A Report on the Institutional Self-Study
of Hamilton College

Prepared for the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Hamilton College
Clinton, New York

Eugene M. Tobin, President

October 2000

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Introduction

Hamilton College is poised on the edge of major and exciting changes in nearly every sector. We have long been one of the nation's most selective residential liberal arts colleges, with a rigorous emphasis on writing, speaking, and critical thinking. Currently a faculty of 165 serves a student body of 1650, providing numerous opportunities for student-faculty interaction. While remaining faithful to the tradition of liberal learning, the College's curriculum and programs have continually changed and expanded to reflect changing disciplinary and interdisciplinary developments and opportunities for learning beyond the classroom. A beautiful rural campus, excellent facilities, and rich co-curricular and cultural activities complement Hamilton's academic program. Hamilton's alumni and Board of Trustees are extremely supportive and interested in furthering the aims of the College. In almost every dimension -- program, admission, physical plant, endowment and finances, community support -- Hamilton can claim to be one of the strongest liberal arts colleges in the country.

Since its last reaccreditation in 1991, the College has undergone some significant changes, particularly since the inauguration of Eugene M. Tobin as President in 1993. The two most important were the March 1995 Residential Life decision, which closed all campus fraternity houses, and the substantial curriculum reform that the faculty passed in May of 2000.

Recognizing the need to reaffirm academic rigor as the centerpiece of a Hamilton education, President Tobin and the Board of Trustees used the Residential Life decision as a way to strengthen the ties between academic and residential life. Though students may still participate in fraternity and sorority activities, the College has expanded social options for all students, created an equity-and seniority-based housing system and significantly improved admission selectivity. In 1993 Hamilton accepted 57% of the students who applied and struggled to attract women candidates at the highest end of the applicant pool. For the last three years, the College has accepted approximately 40% of the applications; this year it is 39.8%. There have been more women than men in the last three entering classes, and now for the first time Hamilton has more female than male students on campus. The class of 2004 is also the most diverse in the College's history, comprising 14% students of color and 5% international students.

Under the leadership of our previous Dean, Bobby Fong, who was appointed in 1995, the faculty conducted a comprehensive review of the curriculum over a four-year period and recently passed legislation that will significantly restructure the College's general education requirements, adding a program of proseminars for first- and second-year students, mandating an interdisciplinary sophomore seminar, and committing itself to strengthening the advising program. The College has also embarked on an ambitious capital campaign to raise money for endowment, faculty support, financial aid, new science facilities, and programs in public affairs. These and other changes obviously have implications for the physical plant, and the College is developing a master plan for campus facilities.

Finally, both the Admissions and Communications and Development offices have been restructured under the leadership of new Officers -- Richard M. Fuller and Richard C. Tantillo -- producing new strategies in recruiting students and conveying Hamilton's image to the public.

The Periodic Review Report of 1996 specifically mentioned "two categories of challenge" that should be part of Hamilton's reaccreditation review. The Report suggests, "The first, rooted in its distinctive history, lies in the areas of gender equity and integration of the academic and residential experiences." The second recommendation concerned the pressures that "Hamilton shares with its peer institutions: sustaining and enhancing its competitive position while enhancing its diversity and controlling its expenditures, particularly for financial aid." In their discussions and reports, every subcommittee dealt with these two issues on which Hamilton has made considerable progress over the past five years.

President Tobin has decided that this comprehensive review should have a special focus on the library. The time is particularly appropriate for this, since we have a new Head Librarian, Randall Ericson. Burke Library, constructed nearly thirty years ago, is clearly reaching or exceeding its capacity, not merely for collections but also for the other functions the building serves (office space, staff support, Information Technology Services). The prospect that the Science Library, currently housed separately, might be moved into or adjacent to Burke as part of the renovation of the science facilities raises further potential issues. Beyond the question of physical facilities, there are equally important issues of how the Library understands its mission in light of the sweeping changes in information technology in the past decade.

Organizational Structure and Process

The Self-Study process was led in 1999-2000 by Associate Deans Barbara Gold and David Paris in consultation with President Eugene Tobin and in 2000-01 by Associate Dean Barbara Gold in consultation with Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty David Paris and President Eugene Tobin. A widely representative Steering Committee composed of twelve faculty (senior and junior) and nine Subcommittees composed of faculty, students, staff and administrators were established (see Appendices). The nine subcommittees were charged with evaluating and assessing the college in the following areas: Admissions and Financial Aid; Athletics; Communications and Development; Curriculum, Academic Programs and Assessment; Faculty and Governance; Financial Condition; Library, Audio-Visual and Information Technology Services; Planning; Student Life (see Appendices). Assessment was a focus of many of these committees. The subcommittees met throughout 1999-2000 to consider the charges given to them, especially as they related to the college's mission. They submitted their reports in draft form to the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, and the Steering Committee to read and discuss. An editor (a senior member of the English Department) was asked to bring the style and form of the various reports into uniformity. President Tobin, Acting Vice President and Dean of Faculty Paris, Associate Dean Gold, and Professor O'Neill made revisions in the drafts to make

the document more suitable to an external audience and to create greater coherence across the document as a whole. The drafts were then resubmitted to the steering committees and again revised in consultation with them. Then a draft of the whole document was widely shared in hard copy in the library and on the web with the on-campus community and the Board of Trustees. Their ideas and reactions were incorporated into the final version of the document. Because it gave the entire community a chance to reflect on our mission, our goals and aspirations, our strengths, our weaknesses, our priorities, and our hopes for the future, the process was a valuable experience for all who participated in it.

Mission

Hamilton College is a highly selective, residential liberal arts college located in upstate New York in the foothills of the Adirondack Mountains. Hamilton's mission is to educate a talented and diverse student body for future leadership roles in a changing, information-based society and economy, and to foster a learning environment characterized by frequent, intensive, and personal interactions between and among our students and exceptionally dedicated teaching scholars. Hamilton's distinguished faculty members offer individualized instruction to their students through engagement in a variety of intellectual communities both on and off campus. A Hamilton education leads to demonstrable outcomes in students' personal growth during the undergraduate years and prepares graduates to contribute their knowledge, leadership and service to the world.

Core Values

Hamilton's dedicated faculty members set a standard of intellectual excellence through their teaching, scholarship, and advising.

Hamilton attracts a student body as talented and diverse as its faculty. Engagement with people of varied backgrounds, interests and perspectives is an essential ingredient of a liberal education.

Hamilton offers a liberal arts education characterized by intensity and self-direction across the curriculum. Students develop the skills to read, observe, and listen with critical perception, and to think, write, and speak with clarity, understanding, and precision.

A Hamilton education is individualized. Working closely with faculty, in advising and in small classes, each student develops and shapes her or his education. Freedom in planning one's education is coupled with responsibility for demonstrating knowledge and skills throughout the undergraduate course of study.

Hamilton students encounter intellectual challenges and demonstrate their understanding of important issues in the classroom and on the campus, in scholarly and artistic communities, and with civic and community groups. Through internships, community service, and off-campus study, students extend their education in local, national, and global settings.

Introduction to the Middle States Self-Study

Hamilton students enjoy a diverse array of student activities and athletic programs that enhance the total educational experience and provide valuable opportunities for leadership.

A Hamilton education affects students well beyond their undergraduate years. Hamilton graduates are versatile, articulate, and valued members of society who remain engaged with ideas and with their college.

Executive Summary

The summaries of the nine subcommittee reports below present the key themes with which Hamilton College is now concerned and will continue to be concerned as we bring the college further into the 21st century.

Admissions and Financial Aid

Our Admissions and Financial Aid policies have led to our recruiting a highly selected group of students to Hamilton in the last five years. We plan to enhance our programs and communicate the distinctive qualities of Hamilton College to new communities and prospective students. By recruiting more minority faculty and students and using Hamilton's alumni of color to help us in this endeavor, by finding new ways to represent the academic and social life at Hamilton, and by using financial aid strategically, the Office of Admissions can contribute substantially to the growth and improvement of the life of the college. Increased financial aid is essential for recruiting highly qualified students from diverse backgrounds.

