions

Main campus: primary campus, including the principal office of the chief executive officer.

Other principal campus: a campus away from the main campus that either houses a portion or portions of the institution's academic program (e.g., the medical school) or a permanent location offering 100% of the degree requirements of one or more of the academic programs offered on the main campus and otherwise meets the definition of the branch campus (below).

Branch campus (federal definition): a location of an institution that is geographically apart and independent of the main campus which meets all of the following criteria: a) offers 50% or more of an academic program leading to a degree, certificate, or other recognized credential, or at which a degree may be completed; b) is permanent in nature; c) has its own faculty and administrative or supervisory organization; d) has its own budgetary and hiring authority.

Instructional location: a location away from the main campus where 50% or more of a degree or Title-IV eligible certificate can be completed.

Distance Learning, e-learning: A degree or Title-IV eligible certificate for which 50% or more of the courses can be completed entirely on-line.

Distance Learning, other: A degree or Title IV certificate in which 50% or more of the courses can be completed entirely through a distance learning modality other than e-learning.

Correspondence Education (federal definition): Education provided through one or more courses by an institution under which the institution provides instructional materials, by mail or electronic transmission, including examinations on the materials, to students who are separated from the instructor. Interaction between the instructor and the student is limited, is not regular and substantive, and is primarily initiated by the student. Correspondence courses are typically self-paced. Correspondence education is not distance education.

Standard Three: University Organization and Governance

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Description

Wesleyan University was established in 1831 under the Special Laws of Connecticut, with all corporate powers to be exercised by the authority of the Board of Trustees (See Charter and By-Laws). The Board is composed of no more than 33 members. Nine members of the Board are elected by the alumni and members of the senior class, and serve a three-year term. The remaining trustees are elected by the Board and serve a six-year term. Since March of 2003 it has been the expectation that Board-elected trustees will serve a single term; occasionally, a trustee will serve a second term if there are compelling institutional reasons to do so.ⁱ Newly elected trustees participate in an intensive, one-day orientation program about roles and responsibilities. All trustees are annually provided with a Conflict of Interest Policy and an opportunity to identify potential conflicts of interest.

The standing committees of the Board are: Audit, Campus Affairs, Finance, Governance, Investment, and University Relations.ⁱⁱ The by-laws afford members of the faculty and the student body the right and responsibility to serve as representatives to the Board, with voice but not vote at the formal Board meetings, and with voice and voting privileges on the Campus Affairs, Finance, and University Relations committees, except with respect to personnel matters. Faculty and student by-laws stipulate which representatives sit on which Board committees.ⁱⁱⁱ

The President and the Board take responsibility for strategic planning, with input from faculty, students, and staff. With the Vice President for Finance and Administration (VPFA), the President presents a budget for consideration and adoption, as required by the University's by-laws, to the Board of Trustees each May. An annual endowment performance report is given to the Board and interim reports are presented at each Board meeting. The Audit Committee reviews (and annually communicates to the Board) the report of the auditors and advises the Board on the University's risk profile and on the adequacy and effectiveness of the University's risk management policies, accounting procedures, systems, and controls. The Board receives regular updates from the President and VPFA on the University budget, long-range planning, and the endowment.

Board materials – including archival information on policies and past decisions, Board and committee minutes and resolutions, and general information about the role and responsibilities of trustees – are provided through a secure server to all trustees and emeriti. The President communicates with the Board through regularly scheduled conference calls and conversation with individual trustees and emeriti.

Appraisal

In 2009–10, Board Chair Joshua Boger instituted Board “working groups,” smaller subcommittees of the standing committees that take on particular tasks (e.g., faculty diversity, creation of internships, etc.). These are designed to encourage Board members to “get their hands dirty,” bringing their skills and energy directly to bear on issues of importance to the University.

In recent years, the manner in which committee meetings of the full Board are conducted has also changed. In the past, lengthy reports by staff left little time for trustees to be involved in discussions. Now agendas have fewer items, and the emphasis has shifted from staff reports to eliciting input from the trustees in the room. Open discussions have been particularly lively. One to two weeks before each meeting, a difficult question of special interest to the University is submitted to the trustees, and toward the end of the meeting the question is opened for discussion. These questions have included “What makes Wesleyan distinctive?” “What is a liberal arts education today?” “*Wesleyan 2020*,” “The relevance of the arts and humanities,” “Inspiring and sustaining innovation,” “Centralization or decentralization,” and in February 2012, “Reaccreditation – assessment of our education's impact on life after

graduation.” More active participation by trustees is not only giving the University the benefit of their expertise and experience, it is also increasing their sense that their time at these meetings is being well spent.

The work of the Board (at Board and Board committee meetings and between meetings) has become more defined and focused by *Wesleyan 2020*, which provides a framework for evaluating whatever issues arise. In considering the distinctive character of Wesleyan’s educational experience, for example, trustees were addressing the first overarching goal of *Wesleyan 2020*, and their discussions led to the idea of “intellectual cross-training” – the development of a fluid intelligence marked by adaptability and creativity. In regard to *Wesleyan 2020*’s second goal of enhanced recognition, the Board developed a vision of the trustees as ambassadors of the University who help to get the word out about the exciting things students, faculty, and alumni are doing. Naturally, the third goal of *Wesleyan 2020* – to work within a sustainable economic model while retaining core values – has received attention at every Board meeting. President Roth and the Board Chair have challenged the Board to take on a more significant role in leading the University through this period of dislocation in our economy. While cuts to capital and annual expenditures have been made, serious reflection continues to be needed on how to generate the necessary revenue to run an educational program at the highest level.

The Board and the administration have expanded their oversight of the Chief Investment Officer (CIO) and the University’s portfolio investment policies. The former Portfolio Subcommittee of the Board’s Finance Committee has become an independent standing body (the Investment Committee), all its members are now encouraged to raise concerns about the University’s investment practices as they see fit, and both the President and the VPFA are now more involved in deliberations of the Committee and in overseeing the work of the CIO.

The Governance Committee (aided by the Office of Institutional Research) conducts a survey evaluating trustee engagement, the structure and functioning of the Board and its committees, communications, and leadership. The Committee then reports to the Board on the survey results and submits recommendations to enhance Board performance. In the 2011 survey, participation was strong, with 35 of 38 current and recently retired trustees taking part. There was considerable satisfaction with Board communication and leadership, somewhat less satisfaction with the effectiveness of the working groups and the accessibility of trustees to other campus constituencies during Board weekends. In response, Board leadership reconfigured the weekend schedule to allow for increased trustee engagement with students and faculty^{iv} and reshaped the working groups – reducing their number and making the focus of each more actionable and more closely related to the agenda of the standing committee with which it is associated.

Projection

The Board will continue to be engaged in fulfilling its governance responsibilities, with the recognition that it should not become overly involved in the daily tasks of management better left to the administration. A simple survey that will now be conducted after each board meeting to understand reaction of trustees to their time on campus may help with the effectiveness of administration and Board relations.

ADMINISTRATION

Description

The President is ultimately responsible for all aspects of the University: including oversight of staff, policies governing student conduct, and affirmative action laws; accepting or denying recommendations of student and faculty committees; presiding over meetings of the Academic Council; submitting a budget for Board approval; and recommending to the Board tenure and promotion of faculty. The President is advised by Cabinet, which meets regularly and consists of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for Institutional Partnerships and

Chief Diversity Officer, the Vice President for University Relations, the Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, the Director of Strategic Initiatives, and the President's Chief of Staff. Starting in the 2012/13 academic year the Chair of the Faculty will be joining Cabinet. Cabinet members develop goals for areas of the University for which they are responsible, present these goals to the Board each fall, and report on progress at the annual meeting in May. Goal-setting for all administrative staff members is required; these goals must be in alignment with *Wesleyan 2020* and are part of the University's annual performance review process.

The President speaks at the beginning of each semester to all staff on the "state of the University" and meets later with the senior administrative staff. The President and Cabinet attend regularly scheduled faculty meetings, and the President and Provost meet monthly with the Faculty Executive Committee (See Faculty Governance, below). The President also meets monthly with the leadership of the Wesleyan Student Association (WSA), briefs the student representatives to the Board prior to each Board Meeting, and afterwards attends the next WSA meeting.

Faculty, students, and staff consult directly with members of Cabinet through standing committees, such as the Educational Policy and Student Life Committees, and on *ad hoc* committees or task forces convened to examine particular campus issues (e.g., Making Excellence Inclusive and the Sexual Violence Task Force). Reports and recommendations from these task forces are made to the President and Cabinet. Open fora for faculty, students, and staff are held when significant issues affecting the general welfare of the institution are being considered to ensure that decisions are informed by views from across the community.

Appraisal

The financial meltdown beginning in 2008 tested the willingness and ability of groups to work collectively. Faced with difficult decisions, President Roth declared a policy of complete transparency: information necessary for decision-making would be available to all. Thus, rather than restricting discussions of reducing expenditures to senior administrators, the University embraced a broad, collective process.

Transparent and collective decision-making, however, requires reliable data on which everyone can agree. Over the past few years the administration has endeavored to develop more complete data than had been available previously and to centralize information in a "data warehouse" accessible to all groups. This turns out to be a formidable logistical and technological challenge, but as of the spring of 2012, one close to being met.

There is, of course, a balance that needs to be found between broad participation and efficiency in decision-making. In the fall of 2011, for example, the library and administration announced a policy of weeding 60,000 volumes from Olin Library. Faculty protested they had not been consulted sufficiently in what they perceived as a fundamental change in library policy, while the library and administration felt this was an administrative procedure rather than a policy change. In this case, the weeding was postponed and a faculty-library committee established to examine the issue. Differences between faculty and administration will doubtless continue to arise, but the commitment to consultation and collective decision-making whenever possible seems genuine on both sides.

Projection

As data continue to be made available in the service of transparency in decision-making, it is to be hoped that the spirit of cooperation that allowed various constituencies to come together in time of crisis will not be lost to the suspiciousness of entrenched interests so common in university politics.

FACULTY

Description

University by-laws define the faculty as the “professors, associate professors, assistant professors, lecturers and instructors, and the President of the University, together with such others as may be constituted members thereof by vote of the Board of Trustees. The faculty includes the full- and part-time teaching staff (including emeriti given appointments as per course visitors) but not those staff who teach in addition to their primary duties. There are currently 375 members of the faculty, 339 of whom are counted as full-time Wesleyan employees. These members are collectively responsible for faculty governance, which chiefly involves matters pertaining to educational policy and practice on one hand and faculty tenure and promotion procedures and decisions on the other. The structure and procedures of faculty governance are articulated in the by-laws of the faculty and the Faculty Handbook, available in individual faculty electronic portfolios.

The faculty carries out its governance duties primarily through two legislative assemblies:

THE FACULTY AS A WHOLE addresses matters relating to the educational policies and practices. It conducts its business primarily through formal faculty meetings, which take place at least three times a semester and are also attended by representatives of the administration and the Wesleyan Student Association. Faculty meetings are open to all faculty members – all of whom have voting privileges. Faculty meetings are run by the Faculty Chair, who sets the agenda in consultation with the Faculty Executive Committee, or by the Vice Chair in the Chair’s absence, with the Vice Chair automatically becoming Chair in the subsequent academic year. Faculty meeting agendas and minutes are available in faculty members’ electronic portfolios.

The faculty has four standing committees: the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), the Faculty Committee on Rights and Responsibilities, the Committee on Honors, and the Compensation and Benefits Committee (CBC). Each committee reports on its work at least once a year at the faculty meeting, with the EPC and the CBC typically reporting more frequently. Four other faculty committees – the Merit Committee, the Academic Review Committee, the Library Committee, and the Graduate Council – have narrower purviews and are not required to report to the faculty on a regular basis.

The Faculty Chair and Vice Chair, the chairs of the four standing committees, the faculty representatives to the Finance and Campus Affairs Committees of the Board of Trustees, the Academic Secretary, the three academic deans and three elected representatives of the untenured faculty together make up the Faculty Executive Committee (FEC). The FEC, which meets roughly two weeks prior to each faculty meeting and regularly with the President and Provost, serves as the Faculty Chair’s “cabinet” and represents the faculty as a whole in working with the administration.


Action items for faculty vote in the form of motions are brought to the faculty meeting by the standing committees or the FEC. In addition, matters pertaining to educational policy and practice and to University governance in general are discussed with the administration at the faculty meeting.

THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL, composed of the tenured faculty and three elected tenure-track assistant professors, addresses matters relating to faculty tenure, promotion, and evaluation. Meetings of the Council are chaired by the University President. There are currently 187 members of Academic Council.

The Academic Council has two standing committees: the Advisory Committee and the Review and Appeals Board (RAB). The Advisory Committee, which meets once a week during the academic year, evaluates recommendations for tenure and promotion brought by individual departments, reviews negative departmental votes on such cases, and makes recommendations on individual tenure and promotion cases to the President. Advisory also sets guidelines to departments for constructing and presenting cases for tenure and promotion, and can remand cases back to departments if it determines that its guidelines have not been met.

The RAB, which consists of 30 members drawn equally from the three primary academic divisions (arts and humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences and mathematics), reviews the recommendations made by Advisory, and hears appeals of negative decisions by Advisory. It has the power to remand cases to Advisory for further consideration or, under certain conditions specified in the Faculty Handbook, to reverse Advisory recommendations.

The chart below summarizes the major faculty governance bodies and standing committees:



The faculty Vice Chair, the members of standing committees of the faculty and of the Academic Council, and the faculty representatives to the Board are all elected via faculty-wide voting, while the untenured representatives to the Academic Council are elected by the junior faculty.^v The number of elected faculty members serving on formal University committees is about 65. This number does not include membership on *ad hoc* committees and task forces or overlapping membership on an elected committee and another committee such as the FEC that draws its members from elected committees. In recent years the total number of faculty committee seats has approached 100.

From time to time, the faculty or the administration initiate *ad hoc* committees to study specific issues. In 2008 the Academic Council chartered a faculty *ad hoc* committee to evaluate Wesleyan's tenure and promotion procedures, and in 2010 it created *ad hoc* committees to study the evaluation of teaching and non-traditional scholarship. (Their reports are provided as appendices.) These committees recommended a number of changes, many of which have been adopted by the Council.

Faculty governance is supported by the Academic Secretary,^{vi} the Academic Deans, and the Chairs of Departments and Programs. The three Academic Deans, one for each of the primary divisions, are appointed by the Provost and serve on the FEC. Chairs are elected by the members of their departments or programs and typically serve terms of three years. They have primary responsibility within their departments or programs for implementing faculty policies with respect to the construction and evaluation of tenure and promotion cases.

The Office of Academic Affairs administers faculty policies and provides clerical, research, and statistical support for the faculty as needed. The Deans and the Chair of the EPC meet weekly with the Provost, and the Provost holds several department/program chair meetings a year. The Provost also is the Chair designate of the President to the Advisory Committee with voice but no vote. The Academic Secretary also attends the Advisory Committee with voice but no vote.

Changes in the structures and procedures of faculty governance were instituted around the time of the last NEASC reaccreditation self-study. In particular, in 2001 the Office of the Academic Secretary and the FEC were established, and, in an institutionally historic move, the by-laws of the Academic Council were revised to shift the responsibility of overseeing tenure and promotion cases from the Academic Council to the newly established RAB. (The Academic Council retained its oversight of procedures and by-laws respecting faculty tenure and promotion.)

The FEC and RAB were reviewed in the fall of 2006 by a faculty *ad hoc* committee on governance, which recommended their continuation.

In 2005, then-President Douglas Bennet issued a policy statement defining the excellence standards in scholarship, teaching, and collegueship for promotion and tenure and the role of the President in that process. His successor, Michael Roth, has affirmed this policy statement. This statement serves as fundamental point of reference for the evaluation of tenure and promotion cases.

Appraisal

Advances in computer technology have enabled more efficient measures for disseminating information pertaining to faculty governance and conducting faculty elections. In 2000 the online faculty portfolio became available, and the faculty governance section of faculty portfolios now contains a number of relevant items: including FEC agendas and policies, EPC annual reports, rosters of faculty committees, faculty meeting archives, and the Faculty Handbook. Electronic online balloting for faculty elections was introduced in 2001, and 12 elections are conducted by this means each spring semester. The average voter participation rate per election was 35% in 2008, 34% in 2009, 32% in 2010, 31% in 2011, and 35% in 2012.

THE FACULTY: Of the 62 motions brought to the faculty meeting during the last 10 years, 58 were passed, three were rejected, and one was withdrawn. On average, six action items per year were passed by the faculty. Several of the motions were amended in the meeting by the faculty after discussion and before final vote. A few examples are cited here to illustrate the diversity of issues approved by the faculty: a motion from the EPC to establish a prison education program in 2011, a Certificate in Civil Engagement in 2010 (one of 11 certificate programs approved in the past decade), and a motion brought by the FEC in 2009 to establish an *ad hoc* committee to advise the President on possible budgetary responses to the economic crisis. This particular *ad hoc* committee increased the degree of meaningful consultation with the administration on budgetary matters. Over the last ten years, the University has made increased use of such *ad hoc* committees and task forces.^{vii}

While the faculty as a whole has been actively and effectively engaged in governance, there is a continuing problem with narrow participation. Despite legislation in 2008 to limit years of committee service by any one faculty member (thereby opening up opportunities for others), faculty leadership has tended to be elected from the same pool of “usual suspects.” Attendance at faculty meetings ranges from 25% to 50%. Efforts have been made to encourage greater attendance via repeated reminders of upcoming meetings and making agendas and accompanying materials more readily available online. In addition, in the current academic year the faculty chair and vice chair set up an online “Moodle” page to which all faculty members are invited to submit their comments and concerns about governance issues, but it is too early to determine if such efforts will have a lasting effect on faculty participation. In spring 2012 the Provost, at the request of the Faculty Chair and Vice Chair, convened an *ad hoc* committee on faculty service and participation, and the report is forthcoming.

There is an inherent tension between the individual professor’s investments in scholarship and teaching and in governance inasmuch as both investments require the limited resource of time. Course relief sometimes serves to mediate the tension, as in the case of department chairs or the chairs of some committees, but this takes teachers out of the classroom and thus cannot be used to reward all service. Other forms of reward, such as research funds and merit increases, are under consideration. But clearly there is also some difference in the way individual faculty think about their careers that lends itself to disparities in taking up the tasks of faculty governance.

THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL AND ITS COMMITTEES: Broader inclusion on Advisory has been encouraged by reducing terms of service from three years to two; over the last 10 years, 60 different faculty members have served. In 2006, the composition of Advisory was changed so that only tenured faculty members serve.

This has garnered mixed reactions: on one hand, many appreciated that untenured faculty were spared a major time commitment. On the other, some senior faculty regretted losing the different perspectives brought by tenure-track colleagues. Members of Advisory are eligible for one course off over the year, a 25% reduction in teaching, unless their normal teaching load is 1-1, as is the case with many faculty in the sciences. The faculty handbook states that faculty may not have course relief for chair or committee service that results in teaching less than one full credit course each semester.

As noted above, in 2001 the Academic Council delegated its power to vote on Advisory recommendations and to review negative decisions in tenure and promotion cases to the newly-created RAB. Almost all agree that this was a procedural improvement, ensuring more consistent and thorough assessment of Advisory decisions than was provided by the much larger (and often poorly attended) Academic Council.^{viii} However, the delegation of the Academic Council's voting power to RAB has led many tenured faculty members to question whether the Council has become irrelevant to decision-making of any importance.

Faculty governance in tenure and promotion serves to advise the President. In tenure cases the President decides whether to bring a case to the Board of Trustees for final vote. In the case of promotion to full professor, the President makes the final decision and informs the Board. In the last 10 years only once has the President not taken to the Board a tenure recommendation of the RAB and the Advisory Committee out of a total of 73 positive recommendations. (During the same period there have been 13 negative recommendations.) In that one case the President did go to Advisory to seek additional input before making the final decision. Nevertheless the negative decision caused consternation among some faculty members.

FACULTY ELECTIONS: Although the institution of online voting has made it easier for faculty to participate in elections, voting rates continue to be highly variable and relatively low overall. Elections of Advisory members and the Vice Chair of the Faculty enjoy the highest average participation rates, about 50% and 40% respectively, with RAB election participation rates close behind at about 37%. The average voter participation rates for elections to standing committees are in the 25%–35% range. This rate is deemed too low by faculty leadership, and ways to generate more faculty involvement in the election process are under discussion.

Projection

While the structural and procedural changes enacted over the past decade have improved the machinery of faculty governance, increasing faculty attendance at meetings, increasing participation in elections, and broadening committee service remain challenges. In 2012, the faculty met in an “executive session” closed to administrators – the idea being that this might help in generating a more independent agenda and more active participation. At the same time, the desire for close consultation with the administration and transparency in decision-making will doubtless remain strong, especially so when differences arise. One suggestion under consideration is to take a more open, issue-driven approach in Academic Council meetings that would increase the give-and-take between faculty and the President.

STUDENTS

Description

The Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA) represents undergraduates and advocates for their interests. The WSA is composed of 38 members across four class years, among them a President, Vice President, Coordinator, and five other committee chairs who compose the Executive Committee. Executive Committee members act as the WSA leadership and serve as student representatives to the Wesleyan Board of Trustees. The WSA holds elections every semester, in which students vote for their representatives, and the President and Vice President are elected

directly from the student body with a year-long term. The WSA Constitution and by-laws govern the general structure of the assembly and its elections.

Apart from the Executive Committee, there are six other permanent standing committees: Finance and Facilities, Community Outreach Committee, Student Affairs Committee, Academic Affairs Committee, Student Budget Committee, and Outreach and External Affairs Committee. Each representative, excepting the President, serves on one of these six standing committees. The standing committees have sub-committees, which include WSA representatives, non-representatives, staff, faculty, and administrators in their composition, varying for each committee.^{ix}

Funds collected from students through the Student Activities Fees enable the WSA to support student events and programs. The Student Budgetary Committee allocates these funds to student groups on a weekly basis. In addition, the WSA manages a \$200,000+ endowment, the first student government endowment in the nation, which is meant to allow the WSA to eventually lower the Student Activities Fee.

The full General Assembly of the WSA meets every Sunday evening to discuss campus issues, activities, and policies. These meetings are open to the public, and often guests from the community are invited to present. The WSA President and Vice President meet every other week with the University President, and the University President visits the General Assembly once a semester to update students on the state of the school and to field questions from community members.

Some recent accomplishments of the WSA include founding a student café, introducing new academic certificates, launching a professor evaluation website, organizing cultural trips, founding a local cheese co-op, reforming the meal plan, and establishing a green projects fund.

Graduate students are represented by the Graduate Student Association (GSA), which considers issues related to international students, housing, benefits and health services, the visibility of graduate students in the community, allocation of student activities funds, green initiatives, and graduate judicial issues. Additionally, the GSA has a representative to the EPC, who can attend faculty meetings.

Appraisal

A WSA survey from December 2011 indicated that 89% of student respondents approved of the work the WSA is doing (190 total respondents). The Assembly has undergone minor structural changes through its constitutional review process and added new committees such as the Financial Aid Committee and the Sustainability Task Force to broaden its scope and influence. Still, the WSA faces some of the same problems of apathy that the faculty encounter, such as low rates of voting and low turnout at meetings.

A recurring complaint from some students through the years has been that the WSA is out of touch with “ordinary” students and not sufficiently accessible. In order to address this complaint, President Zachary Malter ’13 and Vice President Meherazade Sumariwalla ’12 rolled out a number of new initiatives in the 2011–12 academic year. In collaboration with other representatives and concerned students, they created WSA Office Hours, installed a WSA suggestion box, founded a WSA cabinet of non-members, created a user-friendly website, and shored up canvassing efforts. The hope is that increased accessibility will lead to more intensive and diverse student engagement in the WSA’s activities, and ultimately to better policies. The WSA’s move towards greater accessibility will be an on-going effort, and further work, such as the production of WSA-related video content, is planned.

Projection

It is anticipated that the WSA will continue its recent trajectory towards greater accessibility and financial strength. The WSA is well equipped to handle financial instability given its endowment and its fixed operating budget, which is not dependent on or sourced from the endowment. One major financial issue will be the policy governing the WSA endowment, which currently privileges the long-term over the near-term, and whether such a stance should be re-examined.

On the policy front, the WSA will also likely be grappling with issues of financial aid, judicial policy, academic departments, alumni relations, and technology, all of which seem to be on the brink of re-evaluation at the University level. In the near future the WSA will take up the theme of “cultivating community” and work to facilitate and improve collaborations and partnerships among diverse community members in all areas of campus life.

Institutional Effectiveness

Each of Wesleyan’s governance structures – Board, Administration, Faculty, Student Assembly – conducts regular assessments of its own effectiveness. The coordination of these structures is key. The Board recognizes that it must balance its oversight of overarching goals with the efficiency of allowing those on campus to decide how those goals are best pursued on a daily basis. Administration, faculty, and students recognize that making progress on these goals requires embracing shared objectives and not being distracted by “turf” concerns. Effective cooperation during the budget crisis was strengthened by the Administration’s policy of transparency, and while there will always be exceptions (mainly related to confidentiality of individual cases), the policy of transparency will enable the University to make the most of collaborative efforts.

-
- ⁱ At the time of writing, for example, five of 33 trustees were in their second board-elected term; two others first elected by alumni were serving a second term as board-elected trustees.
 - ⁱⁱ The Wesleyan University Board of Trustees also functions as the Board of WESU, a licensed public-radio affiliate, and the Board complies with the public disclosure requirements of the Federal Communications Commission.
 - ⁱⁱⁱ The faculty chair sits on the Finance Committee and the vice-chair sits on the University Relations Committee, each with voting privileges. The faculty chair also sits in the plenary trustee meetings with voice but not vote. In addition, a faculty representative is elected with voting privileges to the Finance Committee, and an elected faculty representative joins the Vice-chair of Advisory and the chair of the Educational Policy Committee on the Campus Affairs Committee. All three of these representatives have voting privileges in the committee.
 - ^{iv} In 2010-11 one-hour sessions connecting trustees to faculty and students were introduced into the schedule. One session focused on the experience of students and faculty in the College of the Environment; another was a roundtable discussion (trustees, faculty, students) about the experience of faculty-student collaborative research. The trustees feel that these sessions are giving them a better sense of campus life.
 - ^v The election process and procedures are governed by the by-laws of the faculty. Voting is based on approval balloting, such that faculty members may vote for as many candidates as they wish with the winner receiving the most votes, subject to receiving at least 50%, or in some cases 40%, of the ballots.
 - ^{vi} The Academic Secretary, who is appointed by the President after consultation with department/program chairs and the Advisory Committee, provides guidance, consistency and continuity to the governance process, advising faculty representatives and committee members on relevant precedents and procedures. The Academic Secretary codifies and clarifies existing and new legislation and provides substantive and logistical support for faculty leadership, the Advisory Committee, the Review and Appeals Board, and the Academic Council. The Academic Secretary also maintains the minutes for Faculty and Academic council meetings, serves as legislative archivist and parliamentarian, and administers faculty elections.
 - ^{vii} Recommendations from the *ad hoc* committees have led to changes in the procedures in the Office of Academic Affairs. For example, the parental leave policy has been recently modified to allow for either one or two semesters of accommodation with regard to teaching and provides a flexible policy with respect to the tenure clock for review. Changes to the sabbatical policy for

tenure track faculty have been implemented to ensure a semester sabbatical after reappointment and before tenure. The Office of Academic Affairs, also in response to faculty recommendations, meets yearly with the tenure track faculty to discuss the tenure and promotion process and meets with the chairs of the departments/programs that will have a tenure case in the following year.

- viii The Academic Council modified the procedures of the RAB in 2006. For cases where there is disagreement between a department's positive vote and Advisory's negative evaluation, the Academic Council voted to change to a simple majority (from two-thirds) the vote required for non-concurrence with the recommendation based on a telling procedural error or the use of inappropriate criteria. The RAB has played an active oversight role, as seen for example in a recent case in which it remanded a negative decision back to Advisory, resulting in a subsequent change in Advisory's vote on the case.
- ix Some notable sub-committees where students work closely with administrators include the Student Life Committee, the University Residential Life Committee, the Dining Committee, the ITS-WSA Committee, the Public Safety Advisory Committee, the Financial Aid Committee, and the Educational Policy Committee. There are also a number of external WSA committees: the Concert Committee, the Green Fund Committee, the Senior Class Officer Committee, the Committee for Investor Responsibility, and the Spring Fling Committee.

**Standard 4: The Academic Program
(Summary - Enrollment and Degrees)**

Fall Enrollment* by location and modality, as of Census Date

Degree Level/ Location & Modality	Main campus FTE	Other Campus FTE	Branches FTE	Other Locations FTE	Overseas locations FTE	On-Line FTE	Corres- pondence FTE	Total FTE	Unduplicated Headcount Total	Degrees Awarded, last year
Associates										
Bachelors	2,870							2,870	2,870	719
Masters	85							85	136	80
Clinical doctorates (e.g., Pharm.D., DPT, Au.D.)										
Professional doctorates (e.g., Ed.D., Psy.D., D.B.A.)										
M.D., J.D., DDS										
Ph.D.	126							126	126	14
Total Degree- Seeking	3,081	0	0	0	0	0		3,081	3,132	813
Non-matriculated students	27								58	n.a.
Visiting Students	10								12	n.a.

Title IV-Eligible
Certificates

**Certificates
awarded,
last year**

Students seeking certificates										
----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

* For programs not taught in the fall, report an analogous term's enrollment as of its Census Date.

Note: Enrollment numbers should include all students in the named categories, including students in continuing education and students enrolled through any contractual relationship.

**Standard 4: The Academic Program
(Headcount by UNDERGRADUATE Major)**

	3 Years Prior (FY 2009)	2 Years Prior (FY2010)	1 Year Prior (FY 2011)	Current Year (FY 2012)	Goal for next Year (FY 2013)	
For Fall Term, as of Census Date						
Certificate						
?						
Total	-	-	-	-	-	
Associate						
?						
?	Undeclared					
Total	-	-	-	-	-	
Baccalaureate						
?	African American Studies	36	32	21	9	**
	American Studies	76	61	68	75	**
	Anthropology	25	34	34	34	**
	Archaeology	4	6	5	4	**
	Art History	25	30	28	29	**
	Art Studio	19	27	35	24	**
	Astronomy	9	8	11	12	**
	Biology	66	60	63	79	**
	Chemistry	42	32	31	48	**
	Classical Civilization	12	8	12	9	**
	Classics	6	7	14	7	**
	College of Letters	63	66	71	61	**
	College of Social Studies	57	59	66	67	**
	Computer Science	15	23	21	18	**
	Dance	18	15	16	11	**
	Earth & Environmental Science	30	38	34	34	**
	East Asian Studies	36	29	23	23	**
	Economics	111	105	121	127	**
	English	116	110	119	129	**
	Environmental Studies	-	13	32	40	**
	Feminist, Gender, & Sexuality Studies	26	22	21	19	**
	Film Studies	68	71	63	67	**
	French Studies	37	32	39	40	**
	German Studies	7	8	13	13	**
	Government	113	117	135	115	**
	History	80	77	59	71	**
	Iberian Studies	8	2	3	3	**
	Italian Studies	11	9	6	6	**
	Latin American Studies	14	13	15	16	**
	Mathematics	65	60	64	72	**
	Mathematics-Economics	40	25	20	25	**
	Medieval Studies	2	1	2	2	**
	Molecular Biology and BioChemistry	51	42	40	48	**
	Music	36	53	58	43	**
	Neuroscience and Behavior	67	76	88	119	**
	Philosophy	29	28	37	36	**
	Physics	28	35	39	34	**
	Psychology	133	139	140	164	**
	Religion	29	35	27	23	**
	Romance Studies	3	4	3	4	**
	Russian	1	2	2	3	**
	Russian & Eastern European Studies	6	6	5	4	**
	Science in Society	47	46	57	57	**
	Sociology	77	74	70	76	**
	Spanish Language and Literature	11	10	15	27	**
	Theater	22	21	28	26	**
	University	5	4	2	6	**
	Undeclared	1418	1,445	1,487	1,507	**
Total	3,200	3,220	3,363	3,466	-	
Total Undergraduate	3,200	3,220	3,363	3,466	-	

**Wesleyan does not set specific goals for the number of majors in any given field of study. However, we do continually monitor the number of majors in each field and use this information as appropriate.

Standard 4: The Academic Program (Headcount by GRADUATE Major)

?

	3 Years <u>Prior</u> (FY 2009)	2 Years <u>Prior</u> (FY2010)	1 Year <u>Prior</u> (FY 2011)	Current <u>Year</u> (FY 2012)	Goal for next <u>Year</u> (FY 2013)	
For Fall Term, as of Census Date						
Master's						
?	Anthropology	0	-	1	-	
	Astronomy	5	4	4	4	
	Biology	4	6	2	2	
	Chemistry	9	9	12	10	
	Computer Science	1	1	3	-	
	Earth & Environmental Science	5	7	7	5	
	Film Studies	2	2	2	2	
	Mathematics	3	2	1	1	
	Molecular Biology & Biochemistry	1	2	4	4	
	Music	20	19	18	17	
	Neuroscience & Behavior	4	-	3	2	
	Physics	3	1	4	1	
	Psychology	3	2	2	2	
	Liberal Studies	111	83	73	83	
	Total	171	138	136	133	-
Doctorate						
?	Biology	21	19	21	18	
	Chemistry	30	29	28	32	
	Ethnomusicology	25	22	25	26	
	Mathematics	18	20	21	20	
	Molecular Biology & Biochemistry	19	19	18	18	
	Physics	12	13	13	12	
	Total	125	122	126	126	-
First Professional						
?						
	Total	-	-	-	-	-
Other						
?	Arts Post-Masters Certificate	2	1	1	-	
	Humanities Post-Masters Certificate	2	2	2	1	
	Mathematics Post-Masters Certificate	1	1	2	1	
	Social Sciences Post-Masters Certificate	2	-	-	-	
	Total	7	4	5	2	-
	Total Graduate	303	264	267	261	-

**Wesleyan does not set specific goals for the number of majors in any given field of study. However, we do continually monitor the number of majors in each field and use this information as appropriate.

Standard 4: The Academic Program
(Credit Hours Generated By Department or Comparable Academic Unit)



	3 Years Prior (FY 2009)	2 Years Prior (FY2010)	1 Year Prior (FY 2011)	Current Year (FY 2012 ¹)	Goal for next Year (FY 2013)
Undergraduate					
African American Studies	1466	884	956	784	**
American Studies	804	948	1,196	856	**
Anthropology	2044	1,500	1,700	2,228	**
Archaeology	236	184	244	4	**
Art and Art History	4745	4,392	3,926	4,290	**
Asian Languages and Literatures	1558	1,370	1,530	1,674	**
Astronomy	776	648	885	790	**
Biology	3592	4,505	3,938	4,039	**
Center for the Humanities	668	644	792	800	**
Center for the Study for Public Life	0	-	-	104	**
Chemistry	4215	4,192	4,811	4,716	**
Classical Studies	1540	1,484	1,910	1,778	**
College of Letters	1276	1,792	1,296	1,668	**
College of Social Studies	1338	1,360	1,192	1,174	**
Dance	2164	2,096	1,930	1,815	**
Earth and Environmental Sciences	2432	2,226	2,270	2,162	**
East Asian Studies	174	190	172	128	**
Economics	4832	4,884	5,228	6,012	**
English	6528	6,432	6,064	6,260	**
Environmental Studies	0	108	423	534	**
Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies	516	624	476	392	**
Film Studies	2800	2,648	2,720	2,564	**
German Studies	876	1,368	1,012	1,288	**
Government	4760	4,484	4,640	4,784	**
History	5466	5,628	5,300	4,552	**
Latin American Studies	88	60	172	36	**
Less Commonly Taught Languages	1,096	1,272	756	628	**
Mathematics and Computer Science	5,405	5,372	5,577	6,215	**
Medieval Studies	8	-	4	16	**
Molecular Biology and Biochemistry	2,015	2,505	2,363	2,552	**
Music	7,748	7,412	7,584	7,300	**
Neuroscience and Behavior	424	548	864	1,084	**
Philosophy	1,904	1,600	1,848	1,992	**
Physical Education	780	668	670	703	**
Physics	3,582	3,730	4,276	3,832	**
Psychology	5,940	7,044	7,068	6,859	**
Quantitative Analysis Center	-	530	476	714	**
Religion	2,192	2,544	2,300	2,672	**
Romance Languages and Literatures	4,720	4,400	4,588	4,716	**
Russian	852	624	852	728	**
Russian and East European Studies	4	-	16	-	**
Science in Society	136	428	620	372	**
Sociology	3,165	2,842	3,204	3,137	**
Theater	1,408	1,100	1,627	1,455	**
University Studies	16	32	12	20	**
Writing Center	-	-	212	216	**
Total	96,289	97,302	99,700	100,643	-

Graduate

Anthropology	0	-	12	-	
Art and Art History	4	-	-	-	
Astronomy	24	16	20	92	
Biology	384	371	302	227	
Chemistry	473	370	365	391	
Earth and Environmental Sciences	28	60	50	36	
Film Studies	48	48	36	60	
German Studies	0	2	-	-	
Mathematics and Computer Science	526	614	640	520	
Molecular Biology and Biochemistry	293	240	204	296	
Music	478	428	395	401	
Neuroscience and Behavior	14	-	24	8	
Physics	330	369	368	312	
Psychology	44	28	28	36	
Graduate Liberal Studies Program (GLSP)	2595	1,902	1,935	1,104	
Total	5,241	4,448	4,379	3,483	-

¹FY2012 data do not include summer of 2012. Total GLSP credit hours are expected to be approximately 1,800.

**Wesleyan does not set specific goals for the number of enrollments in any given field of study.

Standard Four: The Academic Program

Overview

When students direct their own education, in consultation with intensively engaged faculty advisors, they learn to think independently, explore questions from multiple points of view, and develop habits of critical thinking that are hallmarks of a liberal education. Wesleyan upholds the principle that student choice fosters the drive to explore freely and seek connections across courses, generating the intellectual excitement that can fuel liberal education as a lifelong pursuit. Wesleyan espouses an open curriculum, admitting students who are poised to thrive in a flexible environment, who are intensely motivated to study broadly and deeply, and who push themselves and their peers to excel beyond what they may have thought possible.

The Wesleyan curriculum challenges students to create their own plan for general education. Academic coherence does not rely on a core curriculum or a set of required courses; instead, students propose their academic plan to their faculty advisors and recalibrate it with their advisors each semester as their discoveries lead them to pursue new areas or deepen existing strengths.

With the freedom to sample liberally from across the curriculum, students are able to experience the surprise of unexpected ability in fields new to them and to make fruitful connections across subject areas that do not traditionally intersect. This can generate innovative depth of study and new ways of seeing – with students posing questions from one discipline to the assumptions of another.ⁱ

Naturally there are challenges, and not all hopes are realized. Advising, so important, could be stronger still. The curriculum may be wide-ranging, but some areas are more popular than others, and difficulties of course access may skew the decisions students make. Nor is the openness of the curriculum always easily reconciled with Wesleyan's general education expectations. And while double majors are common here, they tend not to involve disparate disciplines to the degree many assume.ⁱⁱ More on these and other challenges, including the interplay with Wesleyan's graduate programs and the vexed question of learning outcomes, below.

Description

Undergraduate Program

Wesleyan awards the Bachelor of Arts degree with 47 majors to about 700 graduating seniors yearly, with an undergraduate population of approximately 2900.

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS

ARTS & HUMANITIES	SOCIAL SCIENCES	NATURAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS	INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAMS
Art History	African American Studies	Astronomy	Archeology
Art Studio	American Studies	Biology	East Asian Studies
Classical Civilizations	Anthropology	Chemistry	Environmental Studies
Classics	College of Social Studies	Computer Science	Feminist, Gender, & Sexuality Studies
College of Letters	Economics	Earth & Environmental Sciences	Latin American Studies
Dance	Government	Mathematics	Mathematics-Economics*
English	History	Molecular Biology & Biochemistry	Medieval Studies
Film Studies	Philosophy	Neuroscience & Behavior	Russian & East European Studies
French Studies	Religion	Physics	Science in Society
German Studies	Sociology	Psychology	University Studies
Hispanic Literatures & Cultures ⁱⁱⁱ			
Italian Studies			
Iberian Studies*			
Music			
Romance Studies			
Spanish*			
Russian*			
Theater	* This major will be discontinued beginning with the class of 2015		

Academic regulations for the B.A. degree require a student to: (1) satisfy the requirements of a major; (2) complete 32 course credits, of which no more than 16 credits in one department can be counted toward the degree requirements^{iv}; (3) maintain a cumulative average grade of 74 (equivalent to a letter grade of C-); and (4) complete at least six semesters in full-time residency at Wesleyan (fewer for transfer students). The major in University Studies allows students to define their own program of study.^v

Wesleyan maintains programs with Columbia University, the California Institute of Technology, and Dartmouth for students wishing to combine the study of engineering with a broad background in the liberal arts.

The University offers 11 interdisciplinary certificates, each of which allows students to study in a coherent manner an otherwise disparate range of topics. Students who complete the requirements for one or more certificates have a notation on the transcript. Most certificates require students to complete about seven courses in specific areas or categories; some require a minimum grade point average; each has a faculty director.

CERTIFICATES

Civic Engagement	Informatics & Modeling	Jewish & Israel Studies	Molecular Biophysics
Environmental Studies	International Relations	Middle Eastern Studies	Social, Cultural, & Critical Theory
	South Asian Studies	Study of Education	Writing

The University by-laws assign responsibility for the Wesleyan curriculum to faculty, and faculty have delegated routine review to the Educational Policy Committee (EPC), which is an elected, standing committee of six tenured and tenure-track faculty plus two undergraduates and one graduate student. The EPC meets weekly during the academic year, conducts reviews of academic departments and programs, and regularly surveys their practices (most recently regarding capstones and FYI courses, for example).

The EPC has recently identified and taken actions to improve the system for pre-major advisee assignments (discussed below), the course access problem (partially resolved by requiring courses to be distributed more

evenly across the time of day and day of week) and the abuse of the option of repeating courses for credit. It oversaw and regulated the 2008 adaptation of the teaching evaluation form to an online version. The EPC continues to seek to provide curricular coherence and multiple pathways through the Wesleyan course structure. In 2011, for example, EPC generated a proposal for minors – a traditional construct in academia but new to Wesleyan. The proposal was approved by the faculty, and Wesleyan’s first minors have been instituted in Economics, Archaeology, and German Studies. Through the proactivity of the EPC, faculty governance over the academic program is nimble, responsive, decisive in addressing critical problems, and focused on long-term solutions through consultation and extensive deliberation with all potentially affected groups.

Graduate Program

It is unusual for an institution known principally as a liberal arts college to have a graduate program. That said, Wesleyan’s basic requirements for the MA and PhD degrees are not unusual for universities. For the MA, we require a minimum of 6 to 8 courses (depending on the department) beyond the BA degree. We also require a thesis, and there is an MA exam, either oral or written or both, depending on the department. Normally it requires two years of study to complete an MA degree for a student arriving from outside Wesleyan and one year for a Wesleyan BA/MA student.

With respect to the PhD, there are no set course requirements, but every department administers an oral and/or written comprehensive exam that the student must pass. Normally, the student takes courses for two or three years to prepare for the exam. Which courses and how many depends on their prior preparation, among other things. A Ph.D. thesis is, of course, required and must be a significant, original contribution to the field of study. The student must defend his/her thesis either before a committee of faculty or before the entire department or both. It normally requires a minimum of 4 years to obtain a Ph.D. degree.

Eight departments at Wesleyan have graduate programs leading to a Ph.D. or M.A degree: Astronomy (M.A. only), Biology, Chemistry, Earth & Environmental Sciences (M.A. only), Mathematics and Computer Science, Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Music, and Physics. In addition, any Wesleyan department may admit students and organize a program of study for them leading to the M.A. degree, although this happens only rarely.

The graduate program is administered by the Graduate Council, which consists of representatives from each of the eight departments, a Director of Graduate Studies appointed by the Provost, the Director of the Office of Graduate Student Services (OGSS), and two graduate students. There are currently 123 full-time students in graduate programs. All of them receive tuition waivers and support for living expenses either as Teaching Assistants or Research Assistants.^{vi} The OGSS oversees graduate student compliance with degree requirements and supports graduate student life at Wesleyan.

Appraisal

Graduate Program

M.A. and Ph.D. Degree Programs

The graduate program is a key part of what attracts many faculty in the sciences, mathematics, and music to come here^{vii}. Graduate students make it possible for faculty members in these areas to participate fully in the scholar-teacher model. Grad students perform in music ensembles, serve as tutors in the Math Workshop program, and work on research teams in the field and in the laboratory. They are vital to science faculty who face stiff competition for the external funding required to carry on frontier research. The existence of graduate programs allows outstanding undergraduates the opportunity to do research alongside graduate students and to take graduate level courses for undergraduate credit.

It is not uncommon for graduate students at Wesleyan to sit in classes with undergraduates; the University, being relatively small, does not have enough staff to warrant separate courses on similar topics. (This is, of course, a real benefit for some undergraduates because it gives them access to an advanced class that they might not get at an exclusively undergraduate institution.)

When graduate and undergraduate students are both present in a class, expectations for their contributions and performance are different. Ways in which this plays out exactly depend on the class and the instructor, but the most common are: 1) graduate students may have extra or different homework assignments, 2) they may have additional class meetings, usually in the form of seminars, 3) they may have different reading assignments, often involving current research literature, 4) they may have different expectations within class, often involving their own class presentations on some parts of the course work, and 5) they are graded on a different basis, requiring a B- or better to get credit for “passing” the course.

The administrative structure of the graduate program is decentralized with most power vested in the departments, which handle admission, recruiting, and management of stipend budgets. The Graduate Council exists as the legislative body of the program but leaves most of the actual operations to the individual departments.

With regards to admission, each department has its own process and deadlines but makes use of a common application form. The lack of full standardization of the process can sometimes be problematic for the OGSS, which has not always been made aware of departmental decisions in a timely fashion. The OGSS is committed to finding ways to improve the admissions process.^{viii}

Almost all graduate students during their first two years serve as teaching assistants as part of their service to the University and their training as future professionals in their fields. The Director of Graduate Studies organizes an annual Graduate Pedagogy course for arriving students designed to ease their transition from student to teacher. Only rarely do graduate students teach a course on their own; more commonly they serve as teaching assistants. In either case, they receive close mentoring from their faculty advisor. (For more on graduate students at Wesleyan, see Standard 6.)

B.A./M.A. Program

In addition to its regular graduate program, Wesleyan has a B.A./M.A. program for undergraduates that allows them to stay for a fifth year and earn an M.A. degree. Students admitted to this program receive tuition waivers for the fifth (M.A.) year but do not receive stipends and do not typically have any teaching duties. Graduate student housing is available to them. These students must be sponsored by a faculty member who will serve as the student’s advisor and with whom the student will conduct research. The main purpose is to provide an extra year of course work and research for students who would benefit from that before moving on in their academic careers. The number of spaces is limited to 23. A three-person committee of the Graduate Council oversees admission decisions and administration of the program. While the tuition waiver is clearly generous, the absence of stipends means that students who are of socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds are not as able to apply for the program as other students whose parents can assist with their living costs.

Continuing Studies

The Graduate Liberal Studies (GLS) program, established in 1953 and administered by The Office of Continuing Studies, awards the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies degree and the Master of Philosophy in the Liberal Arts^{ix} to students who study on a part-time basis in evening and take summer courses. There are approximately 280 active GLS students during any given year, and the program graduates between 45-80 students each spring. The program offers adult students, many of whom completed college several years (or decades) ago, the opportunity to re-experience academic work, explore the liberal arts, and take courses with

Wesleyan faculty. Approximately half of GLS students are secondary school teachers; the other half come from a variety of fields including engineering, social work, performing arts, journalism, and information technology. Students may take up to a maximum of six years to complete the degree.

The GLS curriculum is an extension of Wesleyan's model for a liberal education, with concentrations in arts, humanities, mathematics, sciences, and social sciences. Approximately 70% of courses are taught by regular Wesleyan faculty, with the other 30% taught by artists and scholars from other institutions. Over the past 10 years the program has become more academically rigorous by increasing the percentage of courses taught by Wesleyan faculty, by increasing the scrutiny of the non-Wesleyan faculty who propose courses, and by instituting stricter admission standards for the degree program. During this same time period, enrollments have declined by approximately one-third. The students who are in the program today are better able to handle the academic rigor, but there are concerns about the downward trend in enrollment. Program administrators are exploring the possibility of offering online components to reduce classroom hours in response to changing needs and expectations of adult students.

The Office of Continuing Studies also administers the Institute for Curatorial Practice in Performance: a non-degree post-baccalaureate certificate program for professional artists, arts presenters, and cultural leaders who want to learn to curate time-based art. The program was approved by the faculty as a pilot project for two years, to be evaluated in spring 2013. It began in 2011 with 17 students pursuing a nine-month program that combines intensive on-campus courses with off-campus tutorial/independent study courses.

