

Report to the Faculty, Administration, Trustees, and Students
of Wesleyan University
Middletown, Connecticut

by
An Evaluation Team Representing the
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
of the
New England Association of Schools and Colleges

Prepared after study of the institution's
self-evaluation report and a visit to the campus

October 6-9, 2002

Members of the Team

Mr. David Davis-Van Atta, Director for Institutional Research, Carleton College,
Northfield, MN

Dr. Craig McEwen, Dean for Academic Affairs, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, ME

Dr. Laura Gordon Fisher, Associate Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Harvard
University, Cambridge, MA

Mr. Peter C. McKenzie, Financial Vice President and Treasurer, Boston College,
Chestnut Hill, MA

Dr. Susan Murphy, Vice President of Student and Academic Services, Cornell
University, Ithaca, NY

Dr. Eugene L. Wiemers, Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, Bates College,
Lewiston, ME

Dr. Ellen R. Woods, Senior Associate Vice Provost, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

Dr. Diana Chapman Walsh, President, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA (chair)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

Strengths

- The ten years since Wesleyan’s last re-accreditation have strengthened the University in virtually every respect and re-positioned it for even greater success in the years ahead. The University has accomplished much over the decade. It has:
 - initiated a systematic and broadly-participatory strategic planning process and laid the foundation for an ongoing university-wide commitment to serious, data-driven and action-oriented planning;
 - strengthened, enlarged and diversified its faculty and steadily increased both salaries and total compensation;
 - enhanced its recruitment and retention of students and improved financial aid packages;
 - achieved financial equilibrium and developed a 10-year financial planning model;
 - reviewed and improved the governance structures of the trustees and the faculty;
 - planned, funded, and initiated a new cycle of campus facilities and infrastructure renewal;
 - acquired a 160-acre parcel of land contiguous to the campus;
 - involved its alumni more fully in a number of University activities;
 - accelerated its fund raising;
 - grown its endowment, both nominally and relative to national inflation, and
 - articulated and begun to implement bold educational ambitions and a vision for liberal education and communicated it widely to key audiences.

These accomplishments, and more, are ascribed by many Wesleyan observers to energetic and principled leadership, emanating from the president, and a talented senior management team, and including serious faculty engagement with the University’s educational mission.

- At a time when many colleges and universities struggle to marshal the political forces and the collective will to build a constituency for experimentation and openness to innovation, Wesleyan stands out as a university that seems to understand the danger of complacency in a rapidly changing and unpredictable environment.
- Participants characterize the three-year conversation about the curriculum, beginning in January, 1996, as invigorating, broad ranging, and inclusive. The product – “Wesleyan Education for the 21st Century” -- communicated the University’s

* These findings were presented at the visiting committee’s exit interview on October 9, 2002

determination to carve out a national leadership role as a standard-bearer for excellence in undergraduate liberal education.

- Wesleyan's several planning documents demonstrate an unusually sharp and consistent focus on specific objectives and strategic indicators, monitored on a regular basis by senior managers and the board of trustees.
- The University projects the image of a dynamic institution on the move. Many new initiatives are recently implemented, and others are under discussion. The Program in Curricular Renewal, with its focus on creating curricular coherence in an environment that prizes autonomy and freedom of choice, is a particular source of pride within the senior management team.
- Wesleyan has long been recognized for having diversified its student body well before and to greater extents than its peer institutions did. An unflinching commitment to diversity as a resource for learning remains a widely-embraced institutional value, and an admirable one.
- We applaud Wesleyan's sophistication and depth in both institutional research and information technology, two areas certain to become increasingly important with the passage of time. These strengths provide flexibility and a healthy climate for informed experimentation, and add to existing strengths in the library.
- We also note with admiration the engaged and effective board of trustees that supports Wesleyan's leadership, momentum, and strategic vision.
- The University has a remarkable opportunity to shape the next generation of faculty, with the hiring of 20 new faculty and the anticipated retirement over the next 10 years of roughly a third of the faculty (90 positions). To its credit, Wesleyan is fully aware of the challenges and opportunities embedded in this moment and is attending to the rigor of the hiring process and to the allocation of faculty positions to meet strategic goals and needs. Wisely, the administration and the faculty have reinstated a program of periodic department reviews that include outside visiting committees during this major transition period.
- Recent changes in faculty governance have addressed issues in committee structures and the tenure decision process. Some of the changes are too new to assess but Wesleyan's tenure and promotion procedures appear to us to be vastly improved and now far more understandable and predictable.
- Students appreciate Wesleyan as an intellectually-lively learning community. They are actively engaged in self-governance, campus activism, and the affairs of the world. Even (perhaps especially) when they are expressing strong opinions about improvements that might be made, they love their University and are passionate about the freedom and challenge it offers them in abundance.

- The academic deans are playing an increasingly important role at the interface between the faculty and the administration. They function as honest brokers, translators, and exchangers of information. They are clear about their roles and responsibilities and are respected for the contributions they make.
- We heard uniform enthusiasm among the faculty about the electronic portfolio and the on-line catalogue as valuable tools that enhance their effectiveness in academic advising, which has been substantially improved as a result of the Program on Curriculum and Renewal.
- Overall, then, Wesleyan presents as a university with considerable and admirable strengths that the current leadership is building on with determination and justified pride. The faculty, by all accounts, are exceptionally able teachers and scholars whose commitment to the institution and their students is palpable. The students are smart, engaged intellectually, and fiercely loyal. Throughout the organization, we found people who love the place and who conduct themselves with integrity, confidence, competence, and real commitment to the values embodied in the institution and to its future.

Observations and Suggestions

1. Mission and Purpose

- We thought we observed some gaps between Wesleyan's vision at the highest levels of the organization and the day-to-day reality of faculty and students. Having taken the courageous step of developing and publicly asserting a new vision for achieving curricular cohesion in a culture of unfettered choice, the university now faces the challenge of working out the many details in which the devil resides. We found evidence of dramatic progress over the past ten years. Whether the next ten will see the full realization of the plans so painstakingly developed will hinge in large measure not only on full faculty and student engagement in these changes but also on careful and thoughtful monitoring by faculty working closely with administrators to gauge the implementation and assess its effects.
- Although much has been accomplished over the past decade, many of Wesleyan's newer aspirations and goals are in an early implementation stage. The faculty role at this juncture is less obvious than it was when the institution was generating a new vision of its educational enterprise. As a result, we had the impression that faculty are somewhat unclear at this point how their governance process dovetails with the agenda of implementation now being undertaken largely by the administration. We detected little or no rancor about this, but did pick up some expressions of regret. While faculty morale seems quite good overall, it does seem clear for the long run that the desired changes in the delivery of a Wesleyan education will necessitate the continuing consistent and conscientious efforts on the part of the entire faculty. It remains to be seen whether the systems are fully in place to achieve as deeply rooted

a change in the culture of institutional governance as seems to be needed to support the transformations in curriculum, pedagogy and advising that are planned.

2. Planning and Evaluation

- We were impressed with the quality, consistency, and focus of Wesleyan's planning and implementation at the level of institutional goals, objectives and priorities. But at the level of individual programs, we saw less evidence of clear, robust, and systematic review and evaluation. For example, the Educational Policy Committee should in theory have oversight responsibility for programs the faculty has voted (the Program in Curricular Renewal is an obvious and important example). The committee appears to have ceded that task of program monitoring and assessment to the administration. As a result, feedback of results to the faculty appears not to be occurring on a regular basis. The faculty's share of the responsibility for ensuring the success of programs they have voted is diminished as a consequence. Similarly, the student services division needs to see itself as responsible for regular and broad-scale review of its full complement of programs and services -- how they relate to one another and to the division's mission and how effective the overall program is.
- Nearly everyone we met mentioned the persistent problem of student access to courses during registration. No institution has completely solved this problem but it appears to be especially vexing at Wesleyan for reasons that are not entirely clear. Students have one view of the situation, while faculty, administrators, ITS staff, and others have different perspectives on what is wrong. The University lacks the information at this point to solve the problem well; it is not amenable to a quick fix. In the tradition of being methodical and cross-cutting, as Wesleyan has been in much of its planning, we recommend a good systematic diagnosis of the course access issues, involving all of the constituencies before taking action. This is important because the problem affects academic advising, a key priority. It may be a factor that discourages some students from meeting all of the General Education Expectations, and a thoughtful study of the situation could inform many relevant decisions, for example, those to allocate faculty positions opened by retirements.

3. Organization and Governance

- Wesleyan's commendable efforts to strengthen its governance structures would be enhanced now by finding ways to reinforce practices of consultation, communication and collaboration among the faculty, the students and the administration that are perceived as legitimate, timely, and meaningful. More and better points of contact are needed to build a system of institutional governance that brings together the faculty governance systems, formal and informal, and administrative deliberation. The academic deans may be able to improve the flow of information by playing a particular role but it will have to be nuanced and respectful of their complex obligations to the two constituencies they serve. And it cannot be viewed as a substitute for direct communication with the faculty beyond the "faculty leadership." In addition, it might be productive to explore the varying views of what constitutes

adequate and appropriate consultation and to hammer out mutual understandings about how best to balance the institution's commitment to community with the administrative need for efficiency.

- Academic department chairs play a unique and vital role in the University. As the faculty turns over, the chairs and faculty committees are already experiencing increasing pressures associated with recruitment, hiring, mentoring, and preparing and reviewing tenure and promotion cases for the large complement of new faculty anticipated.
- Also chairs will have expanded responsibilities for departmental planning. We are encouraged to hear of intentions to provide new programs for department chairs through the new Mellon Center. It may be prudent, as well, to assess whether chairs will have adequate incentives and support to meet the new demands of their jobs.