Athletics

The athletic program at Hamilton is a major positive factor in the quality of campus life. Large numbers of students, faculty, and staff participate in a wide variety of programs, ranging from nationally competitive varsity sports to recreational indoor and outdoor activities. Sensitive to a wide variety of issues including gender equity, resource allocation, and interdepartmental communication, the Athletics Department has made a concerted effort to enhance the breadth, balance, and quality of its programs and to improve its administration. Although the department has made a number of advances in these respects, the process of improvement continues. We are in the midst of several important changes: becoming members of a new NESCAC playing conference in 2002-03; naming a new athletic director; forming a new Standing Committee on Athletics.

Communications and Development

The Office of Communications and Development at Hamilton College is divided into three major divisions: Alumni Affairs and Special Programs, Communications, and Development. The missions of the organization are to maximize volunteer support, to maximize financial support and to enhance the College's image and reputation. Under the leadership of Richard C. Tantillo, who joined the College in 1994 as Vice President of Communications and Develop-

ment, the organization has undergone a number of significant changes and achieved several noteworthy accomplishments, most notably reaching a 21-year goal of $200 million nearly two years ahead of schedule in 1999. Hamilton is also improving its media relations and establishing an improved Internet presence.

Curriculum, Academic Programs and Assessment

The College has recently completed a five-year effort to revise the curriculum to (1) eliminate distribution requirements in favor of intensive advising to help students meet goals in the liberal arts; (2) establish a series of low-enrollment, interaction-intensive student seminars (the Proseminar program); and (3) create a required Sophomore Seminar program. Interdisciplinary programs continue to play an important role in the academic program of the College, but additional development of interdisciplinary programs is unlikely to occur without a further commitment of resources. Assessment of departments, programs, and faculty takes place in the form of external reviews, annual reviews, and individual tenure and promotion reviews. Evaluation of student performance occurs in the context of courses and senior programs. Although every concentration at Hamilton includes a culminating experience in the senior year, we do not yet have a systemic, college-wide, end-of-program assessment on the progress of individual students over four years. Our visiting Emerson scholar for 2000-01, who serves as Director of Assessment at Southern Illinois University, will help us to develop means for assessing Hamilton's curricular changes, particularly with respect to advising. The College has in place a number of programs to promote and enhance use of technology and to provide learning support services for students and faculty.

Faculty and Governance

Since the last Middle States accreditation of Hamilton, the faculty has grown by about 20%, and representation of minorities and women has increased, but greater diversity is needed. Although Hamilton's standards for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service are widely understood and accepted, individual faculty members would benefit from better communication concerning their progress in meeting these standards. New policies governing the employment of adjunct and part-time faculty are now being developed. Recent initiatives place more budgetary authority with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty and establish a Faculty Committee on Budget. Current plans emphasize recruitment and retention of faculty of color and female faculty; improving academic facilities; increasing research support for faculty; evaluating the use of faculty time invested in service; increasing the numbers of trustees who are people of color, women and academics; and investigating resources and compensation for administration, faculty and staff.

Financial Condition

Hamilton College completes the decade of the 90's in a very strong financial condition as a result of sound budget management, the successful Campaign for the 90's and New Century Campaign, above-average investment performance,

continuing improvement and expansion of facilities, and the strategic use of tax-exempt debt. The challenge for Hamilton in the first decade of the 21st century is to build on its enviable financial strength in order to fulfill its ambition to be one of the nation's preeminent liberal arts colleges. Careful financial planning, as an outgrowth of an overall strategic plan, will continue to insure financial stability and provide ongoing support for the major programmatic initiatives of the College. Current initiatives include a three-to-five year budget plan and a newly formed Committee on Budget and Finance.

Library and Information Technology Services

The Hamilton College Library, in its relationship with Information Technology Services, is the Special Topic of the Middle States Accreditation Report. The Library and ITS Subcommittee was guided by a charge from the Steering Committee to consider nineteen questions addressed to how well the Library and ITS meet the needs of faculty and students now and in the foreseeable future. These questions were placed under four broad headings: (1) evolving print and electronic media; (2) adequacy of facilities and human resources; (3) evolving division of labor between the Library and ITS; (4) effectiveness of Library and ITS services delivered to users. A new Head Librarian, Randall Ericson, has recently been hired. Current initiatives and problems being discussed include new ways to conceive of the Library and ITS as part of the educational mission of the College, the integration of new technologies into the academic life of the College, space and facilities issues, the uses of print and digital media, and remote access capabilities.

Planning

During the last ten years, Hamilton has met remarkable challenges in implementing a new residential life program, deploying an aggressive admission and financial aid program, and completing an exhaustive review of the curriculum. Throughout this decade, the planning process at the College has alternated in focus between the development of broad guiding principles and the examination of specific problems in detail. The College begins the 21st century by developing a new curriculum, a master facilities plan, and a new strategic plan for the future. Through these activities, the College is poised to continue as one of the top liberal arts colleges in the nation. The success of the College depends, however, on thoughtful planning. The current initiative to develop a three-to-five year strategic plan provides an opportunity for the College to involve a number of constituencies in clarifying its aims for the near future.

Student Life

The Residential Life Decision of 1995 was the most significant change in student life at Hamilton in the last ten years. We are still implementing the recommendations set forth by the Trustees at that time and assessing their effects on the life of the College. As the number, diversity, and nature of social options for students have increased, Hamilton now offers many more safe and attractive housing choices for students, several of them in the renovated former fraternity

houses. Through a large variety of programs and services, the Division of Student Life fosters a campus environment that supports the educational mission of the College. Many initiatives are underway: exploring further the "common meal" ideal, in which faculty and students would dine together, and creating space and opportunities for this to happen; creating a better advising system; encouraging organizations besides private societies to sponsor social events; investigating the possibility of academic interest housing; examining a faculty-in-residence program. A new Dean of Students, Florence Mitchell, was appointed in July, 2000.

Conclusion

Many changes have taken place at Hamilton College over the past ten years that both carry on the best of our old traditions and bring Hamilton forward into the 21st century. We will need to keep the best of the old but at the same time to be flexible in response to the changing world in order to remain one of the top liberal arts colleges. To do this will require wisdom, courage and foresight, all qualities we believe that we have in abundance.

Appendix 1: Steering Committee

Middle States Steering Committee 1999-2001

Co-Chairs, 1999-2000

Barbara Gold, Associate Dean of Faculty

David Paris, Associate Dean of Faculty, 1999-2000;
    Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty, 2000-01

Chair, 2000-01

Barbara Gold, Associate Dean of Faculty

Editor

John H. O'Neill, Leavenworth Professor of English

Lisa Rogers, ITS, Technical Consultant

Steering Committee Members

Sharon Britton, Director of Public Services Burke Library, 1999-2000;
    Acting Head Librarian, Spring 2000

Alan Cafruny, Government, 2000-01

Randall Ericson, Head Librarian, 2000-01

Todd Franklin, Philosophy, 1999-2000

Steve Goldberg, Art

Alfred Kelly, History

Katie Kodat, English

Bonnie Krueger, Romance Languages, 1999-2000

Sam Pellman, Music

Henry Rutz, Anthropology, 1999-2000

Ralph Stenstrom, Head Librarian, 1999-2000

Barb Tewksbury, Geology

Nancy Thompson, Acting Dean of Students, 1999-2000;
    Senior Associate Dean of Students, 2000-01

Sue Viscomi, Physical Education

Ernest Williams, Biology

Appendix 2: Composition of the Subcommittees

Admissions and Financial Aid

Catherine Kodat and Alfred Kelly - Steering Committee Liaisons
Patricia O'Neill, Faculty, English - Chair
Rit Fuller, Dean of Admissions
Ian Rosenstein, Faculty, Chemistry
Carl Rubino, Faculty, Classics
Bonnie Urciuoli, Faculty, Anthropology
Resource Person: Katheryn Doran, Faculty, Philosophy

Athletics

Todd Franklin and Sue Viscomi - Steering Committee Liaisons
Dick Bedient, Faculty, Mathematics - Chair
Julie Diehl, Faculty and Coach, Physical Education
Martine Guyot-Bender, Faculty, French
Hilke Kayser, Faculty, Economics
Dave Thompson, Faculty and Coach, Physical Education
Korey O'Malley, Student
Sam Jackson, Student
Resource People:
Tom Murphy, Athletic Director, Coach
Bob Simon, Faculty (Philosophy), Coach, Chair of Gender Equity Committee