Undergraduate Program

Wesleyan engages in ongoing review and renewal of the curriculum through many sources: faculty, students, staff, the Office of Academic Affairs, and the EPC.

Decisions about the curriculum and resource allocation can be difficult. Should decisions be made on the basis of student demand (in which case we might double the size of the faculty in film studies, psychology, neuroscience, and writing – presumably shrinking other traditional staples of the liberal arts curriculum), or should additions to the curriculum reflect the faculty's long-term vision for a liberal arts education? The two are not necessarily mutually exclusive, and decisions take into account both concerns. (However, the result may not mollify students who could not get spots in the writing course they wanted....)

Renewal and enhancement of the structure of the major may be one of the more important but less noticed aspects of Wesleyan's culture of self-reflection and improvement. Over the past ten years there has been systematic restructuring of majors in American Studies; Dance; East Asian Studies; English; Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies; German Studies; Government; Neuroscience and Behavior; Psychology; Science in Society; Italian Studies; Spanish and Iberian Studies; and Romance Studies. The Environmental Studies major was added in 2009. The process of major review commonly involves an internal self-study and an external review by peer faculty.

Teaching and Learning

Wesleyan proudly espouses the "scholar-teacher" model, holding that engagement in scholarship is the foundation of strong teaching and that a commitment to outstanding teaching is at the heart of the educational mission for a small liberal arts college. Faculty expect themselves and each other to excel as both teachers and scholars, and the institution's generous sabbatical policy, historically deep investment in library resources, and funding for research provide tangible support for scholarship. Internal pedagogy grants support faculty-initiated teaching projects such as Science across the Curriculum. Innovations in teaching have been funded by external grants from Teagle, Mellon, HHMI, and others. And the Center for Faculty Career Development² provides pedagogy workshops, coaching, video recording of class sessions for self-evaluation, and confidential consultation on those videos (roughly 10 per year) by Harvard's Bok Center.

Since the last reaccreditation, increased emphasis has been placed on the admission and retention of students interested in the sciences.^{xi} In 2002, Wesleyan ranked 10th of the COFHE schools in the percentage of students receiving a degree in science. (This appeared to be a problem of recruiting rather than retention, because Wesleyan ranked last among COFHE colleges in the percentage (20%) of entering students who expressed an intention to major in science and ranked 6th in retention.) From 2002 to 2011, there has been a 46% increase in seniors graduating with a major in the sciences and a 30% increase in enrollments in courses in astronomy, biology, chemistry, earth and environmental sciences, molecular biology and biochemistry, neuroscience and behavior, and physics. This growth is, in substantial part, the result of a focused effort by faculty and the Admission Office that began in 2005. Wesleyan also has been aided in this effort by the McNair Fellows program, which supports low-income, first-generation students who may not have the background to succeed in science, and the Hughes program, which has provided students with the opportunity to conduct research with a faculty member over the summer.

Curricular Coherence

Wesleyan's open curriculum presents a challenge for curricular coherence, as has been noted in previous self-studies and NEASC documents. This is less a problem once students enter a major (typically at the end of the sophomore year) since majors provide more or less structured paths for much of the remaining two years, with required courses and in some cases specific sequences of courses. It has been felt, however, that the first two years and the time spent in the last two years outside the major require some mechanisms for ensuring a coherent experience. The mechanisms playing the major role in this have been the General Education Expectations and the essential capabilities.

The General Education Expectations, first adopted in 1968, encourage *breadth* of education by directing students to take courses in all three divisions of study; compliance with this general education expectation is required to earn University honors, Phi Beta Kappa, honors in general scholarship, honors in certain majors, and is required as a condition of completion of certain majors. The General Education Expectations are divided into Stages 1 and 2. The expectation for Stage 1 is that all students will distribute their course work in such a way that by the end of the fourth semester, they will have earned at least two course credits in each of the three divisions, all from different departments or programs. To meet the expectation of Stage 2, students must also take one course credit in each of the three divisions prior to graduation, for a total of nine general education course credits. Some 78% of students graduating in 2011 completed their general education expectations.^{xii} It may be noted that non-compliance with these expectations has few repercussions, leading some to question the extent of Wesleyan's commitment to breadth in students' studies. New efforts to assess advising and general education here should bring this issue to the fore.

In 2005, the Wesleyan faculty adopted a set of ten "essential capabilities" intended to guide students in the development of skills for the various social, intellectual, and ethical challenges that they will encounter in their lives after graduation. The capabilities are:

1. Writing
2. Designing, Creating, and Realizing
3. Speaking
4. Ethical Reasoning
5. Interpretation
6. Intercultural Literacy
7. Quantitative Reasoning
8. Information Literacy
9. Logical Reasoning
10. Effective Citizenship

To help students develop these skills, courses have been marked in the course catalog to show which capabilities the course emphasizes. In their electronic portfolios, first-year students have done a self-evaluation of their capabilities, which their faculty advisors could compare to courses taken that emphasize those capabilities. The capabilities have thus been available for use as touchstones in advising sessions.

It was hoped that such a “scorecard” of the skills a Wesleyan education should develop would provide a form of curricular coherence that would co-exist easily with the open curriculum – students would not be required to take particular courses but encouraged to master particular skills. In theory, this approach seemed quite sound, and some students and faculty members still use the capabilities in precisely this way. But research carried out internally over the past two years has strongly suggested what many already suspected: that the capabilities are used only by a fairly small segment of the University and that their utility as tools for advising is, at best, uncertain.

First, a comparison of self-assessments by members of the class of 2010 at the beginning and end of their careers suggested that self-assessed gains in the essential capabilities were uncorrelated with courses taken. That is, though half of the reporting students said their skills in the essential capabilities had improved over their four years at Wesleyan, there was no correlation between improvement in a given capability and having taken a course that stressed that capability.

In April of 2011, Institutional Research conducted two surveys to appraise student and faculty use of the essential capabilities.^{xiii} The report concluded that “the essential capabilities hold more of a theoretical than practical appeal to both students and faculty. Faculty spend significant time and effort designating courses as addressing specific capabilities, but students seldom consider these labels. Other aspects of the capabilities are also underutilized. Neither faculty nor students use with regularity the tools designed to facilitate consideration of the essential capabilities in advising and course-selection,” and 44% of the students described the capabilities as “not at all useful.”

Even given these results it was possible that the problems with the essential capabilities were a matter of *disuse* rather than a lack of usefulness; that is, it seemed plausible that if the capabilities were more intentionally used, they would be more helpful. This, too, however, was called into question by a third study, carried out in 2011-2012. In this study, one group of students was asked by their advisors to prepare for pre-registration advisor/advisee meetings by writing an essay reflecting on the student’s past and future use of the essential capabilities; another group of students was asked to write a similarly self-reflective essay on their learning objectives at Wesleyan but with no mention of the essential capabilities. Assessments of the students and the faculty of the quality of the ensuing advising meetings were then compared to those for students who wrote neither type of essay. The results further undermined confidence in use of the essential capabilities as a tool: Student ratings of the quality of advising sessions and their own preparedness were lower for the essential capabilities group than the essay group (and the essay group showed no improvement over students who wrote nothing at all). Thus overall, as Institutional Research concluded in one of these reports, “Survey results demonstrate that the essential capabilities are appealing as a framework for organizing a liberal arts education. This appeal, however, does not translate into use of the capabilities beyond the labeling of courses by faculty.”

Many faculty and students, when asked directly, still say that the essential capabilities are an accurate reflection of what skills Wesleyan hopes to develop in its students. Some minority believe they are useful for structuring course selection and aiding curricular planning and coherence. But clearly the capabilities have failed to serve that purpose for many; they do not seem to serve the structural role of aiding curricular coherence.

The problem may lie in the very approach of seeking this kind of structural solution to curricular coherence instead of thinking about the problem at the level of the individual student. Our belief in the benefits of “students direct[ing] their own education, in consultation with intensively engaged faculty advisors,” which began this standard, implicitly suggests that curricular coherence has to be achieved by each student in his

or her own terms rather than through general expectations of courses or capabilities. The General Education Expectations and the essential capabilities may serve as guides for some, but what is essential at Wesleyan is that advisors – pre-major as well as in the major – and students work together to define a coherent program in relation to the each student’s aspirations and capacities.

Faculty Advising and Course Selection

In 2007 NEASC indicated that it would follow up on how we are “strengthening the decisions students make regarding courses so that they achieve a more coherent education at Wesleyan.” The structure and coherence of the open curriculum comes from interactive, engaged faculty advising. At Wesleyan, all faculty are academic advisors, responsible for meeting as needed with students to guide them in their academic choices. Faculty advisors are expected to motivate advisees to pursue depth and breadth of study. Advisors press the student to choose courses across the full range of the liberal arts and to justify the intellectual coherence of those choices. Because faculty advisors are responsible for approving student course selection, they are the linchpins of the open curriculum. But there are problems. Although students are required to meet with their advisor at least once per semester to register for courses, they are not compelled to do more than this, and some fail to actively engage with their advisors. Likewise, faculty are not required to meet an advisee more than once a semester. Students do fill out evaluation forms on their pre-major advisor,^{xiv} but faculty are not required to read or act on them. In fact, Academic Affairs is not even privy to the feedback per agreement with the faculty. Because advising does not figure into tenure or promotion decisions, there are no consequences for poor advising and no rewards for good advising. There remain no mechanisms to make faculty accountable for their advising.

Since the last reaccreditation process, Wesleyan has worked on advising in three ways:

1. *Assigning pre-major advisees to faculty advisors* – In the early 2000s, faculty pressed the EPC to come up with a new model for allocating pre-major advisees because the system in place was not working: Faculty were having too many advisees when on rotation to advise, and too many students were being orphaned when faculty took sabbaticals. The EPC implemented a new model in which every faculty member advises pre-majors for three years, then rotates off pre-major advising for one year (presumably, the year in which that advisor would take a semester’s sabbatical)^{xv}. This new model has succeeded in balancing pre-major advising loads across the faculty (more faculty have fewer pre-major advisees than before) and reducing the number of students who are orphaned by their advisor before they declare the major and become assigned to a major advisor.
2. *Improving the mechanics of advising and online course registration* – In the early 2000s, the online course registration process was re-invented to allow students to rank courses in the order of highest preference, resulting in more students getting into the classes that they most want. Because of the fear of faculty that the new system would reduce the intellectual component of advising (turning the advisor into a button pusher), the approval system requires students and faculty advisors to be physically at the same computer. Of course, even if the system requires them to meet in person, no online system can guarantee the production of intellectual engagement – that is still the responsibility of the advisor and advisee.
3. *Maintaining intellectual vitality in advising* – Faculty see two primary threats to the vitality of advising: first, high advisee loads. While all faculty are assigned equal numbers of pre-major advisees, their number of major advisees varies widely. Faculty in populous majors have much higher loads, making it harder for them to give substantial attention to all of their advisees. The second threat is losing the bond based in shared intellectual interests between advisor and advisee. While the first threat could be reduced by assigning more pre-majors to the faculty with fewer major advisees, this would contravene the goal of matching first-year students to advisors based on shared interests.^{xvi} A task force is looking into equity in advising loads.

Integrity in the Award of Academic Credit

The University's policies regarding the award of academic credit are made clear to students and published in detail in the [Academic Regulations](#). Here we describe some of the more notable elements.

Wesleyan University confers only one undergraduate degree, the bachelor of arts. Graduation requirements include satisfaction of requirements for a major; satisfactory completion of 32 course credits (see next paragraph), no fewer than 16 of which must be earned at Wesleyan or in Wesleyan-sponsored programs; a cumulative average of 74 percent or work of equivalent quality; and at least six semesters in residency at Wesleyan as full-time students for students entering in their first year.

One unit of Wesleyan credit requires 120 to 160 hours of academic work. This work typically consists of 40 hours of scheduled class time, which is made up of 39 hours of class meeting time (the established standard meeting times allow up to 10 minutes for transition to and from other classes) and one scheduled final exam or the equivalent of at least one hour of additional work. In addition, 80 to 120 hours of out-of-class work are expected. A one-credit course that does not conform to a standard meeting pattern of at least 40 hours must still require 120 to 160 hours of academic work. For courses that award more or less than one unit of credit, the required hours of academic work are normally prorated to conform to the above formula.

The University offers required and elective courses as described in electronic format (WesMaps) and in print (annual University Catalog). The academic deans review the curriculum annually at the time classes are scheduled for the upcoming year. Any newly proposed course requires a New Course Justification form submitted through a department or program. A new course must be reviewed and approved by the divisional academic dean before it may be posted to the curriculum. Certificates at Wesleyan are managed by the individual certificate directors, who are members of the faculty, and Certificate requirements are available on WesMaps.

Performances in Wesleyan courses are evaluated by the usual letter grades (A-F, which may be modified by the use of plus and minus signs) or by the designations credit (CR) or unsatisfactory (U).^{xvii} Whenever the credit/unsatisfactory mode is used, the faculty member is expected to submit to the Office of the Registrar a written evaluation of the student's work. The average GPA (Spring 2012) is 89.5 (a solid B+), and for the class of 2012, the GPA of 89.9 rounds up to A-. Two-thirds of our students are in the A- or B+ range; a mere 5% have a GPA at or below a C+. What to make of (and do about) the grade compression is unclear. Faculty do not seem to see this relatively undifferentiated grading to be a sign of lower standards or present a problem of any other sort. It seems that their grading is differentiated enough for their purposes, and it may even be that the compression contributes to a relative indifference to grades and a student ethos here that is often described as more collaborative than competitive.^{xviii}

While a maximum of two credits earned before matriculation by entering first-year students may count toward the Wesleyan degree, all such credits must be duly approved by Wesleyan departments. Aside from AP credits and other credits regularly awarded on the basis of centrally administered examinations, no course that is listed for credit on a student's high school transcript may be used for Wesleyan credit. Students [studying abroad](#) may earn Wesleyan credits through either Wesleyan-administered programs or Wesleyan-approved programs. The University's policies in these regards – and for considering the transfer of credit – are published on its website (see [Academic Regulations](#)) and in other communications.

Faculty, with administrative support, work to ensure the academic integrity of the award of grades, where applicable, and credits for individual courses. While the Honor Code, published in the [Student Handbook](#), is clear on the subject of plagiarism, the University is currently reconsidering the Code's effectiveness.

New Programs

Most curricular initiatives develop through the standard path of faculty meeting together, becoming organized, and submitting proposals to the EPC. But initiatives can arise from other sources as well. For example, the

disability studies course cluster (dating from 2011) was a student initiative: Students formed a group, organized meetings with faculty and departments to garner broad support, and wrote a successful proposal.

There are few bureaucratic impediments to implementing new programs at Wesleyan; the challenge instead is the legwork required to generate faculty support, and this has advantages as well as disadvantages: Non-controversial initiatives that require no new resources are approved easily, but it can be more problematic to gain support when faculty hold strongly divergent views over intellectual developments or resource allocation. Equally problematic is what to do with existing programs that aren't attracting many students. Discussion around the "gentle sundowning" of those programs can be particularly delicate.

During the five years since the mid-cycle self-study, Wesleyan has implemented a number of exciting new programs, several of which are described in sections below. With the College of the Environment, new certificates, the Allbritton Center for the Study of Public Life, the arts and sciences across the curriculum initiatives, and the Disability Studies cluster – the faculty wanted Wesleyan to be a leader in the production of new knowledge in emerging modes of study. With the Certificates in Informatics and Modeling; Social, Cultural, and Critical Theory; South Asian Studies; and Writing – the faculty created coherent plans of study that could be pursued concurrently with the major, that (with the exception of writing) required no new resources, and that made use of existing faculty expertise and curricular strengths whose affinities had not been fully apparent to students. With the Certificates in Civic Engagement and Middle Eastern Studies, as well as the Quantitative Analysis Center,^{xix} the faculty strengthened subjects it saw as having increasing importance in the world.

College of the Environment

In establishing the College of the Environment in 2009, Wesleyan created a new curricular model for the study of the environment. Its academic spine is the new interdisciplinary major in environmental studies that (1) requires a primary major in another discipline in order to give depth to this inherently multidimensional field, and (2) offers students cohort-centered learning emphasizing collaborative research skills, mentoring by faculty, capstone projects, and internship experiences. The College also nurtures research through its think tank. Three Wesleyan faculty members move for a year from their departmental offices to the College, teach only for the College, receive course relief in order to produce scholarship, and participate in weekly colloquia to provide peer mentoring on each other's work. They are joined in the think tank by student fellows, postdoctoral fellows, and visiting scholars, all working together on a topic critical to international debate about the environment.

Allbritton Center for the Study of Public Life

Fostering civic engagement is the goal of the Allbritton Center, which houses the Patricelli Center for Social Entrepreneurship, the Center for Community Partnerships, the Service Learning Center, the Wesleyan Media Project, the Working Papers Series, the certificate in civic engagement, and several endowed lecture series. The Center began offering civic engagement courses in 2012 and will host courses from the Koepfel Journalism Fellow every other year. The Center is still in development; a search is underway for a senior faculty member to become its director. Next steps include awarding fellowships to Wesleyan faculty to teach courses in the Center that feature areas of their scholarship that bear on civic engagement but do not fit into the curricula of their home departments. When fully implemented, the Center will teach students to translate the liberal arts into action through service learning courses, volunteer work, internships, and non-credit workshops on the components of running a public organization.^{xx} Likewise, the Center will also teach students to translate their work of social engagement back into the liberal arts.

Internships

As part of the engagement initiative, Wesleyan is pursuing the goal of providing an internship to every student who wants one. An internship coordinator was hired in October 2011 to work in both the Patricelli Center for Social Entrepreneurship and the Career Center to cultivate internships and promote them to students. The Board's Campus Affairs Committee has set a goal of developing 100 paid internships to be hosted by alumni and their organizations. The University is also seeking to interest donors in endowed internship funding. While most internships will be located outside Wesleyan, some will take place on campus. A few University offices have redefined student employment positions as internships (where the work is a form of mentored apprenticeship into a profession and not just making copies and filing papers). These offices include the Quantitative Analysis Center, the Wesleyan Media Project, and the Wesleyan University Press. President Michael Roth announced in fall 2011 a contribution to the endowment of an operating surplus from the previous year that would provide \$40,000 per year to fund student research internships with Wesleyan faculty.

Summer Session

Wesleyan Summer Session (managed by the Office of Continuing Studies) began in 2010. It gives students the opportunity to gain access to courses that they could not fit into the regular academic year and faculty the chance to offer experimental and thematically connected courses. Classes meet for an intensive five-week period, beginning immediately after commencement in spring. Summer Session enrollments grew 44% from the first year to the second, and another 40% from the second year to the third. The number of students enrolled in Summer Session grew by 47% from the first year to the second, and another 19% from the second year to the third. We believe this growth is the result of a greater awareness among Wesleyan students of the Summer Session option. In 2012 there were 137 enrollments in 14 courses from 82 students, of which 93% were Wesleyan students. Continued increases in enrollments are expected over the next few years, and the possibility of offering a second session in July is under consideration.

Student feedback has been positive, especially regarding small class size and access to courses difficult to take during the academic year.^{xxi}

Study Abroad

Wesleyan sponsors four study abroad programs and has consortial arrangements with several other programs. Students also have the opportunity to study abroad through some 145 approved programs in 43 countries, and to petition the faculty Committee on International Studies for permission to participate in other study abroad programs; 38% of students spend a semester or academic year studying abroad. For more on Study Abroad, see Standard 6.

Service Learning

Wesleyan's engagement initiative placing academic study in experiential contexts began with the establishment of the Center for Service Learning in 2003. Service learning courses are regular departmental/program courses that have an additional experiential component: all students in the course conduct some form of structured community-based research or practice that is connected to theoretical and methodological analyses in the classroom. When students see on-the-ground examples of the cases and theoretical issues they study in class, they can become more invested in both the theoretical concepts and the community context. A practicum in psychology in which a student participates in clinical evaluations of psychiatric patients provides a signal example. In administering diagnostic tools to assess the patient, the student's engagement with the theoretical

assumptions behind those tool increases profoundly and contributes to an extraordinary environment for classroom analysis. In past service learning courses students have:

- Conducted the homeless count required by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Middlesex Supportive Housing Coalition;
- Examined the effect of local preschools on preparing kindergarteners to be school-ready, for the Middletown School Readiness Council;
- Studied the North End landfill to determine whether the methane it produced could be harvested economically.

Beginning this year, students interested in reflecting further on their civic activities can do so by pursuing the Civic Engagement Certificate.

Certificates

One of the areas where Wesleyan has experimented most in its academic planning is in the creation of “certificates” – collections of courses from a variety of departments, from which a student can choose in order to satisfy carefully crafted requirements. The EPC has drawn up a template to assist faculty in planning new certificates and conducts periodic reviews of existing certificates.

Since the last reaccreditation review, seven new certificates have been approved. Through these certificates, faculty from multiple disciplines work together to define a coherent course of study so that students interested in the field can pursue it in a programmatic way and have a credential on their transcript to document the achievement. Certificates are offered in addition to the major. The recent growth of certificates offers an unintended but beneficial consequence of providing outlets for emerging and non-traditional forms of study that might not enter the curriculum at the major level.^{xxii}

While most certificates are mounted on a foundation of existing courses and faculty expertise, three new certificates, approved in 2010, require courses that had to be created in support of the certificate. The Writing and Civic Engagement Certificates require their own capstone courses, but all other courses are already in the curriculum. By contrast, the Middle Eastern Studies certificate was created as the fulfillment of a four-year Academic Affairs initiative to expand curricular strength in this area.^{xxiii}

Writing

Wesleyan faculty have long helped students with critical writing in most areas of the curriculum. Some First Year Initiative seminars (see directly below) are writing-intensive, enabling students to work on their writing in the context of a subject area (as opposed to learning in expository writing classes taught by a separate writing staff.) Since 2007 the University has made concerted efforts to enhance the writing curriculum: hiring two tenure-track creative writing faculty, establishing the Koepfel journalism fellowship to bring visiting journalists to teach writing, establishing the Kim-Frank Family University Writer in Residence position, bringing renowned visiting writers to teach for a semester, adding a writing concentration within the English major, creating the Certificate in Writing, and establishing the Shapiro Center for Creative Writing. The Shapiro Center administers the writing certificate, organizes public readings and lectures, and provides space for students interested in writing to meet and work together.

One of the challenges to the writing curriculum is that writing courses need, by nature, to have small enrollments, but student demand for these courses still outpaces the University’s offerings and can lead to some student frustration.

First Year Initiative Seminars

Every incoming first-year student is enrolled (during pre-registration) in one First Year Initiative (FYI) seminar, although the student does have the option of dropping the course or adding another during drop/add period. FYI courses are open (initially) only to first-year students and have a maximum enrollment of 19 students (some are smaller). Over the past three years, reviews of the FYI program have been conducted by the EPC, an ad-hoc committee of faculty and students, and most recently by the President and Provost. What is clear is that faculty are divided into three camps: those who would like programmatic connections among FYI courses, those who see FYIs as “advanced” research and writing intensive courses (but taught at the first-year level) to introduce students to university-level work, and those whose FYIs are simply first-year only versions of their regular courses. The attempt to clarify a vision for the FYI continues, and administration-faculty discussions have led to a focus on three learning goals for First-Year Seminars: writing, research, and oral presentation. In 2012-2013, we are running a pilot program to determine how we can be more intentional about planning courses that achieve these goals. We are also looking to FYIs to strengthen a sense of cohort among first-year students.

The “learning and living seminar” is a new segment (dating from 2008) of the FYI program. Each fall, three or four FYIs are organized as courses that students take while living together in one residence hall. The goal of the program is to encourage first-year students to continue class conversations in the more informal spaces of their residence hall. (For more on this, see FN 5, Standard 6.)

With a two-year grant from the Teagle Foundation, Wesleyan has created a project, in collaboration with Amherst College, to improve the teaching of expository writing in courses designed for first- and second-year students. Eight faculty members who are teaching writing intensive courses participate in a seminar reviewing recent scholarship on the effectiveness of various teaching methods, engage in peer mentoring, and are guided by a professional writing associate in syllabus construction and writing assignments. Key to this project is developing a program for tracking student progress over the span of a writing-intensive course. The Teagle project may be helpful in evaluating the efficacy of portfolio assessment more generally.

Beginning in 2012-13, incoming students will be able to choose from a selection of first-year seminars that introduce a variety of topics ranging from Greek myth to neuroscience. Some of these classes treat a specific thinker (e.g., Kafka); others provide a sweeping introduction into an interdisciplinary area of study that may be new to first-year students (e.g., animal studies). Students in first-year seminars will become familiar with the methods used to collect, interpret, analyze, and present evidence as part of a scholarly argument. All of these classes emphasize the importance of writing at the university level, which is a University priority.

Senior Capstone Initiatives

All majors offer students the opportunity of completing a capstone experience and many require one. In 2008-09, the EPC conducted a survey of departments and programs on their capstone opportunities and found that of Wesleyan’s 47 majors, 25 require a capstone experience, whether as a final thesis, project, essay, cohort-centered senior seminar with an extended research-based paper, or culminating research experience. In 2010-11, the EPC considered whether to press all departments and programs to require capstones, and concluded that capstones should be encouraged but not necessarily required. Many of the departments that do not require capstone experiences are those with high numbers of majors and high enrollments in courses – making it difficult for faculty to supervise theses for all their majors. Students in those majors who want to complete a thesis often say that they are unable to find a faculty member willing to serve as thesis advisor. If Wesleyan’s goal is to make it possible for every student to have a capstone experience regardless of the student’s major, then more capstone experiences outside the major may have to be created.

Over the past three years, at the request of the administration, the faculty have been looking at how to provide students with more capstone opportunities, and whether to develop more opportunities beyond the extended research paper or the individual creative arts/scientific project.^{xiv} In the Earth & Environmental Studies Department, for example, students assign themselves to collaborative teams in the fall to develop research projects that each will be responsible for in the field during January break; then spend the spring semester analyzing the results of the field research to produce scientific reports. Through this experience, students learn how to do the work of professionals in this discipline. Faculty in other departments and programs are considering how to implement similar capstone experiences.

Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

Assessment of how effectively students learn what the faculty intend them to learn informs decisions in every area of teaching, advising, and curriculum design. The Wesleyan faculty began systematic discussions of assessment of student learning outcomes at faculty meetings and department chair meetings in 2008, bringing together disparate conversations on the topic that had been occurring across campus. In developing assessment plans, the faculty wished to preserve Wesleyan's distinctive educational culture and take into account the fact that different fields use very different metrics and methods. The EPC conducted a survey of departments on assessment practices in 2009 and then selected faculty from seven majors to discuss and develop plans for assessment in their respective areas. The Provost and the EPC Chair sent these seven assessment plans out to the other departments and programs for use as resources in the development of their own assessment plans. Each department/program was asked to define its own goals for student learning, publish those goals, define a method for evaluating student learning in relation to those goals, and inform Academic Affairs annually of how the assessment information is used.

Wesleyan faculty were quite suspicious of the new discourse on assessment (and especially imposition from outside) when the issue was raised at a meeting of the faculty in 2008, but resistance to assessment mechanisms seems to have lessened. It may have been helpful that the assessment plans were designed by Wesleyan faculty for evaluating learning within the major.

As of this writing, 30 majors have implemented assessment plans. The majority of these (16) use the required capstone experience as the evidence of student learning outcomes. Four majors require assessment portfolios: Students create a portfolio of papers written for courses in the major, and in the senior year they write an assessment of their own intellectual growth as demonstrated by the trajectory of knowledge and competence in those papers. Four majors focus on faculty advising; in two, students are required to write short papers for their advisor assessing what they learned, as the basis for their course selection for the coming semester. One department developed a standardized test for all majors to complete twice, upon declaration and completion of the major. A few majors use student and alumni surveys or questionnaires, and student participation in milestones within the major, as the evidence for assessment.

The faculty interpret this evidence in departmental faculty meetings and retreats; in larger departments, committees of faculty are delegated to evaluate assessment evidence and report to the full department's faculty. Departments use the assessment evidence to identify areas of the major requirements and course offerings needing change, and those changes are made in advance of the annual process for submitting next year's courses. Significant changes to major requirements must be submitted to and approved by the Educational Policy Committee. At the end of each academic year, departments are required to submit an annual report to Academic Affairs; beginning in 2012, this report will ask each department to identify what it learned from assessment of student learning outcomes, and what actions were (or will be) taken in response. In addition to these departmental/program-level assessment plans, which focus on student

learning in the major, Wesleyan is considering whether something like the Teagle-funded program focused on writing could be helpful in assessing general education.

Wesleyan has long participated in the COFHE Suite of Surveys: five related instruments designed to garner feedback at each point of the student lifecycle, from incoming freshman to alumni.^{xxv} The recent revision of this suite will allow us to conduct more sophisticated analysis of the relationship between students' incoming characteristics, their experiences as undergraduates, and experiences and trajectories following graduation. And while we have used data from this suite to a moderate extent^{xxvi}, making better use of the data is an ongoing goal.

Athletics

The Wesleyan Department of Athletics and Physical Education supports a broad range of intercollegiate teams that encourage scholar-athletes to develop their skills and themselves to their full potential and to benefit from the lessons learned from perseverance, competition, sacrifice, and teamwork. The Department of Athletics and Physical Education also provides a wide array of skill activities that encourage students to develop the habit of leading healthy and balanced lives. Included in the offerings are 29 varsity sports, 14 club sports teams, 12 intramural activities, and a comprehensive physical education curriculum for credit. Approximately 1,800 Wesleyan students each year participate in various components of the overall program. Wesleyan supports varsity sports for men and women on an equitable basis.

Wesleyan is a member of the New England Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC) and shares its premise that athletes are representative of the entire student body and that athletics operates in harmony with the educational mission of the institution. Although the academic performance of athletes at Wesleyan slightly trails that of non-athletes, the athletes graduate at a rate equal to (or higher) than non-athletes. Wesleyan teams tend to rank very high in all of NCAA Division III for overall team GPA's. Men's and women's swimming, wrestling, field hockey, and cross country are just a few of our teams that have been ranked nationally in the top five for team average GPA's. At the end of the fall 2011 semester, all Wesleyan teams had an aggregate average GPA of 3.0 or better with 14 of the 29 teams having an average of 3.4 or better. However, there are challenges. A small number of matriculating student-athletes are less prepared than their peers and in need of extra academic support and help with course selection. Starting in the fall of 2012, faculty coaches will have permission from students to access their academic performance records, and increased communication between academic faculty and coaches will be encouraged.

Wesleyan provides outstanding sports facilities to faculty, staff, and students. In 2005, Wesleyan completed a 55,000 s.f. addition to the existing 220,000 s.f. Freeman Athletic Center. This addition provided the community with a 7,500 s.f. fitness center, eight international squash courts, an 18,000 s.f. gymnasium, and eight home and visiting team rooms. Also, eight tennis courts were resurfaced in the summer of 2011 and planning is currently underway to reconstruct the Andersen Track in 2013. At Wesleyan, over 60 percent of community members use the athletic facilities. Therefore, expectations for quality sports facilities are quite high. Strong athletic, physical education, and recreation programs require large spaces that are expensive to build and maintain. Also, our students' expectation for quality coaching is much the same as it is for superb instruction in the classroom. In both cases, meeting high expectations requires substantial resources.

Student input is very important in modifying the physical educational and recreational offerings in fitness, aquatics, lifetime sports, and outdoor education. Each year surveys are used to determine the interests of students, and changes are made in the programs to respond to the rapidly evolving physical education activities. For academic year 2011-12, the department added courses in Indoor Cycling and Racketlon to the existing curriculum. In order to keep the curriculum current, faculty coaches are retooling themselves and gaining certification in these emerging activities. However, as the interests of the students become more specialized, it

is difficult to train faculty coaches in these specialized areas. Teaching fundamental yoga is no longer acceptable, for students now want power yoga, hot yoga, and a dozen other forms of the discipline. The department is discussing how to respond to the explosion of fitness mediums.

(For more on Athletics, see Standard 6.)

Arts and Community Programs

Center for the Arts

Wesleyan's Center for the Arts (CFA) serves as a cultural center for the campus and the region. It presents a wide spectrum of events and exhibitions featuring the work of students, faculty, and artists from outside Wesleyan. The presenting program emphasizes international artists and genres, extending the international focus of the performing arts departments. The CFA offers a broad range of contemporary dance performances, and artists often give master classes for students. With the support of national foundations, Wesleyan has commissioned new works from faculty and visiting artists – often with an emphasis on the exploration of environmental issues. The CFA integrates the arts into student life and across the curriculum through programs such as Feet to the Fire (a campus-wide cross-disciplinary environmental sustainability initiative) and the Creative Campus Initiative, which offers a variety of interdisciplinary arts programs, especially for first-year orientation, and provides for pedagogical and research exchanges between artists and faculty outside the arts. Among the challenges faced by the CFA due to space constraints is balancing its commitment to programs that engage the broader community with the curricular needs of the performing arts departments.

Davison Art Center

The Davison Art Center (DAC) houses a gallery and a nationally renowned permanent collection of 24,000 prints and photographs, which is actively used by faculty and students for teaching and exhibition. Teaching from the collections here is restricted, in part, by the fact that there is no space that is both appropriate for rare materials and big enough to accommodate classes larger than 18. The DAC presents 3-4 exhibitions annually, ranging from traveling exhibitions of contemporary graphic arts and photography to student-curated exhibitions organized from the permanent collection. Volunteer members of the Friends of the Davison Art Center contribute to the arts in Middletown by annually organizing tours of the DAC, CFA Zilkha Gallery, Mansfield Freeman Center, and gamelan orchestra for all fourth grade students in the Middletown Public Schools.

Green Street Arts Center

This center is a collaboration among Wesleyan, the City of Middletown, and the North End Action Team (a local neighborhood organization) to bring after-school arts programs to the poorest neighborhood in Middletown. The Center also offers private lessons, evening and weekend classes, programs for home schoolers, special events, and community seminars. Wesleyan students volunteer as tutors, and faculty give classes and talks in programs focused entirely on enhancing the educational opportunities and cultural life of the local community.

Center for Prison Education

Wesleyan students have long volunteered as tutors at area prisons, as part of the volunteerism initiative in the Center for Community Partnerships. Several students who tutor prisoners developed a campaign to have Wesleyan offer courses for credit at the men's prison in Cheshire, Connecticut. The students cultivated faculty support, worked with administrators to learn how to draft a proposal, and proposed the Center for Prison Education to the EPC. The faculty approved the EPC's recommendation for a pilot project, and beginning in fall 2009 two Wesleyan courses have been offered on a non-degree basis to 19 inmates each semester. (The

inmates were selected through a rigorous admissions process in which undergraduates, faculty, and staff read applications and personally interviewed inmates.) The program review in 2011 demonstrated solid academic achievement, and the faculty granted the program a five-year extension.

Projection

The first overarching goal of Wesleyan 2020 is to energize Wesleyan's distinctive educational experience. Tactics for pursuing this goal include:

1. Complete the implementation of major-level assessment plans by spring 2013; EPC to review outcomes and recommend specific actions by spring 2015.
2. Increase the number of courses enrolling 19 or fewer students to 70% by fall 2013.
3. Increase selection of first year seminars emphasizing writing and the use of evidence in scholarly argument.
4. Complete the full cycle of external reviews of academic departments and programs by spring 2015; convene faculty to evaluate whether to repeat the cycle or develop a new model, by spring 2015.
5. Give faculty access in their electronic portfolios to department-level data on teaching evaluations, grade point averages, and a variety of other measures pertinent to course demand, faculty advising load, and success of students after graduation.
6. Complete a pilot project and develop a program of direct assessment of first-year and sophomore-level (pre-major) learning by fall 2014.
7. Increase opportunities for students to pursue internships in conjunction with academic courses.

Wesleyan faces other challenges that will surely be the subject of further reporting to NEASC. For example, we are not yet satisfied with our efforts to ensure that every student has the benefit of the best advising (so important in making the most of the open curriculum). We are currently planning student focus groups to talk about what works best and worst in advising; the groups will be taped, and edited versions will be provided to faculty in their portfolios. And a task force is considering the topic of advising loads. Other challenges include making more progress in identifying shared learning goals for pre-major courses, reducing class size and alleviating course-access problems (the two are often in tension here), supporting interdisciplinary innovation while relying heavily on a traditional departmental structure, and reconciling our commitment to broad liberal learning with the recognition that some aspects seem less relevant to the student of today.

Wesleyan will attain a broader and deeper perspective on the academic program by providing a new level of internal data transparency to faculty and by coming to grips with direct assessment of student learning at the general education and the major level. The faculty will improve the academic program by analyzing these data and outcomes and recommending specific and overall changes to bring the outcomes into line with Wesleyan's mission and goals for student learning.

Institutional Effectiveness

The faculty of the University are dedicated to maintaining the quality of the undergraduate and graduate programs which it oversees mainly through its Educational Policy Committee and Graduate Council. Academic Affairs, led by the Provost, regularly evaluates the academic programs by conducting three to four external departmental reviews each year, followed by EPC review of the full report. The goal for each external review is to identify areas in need of improvement, for external reviewers to suggest ways of making improvements, and to ensure that the department continues to be appropriate for the University's mission and that each program meets standards of quality. Additionally, each department submits an annual report on its faculty, curriculum, and (beginning this year) assessment of student learning outcomes; the Provost and Academic Deans review these reports and follow up with departments where necessary.

- ⁱ For a report on how faculty view the enhancement of student creativity at Wesleyan, see the [Creativity Report](#).
- ⁱⁱ In fall 2011 there were 927 single majors, 601 double majors, 43 triple majors, and 2 quadruple majors. The distribution of double majors is as follows:
 12% are between NSM and HUM – these combinations are probably the most ‘disparate’
 32% are within the same division
 11% are between NSM and SBS
 15% are between SBS and HUM
 61% are within the same division or with one INTD major
- ⁱⁱⁱ Romance Languages and Literatures is phasing out two majors, Spanish and Iberian Studies, and replacing these with Hispanic Literatures and Cultures.
- ^{iv} This “over-subscription policy” has two specific exemptions: double majors in art history and art studio or mathematics and computer science, for whom the limit is 20 credits.
- ^v A University major must be sponsored (and supervised) by three members of the faculty and must be approved by the Committee on University Majors, a subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee.
- ^{vi} The support lasts for as long as they are active, full-time graduate students. This is normally two years for MA candidates and six or fewer for Ph.D. candidates. Occasionally, Ph.D.s take longer and the support continues as long as the student is active and supported in this by the department. Departments have limited numbers of stipends to use and therefore usually wish not to continue a student for too long because it keeps them from accepting a new one.
- ^{vii} At the same time, the fact that graduate students are concentrated in the sciences creates some tension in the faculty around teaching load issues.
- ^{viii} Initiatives include working with departmental administrative assistants to expand their use of PeopleSoft to manage admissions data, working with the Graduate Council to standardize communications to applicants, and working with departments on timely sharing of information about student acceptances, arrivals, and stipends. Keeping reliable data, consolidating deadlines, standardizing processes, and clarifying communication through accurate and up-to-date web pages and procedural documents will reduce confusion and provide better service to students.
- ^{ix} The Certificate of Advanced Study (CAS) has been renamed the Master of Philosophy in Liberal Arts (MPhil). Despite the fact that the CAS has more rigorous requirements than the MALS (students must have already completed an MA or equivalent and must complete a significant thesis), the name did not sound as though it was an actual degree and the number of students who pursued this advanced degree was always very small. Since the announcement of the name change, there is renewed interest from both current and prospective students. There were no changes to the admission standards or degree requirement.
- ^x The CFCD, administered by a single person who works in coordination with the Library and ITS, hosts 20-25 Academic (Technology) Roundtables on a range of pedagogical, technological, and policy issues per year. (The complete archive of the ATR calendars can be found [here](#). Average attendance at a roundtable is 28 people: 12 faculty; 7 librarians; 5 administration or staff; 3 ITS; and 1 student, grad student or other. Over the past 3 academic years, 26 faculty members have made use of the video recording and consultation program.
- ^{xi} The faculty work deliberately on retaining students in introductory science courses, where drop-off in students can be steep. Faculty in Biology and Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, for example, work in concert to design and team-teach the introductory biology course. With support from the Hughes Foundation, over the past four years they added, in addition to the large (unlimited enrollment) lecture section of introductory biology, five small sections that focus on a problem-solving approach to learning. Faculty have found that fewer students drop the small sections and that retention of underrepresented minority groups was significantly higher there. With these data, they are now working to offer more problem-based learning – breaking up large lecture course into smaller problem-based-learning sections. The challenge here is that more faculty are needed to teach more sections, but the departments are committed to teaching in this new model with existing resources because the data convinces them of its success.
- ^{xii} Gen ed completion has been very stable over the past six years, with rates ranging from 77.6% to 79.5%. As a group, science majors have the highest rates of compliance. The following stats are based on students in the graduating classes of 2006-10 who entered as frosh:

DIVISION OF MAJOR	GEN ED COMPLIANCE RATE
HUMA	69%
SBS	79%
NSM	88%
INTD	78%

However, there are non-science fields where the compliance rate is higher than in some sciences. For example, 90% of classics and economics majors were in compliance, surpassing physics (88%) and biology (85%).

- xiii Surveys were sent to random samples of 144 faculty and 1,399 students (faculty response was 45%, n = 144; student response was 19%, n = 260).
- xiv In 2009, Wesleyan implemented an online system by which pre-major advisees would, upon being admitted to a major, submit an evaluation of their pre-major advising experience. With these evaluations, faculty can understand how students experience their advising, assess how their advising fulfills the faculty member's own goals for it, and have a basis for changing how they advise in order to better achieve those goals. These evaluations are accessible only to the individual faculty member and are not intended to be used for administrative assessment (e.g., as teaching evaluations are used for tenure, promotion, and annual salary review).
- xv Under the new model, the rotation is as follows:
 - Year 1: 6 new first-years/transfers
 - Year 2: 6 new first-years/transfers (alongside year one's cohort, now sophomores)
 - Year 3: 0 new first-years/transfers (continue advising year two's cohort, now sophomores)
 - Year 4: sabbatical; no pre-major advisees
- xvi To enhance advising at the pre-major level, for the first-year students entering in fall 2011, a committee from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs revised the questions asked of incoming students on the form they fill out to help us select their advisors. The improvement in the usefulness of students' responses was impressive, and made for much more informed matching on the part of Academic Affairs.
- xvii At the discretion of the instructor, all the students in a course may be restricted to a single grading mode, or each student may be allowed to choose between the two modes also referred to as student option (OPT). Instructors announce the grading options in WesMaps. In courses in which students have a choice of grading mode, the final choice must be made by the end of the drop/add period.
- xviii Grade inflation was thought to be a problem here in the 1990s. In spring 2001 the average GPA was 87.9, which is 1.6 less than today.
- xix The Quantitative Analysis Center (QAC) prepares students for success in an information-driven future through the close collaboration of Wesleyan's faculty with the Center's staff. It provides support for quantitative analysis across the curriculum. In addition, the QAC provides opportunities for students to develop a practical quantitative analytical skill set, supports students and faculty whose work involves data analysis, and enhances Wesleyan's appeal to new faculty engaged in quantitative research. The QAC offers extensive tutorial services in the form of course-specific workshops and one-on-one or small group tutoring. The QAC also offers a summer apprenticeship designed to engage students in research projects, train student research assistants, and train students who can serve as tutors during the academic year. Examples of projects undertaken by students include: "The Earned Income Tax Credit and the Changing Face of Welfare Provision"; "Nocturnal Eating: Association with Obesity, Binge Eating and Psychological Distress"; "How Efficient is Your Bank? A Stochastic Frontier Approach"; and "What Influences the 'Private School Effect?'"

In the fall of 2009, the QAC offered a new course in Applied Data Analysis, developed by faculty from Economics, Biology, Neuroscience, Government, Psychology, and Sociology.
- xx The exemplary social entrepreneurship of Wesleyan students, such as those who created the Kibera School for Girls in Nairobi, has buoyed support for the vision for the Allbritton Center.
- xxi Surveys indicated that students found that the best aspect of Summer Session was small class size. The most common reasons students cited for taking Summer Session courses were to take credit requirements for their major, to focus on a specific field of study, and to take courses that would be difficult to fit into their schedule during the regular academic year. In general, students indicated satisfaction with the academic side of Summer Session but some dissatisfaction with the non-academic side, in particular, the limited dining.
- xxii In only one case so far has approval of a certificate been followed by the approval of a major in that area (Environmental Studies).
- xxiii Until 2009, only one faculty member worked directly on this area, although others had related expertise. To begin the process, a committee was formed of those faculty with expertise related to the Middle East, Islam, and Jewish and Israel studies. When Wesleyan was awarded grants from the Mellon Foundation and the Education Department, this committee distributed small grants to faculty who were interested in expanding their courses to include the Middle East. Four new faculty who are Middle East specialists were hired; two to fill existing vacancies and two into new positions created for this initiative. One of the goals of this initiative was to enhance curriculum, integrating it with Jewish and Israel studies.
- xxiv To be awarded honors, a student must complete a senior thesis/project.

- ^{xxv} The specific surveys (and the frequency of administration) at Wesleyan are as follows: the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) survey of incoming freshmen/The COFHE Survey of Entering Students (annually); the COFHE Enrolled Student Survey (every five years; but now biennially); the COFHE Senior Survey (annually); the COFHE Alumni Survey (every five years); and the COFHE Parent Survey (every five years).
- ^{xxvi} COFHE survey data has been used to understand the composition of our incoming class for Student Affairs planning purposes, to track Wesleyan's performance in areas ranging from course access and academic advising to dining and housing, and to discover graduate education and employment patterns among alumni.