4. Programs and Instruction

- The intense focus in Wesleyan's strategic vision on general education and the quality of students' educational experiences during the first two years must lead next to an examination of the entire undergraduate experience. We wondered how Wesleyan envisages the student's progress through the four-year college career, from orientation and the first year, through the second year, the selection of a major, off-campus courses for credit, study abroad, research experiences, and the gradual mastery of the essential competencies along that developmental pathway.
- We admired the redesigned admissions materials and the research that stands behind them. They communicate beautifully what is distinct to Wesleyan and underscore the emphasis on the undergraduate experience. We were struck, however, by the thin coverage in the self-study of the benefits of the graduate programs for graduate students and strategies for maintaining their quality into the future. We encourage an ongoing, thoughtful dialogue about the graduate programs and their place within the liberal arts framework Wesleyan is articulating so powerfully.

5. Faculty

- Laying the groundwork for a tenure process that is transparent and predictable, Wesleyan has a strong mentoring program for junior faculty, beginning with frank discussions of tenure procedures and criteria during job interviews. In our view, the mentoring program could be enhanced by addressing pedagogical issues earlier and more explicitly. Formal mechanisms should be in place to ensure that junior faculty have support in making sense of student response to their first courses and access to pedagogical support as soon as they are hired to teach at Wesleyan. We note that demands are increasing on senior faculty for mentoring large numbers of new hires.

6. Student Services

- Formal structures are needed, as well, to facilitate faculty engagement with students outside of the academic program in order to ensure the integration of residential and intellectual life which are now widely viewed as quite separate.
- Many opportunities exist for students to engage in co-curricular and extracurricular activities. But we were not able to satisfy ourselves that students with special needs, concerns, or grievances have effective channels through which to communicate them. In addition, we were glad to see that the University is reviewing its support for students with disabilities, including learning disabilities.
- We congratulate Wesleyan on the improvements in the food services. They seem to have produced a dramatic turnaround in just a year's time. Of course it will be important to continue monitoring student satisfaction with dining.
- Many colleges and universities are reassessing the adequacy of the services they offer students with mental illnesses. We encourage an assessment of the Office of Behavioral Health in terms of volume, type, quality, and responsiveness of services provided.

7. Library and Informational Resources

- The library and information technology (ITS) organizations are both strong and esteemed by users. They have built some collaborative relationships at the level of the ITS directors and leadership of the library. There are many opportunities for collaboration for those who deliver services directly and there is an opportunity to extend the reach of both the library and ITS so that each is viewed as an extension of the richness of the other.
- ITS has an active program in information literacy to engage and train students in the use of technology. The library offers strong user education programs. There is a tremendous opportunity to engage those two areas and connect them with the faculty's pedagogical needs to the mutual benefit of all. The new Mellon initiative in information literacy will be a strong first step.
- The approach the institution is taking toward the integration of core technologies through the web is extraordinarily promising. However, this strategy provides a level of flexibility that could result in administrative units replicating their existing business practices rather than changing the way they work. The flexibility that the web provides should not be allowed to undermine the pursuit of efficiency and opportunities to reengineer business practices.

8. Physical Resources

- Wesleyan easily meets all the standards in the facilities area. The University does have clear deficiencies in some facilities; those have been noted and plans have been made to rectify them. Updating the science facility is a high priority. Replacing the Hall-Atwater science building is planned for the next round of major construction and the University Center will be an important addition. There are residence halls and housing units in need of upgrading. Replacing those wood-frame houses in greatest need of repair with a new residence hall would be a great enhancement and would remove the financial burden of significant deferred maintenance.
- The process of facilities planning is highly consultative and is commendable, as is the Web site that maps it out. The master planning process has been detailed and extremely thoughtful.
- We encourage the University to watch debt capacity limits critically. Modeling for the future does not currently incorporate these measures, and should. Financial ratio benchmarks could be set as targets for debt service rating. If the market continues to deteriorate and/or if the University brings on more debt, the rating could fall. It would be wise to set a threshold of credit worthiness as a target that would trigger a reassessment of the financial models.

9. Financial Resources

- Wesleyan clearly meets all the financial standards. Resources are being allocated in support of the University's mission and it is operating in financial equilibrium. The new chief financial officer is advancing a teamwork concept that seems effective.
- With the downturn in the markets and little information on which to predict the timing of a recovery, it would be prudent for Wesleyan to develop appropriate financial standards to gauge its financial health over the long term. The current P&L financial models would be improved if they also incorporated a balance sheet concept.
- The Fund for Excellence is now built into the operating budget through 2005 and covers the new commitments made as part of the Strategy for Wesleyan. In effect, that means that the annual unrestricted fund raising target is more like \$10M than \$6M because of commitments now funded with current-use dollars. Annual fund raising goals are aggressive and they will need to be met.

10. Public Disclosure

- Wesleyan's publications are effective, attractive and accurate.
- Recent innovations in Wesleyan's admissions materials are innovative and potentially transforming in terms of marketing strategy. The next challenge will be to extend the new image into the web as a first point of contact.

11. Integrity

- Codes of conduct at the institution are clearly defined, accessible and fully adequate.
- The current review of the honor code is a healthy and timely response to recent increases in violations of the code. A reconsideration of the faculty role in honor code review may be warranted in light of the increasing threat of litigation nationwide stemming from the handling of violations.
- High levels of integrity, ethical conduct and professional behavior permeate the organization, as does a commitment to the institution. These are wonderful resources.

Concerns

- We believe that the time is right for the administration to demonstrate in more tangible ways its understanding of and respect for the strong faculty and student commitment to community engagement that defines Wesleyan and is a source of institutional loyalty and pride. The discussion of decisions with faculty and students needs to occur before the fact, and an authentic process of soliciting and incorporating a wide range of opinion on important matters needs to be established and communicated well and consistently.
- Strictly speaking, Wesleyan did not present a mission statement that meets the NEASC standard. The excerpt from the president's excellent essay focuses primarily on the undergraduate audience. It was not approved by the trustees and is not consistently included in University publications as the standard dictates.

EVALUATION TEAM REPORT ON WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

Wesleyan University conducted a comprehensive self study that served effectively as a focus for the re-accreditation site visit. The administration provided extensive additional documentation to the site visit team during the on-campus review from October 6-9, 2002.

The visiting team appreciated the open reception extended by the Wesleyan community. Faculty, students, staff, alumni, and trustees were forthright, insightful, and informative in their responses to our many questions. Members of the staff went out of their way to ensure that our visit was productive and enjoyable. We thank all of them for their careful planning and gracious hospitality. We hope that our comments will be useful in assisting the University as it continues to act on the insights its own self study and internal planning processes have been germinating.

The 10 years since Wesleyan's last re-accreditation have strengthened the University in virtually every respect and re-positioned it for even greater success in the years ahead. The University has accomplished much over the decade. At a time when many colleges and universities struggle to marshal the political forces and the collective will to build a constituency for experimentation and openness to innovation, Wesleyan stands out as a university that seems to understand the danger of complacency in a rapidly changing and unpredictable environment. We came away from our visit with an appreciation of Wesleyan as a learning community with considerable and admirable strengths that the current leadership is building on with determination and justified pride.

I. Mission and Purposes

Wesleyan has reaffirmed its identity as an undergraduate residential liberal arts institution through a broadly-based campus discussion and planning process encapsulated in President Bennet's 1997 essay, *Wesleyan Education for the 21st Century*. This process led to a Program of Curriculum Renewal, adopted by the faculty in the spring of 1998, and to the subsequent *Strategy for Wesleyan* that is guiding a capital campaign, the allocation of resources, plans for campus renovation, and revisions in the academic program. President Bennet's statement was circulated to the Trustees in April, 1997; the *Strategy for Wesleyan* was formally adopted by the Trustees in November, 1998.

Wesleyan Education for the 21st Century stresses the first two years of undergraduate education and enumerates "essential capabilities" that students should build during those years as they fulfill the voluntary distribution expectations. It advocates improved advising and greater access to courses. It asserts the centrality of the scholar/teacher model for education and justifies the university's relatively open curriculum that, it argues, follows from that model.

The paper notes the central value of the residential experience as part of a liberal education and places the University's doctoral programs in the context of "their contribution to the nexus of scholarship and undergraduate education." The document does not discuss Wesleyan's substantial continuing education programs.

A paragraph from the 1997 *Strategy* statement that offers a vision of a Wesleyan liberal education appears early in the Wesleyan catalogue in a section entitled "Wesleyan's Curriculum." Both the *Strategy for Wesleyan* and *Wesleyan Education for the 21st Century* are prominently displayed on the University's Web site.

Taken together, these documents go far toward meeting the Commission's standard for Mission and Purposes. They address the primary audience of undergraduate liberal arts students, set out elements of Wesleyan's distinctive character in the context of its traditions, articulate a clear vision for the future, and establish specific and achievable goals. They function as a mission statement for the undergraduate liberal arts program through their broad embrace by administrative leaders and faculty. They have led directly to programmatic initiatives for the undergraduate curriculum as well as to significant aspects of the capital campaign priorities and design. The strategic plan in combination with the Program in Curricular Renewal set out clear goals for most operating units of the University. Progress toward fulfilling the goals of that strategic plan serves in turn as a touchstone in reports to the Trustees; faculty and administrative staff continue to refer to elements of the plan as they work to carry it out. Although it is too early to assess the University's success in implementing the full program outlined in these documents, administrative leaders are clearly attentive to the desirability of doing so.

Significant and effective though these documents are, they fall short of fully meeting the formal NEASC standard in three minor ways. First, only the *Strategy for Wesleyan* has been adopted by the Board. Second, only an excerpt from the *Wesleyan Education* paper appears in the university's catalogue, although the full document along with the *Strategy* are prominent on the Web. Third, none of the statements adequately addresses Wesleyan's identity as a university and captures fully its mission for other audiences – graduate students and adult learners engaged in continuing education – in the context of its deep commitment to the liberal arts.

II. Planning and Evaluation

Wesleyan has invested a great deal of effort in recent years in organized, systematic, and regularized planning activities with active and continuing involvement of the President and senior staff who communicate their genuine interest in honest assessment of the University's strengths and weaknesses. This planning ethos has extended into the academic community and to appropriate sectors and levels of the University's professional staff. Appropriate data supporting various planning efforts as well as the results of relevant evaluation work have been provided to the Board of Trustees.