Communications and Development

Sam Pellman - Steering Committee Liaison
Rob Kantrowitz, Faculty, Mathematics - Chair
Mike Debraggio, Director of Communications
Tim Elgren, Faculty, Chemistry
Philip Klinkner, Faculty, Government
Deborah Pokinski, Faculty, Art
Dick Tantillo, Vice President, Communications and Development
Resource People:
Richard Couper, Trustee
Jennifer Potter Hayes, Director of Special Events
Bob Simon, Faculty, Philosophy
Cindy Wirene, Kirkland alumna

Curriculum, Academic Programs and Assessment

Steve Goldberg and Barb Tewksbury - Steering Committee Liaisons
Cheryl Morgan, Faculty, French - Chair
Carole Bellini-Sharp, Faculty, Theatre and Dance
Jinnie Garrett, Faculty, Biology
Vincent Odamtten, Faculty, English
Resource Person: Dan Chambliss, Faculty, Sociology

Faculty and Governance

Roberta Krueger - Steering Committee Liaison, 1999-2000
Alan Cafruny, Faculty, Government, Steering Committee Liaison, 2000-01
Chris Georges, Faculty, Economics – Chair
Diane Brady, Registrar's Office
Margaret Gentry, Faculty, Women's Studies
Jennifer Potter Hayes, Director of Alumni Affairs
Susan Sanchez-Casal, Faculty, Spanish
Resource People:
Katheryn Doran, Faculty, Philosophy
Rob Kolb, Faculty, Music

Financial Condition

David Paris – Steering Committee Liaison
Daniel Konstalid, Controller
Jeffrey Pliskin, Faculty, Economics
Margaret Thickstun, Faculty, English
Penny Yee, Faculty, Psychology

Library, Audio-Visual, and Information Technology Services

Henry Rutz and Ralph Stenstrom - Steering Committee Liaisons, 1999-2000
Sharon Britton, Director of Public Services, Library,
    Steering Committee Liaison, 2000-01
Richard Seager, Faculty, Religious Studies – Chair
Tim Hicks, Director, Audiovisual Classroom Services
Dave Smallen, Director, Information Technology Services
Teresa Strozik, Director of Technical Services

Jonathan Vaughan, Faculty, Psychology
Resource People:
Bobby Fong, Dean of Faculty
Daniel O'Leary, Vice President, Administration and Finance

Planning

Ernest Williams - Steering Committee Liaison
Tim Kelly, Faculty, Mathematics - Chair
Peter Blanchfield, Director of Institutional Research
Betsy Jensen, Faculty, Economics
Nathaniel Strout, Faculty, English
Resource People:
Steve Bellona, Director of Physical Plant
Bobby Fong, Dean of Faculty
Dan Konstalid, Controller
Dan O'Leary, Vice President, Administration and Finance
David Paris, Associate Dean of Faculty and Chair, Campus Planning
    Committee
Eugene Tobin, President
Doug Weldon, Faculty, Psychology

Student Life

Nancy Thompson - Steering Committee Liaison
Jim Bradfield, Faculty, Economics, ex Assoc. Dean of Students - Chair
Dave Bailey, Faculty, Geology
Karen Green, Assistant Dean of Students (Multicultural Affairs)
Rebecca Reed Kantrowitz, Assistant Dean of Students (Residential Life)
Lisa Stasiowski, Student (Class of 2000)
Resource People:
Beverly Low, Director of Student Activities
Lucille McDermott, Director of Student Health Services

Appendix 3: Charges to the Subcommittees
Subcommittee Charges

The Steering Committee has created nine subcommittees that will address questions relevant to each of the following areas:

* Admissions and Financial Aid
* Athletics
* Communications and Development
* Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment
* Faculty and Governance
* Financial Condition
* Library, Audio-Visual, and Information Technology Services
* Planning
* Student Life

In addition, each subcommittee will consider, where relevant, the following issues:

* Gender equity and the integration of academic and residential experiences: How effective has the implementation of the residential life decision been in creating gender equity on campus? To what extent has the implementation led to enhanced integration of residential and academic experiences?

* Competitive and financial pressures: How well has the College managed to remain competitive while controlling costs and enhancing diversity? How can the various demands on the budget--increases in financial aid, costs associated with acquiring and remodeling former fraternity houses, and other pressures (debt service, faculty compensation, etc.)--be balanced against one another?

* To what extent have the major initiatives undertaken by the College (residential life, curricular review, new admissions and communications strategies, etc.) fit together? Have initiatives in some areas created problems (or opportunities) in others?

Admissions and Financial Aid

1. How can the College continue to promote its academic strengths to prospective students, their families, college counselors and higher education opinion leaders? What efforts are underway to strengthen or highlight specific institutional progress? How will the College ensure that its website conveys the appropriate institutional message and presents a customer-oriented approach?

2. Given the impressions they have gotten from Admissions, are first-year students surprised by the academic and social atmosphere they encounter at the College?

3. What steps are we taking to expand the applicant pool by reaching out to the brightest students, minorities, and students beyond the region?

4. What is the effect of sports recruiting on the academic quality of entering classes?

5. What role does being a legacy, a VIP, or a recruited athlete play in the admissions process?

6. Should faculty become more involved in admissions? If so, how?

7. What sort of feedback, if any, does Admissions get about its successes and failures?

8. How do we make decisions about who gets financial aid and how much? How are admissions decisions affected by financial aid limitations?

Athletics

1. What is Hamilton's general philosophy concerning athletics? What is the College's commitment to the New England Small College Athletic Association?

2. What progress have we made toward addressing the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Gender Equity? (Areas of concern include: coaching personnel, sports programs, equipment, facilities, and program budgets)

3. Are there any additional areas of concern pertaining to gender equity and, if so, in what ways could they possibly be addressed?

4. How effective are the general policies and procedures pertaining to the organization and administration of the athletics department and the scheduling of athletic competitions?

5. What steps can we take to optimize the administration of the athletics department?

6. What is the relationship between athletics and academics on campus? How can the College continue to ensure that our student athletes remain representative of all students?

7. What is the relationship between athletic recruiting and admissions here at Hamilton?

8. What are the resources, in terms of staff time and money, devoted to recruitment?

9. In what ways can we improve the effectiveness of our recruiting efforts?

10. In what ways are Hamilton's athletic resources in terms of coaching and facilities being allocated among courses, varsity sports, club sports, and open recreation?

11. In what ways are outside donations, fund raising, and booster programs handled by the athletics program?

Communications and Development

- What are the overarching philosophy and goals that drive the Office of Communications and Development?

- How effectively has Communications and Development coped with the impact on alumni relations of the Residential Life decision?

- Are Communications activities and Development activities sufficiently well integrated?

- How effective are the channels of communication between Communications and Development and the other units of the College?

- What is the objective of the College's initiative to increase its national profile? What are the prospects for the success of this initiative?

- How can Communications and Development more effectively use information technology to accomplish its missions?

- What has been accomplished by the reorganization of the alumni council?

- To what degree has the capital campaign been successful? How successful have the annual fund campaigns and the campus campaign been? How do we measure success here?

- What are the purposes of Communications and Development's publications for the College (such as the <u>Alumni Review</u>), and how effective are they in meeting these objectives?

- What is the role of Communications and Development with respect to publications that originate in other units of the College (e.g., departmental brochures, the College website)? To what extent is it appropriate and necessary that Communications and Development have editorial, budgetary, and/or production control of these publications?

Curriculum, Academic Programs and Assessment

The Working Group is charged with reviewing the extent to which the total range of curriculum, academic programs, and support services fosters the achievement of the institutional goals of Hamilton College. The Working Group will also investigate the extent to which the College achieves a demonstrable relationship between outcomes and the mission, goals, and objectives of individual departments and programs in particular and of the College as a whole.

Curriculum

1. Does Hamilton's curriculum reflect an appropriate balance between breadth and depth in the study of the liberal arts?

2. To what extent do students understand the connection between courses and curriculum on the one hand and the mission of the College on the other?

3. In terms of the recent curricular reform efforts, what did the faculty perceive was wrong with the old curriculum, and what did the faculty hope curricular reform would accomplish? What are the major changes that have been voted on by the faculty? If all aspects are implemented, to what extent will the changes help the College better achieve its mission?