**Standard 5: Faculty
(Rank, Gender, and Salary, Fall Term)**



		3 Years Prior (FY 2009)		2 Years Prior (FY 2010)		1 Year Prior (FY 2011)		Current Year (FY 2012)		Next Year (FY 2013)	
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Number of Faculty											
Professor	Male	96		90		88		89		89	
	Female	31		29		32		32	1	32	1
Associate	Male	30		35		35		36		36	
	Female	28		31		28		27		27	
Assistant	Male	33		28		26		21		21	
	Female	31		39		41		48		48	
Instructor	Male										
	Female										
Other	Male	37	14	40	15	45	18	41	16	41	16
	Female	42	14	38	16	44	15	45	19	45	19
Total	Male	196	14	193	15	194	18	187	16	187	16
	Female	132	14	137	16	145	15	152	20	152	20

Total Faculty											
Professor		127	-	119	-	120	-	121	1	121	1
Associate		58	-	66	-	63	-	63	-	63	-
Assistant		64	-	67	-	67	-	69	-	69	-
Instructor		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other		79	28	78	31	89	33	86	35	86	35
Total		328	28	330	31	339	33	339	36	339	36

		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Salary for Academic Year											
Professor	Minimum	91,820		91,820		91,290		91,135	113,170	94,780	
	Mean	130,260		129,384		130,232		129,247		134,417	
Associate	Minimum	75,420		75,420		76,800		76,998		80,078	
	Mean	85,138		84,323		85,239		86,239		89,689	
Assistant	Minimum	65,000		65,000		66,300		67,700		70,408	
	Mean	70,699		69,245		71,233		72,387		75,282	
Instructor	Minimum										
	Mean										
Other	Minimum	40,000	26,500	40,000	26,500	40,000	26,500	40,000	21,200	41,600	22,048
	Mean	69,476	39,101	70,498	37,414	68,559	40,967	70,405	38,298	73,221	39,830

Standard 5: Faculty
(Highest Degrees and Teaching Assignments, Fall Term)

		3 Years Prior (FY 2009)		2Years Prior (FY 2010)		1 Year Prior (FY 2011)		Current Year (FY 2012)		Next Year (FY 2013)	
		FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Highest Degree Earned: Doctorate											
Professor		119		111		113		115	1	115	1
Associate		56		63		60		60		60	
Assistant		61		62		62		64		64	
Instructor											
Other		26	14	28	10	31	14	38	14	38	14
Total		262	14	264	10	266	14	277	15	277	15
Highest Degree Earned: Master's											
Professor		7		7		6		5		5	
Associate		2		3		3		3		3	
Assistant		3		5		5		5		5	
Instructor											
Other		43	8	41	15	48	10	37	13	37	13
Total		55	8	56	15	62	10	50	13	50	13
Highest Degree Earned: Bachelor's											
Professor											
Associate											
Assistant											
Instructor											
Other		8	4	7	3	8	6	9	4	9	4
Total		8	4	7	3	8	6	9	4	9	4
Highest Degree Earned: Professional License											
Professor											
Associate											
Assistant											
Instructor											
Other											
Total		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fall Teaching Load, in credit hours											
Professor	Maximum	609		580		714		724	32	724	32
	Median	128		144		130		128	32	128	32
Associate	Maximum	744		723		675		693		693	
	Median	140		161		164		132		132	
Assistant	Maximum	704		480		768		808		808	
	Median	178		176		178		160		160	
Instructor	Maximum										
	Median										
Other	Maximum	868	468	924	312	1,140	252	1,040	148	1,040	148
	Median	100	84	112	80	116	84	148	87	148	87

Explanation of teaching load (if not measured in credit hours):

Standard 5: Faculty
(Appointments, Tenure, Departures, and Retirements, Full Academic Year)

	3 Years		2 Years		1 Year		Current Year		Next Year	
	Prior		Prior		Prior					
	(FY 2009)		(FY 2010)		(FY 2011)		(FY 2012)		(FY 2013)	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
# of Faculty Appointed ?										
Professor	-		-		-					
Associate	1		-		1					
Assistant	10		15		17		13		15	
Instructor										
Other	44	47	35	42	33	49	24	68	31	53
Total	55	47	50	42	51	49	37	68	46	53

# of Faculty in Tenured Positions ?										
Professor	127		119		120		121	1	120	1
Associate	58		66		63		63		64	
Assistant										
Instructor										
Other										
Total	185	-	185	-	183	-	184	1	184	1

# of Faculty Departing ?										
Professor	-		-		1		1		1	
Associate	1		1		1		1		1	
Assistant	2		6		4		1		4	
Instructor										
Other	44	47	35	42	32	49				
Total	47	47	42	42	38	49	3	-	6	-

# of Faculty Retiring ?										
Professor	5		3		8		2		3	
Associate	-		-		-					
Assistant	-		-		-					
Instructor	-		-		-					
Other	1		1		-					
Total	6	-	4	-	8	-	2	-	3	-

Standard 5: Faculty
(Number of Faculty by Department or Comparable Unit, Fall Term)

	3 Years		2 Years		1 Year		Current Year		Next Year	
	Prior		Prior		Prior				Year	
	(FY 2009)	(FY 2010)	(FY 2011)	(FY 2012)	(FY 2013)	FT	PT	FT	PT	
	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT	FT	PT
Number of Faculty by Department (or comparable academic unit)										
African American Studies	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
American Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Anthropology	10	-	9	-	9	-	9	-	9	-
Art and Art History	15	2	15	5	15	4	14	8	14	8
Asian Languages and Literatures	6	2	5	3	6	1	5	2	5	2
Astronomy	5	-	3	-	4	-	4	-	4	-
Biology	14	3	14	1	14	1	15	1	15	1
Center for the Americas	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-
Center for the Humanities	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-	2	-
Chemistry	13	2	14	1	14	1	15	1	15	1
Classical Studies	7	-	7	-	7	-	7	-	7	-
College of Letters	5	2	5	2	5	1	6	-	6	-
College of the Environment	-	-	-	-	1	-	2	-	2	-
Dance	8	3	8	2	7	3	4	5	4	5
Earth and Environmental Sciences	8	-	7	-	7	1	8	-	8	-
Economics	14	1	14	2	14	-	14	1	14	1
English	22	4	19	5	21	5	22	3	22	3
Environmental Studies	-	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-
Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Film Studies	5	-	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1
German Studies	5	-	5	-	5	-	4	1	4	1
Government	16	-	19	-	18	-	19	-	19	-
History	25	-	26	-	27	1	24	1	24	1
Latin American Studies	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Less Commonly Taught Languages	-	4	1	4	-	4	-	3	-	3
Mathematics and Computer Science	18	1	19	1	18	3	18	2	18	2
Molecular Biology and Biochemistry	8	-	9	-	9	-	9	-	9	-
Music	16	2	16	1	17	1	17	1	17	1
Neuroscience and Behavior	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-
Philosophy	8	1	8	-	9	-	9	1	9	1
Physical Education	22	-	21	-	22	-	22	-	22	-
Physics	10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-	10	-
Psychology	16	-	17	1	19	1	19	2	19	2
Religion	8	-	9	-	9	1	9	-	9	-
Romance Languages and Literatures	21	-	18	-	18	2	20	1	20	1
Russian	4	-	4	-	4	-	4	-	4	-
Shapiro Writing Center	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-	1	-
Sociology	7	-	9	-	9	-	9	-	9	-
Theater	8	1	7	1	8	-	7	1	7	1
Total	328	28	330	31	339	33	339	36	339	36

Standard Five: Faculty

Description

Wesleyan has 238 tenured and tenure-track faculty, with 121 full, 63 associate, and 69 assistant professors. In a typical year an additional 90 faculty are present as adjuncts, full- or part-time visitors and artists-in-residence. The student:faculty ratio is 9:1.

Hiring and Retention

Wesleyan is committed to hiring and retaining an outstanding and demographically diverse faculty with a strong commitment to both research and teaching.

The faculty recruitment process begins with specific requests from departments or programs based on their curricular need. These requests are evaluated and selectively approved by the Provost and Associate Provost in consultation with the academic deans. Departments or programs with approved requests subsequently form search committees that meet with the provosts, deans, and the Vice President for Diversity to discuss appropriate practices for advertising and contacting potential applicants for posted positions. Mechanisms for assuring the recruitment of the most diverse applicant pool possible are reviewed. An online application and review process has recently been instituted in response to the concerns expressed by faculty and administrative staff about the time commitment required to carry out a thorough search.

Once the applicant pool for a given position has been established, the search committee and department or program review the application files and in some cases conduct an initial round of interviews with preferred candidates. On the basis of this initial filtering process, the department or program identifies a short list of candidates, whom it proposes to invite for on-campus interviews. The short list and the search report are then carefully reviewed by both the divisional academic dean and the Vice President for Diversity, who then make recommendations for final approval by the Provost.

Candidates invited to campus are interviewed by the department's faculty (and in some cases, student representatives), the academic dean, and a representative from the University Advisory Committee. After all of the candidates on the short list have been interviewed, the department or program decides whether to request that an offer be made. The divisional dean recommends a hiring request to the Provost for approval, and if it is approved, then extends the University's offer to the chosen candidate.

Junior faculty are strongly encouraged to choose one or more tenured faculty as mentors. These mentors guide the professional development of junior faculty and offer them suggestions regarding effective pedagogy, productive scholarship, and engaged collegiality. Tenured faculty formally review the progress and performance of junior faculty in the department in their second, third, and fifth years in order to provide feedback prior to the tenure review, which typically occurs in the seventh year. Because the divisional deans are not involved in the formal process of evaluating cases for promotion and tenure, they are in a particularly good position to act as non-threatening sources of advice for junior faculty.

The University also provides support for junior and senior faculty through the Center for Faculty Career Development: including one-on-one consultation with experienced faculty, videotaping and assessment of classroom performance, and consultation with outside experts on pedagogy. Scholarly productivity is enabled and encouraged by Wesleyan's teaching loads, generous sabbatical policy, in-house Grants in Support of Scholarship, and its Office of Foundation and Corporate Relations, which provides assistance in obtaining extramural funding.

The President receives the recommendation for tenure and/or promotion from the Provost, who forwards the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and the Review and Appeals Board. For tenure cases, the President decides whether or not to bring the case to the Board of Trustees; only the Board awards tenure. For promotion to full tenured professor, the President decides whether or not to award promotion, in consideration of the recommendation from Advisory and the Provost.

Teaching and Advising

Wesleyan's scholar-teacher model is made possible, in part, by its policies with respect to course loads and sabbaticals. In the Arts and Humanities (Division I), Social Sciences (Division II) and Mathematics, most professors teach four classes a year. (In certain language programs, full-time "adjuncts"ⁱ teach 5 classes a year.) Faculty in the Natural Sciences (Division III), who also maintain Ph.D. programs and active laboratories, generally teach 2 or 3 classes a year.ⁱⁱ

One of the features distinguishing Wesleyan from other liberal arts institutions is the presence of graduate TAs, although their use differs markedly from that found in much larger research schools. With very few exceptions, classes at Wesleyan are taught by regular faculty, and TAs are employed in lab and review sessions.

Faculty work with advisees who may be pre-majors, students in their courses, or majors in their departments or programs. The role of advisor changes slightly in each scenario. Effective advising requires both a broad understanding of the institution and a specialized understanding of the student's program of study. [For more about advising, see Standard Four.]

Wesleyan's pedagogical ethos stresses active participation by students as well as faculty. In many departments and programs, for example, faculty involve their majors in the design of curricula and/or serve as master teachers in the teaching apprentice program.

Part-time contingent faculty teach on a per-course basis; the full-time course load for non-tenure-track faculty is five per year, and the University avoids appointing per-course faculty to this full-time load. Contingent per-course faculty do not have a role in governance or advising. Faculty with one-year full-time "visiting" appointments (teaching five courses per year) have a limited role in governance: they are eligible to attend meetings of the assembled faculty and vote on legislation arising there; they are not eligible to stand for election to the standing committees of the faculty or serve as department chair. Full-time visiting faculty do advise majors.

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Wesleyan has remained committed to preserving and enhancing its support of faculty scholarship and creative production over the past decade, though financial constraints have affected the kinds and amounts of support possible. A pillar of this commitment is the University's sabbatical policy. Tenured and tenure-track faculty are eligible for a semester's sabbatical with full pay after every six semesters of teaching, while adjunct faculty are eligible for a sabbatical after ten semesters.ⁱⁱⁱ This policy compares favorably with peer institutions, which often require from seven to twelve semesters of teaching for each semester of sabbatical eligibility.

A second pillar of the University's commitment to faculty productivity is its program of in-house grants. Wesleyan provides more than \$500,000 annually in internal grants for faculty research and scholarship. Grants in Support of Scholarship are awarded on a competitive basis as follows: 1) up to \$500 for general support; 2) project grants up to \$2,500; 3) up to \$1,900 annually to fund presentation of new research at scholarly meetings. In the fall of 2011, President Roth and Academic Affairs announced an additional \$50,000 in support of student "internships," where students participate in faculty research. Faculty may also apply for residential fellowships here at the Center for the Humanities (CHUM) and the College of the Environment.^{iv}

Wesleyan's faculty members, many of whom have gained national and international recognition, routinely seek and procure grants and fellowships in support of their research from external sources, often assisted in this effort by the University's Office of Foundation and Corporate Relations. In the sciences, our faculty receive research support from federal sources such as the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Energy, as well as national organizations such as the American Heart Association, the National Cancer Institute, and so on. In disciplines outside the sciences, our faculty receive funding for research from institutions such as the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Endowment for the Arts, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the U.S. Department of Education. Over the last 10 years, Wesleyan faculty have obtained more than \$6.2 million annually in grants and fellowships in support of research.

Wesleyan has also received institution-wide grants in support of faculty teaching, scholarship, and development. Extending its commitment to supporting research in humanistic disciplines, Wesleyan sought out and was awarded in 2011 a \$2 million challenge grant from The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to help endow the Center for the Humanities; the University is now committed to raising an additional \$4 million in endowment funds over the next four years. Wesleyan also received a two-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education to support faculty research trips to the Middle East and a two-year grant from the Teagle Foundation to enhance student development of skill in expository writing. [See Standard Four].

Technology in Teaching and Research

Wesleyan has been at the forefront of technological innovation among its liberal arts peers. A decade ago, Wesleyan was considered a pioneer in the development of Internet “portals” now used by many universities and colleges across the country. Wesleyan staff also helped create NERCOMP, the Northeast Regional Computing Program, a consortium that sponsors academic technology conferences and allows participating institutions to purchase software at reduced group prices. [For more information on teaching and technology, see Standard Seven.]

Service

Wesleyan has a strong tradition of collegial engagement, and faculty here have long been involved in governance, service, and deliberation on the University’s goals, policies, and practices.

Wesleyan’s collegial structure is grounded in its departments and programs, which elect their own chairs. The chair has responsibilities for curricular and budgetary oversight as well as for managing staff and hiring new faculty. Chairs are given course relief roughly in proportion to the size of their departments or programs. Together, department and program chairs are an essential body of consultation for the Provost and Academic Affairs.

Many faculty contribute to governance through their participation in elected committees of the faculty at large and through the Academic Council. Faculty members are selected by open elections, and committee membership takes into account the need to have representation across the academic divisions and to distribute the burden of committee service as widely as possible. In a given decade most faculty will participate, however unevenly, on at least one of the following standing committees:

- The Advisory Committee of the Academic Council, a nine-member group of tenured faculty, is an essential part in the process of faculty tenure and promotion;
- The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) oversees the core academic policies and practices of the University;
- The Faculty Committee on Rights and Responsibilities (FCRR) adjudicates personal and professional disputes involving faculty;
- The Honors Committee administers the program of student academic honors;
- The Review and Appeals Board reviews recommendations from Advisory and hears appeals of negative decisions by Advisory.

[For more on faculty’s role in governance, see Standard 3.]

Evaluation of Faculty

Evaluation of faculty takes place in a variety of ways. Teaching is evaluated every semester through student teaching evaluations, which combine quantitative data with qualitative comments. Some departments also have senior faculty visit the courses of junior faculty to review their teaching. Teaching evaluations and other indications of pedagogical practices (such as syllabi) are examined in the second- and third-year reviews, which also provide assessments of a junior faculty’s developing research programs. The tenure evaluation, typically undertaken in the seventh year, examines a candidate’s record of teaching, collegiality, and scholarship. Evidence for excellence in both teaching and scholarship is required, and the evaluation of the latter is assisted by letters elicited from outside referees. Cases for tenure are reviewed in succession by the candidate’s department, the nine-member faculty Advisory

Committee, and the Reviews and Appeals Board, after which the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees, who make the final decision.

Faculty compensation

The administration worked with the faculty Compensation and Benefits Committee to establish a group of 15 peer institutions for which compensation data is available and has sought to maintain compensation (salaries and benefits) at a level corresponding to the median of this group for each faculty rank. Benefits are harder to assess in this regard than salaries, since there are multiple dimensions of the former: including contributions to retirement and health care plans, college tuition offsets for faculty dependents, mortgage assistance, etc. Therefore, the University has focused on maintaining competitive parity with respect to at least the major benefits involving contributions to retirement and health care plans.

Appraisal

Hiring and Retention

The current makeup of the faculty is detailed on the Data First sheets for Standard 5. Most notable is a significant increase in women among the tenured and tenure-track faculty over the past four years, with the percentage of women climbing from 36% in 2008 to 42% in 2011. The results of Wesleyan's determined effort to increase the proportion of women in its faculty are most readily seen in the percentages of women faculty by rank: 26% of full professors, 43% of associate professors, and 70% of assistant professors, a trend that also reflects national demographics in higher education and will dramatically change the gender proportions among associate and full professors in the coming years.

While the gains we have made in recent years in the representation of women among the faculty are gratifying, there is still much work to be done in this area. This remains a particular difficulty in the physical sciences and mathematics, though we have had some successes: for example, three of the five most recent hires in chemistry, math, and physics are women.

We have been much less successful in the hiring and retention of faculty of color. Based on 2011 data, Wesleyan has 4% Hispanic/Latino and 5% Black/African American faculty, 8% Asian faculty, 2% identifying in two or more racial/ethnic categories, and 73% white faculty. Disaggregating tenure and tenure track shows tenured faculty: 2% Hispanic/Latino, 4% Black/African American, 5% Asian, 2% two or more, and 83% white; tenure track faculty: 7% Hispanic/Latino, 6% Black/African American, 10% Asian, 1% two or more, and 70% white.

Teaching and Advising

A variety of studies indicate that teaching continues to be one of the great strengths of Wesleyan. Surveys of graduating seniors regularly show that more than 95% are satisfied with the "overall quality of instruction" and about the same are satisfied with "the level of intellectual excitement" (though this latter question is asked less often). However, levels of student satisfaction vary across divisions. Satisfaction with the overall quality of instruction in the arts/humanities and social sciences is typically in the mid-90s, while satisfaction with instruction in the natural sciences and mathematics, which has historically been lower, has climbed from 72% in 2006 to 81% in 2011.

Student surveys also indicate a desire for more faculty-student collaborations in research or performance.^v The creation of the fund for faculty-student research internships in fall 2011 was a direct attempt to provide more opportunities for such collaborations.

Satisfaction among seniors with advising within the majors rose from 76% in 2006 to 85% in 2009. But satisfaction with pre-major advising, while improving, continues to lag far behind, though it has risen somewhat from a rate of 54% in 2006 to 63% in 2010. [For more on advising, see Standard 4.]

Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activity

Wesleyan continues to provide strong institutional support for external grant applications, and faculty success in qualifying for grants remains impressive. Our internal support of sabbaticals on a regular basis for productive scholars continues to be of great importance. Conversations about the criteria for receiving sabbaticals have become more pointed in recent years, with greater enforcement of limits on the number of faculty in a department who may be away at one time. Eligibility for sabbaticals is earned, but sabbaticals are not entitlements. Administrative policy in this regard has been emphasized more clearly to faculty, beginning this past year in the annual memo to chairs on submitted sabbatical requests.

Technology in Teaching and Research

Like many universities and colleges, Wesleyan faces new challenges brought about by continuing advances in technology. Chief among them are those related to Wesleyan's libraries. Faculty and staff are actively engaged in discussing such matters as the digitization of library sources, the role of the "virtual library," the transformation of reading habits among undergraduates, and the best way to integrate academic computing with the services traditionally provided by the University's libraries. [See Standard 7.]

The Academic Technology Roundtable serves as a forum for discussion of issues concerning teaching and its intersection with technology. Although participation of faculty in the roundtable has diminished somewhat in recent years, Wesleyan has hired a CIO who may be able to re-energize this activity. [For more on the Academic Technology Roundtable, see Standard Four, footnote vii.]

Service

In recent years, the administration has made ample use of special committees and task forces to investigate areas of potential reform or innovation. These bodies have been useful in responding to issues from within and without the University. By and large, these have been predominantly composed of faculty, together with some relevant administrators. Significant contributions to campus evaluation and planning have been made over the past few years by faculty-led committees and task forces charged with the following:

- Review of Tenure and Promotion Procedures (2008)
- "Making Excellence Inclusive" Initiative (2010-)
- Evaluation of Nontraditional Scholarship in Tenure and Promotion (2010-11)
- Evaluation of Teaching for the Purposes of Promotion and Tenure (2009)
- Evaluation of the First Year Initiative (FYI) Program (2010-11)
- Relations between ITS and the Library (2010-11)
- Instruction of Languages and Cultures (2010-11)
- Prospects for an Education Program (2010-11)

Given the intense amount of self-study and review of many aspects of the academic endeavor conducted by faculty in recent years, it is probable that fewer (though more regular) task forces will exist in the coming years.

As a self-governing body grounded in the scholar-teacher model, Wesleyan faculty are expected to make contributions to service, teaching, and scholarship. Inevitably, contributions vary by individual, and perceptions of inequity sometimes arise from:

- uneven individual contributions produced by elections for committee service or selection for duty by the administration (which tries to have diverse voices represented) and the effects of service on faculty scholarship;
- disparities in the number of students that an individual faculty member has to teach and/or to advise;
- the burden of chairing that comes with the rotation model, and the disparity in this burden for different departments;
- frequent election of some faculty members to the most onerous committees and tasks.

Perceptions of inequity can come to seem especially important when merit-based salary increases are being considered. Efforts are currently being made to track advising and teaching loads with an eye toward finding ways to distribute these burdens more equitably. Also, the awarding of future faculty positions might take such disparities into account and work to increase staffing in programs and departments with the strongest enrollment demands.

More generally, there is some concern among more active faculty members regarding colleagues who do not share as fully in the burdens of governance. Faculty are always caught between the demands of their individual teaching and scholarly activities and the need to help with collective self-governance. There are no easy solutions to this conflict, but a recent suggestion has been to accumulate information about contributions by individual faculty members to University governance. This “snapshot” of contributions could help in determining merit pay, course relief, and other issues of compensation. At the request of the Chair and the Vice Chair of the faculty, the Provost convened a committee of faculty in the spring of 2011 to consider inequities in faculty service.

Evaluation of Faculty

Since its 2007 mid-cycle reaccreditation self-study, Wesleyan has taken a number of steps to review and improve its practices with respect to evaluation of the faculty’s teaching and scholarship, particularly as this involves the assessment of cases for tenure and promotion. As a first step, the Academic Council voted in February 2008 to create an ad hoc committee to study Wesleyan’s procedures in evaluating cases for tenure and promotion. In its final report, issued a year after its commission, the committee made four primary recommendations for improving Wesleyan’s tenure and promotion procedures:

1. To increase the transparency of the tenure and promotion process and promote understanding of the rationale underlying the key aspects of Wesleyan’s procedures:
 - a. departments and programs should work with the Provost’s office to develop written statements of their expectations for tenure and promotion;
 - b. the Provost’s office should meet each spring with chairs of departments scheduled to bring tenure or promotion cases before the Advisory Committee in the next academic year, to clarify the department’s role;
 - c. the Advisory Committee should clarify and document its expectations concerning departments’ preparation and presentation of promotion and tenure cases, as well as its procedures for assessing these cases.
2. Council should establish a committee to clarify and document University-wide expectations for the evaluation of teaching in the promotion and tenure process, and to develop and propose more comprehensive and effective measures of teaching excellence.
3. Council should establish a mechanism for tenure or promotion candidates to appeal negative decisions by Advisory to the Review and Appeals Board (RAB).
4. The President should clarify the criteria to be applied in making an independent judgment regarding the merit of a case, and should provide an account of his or her deliberations in such cases.

The committee’s recommendations have been discussed by Academic Council, and all of the suggested changes listed under the first recommendation above have been adopted. The second recommendation has also been adopted and is discussed further below. In response to the third recommendation, the Advisory Committee proposed a rule change to make it mandatory for the RAB to review cases in which Advisory reverses a department’s positive recommendation for tenure. This proposal was adopted by Academic Council at the end of the 2009-10 academic year.

An ad hoc committee to study the evaluation of teaching was created in 2010 in response to the second recommendation noted above. The newly established committee reviewed the current practices for the evaluation of teaching at Wesleyan, examined these practices at a cohort of similar institutions, and made eight recommendations. These recommendations were broken down into two areas as follows:

Evaluation of Teaching

1. The Student Evaluation form should be amended to solicit more pertinent information about student learning, and the rating scales for quantitative evaluation should be improved. The form should also include a question about expected grade.
2. Academic Affairs should make available to every faculty member (through e-portfolio) comparative data showing the average scores for both course and teaching for the University as a whole and broken down by division and course format.
3. Departments and programs should be required to employ the same procedures and standards in all cases.
4. Written departmental/program statements concerning tenure and promotion should be amended to address explicitly what procedures and standards will be used in evaluating teaching.
5. The Advisory Committee and Academic Affairs should review official documents in which the evaluation of teaching is discussed and ensure that they are consistent.
6. An ad hoc committee should be established to devise a protocol for peer evaluation that would build on existing practices and conform to the standards being developed by experts in pedagogy and peer evaluation around the country.

Fostering and Supporting Teaching Excellence

7. A clear distinction should be drawn between mentoring of teaching and evaluation of teaching, ensuring that all mentoring observation and advice is kept strictly confidential. Mentoring of teaching should be fostered for all faculty, not only for those in the probationary period of their contracts.
8. More broadly, faculty at all ranks should be supported as teachers and more effort should be directed to the improvement of teaching at all stages of faculty careers.

These recommendations have been considered by the relevant University bodies and are in general being addressed in a timely fashion. Recommendations (1) and (2) involve technical changes to the Student Evaluation form and the e-portfolio; the first of these will be put before Academic Council when completed by Academic Affairs and Academic Computing, and the second has just been implemented. Recommendations (3) and (5) require specific legislation to be passed by Academic Council to change the language of the Faculty Handbook; this legislation is being prepared for (3) and has been acted upon with respect to (5). Substantial progress has been made with respect to recommendation (4), as departments and programs are in the process of codifying their standards for all the areas considered for a case of tenure and promotion, including those for teaching. The committee recommended in (6) has yet to be established. Recommendations (7 and 8) obviously are quite broad and require a change of institutional culture that is beyond the realm of that possible from legislation. A number of departments have addressed the issue of teaching mentorship at all career levels and come up with novel approaches, and Academic Affairs is in the process of analyzing these approaches to choose elements that can serve as a model for the entire University.

Finally, in light of broader changes in the way that new scholarship is produced and disseminated, an ad hoc committee was created in November 2010 for the evaluation of nontraditional scholarship in tenure and promotion. New forms of scholarship, including public scholarship, web-based scholarship, and the like, “increasingly blur the boundary between academic and public life or between academic scholarship and related forms of professional activity, including teaching, service, and collegueship.” The committee found that Wesleyan, as well as a majority of its peer institutions, lacked explicit protocols to guide departments and programs in the evaluation of its faculty’s nontraditional academic work. While reaffirming the centrality of qualified peer review in judging academic scholarship of any form, the committee acknowledged the need for departments and programs to consider and establish procedures for assessing forms of scholarship in which publication and dissemination is not premised on systematic peer review, and recommended that these procedures be reflected in the Faculty Handbook.

Faculty compensation

Wesleyan has recently fallen short of its goal of competitive parity for faculty salaries. To address this shortfall, the University plans to allocate an additional \$600,000 over the next three academic years (2012–13 to 2014–15) for faculty compensation.

Projection

Wesleyan faces important external challenges to its efforts to maintain and expand support of faculty scholarship. Funding is becoming harder to obtain in many areas, especially the natural sciences. We have long had success with external grants far beyond what might be expected of a school our size, but this is endangered in an era of diminishing resources. Expensive technology is often required to compete for grants in the sciences, and this poses challenges for a relatively small school in a time of financial constraint. In the shorter term, there are some issues with regards to governance that we expect to address. Faculty meetings, while often lively, are not always well attended. More efforts will be made to increase faculty attendance.

The Committee on Faculty Service, created this past spring by Academic Affairs and faculty leadership and led by the Faculty Chair, is surveying departments and collecting data on faculty service over the past ten years. In fall 2012 the data will be assessed by the Committee for the purpose of fine-tuning elections to ensure a broader base of participation and wider distribution among faculty serving. During the past five years 46% of faculty eligible to serve on standing committees have done so, and the goal is to raise the five year percentage to 67% in the next five years and to 80% in the five year period after that.

Similarly, the Task Force on Advising is currently assessing advising loads so that faculty in departments with popular majors do not have a disproportionate share of advisees. The task force hopes to conclude its work by early fall of 2012 and will coordinate with the Committee on Faculty Service.

Institutional Effectiveness

Faculty have *the* crucial role in showing Wesleyan students the relevance and power of a liberal education, and the institution periodically evaluates the support it gives to faculty as well as their effectiveness in teaching and advising, scholarship and creative activity, and service. For example, studies have been completed in recent years on tenure and promotion policies, evaluation of nontraditional scholarship in tenure and promotion, and the evaluation of teaching for purposes of promotion and tenure. A premise of Wesleyan's teacher-scholar model is that the best teachers are actively engaged in research, and the University dedicates resources to supporting faculty research in addition to assessing pedagogical practices.

ⁱ “Adjunct” at Wesleyan refers to faculty with long-term renewable (but non-tenured) appointments; many are language pedagogy specialists or musicians. Contingent faculty are given “visiting” appointments.

ⁱⁱ With one exception, there are no faculty with a higher teaching load because of an inactive research agenda.

ⁱⁱⁱ Wesleyan faculty may supplement their sabbaticals with unpaid research leaves, which are commonly supported by external grants or fellowships. To encourage faculty to seek external support for research, beginning in 2007, Wesleyan allows faculty who are on unpaid research leave and are funded by external fellowships that are less than the faculty member's salary (at least 40% of the beginning salary of an assistant professor) to apply for a stipend to cover the difference. Per year, only one faculty member, on average, takes advantages of this program.

^{iv} Recent faculty participants have come from such departments as Government, Science in Society, Religion, Astronomy, and Anthropology, illustrating the broad conceptualization of the “Humanities” here and the way its discourses cross sectarian lines. The Center is especially interested in projects that connect research to pedagogy, and pedagogy to particular problems of culture and society.

^v In the 2010 Senior Survey, 69% of Wesleyan seniors were generally or very satisfied with “opportunities to participate in research with faculty,” placing us 15th among the 17 colleges (83% satisfaction at the top school) and 21st among the 23 universities (93% satisfaction at the top school).

**Standard 6: Students
(Admissions, Fall Term)**

?

Credit Seeking Students Only - Including Continuing Education

	2 Years Prior (FY 2010)	1 Year Prior (FY 2011)	Current Year (FY 2012)	Next Year Forward (FY 2013)	2 Years Forward (FY 2014)
Freshmen - Undergraduate					
Completed Applications	10,068	10,657	9,658	10141-10431	10648-11265
Applications Accepted	2,218	2,190	2,340	-	-
Applicants Enrolled	745	748	808	745	745
% Accepted of Applied	22.0%	20.5%	24.2%	-	-
% Enrolled of Accepted	33.6%	34.2%	34.5%	-	-
 Percent Change Year over Year					
Completed Applications	-	5.9%	-9.4%	5%-8%	5%-8%
Applications Accepted	-	-1.3%	6.8%	-	-
Applicants Enrolled	-	0.4%	8.0%	-7.8%	0.0%
 Average of Statistical Indicator of Aptitude of Enrollees: (Define Below)					
Academic rating by admission dean reading applica	6.8	6.9	6.8	6.8	6.8
 Transfers - Undergraduate					
Completed Applications	604	719	576	633	633
Applications Accepted	131	140	72	114	114
Applications Enrolled	60	58	25	48	48
% Accepted of Applied	21.7%	19.5%	12.5%	18.1%	18.1%
% Enrolled of Accepted	45.8%	41.4%	34.7%	41.7%	41.7%
 Master's Degree					
Completed Applications	93	118	100	104	104
Applications Accepted	36	47	28	37	37
Applications Enrolled	33	33	21	29	29
% Accepted of Applied	38.7%	39.8%	28.0%	35.7%	35.7%
% Enrolled of Accepted	91.7%	70.2%	75.0%	78.4%	78.4%
 First Professional Degree - All Programs					
Completed Applications					
Applications Accepted					
Applications Enrolled					
% Accepted of Applied	-	-	-	-	-
% Enrolled of Accepted	-	-	-	-	-
 Doctoral Degree					
Completed Applications	341	214	264	273	250
Applications Accepted	45	35	58	46	46
Applications Enrolled	25	16	36	26	26
% Accepted of Applied	13.2%	16.4%	22.0%	16.8%	18.5%
% Enrolled of Accepted	55.6%	45.7%	62.1%	55.8%	55.9%

Standard 6: Students
(Enrollment, Fall Census Date)

?

Credit-Seeking Students Only - Including Continuing Education

		2 Years Prior (FY 2010)	1 Year Prior (FY 2011)	Current Year (FY 2012)	Next Year Forward (FY 2013)	2 Years Forward (FY 2014)
UNDERGRADUATE						
First Year	Full-Time Headcount	748	753	811	749	749
	Part-Time Headcount	-	-	-		
	Total Headcount	748	753	811	749	749
	Total FTE	748.0	753.0	811.0	749.0	749.0
Second Year	Full-Time Headcount	749	788	734	833	771
	Part-Time Headcount	-	-	-	-	
	Total Headcount	749	788	734	833	771
	Total FTE	749.0	788.0	734.0	833.0	771.0
Third Year	Full-Time Headcount	567	587	615	585	650
	Part-Time Headcount	-	-	-	-	
	Total Headcount	567	587	615	585	650
	Total FTE	567.0	587.0	615.0	585.0	650.0
Fourth Year	Full-Time Headcount	702	709	709	748	726
	Part-Time Headcount	-	-	1		
	Total Headcount	702	709	710	748	726
	Total FTE	702.0	709.0	710.3	748.0	726.0
Unclassified	Full-Time Headcount	8	8	9	8	8
	Part-Time Headcount	13	9	3		
	Total Headcount	21	17	12	8	8
	Total FTE	12.3	11.0	10.0	8.0	8.0
Total Undergraduate Students						
	Full-Time Headcount	2,774	2,845	2,878	2,923	2,904
	Part-Time Headcount	13	9	4	-	-
	Total Headcount	2,787	2,854	2,882	2,923	2,904
	Total FTE	2,778.3	2,848.0	2,880.3	2,923.0	2,904.0
	% Change FTE Undergraduate	na	2.5%	1.1%	1.5%	-0.7%
GRADUATE						
	Full-Time Headcount	194	208	197	197	197
	Part-Time Headcount	167	153	123	123	123
	Total Headcount	361	361	320	320	320
	Total FTE	249.7	259.0	238.0	238.0	238.0
	% Change FTE Graduate	na	3.7%	-8.1%	0.0%	0.0%
GRAND TOTAL						
	Grand Total Headcount	3,148	3,215	3,202	3,243	3,224
	Grand Total FTE	3,028.0	3,107.0	3,118.3	3,161.0	3,142.0
	% Change Grand Total FTE	na	2.6%	0.4%	1.4%	-0.6%

**Standard 6: Students
(Financial Aid, Debt, and Developmental Courses)**



Where does the institution describe the students it seeks to serve?

<http://www.wesleyan.edu/admission/>
<http://www.wesleyan.edu/admission/video/index.html>

Fiscal year ends month & day (6 /31)	2 years prior	Most recently completed year	Current budget	Next year forward (goal or projection)	Two years forward (goal or projection)
	(FY 2010)	(FY 2011)	(FY 2012)	(FY 2013)	(FY 2014)

Student Financial Aid

Total Federal Aid	\$12,337,679	\$12,293,846	\$11,775,266	\$11,700,000	\$11,700,000
Grants	\$2,992,171	\$3,271,272	\$3,102,496	\$3,100,000	\$3,100,000
Loans	\$6,781,497	\$6,380,625	\$5,893,653	\$5,900,000	\$5,900,000
Work Study	\$2,564,011	\$2,641,949	\$2,779,117	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000
Total State Aid	\$570,859	\$534,281	\$365,024	\$350,000	\$300,000
Total Institutional Aid	\$36,296,580	\$40,388,179	\$45,704,481	\$50,250,000	\$54,250,000
Grants	\$35,976,725	\$40,085,320	\$45,466,503	\$50,000,000	\$54,000,000
Loans	\$319,855	\$302,859	\$237,978	\$250,000	\$250,000
Total Private Aid	\$4,747,468	\$4,335,186	\$4,977,364	\$4,800,000	\$4,800,000
Grants	\$2,731,394	\$2,491,241	\$2,743,425	\$2,700,000	\$2,700,000
Loans	\$2,016,074	\$1,843,945	\$2,233,939	\$2,100,000	\$2,100,000

Student Debt

Percent of students graduating with debt*					
Undergraduates	37%	46%	45%	45%	45%
Graduates	%				
Average amount of debt for students with debt					
Undergraduates	\$20,323	\$19,706	\$19,000	\$19,000	\$19,000
Graduates	\$11,725	\$13,345	\$13,404	\$13,500	\$13,500

Percent of First-year students in Developmental Courses**

English as a Second/Other Language	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
English (reading, writing, communication skills)	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Math	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Other	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

* All students who graduated should be included in this calculation.

**Courses for which no credit toward a degree is granted.

Standard Six: Students

Overview

Wesleyan's curricular and co-curricular programs serve some 2,900 undergraduates and 200 graduate studentsⁱ. Together, these programs seek to create a campus climate that values independence of mind and generosity of spirit. The University seeks to provide a safe and supportive learning environment in which students sharpen their critical thinking, embrace diversity and civic engagement, and enhance their communication and other life skills. Wesleyan values the cultivation of bold and rigorous thinkers who are also effective citizens.

“Wesleyan students do about seven things at once,” says the Wesleyan website, by which is meant that they lead rich lives above and beyond their studies. Year in and year out students here throw themselves into music or help each other with theatrical productions or volunteer their time and effort in serving those in need. The campus is a fertile place for student-driven initiatives – from environmental groups to clubs centered on the arts and publications to organizations focused on gender identity and social justice issues. The “generosity of spirit” of Wes students is notable, and their ability to organize around an issue, culture, or cause that they care about is considered a great strength of campus life. Imaginative Wes students create their own exuberant culture, and while the distinction between artfulness and idiosyncrasy may not always be clear, their creativity is valued by their peers and other Wesleyan stakeholders alike. Student culture is a source of pride for the institution – but sometimes also concern, as we'll discuss below. Even in its more autonomous aspects, student culture is framed by the support structures of the University.

Description

Admissions and Financial Aid

The Offices of Admission and Financial Aid work to bring to campus undergraduates who have a high probability of succeeding in Wesleyan's rigorous academic environment and contributing to a creative and active campus life. The Office of Admission does extensive outreach via print and electronic media, and intensively recruits a diverse geographic, racial/ethnic, and socioeconomic population with a wide range of academic and co-curricular interests. Wesleyan admits students through an annual cycle that includes two early decision and one regular admission process. Financial aid is based on a combination of the student's and family's ability to pay, and awards consist of federal and state aid, and institutional grants. Wesleyan meets 100% of demonstrated need.

This proportion of students receiving aid in academic year 2011-12 was 49%, where aid is defined as “grant or scholarship aid received from the federal government, state/local government, the institution, and other sources known to the institution.” The prior year (2010-11), it was 48%.

Student Services

Student Affairs provides services and learning opportunities that support students' work in the classroom and enrich their lives outside it. Reporting to the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) are the Dean for Academic Advancement, the Dean of Students and the Director of Graduate Student Services.ⁱⁱ The Dean for Academic Advancement oversees the Class Deans, the Associate Dean for Student Academic Resources, and a part-time Associate Dean of International Affairs. The Dean of Students supervises the Davison Health Center, the Office of Residential Life, the Coordinator of International Student Services, the Office of Religious and Spiritual Life, and the Usdan University Center staff. He also supervises the Assistant Director of Student Life, who coordinates the peer-based Student Judicial Board. The VPSA oversees the student-run Honor Board. Partnering with Academic Affairs, Student Affairs works to provide opportunities for curricular and co-curricular learning in a supportive environment that challenges students to move beyond their traditional frames of thinking.

Appraisal

Admissions and Financial Aid

The second overarching goal of *Wesleyan 2020* is to “enhance recognition of Wesleyan as an extraordinary institution,” and one of the ways we judge whether we are making progress in this is by the number of talented young people who want to come here. Application numbers have grown dramatically in recent years (see below), and while it is difficult to know exactly why (conjectures include the arrival of a new president, the commencement speech of Barack Obama, and aggressive outreach in new markets domestically and internationally), the efforts of Admission supplemented by those of University Communications are proving to be successful.

It had long been a priority at Wesleyan to admit domestic first-year candidates regardless of their ability to pay, but in the spring of 2012 President Roth introduced an initiative that changed Wesleyan’s approach to financial aid. The initiative (described in Standard 9) establishes a “discount rate” that is as generous as possible, but that is also one Wesleyan can afford. Just under a third of the University’s tuition charges will go to financial aid. This is approximately the percentage of the budget devoted to aid from 2000-2008.

Wesleyan remains committed to meeting the full financial need of admitted students without increasing required student indebtedness. In future, the Admission Office will have to consider the capacity of some students to pay, as is done now with transfer and international students. Current estimates are that about 90% of each class (depending on the level of need) will continue to be admitted on a need-blind basis. Wesleyan expects to build a more generous and sustainable financial aid program over time by raising more funds for the endowment.

In recent years, Admission has sought to broaden its geographic reach and stimulate applications from international students as well as those in the U.S. outside the Northeast. For fall 2009, first-year applications increased 22%, and for three years running Wesleyan has received about 10,000 applications. That percentage increase puts Wesleyan third in a comparison group of 16 private, selective liberal arts colleges.ⁱⁱⁱ The challenge is to maintain or grow applications in the Northeast, contrary to demographic shifts, and to continue to increase applications from farther afield. Admission has expanded its professional staff (13 deans as of FY 2011), but further application growth will require support and assistance from many other University constituencies.

Wesleyan thinks of “diversity” broadly, and in seeking to create a diverse undergraduate community, Admission takes special note of strong applicants who are low-income, first-generation-college, international, from outside the Northeast, and of varied educational backgrounds, as well as those whose race and/or ethnicity is under-represented in the Academy.^{iv} Longstanding efforts to bring to Wesleyan U.S. students of color – including fly-ins for October and November Open House programs and for our April admit program – have been bolstered recently by our partnership with QuestBridge. Over the past three years, we have enrolled 12-15 “QB Match” students per year, as well as another 24-25 per class who applied and matriculated through the regular process. While our QuestBridge partnership is focused on bringing to campus talented low-income students, the majority of those who end up coming are students of color. Making Wesleyan more international is also a priority. International applications have increased 36% from 2008 to 2011, and this year we enrolled 70 foreign students, the largest-ever international cohort.

In 2007, with the inauguration of President Roth, Wesleyan undertook a low-income-family initiative, where students from families with income under \$40,000 have their student loans replaced with grants. (This includes all the QuestBridge Match students.) At the same time, we capped packaged loans at the Stafford level, which dropped four-year loan levels by one-third, from \$27,000 to \$18,000. Another initiative funded by the generosity of two Wesleyan alumni provides grant money for students who have served in the U.S. military. Ten veterans have received support since the Military Veterans Scholars Program began in the fall of 2008; six are currently on campus.

In 2005, an analysis of majors and class enrollments made it clear that we could and should have a larger number of science/math majors at Wesleyan, and Admission set about accomplishing that. Publications highlighted opportunities in science, availability of research, the benefits of Ph.D. programs, and the B.A./M.A. program. Admission talked about these opportunities, and science faculty spoke with more students and helped recruit the top science admits. The result has been significant growth in the expression of interest in science among matriculants and in the number of science/math majors.

GRADUATION AND RETENTION

Wesleyan's six-year graduation rate for first-year students who entered in the fall of 2006 is 91% overall. Subsets include:

- Men: 91%
- Women: 90%
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 90%
- Black, Non-Hispanic: 79%
- Hispanic: 93%
- International: 93%
- White, Non-Hispanic: 92%

(By financial aid status)

- Students receiving Federal Pell grant: 87%
- Students receiving Stafford Loan, but no Pell: 89%
- Neither Pell nor Stafford: 92%

Graduation rates have trended up slightly over the past decade (from 88.2% for the 1993 six-year graduation rate to the current 91%).^v One-year retention rates have remained fairly flat at approximately 95%. For information regarding retention-oriented programs, see Student Academic Support in this Standard, and www.wesleyan.edu/sarn.

Student Services

The last reaccreditation report looked forward to our evaluation of how well the new Usdan University Center would serve as a focal point for campus activity, and we are pleased to report the results below. We have also paid increased attention to some of the challenges posed by student behavior. Wesleyan students at their best find the balance between freedom and responsibility as they make their way through their four years, but at times the balance is tipped as, for example, when poor choices are made with respect to alcohol and drug use.

Residential Life

Wesleyan believes strongly in the value of the living and learning that occurs in a shared community. Housing options are based on a model of increasing independence. First-year students live with roommates in traditional residential halls; seniors live more independently in Fauver apartments or wood-frame houses on the edges of the campus.

Over the past six years, undergraduate housing capacity has increased from 2,702 to 2,820, and will increase again next year by 92 beds (newly available in the Butterfield residence hall). In 2005, with the construction of Fauver Residence Hall and Fauver apartments, the number of undergraduate students given exemptions from living on campus was drastically reduced; today that number is less than 20.

The last accreditation review recommended Wesleyan strengthen communal aspects of residential life. Community Based Living (CBLV) was created in 2003 to offer first-year students the opportunity to live in a community with a common vision or focus, but with the same residential services and support as the rest of

the incoming class. One-third of the first-year class lives in CBLV, which includes substance-free and single-gender floors as well as West College, a social justice hall, the writing floor, and a quiet floor. In recent years, Program Housing (or themed living), available to students beginning in their sophomore year, has increased from 26 to 33 houses (and from 304 to 446 students). Fraternities have been a part of student life here for decades, and by 2010 all but one had joined program housing. The one fraternity refusing to join had created more than its share of problems over the years. After much discussion with the fraternity members and their alumni and national boards, the University last year convinced this last holdout to join program housing – allowing for clearer and more consistent expectations regarding Greek life at Wesleyan.

In addition to its Mission and Celebration statements, Residential Life has seven learning outcomes that guide its programming and interactions with student residents: developing meaningful relationships, civility, independence/interdependence, ethical behavior, healthy responsible living, social justice, and civic responsibility.

Although faculty have long been involved in student staff programming, there has been an increased emphasis on faculty involvement in recent years; in 2011 there were 255 such programs. One of the most notable is the Faculty Fellows program. Introduced in fall 2010, this program provides opportunities for residents of a particular residence hall to have frequent interactions with a particular faculty member. Other programs promoting intellectual interaction among students outside the classroom include the first-year Learning and Living seminars,^{vi} initiated in 2008, and the Writing House,^{vii} established in 2010.

Usdan University Center

The Suzanne Lemberg Usdan University Center opened in fall 2007 and has become a vibrant and central feature of campus life. Students, faculty, and staff go there for meals and any number of other reasons; it is the site of program presentations, impromptu meetings, and planned University-wide events. Lectures, student art, banquets, and musical performances are among the many activities that Usdan sponsors for the campus community.^{viii} To promote student-faculty interaction in Usdan, Student Affairs launched a student-faculty lunch voucher program, enabling professors to take their students to lunch and vice-versa. Over the 2010–11 academic year, 179 faculty initiated lunches with students and 115 students initiated lunches with faculty. Students report that the opportunity to talk with faculty outside traditional advising or classroom meetings in a more relaxed setting has helped to break down barriers and promote lively intellectual discussion.

The Center houses a number of offices and services (Cardinal Technology Store, the Box Office, Mail Services^{ix}, Print and Copy Shop, Bon Appétit Campus Dining) and is guided on policy and programming by the Usdan Advisory Committee. This committee – composed of staff, students, and faculty – has identified four themes on which to focus: art, marketing, intellectual programming, and facility issues.^x Additionally, a student programming board sponsors activities on Thursday evenings throughout the year, and the Center has dedicated spaces for outside vendors.^{xi}

In 2007, after many years of student dissatisfaction with campus dining, Wesleyan put out a request for proposals to several dining companies. In 2007–2008, a committee composed of staff, students, and faculty identified Bon Appétit as the new campus dining provider. In addition to Summerfield's and Pi Café, Bon Appétit opened and now operates the Marketplace, the Café, and the Daniel Family Commons Faculty Staff Dining Room in Usdan. Usdan Marketplace is the primary dining facility and offers three meals a day, in addition to the first-floor “to-go” café and late night dining, which is open until 1 a.m.^{xii} Wes Shop is also managed by Bon Appétit and provides a mini-market with a large inventory of groceries.^{xiii} Student satisfaction with campus dining has gone from a low of 39% under the last vendor to 69% and 81% in the last two years. (Annual Senior Survey)

Another place to grab a cup of coffee is the Allbritton Center for Public Life in the recently renovated former student center. This facility enriches campus life and promotes interaction between faculty and

students. It also houses the student-run café on the ground floor, provides well-used study space, and a much-used meeting space.

New Student Orientation

The goals of the orientation program are to introduce students to the range of academic and co-curricular activities at Wesleyan and to assist them in integrating into the campus community. An important component is the First Year Matters Program, which begins with summer reading on a particular theme, continues during orientation with faculty lectures and smaller conversations, and culminates with the entire class participating in an interactive music and dance event that embodies the theme. This event is referred to as “The Common Moment.”

Each year participants in orientation program are surveyed, and the results are used to evaluate the program’s effectiveness. Two summers ago, when the program was being shortened from seven days to five, the survey results were crucial in determining which activities to preserve.

International Students

The Office of International Student Affairs (OISA) organizes the orientation of foreign students on their arrival to campus and provides ongoing counsel on aspects of adjustment to life at Wesleyan – cultural, academic, personal, financial, and immigration. International students, comprising 8% of the student body, have (2012) an average GPA of 90.1, slightly higher than that of their peers, and roughly the same graduation rate of 91%.

Foreign applicants whose first language is not English are asked to submit their score from either the TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language) or the IELTS (International English Language Testing Service). Admissions expects to see at least a 100 (of 120) on the TOEFL or a score of at least 7 (of 9) on the IELTS. As with any standardized examination, the scores are viewed in context, and the targets are not absolute requirements. If a student scores a 650 or higher on the Critical Reading section of the SAT, the requirement to submit a TOEFL or IELTS score is waived.

A popular writing course among ESL students is ENGL 130, *The English Essay*, offered every semester by the Associate Dean for International Student Affairs.

Class Deans

In the fall of 2005, Wesleyan changed its class deaning system; now each dean travels with a single class from orientation through graduation (in the past the student traveled from dean to dean each year). This new arrangement helps the Class Deans to get to know their students well and better advise and support them. Class blogs, which the Deans use to convey information and celebrate student accomplishments, and Class Councils contribute to class unity and identity. Class Councils were introduced in the fall of 2009 to organize events that promote class unity and identity, and these have provided individual students the opportunity to cultivate leadership skills through planning, organizing, and implementing events. The Deans’ Office took stewardship of Phi Beta Kappa in the fall of 2009 and now coordinates the twice yearly initiations of seniors’ elected by Chapter members. The Deans’ Office also issues the Dean’s List, which was introduced in the fall of 2010 to recognize students’ academic achievements. Overall, the Class Deans of today are better positioned to contribute to the success of their students than were their predecessors at the time of the last reaccreditation review.