The University's planning efforts have been directed toward the institution's primary mission: teaching and learning. Major planning initiatives appear to be on-going and

organic, each report or end-point leading into the next cycle, to the next set of questions, and into feedback loops of evaluation.

Having recently hired a new Director of Institutional Research (IR) and an Assistant Director, Wesleyan is well positioned to see a very talented team build on this admirable record of commitment to purposeful planning and on-going evaluation. The IR function is well supplied with the essential tools of the trade, including effective and broad access to the University's internal data, rich software tools, and strong support from the information technology organization.

Moreover, the commitment to an information-driven, knowledge-based approach is widely evident in the University: at the level of the Board of Trustees and the President, and among members of the senior staff and the managerial staff who report to them. Examples of highly effective planning processes include the energizing early open call from the President for two-page position papers on Wesleyan's future as well as the development process of WesMaps and the electronic portfolio. Planning efforts at Wesleyan have been integrated across functional areas, as well as from senior to operational staff, and have marshaled the resources necessary for both development and implementation.

Wesleyan makes extensive and effective use of the data resources offered by its membership in the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) as well as the ACE CIRP Freshman Survey and the College Board's Admitted Student Questionnaire (ASQ). In addition, Wesleyan has designed a number of internal surveys to address specific questions, and, too, has conducted qualitative research (in-depth interviews, focus groups, etc.).

Several offices questioned whether COFHE was always the right set of schools against which to make sound, full comparisons of Wesleyan's data. While COFHE is an excellent comparison group, it does lack a number of relevant schools for Wesleyan (e.g., Haverford, Middlebury, and perhaps a few others). Strict comparison always and only to a single set of schools, however similar, on every measure, can produce, at least potentially, some blindness or short-sighted situations. Further, COFHE does not readily offer comparative data on certain topics (e.g. Development). Gathering data on relevant schools outside COFHE may be illuminating at some points, and can be useful even if only to confirm that COFHE appears to provide a good comparison set. To this end, the University may want to consider greater use of the data and analytic tools available through the Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) consortium as a complement to the COFHE data for comparisons with a wider peer group.

One complex problem that warrants a high priority on Wesleyan's future planning and evaluation agenda is the issue of students' access to courses which surfaced repeatedly in our interviews as a concern among many constituencies. Faculty, students, and key staff each describe the problem somewhat differently, not only from their particular perspectives, but even as they struggle to supply an objective understanding of its exact nature (what, where, when, who, why) and its scope. The full issue of "course access"

appears not to be well-understood yet, nor is it clear whether this is “simply” a frustrating irritant or a more serious problem that is affecting students’ curricular choices and the ability of some to meet the general education expectations. Some course access problems appear to emanate from various structural approaches the University takes in areas such as faculty options for setting a matrix of limits to each course, priorities for small courses, and almost surely other policies, procedures, and priorities as well. Course access issues decidedly will not be amenable to a “quick-fix” approach. We recommend careful consideration of what data will provide a better understanding of this complex issue: to what degrees, where, and when it is in fact a problem, if it even genuinely is one, and what its underlying causes are. There is a further discussion of this issue below in the discussion of the Program in Curricular and Pedagogical Renewal under Standard IV (pp 9-10).

Wesleyan “evaluates the achievement of its mission and purposes, giving primary focus to the realization of its educational objectives.” This is currently the Holy Grail of educational assessment. No research effort or institution has fully characterized its educational “products,” outcomes, or the processes that generate them but Wesleyan is making strategic use of high quality survey research on its current students, all four classes as well as new freshmen, on its seniors, and on its alumni. The dissemination of the results of these studies can be strengthened, with better flow and articulation through more effective communication channels between the data generators (primarily Institutional Research) and the faculty. This is not an easy problem, and not all faculty will be interested in seeing research results, even on student educational outcomes, but better dissemination will both bring faculty and administration closer together in the sense of shared mission and involvement, and enhance an important feedback loop in the planning and evaluation cycle.

The next step facing Wesleyan will be to consider, plan for, and conduct an assessment of the effectiveness of its planning and evaluation activities themselves. This will require some years of experience with both planning and evaluation, covering a variety of institutional functions and areas before a sufficient experience- and knowledge-base is developed. Numerous successful planning efforts, and good evaluation programs, are clearly evident at Wesleyan, many with manifest benefits and outcomes for students, for learning, for teaching, and so forth. At some future point (perhaps two to three years hence) these efforts will need to be examined systematically, benefits weighed against the resources required to achieve them, results discussed among those involved and those affected, and, if warranted, corrections and improvements made as necessary. And while such work is important, it should not be undertaken so extensively or at such length as to distract the institution from on-going planning and evaluation efforts but simply to seek ideas for improvement and mid-course correction.

III. Organization and Governance

Wesleyan has evolved a system of governance that generally “facilitates the successful accomplishment of its mission and purposes.” Serious teaching of undergraduates, graduate students and continuing education students takes place; faculty – sometimes

with student collaborators or assistants – are engaged in significant scholarly and artistic work; and the University supports students as well as the work of its faculty and staff.

We were deeply impressed by the dedication of the faculty and staff we met to playing their roles in the achievement of Wesleyan's institutional mission. At the same time, even with a recently revised system of faculty governance and the emergence or strengthening of administrative units of the University, there appear to be points of friction, inadequate support, or lack of coordination that may slow the full realization of Wesleyan's strategic and academic plan.

Wesleyan reevaluates its governance structure periodically. The charter and by-laws of the University were revised as recently as the spring of 2002 in light of a self-study in 1996-97. These revisions mean that the charter and by-laws reflect a contemporary and appropriate set of governing rules for the Trustees that defines the chief administrative roles of the institution; sets out a comprehensive but efficient committee structure that continues to engage student and faculty representatives on standing committees; defines the Faculty Academic Council and the powers of the faculty; delineates degree-granting authority; and provides for indemnification. The faculty have also recently revised their by-laws and adopted significant revisions in the Guidelines of the Academic Council for the Evaluation of Candidates for Promotion Conferring Tenure. In addition, the role of the Academic Council has been revised, as have significant responsibilities of its subcommittees: the Advisory Committee and the newly-established Review and Appeals Board.

The latter changes in particular are widely acknowledged to have improved the consistency and quality of the tenure review process (also see Standard V). The faculty will be wise to continue reviewing its procedures for tenure in view of the potential legal exposure arising from the potential for variability in many of the evaluation steps outlined in Sec. 102 of the Guidelines of the Academic Council. Different choices about solicitation of peer evaluations for example across departments or among candidates within the same department over time could create undesirable legal exposure. These legal concerns tend to militate toward greater consistency and standardization of processes than is generally found in the Wesleyan faculty culture, and the University will want to continue to monitor the balance between exposure and autonomy. Further issues of securing confidentiality of the process in the light of the large size of the Appeals Board will require careful review as well. Ultimately, the crucial standard by which a tenure process is judged is the confidence of faculty, academic administrators, and Trustees in its fairness, integrity and rigor. There is great hope that Wesleyan's new process will achieve this standard, but it is too early to tell at this point.

The by-law changes and altered committee and faculty meeting structures are also still in the early stages of implementation, with such roles as Chair of the Faculty largely undefined; the promising new Executive Committee is still shaping its role and only provisional; the new post of Secretary of the Faculty is developing; and the crucial Educational Policy Committee is struggling with discontinuity of membership and, perhaps, unclear staffing from administrative offices. Faculty governance committees

include administrators (president and vice president *ex officio* on three of four and the three academic deans on the Executive Committee) but there is pressure on the academic officers to participate solely as faculty members when on those groups.

Alongside the formal and very limited committee structure of the faculty is an informal and largely *ad hoc* structure of committees, advisory groups, and task forces that draw in faculty volunteers or appointees designated through varying mechanisms. These groups play a vital institutional role in guiding administrative decision-making that profoundly affects academic life in such crucial areas as honor code policy and implementation, academic computing policy, and library development. Reportedly, faculty respond positively when asked to participate in these groups and play an important and constructive role in moving the University forward. Yet, this structure of committees and task forces is almost invisible to the community (we had to ask to have a list of such groups specially prepared), potentially diminishing their legitimacy and impact.

In this context of narrowly defined “faculty governance” but widely defined institutional issues, the special challenge for Wesleyan is to find ways to construct a collaborative structure of *institutional* governance that builds on but bridges a strong tradition of faculty autonomy. To do so will require an increase in the communication, coordination, and collaboration between administrators and faculty in the context of existing committees and consideration of new ways to make visible and to legitimate joint faculty-administrative (and student) work outside of the official faculty governance structure. In addition, greater coordination and collaboration with administrators including Deans, the Senior Associate Provost and the Director of Institutional Research would strengthen, for example, the capacity of faculty committees such as EPC to monitor and evaluate implementation and effectiveness of elements of the Program in Curricular Renewal.

Another governance challenge for Wesleyan is to find ways to support and expand leadership roles for department chairs in the context of the collegial culture and expectations of their peers. As noted under Standard V, chairs face an expanded range of time-consuming responsibilities including supervising staff, recruiting and reviewing increasing numbers of new faculty, and undertaking three-year plans. The revival of a tradition of external visiting committees for departments will provide additional challenges. But the opportunities are significant as well for leading and engaging colleagues in rethinking and coordinating curriculum (while recognizing the value of individual faculty choice) and reexamining pedagogy. If the University extends its examination of the Wesleyan education to include the development of capabilities throughout the four years and to enrich the already strong major experience, this leadership role for chairs will be vitally important. Our impression is that this role is often experienced as a bureaucratic burden rather than an opportunity for program leadership. Support for the new Mellon Center for Faculty Development with its broad array of programs could assist in broadening the view of this role, but it may also take some rethinking of incentives and of staff support for chairs as well.