4. Is the process of curricular reform at the College effective?

5. What are the most significant challenges facing departments, faculty, and the College in general as a result of implementation of the most recent curricular reform? Evaluate to what extent the various constituencies appear to be prepared to deal with those challenges.

6. Evaluate to what extent the College promotes and rewards curricular innovation at the levels of departments, programs, and individual faculty.

7. To what extent does the advising system help students achieve and understand the goals of the curriculum?

Academic Programs

1. Does the current structure of departments relative to programs meet the needs of both departments and programs?

2. To what extent do courses integrate contemporary technology and a variety of teaching strategies such as the use of computers, "field" experiences, and inquiry-based teaching?

3. Do current academic offerings provide adequate global perspective on inter-relatedness in the contemporary world and opportunities for interdisciplinary work and inter-institutional cooperation?

4. Are the courses that lead to a concentration and a degree appropriately organized into a coherent program that leads a student through increasingly advanced treatment of the discipline?

5. How are academic programs and departments funded? On what basis is the allocation of funds to academic programs and departments decided? Is it based on actual needs, or degree of success, or is it subject to political pressures?

6. What are the functions of the following learning-support services?
   Language Center
   Writing Center
   Levitt Public Affairs Center
   Quantitative Literacy Center
   Peer Tutoring Program
   Kirkland Project
   To what extent are these services used? What is the effectiveness of these resources in support of the curricula and academic programs of the College?

Assessment

1. Are adequate procedures in place for systematic review and assessment of courses and academic programs?

2. In what ways is student progress toward various educational goals measured? Are the methods of assessment adequate? To what extent are data used to improve existing efforts?

3. To what extent do departments and programs engage in establishing goals for students beyond successful completion of course work for the major? For departments and programs that set such goals, how successful are they in evaluating whether students have met those goals?

4. To what extent do departments and programs set standards for the level of intellectual challenge in individual courses within the department or program?

Faculty and Governance

The Faculty

1. How successful is the College in recruiting and retaining its faculty?

2. How are women and faculty of color represented in the different ranks of the faculty? What steps should the College take to improve hiring and retention of women and faculty of color?

3. What mechanisms exist for the mentoring of junior members of the faculty and how effective are they? (What does Hamilton mean by mentoring?)

4. Are the College's expectations regarding teaching, scholarship, and service appropriate? How effectively are these articulated and communicated to its faculty-at all ranks? How well does the structure of rewards and compensation support the College's stated principles?

5. What are the policies, procedures, and structures of compensation for adjunct and visiting faculty?

6. What are our mechanisms for evaluating teaching, scholarship and service at all ranks, and how effective are these in promoting excellence?

7. By what other means can we promote excellence in teaching, scholarship and service at all ranks of the faculty?

Governance

1. How effective are the structures of faculty governance in serving the mission of the College? How do faculty members ensure that their interests are represented ? What are faculty perceptions about the relationship of the quality of governance to amount of time expended? What other concerns do faculty members have about college governance?

2. How well do faculty meetings carry out the business of the faculty? What alternative methods might be considered?

3. How well does the committee structure accomplish the work of the faculty? Evaluate the structure as a whole and the charge and efficacy of individual committees. Are there any committees whose mission or composition should be re-vamped?

4. Evaluate the current organization of the College by departments and programs. What venues exist for communication between and among departments?

5. Should the college consider a divisional structure, or is it satisfied with the current organization of programs and departments?

6. Evaluate the current organization of the Offices of the College and their relationship to the Board of Trustees. How effective is communication between the Trustees and the Officers of the College and their constituents (students, faculty, administrators, and staff)? How are decisions regarding budget, personnel, curriculum and other matters of college policy made? What processes exist for discussion of and communication about budget and policy? How could these processes be improved?

7. How can we improve the appeals process? How have recent changes to the appeals process affected the fairness of the process? Does the appeals process adequately and efficiently address the interests of the appellant and the College?

8. What is the climate on campus for relations between members of the administration, the faculty, and the staff? Are there any interests of the staff that should be represented in our report?

Student Governance

1. How effectively does the Student Assembly serve the interests and welfare of the student body?

2. How effectively do we utilize student representatives on college-wide committees?

Financial Condition

Institutional trends

1. How has the College's financial profile changed over the last decade?

2. What, if any, have been the significant changes in the college's budget over the past decade?

3. What have been the most significant decisions concerning expenditures (financial aid, salaries, debt, etc.) and revenue (tuition, endowment return, etc.)

4. Is the College's financial profile different from our comparison group?

Current budgets:

1. How does the College decide budget allocations? Which officers and groups in the college are involved in budget allocation and how does the different input dovetail?

2. What assumptions are made in preparing the annual budget? Are these assumptions reasonable and sufficient?

3. How does the College balance short-term needs (a balanced annual operations budget) with long-term needs (equipment purchases, repair and replacement, building maintenance, new facilities)?

Budgetary planning projections:

1. What is the process for planning future budgets?

2. What kinds of plans are or should be in place for budget/finance? How detailed can or should budget projections be?

3. What are likely to be the key issues and pressures in the budget over the next three-five years?

Library, Audio-visual, and Information Technology Services

The charge to this committee is to address the mission of the library, audio-visual, and information technology services in a liberal arts education. The charge focuses on an investigation of the inter-relationships between print and electronic media, their organization and administration, the resources that support them, and how they deliver services to their users. Special attention is paid to the delivery of these services in the context of curricular reform, classroom instruction, and the dynamic environment of print and electronic media that require careful attention to the planning process, integration of services, and the management of resources.

The following are general questions that frame the Committee's charge:

1. Are print and electronic materials adequate to meet the current and intermediate term curricular needs and related academic and research activities of students and faculty?

2. Is the planning process, organization, integration and delivery of print and electronic materials and services adequate to meet the current and intermediate term needs of the curriculum, classroom instruction, and individual students and faculty?

3. Has there been adequate provision of human capital, money, and facilities in order for the library, audio-visual, and information technology service providers to meet current and intermediate term curricular, instructional, and individual needs of students and faculty?

Questions to consider under the charge to the Committee

The Committee may want to consider including the following questions under those framing the charge given by the Steering Committee:

1. How is the library confronting the explosion of both print and electronic media as a problem of information management?

2. What provisions are being made for instructing users in electronic media and other library resources? How are these related to the new curriculum?

3. In what areas will electronic media replace print media, and what are the issues in relation to the curricular needs of faculty and students?

4. How do library and related information technology service providers view the current curricular needs of students and faculty?

5. What impact will recent curricular reforms have on faculty and student needs for print and electronic media? How will (should) service providers think about this problem?

6. What are the main issues to be considered in the tradeoffs between print and electronic media, now and in the intermediate term (5-10 years)?

7. Are there bureaucratic-administrative problems, including reorganization, to be solved between the library, audiovisual, and information technology services that would make more effective the delivery of services for curricular, instructional, and personal needs of faculty and students?

8. What is the planning process that envisions and prepares for an increasingly seamless integration of library, audiovisual, and information technology services?

9. How will new technologies such as CD audiovisual and/or networking affect current operations such as the audio-visual center?

10. Do the curricular reforms place new demands on the organization of library, audio-visual and information service providers? If so, is reorganization and integration of some services necessary?

11. Are provisions being made for the systematic instruction of users of electronic and library media?

12. Are library, audio-visual, and information technology services integrated sufficiently for effective classroom instruction?

13. Where are the areas of growth and change in instructional services over the intermediate term, and is there a planning process to meet new needs?

14. Are the present networking services (software and hardware) adequate to the changing needs for instruction inside and outside the classroom?

15. Are there issues in planning and policy for providing all students with the same access to hardware and its locations on campus?

16. How well do library and ITS support off-campus needs for their services?

17. Are the diverse needs of different academic divisions, departments, and programs met by current plans and policies regarding information technology support services?

18. Are personnel adequately trained to meet the current demand for their services?

19. Does the budgetary process result in adequate funding for the Hamilton College Library and ITS to meet the present curricular demand for print and electronic media and to plan for future growth in demand?

20. What retraining or new skills will be necessary for service providers in the intermediate future?

21. How does the use of electronic media affect the physical use of the library? Has the recently completed facilities plan adequately addressed questions of space and location of library, audio-visual, and information technology materials, equipment, and services for the intermediate future?