Student Academic Support

The Class Deans and Associate Dean for Student Academic Support connect students to appropriate academic resources and monitor their progress toward graduation. They work one-on-one with students having

academic difficulties, meet with faculty regarding student concerns in the classroom (and vice versa), conduct Unsatisfactory Progress Report follow up, notify faculty and coaches about students on academic discipline, meet regularly with those students, send early warning letters to explain potential issues with credits and GPA, advise and mentor students for different fellowships and scholarships and, along with the Registrar, enforce academic regulations.

The deans also develop and update academic monitoring and advising tools. In the fall of 2005, for example, they initiated the Academic Skills Assessment Survey in order to facilitate a successful transition to college by encouraging new students to reflect upon their study habits in light of University expectations. Academic skills workshops were recommended to students based on their responses to the survey, but attendance at these workshops proved disappointing. Nor was there a high correlation between students' self-assessment and their academic performance, so the survey was revised for the Class of 2015 to make it solely self-reflective. Getting students to grapple with academic weaknesses remains a challenge. Faculty advisors can also help in connecting students to academic resources and providing encouragement to seek academic support. And students can serve as resources for one another. A peer advising program was developed for Orientation in 2006 and is now a year-round resource. Peer advisors are trained to help students in a number of areas – from advice on how to prepare for meetings with faculty advisors to providing information on academic support programs.

The Office of Disabilities Services (administered by the Associate Dean of Student Academic Resources) was established in 2006 to consolidate under one roof services for students with disabilities. Since then, the number of students who inquire about disability services has risen from 170 to 297. In the fall of 2011, over 125 students received formal reasonable accommodations, more than double the number in spring 2007. In the past few years, the office has added programming on disability issues for staff, faculty, and students and has worked with other offices on campus to look at the University's status with regards to changes in disability law.^{xiv} Wesleyan in recent years has become a much more accessible campus to the disabled and will continue to promote accessibility.

Health Services: Counseling Center

Since the last reaccreditation process, the Office of Behavioral Health for Students (now called Counseling and Psychological Services) has done a self-study and undergone an external review. Several needs were identified: among them, the need to diversify the staff, to look for opportunities to introduce interns to the Center, and to increase programming and outreach. The office is now under new leadership, and expanded staffing includes a therapist/sexual assault resource coordinator as point person for campus educational efforts in this area. The focus of the office continues to be on individual therapy, the demand for which has increased to a degree consistent with national trends. New efforts are underway to reach those students who are struggling with personal and academic stress but might not feel comfortable seeking therapy. Three third-year psychology graduate students have been hired (20 hours a week) to assist the office in these efforts in 2012–13. Support is provided to the Class Deans and faculty to ensure that students at risk get the attention they need. Coordination among the Counseling Center, Health Services, and Health Education has improved, and the three health offices work now as a team rather than as separate entities.

Wesleyan Career Center

The Wesleyan Career Center (WCC) reports to University Relations, which helps it to establish connections between students and the greater Wesleyan community worldwide. Formerly located at the edge of campus, the WCC moved in the beginning of 2012 to a central location adjacent to Usdan. The new facility has been designed to incorporate the most up-to-date video-conferencing technology, furthering the Center's ability to connect students with alumni, parents, organizations, and companies around the globe. The WCC and

Academic Affairs established a new process for awarding credit for internships, and there is a newly-created Civic Engagement Coordinator position charged with developing and supporting both internships for credit and resources for students interested in social entrepreneurship.

With the move to the center of campus, the WCC is expecting a sharp increase in demand for its services. The WCC currently serves only undergraduates and BA alumni, but MA and PhD students are increasingly interested in receiving career support. To begin to meet this need, the WCC has worked with the Graduate Student Services office to produce a Graduate Career Forum – a one-day event providing workshops and seminars on Academic and Non-Academic Careers.^{xv}

Physical Education and Athletics

A challenge that faces most liberal arts colleges with large athletic programs is the integration of athletes into the social and academic fabric of the institution. Athletes build strong bonds with teammates and spend considerable time training and practicing for their sport. They run the risk of having a very different Wesleyan experience (for good and for ill) from that of students who are not so committed to one facet of their education. With this in mind, Wesleyan coaches encourage athletes to become fully engaged in the curriculum and develop a relationship with faculty members. As is the case with students dedicated to the arts, music, or theater (all of which require an enormous time commitment), the athletes do find ways to integrate into Wesleyan's diverse community and take advantage of the expansive curriculum. Still, there are challenges, and athletes disproportionately account for more honor board and disciplinary infractions.^{xvi} Fortunately, the overall numbers of such cases are small.

Another challenge for the athletics department is responding to the growth of club sports. Over the past decade more students have been coming to Wesleyan with a background in team sports, but choose not to compete on a varsity team (or don't have the ability to do so). In the past, intramurals were the outlet for these students, but today the non-varsity athlete wants more rigorous competition. Wesleyan cannot afford to sponsor a full complement of JV teams, so club sports modeled on varsity ones have become very popular. This expansion of club sports, however, is placing tremendous pressure on field space and indoor activity areas. Tiering clubs into three divisions may help relieve some of this pressure, and the athletic department is also exploring the addition of a second synthetic surface field with lights to provide additional activity space.

As mentioned in Standard Four, Wesleyan teams compete in NESCAC, the strongest NCAA Division III athletic conference. Fielding winning teams in NESCAC requires active recruiting of quality student-athletes by Wesleyan coaches. Because recruiting of prospective athletes takes time away from the mentoring of current students and coaches consider student mentoring their highest priority, Wesleyan, along with peer conference members, is considering policies that may restrict recruiting during certain times of the academic year. Fortunately, this difficulty with the time-demands of recruiting does not exist in all sports.

The Wesleyan A+ Athletic Advantage Program is helping the student athlete prepare for life after college through Career Center mini clinics, alumni mentoring, job shadowing opportunities, internships, on campus speaker series, and community service projects. Former Wesleyan athletes are enthusiastic about engaging with current students and providing guidance and support for what lies ahead post Wesleyan.

Community engagement is an important component of the Wesleyan athletic program. Teams regularly volunteer in support of local nonprofit agencies, area schools, and youth sports teams. Wesleyan opens its facilities to the community on a program basis, and five local high schools use the facilities for practice and games on a pro-bono basis.

(For more on Athletics, see Standard 4)

Civic Engagement

The Center for Community Partnerships (CCP) aims to be a one-stop station for anyone interested in establishing collaborative projects between Wesleyan and (greater) Middletown. The CCP – encompassing the Office of Community Service and Volunteerism, Office of Community Relations, the Service-Learning Center, and the Green Street Arts Center – strives to offer meaningful engagement opportunities to the Wesleyan community. CCP’s collaborative activities include Community and University Services for Education, whose programs include introducing fourth graders in Middletown public schools to Wesleyan’s arts galleries, the annual Art Show exhibiting works of local K-12 public school students, and the High School Humanities Program; the Teen Life Conference with the City of Middletown; the Middlesex Chamber Career Expo in partnership with Middlesex Schools Consortium; the Middlesex Transition Academy with cooperation from School District 13 (Durham, Middlefield, and Rockfall); the Center for Prison Education; Let’s Get Ready (SAT-prep for students in Meriden and Middletown); the Foreign Language Bank; and the afterschool program at the Green Street Arts Center.

Through the Office of Community Service and Volunteerism (OCS), Wesleyan students are able to engage in volunteer and work-study positions, reflection activities, learning opportunities, training, and leadership development. Based on Senior Survey data from the past two years, half of Wesleyan students volunteer at some point during their sojourn here. A total of 550 students engaged in OCS programs each semester during the 2010–2011 academic year (not counting an additional 225 who engaged through the New Student Orientation that year). These programs, organized by 20-plus student coordinators, include tutoring and elderly services, and addresses issues such as hunger/homelessness, AIDS and sexual health awareness, and environmental concerns. The Service-Learning Center provides support and leadership for faculty involved with community-based learning on campus. Twenty-two service-learning courses, offered in all divisions of the University, were taught in 2010–2011, enrolling 315 students. Nine were new courses, which received Service-Learning Initiative Grants for 2009–2010 or 2010–2011. With the creation of the civic engagement certificate, the Allbritton Center for the Study of Public Life, and the Patricelli Center for Social Entrepreneurship, Wesleyan will continue to offer intentional engagement activities for students, faculty, and staff that will enrich their Wesleyan experience and add to the quality of life in the greater Middletown community.

Town-gown relations are contingent on various factors: the relationship of elected officials to the President and other senior administrators, organizational relationships and collaborations, student volunteerism, and employment opportunities here for Middletown residents. Over the years, Wesleyan has had challenges with the Middletown community, especially around student housing and raucous parties. But for many years now Wesleyan has made conscious efforts to reach out to city officials, neighboring organizations, and residents. The President and Cabinet members meet regularly with the Mayor and city directors. There is also regular communication with other city stakeholders, and the CCP advisory board includes representatives of the Chamber of Commerce, public schools, Middlesex Hospital, and Middletown Police.

Study Abroad

Under the auspices of the Office of International Studies (OIS), Wesleyan sends 38% of its student body abroad for a semester or year of academic study. Students are required to show proficiency in the language of the host country if it is offered at Wesleyan, and, if not offered, to study that language when abroad. The number of students studying abroad has been decreasing slightly in recent years, and the OIS is working to increase student interest in studying abroad both for educational and pre-professional purposes.^{xvii} The OIS organizes sessions on activities abroad such as internships, employment (in conjunction with the Career Center), and student research. It also oversees application to eight post-graduate fellowships. Students who have returned from studying abroad staff OIS drop-in hours and are essential participants in information and orientation sessions.

Whereas most universities send the vast majority of their students to Western Europe, Wesleyan sends healthy numbers to Latin America, Asia, and Africa – and a handful to Eastern Europe, the Middle East, and Oceania as well. In all, participants study in some 45 countries each year, usually in the junior year and most commonly for a single semester; credit counts toward both graduation and the major. Students elect from a range of academic opportunities, from direct enrollment at universities abroad to thematic programs designed specifically for U.S. college-goers. Wesleyan directs four of its own programs – in Bologna, Madrid, Paris, and Regensburg – run in consortium with peer institutions in the U.S. and in close collaboration with universities in those cities.

While Wesleyan cannot control what students do with their time abroad, the OIS has changed the underlying message of the pre-departure orientation from “study abroad is fun and meaningful” to “study abroad, done well, is difficult and rewarding at both academic and personal levels.” Although some students take the opportunity more seriously than others, most do substantive academic work, many improve their language skills, and some find their *raison d’être* while in a foreign country. Wesleyan provides pre-departure orientations and re-entry workshops, as well as online materials related to cultural and academic adjustment, health and safety, logistics, and so on. The OIS, in collaboration with the Psychology Department, is currently developing an intercultural awareness survey for study abroad participants in order to track student learning in relation to intercultural literacy.

Regrettably, Wesleyan does not track summer study, research, volunteer work, or internships abroad. Such data would give us a much better sense of how many of our students incorporate international experiences into their Wesleyan education. The recent arrival in Academic Affairs of a new internship coordinator could be helpful later in this regard; the coordinator’s primary focus is now on domestic internships. The OIS continues to explore how to offer more services to students interested in international internships, social entrepreneurship opportunities, research, and study over the summer.

Alcohol and Other Drugs

Like their peers at private colleges in the Northeast, Wesleyan students use alcohol and drugs at higher rates than the national average. There is no doubt that the second-hand effects of high-risk drinking have a deleterious impact on the campus living and learning environment. Since 2007, the alcohol and other drug policy has been revised several times in order to clarify community expectations and address problematic behavior. In working with the Wesleyan Student Assembly, Student Affairs staff have focused attention on high-risk drinking and its consequences. In an effort to better understand the experience of students, Wesleyan partnered with AlcoholEdu to administer an annual survey and educational program prior to matriculation followed by a second survey given in the first semester. In 2011, Wesleyan joined with 30 other colleges in an 18-month initiative led by Dartmouth College to reduce high-risk drinking. Through the use of several short-term, small-scale programs, Wesleyan is hoping to identify strategies that will prove effective in reducing alcohol-related harm campus-wide. While troubled by the seemingly intractable nature of high-risk drinking among college students, Wesleyan is committed to reducing its impact on this campus.

Honor Board, Student Judicial Board, and Graduate Judicial Board

Wesleyan employs different processes for peer adjudication of the University’s Honor Code and Code of Non-Academic Conduct. Separate student boards (undergraduate, graduate) work with administrators and faculty to review alleged violations and ensure that infractions are adjudicated and sanctioned appropriately. Over the past several years, the Honor Code and Code of Non-Academic Conduct have been reviewed with student input and clarified to better address the kinds of issues that now tend to arise. Among the most difficult of these are cheating and plagiarism. Wesleyan has long maintained an Honor Code stipulating that students

themselves are personally and collectively responsible for ensuring the academic integrity of their work, yet incidents of cheating have continued to undermine the genuine academic pursuits of others. Responses currently under discussion include the implementation of an on-line tutorial.

The student judicial board hears infractions of the Non-Academic Code of Conduct. While the majority of cases involve alcohol or drug violations, the most intensive cases are those that involve physical and sexual assaults. Incidents of assault on campus are doubtless underreported, and not all students have been satisfied with rulings on those that are reported. In 2010, President Roth appointed a task force on sexual violence that included students, faculty, staff, and parents. The task force built upon previous work that had been done to revise the University's sexual misconduct and assault policy, as well as the procedures surrounding adjudicating allegations. The University implemented its recommendations regarding prevention efforts, sexual assault resource team training, and the hiring of a sexual assault counselor. Wesleyan is making a clear statement against sexual violence, and looks to aggressively investigate reports and hold any perpetrators responsible.

Campus Climate and Diversity

In 2009, the Office of the Dean for Diversity and Student Engagement (DDSE) was moved from Student Affairs to report to the newly created position of Vice President for Diversity and Institutional Partnerships. The move was meant to facilitate synergistic relationships among diversity initiatives involving students, faculty, and staff. The DDSE seeks to affirm identity, build community, and cultivate leadership among students through individual advising, workshops, programs, and outreach – often in collaboration with other departments in the University. With the launching of *Making Excellence Inclusive*, campus-wide discussions have taken place to acknowledge and recognize diversity as an educational asset. The DDSE has also worked to raise awareness about issues facing first-generation college students – partnering with Admission to aid in the transition and success of QuestBridge and other first-generation students.^{xviii}

The Campus Climate Log is a new online reporting and archival resource where students are encouraged to inform the campus community about incidents of hate or discrimination.^{xix} The DDSE monitors the Campus Climate Log and convenes an administrative committee to discuss issues that arise there. The Campus Climate Log should be helpful when controversies arise (such as the discussions around the Anti Affirmative Action Bake Sale of 2010).

The Dwight Greene Internship, overseen by the DDSE, provides two undergraduates with paid internships during the academic year to coordinate and support student discourse and programs around issues of diversity and inclusion. The two interns also manage the Dwight Greene Oral History Project, which conducts and archives interviews with Wesleyan alumni and graduating seniors about their experiences here as students of color. Discussions about campus diversity are also organized by the Wesleyan Diversity Education Facilitation Program, founded by students in 2005 and supported by the DDSE.

Graduate Students

The social and academic life of most graduate students at Wesleyan is focused on their department to a much greater degree than is the case for undergraduates. The Graduate Student Association (GSA) and the Office of Graduate Student Services (OGSS) work to build community across departments, but the natural connections are departmental. This leads to strong links in departments between graduate students and undergraduate majors. The graduate students are in the same labs and same spaces as the undergraduates and often in the same classes. Their social and academic interactions are a real benefit to both groups and are part of the distinctive nature of the Wesleyan model.

Small, supportive departments attract large numbers of international graduate students, contributing to the international character of the campus as a whole. Still, the integration of graduate students into campus

life generally is an ongoing challenge, and the OGSS has identified and prioritized the following areas for attention: new graduate student orientation (including pedagogical training, matters of the honor code, benefits, healthcare), housing, career guidance, and community building.^{xx} Another challenge facing the OGSS is what can (should?) be done to improve recruitment of deserving and qualified Americans, particularly students of color who are normally underrepresented in graduate populations, especially in the sciences.^{xxi} In the last reaccreditation process it was noted that the graduate programs are “the best kept secret at Wesleyan” and fly below the radar here. The OGSS believes that the Wesleyan community would benefit from knowing more about these programs and is making new efforts to raise their visibility on campus. Departments are now providing annual reports to the administration on the health and status of their graduate programs, and the new Director of Graduate Studies will deliver an annual report to the faculty.

Projection

ADMISSION AND FINANCIAL AID – Wesleyan will build on the increase in recognition it has achieved in recent years to develop an even more qualified and diverse applicant pool. The Admission team will continue to broaden its outreach, both domestically and internationally. Affordability will be a priority for the University, and Wesleyan has adopted measures (described in Standard 9) that will make the University more affordable for many students while also maintaining the revenue levels to support the scholar-teacher model at the heart of our mission.

STUDENT AFFAIRS LEARNING OUTCOMES – In 2010–11 Student Affairs developed five learning outcomes (and proficiency standards appropriate to each) to help in guiding and assessing its work with students outside the classroom. These outcomes are Critical Thinking, Effective Citizenship, Diversity, Self-Empowerment and Life Skills, and Effective Communication. While some offices within Student Affairs had already identified learning outcomes specific to their work, Student Affairs as a whole is now beginning to use these overarching outcomes.

PROMOTING A DIVERSE CULTURE – Wesleyan strives to promote a diverse cultural/educational experience for all members of its community. To this end Student Affairs staff will continue to engage with the Making Excellence Inclusive initiative, continue to explore how their own position in a diverse world informs their work with students of varied backgrounds, identities, and abilities, and continue to seek new ways to support difference and promote discussion and action around bias, prejudice, and privilege across the campus community.

RESIDENTIAL LIFE – The option (for seniors) to live in wood frame houses is greatly valued by students, but it presents a significant challenge to the University, which must maintain more than 200 separate buildings. During 2010–11, Residential Life and Facilities staff developed a long-range residential facilities plan, which included a projection of deferred maintenance costs as well as opportunities to consolidate student housing closer to the core of the campus. The plan also identified opportunities for future residential facilities that could reduce maintenance costs and improve students’ living experience. While the plan does not call for eliminating wood frame houses, it does make clear that Wesleyan’s priority must be to contain the residential footprint, improve the infrastructure of the houses, and likely add apartment-style units to replace the most inefficient, costly houses.

The success of the Faculty Fellows pilot program connecting first-year residential halls with a faculty member may lead to its expansion.

COUNSELING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES (CAPS) – Over the last several years, the counseling office underwent an external review, and the University conducted focus groups with students. As a result the University hired a new director and additional staff member to implement a new vision for CAPS. While


significant progress is being made, the staff has identified further steps for the coming years to increase visibility and accessibility. One such step is the collaboration between the new sexual assault counselor and the director of health education to implement a bystander intervention training program. The goal of this program is to equip students with the skills to step in and stop risky and harmful behaviors.

Institutional Effectiveness

Offices and departments concerned with student life – ranging from Admissions to Athletics, from Student Affairs to the Office of Community Service – are regularly evaluated with respect to the effectiveness of their programs and staff. The division of Student Affairs compiles an annual report summarizing the work of each of its departments and includes an assessment of the department’s effectiveness where possible. Additionally, the University conducts a number of evaluations (e.g., annual orientation survey, alcohol.edu and CORE survey, COFHE senior survey) often with the assistance of the Office of Institutional Research – all for the purpose of making changes that improve the student experience. Student Affairs has also embarked upon the development and assessment of student learning outcomes to assess the impact of its programs and various leadership opportunities for the students with whom they work.

- ⁱ This does not include some 300 students in the Graduate Liberal Studies Program.
- ⁱⁱ In 2007, in order to streamline administrative reporting, the Dean of the College position was reorganized under the new title of Vice President for Student Affairs, with two reports, the Dean for Academic Advancement and the Dean of Students. A third report, the director of Graduate Student Services, was added in 2010 when that position moved from Academic Affairs.
- ⁱⁱⁱ The comparison group includes Amherst, Barnard, Bowdoin, Bryn Mawr, Carleton, Middlebury, Mount Holyoke, Oberlin, Pomona, Smith, Swarthmore, Trinity, Tufts, Vassar, Wellesley, and Williams.
- ^{iv} Participation in the *Making Excellence Inclusive* initiative also is one of the ways in which Admission staff are responding to the challenge of creating a diverse student body.

Graduation Rates by First-Year Cohort



- ^{vi} Learning and Living Seminars were implemented in the fall of 2008 to promote intellectual community outside the classroom and to enhance the experience of students inside the classroom in their first semester at Wesleyan. We believed that shared housing would facilitate group assignments and projects that would extend intellectual discussions and collaboration beyond the classroom as well as promote the growth of a strong community in the residence. By all accounts, our goal has been met by

the 13 seminars offered since the fall of 2008. Instructors who offered more structured assignments outside the classroom and were present at activities outside of class were more successful in creating a positive and satisfying intellectual experience for their students in the residence halls. With few exceptions, the living and learning seminars have enhanced students' experience of their intellectual life and community at Wesleyan in the first semester.

vii Writing Hall and Writing House – Writing Hall (2009), a CBLV for first-year students, and Writing House (2010), a program house for upper-level students, were established in collaboration between the Director of Writing Programs (faculty advisor to the House and Hall) and the Director of Residential Life. Wesleyan has long been known for its vibrant community of writers, but new students have sometimes felt uncertain about how to join this swirl of literary life. Activities in these writing-focused residences have provided a solution: new students meet upperclassmen who understand the curriculum and offer ways to join the literary projects on campus. The Writing Programs Office provides student advisors and contributes funding for House and Hall programming. This past year, residents attended writing workshops, receptions, and dinners with the writing faculty; met privately with visiting writers; and worked with editors of campus journals. In the dorms, they organized weekly writing prompts, open-mic nights, and journal publication; and most important perhaps, they formed close friendships with the people they lived with. In fact, residents of Writing Hall were quoted last year in the *Argus* as saying they were the happiest first-year hall on campus. Wesleyan's new Shapiro Writing Center has become a home for many of these House and Hall activities, and we look forward to making use of this wonderful new facility and its support services in the coming years.

viii In sponsoring such activities the Usdan staff has worked with a variety of departments and offices including the Center for the Arts, Music, Theater, Economics, American Studies, Psychology, Wesleyan Career Center, Athletics, College of the Environment, Film Studies, German Studies, and the University Archives. First Year Matters, a threshold experience in which all first-year students participate, and Wesleyan World Wednesday, a speaker series offered by the Office of International Student Services, are examples of joint faculty-student programming that take place in Usdan. There are many initiatives occurring within the Center. As an example, from August 29, 2010 through March 31, 2011, there were 3083 room reservations for a total of 7649 reserved hours. Of those reservations, 10 were for concerts, 37 for banquets/dinners, 493 for meetings, and 282 for rehearsals, as well as various trainings, luncheons, conferences, film screenings, etc.

ix The game room, located on the lower level, has been converted to support the Mail Service. Package service on campus has had to deal with the exploding popularity of on-line textbook purchasing, and using this space as a package pickup location better serves the students and campus community than did the infrequently-used game room. A new gaming location on the first floor includes couches and soft chairs, carpets and tables, mounted televisions, video game technology, and a pool table.

x Beginning in 2010–2011, a graduate intern has aided in programming at Usdan, a significant addition in terms of mentoring the University Center Activities Board (UCAB) and Usdan Common Connections (UCC) programming teams as well as improving programming at Usdan.

xi In 2010–2011, the UCC took over the Welcome Week programming – provided lectures, movies, and music each night of the first week of classes, fall semester. Weekly programming – Each Thursday an event is held in the Café ranging from music to novelty programs, movies and ice cream parties. In addition, a classical musical series occurs each month on the first Tuesday. Held in Beckham Hall, the series is called “Lunchbox Serenata” and is co-sponsored with the Music Department.

xii Total student meals served for the fall 2010 semester: breakfast–9,566, lunch–63,946, and dinner–65,283

xiii The Usdan Café is an a la carte café featuring a variety of grab-and-go salads, sandwiches, coffees and specialty beverages. Usdan Marketplace is the primary dining location on campus, primarily serving underclass students but a good number of upperclass students utilize the space as well. Food stations around marketplace include Classics (pastas, main course meats, vegetables, etc.), a pizza station, the Mongolian grill, Vegan station, Kosher station, Halal station (limited options on occasion only), salad station, specialty station (wing night, taco night, etc.) dessert stations, and beverages. The marketplace also plays host to late night dining from 9:30 p.m. – 1 a.m. seven days a week and features salads and grill items as well as snacks and desserts. The Daniel Family Commons is open for lunch Monday through Friday and is a quiet gathering place for faculty and staff. Faculty and staff have also been encouraged to use a campus voucher program to bring one or two students with them to share a meal and conversation in a relaxed comfortable setting. This space is used for many programs including dinners, receptions, lectures, and musical performances in the evening. It is also a designated quiet study space during finals. The café seating area is also full throughout the weekday and provides a casual seating venue for faculty/staff and students to sit and talk over coffee. The area is also used for weekly performances by faculty and students.

Meals occur three times a day in the main dining room (Marketplace), Monday through Friday and twice a day each weekend day. Total student meals served for the fall 2010 semester: breakfast–9,566, lunch–63,946, dinner–65,283. Late night dining is also offered from 9:30 p.m. – 1 a.m., lunch in the Daniel Family Commons occurs Monday through Friday from 11:30 a.m. – 1:30 p.m., and the first floor café provides grab and go snacks, breakfast, and lunch foods as well as soft drinks, waters, and coffee from 8 a.m. – 8 p.m.

- xiv The number of students with disabilities requesting services is expected to grow – especially in the areas of psychological and chronic medical conditions, autism spectrum, and traumatic brain injury. Technological advances may increase accessibility for online materials and may help Wesleyan meet the needs of these students.
- xv To properly serve this population on an on-going basis, the WCC is looking for new personnel resources. A shared position with Graduate Career Services could provide support for graduate students and augment the current career center staff with a professional possessing expertise in science and technology and the graduate school admission process.
- xvi Over the past six years, athletes (roughly 21% of the student population in a given year) have accounted for some 45% of academic violations and 31% of non-academic violations.
- xvii Turnout at general information sessions, however, has been a bit disappointing, and even those sessions addressed to specific groups (science majors, students of color, financial aid recipients, those interested in Francophone countries) often don't yield the hoped-for audience.
- xviii As we are only in our third year of the QuestBridge program, we have not assessed impact on graduation rates, however, we have seen a high persistence rate among the three cohorts. They are participating actively in on-campus activities, volunteerism, and pre-graduate fellowship programs such as McNair and Mellon Mayes.
- xix The log was established in 2007 as a collaborative effort between the Wesleyan Student Assembly (WSA) Student Life Committee and the Office of Student Affairs/Deans' Office. Since 2006–07, 97 incidents have been posted to the log, an average of 20 per academic year with 2007–08 posting 32 incidents and only 6 during the 2011–12 academic year.
- xx In order to improve graduate students' transition to Wesleyan and Middletown, an orientation planning committee expects a new orientation program to be in place by 2012 that will identify opportunities for participants to learn about the physical surroundings (campus and town), learn practical living advice (especially for international students), hear important academic information, and meet other members of the graduate community through social activities. The Office will work with Residential Life, Physical Plant, and the Housing Committee of the Graduate Student Association (GSA) to assess the current housing stock available to graduate students, work through other housing issues, and improve communication. The Office of Graduate Student Services has partnered with the Wesleyan Career Center, which does not have a dedicated career counselor for graduate students, and it has partnered with the GSA to organize a one-day Graduate Career Symposium that will provide career advice, practical information on how to conduct a job search, and networking opportunities. In addition, the Office is working with the GSA to build community by identifying common spaces, planning social events, and improving the graduate student services website to facilitate better communication among the students.

When Wesleyan completed construction of the Fauver residences, undergraduate students who were living in private housing near campus moved back to university housing, leaving a large stock of desirable non-university housing available for graduate students. This caused a decrease in the demand for Wesleyan-owned graduate housing. The Graduate Housing Committee, made up of staff of Residential Life, Physical Plant, members of the Graduate Student Association (GSA), and the Office of Graduate Student Services, tracks the demand for graduate student housing and makes adjustments in the overall housing stock to meet the demand. Graduate housing stock has decreased from 130 to 105 units in recent years to adjust for the lessened demand.

The Office of Graduate Student Services has partnered with the GSA and the Wesleyan Career Center, which does not have a dedicated career counselor for graduate students, to organize a one-day Graduate Career Symposium that will provide career advice, practical information on how to conduct a job search, and networking opportunities. In addition, the Office is working with the GSA to build community by identifying common spaces, planning social events, and improving the graduate student services website to facilitate better communication among the students.

- xxi Wesleyan is a leader in diversity issues in other places around campus and we would like to see that leadership extend to our graduate student population as well. We are working on the creation of fellowships particularly aimed at students from underrepresented minorities within the sciences that could attract more applicants from this group and create a focus of our program towards the needs of those groups. There is considerable national attention to this need and hopefully we can obtain some external funding to support this.

We are also working towards creating a better “pipeline” for bringing underrepresented populations and first generation college students to advanced degrees (MA and Ph.D.) both in the sciences and in other areas. The current BA/MA program does not include a stipend for fifth year students and so is often an impossible financial burden for many first-generation college and underrepresented minority students. One idea is to create fellowships specifically for these students that would pay them a regular graduate stipend (~\$25K per year) to obtain a MA degree at Wesleyan. This would give them the additional course work and research experience they may need to obtain admission to the best Ph.D. programs in the country.

**Standard 7: Library and Other Information Resources
(Information Technology)**

?

3 years prior 2 years prior Last year Current year (goal or projection) Next year goal
(FY 2009) (FY 2010) (FY 2011) (FY 2012) (FY 2013)

Number (percent) of students with own computers

--	--	--	--	--

Course management system

Moodle 1.9

Number of classes using the system					
Classes on the main campus	unknown	728	770	790	800
Classes offered off-campus	0	0	0	0	0
Distance education courses	0	0	0	0	5

Bandwidth

On-campus network

100 MBPS	100 MBPS	100 MBPS	100 MBPS	1 GB
----------	----------	----------	----------	------

Off-campus access					
commodity internet (Mbps)	100 MBPS	150 MBPS	150 MBPS	1GB	1GB
high-performance networks (Mbps)	100 MBPS	150 MBPS	150 MBPS	100 MBPS	100 MBPS
Wireless protocol(s)	a/b/g	a/b/g	a/b/g	a/b/g/n	a/b/g/n

Network

Percent of residence halls connected to network					
wired	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
wireless	75%	85%	100%	100%	100%

Percent of classrooms connected to network					
wired	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
wireless	60%	75%	90%	100%	100%
Public wireless ports	0	0	0	0	0

Multimedia classrooms (percent)

Main campus	47%	47%	50%	52%	52%
Branches and locations					

IT Personnel (FTE)

Main campus	46.6	48.6	49.6	52.6	52.6
Branch campuses					
Dedicated to distance learning	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Software systems and versions

Students	Peoplesoft 8.9
Finances	Peoplesoft 8.9
Human Resources	Peoplesoft 9.0
Advancement	Millenium 7.9
Library	
website management	Cascade 6.7.2
portfolio management	Vastardis, PerTrac 7.2
interactive video conferencing	Tandberg Edge 95MXP (9.1.1), C20 (4.1.2)
digital object management	Media DB (homegrown), EmbARK 8.0

**Standard 7: Library and Other Information Resources
(Information Technology)**

?

3 years prior 2 years prior Last year Current year (goal or projection) Next year goal
(FY 2009) (FY 2010) (FY 2011) (FY 2012) (FY 2013)

Number (percent) of students with own computers

--	--	--	--	--

Course management system

Moodle 1.9

Number of classes using the system					
Classes on the main campus	unknown	728	770	790	800
Classes offered off-campus	0	0	0	0	0
Distance education courses	0	0	0	0	5

Bandwidth

On-campus network

100 MBPS	100 MBPS	100 MBPS	100 MBPS	1 GB
----------	----------	----------	----------	------

Off-campus access

commodity internet (Mbps)	100 MBPS	150 MBPS	150 MBPS	1GB	1GB
high-performance networks (Mbps)	100 MBPS	150 MBPS	150 MBPS	100 MBPS	100 MBPS
Wireless protocol(s)	a/b/g	a/b/g	a/b/g	a/b/g/n	a/b/g/n

Network

Percent of residence halls connected to network					
wired	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
wireless	75%	85%	100%	100%	100%

Percent of classrooms connected to network					
wired	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
wireless	60%	75%	90%	100%	100%

Public wireless ports	0	0	0	0	0
-----------------------	---	---	---	---	---

Multimedia classrooms (percent)

Main campus	47%	47%	50%	52%	52%
Branches and locations					

IT Personnel (FTE)

Main campus	46.6	48.6	49.6	52.6	52.6
Branch campuses					
Dedicated to distance learning	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Software systems and versions

Students	Peoplesoft 8.9
Finances	Peoplesoft 8.9
Human Resources	Peoplesoft 9.0
Advancement	Millenium 7.9
Library	
website management	Cascade 6.7.2
portfolio management	Vastardis, PerTrac 7.2
interactive video conferencing	Tandberg Edge 95MXP (9.1.1), C20 (4.1.2)
digital object management	Media DB (homegrown), EmbARK 8.0

Standard Seven: Library and Other Information Resources

Description

Library

Wesleyan University Library consists of three facilities: Olin Memorial Library, the Science Library, and the Art Library. Olin Memorial Library was built in 1928 and underwent its most recent expansion in 1986. It contains collections in the social sciences and humanities, as well as Special Collections & Archives and the World Music Archives. The library has been a federal government depository since 1906 and currently receives 30% of the government documents produced in print. Many library functions such as Interlibrary Loan, Acquisitions, and Cataloging are centralized in Olin.

The Science Library is in the Exley Science Center, built in 1970. It contains collections in the sciences and the University's DVD/video collection. Compact shelving holds bound journals in the sciences, older monographs classified using the Cutter classification system, and closed storage for Special Collections & Archives. The Art Library is in the Davison Art Center and contains the most-used books in art and architectural history, photography, and studio arts. It also provides reserve materials for many courses in Art & Art History. The Art Library has been at capacity for 20 years—approximately 1,000 volumes are transferred to Olin each year to create room for new books.

The library has extraordinarily broad and deep collections of monographs and periodicals for a liberal arts university of Wesleyan's size. In the past ten years the number of library journal and database subscriptions has increased over 300%, from 3,483 to 10,883. Of these, 89% are electronic and include new kinds of material such as images and data sets.

The library has an expanding virtual presence that provides access to a variety of electronic resources and library services. Links to these and other information are available through the library's [web site](#). The online library catalog, Caleb, is no longer the only portal through which to access library resources. Links to electronic databases and indexes are provided through an open-source application implemented in 2009; the coordination of print and online journal holdings is through Serials Solutions. Most of the library's electronic resources are available to the Wesleyan community from off-campus through an EZ proxy server. Reference services are available in person, via phone, email, and Meebo chat.

The CTW Consortium – consisting of the libraries of Connecticut College, Trinity College, and Wesleyan University – have shared physical collections and an online catalog system for over two decades. In recent years CTW has negotiated shared licenses for a number of online applications and resources. CTW has also explored how best to coordinate the building of the libraries' combined print and electronic collections. As part of a recently completed Andrew W. Mellon grant project, CTW implemented a successful consortial electronic book purchase-on-demand program, which the libraries are now funding from their acquisition budgets.

Within Wesleyan, the library and ITS have worked together on a number of projects: most notably the implementation and development of Wesleyan's Digital Commons institutional repository, WesScholar; joint conversations with faculty on their experiences with ITS and the library; and the implementation of the MISO survey to gauge student and faculty satisfaction with information technology and library services.

Information Technology Services

The mission of Information Technology Services (ITS) is to support the Wesleyan community in its use of information technology for teaching, research, and administration. To this end, ITS partners with nearly every administrative and academic department on campus, providing and supporting core infrastructure – the network, desktop and mobile computer systems, servers, databases, printing, and facilities. ITS provides expertise in planning, developing, building, and maintaining new web-based services and websites – as well as user training and best practices advice on

all aspects of computing. Also, ITS advises academic units on WesScholar, the planning and support of computing and computational services for research and instruction activities, the planning and installation of computing labs and media-rich classrooms, and general user training and desktop support. The ePortfolio system, which provides web access to a large array of services for faculty, students, and staff, exemplifies the broad scope of ITS collaborations.

ITS is divided into five subunits, each with its own director: Academic Computing Services, Administrative Systems, Auxiliary Services, New Media Lab, and User and Technical Support Services.

Academic Computing Services staff oversee instructional and research support, computing and digital media resources in classrooms and computing labs across campus, and multi-media support for special events. Also, faculty and staff receive support on Mac and PC from Desktop Support Services, which works in conjunction with Academic Computing to provide a full spectrum of hardware and applications support.

The Academic Computing Managers (ACMs) serve as faculty liaisons and are housed in proximity to the academic division they support, although actual department and program-level responsibilities sometimes cut across divisional boundaries. For the most part, ACMs are generalists and provide similar services to each of their assigned divisions, most importantly just-in-time software training for faculty on nearly any sort of general or pedagogically-oriented computing topics, including Microsoft Office, Moodle, Turningpoint, digital media tools, Google Apps, and the use of new web-based presentation, bibliographic/reference management, and social networking platforms. Depending on the skills of individual ACMs, they may also provide support with statistical or computational software. The ACMs visit faculty offices to train them on their own computers, and provide the same support to academic department administrative assistants, graduate students, and other academic staff. More specialized computing support is offered by the High-Performance Computing Cluster administrator in ITS and by tutors and support staff of the Language Resource Center, Quantitative Analysis Center, and Scientific Computing and Informatics Center, which all report to Academic Affairs, but work closely with ITS.

Administrative Systemsⁱ works with offices across campus to support the processing and data needs of the University. Administrative Systems supports PeopleSoft Human Resources, Payroll, Benefits, Student and Financial Systems, PowerFunds Financial Aid, Millennium Fundraising, iModules on-line community, Events Management System (EMS), Web Calendar, Blackboard OneCard, as well as a number of smaller systems. Additionally, Administrative Systems has partnered with campus offices to write applications to support student/faculty self-service (course registration, drop/add, major declaration and certification, curriculum development, grade entry, international study applications), employee self-service (benefits open enrollment, compensation management, goal setting and performance reviews) and outreach to prospective students and alumni. Database services, data warehousing, and reporting are supported by Administrative Systems.

Auxiliary Servicesⁱⁱ maintains a repair center for the University's fleet of computing hardware and printers. Wesleyan uses a self-maintainer model and is reimbursed for warranty repair on covered hardware. Out-of-warranty equipment is also repaired in house, avoiding the need to outsource service requests. Students, faculty, and staff also have access to the repair center on a time and material cost-basis. Most campus technology purchases are made through Auxiliary Services' Technology Store. The Technology Store, located in the Usdan University Center, has 1,800 square feet of retail space. Also in the Usdan University Center is Cardinal Print and Copy, a full-service electronic print shop. High-speed color copiers and large format printers are available to support the printing needs of the campus.

Wesleyan Station, the campus postal service, is also under Auxiliary Services. It is housed in the Usdan University Center and handles all package and mail distribution for the campus and campus telecommunications.

The members of the New Media Labⁱⁱⁱ web group and video staff support many administrative, academic, and student-generated projects. NML staff attempt to stay ahead of the ever-changing digital media landscape as they assist faculty, staff, and students with trouble-shooting and questions regarding digital media. The video staff often provides instruction for camera and camcorder use, tapeless video cameras (SD/flash drives), equipment purchase

recommendations, and instruction on how to transfer and format footage to computers for viewing, editing, and distribution. This web and interactive media support is expanding to assist with the use of social media as well, including troubleshooting issues with Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, iTunes, rss feeds, and Wordpress blogs.

Technical and User Services, formerly under two different directors, is now combined into one unit with a single director, but continues to be divided into two groups along the lines of the former organizational structure. The Technology Support Services (TSS) staff maintains all of the equipment and provides support to the other divisions of ITS that run volumes of applications handling all aspects of the University, both scholarly and operational. Enterprise systems such as ERP (Enterprise Resource Planning), email, file and print services, collaboration tools, course management, and web publishing all run from the data center. Staff are on call to support these systems 24/7.

The Windows System Group, Unix Systems Group, Operations, Network Administration, and Data Center operations are all part of TSS, which is the foundation for ITS operations. Additionally, the Unix Systems Group maintains the operation of a High Performance Computing Cluster (HPCC).

The acquisition of the shared high performance computing facilities was funded by two NSF Major Research Infrastructure awards, the first in 2006 for \$190,000, and a second in 2010 for \$298,736. Additional University support is provided in the form of systems administration, software acquisition and support, and routine maintenance. An advisory committee handles policies and procedures related to use of the HPCC.^{iv} The HPCC user base is primarily Physics, Math, Chemistry, Biology, and Bioinformatics, but use is expanding to such social sciences as Sociology and Economics.

Students with some expertise in IT manage and staff the HelpDesk, open 58 hours/week to provide both hardware and software support to the student population. This group of students is also helpful to ITS in terms of testing and vetting system changes and announcements.

Consultation for ITS is provided by several different sets of campus constituents. Divisional computing committees collect faculty and staff input on academic computing issues and initiatives in each division. The Academic Technology Advisory Committee (composed of faculty, library staff, Academic Affairs, and ITS) provides guidance on larger initiatives such as budget cuts, the recent course management system migration, academic website redesign and planning, and the implementation of WesScholar. The Wesleyan Student Assembly has a standing ITS advisory committee that meets at least twice a semester.

Appraisal

Library

COLLECTIONS: As libraries purchase fewer resources and subscribe to more, the size of the library's collections is becoming less important than the amount of use they receive. For the past several years the circulation of print materials has gradually declined (down 25% between 2005 and 2010). The use of electronic resources, not surprisingly, is almost twice that of print circulation, and has shown a steady increase over the past several years (an 18% increase for electronic reserves from 2005–2010, and a 13% increase in the use of major electronic journal packages). In many subject areas^v electronic reference works and journals are as usable (and more accessible) than their print counterparts, and students and faculty generally prefer the electronic version. The library now subscribes to the electronic version of journals whenever possible and has weeded several thousand volumes of bound journals for which there are now electronic alternatives.

It will take several years for academic e-books, however, to become as usable and accessible as electronic databases and journals are now. Today the library provides access to such e-texts as Early English Books Online (EEBO), Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO), ebrary, Springer e-books, and others. Wesleyan

continues to explore the consortial purchase of e-books with our CTW partners, including alternative models such as purchase-on-demand and short-term loans.^{vi}

The library's holdings (print and electronic) have increased substantially over the past ten years, but the number of easily discoverable resources that the library does not own – journals, databases, images, video, and audio – has increased exponentially in that same period. This is reflected in the library's interlibrary loan (ILL) statistics. In the past 10 years the number of ILL items received has increased 181%: from 6,095 in 2000 to 11,054 in 2010. Much of that increase occurred in the first five years; in 2004–2005 the number of ILL items peaked at 13,771 (including books, dvds, and articles). The library uses a variety of systems to satisfy ILL requests and has successfully done so over the past ten years without an increase in staff.

Microfilm and fiche are still the only formats available for some newspapers and primary source material. There are also many video and sound recordings that are available only in a physical format such as DVD or CD. The library continues to maintain equipment so that these materials can be used, but it is increasingly difficult to find technicians to do repairs and sources for replacement parts.

The library has added extensive resources for many new areas of teaching at Wesleyan such as Middle Eastern Studies and the College of the Environment. ITS and the library worked together to provide a stand-alone workstation at Cheshire Correctional Institution for off-line access to the library's catalog and JSTOR index. These are used by inmates enrolled in Wesleyan's Center for Prison Education program.

Library selectors have worked to balance the needs of new and existing programs while staying at or under budget. In 2007 the library conducted a serials cancellation review, relying heavily on usage data to determine which electronic resources might be cancelled, and cutting to a minimum the number of journals received both in print and electronic form. The Collection Development Coordinator restructured monographic fund allocations based on circulation and expenditures over a five-year period, combined with publication data by classification provided by our primary monograph vendor. The library continues to review and cancel print subscriptions that duplicate electronic holdings when the electronic subscription is comparable in content and usability. Our Acquisitions & Electronic Resources Librarian has saved the library tens of thousands of dollars in recent years by comparing consortial deals for expensive packages and by tough negotiating with vendors.

Great progress has been made in expanding access to Wesleyan's "hidden collections" (materials that have not yet been described or categorized in an online catalog or database). Catalog records have been added for individual items in large sets, Special Collections & Archives collections (such as the Nathan Comfort Starr Collection of Arthuriana) have been cataloged, and more than 100 online finding aids for archival collections have been added using Encoded Archival Description. Scores & Recordings and Cataloging staff have worked together to streamline the cataloging of unique recordings in the World Music Archives. There is much work still to be done to make Wesleyan's hidden collections accessible, however, and both Special Collections & Archives and the World Music Archives are pursuing grants and gifts to catalog and make accessible specific collections of rare material.

STAFF AND ORGANIZATION: The library has continued to adjust its staff and organization to meet new opportunities and challenges, and is working now to create internal processes that make these self-assessments a normal part of its operation. In 2007, as a result of an internal review by library consultants from R2 Consulting, the library decided to convert the vacant position of Collection Development Librarian into a Systems/Discovery Librarian who could identify, adapt, and install library applications to improve library services and access to resources. Collection development functions were distributed among the librarians, and although this has been not been entirely successful, the implementation of new and improved library applications by the Systems/Discovery Librarian has been of tremendous benefit to Wesleyan students and faculty.

In response to the global economic crisis in 2008, Wesleyan implemented early retirement programs that resulted in the library losing two librarian positions (out of 17) and 3.5 FTE bargaining unit positions (out of 20). Librarians and library staff worked together to determine how to reorganize and redistribute responsibilities while

minimizing the effect on library services. In fact, the alignment of librarians' selection responsibilities with the academic departments with whom they liaise actually improved communication with faculty. Although this reorganization was difficult at times and created strain in some library departments, it has on the whole been successful.

SYSTEMS AND SERVICES: The library's extensive and effective programs of Personal Research Sessions (one-on-one appointments in which a student meets with a librarian for research guidance) and class instruction continue to grow; challenges brought on by these programs include the sheer volume of requests, especially in some disciplines, and the need to develop some form of assessment to measure the effectiveness of instruction. In March 2005, the faculty added "information literacy" to the list of essential capabilities for Wesleyan students. Librarians work closely with faculty to design and support instruction that includes information literacy. Many of the FYI (First Year Initiative) courses for Wesleyan first-year students now include library instruction and assignments that draw on library holdings and build information literacy skills.

Wesleyan undergraduate theses from 2008 to the present are currently available electronically via WesScholar, as are some faculty publications and profiles. A library-ITS committee was created in 2011 to explore the further development of this system. In 2011 the library began systematically archiving instances of the University's web presence using Archive-It, a service provided by the Internet Archive. However, archiving other types of electronic documents continues to pose a serious challenge: at this point the library does not yet have a mechanism to ensure historical continuity for the University's data sets, electronic archival records, or faculty data.

The library has begun using a variety of systems both to manage internal processes and to provide services to patrons. The library participates in LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keeps Stuff Safe), in which instances of many electronic resources are archived as insurance against a vendor failure or other situation in which a resource is no longer available. In 2011, the library contracted with the Internet Archive to use Archive-It to systematically archive instances of Wesleyan's web site. In 2008, the library began using LibGuides to produce online finding aids and research guides. In 2008, the CTW Consortium outsourced the hosting of the library's online catalogs to ExLibris, having determined that ExLibris hosting would be more efficient and cost-effective than local hosting.

In 2009, the library used ethnographic techniques to determine how students navigate the library's website and those of other academic libraries. The findings were used to design a new library website that better met the needs of our undergraduates. Although this website design was replaced in 2011 by a new design that conformed to the University's new template, the new library design was heavily influenced by the findings of ethnographic study.

SPACE: In the past several years the library has installed compact shelving in the Science Library, weeded many print volumes of journals available in JSTOR, culled multiple copies of books, and reduced the Olin reference collection by half. With budget reductions and the growing availability of books in electronic format, the library now adds about 13,000 print books a year as opposed to 17,000 ten years ago. Nevertheless, space for the library's physical collections continues to be a challenge, and a major weeding project is underway that will reduce the monograph collection by 60,000 volumes.

Many faculty, however, have expressed concern about the prospect of weeding books and how it might affect the library's ability to support the wide-ranging work of students and faculty. This concern has sparked a campus-wide discussion of the role of the library, the changing nature of collections, and the future of academic and creative work at Wesleyan. The library has used its [project blog](#), the faculty forum email list, and conversations with individual faculty members and students to conduct this discussion, which continued through the spring of 2012. A newly reconstituted Library Faculty Advisory Committee now provides advice on how to work with faculty on library-specific projects.

The weeding project will make possible the incorporation into Olin of the Art Library in 2014, which will reunite the art collections in one place and provide appropriate working spaces for students and faculty using art materials.

In 2005 the library, ITS, and the Student Academic Resources Network (SARN) opened the Information Commons, an innovative study space and help center adjacent to the Olin Library reference desk. Originally intended to be a “one-stop shop” to help students with their academic support needs, the Info Commons has become a place for technology and research assistance, with a convenient and popular study space. There is a satellite office for peer writing tutors near the Info Commons that is very popular as well.