The membership of the Trustees is broadly representative, reflecting the variety of areas of expertise needed for such a Board and “reflecting the public interest.” The Trustees appear to have evolved an appropriate relationship to the President, faculty and administrative staff, playing a strongly supportive role in strategic planning and implementation, while renewing their commitment to building and sustaining the financial strength of the University. At the same time that they provide support, they ask tough questions and require accountability and information from administrators about the University’s progress in meeting particular objectives. They appropriately delegate and leave management questions to the administration and crucial curricular and academic issues to the faculty and administration. Agenda and materials for Board meetings and annual retreats over the last several years reveal a deeply engaged Board, focused on developing, monitoring and supporting implementation of the University’s strategic plan. The strategic indicators used for these purposes are unusually well developed at Wesleyan.

The communication process both within the Board and between its members and leadership and administrative officers of the University appears to be excellent, promoting substantial and rich Board meetings that focus appropriately on the policy concerns and fiduciary duties that are the Board’s responsibility. Members of the senior staff do an outstanding job of providing the Board with thoughtful and thorough reports and materials that support meaningful discussion and deliberation.

The program of Continuing Studies appears until recently to have been less connected to the institution. Recruitment of new leadership in the program and the initiatives of these leaders with support from the Dean of Continuing Studies have strongly reconnected the program to the campus and that connection promises to grow as these new leaders reach out to the faculty. This increased institutional integration is not yet as well reflected in the institution’s public presence and sense of mission as it is in the minds of those who are working to effect it.

IV. Programs and Instruction

Since the last re-accreditation review, Wesleyan has made changes both in degree requirements and in general education to strengthen its long-standing commitment to undergraduate liberal education. These curricular modifications were supported by serious new investments in faculty appointments and pedagogy, as well as an improved information technology infrastructure for advising and registration. Admissions materials and recruitment were also revised to reflect these curricular changes. We were impressed by the depth of the reforms and the pace of their implementation, guided by presidential leadership, with the involvement of faculty and administration.

Also since the last review, Wesleyan has found new ways to embrace the graduate programs and incorporate them within its vision of liberal education. With an admirable record of admissions and placement, the doctoral programs also contribute to the undergraduate experience in a number of ways, expanding the courses available to advanced majors and providing research opportunities. The Masters of Arts in Liberal

Studies has also been revitalized through the efforts and leadership of the new GLSP director.

Undergraduate Programs

Modifications in the degree requirements reflect Wesleyan's commitment to strengthening the rigor and consistency of undergraduate education. Beginning with the class of 2004, students now take more academic courses in residence, with fewer advanced placement or other credits counting toward the degree. As Wesleyan has no course requirements outside the major, we noted that the major requirements therefore become the main structural element guiding students toward a coherent academic experience. In some departments and programs, for example, satisfaction of the general education expectations is required for completion of the major.

Responsibility for review of undergraduate programs – degree requirements, major requirements, general education, etc. -- is not clearly defined. We applaud the Provost's recent reintroduction of outside visiting committees for departments, but the internal review process for college-wide academic programs voted on by the faculty, such as the General Education Expectations and the Program in Curricular Renewal, remains to be clarified. For example, the standing Educational Policy Committee (EPC) of the faculty has a very broad mandate, but its agenda does not include a systematic plan for regular review of those programs. Senior staff members in the area of academic affairs conduct assessments and collect information about the effectiveness of undergraduate programs as part of their administrative duties, but it is not clear to us how this information is used to inform faculty in oversight of these programs.

Wesleyan would do well to define more clearly the appropriate roles and responsibilities of the EPC and senior administration in the tasks of review, evaluation, and assessment. Regular internal reviews of undergraduate programs should be instituted to complement external departmental reviews, with a clear division of responsibility between faculty oversight and the administration. In particular the Academic Deans should be considered as potential contributors to this review process, given their responsibility to oversee the curriculum at the departmental level.

We also encourage faculty and administrators to think about the comprehensive picture of undergraduate education as a four-year career. In what ways are the essential capabilities developed beyond the first two years? How does international study fit into the picture? And the major requirements? Are students encouraged to undertake research and honors? In the planned assessment of the success of Curricular Renewal, we suggest a focus on the integration of the goals of the program into the wider spectrum of education of Wesleyan undergraduates for the 21st century.

General Education

Since the last review, Wesleyan's general education expectations remain unchanged in their substance – completion of three courses in three major areas of the curriculum.

However, the process of course certification for general education has been strengthened: the divisional deans now review all courses annually and monitor the number and type of general education courses offered by each department. (This task was previously handled by the EPC.) Though not a requirement, an estimated 75% of students complete the full set of expectations; with an additional 5% estimated who complete at least two courses in each general education area.

Analyses of course-taking patterns reveal that the main deficiency in completion of general education expectations is the failure of humanities and social science majors to enroll in natural science or mathematics courses. Decanal involvement in the certification of courses has created new opportunities to encourage course development of substantive new courses in science for non-scientists, with support from pedagogical renewal grants (see below).

While the general education expectations were sustained without change, a new initiative designed to enhance liberal education– the Program in Curricular Renewal – was conceived, developed and implemented since the last review (see below). This program, like the general education expectations, categorizes courses according to a set of criteria defined not as areas of knowledge but as “key capabilities.” Both general education and key capabilities are classifications designed to provide information to students about the courses they select. However, it is unclear how the two types of categories relate to each other in guiding the students toward a coherent personal academic plan. It is also unclear to what extent the new categories are incorporated into curricular planning at the departmental and decanal levels.

We recommend that the EPC consider the relationship of the older and more traditional general education expectations to the recently defined essential capabilities. Deans and department chairs should attend to the relationship between general education and essential capabilities in the process of approval of new courses and annual curriculum management.

Program in Curricular and Pedagogical Renewal (Instruction, Advising)

The rich variety of courses in the Wesleyan curriculum is a direct outgrowth of the active research and scholarship of the faculty. The richness of the curriculum challenges students to find a coherent pathway toward intellectual development. In the absence of formal requirements outside the major, the Curricular Renewal Program provides a focus on a set of essential capabilities which are developed through courses in writing, public speaking, reading nonverbal texts, quantitative reasoning, and ethical reasoning. Faculty label their courses for these qualities, and students, with faculty advising assistance, use the WesMaps course database to select courses. Other ‘sorts’ of courses include identification as part of a cluster grouped by association with a topic, such as Jewish and Israeli Studies or Urban Studies. These clusters do not lead to an academic degree or formal certificate but are instead ways to guide students in locating clusters of related courses.

The electronic tools are widely used and enthusiastically endorsed by faculty and students as effective ways to help with course selection. It is less clear that the additional new information about courses effectively creates the curricular “coherence” that the University seeks for its students, though it certainly allows students to make better informed decisions in their individual academic planning. Complicating, and perhaps undermining, students’ best efforts to plan a coherent program is the issue of access to courses. Students and administrators report that the system for allocating spaces in classes is fraught with problems; “irritating” “annoying” and “frustrating” are descriptors heard during the team’s visit.

As discussed in the Planning and Evaluation section, the Committee observed that the nature and scope of the course access problem appears to be poorly understood. Where is the unmet student demand? How large is this problem – e.g. if a course is limited to 40, would raising the size to 50 handle the need? How many students are turned away from their first choice? Are they happy with their second choice? What is the optimal class size for pedagogical effectiveness in different courses? What factors influence professors in setting class size? Current systems apparently do not capture data that can be used to analyze the problem, and we recommend that the process of course access be thoroughly examined and that alternative solutions be considered by all constituents – faculty, students, and administrators.

Advising of new students by faculty has been transformed by the development of innovative new electronic tools. In addition to WesMaps and online registration described above, the new electronic portfolio has enormous capacity to capture information about students and make it accessible to advisors. So far, students have not used it much beyond the interface with the online course registration system, but many acknowledge its potential. For example, students mention that they might use its resume function when they apply for jobs and need recommendations, and the Director of Writing notes the possibility of students recording their writing for analysis of progress over their four years. Faculty and students praise the effort to match students with advisors who are also their teachers in the first year, either in introductory courses or in special First Year Initiative Seminars. We recommend that the advising experience be evaluated as part of the review of the effectiveness of Curricular Renewal and that this evaluation of advising be a regular activity of the faculty.

The Curricular Renewal Program has also resulted in the hiring of 20 new faculty at Wesleyan. This rapid expansion of the faculty raises issues of support for new faculty, especially in teaching. The Pedagogical Renewal accompanying Curricular Renewal has led to the development of a new handbook, discussion sessions, and revised orientation for new faculty. We were impressed by ways that faculty are encouraged to bring their scholarship into their teaching, for example, through grants for curriculum development and a program of WebTech assistants. The new Mellon Center for Faculty Development is a promising locus for organizing these initiatives into ongoing and regular support for faculty in their role as instructors. We encourage Wesleyan to continue its programs of support for teaching, which will be ever more important as the hiring of replacements for retiring faculty proceeds apace over the next few years.

Graduate Programs

Graduate education at Wesleyan has been a well-kept secret. The contribution of graduate degree programs to the health of the institution deserves higher visibility. Doctoral programs in the sciences not only train graduate students but also provide expanded opportunities for undergraduates. These include the enrollment by advanced undergraduates in graduate courses as well as research projects where undergraduates work with graduate students and faculty to produce new knowledge in the field. Faculty and students co-author papers as a result of these collaborations, and students go on to graduate school well prepared for advanced study. In music, undergraduate and graduate student collaboration may take the form of a composer organizing undergraduate performance of an original work or an assistantship for a graduate student teaching a course in the new community arts program.

For the Masters of Arts in Liberal Studies, new procedures and policies are being implemented to improve the academic rigor and the faculty and student connections with other Wesleyan programs. The newly appointed academic administrator is energetic and effective in carrying out the goals set by the recent Task Force. We recommend that Wesleyan continue to expand the ways of integrating graduate education into its liberal education mission.