22. How do the library and ITS envision their need for facilities to match current demand and their plans for future support of curricular needs of faculty and students?

23. How do both library and ITS think about tradeoffs when confronted with the rising costs of print and electronic media in the context of meeting curricular, instructional, and individual needs? Is there a planning process, and if so, what are the important questions to be addressed now and in the intermediate future?

Planning

The Subcommittee on Planning will examine how the College determines needs, establishes priorities and is guided by assumptions while preparing budgets, planning the development of the campus, and anticipating requirements for personnel. The focus of this group's attention will be the processes by which the College plans for the future.

General Planning

1. What are the mechanisms for broad-scale strategic planning at Hamilton?

2. Have our processes for decision-making served us well?

3. Do we use ad hoc planning effectively within a framework of comprehensive planning?

4. How well integrated is planning in different areas (budget, facilities, equipment, personnel)?

Budgets

1. How does the College decide budget allocations?

2. What assumptions are made in preparing the annual budget? Are these assumptions reasonable and sufficient?

3. Are opinions from different parts of the College community incorporated into the budgetary process?

4. How does the College balance short-term needs (a balanced annual operations budget) with long-term needs (equipment purchases, building maintenance, new facilities)?

Facilities

1. How can the on-campus Planning Committee's role and mission be strengthened?

2. How does the Planning Committee solicit information from and consult with other committees and constituencies in the planning process?

3. How can the relationship between the on-campus Planning Committee and the Trustees' Planning Committee be improved?

4. Are decisions about development of the campus communicated clearly to the different segments of the College community?

5. Has the College maintained its physical plant effectively in support of its academic and residential mission? What steps are being taken to address short- and longer-term classroom and office space needs?

Equipment

1. How well does the College plan for equipment replacement?

2. Are equipment budgets designed to allow us to deal with equipment needs effectively?

Personnel

1. Do changes in personnel positions match the long-range plans of the College?

Student Life

Mission and Goals

For each area within the Division of Student Life, review mission and goals within the context of the College's mission and CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education) standards.

           Academic Advising
           Adventure Program
           Alcohol and Other Drug Programs
*   Campus Safety
*   Career Center
           Chaplaincy
           Counseling and Psychological Services
*   Health Services
           International Students
           Judicial Affairs
           Multicultural Affairs
           Orientation
*   Residential Life
           Student Activities
           Study Abroad

      *these have experienced significant changes since last self-study

General Charges

1. What steps does the Division of Student Life take in assessing student needs and interests?

2. To what extent does the residence hall environment support serious students? How do we measure the effectiveness of our resident advisor system?

3. What are the possible benefits and issues related to offering academic interest housing blocks? How would such options be accommodated within the equity-based principles of the Residential Life decision?

4. To what extent does first-year student orientation support and promote the academic mission of the College? How can we ensure that the program has a continuing academic and residential focus throughout a student's entire first year?

5. How are student publications monitored? How does one become an editor of a student publication? To whom are editors accountable? Do editors receive appropriate training and supervision?

6. Should the editor or the student newspaper (The Spectator) receive academic credit or remuneration of some sort?

7. To what extent does the image portrayed in the College catalogue and admissions materials accurately reflect the academic and residential environments at Hamilton? How can we strengthen academic advising?

8. How effective are the health and counseling services we provide our students? How successful have the changes been in moving from a 24-hour infirmary to a clinic supervised by a nurse practitioner and open from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.?

9. Are there adequate alcohol-free social options for students?

10. How have the changes in residential life affected campus-wide social life?

11. Is funding for student organization activities adequate?

12. Are there enough College vans available to support student activities?

13. Is there adequate space and support for recreational activities such as intramurals and personal fitness?

Charges Related to Residential Life Decision

1. To what extent have the recommendations that were part of the 1995 Residential Life Report been implemented?

2. To what extent has that implementation served to accomplish the stated goals of the report?

3. In what areas is work still needed?

Appendix 4: Timetable and Calendar of Community Involvement

March 1999	Establish Steering Committee and Organization of Self-Study
April 1999	Initial campus visit of Middle States Association liaison (Robin Dasher-Alston)
May 1999	Set up subcommittees Establish charges
June 1999	Submit Self-Study Design to MSA
September 1999	Adopt Final Self-Study Design Convene Subcommittees
September 1999 to March 2000	Subcommittees meet together and with liaisons, Report to Steering Committee
February 1, 2000 to March 2000	Subcommittee reports due to Steering Committee (staggered)
March 2000	All subcommittee reports due to Steering Committee
May 2000 to November 2000	Preliminary draft of Self-Study Circulate draft to College community, trustees Document online; in library Meetings with community Incorporate feedback
November 2000	Submit final draft of Self-Study to MSA and Chair of MSA visiting team
December 2000	Visit to campus by Chair of MSA visiting team
January 15, 2001	Send final self-study to MSA visiting team
February, 2001	Visit of MSA team to campus
March 2001	Process completed
April 2001	Draft of report of MSA team. Hamilton College response to report.
May 2001	MSA formal response and accreditation action

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Admissions and Financial Aid

Abstract

We believe that, on the whole, our Admissions and Financial Aid policies have been successful in recruiting a highly selected group of students to Hamilton in the last five years. This report includes recommendations to enhance our programs and communicate the distinctive qualities of Hamilton College to new communities and prospective students. By recruiting more minority faculty and students, by finding new ways to represent the academic and social life at Hamilton, and by using financial aid strategically, the office of Admissions can contribute substantially to the growth and improvement of the life of the college.

Basic Description of Operations

Over the past five years, Admissions has developed new ways to get out the message about Hamilton's program. In order to recruit better students, Admissions has developed a number of strategies for contacting students and eliciting their interest in Hamilton College. We now purchase approximately 70,000 names nationally from the PSAT/NRCCU search and such organizations as ECIS, CICU and ABC. Hamilton also advertises in magazines such as *Barrons, Petersons,* and *Private College and Universities*. In addition, Hamilton solicits evaluations from education opinion leaders and promotes its image as an academically rigorous college through its web site and news releases.

One of the most important means for improving Hamilton's ability to recruit excellent students has been Admissions' efforts in community outreach programs and through faculty and alumni involvement. Five hundred alumni volunteers have been trained and are working to assist recruitment efforts in their own regions. Campus visits have also increased, and new open house programs have attracted over 1,000 visitors annually. New programs have built better relations with high school counselors and community-based organizations; and improved publications and mail flow to prospective students have increased the number of inquiries and applications to the college.

Hamilton's ability to attract students whose qualifications and needs are compatible with our goals as a college depends on all of its outreach programs. But perhaps the most important and immediate means for prospective students to learn about the social and academic life of the college are campus tours. Campus tours at Hamilton reach nearly 5,000 parents and prospective students annually. In the Issues section below, we discuss the way these tours are conducted and how they might be improved.

In order to promote the academic strengths of the college, the Faculty Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid has taken a more active role in the Admissions process. Faculty members of the Committee are asked to read at

least 100 folders a year in order to give Admissions officers their comments on applications, especially student essays. The Admissions Committee also reads the applications of all candidates for Bristol and Schambach Scholarships. Reading students' applications has given faculty insight into the admissions process and the criteria that Admissions officers take into account. Faculty members meet with prospective students during fall Open House days and spring meetings with accepted students. Some faculty write letters to our top applicants through our "Make a Connection" program, which has helped increase our yield with these students. Because these contacts have created better communication between the Admissions office and the faculty, Admissions personnel can convey an accurate picture of the college's academic programs and expectations for graduation, and the faculty can depend on Admissions to recruit the most academically engaged students.

Hamilton College is particularly committed to making its student body more diverse through recruitment of minority students. Over the last few years, Admissions has made slow but steady progress, increasing the percentage of minority students from 7% to almost 16%. Although the College's rural environment and high cost remain challenges, President Tobin and the Board of Trustees are committed to making Hamilton representative of the world our students will enter after their graduation.

In the past five years, Hamilton College has made a significant increase in its commitment to financial aid. In fact, the percentage increase in financial aid has exceeded the percentage increase in tuition. Acknowledging the financial burden college tuition places on families, financial aid packages have assisted in allowing a number of highly qualified students to come to Hamilton. While more money is needed to increase the number of student scholarships, a need-blind program of admissions does not seem feasible. Instead, the Bristol and Schambach Scholarships, which include incentives for summer projects, have attracted a number of brilliant students. These students have become the core group of intellectually motivated students we hope will generate a more vibrant atmosphere among the student body in general.