The library’s Conservation Lab, renovated and enlarged in 2009, repairs, conserves, and preserves Wesleyan’s physical collections. The Conservator of Collections is internationally known and has recently conducted workshops in Nigeria on preserving Islamic manuscripts using materials available locally. In the lab, she selects and carefully trains the students working with her, and several have gone on to internships at the Smithsonian and elsewhere.

Information Technology Services

Technological advancement outpaces the ability of most organizations to adapt and upgrade their infrastructure in line with changes in the consumer environment. The pressure to be innovative is tremendous, and our response can have an impact on how prospective students view Wesleyan. The key to success is identifying those changes that are likely to be long lasting and sustained while not getting distracted by fad technologies that might divert resources unnecessarily. Leadership is also a pending issue. The process of considering integration of ITS and the Library kept ITS from having a full-time director for two years; new leadership is needed to make decisive changes as technology moves forward.

Many new instructional technologies have been adopted since the 2007 self-study. Echo360, a classroom lecture recording system, has been installed in four classrooms, and the Turningpoint personal response system (i.e., clickers) is also available for use.

Echo360 was purchased in 2005 and has been used most heavily by large introductory science courses, but also by some language instructors and by instructors who wish to record a lecture outside of class time. Recordings of classes can be made available through Moodle shortly after class ends. Access to this system permits students to review course materials before exams and to revisit difficult concepts introduced or discussed in class. Echo 360 was introduced as part of a study of lecture recording (by several different means, not just Echo360) in which the Office of Institutional Research provided assessment and a final report on usage and its effects on student attendance. In this study, the positive learning outcomes outweighed concerns over decreased attendance.

The TurningPoint personal response system is available for use by any course on campus. Faculty can ask students to purchase a clicker for their course, or instead, for *ad hoc* use, borrow a set of clickers from ITS (ITS has two sets of 100 clickers). Clickers introduce an active component to lectures. Students use their clicker to “vote” for answers to multiple choice questions posed by the instructor, and summaries of the responses can be used to generate discussion, peer-tutoring, team-work, and the like, even in a large course such as introductory physics for non-majors (i.e., Physics for Future Presidents).

A more recent trend in instructional technology at Wesleyan is the pedagogical use of new media, such as digital storytelling and podcasting. Digital storytelling is the use of video and audio to produce rich narratives about a subject of interest, or as a form of reflection; podcasts are short recordings that can be presented together as a serial work on a specific subject matter. For example, in Iris Bork-Goldfield’s “German Culture Today” course, students create digital stories (narrated in German) to introduce the viewer to their hometowns. In his “Nationalism” course, Peter Rutland asked students to produce short video case studies of nations or regions not covered by the syllabus. He conveyed high expectations for the script writing and limited the videos to 10 minutes in length. The students praised the assignment and reported that they learned from each other’s work. Podcasting examples include Suzanne O’Connell’s “Science on the Radio” course, where students produce half-hour public science shows for the “Lens on the Earth” broadcast on WESU, the campus radio station. The students research a subject, write a script, then record and produce an episode. Similarly, Ishita Mukerji’s “Light

and Life” course produced podcasts in place of research reports, and these are also scheduled to be broadcast on WESU. Both digital storytelling and podcast assignments combine research, writing, performance, and reflection, and help students develop skills in public communication.

High-definition projectors have been installed in several classrooms heavily used by Art History courses. The improved quality of projected images has led most of the Art History faculty to begin adopting digital formats, moving away from their long-favored 35mm slides. This transition is far from complete, but there is enough confidence in the digital formats and display quality that the Art History faculty are backing a project to digitize their primary teaching slide collection. The Library and ITS are collaborating with the Art History slide library on this important transition.

The NML video staff digitized and/or edited approximately 200 video excerpts for 11 faculty members to be used as part of their class materials this year; however, this type of request has been on the decline over the past three years. Requests for large format printing and scanning, primarily for faculty projects and student poster sessions, have decreased over the past two years, perhaps as a result of easier access to digitizing tools and student and faculty use of more born-digital materials.

During the summer of 2010, ITS migrated the campus off Blackboard (an expensive, commercial course management system) to the free, open source platform Moodle, a much more flexible and efficient system. Students and faculty express satisfaction with the new platform, and it is now used in more than 50% of all courses, up more than 10% from Blackboard. Confluence wiki and WordPress blogging platforms previously used primarily by ITS are now used by some instructors for courses, registered student organizations, researchers, as well as academic and administrative departments for internal communication. WesFiles, introduced in 2008, is our Xythos file-sharing platform on which every campus user has a home directory, and it is used by many courses, departments, campus committees, and research labs. The Wesleyan Media Database, developed by ITS in collaboration with the Art & Art History Department and the Library, has proven to be a valuable repository for faculty to store and present digital images used in teaching. We continue to upgrade and improve this important system. ITS also collaborated with the Library on a recent study of student satisfaction with the iPad platform and electronic texts in courses.

A number of ITS initiatives have addressed cost-effective service. A large-scale shift to virtualization technologies, for instance, has reduced energy consumption. Data center virtualization, moreover, has changed the way ITS does business. Servers can be deployed rapidly, ITS can sustain an environment with multiple test and development servers while not increasing the cost of hardware, and eleventh-hour requests for dedicated servers can be accommodated in a matter of hours instead of days.

Modest progress has been achieved with desktop virtualization. The initial ambition to replace the majority of physical desktops with virtual ones has been modified. With desktop virtualization, of course, deployment is a key benefit: virtual desktops can be deployed in less than an hour. With our Citrix environment, users have greatly enhanced capabilities to access their desktop from anywhere off campus, a functionality we will be encouraging and advertising more in months to come.

The biggest successes have been with administrative staff and student employee computers. The thin client hardware has more than twice the life of a physical desktop and half the cost. Additionally, virtualization allows us to provide remotely executed desktops with specialty applications that may be OS specific or have license restrictions. We are now embarking on an environment that will allow students to launch virtual machines with software for which they would typically need to go to a physical lab.

Problems have arisen, however, when central storage configuration has not been sufficient to support the demands of virtualization. This has resulted in performance lags and systemic issues that have a direct impact on users, particularly with the introduction of virtual desktops. System administrators embarked on a complete storage redesign that has improved performance and allowed ITS to realize cost savings. The full redesign will not be complete until mid to late 2012.

Last year ITS made progress on one of its most visible challenges. Students expected the level of service that home broadband provided and were becoming increasingly frustrated with the campus service. Complicating the situation further, Wesleyan had been purchasing bandwidth entirely from the state network, CEN (known for its robust architecture, exceedingly high up time, and outstanding service), but the cost had become prohibitive. Bandwidth requirements reached a critical mass in 2009–2010. Wesleyan responded in two ways: leveraging the higher education network in Connecticut to put pressure on CEN to be more competitive and pursuing a commodity provider. Ultimately, both avenues proved fruitful as CEN dropped rates and Wesleyan was able to obtain a low-cost 1GB circuit from a commodity provider. As such, access to Internet2 and other institutions connected via CEN will continue uninterrupted. We now have adequate bandwidth likely to satisfy our student demands and academic needs for the next 2-3 years based on usage and rate of growth over the last year.

For several years, Wesleyan provided wireless access on an open unsecured connection relying solely on Network Access Control for authentication and registration. While this was convenient, as sniffing technologies became easier to access and use with less skill, the need for an encrypted network became increasingly apparent. During 2011, Wesleyan decommissioned the unencrypted wireless and migrated to a WPA2 Enterprise encrypted network for faculty, staff, and students as well as a low level WEP encrypted network for guests. Using 802.1X for authentication, ITS ensured that access was as seamless as possible while still protecting the users. Nearly all of the student population relies exclusively on wireless access. This is becoming increasingly true, though not nearly at the same rate, for faculty and staff who are using more mobile devices such as tablets and smart phones for business applications. Wesleyan has committed to improving wireless saturation in all academic buildings and residence halls.

The single greatest networking challenge for Technical Support Services is Wesleyan's housing environment, which includes approximately 150 single and multi-family homes within a two-mile radius of the central campus. Most of these homes lie outside the fiber perimeter of the campus. Running fiber to these building has been explored twice in the last decade, but the cost has been high and long-term viability of such an investment questionable at best. Wesleyan has instead relied on commercial providers for Internet access to these locations. The actual service from these providers, however, has ranged been marginal to poor, and this has necessitated ITS intervention and extensive support for what was supposed to be an outsourced service. Students are frequently inconvenienced and unhappy, but Wesleyan's ability to resolve the problem is limited. In the past six years, the network team has twice investigated other wireless solutions to address the issue, but the available technologies were inadequate. Wireless technologies have since advanced, however, and Wesleyan is once again looking to newer solutions to address these issues. The increase in Wesleyan's bandwidth should allow for easy absorption of these residences should the right technology be located.

Improving the user experience at Wesleyan is a focus. ITS prides itself on its decentralized support model—departments have an assigned desktop support specialist, and faculty have an assigned liaison—instead of a centralized help desk model. Users have very high expectations with regard to response time, and our ability to deliver more often than not only increases that expectation.^{vii}

The University's homegrown electronic portfolio is aging. Once a model portal environment, the ePortfolio needs evaluation to determine next steps. While the portfolio has served as the means for single-sign on for most services, newer protocols that allow for federation (authentication across multiple systems or organizations) are making this older means of entry less attractive.

One notable change is the proliferation of mobile devices. For several years, managing smartphone use by the Cabinet and other higher-level administrators presented hurdles for desktop support because the campus did not have a standard for models or platforms. Now, of course, the entire user population expects easy access from multiple devices, and this is presenting challenges within the constraints of a secure environment. In 2011, ITS developed the University's first mobile device application. The mobile version of the Wesleyan website launched on in October 2011, and additional mobile applications are being rolled out in 2012.

The Event Management System (EMS) is a relatively new service that gives faculty, staff, and students the ability to see room features and availability and to request rooms and performance spaces across campus. EMS is integrated with class schedules and the University Calendar. As part of the scheduling request, faculty, staff, and students can specify food, facilities, technical, and recording support. EMS allows us to fully utilize University spaces and coordinate support and event publicity.

The emergency communication system, BlackBoard Connect, allows Wesleyan to reach the campus community quickly in the event of an urgent emergency.

For management of the hiring process of faculty and staff, Wesleyan has adopted PeopleAdmin. Through PeopleAdmin, hiring managers and human resource recruiters can create and approve job posting, rate candidate applications, and easily distribute resumes and cover letters. Candidates can upload resumes/CV's, cover letters, and other supporting materials.

Financial Services has implemented the Wesleyan Financial System (WFS), a PeopleSoft/Oracle System that distributes fiscal responsibility to departments and office across campus. With its variety of modules, a sophisticated workflow infrastructure and paperless financial record keepers, the WFS implementation is a major step forward in maintaining the financial equilibrium of the University.

Initiatives undertaken by ITS have greatly improved Wesleyan's public presentation. At the end of 2008, Microsoft stopped supporting Microsoft FrontPage, the website editing system. In January 2009, the New Media Lab web team was charged with researching and implementing the website migration and redesign project, and staff ultimately selected Cascade by Hannon Hill as the new content management system. As of January 2012, more than 170 of the 270 University websites under the Wesleyan domain are in development or have been migrated to Cascade. Of the 270, 12 websites have been moved into University Relations's iModules content management system, which is a vendor-hosted solution.

In addition to the on-going redesign and migration process, NML continues to support day-to-day requests from University staff and faculty on Wordpress site setups, header designs, newsletters, and specialty website development, such as the Faculty Bookshelf, Video Aggregate, Faculty Syllabus, and Athletics video page.

The primary objective for the video production and post-production team within NML over the past two years has been to improve the visual (broadcast) quality and professionalism of Wesleyan video programming and to streamline the process of video production and distribution. This was accomplished by one-on-one training with student videographers and student video editors, improving the quality of production equipment (to HD), and streamlining compression and distribution process.^{viii}

For alumni outreach, Wesleyan has recently implemented WesConnect, an iModules-based online community. WesConnect features a Facebook tie-in, pre-defined and user-defined groups, and an alumni directory. In addition, University Relations will manage events through the WesConnect with the goal of integrating Wesleyan's online presence with events. Also in University Relations, a new business intelligence and dashboard tool, Visual Analyzer, has been implemented. It allows University Relations to analyze fundraising trends and establish goals as well as follow-up with individual parents and alumni.

Wesleyan students play an integral part in determining the direction of many of ITS's services. Students interact with ITS through employment in the student-run ITS HelpDesk, Instructional Media Services, and the New Media Lab, and also in an advisory capacity through the Wesleyan Student Assembly's ITS Advisory Committee.

The ITS HelpDesk provides testing and feedback for changes that affect student computing. Students on the HelpDesk are informed in advance of the general population and are often early adopters. Some specific examples include the Google Apps migration in January 2009 and the adoption of a new antivirus program and deployment for student use in 2010. These students receive more information about the state of technology and hear in detail many aspects of how the IT organization works, and this "give and take" of information contributes to a good working relationship.

Another important contribution by ITS student staff is the new Wespregame program. Broadcast prior to the live webcasting of sporting events, it features interviews with coaches and athletes, weekly highlights, and much more. Wespregame was created by ITS student staffers Mike Yoshida '13 and Lionel Nyange '12, both of whom work in Instructional Media Services and Special Events support. The program harnesses student videography skills and ITS resources to organize, shoot, produce, and broadcast its athletics material. The program was designed from the ground up to be not only an outlet for Wesleyan student creativity, but also to spread awareness of Wesleyan's athletics program and its athletes' achievements.

When the position of director of ITS became vacant in late 2009, Wesleyan decided to consider redefining the position, given the open question of more deeply integrating ITS and the library. In order to explore this question in depth, a search for a new director was put on hold, and the Vice President for Finance and Administration (who was ITS director here until 2005) added "interim ITS director" to his portfolio of duties. Many faculty were skeptical of the idea to hire a "chief information officer" who would supervise both ITS and the library. A concern was that academics would become a lower priority than technology in a merger of ITS and the library. An ad hoc committee of faculty, librarians, and ITS staff was formed to study the organization at other institutions and make recommendations for Wesleyan. That committee did not achieve consensus, and the primary outcome was to retain the existing organizational structure. The process demonstrates Wesleyan's approach to institutional effectiveness: We explored new ideas even through controversial; the community held broad, transparent discussions; and we invited multiple experts to offer divergent experiences from other institutions. Further discussion is underway to determine how to improve services in both the library and ITS.

Projection

Library

In the library, numerous projects have been undertaken to make the online catalog more complete and accurate. In 2014, after the weeding project is complete and the Art Library has been incorporated into Olin, a long-overdue inventory of the collections will be implemented to ensure that the online catalog accurately reflects the library's holdings. There are also some "hidden" collections not yet represented in the online catalog; these are being cataloged on an ongoing basis.

The library, which struggles with the high cost of scholarly journals, supports the open access movement. In the fall of 2011, the library began a campus discussion of open access issues that we hope will garner support among students and faculty for a formal open access resolution by the end of the 2012–13 academic year, in which the faculty will commit to publishing in open access journals whenever possible and to depositing their publications in WesScholar. The library and ITS will be exploring other ways to provide journal, conference, and other locally produced content via WesScholar.

As the library provides a greater number of resources than ever before in a greater variety of formats, it is becoming more and more difficult to organize these resources so they can be efficiently accessed and used. The library, in close collaboration with ITS, our CTW partners, and others, will continue to explore ways to make resources easy to find and use. CTW now finances link resolvers and similar software in addition to the online catalog. With the advent of an expanding number of library-specific applications, the CTW Future of the Catalog committee is looking into sharing the cost of applications such as a new catalog interface and web discovery tools, and will make a recommendation to the CTW library directors by the end of the 2011–12 academic year.

The library is experiencing a similar problem in organizing internal data on its thousands of electronic resources and has not yet implemented an electronic resource management system (ERM). But the increasing variety, complexity, and sheer number of electronic resources will soon make an ERM imperative. The library is beginning to evaluate systems with a view to acquiring and implementing an ERM by the end of 2014.

Information Technology Services

The University has aggressively begun developing a Student and Academic Affairs Data Warehouse. The goal of the data warehouses is to ensure clean data in our transactional systems and fuel data-driven decision-making, as well as to simplify and standardize official University reporting.

As there are no standing IT-oriented faculty committees, gaining full participation by faculty is often the biggest challenge for establishing a committee's influence. For example, Division I (Arts & Humanities) was at one time represented by two separate IT committees, one for Arts and one for Humanities, but there has been no Humanities committee for many years, although efforts are being made to reconstitute it. Improving faculty participation in ITS oversight is a priority.

Building up the collaborative relationship between ITS and the Library is an important goal for the coming years. To this end, Academic Computing and the Library have begun planning a new service "superstructure" and web presence on campus for support of digital research and scholarship, to be followed by a similar undertaking focused on teaching and learning. The new web presence for these services will exist outside the departmental websites for the Library and ITS and provide one-stop-shopping for information related to research, publishing, conference planning and hosting, teaching, and learning. Services and resources relevant for a particular activity will be presented together, even though individual services are still offered separately by ITS, the Library, and other offices like the Quantitative Analysis Center, the Scientific Computing and Informatics Center, Academic Affairs, and Events and Scheduling.

In an effort to help meet Wesleyan's increasing need to distribute content using mobile technologies, our web administrator and web developer will continue to evaluate mobile authoring tools and methods to allow for the maximum efficiencies of resources while meeting expectations of our user base.

One mobile app currently in development for Admission is a University walking tour devised specifically for mobile devices that will enable a user to walk around campus, identify buildings, streets, and landmarks through the device's GPS system. This project will serve as a springboard for other mobile apps and can be used as a basis for smaller, more targeted programs such as finding dorms or even classrooms.

In fall of 2012, we will begin a paperless Admission Office project, allowing admission deans to read applicant folders on-line. This will streamline the review process and alleviate the need to print and handle paper applications, saving both paper and support staff time. In the summer of 2013, the Deans, Financial Aid, and Registrar Offices will build on the paperless Admission Office project to create digital student folders that will follow students through their Wesleyan careers.

From 2011–2013, the switch infrastructure will be replaced with a new core that handles a much higher-rate backbone, likely 10GB. Wesleyan is attempting to stay ahead of the bandwidth demands that increased multimedia and two-way video brings. Additionally, Wesleyan is phasing in a Voice over IP solution. A new building opened in 2012 featuring a VoIP system that integrates with the University's current phone system. Eventually, the entire phone network will transition to VoIP.

Institutional Effectiveness

Library

Through conversations with faculty regarding their experiences with the library, through ethnographic study of the ways students navigate the library website, through the library's project blog and the faculty forum listserv, and through the library's ongoing internal process of self-assessment, the library maintains a dialog with its constituents about the effectiveness of its services. The "weeding" project is a particularly apt example of transparent discussion of a sensitive topic, leading to improved institutional effectiveness.

While the library continues to receive more than 95% approval ratings in Wesleyan's senior survey and collects extensive amounts of data about the uses of its collections, librarians are still exploring ways to effectively assess all aspects of the library's instruction program. The library is working with faculty and the academic deans to determine how to effectively and unobtrusively assess library instruction outcomes.

Information Technology Services

Evaluation of current and future needs led Wesleyan to substantially improve campus bandwidth and to provide campus-wide, secure wireless access. A realistic assessment of resources led the University to defer upgrading service to single and multi-family homes in the campus vicinity, though advances in wireless technology may provide a solution to this vexing problem. In collaboration with the Library, ITS will be participating in the 2012 MISO Survey, which will furnish quantitative assessment data on student, faculty, and staff— interest in resources, satisfaction with services, and suggestions for services not currently offered. Because feedback from users has historically been anecdotal in nature, provided through ITS staff and committees that meet too infrequently, the MISO Survey should enhance institutional effectiveness.

-
- ⁱ includes Analyst Programmers, a Human Resources Technical Specialist, Database Administrators, and a Director.
 - ⁱⁱ includes computer technicians, a retail store manager, a telephone technician, a central printing specialist, a mail room supervisor, and postal clerks all reporting to an associate director.
 - ⁱⁱⁱ includes a web administrator, web developer, graphic designers, a video post-producer, an imaging/video coordinator, and a video/animation specialist.
 - ^{iv} Three faculty, the HPCC system administrator, the Director of the Quantitative Analysis Center, and the Director of Academic Computing Services (ex officio), compose this committee.
 - ^v The exceptions are in disciplines in which high-resolution images are important – the graphics within electronic resources are not consistently of a quality to replace print versions.
 - ^{vi} E-book purchasing models and delivery systems continue to evolve rapidly, and a CTW Collections Group has been formed to assess this and other models of content delivery to ensure that the libraries provide students and faculty with the content they need in the most cost-effective way.
 - ^{vii} The shift to a four-year hardware replacement cycle was not well received when introduced in 2009, but the overall impact has been less than was originally anticipated. A combination of virtual desktops and terminal service clients in appropriate areas has reduced hardware expenditure and the need to support desktops aging beyond their useful life.
 - ^{viii} NML distributes and manages via Condor, iTunes U, YouTube, and web-based video. As of September 2011, 80% of the New Media Lab's video acquisition is now in High Definition format, which has resulted in a new challenge concerning video file storage and back up.

Standard 8: Physical and Technological Resources

Campus location	Serviceable Buildings		Assignable Square feet (000)	
main campus	311		1,503,370	
other U.S. locations	0		0	
international locations	0		0	

	2 years prior	1 year prior	Current Year	Next Year Goal	Goal in 2 years
	(FY 2010)	(FY 2011)	(FY 2012)	(FY 2013)	(FY 2014)
Revenue (\$000)					
Capital appropriations (public institutions)	\$15,555,000	15,542,000	\$17,786,000	\$18,449,000	\$18,993,000
Operating budget	\$2,814,000	1,453,000	\$900,000	\$900,000	\$900,000
Gifts and grants	\$0	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Debt	\$18,369,000	\$16,995,000	\$18,686,000	\$19,349,000	\$19,893,000
TOTAL					
Expenditures (\$000)					
New Construction	\$10,044	35,469	\$0	\$0	\$0
Renovations, maintenance and equipment	\$10,108,437	18,484,374	\$18,700,000	\$10,000,000	\$9,000,000
Technology	\$7,820,000	7,807,000	\$8,051,000	\$8,463,000	\$8,852,000
TOTAL	\$17,938,481	\$26,326,843	\$26,751,000	\$18,463,000	\$17,852,000

Assignable square feet (000)	Main campus		Off-campus	Total
classroom	100,144		0	100,144
laboratory	65,496		0	65,496
office	184,523		0	184,523
study	4,663		0	4,663
special	157,804		0	157,804
general	359,279		0	359,279
support	13,027		0	13,027
residential	333,969		0	333,969
other (Health Care)	9,053		0	9,053
other (Woodframe Houses)	275,412		0	275,412

Building name	Purposes	Assignable Square Feet (000)	Cost (000)		Year
Zelnick Link - Chapel/Theater	New Assembly Facility	755	\$ 5,828,194.00		2002-2005
Center for Film Studies Phase I	New Academic/Administrative Facility	10,694	\$ 5,935,097.36		2002-2004
Freeman Athletic Center Addition	New Athletic Facility	33,737	\$ 12,945,060.46		2003-2006
Fauver Field Housing	New Undergraduate Dormitories	48,821	\$ 19,917,610.41		2004-2007
East Asian Study Addition	New Academic/Administrative Facility	1,582	\$ 725,962.41		2006
Center for Film Studies Phase II	New Academic Facility	4,104	\$ 4,155,584.58		2007-2008
Usdan University Center	New Food Service/Administrative	31,220	\$ 43,157,394.78		2003-2009
Sr Student Housing-Phase I (25 Fountain/14 Warren)	New Undergraduate Housing	5,534	\$ 1,678,974.23		2005-2006
Sr. Student Housing-Phase II (20 Fountain)	New Undergraduate Housing	3,511	\$ 1,116,892.98		2006-2007
Sr Student House Phase III (19 Fountain/231 Pine)	New Undergraduate Housing	8,007	\$ 2,433,295.46		2008-2009
247 Pine-Schoenberg Dance Studio	New Academic Facility	2,049	\$ 832,102.15		2002-2003
Synthetic Turf Field	New Athletic Turf Field	n/a	\$ 1,429,872.52		2006-2007

Building name	Purposes	Assignable Square Feet	Cost (000)	Year
N/A	N/A	0	\$0	N/A

Building name	Purposes	Assignable Square Feet	Cost (000)		Year
Hall-Atwater Phas II	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a	\$ 1,372,567.85		2002-2003
Olin Lib HVAC	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a	\$ 1,477,802.56		2002
Classroom Renov 2001	Classroom Upgrades	4,500	\$ 1,001,579.15		2002
Classroom Renov 2002	Classroom Upgrades	4,200	\$ 780,141.49		2003
Butterfield Steamline	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a	\$ 632,011.54		2003
Downey House-Humanities	Academic/Administrative Upgrades	8,759	\$ 3,499,535.45		2004-2005
Hall Atwater Ph III	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a	\$ 596,314.55		2004
Chiller	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a	\$ 794,566.28		2003-2004
Campus Masterplan	Design Services	n/a	\$ 275,403.56		2003
Science Programming	Design Services	n/a	\$ 270,259.39		2004
Classroom Phase V	Classroom Upgrades	7,500	\$ 1,223,430.06		2004
Phase I Parking Lots	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a	\$ 1,017,677.80		2004
College Row Landscaping	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a	\$ 394,123.96		2004-2005
Lot E Expansion-57	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a	\$ 440,152.00		2004-2005
Long Lane Demolition / Reno.	Facility Administrative Upgrade	11,124	\$ 3,190,362.21		2004-2006
Teaching Museum	Design Services	n/a	\$ 665,424.56		2004-2005
Classroom Phs VI	Classroom Upgrades	4,700	\$ 706,249.77		2004-2005
AC Housing & Office	Housing Upgrade	4,172	\$ 166,563.67		2005
Library Compact Strg	Library Upgrades	16,183	\$ 2,248,849.22		2005-2007
CFA Bldg. L-Art Workshops	Academic/Administrative Upgrades	4,089	\$ 373,808.72		2005-2006
Building I, ITS	ITS Academic/Administrative Upgrades	n/a	\$ 144,204.36		2005
High Rise AC Apt	Housing Upgrade	904	\$ 111,587.02		2006
5 Vine Renovation	Woodframe Renovation	1,264	\$ 145,560.00		2006
Vine St Negotiations	Electrical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a	\$ 2,720,645.78		2007-2009
Foss Hill Life Safety	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	79,606	\$ 6,930,148.68		2006-2007
285 Court St Renovation	Academic/Administrative Upgrades	3,118	\$ 982,496.67		2007
Undergrad Fire/Sprinkler	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	n/a	\$ 2,708,743.71		2006-2009
Molecular Life Science	Design Services	n/a	\$ 3,709,954.64		2007-2009
Chapel-Restoration	Assembly Space Renovation	4,852	\$ 7,942,041.05		2002-2005
92 Theater Renovation	Assembly Space Renovation	4,160	\$ 6,411,692.48		2002-2005
73 Pearl Renovation	Woodframe Renovation	1,632	\$ 160,990.12		2002
Shanklin 260-Renovation	Lab Renovation	430	\$ 184,231.59		2002
HLAtwtr-5 Labs	Lab Renovation	1,750	\$ 254,161.61		2003
Relocation Of House	House Relocation	2,170	\$ 437,757.73		2003
Russell House - ADA Ramp	ADA Accessibility Upgrade	n/a	\$ 196,143.35		2004
167 High Create Space	Administrative Upgrades	1,340	\$ 410,420.03		2004
Shanklin 203 & Greenhouse	Lab Renovation	2,430	\$ 165,253.46		2004
Chernoff Renovations	Lab Renovation	1,162	\$ 118,888.24		2004

		2 years prior	1 year prior	Current Year (Projected)	Next Year Goal	Goal in 2 years
Butterfield ADA Ramp	ADA Accessibility Upgrade			n/a	\$ 104,133.76	2004
Summerfld ADA Ramp	ADA Accessibility Upgrade			n/a	\$ 113,075.37	2004
51 Lawn Ave/Wasch Ct	Administrative Upgrades	2,488			\$ 1,205,259.20	2005-2006
Flory Lab Hall Atwater	Lab Renovation	1,043			\$ 265,808.18	2005-2006
CAAS & DAC ADA Ramps	ADA Accessibility Upgrade	n/a			\$ 328,495.69	2006
164 Mt Vernon Reno	Administrative Upgrades	1,693			\$ 167,012.08	2006
Gloster Lab Renovation	Lab Renovation	1,136			\$ 244,633.50	2006
N.College ADA West Entrance	ADA Accessibility Upgrade	n/a			\$ 169,998.15	2008
ITS Expansion - SC516	Data Center Expansion	733			\$ 109,542.27	2007
CFA P-Theater lighting	Lighting Upgrades	9,553			\$ 112,408.75	2007
Judd Hall 5th Flr	Administrative Upgrades	784			\$ 243,947.00	2007
74 Wyllys Reno	Administrative Upgrades	1,210			\$ 448,707.20	2007
CPP Cogeneration	Mechanical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a			\$ 4,391,610.56	2007-2009
Hall Atwtr 171/175B	Lab Renovation	1,801			\$ 133,605.38	2007
Weshop Reno-Bon Appetite	Convenience Store Renovation	2,128			\$ 152,365.28	2008
Judd Rms 314&410 Ren	Lab Renovation	1,631			\$ 288,698.96	2008
Sofball Field Relocation	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a			\$ 163,717.05	2008
Univ Ctr Landscaping	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a			\$ 3,109,544.55	2008
University Center Loading Dock	New Food Service/Administrative	n/a			\$ 1,155,000.00	2008
CL&P Comp 07	Electrical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 2,028,821.62	2008-2009
Allbritton Reno Four Levels	Academic/Administrative Upgrades	12,676			\$ 6,652,975.35	2008-2010
Security Camera Ph I	Campus Security Upgrades	n/a			\$ 122,144.40	2008
ST Lab Renovation	Computer Lab Renovation	1,312			\$ 142,627.04	2009
Long Ln Remediation	Site Environmental Remediation	n/a			\$ 4,446,978.76	2009
All-Annual ERI Charge	Loan Payment	n/a			\$ 217,000.00	2002
HAtwtr Renov. Phase I of III	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 210,844.49	2002
CFA-Life Safety Upgrade	Life Safety Upgrades	n/a			\$ 303,662.45	2002
Annual Roof Replacement 01/02	Roof Replacement	n/a			\$ 278,694.18	2002
MM01/02: Butterfield A	Life Safety-Fire Sprinkler	24,711			\$ 665,027.02	2002
MM01/02: CFA Cinema	Academic Upgrades	3,050			\$ 109,061.80	2002
MM01/02: Foss Hall 5-7	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	30,129			\$ 225,750.01	2002
MM01/02: WillStreet	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a			\$ 393,298.44	2002
MM01/02: Mcconaughey	Food Service Upgrades	20,645			\$ 107,243.40	2002
MM01/02: Intown 13-16	Apartment Housing Upgrades	5,500			\$ 283,540.83	2002
MM01/02: Campus Site Wrk	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a			\$ 189,648.33	2002
MM01/02: PAC-Interior - Office Reno, 2nd, 3rd, 4th Fl	Academic/Administrative Upgrades	14,765			\$ 360,480.55	2002
MM01/02: CPP/Infrastructure	Mechanical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a			\$ 324,365.04	2002-2003
MM01/02: 190 High	Administrative Upgrades	2,280			\$ 149,711.90	2002
MM01/02: FAC- Hockey Rink/Pool Controls Upgrade	Athletic Facility Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 166,200.00	2002
Dormitory Furniture	New Dormitory Furniture Upgrades	n/a			\$ 119,269.00	2002
MM01/02: North College-Windows	Administrative Window Upgrades	19,127			\$ 199,681.77	2002
Undergraduate Upgrades	Undergraduate Woodframe Upgrades	n/a			\$ 187,410.51	2002
MM02-03: 200 Church Sprinkler	Life Safety-Fire Sprinkler	n/a			\$ 252,532.00	2003
MM02-03: ACM Abatement, Rental Properties	Environmental Remediation	n/a			\$ 160,754.00	2003
MM02-03: Esley AHU Rebuild	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 146,945.00	2003
MM02-03: 200 Church, Elec./FA Upgrades	Life Safety-Fire Alarm	n/a			\$ 180,160.00	2003
MM02-03: Rental Properties, Rumberger Contract	Rental Properties Maintenance	n/a			\$ 274,999.00	2003
MM02-03: CFA Complex, FA Install	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	n/a			\$ 175,106.00	2003
MM02-03: CPP/Butterfield, Steamline	Mechanical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a			\$ 670,690.00	2003
MM02-03: Lowrise E Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	5,857			\$ 133,766.00	2003
MM02-03: 240 Court St., Reno	Undergraduate Woodframe Upgrades	3,380			\$ 126,899.00	2003
MM02-03: N. College, FCU Repl. 3rd & 4th Floors	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 100,590.00	2003
MM02-03: 77 Pearl, UR Ext Reno	Administrative Upgrades	n/a			\$ 139,486.00	2003
MM02-03: 281 High - Carpentry Reno	Academic/Administrative Upgrades	n/a			\$ 173,088.00	2003
265 Church-Rbld Ahu's	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 132,582.78	2003
Various-Asbestos Abt	Environmental Remediation	n/a			\$ 160,754.00	2003
CPP - Burner Modfctn	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 101,811.70	2004
MM 03-04: N. College FCU 1st & 2nd Fl.	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 161,018.00	2004
MM 03-04: CPP Repair Stacks	Mechanical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a			\$ 531,936.00	2004
MM 03-04: CAAS Paint / Electrical FA	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Administrative Upgrades	n/a			\$ 131,333.00	2004
MM 03-04: 200 High, Sprinkler / FA	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	n/a			\$ 135,099.00	2004
MM 03-04: 300 High Roof Replacement	Roof Replacement	n/a			\$ 112,979.00	2004
MM 03-04: Malcolm X Sprinkler	Life Safety-Fire Sprinkler	n/a			\$ 114,154.00	2004
MM 03-04: DAC HVAC Repl.	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 117,433.00	2004
MM 03-04: Zilkha Gallery Reno	Art Gallery Renovation	4,945			\$ 691,501.00	2004
MM 03-04: FAC Field House, Curtain Repl.	Athletic Facility Upgrades	n/a			\$ 120,295.00	2004
MM 03-04: Highrise Elev. Modernization	Elevator Modernization	n/a			\$ 102,000.00	2004
Transfer Funds R.P.	Rental Properties Maintenance	n/a			\$ 274,999.70	2003
W/F Fire Code Scp/Es	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	n/a			\$ 364,590.85	2004
William St Complex, Ceiling / Steamline	Dormitory Housing / Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 102,124.03	2004
Rumberger Contract	Rental Properties Maintenance	n/a			\$ 168,006.00	2004
MM04/05: Foss Upgrades	Life Safety-Fire Alarm / Fire Sprinkler	n/a			\$ 2,138,241.65	2004-2005
Boiler 2 Burner & Controls	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 135,190.14	2006
MM04-05 CFA DDC Controls	HVAC Controls Upgrade	n/a			\$ 102,662.80	2004
Esley Science Ctr. - ITS Genset 04/05	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 194,546.68	2005
AHU 3 Rebuild	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 176,026.48	2005
Campus Infrastructure	Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a			\$ 142,940.95	2004
Foss1/4 Steamline 04/05	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 164,734.10	2005
Lobby Ceiling - Esley	Academic - Ceiling Refinishing	12,407			\$ 110,036.72	2005
Campuswide Infrastructure	Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a			\$ 144,919.78	2005
Rumbergers Salary	Rental Properties Maintenance	n/a			\$ 167,000.00	2005
Hazardous Abatement	Environmental Remediation	n/a			\$ 106,139.79	2006
Control Replacement	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 164,634.70	2006
Rejacket Boiler 1&2	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 742,621.21	2005-2006
200 Church Interior Reno.	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	2,526			\$ 124,519.06	2006
AHU 4 Rebuild	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a			\$ 154,272.73	2006
Roofing Contingency	Roof Replacement	n/a			\$ 125,868.43	2006
Kitchen/Lounge Reno	Design Services	n/a			\$ 103,281.73	2006
Lowrise A Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	9,426			\$ 571,250.72	2005-2006
Lowrise B Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	9,418			\$ 158,802.74	2006
Lowrise C Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	5,664			\$ 336,980.60	2005-2006
Lowrise D Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	3,800			\$ 218,690.20	2005-2006
Lowrise E Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	5,857			\$ 115,651.03	2005
Shanklin Window Replacement	Academic Window Upgrades	15,580			\$ 358,836.67	2007
William Street High Rise-Ext. Rep.	Dormitory Housing Exterior Repairs	n/a			\$ 185,125.11	2006

		2 years prior	1 year prior	Current Year (Projected)	Next Year Goal	Goal in 2 years
Rumberger Contract	Rental Properties Maintenance			n/a	\$ 167,000.00	2006
Mm 06-07: Various Projects	Campuswide Major Maintenance			n/a	\$ 477,094.88	2006
Emergency Infrastructure	Infrastructure Upgrades			n/a	\$ 140,890.66	2007
Emergency Roofing	Roof Replacement			n/a	\$ 248,162.25	2007
Non Tradn'l Clssrns: J. Seely/CFA RH 105	Classroom Upgrades	1,250		\$ 295,868.63	2007-2008	
World Music Hall HVAC	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a		\$ 119,894.17	2008	
Rebuild AHU 6	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a		\$ 173,629.83	2007	
High Rise - 110 Church Reno 8th Floor	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	5,850		\$ 310,076.90	2006-2007	
W/F Window Replacements	Woodframe Window Upgrades	n/a		\$ 110,534.50	2007	
Reno/FA - Sprinkler	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	n/a		\$ 113,053.50	2007	
Reno/FA - Sprinkler	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	n/a		\$ 113,295.00	2007	
Rumbergers Salary	Rental Properties Maintenance			n/a	\$ 137,608.00	2007
CPP Roof Replacement	Roof Replacement			n/a	\$ 495,620.36	2008
High Rise 6th & 7th Flr Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	11,700		\$ 428,240.71	2007-2008	
Infrastructure	Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a		\$ 279,060.28	2008	
Emergency Roofing	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 164,212.11	2009	
Fire Alarm Upgrade	Life Safety-Fire Alarm/Sprinkler	n/a		\$ 114,755.99	2008	
General Reno - 203 Pine	Undergraduate Woodframe Upgrades	1,960		\$ 120,473.37	2008	
CFA B Roof Replacement	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 117,995.00	2008	
Residential Painting	Campuswide Interior Residential Painting	n/a		\$ 149,625.00	2008	
Rigging Repairs	Theater Rigging Upgrades	n/a		\$ 127,670.34	2008	
Rumbergers Salary	Rental Properties Maintenance			n/a	\$ 137,607.70	2008
Window Replacement	Window Replacement Upgrade	n/a		\$ 129,920.44	2008	
North Mech Room	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a		\$ 202,042.50	2009	
Upgrade Fire Alarm	Life Safety-Fire Alarm Upgrades	n/a		\$ 264,017.87	2009	
Ext Paint-1st Impressions	Campuswide Exterior Painting	n/a		\$ 447,067.68	2008-2009	
Emergency Roofing	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 207,419.18	2009	
Alternative Teaching Space: CAAS,CFA Music	Classroom Upgrades	3,100		\$ 202,779.72	2009	
High Rise 4th & 5th Flr Renovation	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	11,700		\$ 332,372.84	2008-2009	
Summer Painting	Campuswide Interior Residential Painting	n/a		\$ 230,926.50	2008-2009	
CFA M Roof Replemnt	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 195,554.15	2009	
Reno Entire House - 64 Fountain	Undergraduate Woodframe Upgrades	1,260		\$ 118,230.00	2009	
Replace AHU 9	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a		\$ 132,244.80	2009	
Lasting Impressions	Campuswide Exterior Painting	n/a		\$ 276,690.75	2009	
Replace Buried Feeders	Electrical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a		\$ 164,732.25	2009	
Lowrise Landscaping	Campus Site Upgrades	n/a		\$ 127,629.60	2009	
Rental Property Maint.	Rental Properties Maintenance	n/a		\$ 131,574.43	2009	
Vine St Negotiations	Design Services	n/a		\$ 866,837.87	2010	
CPP Cogeneration	Mechanical Upgrades	n/a		\$ 150,597.78	2010	
Emergency Roofing	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 106,520.23	2010	
Infrastructure	Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a		\$ 146,458.60	2010	
MBB Richard Olson Lab	Lab Renovation	1,109		\$ 161,412.29	2010	
B. Northrup Lab	Lab Renovation	873		\$ 217,034.69	2010	
C.Sanslow Judd 307	Lab Renovation	587		\$ 147,268.32	2010	
Vine St Substation	Electrical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a		\$ 367,504.79	2010-2011	
218-Rental Properties Maint.	Rental Properties Maintenance	n/a		\$ 125,571.35	2010	
022-FAC diving platform	Athletic Facility Upgrades	n/a		\$ 140,265.30	2010	
215-Roofting Contingency	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 234,223.29	2010	
001-Annual Summer Painting	Campuswide Interior Residential Painting	n/a		\$ 217,150.62	2010	
195-Minor Maintenance	Campuswide Minor Maintenance	n/a		\$ 497,577.42	2010-2011	
Hall Arwater Life Safety	Life Safety Upgrades	n/a		\$ 1,595,794.78	2010-2011	
Mocon Demolition	Building Demolition	20,645		\$ 704,032.78	2010-2011	
CFA Crowell ADA ramp-Const.Doc	ADA Accessibility Upgrade	n/a		\$ 534,455.72	2010-2011	
Comprehensive Enrgy PH II	Electrical Upgrades	n/a		\$ 4,340,012.31	2010-2011	
Squash - Reno - Adaptive Reuse	Academic/Administrative Renovation	12,241		\$ 3,553,952.29	2010-2011	
Metering Expansion campuswide	Electrical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a		\$ 178,244.17	2010	
Chemistry Teaching Labs	Lab Renovation	3,554		\$ 2,268,137.22	2011	
Campuswide Add a Bed FY11	Renovations Required for Adding U/G Beds	2,250		\$ 880,357.34	2010-2011	
FAC Courtyard Wood Siding	Athletic Facility Upgrades - Ext. Siding	n/a		\$ 131,323.60	2011	
Campuswide Minor Maintenance Budget	Campuswide Minor Maintenance	n/a		\$ 515,119.50	2011	
Campuswide Roofing Annual Budget	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 357,667.76	2011	
Rental Property Annual Maint. Budget	Rental Properties Maintenance	n/a		\$ 137,756.66	2011	
Transformer Replacements Campuswide	Electrical/Infrastructure Upgrades	n/a		\$ 369,916.17	2011	
FAC Football /Women Hockey Locker Rm.	Athletic Facility Upgrades	1,750		\$ 375,393.89	2011	
Physics - Christina Othon	Lab Renovation	450		\$ 190,607.28	2011	
Stream Ecology/Bio Chemistry Reno.	Lab Renovation	1,162		\$ 107,752.74	2011	
N.College 4th Flr Invstmnt Office	Administrative Upgrades	1,777		\$ 289,350.62	2011	
High Rise 2nd & 3rd flr Reno.	Dormitory Housing Upgrades	11,302		\$ 370,795.75	2011	
PAC exterior paint	Exterior Envelope Upgrade	n/a		\$ 195,452.45	2011	
CFA-P Vortek System	Theater Lighting/Rigging Upgrade	n/a		\$ 175,085.64	2011	
300 High Minor Bldg Reno	ADA Accessibility Upgrade/Minor Reno	6,277		\$ 157,572.23	2011	
Roof Replacements	Roof Replacement	n/a		\$ 176,448.95	2011	
Summer Painting annually	Campuswide Interior Residential Painting	n/a		\$ 113,660.88	2011	
Ishita Mukerji Lab,Equip. Chem.	Lab Renovation	1,429		\$ 284,454.49	2011	
Comprehensive Energy PH III	Electrical Upgrades	n/a		\$ 423,372.12	2011	
Hall Arwtr 2nd Flr, Phs I	Lab Renovation	13,093		\$ 109,941.62	2011	

Renovations planned for next 5 years

Building name
Major Maintenance FY13-FY17
Judd Hall Mechanical/Envelope Upgrades
Energy Conservation Projects - Ph IV
Energy Conservation Projects - Ph V
Energy Conservation Projects - Ph VI
Energy Conservation Projects - Ph VII
Energy Conservation Projects - Ph VIII
CPP Upgrades
Science Center Passenger Elevator Upgrades
Butterfield Dormitory Renovations
Sciences Masterplan Upgrades
Campuswide ADA Projects

The list below includes renovations costing \$100,000 or more

Purposes	Assignable Square Feet	Cost (000)	Year
Campuswide Renovations	n/a	\$38,000,000	2013-2017
Mechanical / Envelope Upgrades	n/a	\$425,000	2013
Electrical / HVAC Upgrades	n/a	\$3,000,000	2013
Electrical / HVAC Upgrades	n/a	\$2,000,000	2014
Electrical / HVAC Upgrades	n/a	\$2,000,000	2015
Electrical / HVAC Upgrades	n/a	\$2,000,000	2016
Electrical / HVAC Upgrades	n/a	\$2,000,000	2017
Mechanical Upgrades	n/a	\$900,000	2013-2015
Mechanical Upgrades	n/a	\$330,000	2013
Dormitory Housing Upgrades	23,346	\$5,500,000	2013
Laboratory / Academic Upgrades	26,000	\$9,700,000	2013-2017
ADA Accessibility Upgrades	n/a	\$1,250,000	2013-2017

Standard Eight: Physical and Technological Resources

Overview

In 2003, Wesleyan completed a Strategic Facility Masterplan that outlined the next decade of campus improvements. Since then, approximately \$267 million has been invested into Wesleyan's facilities, including the restoration of historic buildings such as Downey House and Allbritton Center, new buildings such as the Usdan University Center, the expansion of the Freeman Athletic Center, the Schoenberg Dance Studio, the Center for Film Studies, and the construction of student housing facilities for 340 students. At the same time, significant strides were made in the area of major maintenance, utilities infrastructure, fire safety, and code compliance.

Renovations were recently completed for the adaptive reuse of the McKim, Meade and White building at the heart of campus formerly used for Squash. The new academic building houses the College of Letters, Art History, and the Career Center. Spaces in the Butterfield Residence Hall, where the College of Letters and the Career Center used to reside, will be renovated into new student housing. Plans are being developed for expanded facilities for dance, theater, and art, and the long-term plan to upgrade and replace science and student-housing facilities continues.

Description

Wesleyan University is situated on 316 acres in the center of Middletown, Connecticut, overlooking the Connecticut River. The campus includes a 160-acre parcel purchased from the State of Connecticut in 2000, which is now predominantly used for recreation and open space. In 2011, Wesleyan's 311 buildings totaled 2.85 million gross s.f. and were valued at approximately \$1.1 billion. Approximately 43% of the space is assigned for residential use, 40% for academic and administrative uses, 9% for athletics, 5% for student life, and 3% for support services.

Wesleyan's academic portfolio includes 169 classrooms comprising approximately 94,000 s.f. of space and 57,000 s.f. of laboratories for teaching and research. The renovation age of Wesleyan buildings is relatively old (compared to peers) but is improving.ⁱ

The Facilities Department is responsible for maintaining the physical plant and for overseeing environmental health and safety, sustainability, and construction services. The Associate Vice President for Facilities reports to the Vice President for Finance and Administration. The Facilities Department has 136 full-time equivalent positions: 73 full-time employees and 63 contract employees. Its annual operating budget is \$14.2 million. This includes compensation, service contracts, materials, and minor equipment repair/replacement and \$8.2 million in utilities.

The Facilities Departments

- Physical Plant Department has 121 full-time positions. Of these, 58 are in-house positions providing energy management, carpentry, plumbing, electrical, mechanical, heating, ventilation, cooling, refrigeration, power plant maintenance, limited custodial, moving, event set-up, and lock shop. The remaining 63 positions are contracted staff providing most of the custodial services and all grounds maintenance.
- Environmental Health, Safety, and Sustainability (a staff of 3 full-time professionals) supports fire safety, radiation safety, laser safety, lab safety, chemical hygiene, and hazardous materials testing and management services. This group also provides the leadership for sustainability programs at Wesleyan.
- Construction Services (a staff of 6 full-time professionals) plans and manages renovations, new construction, major maintenance projects, real estate, and space assignments. The team is supplemented by contracted engineers, architects, and builders for each project through a competitive bidding process.
- Administrative staff (5 full time) support all facilities departments and manage approximately 30,000 work orders annually, administer all service contracts, manage rental properties, and provide financial management for the facilities operation.