Scholarship and Research

Faculty scholarship is encouraged and supported by a strong policy of sabbatical leaves. This creates a challenge in sustaining continuity in such activities as committee membership/leadership and curricular planning. For example, the EPC chair and three of its members are serving only one semester each, replacing faculty on sabbatical leave this year. The recently adopted practice of planning course offerings on a three-year cycle is a promising step toward managing the curriculum to insure that major requirements as well as general education and essential capabilities are covered.

Admissions

Implementing recommendations from outside consultants, the Admissions Office has revised its viewbook and other materials. They reflect Wesleyan's uniqueness in offering undergraduates at a liberal arts college the opportunity to benefit from research opportunities tied to graduate study in some fields. The publications are also designed to feature recent changes in the curriculum and advising implemented through the Curricular Renewal program.

In addition to achieving standards of academic rigor and excellence in high school preparation, prospective Wesleyan students are expected to demonstrate such personal qualities as intellectual curiosity, creativity, and independence. These qualities match the demands of the Wesleyan environment for self-directed academic choice.

Recent trends affirm Wesleyan's growing selectivity and competitiveness. The challenge is to continue to celebrate the University's commitment to students from minority backgrounds and first-generation college students. Expanding this commitment to diversity is reflected in increasing the number of international students at Wesleyan, especially those from Asia with support from a grant by the Freeman Foundation. Other diversity goals include outreach to new geographical areas of the U.S. and to public schools that have not previously prepared students for matriculation at Wesleyan.

We recommend that the program of annual evaluation of admissions continue, and that the faculty participate in assessing the results of the evaluation.

V. Faculty

Wesleyan University clearly meets all the standards for Faculty set by NEASC. The Wesleyan faculty is of exceedingly high quality and is strongly dedicated to fulfilling the mission and purposes of the institution. The faculty is committed to preserving its distinctiveness as a community of scholars dedicated to teaching, and the synergy of teaching and research defines the intellectual environment and underpins the curriculum. Beyond the classroom, the demands on faculty are extensive: they have worked to improve student advising and have created a culture of strong student-faculty interaction; they are actively engaged in governance, ranging from academic planning to a reorganization of their own committee structure. While their level of commitment and involvement is impressive, what distinguishes the Wesleyan faculty is their understanding and acceptance of institutional expectations. We heard no complaints about workloads. Contributing to this phenomenon may be the high premium placed on faculty autonomy and collegiality. The University's strong sabbatical policy may also be a factor. Just as the faculty consider the demands on their time justifiable, even normal, so too do they consider the sabbatical well earned.

The process of recruitment of new faculty at Wesleyan is a model of openness and order, adhering to the guidelines approved by the faculty and in accordance with requirements for equal opportunity employment. In fact, it may be cited among "best practices." Faculty members work with the administration to develop strategies for the search and canvass broadly to ensure that the search yields an appropriate pool of candidates—of high quality and diverse. Departments and programs have a reporting mechanism that mandates the participation of all faculty members in the process and ensures the establishment of an expanded network of contacts. These contacts can also establish the foundation for ongoing relationships for the identification of a diverse pool of candidates in the future. No search may go forward without demonstrating extensive consultation with experts in the field and with those who may be in a position to identify a diverse group of applicants. No short list can be established for campus interviews and lectures without the President's approval, which is granted on the basis of evidence of efforts to recruit individuals of color and women. With few exceptions, Wesleyan has a strong record of hiring its first choice, and in the past five years these choices have included a critical mass of minorities and women, substantially increasing the diversity of the faculty. The decline in these numbers last year notwithstanding, the continuing

commitment to diversity on the part of the faculty and administration is impressive. With the expected turnover in the faculty resulting from retirements over the next several years, there will be greater opportunities to diversify the faculty. As a consequence, there is a need for continuing oversight and scrutiny, even as the demonstrated level of commitment suggests that this process is becoming institutionalized.

Wesleyan's willingness to devote substantial resources to the recruitment of faculty is evident across the divisions in the quality of new hires. In the natural sciences for example, the high level of start-up packages for new faculty has consistently been a significant factor. One issue that should be examined is how realistic it is to engage in cost sharing with Natural Sciences and Mathematics departments without endowments or opportunities for indirect cost recovery through external grants. Further, in those fields where the market is particularly competitive and the pool deep, some flexibility in administering these hiring procedures, especially in the number of candidates invited for campus interviews, should be considered.

Similar to the process of appointment for ladder faculty, the appointment process for academic support staff follows appropriate procedures. Graduate teaching assistants undergo training before they are allowed to assume responsibilities for grading and laboratory and section support, for which they are closely supervised by faculty. Some thought might be given to providing an intensive English course prior to matriculation for graduate students for whom English is a second language. This would facilitate the transition to the graduate program and allow them to participate as teaching assistants at an earlier stage.

Faculty categories are clearly defined by the institution as are the roles of faculty in each category in fulfilling its mission and purposes. Unlike many other institutions, the University employs adjunct faculty on multiyear renewable contracts, and salaries and benefits are consistent with the requirements of the position and even include sabbaticals. While adjunct faculty are important contributors to foreign language programs, and the arts, such as applied music and dance, and visitors are employed to replace faculty on leave or to fill vacancies in the faculty, there is no reliance on temporary or part-time faculty or graduate assistants to conduct classroom instruction.

After some cutbacks to the faculty through attrition for financial reasons 10 years ago, a total of 26 positions were recently authorized, a combination of six "reallocated" positions and 20 incremental positions, for a net gain of 11. All but five of these positions have been filled and four of them will likely be filled during this academic year. The allocation of the incremental positions was based on a number of criteria, including the mounting of additional general education courses for first- and second-year students, intellectual adjacencies, enhanced course access, and support of the initiative in Curricular Renewal, and involved input from the Educational Policy Committee, followed by recommendations from the academic deans to the vice president for academic affairs.

These incremental positions along with vacant positions from retirements and “bridge” appointments, funded by the Mellon Foundation, which anticipate retirements, have produced cohorts of 18-23 new faculty over several years. With a high turnover predicted from future retirements, this rate of hiring is likely to continue, but even without it, the size of the recent cohorts alone have serious implications for faculty workloads in terms of hiring, mentoring, and reviews for contract renewal and tenure, on both the departmental and committee levels. The tenure process, characterized by the near transparency and predictability of its procedures and the seriousness and care which faculty bring to it, is a hallmark of the institution, and it is clear that the faculty will not allow any compromises. Recognition of the level of commitment to this enterprise perhaps by additional course relief, additional staff support, or other measures at the appropriate time may be in order.

Wesleyan faculty salaries are set at levels which ensure its continued ability to attract the most outstanding teacher-scholars. Efforts have been made in recent years to increase salaries overall and salary levels have improved relative to the comparison group. These increases have not come fast enough or made enough difference to satisfy most faculty who also have concerns about the way merit increases are allocated as well as about the narrowness of the differential in the merit component itself. The egalitarian culture that exists among the faculty makes any change in both the overall process and the merit process difficult.

The policies with regard to faculty are clearly defined in written documents; these policies have undergone review and revision when appropriate in response to faculty concerns. Assurances regarding the protection of academic freedom and the monitoring of professional and ethical conduct are in place.

The task of evaluating and developing faculty is undertaken with apparent seriousness at every level. The review processes through which faculty are reappointed and eventually tenured and promoted are well understood and involve significant faculty input and discussion. Even before they are hired, new faculty learn about the tenure process at meetings with the relevant academic dean and a member of the Advisory Committee during their first campus visit. This is reinforced by the department chair and other mentors once they are here. There are written reviews in the second and fifth years (the first for contract renewal) and while these may be burdensome and there was some question about the need for as much formality in the fifth year, there is consensus among faculty about the importance of the processes of mentoring, documentation and preparation for the tenure review. It is important to note that once a successful hire is made, senior faculty have a high expectation for success for that individual at the time of tenure. The mentoring processes are based on that philosophy and the senior members of the department view it as their responsibility to ensure that that happens.

Because there may be some variability across departments in what information is solicited for tenure reviews, and because what has been consistent practice within departments could be subject to modification in the turnover of chairs, we believe that decanal oversight in the early stages of the tenure process, that is, oversight of external

(and internal) letters requesting evaluation, is important. This is not intended as a recommendation for “a one size fits all” process but rather as a way to ensure some commonality of practice to protect the candidates and the institution from legal exposure. Further, as there are more shared appointments and faculty engaged in interdisciplinary work, faculty need to be reassured that the totality of their fields of expertise will be evaluated fully at the time of the tenure review. The confidentiality of the tenure process is of critical concern to all. While the newly established Review and Appeals Board is intended to provide a more consistent review process than the larger Academic Council, there are still concerns, even at this early stage of its existence, about its size and the need to balance the extent of disclosure of individual cases by the Advisory Committee with future legal consequences. There should be careful and continued monitoring to ensure its effectiveness (see III above).

Wesleyan provides its faculty with opportunities for professional development and the new Mellon Center for Faculty Career Development, in establishing a centralized resource for such activities, will only serve to enhance those opportunities. However, up to now, there has not been any systematic way for new faculty to improve their pedagogical skills in a hands-on manner. The program in pedagogical renewal is an important innovation but does not address this issue directly and needs to be integrated into the regular faculty processes for faculty development, particularly in ways that develop the teaching abilities of assistant professors in the classroom.

The role of the department chair reflects the strong culture of faculty autonomy at Wesleyan. Faculty appreciate the lack of a hierarchical structure and the more collegial atmosphere that results. At the same time, departments have much to gain from more involvement in planning, in shaping curriculum and advancing pedagogy. Faculty leadership in these efforts on the part of department chairs need not be at odds with the egalitarian ethos so long as there is buy-in from all members as to the importance of these activities and recognition of the need for their participation in the planning process, in partnership with the administration (see III above).