According to the Dean of Admissions, the factors most important for admissions to Hamilton include the following: 1) the high school record -- courses, grades, rank and quality of high school. 2) standardized test scores; 3) student involvement in extra curricular activity, including athletics; 4) letters of recommendation, student essays, and interviews with the Admissions staff; 5) a student's status as legacy candidate, VIP, or contributor to campus diversity; and 6) application for Early Decision or Regular Admit and for financial aid. How extra-curricular activities or legacy and VIP status affect the academic quality of the student body is a continuing concern. On the one hand, recruiting students with a wide variety of interests insures that Hamilton is addressing the changing attitudes and values, skills and cultural diversity of the student population. On the other hand, consideration of qualifications other than academic achievement risks Hamilton's status as a highly selective institution. In light of the success of our efforts to introduce Hamilton to both a national and international community, it remains important to continue to monitor the Admissions criteria and their

effects. In this study we have given special attention to the relationship between athletic recruitment and our overall Admissions goals and priorities.

Historical Overview

The Admissions report of 1990 expressed considerable concern about the effect of decreasing numbers of high school graduates, especially in the New York and Eastern region, our traditional area for recruitment. Steps were taken to develop a broader geographical reach by increasing the quality and distribution of Hamilton publications and enlisting more participation on the part of alumni. Nevertheless, by 1993 the number of applicants had decreased significantly, the percentage of applicants admitted was the highest in Hamilton's history, and the yield was at an all time low. The faculty also was concerned because average Verbal and Math SAT scores of matriculating students, as well as the class rankings of both female and male applicants, had steadily declined.

One of the first steps President Tobin took when he became president was to hire a new Dean of Admissions. Richard M. Fuller, formerly Director of Admissions at The Johns Hopkins University, has been committed to recruiting academically excellent students. Since July 1994, Dean Fuller and his staff have substantially changed the procedures and programs followed by the Admissions office. As a result, Hamilton has significantly improved its position among highly selective colleges. Whereas in 1993, Hamilton accepted 57% of the students who applied, with the first-year class recruited for 1995-96 (Class of '99), total applications increased to the highest level since 1990, the percentage accepted declined to 48%, and the mean SAT scores were higher than in the past. Moreover, the class of '99 also showed more geographic diversity and a more nearly equal ratio of men to women than had the immediately preceding classes.

These positive trends have continued throughout this decade. While the total number of applications remains around 4,000, the percentage accepted declined to 40% in 1998, rose slightly to 42% in 1999, and declined to 39% in 2000. In 1995, the College Board began reporting SAT scores using a new set of scales. Recentered scores for Hamilton students show that Verbal and Math SAT scores have improved and remain well above the national SAT means. In addition, statistics on class rank have made modest gains each year since 1993-94, with the exception of last year's class. Entering students in 1998 showed an overall decline in class rank because of a sharp decline in rank among male students, but SAT scores for the class of 2003 have rebounded. In every area of concern in the 1990 study -- male-female ratios, minority enrollments, public/independent school ratio, and SAT scores -- Hamilton's entering classes in the last years of the decade demonstrate the effectiveness of the new Admissions program. (See Appendix for comparative figures for 1990 through 1999).

Issues

In the next decade, Hamilton will address less quantifiable issues in its admission procedures. In accordance with the Middle States publication, *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education*, we have looked at the

experiences of first-year students to determine if the expectations created by our publications, campus tours and admissions process are consistent with their experience of the college. Because of the Residential Life decision (1995), we have been particularly interested in the impressions students have of the social atmosphere. Most importantly, we have discussed how Admissions promotes the academic strengths of the institution. Our goal is to attract a diverse student body interested in a curriculum that emphasizes interdisciplinary programs, written and oral communication, and opportunities for faculty-student research. With regard to diversity and academic quality of our entering classes, we have considered the role of sports recruiting and the initiatives that Admissions has taken to recruit minority students. Given increased competition for highly qualified students, we have also reviewed the financial aid processes and cost of increasing the number of student scholarships.

In general, campus tours have improved in the last few years as student tour guides have been selected more carefully and given wages for their services. This practice has attracted more upper-class students to the positions and increased the sense of responsibility and accountability among the tour guides. Beyond the recruitment of good students to act as tour guides, our ability to use campus tours to convey an accurate and appealing view of the college has been somewhat unpredictable. Tour guides are not given scripts. Instead they convey their own experiences of the campus in response to questions from their groups. This approach is similar to what happens at other campuses and provides visitors with a personal view of the campus. What these tours have not always provided is a sense of Hamilton's academic strengths, its progress in the area of faculty-student research, and its evolving social atmosphere from one dominated by fraternities to one that is responsive to a diversity of interests.

In order to make tours of Hamilton distinctive, we have suggested that tour guides speak more fully about the academic projects that involve students and faculty together. It appears to us that the tour guides place too much emphasis on the social scene at Hamilton. The faculty would like our strengths as an institution to be seen in terms of the opportunities for intellectual achievement and mentorship between faculty and students. Second, we suggest the possibility of including meetings with faculty as part of the tour whenever possible. Since most of our campus tours occur during the summer months, faculty involvement would need to be on a volunteer basis. A list of faculty willing to chat with prospective students and their parents would enhance the campus tour experience for parents and prospective students. In addition, information about the residential life decision and the institution's plans for new social and residential spaces may give students and families a more balanced picture of campus life.

Hamilton is aware of the geometrically increasing importance of the Internet in all aspects of the educational enterprise, including admissions. Last year, President Tobin established a group of faculty and administrators as the President's Internet Initiative, to work in concert to create and carry out a plan to make Hamilton's Internet presence as effective and forward-thinking as possible. The initiative has focused initially on the Internet as it relates to student recruitment and alumni. A nationally recognized consulting firm, Lipman

Hearne of Chicago, has contracted with Hamilton. New hardware and software have been purchased, and an additional staff member has been recruited to assist in developing and editing the Web presence.

In accordance with its charge to sample student opinion, the subcommittee surveyed fifteen first-year students and 35 sophomore students. Almost all of these students perceive Hamilton as academically challenging. They are generally well pleased with the rigor of their courses and the opportunity to take small classes. Their expectations about the variety of courses and quality of teaching have been met. There is some ambivalence about the intellectual atmosphere. Some students wish for more opportunities to talk informally with peers about course work or academic subjects. But all of these students mentioned the benefits of their contact with faculty both in and out of class.

Although the students we spoke to indicated that Hamilton meets their expectations of its academic goals and resources, they were not as satisfied that social life on campus was what they expected. In admissions materials and tours, Hamilton presents itself as a place where, although private societies are active, they no longer control the social space and social activities on campus. But some students feel that private societies, funded to some extent by alumni and membership dues, continue to dominate social life at Hamilton.

The Division of Student Life is taking the initiative to "level the playing field" between fraternities and other groups in social life. In the coming academic year, the Office of Student Activities and the Community Activities Board will sponsor more events that are open to the entire student body, such as dances with DJ's and a Casino Night. Some of these sponsored events may include a cash bar (staffed by Bon Appetit, the college's meal service) for students 21 years old or older who are prepared to drink responsibly. The Office of Student Activities will test a late-night social option, from midnight to 4:00 am on weekends, organized by students and alcohol-free. The bulk of these events will take place early in the academic year, so as to set the tone for a social life independent of private societies.

In addition, the hope is that a progressively more diverse and academically oriented student body will eventually redefine student culture in ways that will make private societies less influential. An indication that this change may be occurring can be seen in the fact that Hamilton's rates of retention of enrolled students have risen in recent years and are slightly higher than the mean for our peer institutions.

Athletics are important to the majority of applicants to Hamilton College, and the college has a rigorous set of physical education requirements for graduation. Like most of our peer institutions, Hamilton has extended admission to athletes recommended by the Athletics program. These recruits have most often contributed to sports such as football, ice hockey, and basketball. With the increasing interest in women's sports and the need to emphasize academic achievement, the committee recommends that Admissions give more priority to recruiting students in non-traditional areas of athletic endeavor. Although football continues to be of great interest to alumni, our current student population

shows equal or greater interest in other sports, including soccer, field hockey, swimming, crew, and tennis. Because those who participate in these sports are often academically strong, recruiting them might enhance the overall quality of incoming classes. We also note the adoption of the 75-player rule for all NESCAC football teams beginning in 2001 as a promising factor in balancing athletics and academics.