Appraisal

Facilities Planning

In 2002, the University created a set of committees to include broader community participation in the planning process. A masterplan executive committee was formed to provide the leadership for planning and implementing strategy. Committee membership included the President, Cabinet, and the three academic deans. The committee was chaired by the Director of Facilities. For each strategic project (athletics, housing, film, dining, humanities, sciences, etc.), a sub-committee was formed and chaired by one member of the masterplan committee. This kept the lines of communication open in the Wesleyan community.

In 2003, Wesleyan engaged the services of Ayers, Saint, Gross planners and architects and undertook a year-long effort to develop a Strategic Facility Masterplan. The masterplan provided a road map for the development of campus over the succeeding 10 years.ⁱⁱ The masterplan puts a premium on adapting and reusing existing spaces. Individual projects are sequenced so that renovations in one place free space for adaptation in another. Timing of projects is also determined by their order in the sequence and by the success of fund-raising. All of the strategic priorities identified in the masterplan have been addressed or completed in the last decade. More than 100 classrooms and non-traditional teaching spaces, such as those serving dance and theater, have been renovated, and technology upgrades were completed. An annual major maintenance fund ensures that each teaching space is assessed annually and renewed as required. The historic Memorial Chapel and '92 Theater were renovated and expanded to include handicap accessibility and state of the art mechanical systems. Student housing improvements include the complete restoration of Clark Hall (built in 1916), fire safety upgrades in student housing to include fire alarms and fire sprinklers, the new construction of 270 beds at the Fauver Housing complex, and new wood-framed housing for 69 senior students. A Center for Film Studies was constructed in two phases, athletic facilities were consolidated into an expanded Freeman Athletic Center, and the Humanities District historic buildings were renovated. The newly constructed Usdan University Center provides a critical focal point for activity at the heart of campus.

In 2009, the masterplan executive committee and various other committees were reconstituted as the Facilities Planning Committee.ⁱⁱⁱ The scope of responsibilities now includes planning and approval for capital projects, space assignments, ADA projects, major maintenance, and a review of real estate proposals for acquisition and disposition.

A committee of facilities and residential life staff has developed a plan to coordinate student housing with enrollment targets. Buildings with excessive gross square footage per bed have been evaluated and renovated each summer since 2009 to optimize the occupancy. To date, a net of 58 new beds have been added to campus by renovating and optimizing existing buildings at an average cost of \$7,600/bed – a return on investment of less than one year. These renovations occur during the summer and are based on the following year's enrollment projections. This program has allowed the University to divest of beds in less desirable locations or in poor condition, primarily wood-frame houses. A reduction in operating costs is the natural outcome of this optimization.

In 2011, the University engaged the services of a traffic and parking consultant to evaluate the effectiveness of existing facilities. A parking survey was completed in April 2011, which indicated that an adequate parking supply exists. The report included a number of recommendations related to monitoring and regulating parking,^{iv} and the University will be implementing them shortly.

In January 2012, Wesleyan celebrated the opening of the former squash building – renovated and expanded to meet LEED Gold standards for sustainability – as an academic building and home to the Career Center.

Classrooms

The classroom committee was resurrected in 2006 by the Registrar's office to address faculty needs.^v An electronic classroom request form in the electronic portfolio allows faculty to submit classroom requests that will enhance

their teaching. These requests are reviewed quarterly by the classroom committee. There are more than 169 classrooms on campus, and faculty requests vary greatly: from improvements in technology – to finishes, furnishing, electrical, lighting, and shades – to full renovation.

Sciences

In December 2006, the University engaged the services of Payette Associates to design a new Molecular and Life Sciences Building (at an estimated cost of \$160 million), but this project was canceled in 2008 (to the dismay of some faculty) in favor of upgrades to the existing Hall-Atwater and Shanklin Laboratory facilities (at a more affordable rate of approximately \$2 million per year). The major elements of the plan include: updating Hall Atwater and Shanklin life safety systems including fire sprinklers and alarm systems; improving indoor air quality in Hall Atwater; renovating all teaching labs in Hall Atwater original to the building; creating new shared research and teaching equipment and work zones; and renovating new and existing faculty research labs that are original to the building.

Each year the dean of Division III meets with the designated project manager to review the list of impending projects and to develop the scope of work for the subsequent year. Once funding is approved by senior administration, a committee of affected faculty becomes engaged in the design process.

Since 2009, \$8 million of capital improvements have been made to the Hall Atwater and Shanklin buildings. Renovated classrooms and laboratories look as good as any new building and have allowed spaces to be reconfigured to meet the current needs of the sciences. An additional \$2 million of fire sprinklers and fire alarms were installed in 2010. This action was prompted by a fire in a Hall Atwater chemistry lab in April 2009 that caused \$1 million of damage. Following the fire, the corridors throughout Hall Atwater were renovated and new ceilings, flooring, and lighting were installed – changes that have also made a significant impact on the aesthetics of the building.

Major Maintenance

In 1989, the University established a major maintenance fund to upgrade and maintain all campus buildings at current, competitive standards. The original fund was budgeted at 2% of the replacement value of the buildings. Due to the age of Wesleyan's building portfolio, deferred maintenance is a significant, ongoing challenge, and the budget has not kept pace with the replacement value of the campus. In FY12 the University has budgeted approximately \$6.8 million for major maintenance projects. Sightlines, a collaborative of colleges and universities that share performance data, estimates that approximately \$42 million of major maintenance has been deferred over the last 10 years, and the gap between available major maintenance funding and the annual need grew to \$6 million in FY11. Each year faculty, staff, and students are invited to submit proposed major maintenance projects. The list, which generally includes more than 300 proposals, is reviewed and voted on by the facilities management staff and a student representative. Finally, a list of projects in priority order, along with estimated costs for each item, is submitted to the Facilities Planning Committee for review and approval. The final list is posted on the University web site.

During the summer of 2011, 108 major maintenance projects were completed, which is typical of any given year. The process has evolved over the last few years and now includes three years of projects in priority order. This enables the University to anticipate maintenance work that might impact summer programs as far ahead as three years.

Americans with Disability Act (ADA)

In 1995 the University commissioned an independent study to determine the status of accessibility on campus. The project team was chaired by an alumnus, Chris Palamas, who is disabled and traversed the hilly campus in a wheel chair. The final report, completed in 1997, identified a number of proposed improvements. Progress was initially slow. Limited funding, steep topography, and numerous historic buildings challenged the University's ability

to satisfy accessibility needs without compromising the historic character of the campus. In FY03, the University established an annual capital budget for ADA projects, which began with \$217,000 and has increased annually.

In addition to major projects, the University has taken specific actions to improve accessibility in buildings not scheduled for renovation. Since the ADA budget was established in FY03, the University has spent approximately \$2 million to improve accessibility, and has developed an [accessible route map](#) added to Wesleyan's web page.

In the summer of 2012, approximately 30,000 square feet of the Butterfield Residence Hall complex (hitherto not accessible) will undergo a renovation to provide 92 accessible beds.

Sustainability and Energy Conservation

Sustainability is a community effort at Wesleyan. The Sustainability Advisory Group for Environmental Stewardship (SAGES) – a committee of students, faculty, and staff chaired by the director of EHSS – is responsible for developing a [Campus Climate Action Plan](#). This plan describes the actions, policies, programs, and measures that Wesleyan will take to meet specified greenhouse gas reduction targets and timetables as well as identify other ways to achieve carbon neutrality. The committee looks at all aspects of campus activity – including energy consumption, procurement, transportation, construction and renovations, recycling and waste, grounds management, and dining – and recommends ways for all of them to become more environmentally sustainable.

In 2007, President Roth signed the American College and University's Climate Commitment Pledge (ACUCCP) with a goal of carbon neutrality by 2050. In the last five years, Wesleyan reduced its total carbon emissions by 25 percent and the University is on track to reach [the 2050 goal](#). In 2007, Wesleyan offered all faculty, staff and students a challenge to sign a personal Wesleyan Community Climate Commitment. Signers commit to at least five sustainable actions such as not buying bottled water, replacing light bulbs with CFL bulbs, and reducing gasoline use by driving slowly or by walking. Wesleyan's first greenhouse gas emission inventory was conducted in 2008, and the results were published in January 2009. In May 2010, Wesleyan published the Wesleyan University Climate Action Plan. The University participates in the annual RecycleMania contest with peer schools administered by the College and University Recycling Coalition.

Transportation initiatives include The Ride, free student transportation, two Zip Cars sponsored by the Wesleyan Student Assembly, airport shuttles available to students, a ride board for faculty, staff, and student carpooling, a student bike rental program with 200 bicycles in use, and electric and hybrid vehicles used by the University and vendors. A new faculty and staff garden is adjacent to a student-run farm to further promote sustainability. A student group, WILD Wes (Working for Intelligent Landscape Design) is developing a permaculture project in the central campus area. In 2010, students founded the Green Fund, a student-managed fund for sustainability that is financed through a \$15 opt-out student fee, independent of the University's budget. It supports initiatives that decrease the carbon footprint of the University, decrease waste, increase the University's use of energy from renewable resources, and increase the visibility of environmentally responsible practices on campus. The Green Fund's total budget for the 2010–11 academic year was \$79,755. Approved projects included a composting project that encouraged 1,000 students to compost food for the student garden and prizes given to the 2011 first annual Dorm Energy Competition (April Energy Fest).

Since 2005, Wesleyan has completed nearly \$30 million in energy conservation projects (with \$5.4 million in grants and incentives) that should save \$2.6 million in annual energy costs. The installation of solar photovoltaic panels on the roof of the Admission building, for example, was facilitated by a power purchase agreement with a company owned by two recent Wesleyan alumni. The output of the panels is [monitored](#) via the web. The panels, completed in 2009, are expected to offset 72,000 pounds of CO₂ in a lifetime. Another notable example is a new 200-kilowatt solar PV array completed in January 2012 at the Freeman Athletic Center.

Utility Infrastructure

The University has maintained a long-term view and near-term plan of its investment in campus wide utility infrastructure, including its Central Power Plant (CPP), Vine Street Electrical Substation, and the systems that distribute utilities from these facilities. Currently, its entire utilities infrastructure is in fair to very good condition with plans in place to improve its efficiency and reach.

Maintenance and expansion of utilities infrastructure is supported directly by major maintenance and coincident funding of capital when appropriate. This approach has allowed us to take advantage of incentives and grants that have become available through the statewide deregulation of utilities.

Highlights of energy use improvements include:

- A 2.4 mega-Watt cogeneration system was installed in 2010 to generate approximately 85 percent of the University's electrical consumption and 19 percent of connected loads thermal energy requirement. The work cost approximately \$3.4 million and received over \$1.3 million in grants and incentives.
- Beginning in 2007, the central chilled water system underwent a complete redesign and capacity expansion. This effort, for which Wesleyan received over \$600,000 in grants and incentives, will be completed in 2012 with the introduction of "Free-Cooling." The total cost will be approximately \$2 million.
- In 2007 we began the introduction of new 15 kV electrical switchgear at the Vine Street Substation to allow for the progressive upgrade of the campus electrical grid to 15 kV and the ultimate decommissioning of the existing 5 kV transformers.
- In 2010, we installed energy meters to record electrical, steam, and chilled water consumption of large student residences connected to central distribution systems.

Real Estate Portfolio Management

While the overall campus size (2.85 million s.f.) has remained relatively stable since 2002, the total number of buildings has decreased from 375 to 311. Wesleyan still owns approximately 150 more buildings/1 million gross s.f. than our peer average, according to an independent report by Sightlines. This is in large part due to the inefficiency of the undergraduate student housing portfolio, which includes more than 100 single family houses owned by the University. The high percentage of residential space also reflects the portfolio of 160 rental property units available to faculty, staff, and graduate students and their families.

Wesleyan is reducing its real estate portfolio through the Advanced Purchase Program (APP), initiated in 2002 to divest of unneeded housing stock and to encourage home ownership near campus by faculty and staff. The University has sold 49 homes with net sales proceeds of \$8 million through the APP, and the proceeds have been reinvested into new student housing and renovation projects. Approximately two-thirds of the homes have been purchased by faculty and staff. Eligible faculty and staff may use a Wesleyan mortgage incentive program that provides 5% of the mortgage (up to a mortgage limit of \$300,000) to be applied toward the purchase of any local home. A new Sustainable Campus program introduced in the 2011 provides faculty and staff with an added \$10,000 incentive to buy a home from Wesleyan.

Environmental Health and Safety

Environmental Health, Safety, and Sustainability (EHSS)^{vi} ensures safety and regulatory compliance across campus. The department offers occupational safety courses, environmental and fire safety inspections, and ergonomic assessments to maintain compliance with local, state, and federal regulations. The EHSS coordinates and implements fire drills (working closely with the City of Middletown's Fire Marshal office) in all residential buildings each semester.

The EHSS Director is a Certified Radiation Safety Officer who oversees the implementation of safety policies and guidelines in our science research facility and supports the Laser Safety Officer in regular inspections of our laser facilities. Wesleyan has been inspected by the Nuclear Regulatory Agency (NRC) three times in the last 15 years and has always maintained a compliant program with no violations. Wesleyan has been inspected by the

Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection for Hazardous Waste operations and also received no fines. Currently, five of Wesleyan's professional facilities staff are licensed lead inspectors including one State-certified lead and asbestos professional. All Physical Plant, Construction Services, and EHSS staff are OSHA certified and receive annual training as required by law. The Director participates in the development and management of the Chemical Hygiene Committee and Plan, the Animal Care and Use Committee per IACUC, and the Employee Safety Committee as required by State Commission on Workers Comp.

The EHSS staff are all recognized professionals in their area of expertise and attend annual professional development/refresher training to ensure the highest level of service to the Wesleyan community.

Facilities Management Performance

Wesleyan continues to benchmark the performance of the facilities organization with peers with the assistance of Sightlines. Since 2002, Sightlines has collected Wesleyan data relative to facilities staffing, operating costs, material spending, capital investments in facilities, utilities consumption, and the condition of buildings, equipment, and grounds. This data is used each year to guide the investment of resources into the campus and to gauge the effectiveness of those investments. See the full [FY11 report](#).

Wesleyan has struggled for years to improve upon quality scores for grounds maintenance. A special effort was made to address this issue with the development of performance standards and daily inspections of the grounds. In 2009, perennial wild flower fields were planted in strategic locations, and 40 planters were added throughout the campus to add curb appeal. The result has been remarkable. Wesleyan's grounds inspection scores increased from 2.4 in 2008 to 4.2 in 2011, higher than the peer average of 3.9. (Scores are on a 5-point scale.) This effort was accomplished within existing financial resources by rebidding the grounds service contract.^{vii}

A two-year project focused on improving curb appeal resulted in Sightlines general repair inspection scores improving from 2.7 in 2008 to 4.3 in 2011. This score exceeded the peer average of 3.7 in 2011. To achieve these results, in the summer of 2008, a project titled "First Impressions" improved all of Wesleyan's historic buildings leading from the edge of campus to the admission office. A total of 15 buildings received complete exterior makeovers as part of a \$453,000 major maintenance project. Later in 2008, another project called "Lasting Impressions" improved the Wesleyan buildings that visitors would pass as they left the campus. A total of 14 buildings, mostly faculty rental houses, received \$300,000 of complete exterior makeovers. This focus on major maintenance in a concentrated location allowed the University to achieve the greatest impact for dollars spent. More important, the project did not compromise other major maintenance priorities on campus.

Custodial performance has received significant attention in the last few years. In 2008, Wesleyan's Sightlines inspection score for custodial was equal to the peer average of 3.2. That same year the staffing level and supervision was at the peer average. To improve this performance, a new performance-based contract was developed and competitively bid in 2008. Approximately 75% of Wesleyan's custodial workforce was outsourced at that time. In 2011, Wesleyan's custodial inspection scores improved to 4.3 vs. the peer average of 3.8. In December 2010, the custodial team lost 9 FTEs as part of a voluntary separation program. This represented approximately 10 percent of the custodial work force. To balance the reduced staffing levels, custodial services were revised and remaining staff were redistributed accordingly. The new standards require faculty and staff to hand-carry personal trash and recycling to containers in the corridors, and office cleaning has been reduced to one day per week from five days per week. Public spaces continue to be cleaned daily. In 2012 Wesleyan is rebidding the contract with the hopes of improved custodial services and clearer expectations under a new set of specifications.

While recent attention seems to have focused on the qualitative aspects of campus facilities, it should be noted that Wesleyan has been highly attentive to the financial aspects as well. In FY10, Wesleyan's spending on facilities operations was \$4.23/ gross s.f., which is 12 percent below our peer average of \$4.80/gross s.f. Much of the savings can be attributed to rigorous budget management strategies. For example, overtime paid to physical plant staff has been reduced by \$500,000/year since 2004. Since 2007, annual savings of more than \$389,000/

year were achieved through rebidding service contracts for custodial, sanitation, sewer, elevator, pest control, alarm monitoring and testing, equipment maintenance, and grounds. Reorganizing property management services for rental properties has saved another \$345,000/year.

Projection

Elements of a short-term masterplan plan will include the next phase of the science masterplan renovations to existing facilities including, but not limited to: updating Hall Atwater and Shanklin life safety systems, building mechanical and envelope improvements, renovating all teaching labs in Hall Atwater that are original to the building, creating shared research and teaching equipment zones, renovating research labs for new and existing faculty. Under development is a new masterplan for academic spaces in the arts – including dance, theater, student art workshops, and musical instrument storage. Center for the Arts buildings are 38 years old with major maintenance needs that exceed available funding.

The Facilities Planning Committee will also update the plan for the disposition of vacant buildings, continue a project to optimize the existing real estate portfolio, and implement student housing projects to accommodate increased enrollment projections (particularly regarding the class of 2015, which is larger than anticipated).

Institutional Effectiveness

The Facilities Planning Committee oversees the planning and approval of capital and major maintenance projects consistent with Wesleyan's needs and mission. The Committee's goals include evaluating the effectiveness and funding level of the annual major maintenance program and developing a short-term plan for facilities that reflects current financial constraints. The University maintains a three-year list of projects in priority order as a basis for realistic planning and budget allocation. Capital projects are supported through fundraising (e.g., the renovation of the Squash Building, now 41 Wyllys Avenue).

ⁱ In 2002, 99% of the campus was greater than 25 years old, 1% was between 10-25 years old, and none of the space was less than 10 years old. In 2011, 89% of the campus is greater than 25 years old, none was 10-25 years old, and 11% was less than 10 years old.

ⁱⁱ Based on the 1998 conceptual plan for campus renewal

ⁱⁱⁱ The new committee membership includes the Chair and AVP for Facilities, Provost and VP for Academic Affairs, Associate Provost, VP Finance & Administration, VP for University Relations, Dean of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Dean of Arts & Humanities, Dean of Social Sciences, VP for Student Affairs, the President's designees, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid, Architecture Faculty and Chair of Art History.

^{iv} Recommendations include: monitor use in visitor areas, install barriers or gates during non-business hours; review allocation of assignments for faculty and staff; improve walking paths between parking lots and destinations; develop parking management plan for admission visitors; consider not allowing frosh and sophomores to have cars; consider a stratified parking fee for faculty and staff; consider daytime shuttle for faculty and staff.

^v The committee is chaired by the Registrar and attended by the Assistant Registrar, Associate Director of Construction Services, Director of Academic Computing, Manager of Instructional Media Services, and Director of University Events and Scheduling.

^{vi} Staffed by a Director, Project Manager, and Safety Coordinator

^{vii} That Wesleyan's annual \$2,000/FTE spent on material costs for grounds maintenance is significantly below the peer average of \$10,000/FTE (and staffing per acre and supervision per worker are at the peer average) makes the high inspection score especially gratifying.

Standard 9: Financial Resources
(Statement of Financial Position/Statement of Net Assets)

FISCAL YEAR ENDS month & day: (06/30)		2 YEARS PRIOR (FY 2009)	1 YEAR PRIOR (FY 2010)	MOST RECENT YEAR	Percent Change	
					yrs-1 yr prior	1 yr-most recent
ASSETS						
?	CASH AND SHORT TERM INVESTMENTS	\$66,358,000	\$86,502,000	\$112,333,000	30.4%	29.9%
?	CASH HELD BY STATE TREASURER				-	-
?	DEPOSITS HELD BY STATE TREASURER				-	-
?	ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE, NET	\$2,853,000	\$4,287,000	\$2,931,000	50.3%	-31.6%
?	CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVABLE, NET	\$27,961,000	\$28,417,000	\$29,223,000	1.6%	2.8%
?	INVENTORY AND PREPAID EXPENSES	\$3,044,000	\$1,403,000	\$1,876,000	-53.9%	33.7%
?	LONG-TERM INVESTMENTS	\$463,974,000	\$492,939,000	\$562,693,000	6.2%	14.2%
?	LOANS TO STUDENTS	\$8,752,000	\$9,031,000	\$8,997,000	3.2%	-0.4%
?	FUNDS HELD UNDER BOND AGREEMENT	\$567,000	\$156,000		-72.5%	-100.0%
?	PROPERTY, PLANT AND EQUIPMENT, NET	\$284,810,000	\$282,508,000	\$286,737,000	-0.8%	1.5%
?	OTHER ASSETS				-	-
	TOTAL ASSETS	\$858,319,000	\$905,243,000	\$1,004,790,000	5.5%	11.0%
LIABILITIES						
?	ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AND ACCRUED LIABILITIES	\$13,030,000	\$15,172,000	\$13,102,000	16.4%	-13.6%
?	DEFERRED REVENUE & REFUNDABLE ADVANCES	\$1,169,000	\$4,181,000	\$3,041,000	257.7%	-27.3%
?	DUE TO STATE				-	-
?	DUE TO AFFILIATES				-	-
?	ANNUITY AND LIFE INCOME OBLIGATIONS	\$6,036,000	\$6,150,000	\$7,721,000	1.9%	25.5%
?	AMOUNTS HELD ON BEHALF OF OTHERS	\$575,000	\$721,000	\$1,357,000	25.4%	88.2%
?	LONG TERM DEBT	\$208,959,000	\$222,798,000	\$221,040,000	6.6%	-0.8%
?	REFUNDABLE GOVERNMENT ADVANCES	\$5,278,000	\$5,331,000	\$5,331,000	1.0%	0.0%
?	OTHER LONG-TERM LIABILITIES	\$51,037,000	\$47,694,000	\$29,759,000	-6.6%	-37.6%
	TOTAL LIABILITIES	\$286,084,000	\$302,047,000	\$281,351,000	5.6%	-6.9%
NET ASSETS						
UNRESTRICTED NET ASSETS						
	INSTITUTIONAL	\$177,152,000	\$183,516,000	\$250,709,000	3.6%	36.6%
?	FOUNDATION				-	-
	TOTAL	\$177,152,000	\$183,516,000	\$250,709,000	3.6%	36.6%
TEMPORARILY RESTRICTED NET ASSETS						
	INSTITUTIONAL	\$243,241,000	\$247,782,000	\$277,669,000	1.9%	12.1%
?	FOUNDATION				-	-
	TOTAL	\$243,241,000	\$247,782,000	\$277,669,000	1.9%	12.1%
PERMANENTLY RESTRICTED NET ASSETS						
	INSTITUTIONAL	\$151,842,000	\$171,898,000	\$195,061,000	13.2%	13.5%
?	FOUNDATION				-	-
	TOTAL	\$151,842,000	\$171,898,000	\$195,061,000	13.2%	13.5%
	TOTAL NET ASSETS	\$572,235,000	\$603,196,000	\$723,439,000	5.4%	19.9%
	TOTAL LIABILITIES AND NET ASSETS	\$858,319,000	\$905,243,000	\$1,004,790,000	5.5%	11.0%

**Standard 9: Financial Resources
(Statement of Revenues and Expenses)**

FISCAL YEAR ENDS month & day: (06 /30)		2 YEARS PRIOR (FY 2010)	MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED YEAR (FY211)	CURRENT BUDGET (FY 2012)	NEXT YEAR FORWARD (FY 2013)	TWO YEARS FORWARD (FY 2014)
OPERATING REVENUES						
?	TUITION & FEES	\$122,002,000	\$130,747,000	\$137,938,085	\$146,490,246	\$151,617,405
?	ROOM AND BOARD	\$33,802,000	\$35,531,000	\$37,520,736	\$39,471,814	\$41,287,518
?	LESS: FINANCIAL AID	(\$42,223,000)	(\$44,819,000)	(\$49,345,719)	(\$55,316,551)	(\$56,422,882)
	NET STUDENT FEES	\$113,581,000	\$121,459,000	\$126,113,102	\$130,645,510	\$136,482,041
?	GOVERNMENT GRANTS & CONTRACTS	\$7,556,000	\$11,073,000	\$12,512,490	\$13,150,627	\$13,821,309
?	PRIVATE GIFTS, GRANTS & CONTRACTS	\$13,762,000	\$13,535,000	\$13,968,120	\$13,590,981	\$14,229,757
?	OTHER AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES					
	ENDOWMENT INCOME USED IN OPERATIONS	\$33,276,000	\$30,660,000	\$27,379,380	\$26,338,964	\$27,260,827
?	OTHER REVENUE (specify):	\$8,810,000	\$8,791,000	\$8,791,000	\$9,212,968	\$9,212,968
	OTHER REVENUE (specify):					
	NET ASSETS RELEASED FROM RESTRICTIONS	\$10,862,000	\$8,577,000	\$8,577,000	\$8,577,000	\$8,577,000
	TOTAL OPERATING REVENUES	\$187,847,000	\$194,095,000	\$197,341,092	\$201,516,049	\$209,583,902
OPERATING EXPENSES						
?	INSTRUCTION	\$80,985,000	\$83,058,000	\$88,322,292	\$92,385,117	\$96,450,062
?	RESEARCH	\$11,465,000	\$11,642,000	\$12,294,963	\$12,922,006	\$13,581,029
?	PUBLIC SERVICE					
?	ACADEMIC SUPPORT	\$10,443,000	\$10,300,000	\$11,002,404	\$11,486,510	\$11,831,105
?	STUDENT SERVICES	\$9,346,000	\$9,026,000	\$9,544,835	\$9,802,546	\$10,302,476
?	INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT	\$24,200,000	\$23,101,000	\$23,770,042	\$23,128,251	\$23,243,892
	FUNDRAISING AND ALUMNI RELATIONS					
?	OPERATION, MAINTENANCE OF PLANT (if not allocated)					
?	SCHOLARSHIPS & FELLOWSHIPS (Cash refunded by public institutions)					
?	AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES	\$42,183,000	\$43,645,000	\$46,754,465	\$48,858,416	\$51,203,620
?	DEPRECIATION (if not allocated)					
?	OTHER EXPENSES (specify):					
	OTHER EXPENSES (specify):					
	TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES	\$178,622,000	\$180,772,000	\$191,689,002	\$198,582,846	\$206,612,184
	CHANGE IN NET ASSETS FROM OPERATIONS	\$9,225,000	\$13,323,000	\$5,652,090	\$2,933,203	\$2,971,718
NON OPERATING REVENUES						
?	STATE APPROPRIATIONS (NET)					
?	INVESTMENT RETURN	\$27,014,000	\$43,088,000	\$44,811,520	\$46,603,981	\$48,468,140
?	INTEREST EXPENSE (public institutions)					
	GIFTS, BEQUESTS & CONTRIBUTIONS NOT USED IN OPERATIONS					
?	OTHER (Adjustment of Post Retirement Benefit Obligation):	(\$21,299,000)	\$18,491,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
	OTHER (Appropriation of endowment assets for expenditure):	(\$8,576,000)	(\$7,709,000)	(\$6,884,137)	(\$6,622,540)	(\$6,854,329)
	OTHER (specify):					
	NET NON OPERATING REVENUES	(\$2,861,000)	\$53,870,000	\$37,927,383	\$39,981,441	\$41,613,811
	INCOME BEFORE OTHER REVENUES EXPENSES, GAINS, OR LOSSES	\$6,364,000	\$67,193,000	\$43,579,473	\$42,914,644	\$44,585,529
?	CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS (public institutions)					
?	OTHER					
	TOTAL INCREASE/DECREASE IN NET ASSETS	\$6,364,000	\$67,193,000	\$43,579,473	\$42,914,644	\$44,585,529

Standard 9: Financial Resources
(Statement of Debt)

FISCAL YEAR ENDS month & day (/)		2 YEARS PRIOR (FY 2010)	MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED YEAR (FY2011)	CURRENT BUDGET (FY 2012)	NEXT YEAR FORWARD (FY 2013)	TWO YEARS FORWARD (FY 2014)
	DEBT					
	BEGINNING BALANCE	\$208,959,000	\$222,798,000	\$221,040,000	\$219,510,000	\$217,922,000
	ADDITIONS	\$217,419,000				
	? REDUCTIONS	(\$203,580,000)	(\$1,758,000)	(\$1,530,000)	(\$1,588,000)	(\$1,649,000)
	ENDING BALANCE	\$222,798,000	\$221,040,000	\$219,510,000	\$217,922,000	\$216,273,000
	INTEREST PAID DURING FISCAL YEAR	\$8,954,000	\$8,527,000	\$8,872,000	\$8,812,000	\$8,752,000
	CURRENT PORTION					
	BOND RATING	Moody's AA3 and S&P AA	Moody's AA3 and S&P AA			
	DEBT COVENANTS (PLEASE DESCRIBE):					

**Standard 9: Financial Resources
(Supplemental Data)**

FISCAL YEAR ENDS month & day (/)		2 YEARS PRIOR (FY 2010)	MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED YEAR (FY2011)	CURRENT BUDGET (FY 2012)	NEXT YEAR FORWARD (FY 2013)	TWO YEARS FORWARD (FY 2014)
NET ASSETS						
	NET ASSETS BEGINNING OF YEAR	\$572,235,000	\$603,196,000	\$723,439,000	\$767,018,473	\$809,933,117
	TOTAL INCREASE/DECREASE IN NET ASSETS	\$30,961,000	\$120,243,000	\$43,579,473	\$42,914,644	\$44,585,529
	NET ASSETS END OF YEAR	\$603,196,000	\$723,439,000	\$767,018,473	\$809,933,117	\$854,518,646
FINANCIAL AID						
SOURCE OF FUNDS						
	UNRESTRICTED INSTITUTIONAL	\$37,428,000	\$41,235,000	\$45,399,735	\$51,755,698	\$55,119,818
	FEDERAL, STATE & PRIVATE GRANTS	\$4,795,000	\$3,584,000	\$3,365,376	\$3,365,376	\$3,365,376
	RESTRICTED FUNDS					
	TOTAL	\$42,223,000	\$44,819,000	\$48,765,111	\$55,121,074	\$58,485,194
	% DISCOUNT OF TUITION & FEES	34.6%	34.3%	35.8%	37.8%	37.2%
?	% UNRESTRICTED DISCOUNT					
PLEASE INDICATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S ENDOWMENT SPENDING POLICY:						
<p>and 6% more than prior year as long as withing a range of 4.5% to 5.5% of the 12-quarter moving average of market values as of Decemb</p>						

Standard Nine: Financial Resources


Description

One of the three overarching goals of *Wesleyan 2020* is to “work within a sustainable economic model while maintaining core values.” Those values include commitment to diversity (including economic diversity in the student body); commitment to employing highly qualified faculty and staff; commitment to supporting research; and commitment to supporting effective pedagogy and co-curricular programming. These commitments are becoming more and more expensive to sustain, and Wesleyan’s efforts to establish a sustainable financial structure have featured important changes in both asset management and long-term budget planning.

Wesleyan’s bylaws stipulate that the Finance Committee of the Board is responsible for the Board’s activities relating to the University’s capital and operating budgets, as well as the establishment and monitoring of a long-range financial plan. For a description of Wesleyan’s budget planning process, please see Standard 2, Planning and Evaluation.

The Audit Committee of the Board has responsibilities related to monitoring the integrity of the University’s financial statements, compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, and oversight of risk assessment practices and adequacy of internal controls. The committee also reviews the University’s tax returns. The audit committee meets a minimum of two times a year. Every year the audit committee retains a firm of certified public accountants (KPMG) to examine the accounts of the University and to consult with the committee. In addition to the annual audited financial statements, the University retains KPMG to opine on the use of state and federal funds (principally financial aid and faculty grants) and debt compliance issues. In addition, the University retains a regional auditing firm to audit its retirement plan.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, Wesleyan University’s net assets increased by \$120 million (20%) from \$603 million to \$723 million. Net assets are still below levels reached before the fiscal crisis, but have largely rebounded because of the increase in the market value of Wesleyan’s endowment.



Wesleyan’s total assets increased to over \$1.0 billion in 2011. Liquidity remains strong with over \$300 million in assets that can be made available within 30 days. A large cash position provides flexibility to meet commitments during these challenging fiscal times.

To deal with the economic downturn, Wesleyan cut \$25 million from its budget and eliminated over 60 staff positions, mostly through a voluntary separation program. Reductions included a salary freeze in 2010 and slower compensation growth. Enrollment will increase by 120 students from 2010 to 2013 (30 more students each year) generating an additional \$5 million in student charges revenue net of financial aid. The process was aided by discussions with the newly created Budget Priorities Committee made up of faculty, staff, and students and the Ad-Hoc Faculty Working Group.

In FY 2010/11, alumni, parents, and friends gave over \$37 million on a cash basis to Wesleyan, the largest amount of cash received in any year in history. This \$3 million (8.8%) increase from the prior year, with 51% of the alumni donating funds, reflected a strong financial commitment to Wesleyan from our donors, even during challenging economic times.



Appraisal

Managing Debt

In May 2010, Wesleyan reduced risk related to the debt portfolio, its largest liability. At that time, 100% of debt was in the form of weekly or daily floating variable rate demand bonds. Wesleyan refinanced all of this debt into 90% fixed (\$186 million) and 10% variable (\$20 million) bonds. In addition, all interest rate swaps were terminated. These changes reduced Wesleyan’s risk from bondholders, counterparties, and banks. The refinancing also created budget certainty at an attractive cost (5.12% all in cost). Wesleyan maintains its strong Moody’s AA3 and Standard & Poor’s AA ratings.

Endowment Management

The endowment market value of \$610 million as of April 2012 has rebounded from a low of \$442 million in March 2009. In 2011, investment performance was 21% with a 10-year annualized performance of 5.8%.

Three changes were made to promote endowment preservation and growth. First, a new Chief Investment Officer started in August 2010 and is in the process of reviewing all Wesleyan investments and planning a new strategy for a staff-driven investment process. In addition, the Board of Trustees established a new standing committee, the Investment Committee, to oversee the office, as well as recommend and implement investment policy.

Second, since 2009, the endowment draw has been 5.5% of the trailing 12-quarter average market value of the endowment ending December 31. This spending level is within the policy established by the Board in 1981. This is a decrease from 7.4% in 2006.

By making strategic budget cuts, Wesleyan was able to reduce the Wesleyan Fund (annual unrestricted giving) goal from a high of \$17.6 million in 2008 to \$10.2 million in 2012, with gradual increases scheduled thereafter. Alumni have responded favorably to this shift in emphasis toward endowment, and in 2010 for the first time in recent memory Wesleyan raised more dollars for endowment than for the annual fund.

In 2012 Wesleyan's Board adopted a new endowment spending policy incorporating the principles of minimizing disruptions in annual disbursements to the operating budget and maintaining the inflation-adjusted value of gifts (intergenerational parity) by setting payouts plus inflation less than expected investment return. Payouts will be based on a weighting of 70% determined by the prior year distribution, increased by inflation, and 30% determined from 4.5% of endowment market value from June 30 of the prior fiscal year. The policy provides a "yellow light" if the draw should rise above 6% as a consequence of significant declines in equity markets; the administration and the Board would then reconsider the draw.

Financial Aid and Affordability

In the spring of 2012 President Roth introduced an initiative designed to make Wesleyan more affordable in a sustainable way, with three principal elements. The first is to establish a "discount rate" that is as generous as possible, but that is also one Wesleyan can afford. Just under a third of the University's tuition charges will go to financial aid. This is approximately the percentage of the budget devoted to aid from 2000-2008.

Setting financial aid to a discount rate is a significant change in practice for Wesleyan. From 1997 to 2013 (projected), the discount rate has risen from 22% to 37% – an unsustainable rate of increase.

Wesleyan remains committed to meeting the full financial need of admitted students without increasing required student indebtedness. The Admission Office will have to consider the capacity of some students to pay, as is done now with transfer and international students. Current estimates are that about 90% of each class (depending on the level of need) will continue to be admitted on a need-blind basis. Wesleyan expects to build a more generous and sustainable financial aid program over time by raising more funds for the endowment.

The second component of the affordability effort will be linking tuition increases to the rate of inflation. Restraining tuition increases will require the University to maintain its search for efficiencies while also investing in educational innovation across the curriculum.

The third component is to emphasize a three-year option for those families seeking a Wesleyan experience in a more economical form. Wesleyan will help those students who choose to graduate in six semesters get the most out of their time on campus. For those students who are prepared to develop their majors a little sooner, shorten their vacations by participating in the intensive Summer Sessions, and take advantage of the wealth of opportunities on campus, this more economical BA might be of genuine interest. Allowing for some summer expenses, families would still save about 20% from the total bill for an undergraduate degree.

Projection

Endowment draw will be further reduced from 5.5% to 5.0% of the trailing 12-quarter average market value of the endowment ending December 31 over the next five years. The 2012-13 operating budget will include a 5.3% endowment spending rate with the goal of reaching 5.0% in 2015-16. In addition, the Board will review the current spending policy and make recommendations for any changes by May 2012 with implementation starting in 2013-14.

The University is exploring ways of increasing revenue other than general tuition hikes to support both educational quality and fair access. To generate new revenue sources Wesleyan is focusing on its strength: providing

quality educational experiences. An undergraduate summer session pilot is underway. The pilot has been approved for an additional five years ending in 2016. Master's level programs are also under development and review.

The quiet phase of the new campaign began July 1 2007, with some pre-campaign gifts grandfathered. As of May, 2011, \$237 million in gifts and pledges has been received toward a working goal of \$400 million. Of this amount, \$141 million in cash has already been received. There are sub-goals of \$225 million for endowment; \$115 million for the Wesleyan Fund; \$20 million for facilities; and \$40 million for current other restricted. The launch date of the public phase is dependent on the fundraising pace, but is planned for spring 2013.

Faculty salaries for assistant and associate professors should be more competitive and be at least at the median of the peers. Based on 2011 faculty compensation data, assistant faculty and associate faculty lag behind the peers by \$3,500 and \$3,400 respectively. The University will implement this goal over the next three fiscal years at a cost of approximately \$200,000 a year. A projected total of \$600,000 will be added to the faculty compensation budget by 2014/15 for this purpose.

To date, Wesleyan has adopted measures to improve the reliability of its endowment returns and to increase the proportion of annual gifts going into the endowment while reducing the draw on the endowment to cover current operating expenses. These changes have yielded significant results, which have nonetheless been offset by adverse financial trends relating to the state of the economy. To move closer to its goal of economic sustainability, the University will be reviewing all its policies regarding revenue as well as its strategies for managing costs, endowment draw, and ongoing debt burdens.

Institutional Effectiveness

Since its last reaccreditation, Wesleyan has implemented a new financial reporting system with much tighter controls and electronic approvals of expenditures. Wesleyan also has created a Budget Working Group that reviews each request for new or replacement positions before the hiring process can move forward. Staffing levels are benchmarked through the COFHE staffing survey. Wesleyan's annual budgeting process and long-range planning, overseen by the Board and its Finance Committee, and the annual audit process, overseen by the Board and its Audit Committee, assure appropriate evaluation of its fiscal condition and financial management.

Standard 10: Public Disclosure

Information	Web addresses	Print Publications
How can inquiries be made about the institution? Where can questions be addressed?	www.wesleyan.edu	
Notice of availability of publications and of audited financial statement or fair summary	http://www.wesleyan.edu/finance/financeDept/reporting/annualFinancialReport.html	
Institutional catalog	https://iasext.wesleyan.edu/regprod/wesmaps_page.html	
Obligations and responsibilities of students and the institution	http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/appendix.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/academic-freedom.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/university-responsibilities.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/standards-of-conduct.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/student-conduct.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/plagiarism.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/code-of-non-academic.html	Student handbook
Information on admission and attendance	http://wesleyan.edu/admission/index.html	
Institutional mission and objectives	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/mission.html	
Expected educational outcomes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/wesleyanplanning/final/essential.html	
Requirements, procedures and policies re: admissions	http://wesleyan.edu/admission/index.html	
Requirements, procedures and policies re: transfer credit	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/academic_regulations/index.html	
Student fees, charges and refund policies	http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaccounts/tuition.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaccounts/refunds.html	
Rules and regulations for student conduct	http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/student-conduct.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/standards-of-conduct.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/code-of-non-academic.html	
Other information re: attending or withdrawing from the institution	http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/forms.html	
Academic programs	http://www.wesleyan.edu/acad/dept.html	
Courses currently offered	https://iasext.wesleyan.edu/regprod/wesmaps_page.html?term=1119 https://iasext.wesleyan.edu/regprod/wesmaps_page.html?term=1129	
Other available educational opportunities		
Other academic policies and procedures		
Requirements for degrees and other forms of academic recognition	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/academic_regulations/index.html	
List of current faculty, indicating department or program affiliation, distinguishing between full- and part-time, showing degrees held and institutions granting them	https://iasext.wesleyan.edu/regprod/wesmaps_page.html?fac_info_page=(click on faculty name for bio)	
Names and positions of administrative officers	http://www.wesleyan.edu/president/leadershipteam.html	
Names and principal affiliations of members of the governing board	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/trustees.html	
Locations and programs available at branch campuses, other instructional locations, and overseas operations at which students can enroll for a degree, along with a description of programs and services available at each location		
Programs, courses, services, and personnel not available in any given academic year.	Courses not offered: http://www.wesleyan.edu/courses -- click the subject, then click "courses not offered"; Programs not offered: http://www.wesleyan.edu/acad/dept.html (those majors being discontinued are listed as such)	
Size and characteristics of the student body	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/profile.html	
Description of the campus setting	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/profile.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/middletown.html	
Availability of academic and other support services	http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/about/classdeans.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/facguide/premajoradvising.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studentlife.html	
Range of co-curricular and non-academic opportunities available to students	http://www.wesleyan.edu/admission/student_life/index.html	
Institutional learning and physical resources from which a student can reasonably be expected to benefit	http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/resources/index.html	
Institutional goals for students' education	http://www.wesleyan.edu/wesleyanplanning/final/essential.html	
Success of students in achieving institutional goals including rates of retention and graduation and other measure of student success appropriate to institutional mission. Passage rates for licensure exams, as appropriate	http://www.wesleyan.edu/ir/graduation-retention.html	
Total cost of education, including availability of financial aid and typical length of study	http://www.wesleyan.edu/finaid/cost.html https://wesleyan.studentaidcalculator.com/survey.aspx	
Expected amount of student debt upon graduation	http://www.wesleyan.edu/finaid/financing/index.html http://www.wesleyan.edu/finaid/financing/packagedloans.html	
Statement about accreditation	http://www.wesleyan.edu/about/profile.html	

Standard Ten: Public Disclosure

Overview

In the ten years since Wesleyan's last reaccreditation self-study, the Web has significantly altered the environment for communicating information about the University's mission, programs, admission requirements, news, and much more. Wesleyan has adapted to the changing environment by developing the capacity of departments and offices across the campus to maintain their own websites within a common framework in the Wesleyan domain. The result has been substantial progress in making Wesleyan more web-centric, but challenges remain in our effort to ensure timely, accurate, and consistent presentation of information about the institution and its people.

Description

Print Publications

Print publications remain an important part of the University's communications portfolio, although many have been migrated to the Web during the past decade. Important print pieces include:

Admission Viewbook: The Admission Office continues to produce a print "viewbook" that complements the Admission website. A suite of supplementary materials supports the Admission process from first contact with potential applicants through matriculation, including detailed information on applying for and financing a Wesleyan education. The Office of Graduate Student Services produces a recruitment document for Wesleyan's masters' and doctoral programs, and some departments produce additional literature that describes their graduate programs.

Course Catalog: The University Catalog is published annually and lists all courses that have been taught in the last five years, and if they are to be offered in the current academic year, that is duly noted. The catalog also contains the current academic calendar, the University Academic Regulations, and descriptions of the 47 academic organizations (including the requirements for all majors and certificates offered by the University), as well as rosters of the board of trustees, the faculty, and senior administrative staff. The Catalog makes no claims regarding educational outcomes or postgraduate placement success.

Fundraising literature: Efforts are currently focused on the annual fund and include direct mail pieces as well as softer appeals such as the annual calendar for donors. Wesleyan will be entering the public phase of a campaign in 2013, and there will be print publications in support of that effort.

Wesleyan magazine: Produced three times a year and directed primarily at alumni and parents, the magazine depicts the achievements of members of the Wesleyan community.

The Wesleyan Argus: the *Argus* is an independently produced student newspaper, issued twice weekly when school is in session.

The Web

Wesleyan's [home page](#) is the University's primary means of disseminating news and information in a timely fashion. It also plays a role in emergency communications. Although the home page is designed to serve both the public and the Wesleyan community, it has a particular focus on the Admission audience and is meant to be a window into University life. Two of its more notable features are the President's blog, *Roth on Wesleyan*, and *WesLive*, which aggregates blog content from many campus sources and is available for posting by anyone with Wesleyan login credentials. A link to Wesleyan's strategic planning document, *Wesleyan 2020*, is prominent on the home page. Users may access all of Wesleyan's social media sites from the home page.

Since the last reaccreditation, the Office of Communications has introduced *Wesleyan Connection*, an online newsletter about Wesleyan and its community sent every other week to the alumni, parent, and campus audiences. The Admission site, linked from the home page, was redesigned in 2009. It offers detailed information about applying, the curriculum, and financial aid (including sample financial aid packages and the new federally mandated Cost Calculator). In addition, the site hosts student blogs, chats with Admission representatives, and videos, all intended to help high school students understand Wesleyan's culture. Spanish language pages and Google Translate for international students were recently added. In 2009 the Admission Office introduced online notification of admission decisions and in 2011 enabled students to respond to offers electronically, making the matriculation process more convenient and seamless. Admission is one of the most heavily trafficked sites in the Wesleyan domain.

Wesleyan posts annual budget reports on the Finance website. The Office of Institutional Research provides information on its site about common data sets, six-year graduation and retention rates, and data relevant to the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

Detailed information about the curriculum—including the online course catalog (WesMaps) and academic regulations—is available through the Academics landing page. In 2011 Wesleyan launched the Syllabus Library, a site with information about syllabi for a limited but growing number of courses, and the Faculty Bookshelf, which attractively displays information about recent faculty books. Detailed information about major and program requirements is available through departmental pages. The University's mission statement and *Wesleyan 2020* describe in general terms the expected outcome of a Wesleyan education. Wesleyan is nearing completion of a project to convert all sites in the Wesleyan domain to a new content management system, Cascade. The system gives website owners substantially increased capacity to manage content on their sites. The Cascade conversion process also includes a review of content and a redesign of every site (upwards of 300) with a common framework. In 2011, Information Technology Services introduced the Wesleyan mobile site, with selected content optimized for mobile viewing.

In May 2011, Wesleyan introduced a new site for alumni, Wesconnect. Based on a commercial platform, iModules, the site provides alumni with a comprehensive suite of services, including news, directory information, giving links, and event registration. Development of the site is ongoing.

Other Media

Since the last reaccreditation, Wesleyan introduced an emergency notification system, Blackboard Connect, for the purpose of delivering urgent information in an emergency to all students, faculty, and staff by whatever means they choose to receive it: office phone, cell phone, text, email, voice mail.

Appraisal

Print Publications

Although Wesleyan has focused its communication efforts on the Web in recent years, print publications continue to play a key role in circulating information about the University. Surveys and focus groups indicate that many potential applicants still rely on print materials for information about the University, and *Wesleyan* magazine is widely read by alumni.

The continued need for a printed course catalog has been questioned. Its use has declined in recent years, and all of its information is available online. Yet for those who prefer print, it remains a useful and comprehensive statement about Wesleyan's curriculum and programs. Nor does the online course information system, WesMaps, offer an adequate substitute. WesMaps is primarily intended to help current students in the course selection and registration process; its visual appearance is neither attractive nor compelling. Unlike the print catalog, it does not give a quick sense of the impressive scope of Wesleyan's curricular offerings. For both print and online purposes, the

content of Wesleyan's catalog is reviewed annually by administrative staff, the Educational Policy Committee, and academic department and program chairs to check that information is accurate and up-to-date.

The Web

The Web has been hugely useful to Wesleyan's daily communications efforts and in special situations such as crisis communications. When a snowstorm in the fall of 2011 left the campus without power and heat, the home page was used to provide regular updates about campus conditions. President Roth blogged several times a day. The Web was an important supplement to campus notifications through the emergency system, Blackboard Connect, and traffic to the home page during the storm spiked significantly. At the same time, the dearth of power meant that many students, faculty, and staff lost access to their computers and cell phones. In the end, staff resorted to posting regular announcements on paper and putting them up around campus. Staff have addressed the problems posed by a power outage through the purchase of portable generators and a development of a plan, now being implemented, to install co-generation at Freeman Athletic Center. ITS has developed emergency practices for Wesleyan's website that provide a set of standard messages for the community in a time when the website might be challenged (for example, by power outage or too much traffic).