VI. Student Services

The student experience at Wesleyan is unusually rich. The energy the students bring to their own education, both in and beyond the classroom, their commitment to one another and their University, and their participation in the wide range of co-curricular and extra-curricular offerings result in an engaged student body. As noted in the self-study, the challenge for the University is to channel this engagement so that students may achieve their full potential. Toward that end, the attention directed toward the residential experience, the creation of a university center, the changes associated with new student orientation and the support of the academic experience through improved advising are all on target. These initiatives, together with the on-going efforts of an accomplished, dedicated and hard-working staff in the dean’s office and related departments, contribute to a vibrant student life on campus.

The residential experience at Wesleyan has been the subject of considerable review, as noted in the May 2002 report of residential life at Wesleyan. The Task Forces on Residential Life in 1987 and 1992 and the Residential Life Facilities Master Plan in 1998 outlined many steps to improve residential facilities, to enhance the staffing in support of the residential program and to address issues between some of the residences and the local neighborhoods. The University is to be commended for the attention directed toward this central aspect of a residential University and is encouraged to stay on course.

The 2002 report provides a well-articulated philosophy for how the University should continue to enhance the residential experience and outlines a comprehensive approach for meeting and supporting the needs of Wesleyan students at each stage of their development. It also defines the facilities that are necessary to support those programmatic goals. While some of these changes will be controversial for the students (e.g., replacement of some of the wood-frame houses that are in need of substantial repairs with new complexes), the proposals are worthy of very serious consideration. The deferred maintenance needs of those facilities, the impact on the local residents and the potential fragmentation to the campus community all can be addressed through new and different facilities.

The 2002 report also calls for enhanced staffing in the residential areas, building on the changes put in place six years ago. If the University is intent on developing an active living-learning environment through its residential program, these changes are necessary and in fact should be supplemented by increased connection with the faculty. The program houses, for example, provide a natural way to engage faculty, through their professional or avocational interests, in the residential experience with students. Moreover, with the concentration of first year students in a residential complex, there are opportunities for faculty to connect with new students, as advisors or through the first year initiative, again integrating these programs and the faculty in some formal way with the residential experience. Without being intentional in program design and infrastructure, the University will struggle to develop true learning communities.

The enhanced dining experience also provides new opportunities for the University to develop formal linkages between students and faculty. The University is to be commended for its comprehensive, and honest, assessment of the dining program and should continue to monitor the noticeable and appreciated changes assiduously. Now that the basics of quality food have been addressed, the institution can turn its attention to the quality of space and opportunity for program development so that dining can play an integral part in enhancing community.

The proposed university center should go a long way in helping provide such a focus for community building. The central location for the proposed facility and the planned use for academic, social, and cultural activities (rather than retail space) provide great promise in strengthening the living-learning community and providing a focus for the University community. The challenge will be to insure that the space accomplishes a defined set of goals well and does not fall victim to trying to satisfy every need for community building, resulting in mediocre accomplishments.

In the past several years, Wesleyan has devoted considerable attention to the first year experience, and especially improving the orientation program, first year advising and course enrollment. The change in the orientation schedule appears to have yielded positive results and provides a good framework upon which to build in the future. The extension of orientation through *First Year Matters* holds promise, though its success will need to be evaluated at the end of this first year. The assignment of freshman advisors by common interest or course enrollment is a very positive change and should be continued. The electronic tools available to students and faculty are becoming more widely used and make access to information (about the curriculum, the student or the registration process) more easily accessible. Overall, the technology enhancements in support of advising and registration are significant accomplishments for the University.

One area for new students (and others, for that matter) that deserves increased attention is the work done with students with disabilities. Currently, that responsibility is split between staff in student services and the freshman class dean. In neither case is there professional expertise in the area of physical or learning disabilities and in both cases, the individuals have more than full time responsibilities already. While the current students seem to be reasonably well supported, the self-study correctly identified this area as one needing review and recommendations for the future. The population is bound to continue to increase and the necessary support of those students also will increase. Moreover, there is a need to examine, and most likely to increase, the level of academic support for students with disabilities. Now, virtually all support falls on the writing program, with minimal support elsewhere in the University, despite what the learning needs may be for students. Also, support for faculty members about how to meet the needs of students with learning disabilities is minimal and deserves increased attention.

Another area deserving of review is the support through the Office of Behavioral Health for students. Nationally, the demand for services continues to increase at a rapid pace and the complexity of issues and populations to be served also are increasing. There is a good working relationship between the class deans and the office, providing a continuum of care for students, but some populations in the University community did raise questions about whether their needs were adequately met. Given the pace of change in this area, it is important to review the Office's goals, staffing, information and outreach across campus and its ability to meet the needs of the community. A self-study, followed by an external review, would be in order. In fact, establishing a regular process of program review would strengthen the entire area of student services. While specific program evaluation is a regular part of the process in student services, there does not appear to be a routine of more comprehensive program review. The University would be strengthened if such a process were in place.

There have been significant and positive changes in the financial support provided to students with need and the University is to be commended for making this a high priority. The loan freeze appears to have had some positive results *vis a vis* admissions and enrollment and certainly is helping students make Wesleyan affordable. The priority for financial aid fundraising is essential to sustain this level of commitment; every effort

should be made to connect students and alumni who are associated with named scholarships to strengthen the stewardship of funds. Moreover, the University should give careful consideration to its tracking of scholarship recipients to build a base for support in the future.

One area that may be worth review is that of student employment, especially in the area of community work-study. Given the level of engagement of Wesleyan students, it appears that more could be done to expand and deepen their connection to community agencies and to facilitate the use of work-study funding in the community. The suggested attention to doing more in service learning would also strengthen this entire area of the University, one that should be strong given the values of Wesleyan.

The suggested changes for athletics facilities are necessary if the plans for the university center are realized, and they will add to the quality of the overall athletic complex. The University has a comprehensive athletic and recreational program and is to be commended for the support it is giving the efforts of NESCAC to find the right balance between a rigorous academic program and competitive intercollegiate athletics. The athletic director has initiated efforts to engage the faculty in the life of athletics through participation in searches for coaches and in one or two cases, involving faculty as mentors to athletic teams. More should be done in both regards, again to reinforce the ethos of the integration of living and learning. Similarly, every effort should be made to insure that the coaches are knowledgeable about the academic programs and requirements so that they can be appropriately supportive of their team members as they balance their athletic and academic obligations.

The structure of the Career Resource Center is an interesting one that holds real promise. Its integration into University Relations gives it easier access to alumni and to parents and also provides a window back to the University for young alumni, many of whom continue to take advantage of the resources made available to them. The University is to be commended for extending itself to its alumni and making real the lifelong connection to the University. Such a benefit to alumni has obvious advantages, as well, for current students. Similar benefits accrue from the linkages available with the Parents' Program. If there is a need in this area, it appears to be space. Locating the Career Resource Center in a residence hall limits access (literally and figuratively) to staff, and to recruiters. If the plan is realized to locate the Career Resource Center in the new University Center, the success of this program will no doubt be increased.

Two populations on campus who have benefited from increased attention and staffing in recent years are international students and graduate students. Thanks to the Freeman Scholar program, enrollment among international students from the Pacific Rim has increased; in addition, enrollment from international students, overall, has increased. Their contribution to the campus community is appreciated by all, and if there is any concern, it is how to extend their connection with all other students across the campus. The challenge will be to maintain focus on expanding such linkages and program opportunities given the increased attention necessary on immigration issues. It will be important to maintain strong connections with the graduate student support (where most

of the immigration issues are indeed being handled) and with others in student services who can help meet the needs of international students through their programs and services.

The visibility given to graduate student issues also has increased in the past few years and is welcome. The focused efforts provided by staff for these students are appreciated and the connections with Academic Affairs and with Student Services seem to work well. As the University continues to provide focus and attention on a number of student services issues in the future, it needs to be sure to remember that the needs of the graduate students may be different, but must be supported as well.

Given the assigned staffing for these populations, one might wonder if other populations (e.g., students of color, women, GLBTQQ students) should have dedicated staff focused on their needs as well. The decision not to staff in that way is a conscious one on the part of the University, and stems from the commitment of all staff to serve the needs of all students. While such a philosophy is to be commended, and may indeed be the appropriate extension of Wesleyan's long term and successful commitment to building a diverse student body, it is important for the institution to be sure it is meeting the needs of students who have been, or continue to feel, marginalized. Greater attention to assessing these needs is in order.

Overall, Wesleyan is to be praised for developing a comprehensive program of student services. The staff are accomplished professionals, the students are active participants in the life of the campus, the programs are comprehensive, the policies are clear and the space needs are well documented. The University certainly meets all of the requirements for the Student Services standard.

VII. Library and Information Resources

Through its library and information technology organizations, Wesleyan provides a truly impressive range of collections, facilities and services to the Wesleyan community. Its library is among the largest liberal arts college libraries in the United States and is known as a leader in library collaboration. The library collections are carefully built and expertly selected, relying on some approval plans when appropriate. ITS, the information technology organization, has established a national reputation for innovation, imagination, and effectiveness in systems development and service. Both organizations have been partners in the innovation and change that the University is experiencing.

Wesleyan has developed a "Web-centric" technology development strategy that makes the Web an asset that permeates application deployment. The Web is not an add-on. This strategy is providing the technologies that can link information systems, library systems, public relations systems and systems supporting most business functions of the University. Wesleyan's strategy is resulting in a staff with an understanding of the Web throughout the information technology and library organizations. Planning core administrative information systems that serve the University's academic and business functions is based on the Web-centric strategy and a thorough analysis of build-or-buy

options. A path and sequence appears to be in place for improvements in systems supporting Human Relations and Finance functions; planning and funding is in place to purchase a new library management system for the Connecticut-Trinity-Wesleyan (CTW) consortium.