The faculty of the athletic department has shown a growing awareness of the priority of academic responsibilities for students engaged in sports. Coaches counsel students to be mindful of their academic goals and commitments and to understand that to come to Hamilton means assuming responsibility to become scholar-athletes.

In order to make athletics and academics more compatible within the Admissions process, the committee recommends that the Office of Admissions study the academic and financial effects of all categories of sports on campus. Such a study might consider the grade point averages of students in different sports and the amount of general student interest in attending the various sporting events. This information might be weighed in relation to the costs of recruitment and retention of student athletes in each sport and the impact of each sport on meeting our goals for gender equality and cultural diversity. An important consideration in athletic recruitment is how these students contribute to the cultural and ethnic diversity of the campus. Any change to our current policies would need very strong empirical support. But this kind of study could help the college and the Board of Trustees project more clearly the consequences of any change in the athletic program or admissions policies.

In September, 2000, President Tobin asked the Academic Council to propose to the faculty the creation of a new standing Committee on Athletics. This committee will have as its focus all issues relating to athletics, including scheduling, academic policies, and the effects of athletics on admissions, and will advise the President about any changes in policy that it regards as desirable. The faculty passed the motion to establish the committee at its October meeting.

Admissions has made progress in recruiting minority students by appointing Andrea DuVall as Coordinator for multicultural recruitment, and by working through community-based organizations. Increased funding for financial aid packages has also helped make it possible for more minority students to attend Hamilton College. In addition, the College has recently undertaken two additional initiatives directed towards the recruitment of minority students.

Under the Summer Starter program, begun this year on a grant from the Roger Vasey Foundation, 27 rising high school juniors from a number of states around the country were selected to be brought to Hamilton for a week at no expense to themselves or their families. During the week the students lived in South Dormitory and took mock classes with the Hamilton faculty and college seminars with the Hamilton admission staff. In addition, the students were mentored by campus administrators and went on a number of social and off-campus excursions. We hope, of course, that some of these students will decide to

apply to Hamilton. Our first goal, however, is to prompt them to begin thinking about college and to realize that small liberal arts colleges like Hamilton can fit into their college plans.

The second new initiative promises to be even more influential in accelerating Hamilton's commitment to become a more diverse community. The Posse Foundation identifies, recruits, and selects student leaders from public high schools to form multicultural teams called "Posses." These teams, or Posses, of ten students each, are then put through an intensive eight-month Posse Training Program for enrollment at top universities and colleges to pursue their own academic careers and to help build cross-cultural communication on campus. Each sponsoring institution must guarantee its Posse team full tuition and cover other associated costs. Hamilton has recently signed an agreement of participation with the Foundation. Other schools currently participating include Middlebury, Bowdoin, Brandeis, Vanderbilt, and DePauw.

Of course the presence of a significant number of minority faculty on the campus is a positive factor in recruiting students of color. One large recent initiative Hamilton has undertaken is a membership in the Consortium for a Stronger Minority Presence at Liberal Arts Colleges, an association of selective undergraduate institutions based at Grinnell College that aims to assist minority scholars in the early stages of their careers and to produce a pool of minority scholars who will have firsthand experience teaching at a liberal arts college. Next year Hamilton will host at least one, and possibly two, minority scholars-in-residence, and we hope to continue doing this on a yearly basis.

Financial aid is an essential part of the Admissions effort to recruit a diverse and academically engaged student body. We believe that helping qualified students cover the cost of education at Hamilton is a top priority. The recent addition of $35 million to the endowment for financial aid and future plans to increase the monies available still more will help us attract and retain first-generation college students and minority students who are eager for the kind of intense educational experience that Hamilton is known for. To this end, Admissions has a needs awareness that balances the desirability of the candidate with the resources available overall for financial assistance. Since much of the money for financial aid comes from the generous donations of alumni and members of the Board of Trustees, the administration and the faculty have made presentations to and received important feedback from the Board of Trustees about our goals and priorities for the future. Such discussions have allowed us to present Hamilton College as an academic institution fully aware of its role and responsibilities in the community at large.

Recommendations

- Campus tours should include more discussion of academic programs and opportunities for faculty/student collaborations.

- Whenever possible, prospective students and their parents should have the opportunity to meet with faculty.

Report on Admissions and Financial Aid

- Prospective students need a more informed view of new social and residential spaces and programs.

- Admissions should broaden its athletics outreach to students in non-traditional areas, such as soccer, swimming, and tennis.

- A study should review all categories of sports for their impact on the college's academic standing, diversity, and financial aid.

- Admissions should make more use of Hamilton's multicultural alumni in order to recruit more multicultural students to Hamilton.

- Increased financial aid is essential for recruiting highly qualified students from diverse backgrounds.

Appendix 1: Admissions Master Sheet

Appendix 1 to the Report on Admissions and Financial Aid is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Athletics

Abstract

The athletic program at Hamilton is a major positive factor in the quality of campus life. Large numbers of students, faculty, and staff participate in a wide variety of programs, ranging from nationally competitive varsity sports to recreational indoor and outdoor activities. Sensitive to a wide variety of issues including gender equity, resource allocation, and interdepartmental communication, the Athletics Department has made a concerted effort to enhance the breadth, balance, and quality of its programs and to improve its administration. Although the department has made a number of advances in these respects, the process of improvement continues.

Description of Hamilton Athletics

A large majority of the members of the Hamilton community participate in programs administered by the athletics department. We are one of a small number of schools with a physical education requirement for all students. Many members of the student body, faculty and staff play on intramural teams and use the athletic facilities as part of their personal fitness programs. The most visible aspects of the department's activities are the varsity teams. The athletic program at Hamilton strives to incorporate student-athletes fully into the life of the college. The faculty in the Department of Athletics is committed to this first principle:

> Hamilton College is an academic institution. Although the College is
> committed to the importance of athletics as part of a liberal
> education, student-athletes are students first. Student-athletes at
> Hamilton have the same academic obligations as other students.

Although in general the athletic programs contribute positively to the overall life at Hamilton, we have identified some areas of concern. The issues that we address fall into four broad areas: general policies, equity issues between sports and genders, recruiting and admissions, and relationships with academics. We describe our findings in that order.

General Policies

Hamilton is a member of The New England Small College Athletic Conference (NESCAC) and abides by all of its policies as well as our internal policies. NESCAC's eleven members are all highly selective liberal arts colleges. Its members' primary commitment is to academic excellence; they believe that athletic excellence supports the educational mission. The conference is dedicated to establishing common boundaries that keep athletics in an appropriate relationship to the overall academic mission of the member institutions. The limitations

imposed on coaches and athletes by NESCAC athletic policies are among the strictest in the nation.

For the most part, NESCAC has served as a policy setting organization, not a playing conference. For the past five years Hamilton has competed in the Upstate Collegiate Athletic Association (UCAA). The UCAA schools are not members of NESCAC and hence have fewer restrictions on recruiting and practice policies.

A recent change within NESCAC will have significant ramifications for athletics at Hamilton. Beginning with the 2000-2001 academic year, the other 10 NESCAC schools will form a playing conference in every team sport, resulting in NESCAC Champions who will then receive automatic qualification to the NCAA Tournaments. Under the currently proposed plan, Hamilton will become a full-playing member in 2002-2003, having been granted a two-year waiver to convert our schedules accordingly. This move benefits Hamilton in that we will compete with schools who have the same rules as we do, but it will also entail a much larger travel commitment because of our location at the western edge of the NESCAC area. This change will certainly increase the number and duration of conflicts with academic commitments, an issue addressed below.

At the same time, the leadership of the Athletic Department will change. Thomas Murphy, who has served for 24 years as the Athletic Director at Hamilton, will be succeeded by David Thompson, currently Associate Athletic Director and head swimming coach, who has served in the Department for 17 years.

Over the last four years, the Athletic Department has produced a detailed set of policies and procedures. Our survey of coaches indicates that most are familiar with these policies and that they are effectively administered. There do seem to be a few gaps in these policies most notably in the areas of facility scheduling, team travel outside the standard schedule, and evaluation of department members.