Oversight of the Web does present challenges. Considerable responsibility for keeping information up to date lies with website owners and is often delegated to administrative assistants. With changing personnel, the need for training is continual. ITS offers hands-on training weekly and individual assistance on specific projects. Staff members have made a concerted effort to develop single-source publishing and to draw information from databases that are well maintained, but this is a work in progress. Assuring consistency of information, accuracy, and timeliness is an ongoing problem.

The admissions web presence has become increasingly important to marketing and outreach efforts. In particular, Wesleyan seeks to increase its international student representation, and a web-based strategy is critical to meeting that goal. Also, top students increasingly disregard mass mailings and other traditional ways of conveying information about colleges. Over the last several years, fully 30 percent of the students who apply (and a similar percent of those who matriculate) have had no formal communication with the Admission Office prior to application. In the "old world" these were "phantom" applications; in the new world they are independent consumers for whom the Web is the crucial source of information.

Ideally, users should find a consistent level of quality as they go deeper into the Wesleyan website. This goal has yet to be fully achieved: for example, the pages of individual faculty members vary dramatically with respect to scope and level of detail. More consistency in this regard requires a cultural shift among some faculty as well as training and software. Another issue is the online calendar, which is difficult to use. Students shy away from it, preferring instead to post their events on blogs such as the popular student site *Wesleying.org*. The unfortunate consequence is that the University's principal calendar for public use delivers an inadequate picture of campus activities. How to improve the situation is under discussion.

Other Media

Our Blackboard Connect emergency system has proven to be an effective way of reaching the community quickly. The annual test serves as a useful reminder for individuals to update their preferred method of emergency notification. The system performed well in 2009 with regards to updates on a gunman whose whereabouts were unknown after a murder near campus.

Wesleyan relies on email for routine communications about University matters, and students are informed that they are expected to monitor their email for such correspondence. Some departments are exploring the use of Facebook and Twitter to supplement, but not replace, email communication.

Web video is a growing means of conveying campus culture. Processing and storage of the very large files used in video, however, is already posing challenges to Information Technologies.

Projection

Wesleyan will continue to make its web presence more consistent and powerful, although a gap exists between aspirations and resources in this economically constrained environment. At the very least, Wesleyan will continue to raise awareness of the importance of the Web for public presentation of all aspects of University life and to strengthen expertise among the wide variety of contributors to Web content.

Institutional Effectiveness

Annually, Wesleyan reviews and updates the catalog and admission publications. The Office of Communication reviews these and numerous other publications to ensure that content is up to date and accurate. Information regarding the admission process and criteria, academic and nonacademic regulations, course availability, and financial aid is readily available on the Web, as well as in various print publications. As part of the process of converting to a new content management system, all of the websites in the Wesleyan domain either have been reviewed for timely and accurate content or will be reviewed in the next few months.

Standard 11: Integrity

Policies	Last Updated	URL where policy is posted	Responsible office or committee
Academy honesty		Faculty Handbook p. 65;	Academic Affairs
Intellectual property rights		http://www.wesleyan.edu/ip/	Academic Affairs
Conflict of interest	11/02/07	www.wesleyan.edu/generalcounsel/policies	General Counsel
Privacy rights			
Fairness for students		http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/appendix.html and Faculty Handbook (see hardcopy, p. 27)	
Fairness for faculty		Faculty Handbook (see hardcopy, p. 57)	Academic Affairs
Fairness for staff			Human Resources
Academic freedom		Faculty Handbook p. 25	Academic Affairs
Other _____			
Other _____			

Non-discrimination policies

Recruitment and admissions	03/2011	www.wesleyan.edu/hr/	Human Resources
Employment	03/2011	www.wesleyan.edu/hr/	Human Resources
Evaluation	03/2011	www.wesleyan.edu/hr/	Human Resources
Disciplinary action	03/2011	www.wesleyan.edu/hr/	Human Resources
https://iasext.wesleyan.edu/regprod/lwesmaps_page.html?fac_info_page= (click on faculty name)			
List of current (f for bio)	03/2011	www.wesleyan.edu/hr/	Human Resources
Other _____			

Programs, courses: Courses not offered: <http://www.wesleyan.edu/courses> -- click the subject, then click "courses not offered"; Programs not offered: <http://www.wesleyan.edu/courses>

Resolution of grievances

Students		See "Student grievance procedure" in http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/academic_regulations/general_regulations.html	
Faculty		Faculty Handbook (see hardcopy; e.r., pp. 41, 59)	Academic Affairs
Staff	06/2011	www.wesleyan.edu/hr/	Human Resources
Other _____			

Other	Last Updated	Relevant URL or Publication	Responsible office or committee
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			

Standard Eleven: Integrity

Description

The University is committed to the principles of academic freedom and the promotion of free and open exchange of ideas. These principles are clearly articulated to members of the University community in Wesleyan's statements on academic freedom and the responsibilities of the University, and in other components of the Faculty Handbook, the Honor Code, the Code of Non-Academic Conduct, and the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students.

The University has clear and well-distributed guidelines and standards for ethical conduct by the institution and its members. The essential capability in ethical reasoning, outlined in Standard Four, and engagement with ethical issues across the University curriculum, are factors in curricular development.

The University has endeavored to conduct regular and critical self-analysis, along with timely amendments and updates to ensure that its standards and policies remain appropriate and applicable.

The University operates as a non-profit corporation under a special Charter granted by the State of Connecticut and By-Laws last revised and amended by the Board of Trustees in May of 2011. The University, while private, strives for transparency in its governance and operations. Decisions by the Board of Trustees and the administration are made with the participation of students, faculty, staff, and others through their own governance structures.

The University's faculty is the principal vehicle for the fulfillment of the University's core mission of scholarship and teaching. The faculty is governed by written standards of faculty governance and conduct set forth in the Faculty Handbook.

Student academic integrity is governed by an Honor Code, enforced by a student Honor Board under the supervision of the University's Vice President for Student Affairs. The conduct of students in other aspects of their life at the University is governed by a Code of Non-Academic Conduct, enforced by a Student Judiciary Board under the supervision of the Office of Student Affairs.

Guided by its Vice President for Diversity and Office of Affirmative Action, Wesleyan emphasizes nondiscriminatory behavior and practices in all areas including recruitment, admissions, employment, disciplinary activities, and community and business partner relationships. The University seeks to go beyond non-discrimination to create an institutional environment that welcomes and promotes diversity in its faculty and student body, and in all University operations. Consistent with the mission statement of the New England Small College Athletic Association, of which Wesleyan is a founding member, the University is committed to institutional control of its athletic programs to secure a proper balance in accord with its academic mission.

The University makes its Charter, By-Laws, and key policies available to the Wesleyan community and the general public alike – encouraging education, questions, criticism, discussion, and a spirit of cooperative compliance. Its Board of Trustees conducts regular evaluations of all governance documents in order to allow for deliberation, debate, and updating, and it completed its last such update in 2011. The University emphasizes integrity: The same standards and policies apply at all levels of the University. A Cabinet position (Vice President for Institutional Partnerships and Chief Diversity Officer) is dedicated to oversight of these and other issues.

Appraisal

Cultural, economic, technological, and institutional changes in higher education have the potential to affect many aspects of the University's integrity as an academic institution. Since the previous reaccreditation, the University has undertaken systematic reviews and revisions of many of its most important policies and practices that sustain the University's commitments to integrity and transparency.

Concerning its academic core, the University has systematically reviewed and revised its processes for the reappointment, promotion, and tenure of faculty with regards to the following: improving transparency and uniformity

of standards, focusing and clarifying its appeal procedures, ensuring confidentiality, providing a more appropriate role for tenure-track faculty in the tenure process and tenure policy, and keeping candidates appropriately informed of their standing in the process. The Advisory Committee of the Academic Council oversees the implementation and assessment of these changes. The University also regularly conducts reviews and updates to its general faculty standards and conduct contained in the Faculty Handbook.

The University's two major policies and processes for ensuring the integrity of student life at the University have received extensive attention since the previous reaccreditation. The Student Honor Code was recently revised to enhance its visibility and transparency. The Code of Non-Academic Conduct has also recently been revised in order to remove barriers to reporting sexual violence, and to enhance the visibility of University resources and procedures for responding to such violence. The University continues to address other concerns with aspects of student conduct and culture, seeking to enhance the visibility and recognition of the Code of Non-Academic Conduct, address specific concerns that may arise from time to time, and maintain clearer and more effective enforcement of its provisions.

The University is currently undertaking a new initiative to enhance awareness and understanding of what diversity should mean in an academic setting, "Making Excellence Inclusive," presented in Standard 6. This project has initiated discussions on inclusiveness throughout the academic and supporting units.

The University expects behavior by all employees to be consistent with its key policies, routinely enforces those policies, and has recently instituted several new procedures to help fulfill that expectation. The University has created an on-line University Code of Conduct wherein all employees are required to review and acknowledge the University's key policies and are afforded an opportunity to report issues, concerns, or questions. Included therein is a Whistleblower Policy affording concerned parties a safe method for reporting problems or concerns without fear of inappropriate retribution.

The University requires its business partners to agree to University terms and conditions including nondiscriminatory behavior, fair employment practices, avoidance of conflicts of interest, and general compliance with the law. These terms are regularly updated, and the University trains its applicable personnel in the significance of these key terms.

Finally, the Athletic Department regularly reviews its policies and practices for compliance with the University's core values. The University is currently conducting a review of the Athletic Department's fulfillment of the University's commitment to gender equity.

Projection

Maintaining academic and institutional integrity in a changing environment requires continued attention and oversight. Because many of our core policies and practices in this area have recently been revised, we anticipate that during the next few years, we shall primarily be monitoring the implementation of these changes and assessing their effectiveness. Further change will be undertaken if and when new issues arise or if recent changes were to prove ineffective or insufficient. The extent of the University's effort to review key policies and practices reflects the level of recognition by senior administration, faculty, and staff that the appropriateness and effectiveness of our policies concerning academic freedom, ethical behavior, and institutional integrity and fairness are indispensable to fulfillment of our institutional mission.

Institutional Effectiveness

The University has endeavored to conduct regular and critical self-analysis, along with timely amendments and updates to ensure that its standards and policies remain appropriate and applicable. Wesleyan monitors the implementation of its policies with the intent of improving both policy and practice regarding academic freedom, ethical behavior, and institutional integrity and fairness.



**NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES
COMMISSION ON INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

209 Burlington Road, Bedford, MA 01730

Voice: (781) 271-0022

Fax: (781) 271-0950

Web: <http://cihe.neasc.org>

AFFIRMATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REGULATIONS RELATING TO TITLE IV

Periodically, member institutions are asked to affirm their compliance with federal requirements relating to Title IV program participation, including relevant requirements of the Higher Education Opportunity Act.

- 1. Credit Hour:** Federal regulation defines a credit hour as an amount of work represented in intended learning outcomes and verified by evidence of student achievement that is an institutional established equivalence that reasonably approximates not less than: (1) One hour of classroom or direct faculty instruction and a minimum of two hours of out of class student work each week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester or trimester hour of credit, or ten to twelve weeks for one quarter hour of credit, or the equivalent amount of work over a different amount of time; or (2) At least an equivalent amount of work as required in paragraph (1) of this definition for other academic activities as established by the institution including laboratory work, internships, practica, studio work, and other academic work leading to the award of credit hours. (CIHE Policy 111. See also *Standards for Accreditation* 4.34.)

URL	wesleyan.edu/registrar/academic_regulations/general_regulations.html
Print Publications	2012/13 Course Catalog, page 15
Self-study/Fifth-year Report Page Reference	Self-study, Standard 4, page 10

- 2. Credit Transfer Policies.** The institution's policy on transfer of credit is publicly disclosed through its website and other relevant publications. The institution includes a statement of its criteria for transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education along with a list of institutions with which it has articulation agreements. (CIHE Policy 95. See also *Standards for Accreditation* 4.44 and 10.5.)

URL	wesleyan.edu/registrar/academic_regulations/special_programs_external.html
Print Publications	2012/13 Course Catalog, page 13
Self-study/Fifth-year Report Page Reference	Self-study, Standard 4, page 11

- 3. Student Complaints.** "Policies on student rights and responsibilities, including grievance procedures, are clearly stated, well publicized and readily available, and fairly and consistently administered." (*Standards for Accreditation* 6.18, 10.5, and 11.8.)

URL	wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/standardsregulations/wesleyan.edu/registrar/academic_regulations/general_regulations.html scroll to "Student grievance procedure"
Print Publications	Course Catalog, p 17
Self-study/Fifth-year Report Page Reference	No reference

- 4. Distance and Correspondence Education: Verification of Student Identity:** If the institution offers distance education or correspondence education, it has processes in place to establish that the student who registers in a distance education or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the program and receives the academic credit. . . The institution protects student privacy and notifies students at the time of registration or enrollment of any projected additional student charges associated with the verification of student identity. (CIHE Policy 95. See also *Standards for Accreditation* 4.42.)

Method(s) used for verification	Not applicable
Self-study/Fifth-year Report Page Reference	Not applicable

- 5. FOR COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATIONS ONLY: Public Notification of an Evaluation Visit and Opportunity for Public Comment:** The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public of an upcoming comprehensive evaluation and to solicit comments. (CIHE Policy 77.)

URL	wesleyan.edu wesleyan.edu/accreditation/ middletown-ct.patch.com/
Print Publications	The Middletown Press
Self-study Page Reference	No reference

The undersigned affirms that Wesleyan University meets the above federal requirements relating to Title IV program participation, including those enumerated above.

Chief Executive Officer: _____

Date: 8/2/2012

Option E1: Part a. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.)	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
At the institutional level:			No					
For general education if an undergraduate institution:			Yes: Essential Capabilities	http://www.wesleyan.edu/capabilities/	Survey of students' self-assessment of skills in each Capability, upon entry and exit.	Institutional Research analyzed the data and wrote a report (see self-study standard 4, pages 7-9).	Emphasis is being shifted away from the Essential Capabilities to academic advising as the linchpin of curricular coherence and student academic progress.	
List each degree program:								
1.	B.A.	African American Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/afamt.htm	Capstone project (honors thesis, senior essay, or research paper).	The majors committee evaluates student performance, which is considered during the annual curriculum development process.	No recent changes.	2012
2.	B.A.	American Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/amstt.htm	Senior seminar and student written self-assessment.	Annual departmental assessment meeting.	No recent changes.	2011
3.	B.A.	Anthropology	Yes	http://wesleyan.edu/anthro/Anthropology_Assessment_Plan.pdf	Capstone project (honors thesis, senior essay, or extended seminar paper) and oral presentation to faculty and majors; questionnaire to alumni who graduated five years prior	Departmental faculty critique capstone proposals in end-of-semester meeting; annual curricular decisions made in departmental faculty meetings are informed by analysis of capstone outcomes	In 2009-10, the introductory and core theory requirements were revamped on the basis of assessment; the two-field introductory course was replaced with separate courses on cultural anthropology and archeology. The survey format of the core courses was changed to a topical format to show how contemporary perspectives on particular issues are shaped both by and against historical approaches.	2010
4.	B.A.	Archeological Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/arcpt.htm	Capstone: thesis or senior essay with oral presentation to program faculty and majors.	all the program faculty engage in an ongoing process of revising the curriculum and major requirements based on capstone projects.	No recent changes.	
5.	B.A.	Art History	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/artt.htm	Survey of majors and graduates (last done 2003), informal communication with alumni, data on majors' completion of general education stages; optional honors projects.	All faculty meet 3-4 times per semester to review evidence, and the curriculum committee reports to the program regularly; program retreats are held every six years.	A new introductory course was added in spring 2009; a requirement to complete two years of a foreign language was added to the major, and that decision was re-evaluated in spring 2012 based on the department faculty reviewing the data on how students completed this requirement. Based on this review, the requirement was retained.	2015

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.)	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
6.	B.A.	Art Studio	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/artt.htm	Capstone: senior thesis exhibition and senior critique/review.	All program faculty conduct a fall-semester review of thesis work in progress, with all majors present. All faculty collectively review all thesis exhibitions and conduct an formal oral critique with the student. All program faculty meet at least five times per year to discuss refinements to the major: when they review thesis work (three times per year), when they review applications for admission to the major (once per year), and when they develop the coming year's curriculum (once per year).	Recent changes include: making the senior thesis a two-semester requirement; requiring a mid-year senior group critique in which all faculty and all majors participate (with non-majors invited to observe); the options were modified regarding which four art history course topics must be taken.	
7.	B.A.	Astronomy	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/astro/about-the-major/index.html	Major seminars, progress in completing the courses for the major. All department faculty participate in the assessment of students at regular faculty meetings.	The chair of the department reviews student progress in completing the major and all department faculty participate in the assessment of students at regular faculty meetings.	An advanced course in exoplanets was added. An advanced course in radio astronomy is being added for 2012-13, which is a growth area for the field.	
8.	B.A.	Biology	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/biolt.htm	Senior colloquium and questionnaire of majors.	Each year, the assessment subcommittee of the department will prepare an assessment report, summarizing the quantitative data, qualitative responses, and highlights of student discussions from the senior colloquium, and bring it to the department faculty for consideration.	The large (~200 student) introductory course is being broken into several smaller (~40 student) sections beginning in fall 2012, in order to engage in intensive, problem-based learning.	2009
9.	B.A.	Chemistry	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/chemt.htm	Advanced "integrated chemistry" laboratory and two semester Chemistry Symposium. Each year the chemistry faculty as a whole, at a regularly scheduled chemistry faculty meeting, discuss the absolute and relative performance of student majors while evaluating them for departmental honors and prizes.	Each year the chemistry faculty as a whole, at a regularly scheduled chemistry faculty meeting, discuss the absolute and relative performance of student majors while evaluating them for departmental honors and prizes.	In fall 2010, the emphasis in the "general chemistry laboratory" course was changed to add more organic chemistry while still retaining the quantitative aspect of the course. In spring 2012, "physical chemistry for life sciences" was revised. Beginning in fall 2012, 1-2 faculty will moderate informal research discussions with students once per month, to encourage students to share their immediate experiences, thus gain perspective on them, and learn from other students' different experiences.	2007

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
10.	B.A.	Classical Civilization	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/classics/major_description.htm	Capstone: project as part of senior seminar; self-assessment forms that majors complete twice, upon declaration of major and during senior seminar.	All department faculty review capstone outcomes and self-assessment forms at final departmental meeting of the year.	The department will consider changes to be made on the basis of assessment evidence in 2012-13.	
11.	B.A.	Classics	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/classics/major_description.htm	Capstone: project as part of senior seminar; self-assessment forms that majors complete twice, upon declaration of major and during senior seminar.	All department faculty review capstone outcomes and self-assessment forms at final departmental meeting of the year.	The department will consider changes to be made on the basis of assessment evidence in 2012-13.	
12.	B.A.	College of Letters	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/colt.htm	Capstone: senior thesis or essay and oral presentation; junior comprehensive examinations.	External evaluators grade the junior comprehensive examinations; the College of Letters faculty review feedback from the external examiners and capstone performance in the annual COL retreat and at the year-end meeting to assess the success of the curriculum in fulfilling the pedagogical goals of the college.	No recent changes.	2013
13.	B.A.	College of Social Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/csst.htm and http://www.wesleyan.edu/cs/formajors/studenthandbook.html	Capstone course and thesis or essay; sophomore examinations (written and oral) reviewed by evaluators from other institutions.	Written evaluations by senior thesis readers and external examiners are reviewed by the CSS co-chairs annually.	Different faculty have been recruited in from other departments; existing faculty have been given advice to improve their teaching; senior thesis workshops have been improved; the process for selecting thesis advisors has been improved.	2003
14.	B.A.	Computer Science	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/mathcs/cs/info_major.html	Successful placement in graduate school or computer science-related jobs.	The curriculum committee meets routinely.	No recent changes.	2005
15.	B.A.	Dance	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/danct.htm	Capstone: senior essay or thesis involving written research plus a choreographic work as part of a fully produced student concert.	The full department faculty engage in group critique sessions of the choreographic work and the departmental steering committee reevaluate the major on the basis of the capstones and other milestones of student work.	The faculty noticed that students are deficient in technical production abilities; to address this they are consulting with the Theater Department about restructuring methods for teaching this skill and will submit a proposal to the academic dean during the 2012-13 year. In 2010, they saw increased student interest in alternate site work, community engagement, and interdisciplinary projects, and added a section of the choreography workshop course that focuses specifically on site-specific work and environmental issues.	2005

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) Include URLs where appropriate.	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
14.	B.A.	Computer Science	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/mathcs/cs/info_major.html	Successful placement in graduate school or computer science-related jobs.	The curriculum committee meets routinely.	No recent changes.	2005
15.	B.A.	Dance	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/danct.htm	Capstone: senior essay or thesis involving written research plus a choreographic work as part of a fully produced student concert.	The full department faculty engage in group critique sessions of the choreographic work and the departmental steering committee reevaluate the major on the basis of the capstones and other milestones of student work.	The faculty noticed that students are deficient in technical production abilities; to address this they are consulting with the Theater Department about restructuring methods for teaching this skill and will submit a proposal to the academic dean during the 2012-13 year. In 2010, they saw increased student interest in alternate site work, community engagement, and interdisciplinary projects, and added a section of the choreography workshop course that focuses specifically on site-specific work and environmental issues.	2005
16.	B.A.	Earth & Environmental Sciences	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/eest.htm	Senior capstone seminar; seniors present final project reports at the department colloquium before the entire department faculty.	All faculty review and discuss student outcomes following the senior colloquium presentations.	No recent changes.	2002
17.	B.A.	East Asian Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/eastt.htm	Capstone project involving the use of East Asian language materials, concluding with poster session in April; sophomore colloquium course.	Annual review of the major by all program faculty.	Key concentrations within the major were redesigned to give a clearer disciplinary and comparative focus; sophomore colloquium course focus modified to include environmental studies and the use of film; development of annual capstone poster session.	2014
18.	B.A.	Economics	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/econ/ECON-MECOassessmentplan1.pdf	Instructors of upper-level electives are asked to fill out a short checklist indicating whether students' performance on the respective courses' final research projects demonstrates competency with respect to the three learning goals listed on our departmental statement. Looking forward, we are planning to investigate the utility of developing a placement test for our introductory courses (101 and 110) that might also serve as a "pre-test" for assessment purposes.	Each semester the department chair will collect the assessment results from the upper-tier course instructors and prepare a summary of these results for the department faculty. These results and their possible implications for curricular revision will be discussed by department faculty early in the following academic year. The chair will synthesize any suggestions for curricular change emerging from this discussion into formal motions to be voted on by the tenured and tenure-track faculty.	The department plans to incorporate feedback from the assessment channels described in part 3 in its ongoing discussions concerning curricular content and structure. In 2000-01, the department undertook a comprehensive assessment of its introductory and major curriculum that resulted in a multiphase restructuring in which the mathematical content of the gateway introductory course was increased and the two-tiered structure described in the first bullet point in part 3 was introduced. The effectiveness of these changes will continue to be evaluated in light of information generated by the newly implemented assessment procedures.	2002

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.)	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
19.	B.A.	English	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/englt.htm and www.wesleyan.edu/english/major.html	Advising review: faculty advisors review the required "progress in the major" form with major advisees in their advising meetings prior to approving course registration and major certification.	Annual departmental review of the student forms and advisor reports.	No recent changes.	2006
20.	B.A.	Environmental Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/college/academics/index.html	Capstone: thesis or essay and senior colloquium.	Seniors present oral reports on their capstone work throughout the senior colloquium, culminating in a senior reflection exercise of students and faculty analyzing the success of the capstone process. Once per year, a faculty committee will evaluate the senior work to assess the state of the program.	This is a new program, approved in spring 2009; major changes have not been made since then.	
21.	B.A.	Feminist, Gender, & Sexuality Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/fgs/major.html	Capstone course (senior seminar) and project (senior essay or honors thesis).	Capstone projects are evaluated by two program faculty; additionally, theses (not essays) are presented by students at a public forum attended by program faculty. Core faculty consider capstone outcomes in monthly meetings.	The program has strengthened student/faculty engagement through brown-bag faculty/student lunch discussions each semester, and has made the curriculum more coherent and integrated.	2009
22.	B.A.	Film Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/filmstudies/	Capstone course (senior seminar) and project.	All department faculty review: the curriculum against their evaluation of annual capstone performance; ongoing surveys of departmental alumni.	Introductory/gateway courses have undergone revision to make fundamental improvements. The department is considering adding a minor and shifting emphasis away from letter grades in its evaluation of student applications to enter the major.	2002
23.	B.A.	French Studies	No		At the May 2012 Romance Language faculty retreat, use of assessment portfolios hosted by the Mahara web-platform was proposed; a decision on adaption and implementation (e.g., which evidence to require for majors and non-majors?) will be decided in fall 2013.	To be determined in fall 2012.		2011

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) Include URLs where appropriate.	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
24.	B.A.	German Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/grstt.htm	Language proficiency testing, regular conferences for majors and their faculty advisors, and an advanced course requirement.	All department faculty, as part of regular faculty meetings.	No recent changes.	
25.	B.A.	Government	No			Faculty advisors assess student performance during annual departmental curricular review.	No recent changes.	2004
26.	B.A.	Hispanic Literatures and Cultures	No		At the May 2012 Romance Language faculty retreat, use of assessment portfolios hosted by the Mahara web-platform was proposed; a decision on adaption and implementation (e.g., which evidence to require for majors and non-majors?) will be decided in fall 2013.	To be determined in fall 2012.	No recent changes.	2011
27.	B.A.	History	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/hist.htm and http://www.wesleyan.edu/history/about_major.html	Capstone: senior research project; questionnaire of majors.	During 2011-12, the entire faculty, as a "committee of the whole" analyzed student exit surveys on the effectiveness of our curriculum in preparing the majors for completion of the research requirement; the geographic and thematic distribution of honor theses; enrollment data; student exit surveys on our required method/theory seminar, HIST 362; and consulted with the Student Majors Committee in considering changes to the major. In fall 2012, the department will consider forming a curriculum committee to interpret assessment evidence annually.	The department as a whole voted in 2011-2012 to revise the requirements for the major, replacing the "concentration" of 6 courses with 2 required "modules" of 4 courses each, to allow for greater flexibility of thematic focus; the requirement to take a sophomore seminar was eliminated but students are still required to take three seminars to complete the major.	2006
28.	B.A.	Iberian Studies (discontinued with Class of 2015, see instead Hispanic Literatures and Cultures)	No		Due to discontinuation of this major, assessment will not be conducted.	Due to discontinuation of this major, assessment will not be conducted.	In spring 2012, the Romance Languages and Literatures department discontinued the majors in Spanish as well as Iberian Studies, and replaced both with one major in Hispanic Literatures and Cultures, effective beginning with the class of 2015.	2011

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.)	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
29.	B.A.	Italian Studies	No		Students produce a narrative of their "senior concentration form" to deliver orally to the major advisor in the senior year. Additionally, at the May 2012 Romance Language faculty retreat, use of assessment portfolios hosted by the Mahara web-platform was proposed; a decision on adaption and implementation (e.g., which evidence to require for majors and non-majors?) will be decided in fall 2013.	Faculty in the major meet together to discuss student narratives. The process for interpreting the Mahara evidence will be determined in fall 2012.	Requirements for the major were revised in 2011-2012.	2011
30.	B.A.	Latin American Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/lastt.htm	Capstone project (Honors thesis, senior essay, or research paper).	Program faculty analyze student outcomes in regular program meetings.	No recent changes.	
31.	B.A.	Mathematics	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/mathcs/math/info_major.html	The faculty teaching the 9 sections of the department's 2 key courses for the major (Real Analysis and Abstract Algebra) report to the curriculum committee on outcomes of those sections.	The curriculum committee reviews reports each semester.	The department plans offer Real Analysis and Abstract Algebra in smaller sections in 2012-2013; the policy on AP credit was changed; the first-year student placement exam is being rewritten to be more conceptual and less formulaic.	2005
32.	B.A.	Mathematics & Economics (Discontinued with Class of 2015)	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/econ/ECON-MECOassessmentplan1.pdf	Due to discontinuation of this major, assessment will no longer be conducted.	Due to discontinuation of this major, assessment will no longer be conducted.	No recent changes.	
33.	B.A.	Medieval Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/m-edistud/major_description.html	Capstone: research project.	Three faculty members review each research project.	Program faculty are currently discussing changes in the structure and the program, aimed at better clarity and better access to the major, with the possibility of changing the major to a minor. They expect to implement changes during the 2013 academic year.	
34.	B.A.	Molecular Biology & Biochemistry	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/m-bb/index.html	Standardized online test taken by beginning and graduating students, to track their progress toward learning goals.	The test is scored by a computer; a faculty member presents the results to the department faculty for analysis and discussion, annually.	No recent changes.	2013

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) Include URLs where appropriate.	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
35.	B.A.	Music	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/music/undergrad.html	Capstone project	All departmental faculty review every major's plan of study; the department's honors committee reviews and reports to all faculty on all capstone projects.	A new introductory-level course was added to enhance theoretical knowledge lacking among incoming students; theory requirements and other distribution requirements were added to the major based on capstone outcomes.	2007
36.	B.A.	Neuroscience & Behavior	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/nsb/about.html	The program intends to develop an assessment plan in fall 2012.	The program intends to develop an assessment plan in fall 2012.		2011
37.	B.A.	Philosophy	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/philosophy/formajors/index.html	Completion of the philosophical reasoning requirement.	All department faculty meet twice per year to discuss student majors and their academic progress; in the fall, the focus is new majors, and in spring the focus is graduating majors.	In 2011-12, the faculty recognized that some faculty advisors do not know double-major students well, and determined that advisors must meet with every major advisee at least once per year. The department is considering asking new majors to submit written statements of goals in the major, to support departmental assessment.	2008
38.	B.A.	Physics	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/physt.htm	Advising review: students conduct written self-assessment and review it with faculty advisors.	Faculty advisors report to the full department at annual January retreat and in weekly departmental faculty meetings.	Ongoing corrections to curriculum and scheduling result from the process.	2003
39.	B.A.	Psychology	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/psyc.htm	Students complete an assessment questionnaire immediately upon return from study abroad or other cultural immersion experience.	The department engages in ongoing discussions about the curriculum and develops new courses each year; the discussions include a constant comparison between the new and previous curricula.	The department underwent a complete overhaul of the requirements for the major in 2009, to emphasize sociocultural and international awareness, by requiring a cultural immersion experience (usually through study abroad) and a foreign language proficiency through the intermediate level.	2004
40.	B.A.	Religion	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/relit.htm	Assessment portfolio and capstone symposium.	All departmental faculty analyze student outcomes in regular department meetings.	Ongoing corrections to curriculum result from the process.	2008
41.	B.A.	Romance Studies	No		At the May 2012 Romance Language faculty retreat, use of assessment portfolios hosted by the Mahara web-platform was proposed; a decision on adaptation and implementation (e.g., which evidence to require for majors and non-majors?) will be decided in fall 2013.	To be determined in fall 2012.	Substantial changes to the major were approved by the Educational Policy Committee in 2011-2012.	2011

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) Include URLs where appropriate.	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
42.	B.A.	Russian (Discontinued with Class of 2015, see instead Russian and East European Studies)	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/russt.htm	Assessment portfolio and capstone symposium.	Annual review of portfolios by all department faculty, followed by a one-time seminar discussion with the faculty and students, followed by departmental meeting to assess curricular success	No recent changes.	
43.	B.A.	Russian and East European Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/reest.htm	Assessment portfolio and capstone symposium.	Annual review of portfolios by all department faculty, followed by a one-time seminar discussion with the faculty and students, followed by departmental meeting to assess curricular success.	Based on the assessment exercise in the Russian Department in 2011-2012, the faculty are considering requiring a capstone thesis or essay.	
44.	B.A.	Science in Society	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/sisp/for_majors/index.html	Self-assessment and portfolio review.	The entire program faculty will meet in early September 2012 to read the student documents in light of advisors' review of those students' transcripts.	No recent changes.	2012
45.	B.A.	Sociology	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/soc/major_desc.html	Capstone: senior research thesis or essay.	Read, graded, and corrected on two faculty members.	No recent changes.	2003
46.	B.A.	Spanish (Discontinued with Class of 2015, see instead Hispanic Literatures and Cultures)	No		Due to discontinuation of this major, assessment will not be conducted.	Due to discontinuation of this major, assessment will not be conducted.	In spring 2012, the Romance Languages and Literatures department discontinued the majors in Spanish as well as Iberian Studies, and replaced both with one major in Hispanic Literatures and Cultures, effective beginning with the class of 2015.	2011
47.	B.A.	Theater	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/theat.htm and http://www.wesleyan.edu/theater/TheaterHandbook.pdf	Advanced practica are required of all majors, in technical practice and performance practice.	All department faculty, as part of regular faculty meetings.	In 2010-11, the faculty made significant changes to the gateway courses, created new and updated Theater History and Criticism, expanded the range of cross-listed courses to include visual literacy, and increased support to senior theses.	2015
48.	B.A.	University Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/resources/major_declaration/umajor.html and http://www.wesleyan.edu/studentaffairs/pdfs/University%20Major%20Application_revised_2012%20B.pdf	Capstone: honors thesis or senior essay/project.	Three faculty members sponsor each student, supervise his/her program, which must be approved by the Educational Policy Committee. The Committee on University Majors reviews each application for admission to this ad hoc major once each semester and this review constitutes a review of the major itself.	No recent changes.	

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.)	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
49.	M.A.L.	Graduate Liberal Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/masters/academics/degrees.html	Mid-point advising meetings and milestone tracking.	Advisors report to the Director who conducts an annual review with the faculty advisory committee.	The requirements for the degree were revised in 2008; in 2007 a writing consultant was engaged to work one-on-one with students; writing-intensive "foundation" course sections were added in 2010; new student orientation was enhanced in 2011.	2000
50.	M.A.	Astronomy	Yes	Page 13 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's qualifying Exam (oral and written) taken at the end of the first year, master's thesis and oral examination.	All department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	2007
51.	M.A.	Biology	Yes	Page 15 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's thesis and oral examination	Department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	
52.	M.A.	Chemistry	Yes	Page 18 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's thesis and oral examination	Department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	
51.	M.A.	Computer Science	Yes	Page 25 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's thesis and oral examination	All department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	2005
53.	M.A.	Earth & Environmental Science	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/ees/grad/ and page 22 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's thesis and oral examination	All available department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	2002
54.	M.A.	Mathematics	Yes	Page 25 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's thesis and oral examination	The Graduate Education Committee oversees all student plans for their programs of study. The thesis is defended before the department faculty, who conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	2005
55.	M.A.	Molecular Biology & Biochemistry	Yes	Page 27 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's thesis and oral examination	Department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
56.	M.A.	Music	Yes	Page 30 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	A language exam in a scholarly or research language; a public concert is required in the composition track; a departmental colloquia is given on the thesis while in progress in the ethnomusicology track; a master's thesis and oral examination by a three-member faculty committee.	Department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	2007
57.	M.A.	Neuroscience & Behavior	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/nsb/about.html and http://www.wesleyan.edu/nsb/liveyearprogram.html	Master's thesis and oral examination	Department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	
58.	M.A.	Physics	Yes	Page 33 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Master's thesis and oral examination	Department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.		
59.	M.A.	Psychology	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/registrar/catalog/psyc.htm	Master's thesis and oral examination	Department faculty attend the thesis defense and conduct a comprehensive assessment of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	
60.	M.Phil.	Graduate Liberal Studies	Yes	http://www.wesleyan.edu/masters/academics/degrees.html and http://www.wesleyan.edu/masters/pdfs/MPhil_Guidelines_2012-2013.pdf	Master's thesis and colloquium presentation before the faculty committee, and thesis review by the program director.	Thesis committee faculty report to the program director who presents findings to the faculty advisory committee.	The former Certificate of Advanced Study was converted to the M.Phil. Degree in spring 2012; requirements for the Certificate were substantially revised and expanded in spring 2008.	2000
61.	Ph.D.	Biology	Yes	Page 15 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	During each semester in the first year, the student meets with an evaluation committee of the faculty to review progress; before the end of the second year a qualifying exam is conducted, including a written research proposal followed by an oral examination by four faculty members; the dissertation is evaluated by a committee of three faculty members who meet twice per year to review progress.	Those faculty on the evaluation committee, conducting the qualifying exam, and on the thesis committee report to the entire department faculty on student progress at the conclusion of each milestone.	The format of the qualifying exam was revised 2-3 years ago to add an option on the focus of the research proposal, allowing students to present a research proposal on the work they actually plan to do (previously they were required to present a proposal for a project that was outside of the expertise of the student's lab).	2009

E-Series: E1 Part A			(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Category			Have formal learning outcomes been developed?	Where are these learning outcomes published? (please specify) (include URLs where appropriate.)	Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?	Date of most recent program review (for general education and each degree program)
62.	Ph.D.	Chemistry	Yes	Page 18 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Progress examinations are conducted six times each year; students draft research proposals and defend them before the departmental faculty; students give a one-hour seminar talk each year; the dissertation must be defended during a departmental colloquium.	Department faculty evaluate each milestone of student progress; the dissertation committee and full department faculty evaluate the dissertation and the student's presentation of its findings, conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	Two years ago, in response to evidence derived from the above that suggested that students were not mastering the background literature of their research area quickly enough, the department changed to a two proposal system. One proposal in the second year centered on the student's proposed research and a second, in the fourth year, must be in an unrelated area. The faculty are currently assessing the results of this change.	2007
63.	Ph.D.	Mathematics	Yes	Page 24 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	General preliminary examinations in the summer after the first year; special preliminary examination during the third year; Ph.D. dissertation and oral examination	A faculty committee evaluates student performance in preliminary examinations; the dissertation is defended before the departmental faculty; the Graduate Education Committee oversees all student plans for their programs of study	The special preliminary examination has recently been changed to be a private examination by a faculty committee, though the old method of a public talk followed by a less extensive private examination by the faculty committee is still available at faculty option.	2005
64.	Ph.D.	Molecular Biology & Biochemistry	Yes	Page 27 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	A written qualifying exam is conducted at the end of the third semester; an oral defense of an original research proposal is conducted in the fourth semester; yearly monitoring of the student's progress by a committee of typically four professors; students are expected to publish their research; students write and defend the dissertation to their faculty committee, and they present a public lecture.	Department faculty evaluate each milestone of student progress; the dissertation committee and full department faculty evaluate the dissertation and the student's presentation of its findings, conducting a comprehensive evaluation of the student's achievement of the goals for the degree.	No recent changes.	
65.	Ph.D.	Music	Yes	Page 30 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	Qualifying examinations consisting of written essays and an oral examination are conducted at the end of the second year; passing examinations in two languages; Ph.D. dissertation and public oral defense with a three-member faculty committee.	Faculty committees evaluate the qualifying examination, the dissertation, and the defense.	No recent changes.	2007
66.	Ph.D.	Physics	Yes	Page 33 of: http://www.wesleyan.edu/grad/academics/GradCatalog.pdf	A written exam at the beginning of the second year; the Ph.D. candidacy exam at the end of the second year constituting an oral description and defense of a research proposal; the Ph.D. dissertation and oral defense.	Faculty committees evaluate the qualifying examination, the dissertation, and the defense.	No recent changes.	2003

Option E1: Part b. Inventory of Specialized and Program Accreditation

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(6)
Professional, specialized, State, or programmatic accreditations currently held by the institution (by agency or program name).	Date of most recent accreditation action by each listed agency.	List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board, or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.).*	Date and nature of next scheduled review.
No degree programs undergo independent or specialized accreditation				

PART II: DOCUMENTING STUDENT SUCCESS (THE S-SERIES)

The S-series of forms has been devised for institutions to present data on retention and graduation rates and other measures of student success appropriate to the institution's mission. (*Standards for Accreditation*, 6.6, 10.10) Clearly, not every measure listed here is appropriate for every institution. At the same time, some institutions may have multiple instances of a single item (e.g., licensure pass rates). In developing these forms, the Commission recognizes the value of trends in data, and the importance of the institution's own goals for success.

By listing several ways to measure student success and achievement, the Commission encourages institutions to reflect on how they are using data to understand student success. As always, the Commission expects that the institution's mission will provide useful guidance in thinking about which measures of student success are most important and most useful. In brief, the forms are:

S1. Retention and Graduation Rates. Here institutions are asked to provide information on their IPEDS-defined retention and graduation rates, along with their goals for these indicators. Institutions can also provide additional retention and graduation indices, depending on their mission, program mix, locations, and method of program delivery. For example, some baccalaureate institutions may also track 4- and 5-year graduation rates; some community colleges may find 4- and 5-year rates to complete an associate's degree to be helpful in evaluating their success with their student population. Institutions can also track the success of students studying at a distance or in programs offered on-line.

S2. Other Measures of Student Achievement and Success. The measures recorded here are likely to be mission-related. For example, some institutions may track the success of students gaining admission into certain graduate- or first-professional degree programs. Community colleges may track the success of their students entering baccalaureate programs. For some institutions, the number of students who enter programs such as Teach for America, the Peace Corps, or public service law may also represent indicators of institutional effectiveness with respect to their mission.

S3. Licensure Passage and Job Placement Rates. Institutions that prepare students for specific careers will find it appropriate to record the success of their students in passing licensure examinations. Also included in this form is the provision to record the success of students – perhaps by their academic major – in finding employment in the field for which they were prepared.

S4. Completion and Placement Rates for Short-Term Vocational Programs. Institutions with such programs in which students are eligible for Title IV federal financial aid should use these forms.

Using the forms: By using these forms early in the self-study process, institutions will have time to collect and analyze all available information. The Appraisal section of the self-study provides a useful opportunity for the institution to reflect both on the findings recorded in the forms and the extent to which the institution has developed the systems to collect and use the most important data on student success. Similarly, the Projection section affords the institution an opportunity to state its commitment for improvement in the area of assessment.

Form S1. RETENTION AND GRADUATION RATES						
Student Success Measures/ Prior Performance and Goals	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year	Goal Next Year	Goal 2 Years Forward	
IPEDS Retention Data						
Associate degree students						
Bachelors degree students	95.1	97.9	94.3	95.0	95.0	
IPEDS Graduation Data						
Associate degree students						
Bachelors degree students	94.4	92.2	90.6	93.0	93.0	
Other Undergraduate Retention Rates (1)						
a	Students of Color	96.6	97.3	96.1	96.0	96.0
b	First-generation college student	97.3	98.3	98.0	98.0	98.0
c	Recruited Athlete	97.0	97.9	94.4	96.0	96.0
Other Undergraduate Graduation Rates (2)						
a	Pell recipients	92.2	90.5	87.2	90.0	90.0
b	Recipient of a Stafford Loan, but no Pell	91.6	92.8	89.4	91.3	91.3
c	Recipient of neither a Stafford Loan, nor Pell	95.8	92.2	91.8	93.3	93.3
d	Students of Color	92.8	92.6	88.3	93.0	93.0
e	First-generation college student	90.7	89.8	86.7	90.0	90.0
f	Recruited Athlete	93.3	94.6	90.7	94.0	94.0
Graduate programs *						
Retention rates first-to-second year (3)						
Graduation rates @ 150% time (4)		66.7	77.2	64.9	69.6	69.6
Distance Education						
Course completion rates (5)						
Retention rates (6)						
Graduation rates (7)						
Branch Campus and Instructional Locations						
Course completion rate (8)						
Retention rates (9)						
Graduation rates (10)						
Definition and Methodology Explanations						
1	Graduate programs graduation rate is a combination of the MA and PhD programs					
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						
* An institution offering graduate degrees must complete this portion.						

Form S2. OTHER MEASURES OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND SUCCESS

Measures of Student Achievement and Success/ Institutional Performance and Goals		2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year	Goal for the Future
Success of Students Pursuing Higher Degree					
1	Graduate school attendance immediately following Wesleyan.	17%	16%	na	17%
2	Graduate school attainment, 10 years out				
3					
4					
5					
Definition and methodology explanations					
#1 is taken from the Career Resource Center's First Destination Survey. #2 is from our Alumni Survey					
Rates at Which Graduates Pursue Mission Related Paths (e.g., Peace Corps, Public Service Law)					
1					
2					
3					
4					
Definition and methodology explanations					
Rates at Which Students Are Successful in Fields for Which They Were Not Explicitly Prepared					
1					
2					
3					
4					
Definition and methodology explanations					
Documented Success of Graduates Achieving Other Mission-Explicit Achievement (e.g., Leadership, Spiritual Formation)					
1					
2					
3					
Definition and methodology explanations					
Other (Specify Below)					
1					
2					
Definition and methodology explanations					

Form S3. LICENSURE PASSAGE AND JOB PLACEMENT RATES						
	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year	Goal Next Year	Goal 2 Years Forward	
State Licensure Passage Rates *						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
National Licensure Passage Rates *						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
Job Placement Rates **						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
* For each licensure exam, give the name of the exam above along with the number of students for whom scores are available and the total number of students eligible to take the examination (e.g. National Podiatric Examination, 12/14). In following columns, report the passage rates for students for whom scores are available, along with the institution's goals for succeeding years.						
** For each major for which the institution tracks job placement rates, list the degree and major, and the time period following graduation for which the institution is reporting placement success (e.g., Mechanical Engineer, B.S., six months). In the following columns, report the percent of graduates who have jobs in their fields within the specified time.						
Institutional Notes of Explanation						
a						
b						
c						
d						
e						
f						

Form S4. COMPLETION AND PLACEMENT RATES FOR SHORT-TERM VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS FOR WHICH STUDENTS ARE ELIGIBLE FOR FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID

	2 Years Prior	1 Year Prior	Most Recent Year	Goal Next Year	Goal 2 Years Forward
Completion Rates *					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
Placement Rates **					
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
* List each short-term vocational training program separately. In the following columns indicate the annual weighted average completion rate for the most recent and two prior years. In the final two columns, list institutional goals for the next two years.					
** List each short-term vocational training program separately. In the following columns indicate the annual weighted job placement rate for the most recent and two prior years. In the final two columns, list the institutional goals for the next two years.					

ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT
YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2011

WESLEYAN
UNIVERSITY



WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR 2010–11

TRUSTEES

Robert L. Allbritton
K. Tucker Andersen
David M. Bartholomew
Andrea G. Barthwell
Joshua S. Boger
Phoebe C. Boyer
Jack W. Braitmayer
James M. Citrin
Bobby J. Donaldson II
Geoffrey M. Duyk
Sidney A. Espinosa
John B. Frank
Karen J. Freedman
Joseph Haddad, Jr.
Darryl B. Hazel
Ellen Jewett
Daphne Kwok
Michael S. Lewis
Michelle A. Lyn
Paul S. Mason
Frederick C. Maynard III
Donna S. Morea
Ilana Wind Newell
Megan P. Norris
David D. Olson
Linda E. Rappaport
Ellen E. Remmer
Michael S. Roth
Brian L. Schorr
Amy Schulman
Frank V. Sica
Shonni J. Silverberg
Warren “Renny” C. Smith, Jr.
Adam Usdan

TRUSTEES Emeriti

Kofi Appenteng
John W. Baird
Frank G. Binswanger, Jr.
Vanessa J. Burgess
Richard E. Cavanagh
Robert S. Cohen
James P. Comer
Alan M. Dachs
Emilio Q. Daddario
D. Ronald Daniel
James van B. Dresser
Mark M. Edmiston
Charles E. Exley, Jr.
Emil H. Frankel
Houghton Freeman
Walter B. Gerken
Stephen A. Hansel
William W. Harris
Peter J. Hicks
Gerald Holton
Robert E. Hunter
John R. Jakobson
Moirra McNamara James
David B. Jenkins
David R. Jones
Caroline M. Macomber
Cornelia B. McCann
Robert G. McKelvey
Priscilla C. McKenna
Mary O. McWilliams
C. Richard Nicita
Peter C. Nowell
Robert E. Patricelli
Steven B. Pfeiffer
Stewart M. Reid
George M. Ring
Theodore M. Shaw
Jonathan Spector
Robert E. Stevens
Frederick B. Taylor
John L. Usdan
Susan Webster
John F. Woodhouse
Strauss Zelnick
Donald E. Zilkha
Ezra K. Zilkha

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

Michael S. Roth	President
Rob Rosenthal	Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Marianne Calnen	Secretary of the University and Special Assistant to the President for Board and Campus Relations
Sonia BasSheva Mañjon	Vice President for Institutional Partnerships and Chief Diversity Officer
Anne Martin	Chief Investment Officer
John C. Meerts	Vice President for Finance and Administration
Nancy Hargrave Meislahn	Dean of Admission and Financial Aid
Charles Salas	Director of Strategic Initiatives
Andy Tanaka	Chief of Staff
Michael Whaley	Vice President for Student Affairs
Barbara-Jan Wilson	Vice President for University Relations

WESLEYAN

U N I V E R S I T Y

Vice President for Finance and Administration
237 High Street
Middletown, CT 06459-0241
(860) 685-2607 Fax (860) 685-2458



For: The Board of Trustees
From: John C. Meerts
Date: October 19, 2011
Subject: FY 2010/11 Annual Financial Report


It is my pleasure to present the Wesleyan University Annual Financial Report. The Financial Report is the means through which the University presents its financial condition to the trustees, to donors and friends of the University and to external constituencies.