Both the Library and ITS provide attractive and effective documentation that describe their services and how to use them. Both extend this documentation with extensive Web sites which orient users to the services, and whenever possible, link directly to them. Help is available to solve information and technology problems. The Library is a leader in experimentation with online live reference. The ability to extend direct live user support well into the night may prove to be of great value to residential colleges. A complete software inventory is in place and is up to date. It provides key data for ITS staff on the location, deployment and stewardship of software, and is open to the user community to show each licensed group or individual what applications are available to meet their needs. This software inventory will lead to more effective use of funds and better service to users.

The Library's collections are rich and deep and strong in areas of curricular emphasis at Wesleyan. Faculty members remark on the quality and quantity of the collections. In addition, the Library has taken steps through the CTW consortium to assure access to even more. In addition to the Library's historic strengths as a print collection, which have continued as a priority right up to the present, the library has pursued an aggressive strategy to expand access to electronic journal titles and develop imaginative ways to help users find them. Members of the faculty express concerns about the number of journal titles to which they have access. This may be inevitable, given the strong research interests of the faculty and the level of undergraduate and graduate research. The Library staff recently has undertaken collection management and use studies which are providing extremely helpful information to guide planning regarding the balance between serials and monographs.

The central servers and networks that underlie all the information services of the University are well planned and effectively deployed. They provide a solid and stable platform upon which very rich services can be provided. An ambitious and well-funded classroom renovation project is in its fourth year. Classroom renewal is making it possible for instructors and students to use library, information, data analysis and display tools in a very wide range of settings. The classroom designs are imaginative and up-to-date, and the ITS organization has sought and used faculty input in making these changes.

ITS uses several sets of tools to support Web delivery of course materials, and is currently supporting Blackboard, WebCT and some homegrown systems. Assessing tools in this way allows creativity and flexibility to be incorporated into expensive software choices. The choice between Blackboard and WebCT will be made this year, in order to allow the University to get behind and support the integration of one course management system with the electronic portfolio. Appropriately, as choices are made regarding the systems themselves, ITS staff members are building interesting user interfaces that promise to make routine digitization of course materials a reality.

Financial support for the Library has been historically strong, with consistent increases in the library materials budget that have enabled Wesleyan to build collections in steady and consistent ways. The increases have been close enough to the inflation rate for scholarly publications so that the Library has been able to adapt the collections at the margin to meet new curricular initiatives. In recent years the level of funding and number of staff in the information technology organizations has also increased, with positive results that users notice and appreciate. This includes the funding for the classroom technology improvement project, the project to build the PeopleSoft student information system, and the electronic portfolio system. There is also a hardware reserve account for technology that creates the flexibility within the ITS budget to deal with critical or unplanned technologies that may be needed to keep services running.

Care for the security and preservation of information resources is evident throughout the University. There is a small but effective preservation program in the Library. The persistent problem of mold, attributed to ineffective humidity control in Olin Library, appears to be under control, and with improvements to HVAC systems, humidity control has been addressed. The investment of funds to solve the mold problem is noteworthy, as it addresses immediate concerns about the health and safety of library users and also addresses the long-term preservation needs of the collections. Security for data is being addressed through sophisticated backup systems that currently cover the core servers and are rapidly extending to desktop systems. A redundant machine in a separate location, already in place, reduces the risk of data loss for the core servers. Privacy and security policies are in place enabling backup systems to be used effectively.

An active training program in ITS is in place and runs a full range of training sessions. User education programs in the Library are extensive and well regarded. Of particular note is the user education and outreach program in archives and special collections that identifies opportunities throughout the curriculum for bringing students in contact with original documents, archives, manuscripts and rare books. ITS also has a successful program of faculty and staff interchange (Academic Technology Roundtables) that showcases, critiques and disseminates information about new approaches to teaching and learning with technology. These forums have also contributed to development of collegial relationships among library and technology staffs. All the building blocks are in place to build a coordinated University-wide effort to learn new faculty needs, understand the problems users have in accessing and using information and technology, and identifying the most critical needs for systems improvement and user education.

A leader in the area of resource exchange, Wesleyan is the home institution of the staff that supports the CTW library consortium, and is also the home site of NERCOMP, the computing consortium for colleges, universities and independent schools in the Northeast. These organizations exemplify a commitment to sharing of material and intellectual resources that permeate and enrich the University and provide real benefits to faculty members and students.

A culture of experimentation and assessment is evident throughout the library and ITS organizations. Some examples include the formal use studies of the Library's collections, the use of multiple low-cost strategies for supporting technology in the classroom, and the rigorous assessments that go into the adoption of expensive software and hardware purchases. Wesleyan shows that it evaluates its services and changes them based on what they learn.

This will be a time of transition for the Library and the University with the departure of a University Librarian with more than two decades of service, and a vacancy at the position of Associate University Librarian. A leadership change will create many opportunities to reexamine services and priorities, starting from a very strong base. An internal and external review process is already underway. The Library and ITS have built some collaborative relationships among the ITS directors and the leadership of the Library. There are many opportunities for collaboration among those who deliver services directly, such as reference librarians and academic computing managers and at most other levels within these organizations. There are also opportunities to extend the reach of both library and information technology services. The libraries could be viewed as jewels in the technological environment as well as the intellectual environment of the University, and the computing operations as a deliberate extension of the intellectual vitality of the libraries, in addition to the strong image both organizations already have developed on their own.

The approach the University is taking to use the Web to integrate core technologies allows the selection of software that is best adapted to the needs of functional areas. The use of flexible display options could result in administrative organizations replicating their existing business practices rather than changing the way they work. Care should be taken to include in the analysis of software choices a view, not only of how a system meets current needs, but also how it could facilitate organizational and functional change that might result in long-term efficiencies. For example, an online registration system could be used as a way to measure demand for courses, in addition to providing a way to support the existing registration methods. The flexibility the Web provides should not undermine the pursuit of efficiency and the opportunity to reengineer business practices in the operating units of the University.

Space issues related to the library, particularly collection storage space, were a constant theme throughout the visit. The concerns are particularly critical in the small spaces that are expected to function as growing libraries, such as the Art Library. A full review of space needs in all of Wesleyan's libraries should be an early task for a new University Librarian, and the University should take steps to assure that library space needs are featured in campus master plans for space.

It appears that there are two clusters of technologies that are not under unified management: grant-funded UNIX systems in science areas, and the servers that support the Library. For UNIX, policy development is underway to achieve sustainable service expectations between ITS and the affected departments. For the Library, a separate staff manages these servers and communications technologies. Care should be taken to avoid

duplication of effort, and to assure that all the University's systems are effectively supported, secure from attack from the outside, and backed up with redundant systems when appropriate. Care should also be taken so that all campus servers function effectively with campus-wide communications protocols and network technologies work.

Some critical choices are on the horizon with the CTW library consortium, which will include purchase of a new library management system. This development is timely and a new system is needed. The investment of staff resources in making a conversion will be extensive, and should provide an opportunity to look for ways to coordinate library technologies with other technologies that support teaching and learning at Wesleyan. As all three colleges strive to incorporate the new library management system into their own campus environments, we can expect that tensions between the consortial view and the campus view will need careful attention and careful management. The University should also consider options for management of the hardware that supports this new system.

VIII. Physical Resources

Wesleyan University has made substantial improvements in its physical resources since the time of the last full accreditation review in 1991. Notable additions include the construction of Reid Admission Center and major renovations of Clark Hall, North College, Fisk Hall, Judd Hall, The Center for the Americas and the Van Vleck Observatory. A number of classrooms and laboratories have been renovated and building infrastructure needs have been routinely addressed as part of the major maintenance fund. Computer laboratory areas have been expanded. Data networking capabilities have been provided throughout the campus, including residential facilities.

The overall appearance of the campus is favorable. Ground space is well maintained and attractively landscaped. Building exteriors, roofs, roads and walkways all appear to be in good repair and functional. Building interiors are clean and generally appear to be updated for current office, classroom, laboratory or student life use. The University has identified significant deferred maintenance needs in many of its residential housing structures. The University is currently investigating alternatives to this need, including the sale of certain properties and the construction of more on-campus housing.

The University's fiscal 2001 capital budget approximates \$10.5 million. Of this amount, the University presently allocates \$8 million annually for the major renewal and repair of its existing facilities and \$2.5 million for equipment and start-up lab renovations. Funding for the \$10.5 million capital budget is fully incorporated in the University's operating budget. In addition to the capital budget funds noted above, the University has also borrowed some \$55 million in new debt funds which will be used in part to address large project facility upgrades including Memorial Chapel and '92 Theater, Clark Hall, science lab renovations and classroom renovations including technology upgrades. The University has also targeted \$50 million of its campaign goals for future facility needs.

In fiscal 2000, the University negotiated the purchase of a former state facility adjacent to its campus. This purchase of 160 acres of land and facilities will provide significant flexibility for

future campus development and expansion. The University is presently assessing options for the use of this property.

The University is in compliance with appropriate city and state building codes on existing facilities. As the University upgrades its facilities or constructs new facilities it meets all applicable code updates. As part of its major maintenance fund project identification process, the University has identified a number of projects to continue to address ADA compliance issues. The University is also in the process of updating the fire detection and suppression systems in its facilities. The University recently completed an EPA self study which resulted in no adverse findings for the University.

The University has undertaken a number of planning initiatives to ensure that its physical resources are in good working order and appropriate to the mission of the University. The major maintenance fund project identification process routinely involves substantial community involvement and input. The University utilizes its facility web-site to update the community on the status of on-going maintenance projects. Following the completion of the strategic planning process, the University engaged outside assistance in fiscal 1998 to begin a facility master planning process. The University has continued with this effort and expanded the process to include significant community involvement. Currently a Masterplan Executive Committee, headed by the Vice President for Finance and Administration and composed of senior administrators, academic deans and support staff coordinates on-going projects and overall planning efforts. The work of this committee is coordinated on a regular basis with the Facilities Working Group, an *ad hoc* Board committee that reports to the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees. Individual facility project teams include relevant faculty, staff and student representation. A masterplan consultant has been engaged to help develop a coherent overall facility plan.

We encourage the University to watch debt capacity limits critically. Modeling for the future does not currently incorporate these measures, and should. Financial ratio benchmarks could be set as targets for debt service rating. If the market continues to deteriorate and/or if the University brings on more debt, the rating could fall. It would be wise to set a threshold of credit worthiness as a target that would trigger a reassessment of the financial models

IX. Financial Resources

Since the last re-accreditation visit in 1992, Wesleyan has improved its financial viability in a number of ways. Through fiscal 2001 the University has produced 10 consecutive years of balanced operating results. In fiscal 1997 the University began The Wesleyan Campaign, a seven-year, \$250 million fundraising effort. To date over \$180 million of new funds have been received against the campaign goal. Annual giving has increased from a \$7-million level in fiscal 1991 to a \$31-million level in fiscal 2001.

The University's endowment benefited from this enhanced fundraising and from the rising financial markets of the late 1990s. Total endowment at the end of fiscal 2001

exceeded \$520 million, nearly double the balance of \$272 million at the end of fiscal 1991 and nearly five times the size of the fiscal 2001 operating budget.

Facility maintenance and renewal were substantially improved during this period as annual repair and maintenance budgets were increased from \$2.9 million in fiscal 1991 to over \$8.6 million in fiscal 2001. In fiscal 2000 the University acquired some 160 acres of land adjacent to campus for a total capital purchase of \$18 million. The addition of this property more than doubled the total campus acreage. In fiscal 2001 the University completed a successful debt offering providing funds for debt refinancing, new construction, facility renovation and land acquisition. In conjunction with this debt offering the University received a very favorable bond credit rating of Aa2 from Moody's and AA+ from Standard & Poors.

General market conditions in fiscal 2001 and fiscal 2002 have reduced the University's endowment levels and thus have had a negative impact on current financial strength. The University's plans for additional debt to finance future construction projects will also place further stress on key financial indicators used by credit agencies to evaluate institutional financial health and creditworthiness. As part of its financial planning process the University should continue to develop various analytical tools and key indicators to help assess and quantify its own standards for financial viability. The setting of these standards will allow senior management and the Board to judge more effectively the impact of major financial decisions (i.e. endowment spending policies, debt capacity, etc.) or major budgetary assumptions (i.e. financial aid policies, salary and benefit policies, etc.) on its financial equilibrium.

The University effectively controls its financial resources and allocates those resources in a manner consistent with its academic mission and objectives. Its revenue sources are very stable. It has a strong enrollment base of 2,700 undergraduate students. Undergraduate applications have risen from 4,500 in fiscal 1991 to 7,000 in fiscal 2001. Gifts used to support operations have increased from \$2.7 million in fiscal 1991 to \$8.6 million in fiscal 2001. The increase in gift support to operations has helped reduce tuition dependence from over 65% in fiscal 1991 to 62.5% in fiscal 2001. In fiscal 1995 the University completed a strategic planning process that articulated a specific set of academic spending priorities, including faculty compensation, faculty size, financial aid enhancements and infrastructure improvements (i.e. facility and technology). These priorities were incorporated into the goals of The Wesleyan Campaign. The majority of these priorities have been fully incorporated into past or future year (fiscal 2003 and 2004) budget plans.

The University's ability to fund the priorities of the strategic plan was due in large part to its ability to increase its annual fund raising and to raise monies for its Fund for Excellence. The Fund for Excellence has provided nearly \$21 million of new monies that has been targeted for the implementation of strategic planning initiatives. Continuation of this type and level of giving is essential to maintaining the strategic planning initiatives that have been fully incorporated in the operating budget.

The University has a comprehensive budget development process managed by the University's financial offices. The process has been recently revised to lengthen the time span of the budget development process. Final Board approval of the budget has been pushed back to the May meeting of the Board of Trustees. The additional time of the process has allowed for increased community participation in review of assumptions and has also provided greater opportunities for more up-to-date economic and market comparative data. The process is well documented in the form of the published Red Book. The preliminary planning assumptions are reviewed frequently by senior management with the appropriate Board committees. The finance office monitors budget to actual results on a monthly basis. Quarterly updates are provided to the Finance Committee of the Board. A year-end report of financial performance (Blue Book) is published by the finance office and reviewed with senior management and Trustees.

The University's financial practices, policies and systems are well organized and effectively managed. The University has paid particular attention to addressing administrative system infrastructure needs. A new student information system and a development information system have been implemented. An updated Human Resource and Position Management system is currently being implemented. Enhancements to the financial management systems are being studied.

During the past few years the University has also enhanced the capabilities of its Treasury function. The Treasury staff has been expanded and the University has created a separate Board committee to oversee the investment process. This committee is composed of trustees and non-trustees with specific investment management experience.

The University's budget process is supported by a long-range financial projection model. This model provides a 10-year forecast of operating results under varying internal and external variables and assumptions. These projections help drive resource allocation decisions by Trustees, senior management and key faculty and staff. As noted earlier, the ability to assess financial progress as measured by University-established financial standards – both operating and balance sheet standards – is important to the continuing financial equilibrium of the University. The University should investigate the potential to enhance its long-range financial projection model by including balance sheet measures in addition to the various operating measures currently residing in the model.

As previously noted, the University's current fundraising initiative, The Wesleyan Campaign, has been fully integrated into the University's various planning processes. The University has paid particular attention to the development of an effective fundraising capacity. New staff resources have been added, a new development information system has been installed and a campaign steering committee comprising Trustees, alumni and parents has been formed to assist in the fundraising effort. The development function is overseen by the University Relations Committee, a standing committee of the Board of Trustees. The high level of alumni participation (49% in fiscal 2001 annual fund) and the excellent payment record on outstanding pledges (60% of campaign pledges to date as of May 2002) speak well to the donor acceptance of this University fundraising initiative.

The University's books and records are reviewed by the firm of KPMG LLP. The University received an unqualified opinion for its most recent audited statement, fiscal 2001. In fiscal 2002 the Board of Trustees created an Audit Committee as a new standing committee of the Board. The Audit Committee (and prior to fiscal 2002, the Finance Committee) meets with the outside auditors to review the University's financial results, financial controls and results of the audit process. All appropriate state and federal filings and reports are routinely submitted by the University on a timely basis. The University clearly meets the NEASC standard for Financial Resources.

X. Public Disclosure

In its publications and other information dissemination efforts, the University presents itself in attractive, effective and accurate ways. The catalogue and related publications describe the University's programs and resources, and great strides have been made to use the Web and other technologies to increase the ability of students and faculty to understand the curriculum and course offerings in a variety of different views. The Web views of the catalogue clearly indicate which courses are not currently being taught. The recent effort to reduce the number of courses listed in the catalogue to those taught within the last five years has been effective in clearing the catalogue of non-current courses. The University should consider whether there are additional benefits to be gained by reducing the window to three years as specified in the standard. There are benefits to keeping infrequently taught courses on the books in a setting where conflicts related to sabbaticals and other demands on instructors are present. In an environment where access to courses is a persistent issue, reducing the number of published courses may help bring student expectations into better alignment with the reality of the University's ability to offer the courses on predictable schedules.

The newly redesigned admissions publication has involved a new level of analysis and production that is potentially transformational. The effort to extend the images and messages of this publication to the Web can have similar benefits. The next challenge will be to conceive of and design the Web site as a publication of first contact for prospective students and their families. NEASC's standard for Public Disclosure is more than adequately met by Wesleyan.

XI. Integrity

Wesleyan fully meets the Integrity standard as well. This is an institution that is committed to the principles of academic freedom and the free and open exchange of ideas. These principles are well articulated to the members of the University community in the statement on academic freedom and responsibilities of the University and in the Honor Code, Code of Non-Academic Conduct and the Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students. Through printed and electronic communications, these statements are widely distributed to all members of the community and are made especially obvious to faculty through its handbook, to students through its handbook and to staff and administrators through a publication provided for them. Comprehensive summaries of

judicial cases associated with violations both of the Honor Code and the Code on Non-Academic conduct are also widely distributed through the Web, thus informing the community about how it is living up to its stated values.

All new students are introduced to the Honor Code through a required session in orientation, followed by a signed affirmation to accept the responsibility to adhere to the code and to take ‘constructive action’ when there is awareness of violations of the code. In addition, students may be asked to sign a pledge of ‘no aid, no violations’ on specific formal academic exercises.

Violations of the honor code are adjudicated by the Honor Board composed of four students (two juniors and two seniors). The Dean of the College is *an ex officio* member of the board. Any appeal of an Honor Board decision may be taken to the President. It is perhaps curious that the full responsibility for adjudicating any violations of the Honor Code rests solely with students. While such accountability is consistent with the expectation of students at Wesleyan, it does appear to leave the faculty somewhat distant from the process. As the University reviews the efficacy of the codes this year through the task force of faculty, students and administrators convened by the President, it would be wise to examine if there are ways to strengthen the faculty connection to the Honor Code. In an era of increased litigation associated with campus discipline, and at a time of increasing engagement of the faculty in the governance of the University, greater faculty participation in the Honor System seems warranted.

In the case of the Non-Academic Code, special attention to the overall environment associated with alcohol use and abuse is warranted given the predominance of cases involving alcohol. The Alcohol and Drug Task Force Report of 2001 suggests some important changes to the university’s policies and procedures that should be implemented. The call for a standing committee reporting to the President is also wise as a vehicle to provide constant assessment of the impact of the changes and to determine if additional changes to the code are in order.

The University is to be commended for its strong articulation of and adherence to non-discriminatory policies and practices. In fact, the University is well recognized for going far beyond non-discrimination to creating an environment that is welcoming of difference. Such an ethos is especially apparent in the recruitment and support of students, but is found, as well, in the processes guiding the recruitment of faculty and staff.

Finally, there is good documentation for faculty regarding the tenure and tenure appeal process. As much of the protocol is new in the past year, it will be important to monitor its effectiveness and use, as well as ensuring that members of the community understand how it works.