Wesleyan's FY 2010/11 statements of financial position reflect the upturn in the stock market over the past two years. Wesleyan's FY 2010/11 operating revenue exceeded expenditures by \$13 million. Endowment spending met Board policy guidelines at 5.5% of the 12-quarter moving average of the market value.

2010-2011 Year in Review

Total operating revenue and support for FY 2010/11 was \$195 million, an increase of 0.8% from FY 2009/10. Operating expenses were \$182 million, an increase of 1.7% from FY 2010/11.


During the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, Wesleyan University's net assets increased by \$120 million (20%) from \$603 million to \$723 million. The 17% increase in the market value of Wesleyan's endowment from \$513 million to \$601 million and the reduction of our post retirement benefit obligation are the major factors in the increase in net assets.



Operations

Revenue


More than half of Wesleyan’s total operating revenue comes from student fees (tuition, room, and board). Net of student financial aid, this revenue totaled \$121 million. Net student charges increased 7.0% as tuition, room, and board rates increased at 3.8% and student enrollment increased. It was the second year of Wesleyan’s plan to increase enrollment by thirty students annually; financial aid totaling \$45 million increased 5.8%.



The second most significant source of unrestricted revenue is endowment spending. At \$30 million, this support is determined in accordance with an endowment spending policy approved by the Board of Trustees. Endowment spending decreased almost \$3 million (-8%) in FY 2010/11. Endowment spending will continue to decline, as lower endowment values will be factored into our spending formulas coupled with our plan to reduce spending from 5.5% to 5.0% of the twelve-quarter market value over the next five years. The endowment provides Wesleyan with resources that support a wide variety of programs across the University, ranging from general operations, to scholarships and professorships.

Expenditures

About half of Wesleyan's \$182 million operating budget is spent on its central academic mission, instruction and research (\$99 million). In addition, Wesleyan spends proportionately more on academic priorities and less on support activities than peer institutions.



Financial Assets to Support the University

Wesleyan's assets totaled over \$1 billion, getting back to levels before the economic downturn. The good news, of course, is related to the increase in the endowment value; Wesleyan's endowment totaled \$601 million at year-end, an increase of \$88 million (17%) after taking out spending and adding new gifts.

Assets

Assets increased to over \$1.0 billion. While assets increased primarily because of the endowment, cash and short term investments increased by \$26 million (30%) to \$112 million. A larger cash position provides flexibility to meet commitments during these challenging fiscal times.

Liabilities

Liabilities decreased \$21 million (6.9%). In 2009/10 we were required to increase our post retirement benefit obligation by \$21 million primarily because of the new healthcare reform legislation that eliminated annual and lifetime maximum allowances in health plans except for retirees (Footnote 11, page 27). In 2010/11 this liability was reversed as Wesleyan separated retirees from its' medical plan.

Wesleyan Fundraising

In FY 2010/11, alumni, parents, and friends gave over \$37 million on a cash basis to Wesleyan University, the largest cash received year in history. This \$3 million (8.8%) increase from the prior year, with 51% of the alumni donating funds, reflects a strong financial commitment to Wesleyan from our donors, even during challenging economic times.



Conclusion

Wesleyan remains a strong and financially healthy University. Wesleyan will continue to exercise a disciplined budget process, investing in focused and strategic opportunities that improve our competitive position. Over the next several years Wesleyan plans to generate new revenue and reduce expenditures by \$30 million in light of current fiscal realities. All these actions will be accomplished with the understanding that we must do our best to protect the teaching, research, and the student experience from the impact of our cost cutting measures.

Financial Results

Year Ended June 30, 2011





KPMG LLP
One Financial Plaza
755 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103

Independent Auditors' Report

The Board of Trustees
Wesleyan University:

We have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of Wesleyan University (the University) as of June 30, 2011 and 2010, and the related statements of changes in unrestricted net assets, changes in restricted and total net assets, and cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the University's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the University's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Wesleyan University as of June 30, 2011 and 2010, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

KPMG LLP

October 26, 2011

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Statements of Financial Position
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(in thousands)

	2011	2010
ASSETS		
Cash and cash equivalents	\$ 15,591	2,737
Short-term investments	96,742	83,765
Receivables and other assets	13,804	14,877
Pledges receivable	29,223	28,417
Long-term investments	562,693	492,939
Investment in plant, net	286,737	282,508
Total assets	\$ 1,004,790	905,243
LIABILITIES		
Accounts payable and accrued expenses	\$ 14,459	15,893
Deposits and deferred revenues	8,372	9,512
Split interest obligations	7,721	6,150
Postretirement benefit obligation	17,900	36,391
Long-term debt	221,040	222,798
Asset retirement obligation	11,859	11,303
Total liabilities	281,351	302,047
NET ASSETS		
Unrestricted	250,709	183,516
Temporarily restricted	277,669	247,782
Permanently restricted	195,061	171,898
Total net assets	723,439	603,196
Total liabilities and net assets	\$ 1,004,790	905,243

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Statements of Changes in Unrestricted Net Assets
Years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010
(in thousands)

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
REVENUES		
Tuition	\$ 130,747	122,002
Room and board	35,531	33,802
Less undergraduate scholarships and graduate tuition remission	<u>(44,819)</u>	<u>(42,223)</u>
Net student charges	121,459	113,581
Investment return used in support of operations	30,660	33,276
Private gifts and grants	13,535	13,762
Federal, state and local grants	11,073	7,556
Other	8,791	8,810
Net assets released from restrictions	<u>8,577</u>	<u>10,862</u>
Total revenues	<u>194,095</u>	<u>187,847</u>
EXPENSES		
Instruction	83,058	80,985
Research	11,642	11,465
Libraries	10,300	10,443
Student services	9,026	9,346
Institutional support	23,101	24,200
Auxiliary activities	<u>43,645</u>	<u>42,183</u>
Total expenses	<u>180,772</u>	<u>178,622</u>
Revenues in excess of expenses from operations	<u>13,323</u>	<u>9,225</u>
NON-OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
Net investment return	43,088	22,394
Appropriation of endowment assets for expenditure	(7,709)	(8,576)
Adjustment for postretirement benefit obligation	18,491	(21,299)
Realized gain on termination of interest rate swap agreements	<u>-</u>	<u>4,620</u>
Total non-operating activities	<u>53,870</u>	<u>(2,861)</u>
Change in unrestricted net assets	67,193	6,364
Unrestricted net assets at beginning of year	<u>183,516</u>	<u>177,152</u>
Unrestricted net assets at end of year	<u>\$ 250,709</u>	<u>183,516</u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Statements of Changes in Restricted and Total Net Assets
Years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010
(in thousands)

TEMPORARILY RESTRICTED NET ASSETS	2011	2010
Gifts	\$ 4,877	5,164
Pledge activity, net	(3,243)	(5,060)
Net investment return	63,835	42,998
Appropriation of endowment assets for expenditure	(25,342)	(27,184)
Change in value of split interest obligation	(1,663)	(515)
Net assets released from restrictions	<u>(8,577)</u>	<u>(10,862)</u>
Change in temporarily restricted net assets	29,887	4,541
Net assets at beginning of year	<u>247,782</u>	<u>243,241</u>
Temporarily restricted net assets at end of year	<u><u>\$ 277,669</u></u>	<u><u>247,782</u></u>
 PERMANENTLY RESTRICTED NET ASSETS		
Gifts and pledges	\$ 21,730	19,147
Reinvested investment return	<u>1,433</u>	<u>909</u>
Change in permanently restricted net assets	23,163	20,056
Net assets at beginning of year	<u>171,898</u>	<u>151,842</u>
Permanently restricted net assets at end of year	<u><u>\$ 195,061</u></u>	<u><u>171,898</u></u>
 TOTAL NET ASSETS		
Change in total net assets	\$ 120,243	30,961
Total net assets at beginning of year	<u>603,196</u>	<u>572,235</u>
Total net assets at end of year	<u><u>\$ 723,439</u></u>	<u><u>603,196</u></u>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Statements of Cash Flows
Years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010
(in thousands)

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
CASH FLOWS FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES		
Change in net assets	\$ 120,243	30,961
Adjustments to reconcile change in net assets to cash used for operating activities:		
Depreciation and amortization	10,292	10,548
Amortization of bond premium	(1,159)	-
Net return from investments and trusts	(105,965)	(62,263)
Gifts received for long-term investment	(18,311)	(15,533)
Postretirement benefit obligation change	(18,491)	21,299
Realized gain on termination of interest rate swap agreements	-	(4,620)
Changes in working capital, net	(837)	2,551
Net cash used for operating activities	<u>(14,228)</u>	<u>(17,057)</u>
CASH FLOWS FROM INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES		
Additions to property and equipment	(14,019)	(5,931)
Purchases of long term investments	(132,337)	(73,107)
Sales of long term investments	166,890	106,405
Purchases of short term investments	(118,351)	(179,756)
Sales of short term investments	107,031	155,506
Decrease in cash on deposit with bond trustee	156	411
Net cash provided by investment activities	<u>9,370</u>	<u>3,528</u>
CASH FLOWS FROM FINANCING ACTIVITIES		
Gifts received for long-term investment	18,311	15,533
Proceeds from issuance of long term debt, including premium	-	217,419
Repayments of long term debt	(599)	(203,580)
Cash paid for termination of interest rate swap agreements	-	(20,405)
Net cash provided by financing activities	<u>17,712</u>	<u>8,967</u>
Net change in cash and cash equivalents	12,854	(4,562)
Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of year	<u>2,737</u>	<u>7,299</u>
Cash and cash equivalents at end of year	<u>\$ 15,591</u>	<u>2,737</u>
Cash paid for interest	\$ 8,495	7,795
Change in accounts payable related to property and equipment	\$ 503	2,315

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(1) Organization

Wesleyan University, founded in 1831, is a private residential not-for-profit institution of higher learning. The University is co-educational and has approximately 3,000 students, situated on a 280 acre campus, located in Middletown, Connecticut. It offers Bachelors of Arts in 44 fields, plus Masters and Ph.D.s in selected disciplines. The University is accredited by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.

(2) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

The significant accounting policies followed by the University are described below:

(a) Basis of Reporting

The financial statements of the University have been prepared on the accrual basis in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). The University applies the Financial Accounting Standards Board's (FASB's) Accounting Standards Codification (ASC), which is the single source of authoritative GAAP.

(b) Net Asset Categories

The financial statements report on the University as a whole and report transactions based upon the existence or absence of donor-imposed restrictions. The statements reflect the following net asset categories:

Permanently Restricted Net Assets: Gifts that a donor restricts to be held permanently. These funds represent primarily the original gift value of true endowment funds and also include pledges to endowment.

Temporarily Restricted Net Assets: Gifts subject to donor-imposed restrictions that will be met by the actions of the University and/or the passage of time. This includes unspent endowment income and gains or losses on restricted endowment funds, restricted gifts for current operations and gifts for plant projects, life income and other deferred gifts, and pledges for purposes other than endowment.

Unrestricted Net Assets: All other net assets not subject to donor-imposed restrictions, which the University may use at its discretion. Certain net assets classified as unrestricted are internally designated for specified use. Federal and foundation grants are generally not considered gifts to the University, and consequently, increase unrestricted revenue as they are expended.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(c) Expiration of Donor-Imposed Restrictions

All gifts are considered available for unrestricted use unless specifically restricted by the donor. Amounts that are restricted by the donor as to time or for specific purposes are reported as temporarily restricted or permanently restricted support that increases those net asset classes. When a qualifying expenditure occurs or a time restriction expires, temporarily restricted net assets are reduced and unrestricted net assets are correspondingly increased as net assets released from restrictions in the statements of changes in net assets. However, if a restriction is fulfilled in the same time period in which the gift is received or endowment income is earned, the gift or income is reported as unrestricted revenue.

(d) Investments

Investments are reported at fair value. If an investment is held directly by the University and an active market with quoted prices exists, the University reports the fair value as the market price of an identical security. The University also holds shares or units in nonmarketable securities including alternative investments such as private equity, venture capital, hedge funds, and real asset strategies. Such alternative investment funds may hold securities or other financial instruments for which a ready market exists and are priced accordingly. In addition, such funds may hold assets which require the estimation of fair values in the absence of readily determinable market values. Such valuations are determined by fund managers and generally consider variables such as operating results, comparable earnings multiples, projected cash flows, recent sales prices, and other pertinent information, and may reflect discounts for the illiquid nature of certain investments held.

The University follows the provisions of Accounting Standards Codification (ASC) 820-35-58, *Investments in Certain Entities that Calculate Net Asset Value Per Share (or Equivalent)*, with respect to investments in non-registered and alternative funds. This guidance allows for the estimation of the fair value of such investments using net asset value (NAV) per share or its equivalent as a practical expedient.

These investments are generally redeemable or may be liquidated at NAV under the original terms of the subscription agreements and operations of the underlying funds. However, it is possible that these redemption rights may be restricted or eliminated by the funds in the future in accordance with the underlying fund agreements. Due to the nature of certain investments held by these funds, changes in market conditions and the economic environment may significantly impact the NAV of the funds and, consequently, the fair value of the University's interests in the funds. Furthermore, changes to the liquidity provisions of the funds may significantly impact the fair value of the University's interest in the funds. Although certain investments may be sold in secondary market transactions, subject to meeting certain requirements of the governing

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

documents of the funds, the secondary market is not active and individual transactions are not necessarily observable. It is therefore reasonably possible that if the University were to sell its interest in a fund in the secondary market, the sale could occur at an amount materially different than the reported value.

(e) Operations

The statements of changes in unrestricted net assets report the change in unrestricted net assets from operating and non-operating activities. Operating revenues consist of those items attributable to the University's undergraduate and graduate education programs and research conducted by the academic departments. Tuition revenues are reported net of the discount attributable to reductions in the amounts charged to students, whether as unrestricted University financial aid or reductions from endowment funds or government grants awarded to students by the University. Endowment return from the University's unrestricted investments used in support of current year expenditures are reported as operating revenue. Other income, consisting of investment earnings on the University's endowment funds not utilized for operations, gains and losses on interest rate swap agreements, adjustments for post retirement benefits obligation and other items not related to the University's on-going operations are reported as non-operating activities. Expenses associated with the operation and maintenance of University plant assets, as well as interest and depreciation expense, are allocated on the basis of square footage utilized by the functional categories.

(f) Cash and Short Term Investments

For purposes of the statement of cash flows, cash and cash equivalents includes only short-term, highly liquid working capital investments (those with original maturities three months or less). Short term investments include amounts invested in short term, liquid assets to provide optimum return for the University's operating cash.

(g) Receivables

At June 30, 2011 and 2010, student accounts receivable are net of an allowance for doubtful accounts of \$242 and \$103, and student loans receivable are net of an allowance for doubtful accounts of \$1,129 for 2011 and 2010.

(h) Investment in Plant

Investment in plant is stated at cost at the date of acquisition or fair market value at the date of donation in the case of gifts. Equipment with a value greater than five thousand dollars and major renovations are capitalized, whereas renewals and replacements are not capitalized. Depreciation is calculated on a straight-line basis using useful lives of 50

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

years for buildings and between 7 - 20 years for equipment, depending on the type of equipment.

The University recognizes the fair value of a liability for legal obligations associated with asset retirements in the period in which the obligation is incurred, in accordance with ASC 410, Asset Retirement and Environmental Obligations, if a reasonable estimate of the fair value of the obligation can be made. When the liability is initially recorded, the cost of the asset retirement obligation is capitalized by increasing the carrying amount of the related long lived asset. The liability is accreted to its present value each period, and the capitalized cost associated with the retirement obligation is depreciated over the useful life of the related asset. Upon settlement of the obligation, any difference between the cost to settle the asset retirement obligation and the liability recorded is recognized as a gain or loss in the statement of operations.

(i) Income Taxes

The University is generally exempt from income taxes under Internal Revenue Code, Section 501(a), as an organization described in Section 501(c)(3). The University assesses uncertain tax positions and determined that there were no such positions that have a material effect on the financial statements.

(j) Disclosure about Fair Value of Financial Instruments

The University discloses fair value information about all financial instruments, whether or not recognized in the statements of financial position, for which it is practicable to estimate fair value. The University's financial instruments not carried at fair value are generally carried at net realizable value, which approximates fair value, in the statements of financial position. Such financial instruments consist of cash and equivalents, receivables from students, grantors and donors, and payables. The carrying values of the University's bonds payable approximate their fair values based on analysis of relevant interest rates and marketing pricing.

(k) Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with GAAP requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts of assets and liabilities and disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities at the dates of the financial statements and the reported amounts of revenues and expenses during the reporting periods. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(1) Reclassifications

Certain amounts in the fiscal 2010 financial statements have been reclassified to conform to the fiscal 2011 presentation.

(3) Pledges Receivable

The University recognizes the present value of unconditional pledges receivable as revenues in the period in which the pledges are made. Contributions expected to be received after one year are discounted at the risk free discount rate in effect for the date of the gift. The discount rates used range from 1.5% to 10.64% for June 30, 2011 and 2010. The University has also created an allowance for uncollectible pledges based on factors such as prior collection history, type of contribution and nature of the fundraising activity. The receivables, net of allowances, approximate fair value.

A summary of pledges scheduled to be received at June 30 as follows:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Less than one year	\$ 13,694	14,431
One to five years	20,576	19,499
More than five years	2,198	2,198
	<u>36,468</u>	<u>36,128</u>
Less allowance for uncollectible pledges	(3,015)	(2,995)
Less discount for present value	(4,230)	(4,716)
Net pledges receivable	<u>\$ 29,223</u>	<u>28,417</u>

University Relations expenditures, which are primarily for fundraising purposes and alumni activity, totaled \$7,194 and \$7,262 in fiscal years 2011 and 2010, respectively, and are included in institutional support in the statements of changes in unrestricted net assets.

(4) Investments and Fair Value

The University follows the provisions of ASC 820, Fair Value Measurement, which defines fair value and establishes a framework for measuring and disclosing fair value measurements. Fair value generally represents the price that would be received upon the sale of an asset or paid upon the transfer of a liability in an orderly transaction between

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

market participants as of the measurement date. The GAAP fair value hierarchy prioritizes observable and unobservable inputs used to measure fair value into three levels:

- Level 1 – quoted prices (unadjusted) in active markets that are accessible at the measurement date for assets or liabilities;
- Level 2 – observable prices that are based on inputs not quoted in active markets, but corroborated by market data; and
- Level 3 – unobservable inputs are used when little or no market data is available.

The fair value hierarchy gives the highest priority to Level 1 inputs and the lowest priority to Level 3 inputs. In determining fair value, the University utilizes valuation techniques that maximize the use of observable inputs and minimize the use of unobservable inputs to the extent possible. The University classifies its assets and liabilities in the hierarchy based on these inputs, except for investments in funds measured at NAV. The University owns shares or units in each fund rather than in the fund's underlying securities. Accordingly, such investments are classified in Level 2 of the hierarchy if the University has the ability to redeem its interest at or near the statement of financial position date and in Level 3 if it does not, even though the underlying securities may not be difficult to value or may be readily marketable. Therefore, the classification of these investments in the hierarchy is not necessarily an indication of the risk associated with investing in those funds or a reflection on the liquidity of each fund's underlying assets and liabilities.

As of June 30, 2011 and 2010, the University had no specific plans or intentions to sell investments at amounts different than NAV.

The University's assets at June 30, 2011 that are reported at estimated fair value are summarized in the following table by their fair value hierarchy classification:

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total	Redemption or Liquidation	Days' Notice
Fixed Income	\$ 24,139	-	-	24,139	Daily	1
Domestic equities	72,501	21,127	129	93,757	Mostly Daily to Quarterly	1 to 5
Global (ex-U.S.) equities	41,454	55,239	-	96,693	Daily to Monthly	1 to 15
Absolute return						
Event driven	-	-	35,461	35,461	Annual	180 to n/a
Long/short equity	-	23,444	-	23,444	Quarterly	60
Fixed income arbitrage	-	-	46,838	46,838	Quarterly to illiquid	60
In liquidation	-	-	16,035	16,035	Pending	n/a
Private Equity						
Venture Capital	-	-	38,883	38,883	Illiquid	n/a
Buyout	-	-	53,306	53,306	Illiquid	n/a
Real Assets	-	-	86,971	86,971	Illiquid	n/a
Diversified Inflation						
Hedging	-	22,868	-	22,868	Monthly	7
Funds held or administered by others	-	17,963	6,335	24,298	Not Applicable	n/a
Total	\$ 138,094	140,641	283,958	562,693		

The University's assets at June 30, 2010 that are reported at estimated fair value are summarized in the following table by their fair value hierarchy classification:

	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Total	Redemption or Liquidation	Days' Notice
Fixed Income	\$ 47,941	-	-	47,941	Daily	1
Domestic equities	47,843	22,992	129	70,964	Daily/Monthly	1 to 5
Global (ex-U.S.) equities	-	76,916	-	76,916	Weekly/Monthly	6 to 15
Absolute return						
Event driven	-	-	47,991	47,991	Annual or illiquid	180 - n/a
Long/short equity	-	9,453	-	9,453	Quarterly	60
Fixed income arbitrage	-	-	38,934	38,934	Rolling lockups	60
In liquidation	-	-	18,664	18,664	Pending	n/a
Private Equity						
Venture Capital	-	-	29,526	29,526	Illiquid	n/a
Buyout	-	-	45,846	45,846	Illiquid	n/a
Real Assets	-	-	69,614	69,614	Illiquid	n/a
Diversified Inflation						
Hedging	-	17,479	-	17,479	Monthly	7
Funds held or administered by others	-	14,092	5,519	19,611	Not Applicable	n/a
Total	\$ 95,784	140,932	256,223	492,939		

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

Substantially all of the investments classified in Levels 2 and 3 have been valued using NAV as a practical expedient.

The following tables present the University's activity for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010 for Level 3 investments.

2011					
Level 3 roll forward	Domestic Equities and Funds Held by Others	Absolute Return	Private Equity	Real assets	Total
Fair value at June 30, 2010	\$ 5,648	105,589	75,372	69,614	256,223
Acquisitions	-	-	12,007	12,765	24,772
Dispositions	-	(14,287)	(13,547)	(10,885)	(38,719)
Net realized and unrealized gains	816	7,032	18,357	15,477	41,682
Fair value at June 30, 2011	\$ 6,464	98,334	92,189	86,971	283,958

2010					
Level 3 roll forward	Domestic Equities and Funds Held by Others	Absolute Return	Private Equity	Real assets	Total
Fair value at June 30, 2009	\$ 5,377	99,341	74,545	41,598	220,861
Acquisitions	-	1,483	6,870	23,806	32,159
Dispositions	-	(6,600)	(12,889)	(4,032)	(23,521)
Net realized and unrealized gains	271	11,365	6,846	8,242	26,724
Fair value at June 30, 2010	\$ 5,648	105,589	75,372	69,614	256,223

The University has committed to invest in numerous investment partnerships that diversify in the types of alternative investments over a period of years pursuant to provisions of the individual partnership agreements. As of June 30, 2011, the maturities of these investments in the Private Equity asset class and the related unfunded commitments were as follows:

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

Investments maturing in	Fair value	Related unfunded commitments
1 - 5 years	\$124,511	23,383
6 - 10 years	60,698	49,696
11 years or more	2,988	10,922

Investment liquidity as of June 30, 2011 is aggregated below based on redemption or sale period:

Investment redemption or sale period:	Investment fair values
In liquidation	\$ 16,035
Daily	138,094
Weekly	22,372
Monthly	55,735
Quarterly	65,306
Annual	46,477
Illiquid	218,674
	<u>\$ 562,693</u>

The following summarizes investment return components for the years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010:

Investment return:	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Interest and dividends, net of advisory fees	\$ 2,323	1,554
Net realized and unrealized gains	103,642	62,263
Investment return	<u>\$ 105,965</u>	<u>63,817</u>

Investment returns are included in the statements of activities as follows for the years ended June 30:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Investment return used in support of operations	\$ 30,660	33,276
Net investment return after appropriation to operating:		
Non-operating activities	35,379	13,818
Temporarily restricted	38,493	15,814
Permanently restricted - reinvested investment return	1,433	909
Investment return	<u>\$ 105,965</u>	<u>63,817</u>

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

Interest and dividends are presented net of advisory fees of \$4,761 and \$4,975 for the years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

(5) Endowment

The University follows the guidelines in ASC 958-205 to classify net assets of donor restricted endowment funds for a not-for-profit organization that is subject to an enacted version of the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA).

The University's endowment consists of approximately 1,300 individual funds established for a variety of purposes including both donor-restricted endowment funds and funds designated by the Board of Trustees to function as endowments. Net assets associated with endowment funds, including funds designated by the Board of Trustees to function as endowments, are classified and reported based on the existence or absence of donor-imposed restrictions.

(a) Relevant Law

The University is subject to the State of Connecticut's Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act (UPMIFA), which requires the preservation of the fair value of the original gift as of the gift date of the donor-restricted endowment fund absent explicit donor stipulations to the contrary. The University classifies as permanently restricted net assets (a) the original value of gifts donated to the permanent endowment, (b) the original value of subsequent gifts to the permanent endowment, and (c) accumulations to the permanent endowment made in accordance with the direction of the applicable donor gift instrument at the time the accumulation is added to the fund. The remaining portion of the donor-restricted endowment fund that is not classified in permanently restricted net assets is classified as temporarily restricted net assets until those amounts are appropriated for expenditure by the University in a manner consistent with the standard of prudence prescribed by the Act.

UPMIFA provides precise standards for investing in a prudent manner by establishing a duty to minimize cost, diversify the investments, investigate facts relevant to the investment of the fund, to consider tax consequences of investment decisions and that investment decisions be made in light of the fund's entire portfolio as a part of an investment strategy having risk and return objectives reasonably suited to the fund and to the University. UPMIFA also permits the University to appropriate for expenditure or accumulate so much of an endowment fund as the University determines to be prudent for the uses, benefits, purposes and duration for which the endowment fund is established, thereby eliminating the restriction that a fund could not be spent below its historical dollar value. The University considers the following factors in making a determination to appropriate or accumulate donor-restricted endowment funds:

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

1. The duration and preservation of the fund
2. The purposes of the University and the donor-restricted endowment fund
3. General economic conditions
4. The possible effect of inflation and deflation
5. The expected total return from income and the appreciation of investments
6. Other resources of the University
7. The investment policies of the University

Endowment funds consist of the following at June 30, 2011:

	<u>Unrestricted</u>	<u>Temporarily restricted</u>	<u>Permanently restricted</u>	<u>Total</u>
Donor-restricted endowment funds	(\$8,400)	262,535	171,190	425,325
Board-designated endowment funds	173,088	3,065	-	176,153
Total endowed net assets	<u>\$164,688</u>	<u>265,600</u>	<u>171,190</u>	<u>601,478</u>

Endowment funds consist of the following at June 30, 2010:

	<u>Unrestricted</u>	<u>Temporarily restricted</u>	<u>Permanently restricted</u>	<u>Total</u>
Donor-restricted endowment funds	(\$17,705)	228,332	153,031	363,658
Board-designated endowment funds	146,518	2,699	-	149,217
Total endowed net assets	<u>\$128,813</u>	<u>231,031</u>	<u>153,031</u>	<u>512,875</u>

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

Changes in endowment funds for the year ended June 30, 2011 are as follows:

	<u>Unrestricted</u>	<u>Temporarily restricted</u>	<u>Permanently restricted</u>	<u>Total</u>
Endowment net assets, July 1, 2010	\$128,813	231,031	153,031	512,875
Investment return:				
Investment income	1,673	363	249	2,285
Net appreciation	41,461	59,548	706	101,715
Total investment return	43,134	59,911	955	104,000
Contributions	450	-	17,204	17,654
Appropriation of endowment net assets for expenditure	(7,709)	(25,342)	-	(33,051)
Endowment net assets, June 30, 2011	<u>\$164,688</u>	<u>265,600</u>	<u>171,190</u>	<u>601,478</u>

Changes in endowment funds for the year ended June 30, 2010 are as follows:

	<u>Unrestricted</u>	<u>Temporarily restricted</u>	<u>Permanently restricted</u>	<u>Total</u>
Endowment net assets, July 1, 2009	\$118,205	219,418	138,858	476,481
Investment return:				
Investment income	1,031	107	416	1,554
Net appreciation	18,153	38,690	493	57,336
Total investment return	19,184	38,797	909	58,890
Contributions	-	-	13,264	13,264
Appropriation of endowment net assets for expenditure	(8,576)	(27,184)	-	(35,760)
Endowment net assets, June 30, 2010	<u>\$128,813</u>	<u>231,031</u>	<u>153,031</u>	<u>512,875</u>

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(b) Funds with Deficiencies

From time to time, the fair value of assets associated with individual donor-restricted endowment funds may fall below their original contributed value. Deficiencies of this nature that are reported in unrestricted net assets were \$8,400 and \$17,705 as of June 30, 2011 and 2010, respectively. These deficiencies resulted from unfavorable market fluctuations that occurred after the investment of new permanently restricted contributions. Subsequent gains that restore the fair value of the assets of the endowment fund to the required level will be classified as an increase in unrestricted net assets.

(c) Return Objectives and Risk Parameters

A portion of the endowment assets are included in an investment pool that is accounted for on a unitized market value basis, with each individual fund subscribing to or disposing of units on the basis of the market value per unit of the pool at the end of the calendar month within which the transaction took place. The value of the units is based on a total return investment policy.

The University has adopted investment and spending policies for endowment assets that attempt to provide a predictable stream of funding to programs supported by its endowment while seeking to maintain the purchasing power of the endowment assets. Endowment assets include those assets of donor-restricted funds that the University must hold in perpetuity or for a donor-specified period as well as board-designated funds.

(d) Strategies Employed for Achieving Objectives

To satisfy its long term rate-of-return objectives, the University relies on a total return strategy in which investment returns are achieved through both capital appreciation (realized and unrealized) and current yield (interest and dividends). The University targets a diversified asset allocation that places emphasis on investments in equities, fixed income and alternative investments to achieve its long-term return objectives with prudent risk constraints.

(e) Spending Policy and How the Investment Objectives Relate to Spending Policy

The University follows a policy of spending between 4.5% and 5.5% of the 12-quarter moving average of the market value of the endowment in support of the operating and capital budgets. For fiscal 2011, \$33,051 was spent (\$35,760 in fiscal 2010), which represented 5.5% of the 12-quarter moving average of the market value of the endowment in fiscal 2011 and fiscal 2010. Of this amount, \$2,391 (\$2,484 in fiscal 2010) is recorded in temporarily restricted net assets as part of income and gains.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(6) Temporarily Restricted Net Assets

Temporarily restricted net assets consist of the following at June 30, 2011 and 2010:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Restrictions for:		
Instruction and research	\$ 180,712	157,048
Financial aid	80,089	73,625
Facilities	1,278	3,472
Library	8,090	6,997
Subtotal	<u>270,169</u>	<u>241,142</u>
Time restrictions for charitable remainder trusts	6,753	5,640
General purpose pledges	<u>747</u>	<u>1,000</u>
Total temporarily restricted net assets	<u>\$ 277,669</u>	<u>247,782</u>

Net assets released during fiscal 2011 and 2010 from temporary donor restrictions by incurring expenses satisfying the restricted purpose or by occurrence of events specified by donors were as follows:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
To Unrestricted:		
Instruction and research	\$ 4,331	5,672
Financial aid	2,476	3,577
Other	423	198
Pledge payments on general purpose gifts	<u>1,347</u>	<u>1,415</u>
Total net assets released	<u>\$ 8,577</u>	<u>10,862</u>

(7) Permanently Restricted Net Assets

The original gift value of permanently restricted net assets consists of the following at June 30, 2011 and 2010:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
For which the income is restricted:		
Financial aid	\$ 91,220	81,894
Instruction and research	77,065	66,918
Facilities maintenance	4,045	4,020
Library	1,786	1,774
Loans to students	<u>2,962</u>	<u>2,786</u>
Total	<u>177,078</u>	<u>157,392</u>
For which the income is unrestricted	<u>17,983</u>	<u>14,506</u>
Total permanently restricted net assets	<u>\$ 195,061</u>	<u>171,898</u>

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(8) Investment in Plant

At June 30, 2011 and 2010, the components of the University's investment in plant were as follows:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Campus land and improvements	\$ 25,885	25,885
Buildings	338,759	332,928
Equipment	97,915	94,594
Construction in progress	6,542	2,549
Total	<u>469,101</u>	<u>455,956</u>
Less accumulated depreciation	<u>(182,364)</u>	<u>(173,448)</u>
Total investment in plant, net	<u><u>\$ 286,737</u></u>	<u><u>282,508</u></u>

As of June 30, 2011 estimated remaining costs committed to contractors for construction in progress were \$5,207 and the estimated completion dates ranged from June 30, 2013 to June 30, 2015.

(9) Allocation of Physical Plant Operations, Major Maintenance Expenses, Depreciation and Interest Expenses

The University has allocated all expenditures for physical plant operations, major maintenance expenses, depreciation and interest expenses to six functional expenditure categories based on square footage of facilities identified for each functional expenditure category. The expenditures and allocations for fiscal 2011 and 2010 are listed below.

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Expenditures:		
Physical plant operations	\$ 19,872	20,873
Major maintenance expenses and non-capitalized costs	7,693	4,475
Depreciation	10,319	10,548
Interest expense	9,090	9,344
Total expenditures to be allocated	<u><u>\$ 46,974</u></u>	<u><u>45,240</u></u>

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

Allocations to functional expenditure categories:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Instruction	\$ 14,022	13,504
Research	4,697	4,524
Libraries	3,424	3,298
Student services	982	946
Institutional support	1,353	1,303
Auxiliary activities	22,496	21,665
Total allocations	<u>\$ 46,974</u>	<u>45,240</u>

(10) Debt

At June 30, 2011 and 2010, long-term debt, including premium related to Connecticut Health and Educational Facilities Authority (CHEFA) Series G, consisted of the following:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Revenue bonds payable (CHEFA Series G)	\$ 186,475	186,475
Revenue bonds payable (CHEFA Series H)	20,105	20,105
Term loans	4,780	5,379
Total	<u>211,360</u>	<u>211,959</u>
Premium on CHEFA Series G	9,680	10,839
Long Term Debt, including Premium	<u>\$ 221,040</u>	<u>222,798</u>

In May 2010, the proceeds of the Series G and H bonds were used to refund the University's existing debt, fund swap termination payments, and pay costs of issuance. The University refunded all of its existing bonds, which consisted of the Series D, E, and F totaling \$203,000; these bonds were all in a variable rate mode with liquidity support provided by standby bond purchase agreements with JPMorgan Chase Bank and Bank of America. In addition, the three existing interest rate swaps associated with these bonds were terminated.

The Series G bonds were issued in the fixed rate mode and the Series H bonds in a variable rate mode. The resulting long-term bond portfolio is 90.3% fixed and 9.7% variable. The University took advantage of historically low interest rates to reduce its exposure to put risk by bondholders and counterparty risk that stems from dependence on banks to provide external liquidity support.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(a) CHEFA Series G

\$186,475 fixed rate bonds have their interest rate specified in the bond-offering document ranging from 4.0% to 5.0% depending upon the underlying principal maturity date. These bonds were issued at a premium that is being amortized over the remaining life of each series of bonds resulting in an effective yield ranging from 4.12% to 4.67%. The University makes semi-annual payments of interest to the bondholders through the trustee (Bank of New York Mellon). The University is required to make principal payments beginning July 1, 2023 and ending July 1, 2039. The University estimates the fair market value of these bonds to be \$194,923 on June 30, 2011.

(b) CHEFA Series H

\$20,105 variable rate demand bonds have their interest rates set weekly. The interest rate at June 30, 2011, and 2010 were 0.07% and 0.24% respectively. The University makes monthly payments of interest to bond holders through the trustee (Bank of New York Mellon). The University may make prepayments of principal, and is required to pay any remaining principal balance on July 1, 2040. The fair value of this debt approximates the carrying value because of the variable rate.

In addition to relying on its own liquid assets, the University supports the variable rate demand bonds through a self-liquidity program that also relies on a standby liquidity support agreement from Bank of America. This agreement provides \$20,000 to purchase bonds that are not successfully remarketed and expires on May 17, 2013. The base interest rate is set equal to the highest of 1) the prime rate plus 1%, 2) monthly LIBOR plus 0.8%, or 3) 6.5%.

(c) Swap Agreements

As part of the restructuring of its long-term debt, the University terminated all existing interest rate swap and stand-by purchase agreements. Termination costs in 2010 for all three-interest rate swaps totaled \$20,405. Of this amount, \$12,860 was funded through Series G bond proceeds and the remaining \$7,545 came from University cash.

(d) Term Loans

In June, 2008, the University entered into a Master Financing Agreement with Banc of America Public Capital Corporation and State of Connecticut Health and Educational Facilities Authority in the amount of \$6,520. The proceeds of the loan were used for the replacement of the Vine Street substation, the installation of a cogeneration system in the Central Power Plant and a comprehensive retrofit, pursuant to a Connecticut Light and Power incentive program encouraging energy conservation. The loan is payable

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

over ten years at a fixed rate of 3.22%. The University was awarded a 1% rebate from Department of Public Utility Control bringing the effective interest rate down to 2.22%.

(e) Debt Maturities

Payments for the principal of all long-term debt for each of the next five fiscal years and thereafter are as follows:

2012	\$ 619
2013	639
2014	660
2015	681
2016	704
Thereafter	208,057
Total outstanding debt	<u>\$ 211,360</u>

(f) Debt Covenants

The University is subject to certain debt covenants that would impose certain restrictions if the University does not maintain its credit rating. The University is in compliance with all covenants.

(g) Line of Credit (LOC)

The University has a standing \$10,000 line of credit with Bank of America. As of June 30, 2011 and 2010, there were no outstanding advances under this LOC. The interest rate is set at 75 basis points above the LIBOR rate. Unless renewed, the LOC terminates November 27, 2011.

(11) Benefit Plans

(a) Defined Contribution Plan

The University has defined contribution retirement plans, with contributions based on a percentage of salary, covering substantially all employees. Total expense was \$5,862 and \$5,648 for fiscal 2011 and 2010, respectively.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

(b) Postretirement Benefits

The University provides certain health care benefits to retired employees. All of the University's employees, with ten or more years of employment, become eligible for these benefits upon retirement. The University recognizes the cost of providing postretirement health care benefits to the employees and dependents, if applicable, in the financial statements during the employees' active working lives. Faculty between the ages of 59 to 68 and staff between the ages of 60 to 65 who elect early retirement can continue in plans for active faculty and staff, which require premium sharing. Retired faculty who are 68 or older and retired non-faculty, who are 65 or older, participate in a different University paid Medicare supplement plan.

In March 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and a reconciliation measure, the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, ("Act") were signed into law. The Act contained a provision that eliminated certain annual and lifetime limits on the dollar value of benefits. On June 17, 2010 the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health and Human Services published guidance in the Federal Register stating, in effect, that the lifetime and annual benefit limits under the Act do not apply to plans that cover only retirees. As of June 30, 2010, the University had a plan that contained both active employees and retirees. Therefore, the University included the impacts of the Act in the calculation of the accumulated post-retirement benefit obligation ("APBO"). The Act increased the APBO by approximately \$19,000 and increased the fiscal 2010 expense by approximately \$700.

In December 2010, the University created a separate plan for retirees that allowed it to recalculate the APBO with the lifetime maximum benefit in place and eliminate the impact of the Act.

The University applies the provisions of ASC 715 to its postretirement plan. The status of the University's plan and the amounts recognized in the statements of financial position at June 30, 2011 and 2010 are as follows:

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Change in benefit obligation:		
Projected benefit obligation as of beginning of year	\$ 36,391	15,092
Service cost	994	481
Interest cost	1,358	966
Plan participants' contributions	147	103
Health care reform legislation	(21,723)	12,966
Benefits paid	(829)	(651)
Medicare Part D Subsidy	88	105
Actuarial loss (including impact of health care reform)	1,474	7,329
Benefit obligation as of end of year	<u>\$ 17,900</u>	<u>36,391</u>

Components of net periodic benefit cost are as follows for the years ended June 30:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Interest on accumulated postretirement benefit obligation	\$ 1,358	966
Service cost	994	481
Amortization of actuarial loss	2,701	581
Total	<u>\$ 5,053</u>	<u>2,028</u>

In addition to service and interest costs, the estimated prior service cost and net loss that will be amortized from accumulated unrestricted net assets into net periodic benefit cost over the next fiscal year are (\$1,672) and \$1,828, respectively.

For measurement purposes, an annual rate of increase of 8.7% in the per capita cost of covered healthcare and prescription drug benefits was assumed as of June 30, 2011. The rates were assumed to decrease to 6.9% by 2017 and 4.5% by 2025 and remain at that level thereafter. Assumed healthcare cost trend rates have a significant effect on the amounts reported for the healthcare plans. It is estimated, based on actuarial calculations, that a one-percentage point increase in the health care cost trend rate would have increased the service cost and interest cost for fiscal 2010 by \$404 and the accumulated postretirement benefit obligation by \$724.

The weighted average discount rate used to determine benefit obligations and net periodic postretirement benefit costs were as follows:

	<u>2011</u>	<u>2010</u>
Benefit obligations	4.75%	5.25%
Net periodic postretirement benefit costs	5.25%/4.75%	6.00%

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY
Notes to Financial Statements
June 30, 2011 and 2010
(Dollars in thousands)

The benefits, as of June 30, 2011, expected to be paid in each of the next five fiscal years, and in the aggregate for the five fiscal years thereafter are as follows:

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Amount</u>
2012	\$ 1,170
2013	1,192
2014	1,321
2015	1,448
2016	1,548
Five years thereafter	9,721

(12) Commitments and Contingencies

All funds expended in conjunction with government grants and contracts are subject to audit by governmental agencies. In the opinion of management, any potential liability resulting from these audits will not have a material effect on the University's financial position.

The University is a defendant in various legal actions arising out of the normal course of its operations. Although the final outcome of such actions cannot currently be determined, the University believes that eventual liability, if any, will not have a material effect on the University's financial position.

(13) Related-Party Transactions

Members of the Board of Trustees and senior management may, from time to time, be associated, either directly or indirectly with companies doing business with the University. The University has a written conflict of interest policy that requires annual reporting by each Board member as well as the University senior management. When such relationships exist, measures are taken to mitigate any actual or perceived conflict, including requiring that such transactions be conducted at arms' length, based on terms in the best interest of the University.

(14) Subsequent Events

In accordance with ASC 855, management has evaluated events subsequent to June 30, 2011 and through October 26, 2011, the date on which the financial statements were issued, to provide additional evidence relative to certain estimates or to identify matters that require additional disclosure.

WESLEYAN
UNIVERSITY



OFFICE OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION
NORTH COLLEGE, 4th FLOOR
237 HIGH STREET
MIDDLETOWN, CT 06459

FIN 76



KPMG LLP
One Financial Plaza
755 Main Street
Hartford, CT 06103

Independent Auditors' Report

The Board of Trustees
Wesleyan University:

We have audited the accompanying statements of financial position of Wesleyan University (the University) as of June 30, 2011 and 2010, and the related statements of changes in unrestricted net assets, changes in restricted and total net assets, and cash flows for the years then ended. These financial statements are the responsibility of the University's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the University's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of Wesleyan University as of June 30, 2011 and 2010, and the changes in its net assets and its cash flows for the years then ended in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

KPMG LLP

October 26, 2011

KPMG LLP is a Delaware limited liability partnership, the U.S. member firm of KPMG International Cooperative ("KPMG International"), a Swiss entity.

**LIST OF DOCUMENTS
FOR THE WORK ROOM**

Wesleyan University NEASC Reaccreditation, 2012

Standard/Supporting Documents	May also be useful for Standards
Standard 1: Mission and Purposes	
Current institutional mission statement	2, 4, 5, 6, 9
Wesleyan Charter and By-Laws	
Standard 2: Planning and Evaluation	
Planning	
Strategic plan	4, 5, 6, 8, 9
Campus Master Plan	7, 8, 9
Enrollment planning materials and enrollment projections	4, 6, 9
Financial Plan/Projections	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
Evaluation	
Strategic plan metrics and updates	4, 5, 6, 8, 9
Program reviews of academic units	4
Graduate program reports	4, 5
Teaching evaluation forms and reports	4, 5
IPEDS common data	1, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10
Student and alumni survey results (e.g., CIRP, COFHE)	4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9
Special institutional studies (e.g., advising, double majors, Essential Capabilities)	4,5,6
Standard 3: Organization and Governance	
Wesleyan charter and by-laws	
Faculty committee rosters	5
Staff collective bargaining agreements	9, 10
Faculty Handbook	5
Handbook of policies and procedures for administrative staff	
By-Laws of the Academic Council of Wesleyan University	5
Guidelines for service on faculty committees	5
Board of Trustee meeting materials and minutes	
Standard 4: The Academic Program	
General	
Catalogues	6, 10, 11
Ad hoc committee reports	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9
Educational Policy Committee motions related to departments, programs and curriculum	3, 5, 6, 9, 11
Data reports related to the curriculum	2, 5, 6
Teaching evaluation reports	2, 5, 6
GPA reports	2, 5, 6
Degree program descriptions and requirements	1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11
Course syllabi	1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11
Three-year program	1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11
Honors	1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11
Volunteer opportunities	1, 5, 6, 10, 11
Policy on satisfactory academic progress	4
Course syllabi	5
Undergraduate Education	
General education expectation reports	1, 2, 5, 6
Undergraduate education data (e.g., statistics on majors, class size)	1, 2, 5, 6
Studies of Wesleyan's advising and Essential Capabilities	1, 2, 5, 6
Academic regulations (undergraduate)	1, 2, 5, 6, 10, 11

Graduate Education

Graduate program reports	1, 2, 5, 6
List of thesis and dissertations	
Graduate catalog	

Integrity in the Award of Academic Credit

Policy on evaluation of transfer credit	
Policy on student grading	
Policies on satisfactory academic progress and results	

Assessment of Student Learning

Assessment pilot project report	1, 2
Capstone committee and pilot project	1, 2, 5, 6
Student self-reported learning gains	2, 5, 6

Standard 5: Faculty

Center for Faculty Career Development	
Center for Faculty Career Development survey results, spring 2012	
Chairs Calendar	
COACHE tenure-track faculty survey results, 2008	2
Early retirement policy	
Faculty achievements	
Faculty appointment, promotion and tenure procedures	
Faculty committee rosters	
Faculty salary compensation reports	2, 9
Guidelines on recruiting new faculty	2

Teaching and Advising

Committee report: Evaluation of Teaching	2, 4, 6
Teaching evaluation summary reports	2, 4, 6

Scholarship and Research

Committee Report: Evaluation of Non-traditional Scholarship	
Faculty publications - WesScholar	
Support for faculty research, publishing, and pedagogy	
Faculty Bookshelf	
Statement on academic freedom	11
Academic freedom and tenure	11

Standard 6: Students**Admissions**

Admissions annual reports	1, 2
Admitted Student Questionnaire results	2
Mid-year transfers report	2

Retention

Retention and graduation rate statistics and studies	2
--	---

Student Services

Student Affairs annual reports	2
Student Affairs learning goals	2
Student Affairs survey results (e.g., New Student Orientation, Dining Services)	2
Student Affairs studies & reports (e.g., Athletics, University Center, Behavioral Health Study)	2
Surveys of student satisfaction with campus resources	2, 7, 8
Student association information	

Standard 7: Library and Other Information Resources

Library budget, past five years	4, 5, 6, 9
Library PR task force report and recommendations	
MISO Survey results	2, 4, 5, 6
Library annual report	
Librarian liaisons to academic departments	
University Librarian blog	
Wesleyan Oberlin Group statistics, past 5 years	
CTW Consortium - Final report to the Mellon Foundation on collaborative collection development project	
Software, helpdesk, IMS, and lab usage statistics	
Store sales and class room spending data	
Desktop support policy	
Website and media usage data	

Standard 8: Physical and Technological Resources

1998 Planning for the Future	
Accessible route map	
Facility master plan	
Hall-Atwater/Shanklin plan	
Instructional equipment replacement	
Major maintenance schedule	
Sample contract for leased space	11
Sightlines FY11 facilities measurement & benchmarking	2
Wesleyan University Climate Action Plan	
Sustainability advisory group for environmental stewardship	

Standard 9: Financial Resources

Annual financial reports	
Audit	
Financial planning cycle	2
Fiscal 2011 year-end report	
Fiscal 2012/2013 budget	
FY2011 investment report	
Long-range planning report	
Report of endowment spending working group	

Standard 10: Public Disclosure

Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA) compliance	
Net price calculator	
Publications other than the catalog	
Samples of recruiting materials	4, 6
University catalogs	4

Standard 11: Integrity

Academic freedom: faculty handbook	5
Academic freedom: student handbook statement	6
Affirmative action and equal opportunity statements	
Grade grievance process	4, 6
Policy on discrimination and harassment	
Rights and responsibilities (faculty)	
Student grievance process	6
Union contracts	