Almost all of the athletic policies relate to varsity sports. All of the non-varsity activities of the department (intramurals, club sports, PE courses and open recreation) are either taught or administered by faculty members who are hired primarily for their coaching credentials and whose schedules are already filled with concerns for their own teams. This is, we are sure, not unique to Hamilton, but is rather indicative of the growing emphasis placed on varsity athletics at all levels.

Equity Issues

Several questions involving athletics concern issues of equity. Different sports, of course, require different amounts of resources. It costs a great deal more to equip a hockey player than a cross-country runner. Football presents the largest built-in inequities due to the nature of the sport. This sport, played only by men, requires a large team with specialized sub-teams requiring numerous assistant coaches and extensive equipment. The presence of the football team greatly magnifies the problems of budgets and travel expenses, recruiting

questions, and the numbers of students missing classes. As noted above, we are pleased to note that the NESCAC presidents have set a 75-player limit for all football squads beginning with the Fall, 2001 season.

On the other hand, some inequities are not explained by differences in the sports themselves. Two areas of concern are external alumni fundraising to supplement the budgets of individual sports (booster clubs), and internal inequalities in sports where Hamilton offers both men's and women's teams. The two areas overlap since with a much longer history, most Hamilton's men's teams have a much larger alumni pool to draw from in fundraising.

To address the first issue, the athletic department has formulated a written policy that outlines the administration of booster clubs. Although these policies have not yet been fully implemented, they have helped to address some problems. For example, a general fund was established to promote gender equity in the distribution of monies. A golf tournament during Trustee/Reunion Weekend was established in 1995-96 to raise money for the general fund. In 1997, a policy was established whereby donations could be designated for certain sports teams, but a percentage of those donations still went into the general fund. However, in 1998 this practice was discontinued, so that now all designated funds go to the teams for which they are designated.

Requests for disbursements from the general fund are competitive and are to be judged on their merit. The distribution of these funds is to be overseen by the Booster Club General Fund Review Committee. Because the makeup and function of that committee has varied greatly since its formation, there is concern among coaches about the distribution process. Further, in the absence of clear guidelines as to what merits funding, newly hired coaches, many of whom coach women's teams, may lack the information necessary to obtain needed funds.

In the fall of 1993, President Tobin established the Ad Hoc Committee on Gender Equity to evaluate the College's progress in achieving gender equity in the intercollegiate athletics program. The Committee consisted of selected members of the Department of Athletics, representatives of male and female student athletes, the Assistant to the President (Title IX Compliance Officer), and a representative of the Athletic Department faculty. Following an initial report in May of 1994, annual progress reports show areas of improvement and of remaining concern together with suggestions for further progress.

Throughout the years, progress reports by the Ad Hoc Committee have indicated that progress has been made with respect to coaching support, medical and training facilities, program budgets, and equipment and facilities, putting the College clearly in compliance with Title IX. Although the reports indicate that information about budgets and funds is being dispersed to the members of the department, several coaches have expressed to the subcommittee a desire for more information. Progress reports also indicate that further improvements are desirable to guarantee that gender equity encompasses broader standards of fairness and equity. Following 20 years of expansion, primarily of women's varsity teams, Hamilton College currently features 28 varsity sports, 14 for women and 14 for men, and 5 junior varsity teams, 3 for men and 2 for women.

As of this year with the recent increase of full-time professional trainers from 2 to 3, and a part-time athletic trainer, Hamilton College has closed the gap between us and our peer institutions and made significant progress in assuring the safety of all student athletes. In the past, the Ad Hoc Committee has voiced concerns about the safety of our student athletes due to an insufficient number of professional trainers. When fewer professional trainers were available, they tended to be allocated to the sports with higher risks of injury – generally men's sports – leaving many women's sports without the care of a professional.

Despite the recent addition of two additional full-time women coaches to the staff of the department since the last academic year, the 1999-2000 NESCAC Survey shows that Hamilton College is still at the very low end of the distribution of full-time coaching and administration positions and toward the low end for full-time women coaches and administrators. Hamilton College has 15 full-time coaching positions compared to an average of 18.8 for NESCAC schools as a group. Hamilton has 5 full-time women coaches as compared to an average of 6.3. Hamilton College still has an above-average number of part-time coaches with 29 compared to an average of 25.7, and an above-average number of part-time head coaches. Thus although Hamilton College can certainly show a path of expansion, particularly with respect to full-time positions for women coaches, there still remains a gender gap in coaches of varsity sports. President Tobin is aware of this gap and is committed to the appointment and retention of more full-time women coaches.

Recruiting and Admissions

Both NCAA and NESCAC principles stress the importance of the educational welfare of student-athletes. School policies regarding athletic programs reflect the Hamilton principle that athletics are not only extracurricular, but an integral part of the total educational curriculum, that "athletic quality and excellence [should be] comparable to the quality and excellence of the Hamilton College academic program" and, finally, that student-athletes are expected to "fall in the range provided by [Hamilton] office of admission." Student-athletes applying to Hamilton are thus expected to have as solid an academic preparation and positive attitude toward academics as other students. The Admission office has a crucial role in determining which applicants have the potential for balancing athletics and academics in a way that will be positive for them and for the entire community.

Clearly, the relationship between the departments of Admission and Athletics profoundly affects the relationship between academics and athletics. As is the case in all liberal arts colleges where intellectual inquiry plays a major role, it is in the interest of the whole Hamilton community that only athletes who accept the primacy of Hamilton's academic mission be admitted. In order for this to happen, of course, Hamilton academic expectations must be clearly stated throughout the processes of recruiting and admission as well as during the orientation period.

A vast majority of student-athletes support Hamilton's double mission. However, there are indications that conflicts between faculty and the athletic

department do arise, usually when student-athletes compromise academic responsibilities for athletic responsibilities, and that these conflicts may reflect negatively upon Hamilton's whole athletic program. Faculty are concerned that pressure from some coaches on admissions to accept students with low high school performance in light of their athletic promise is contrary to Hamilton's academic mission, detrimental to efforts to establish positive classroom atmosphere, and unfair to the student-athletes themselves.

According to Dean of Admission and Financial Aid Richard M. Fuller, student athletes, like other students, are evaluated first for their ability to undertake the academic work of the College. Among the non-academic factors that influence an admission decision, athletic achievement may play a larger role than other extra-curricular activity. Dean Fuller states further that each year Hamilton admits some student-athletes who might not be accepted at Hamilton if it were not for their athletic promise. The faculty members of the Committee on Admissions have urged the Dean of Admission and Financial Aid to share with them the files of students for whom non-academic factors, including musical talent, legacy status, or athletic achievement have special priority. President Tobin has advised the Subcommittee on Athletics that NESCAC presidents annually share admission, financial aid, and grade point average information and that Hamilton's policies are consistent with those of our peers. The faculty members of the Committee on Admissions have been discussing with the Dean the many aspects of the admission decision-making process and how best to improve the overall quality of our student body.

Over the last few years the faculty has taken a more active role in admissions recruiting in general, and some of this activity directly involves the recruitment of student athletes. Faculty participate in the summer athlete open house, and individual coaches ask faculty members to meet with recruits in areas of academic interest. Since these efforts can raise the academic level of admitted student-athletes, it is important to increase participation in them. Improved communication between faculty and coaches during the admission process will alleviate some of the conflicts in recruiting the unique type of student who can balance athletics and academics and be successful in both.

Relationships with Academics

To understand the relationship between academics and athletics at Hamilton, it is important to look at the context in which we find ourselves. Hamilton's primary athletic affiliation in NESCAC represents membership in the most restrictive athletic conference in the country. Strict guidelines hold season lengths, contest numbers, as well as pre- and post-season activity to a minimum. The rules provided by the NESCAC, however, do not dictate all policy to member institutions. For instance, the problem of class conflicts is the responsibility of each institution and is not covered under NESCAC rules. These conflicts are the source of the greatest potential for trouble in the academic/athletic relationship at Hamilton.

Class and contest/practice conflicts are mentioned in several documents available to faculty members. The most frequently cited source, "The Athletic Scheduling Policy" in the Faculty Red Book, states the policy as follows:

Students may miss only one full day or two half-days of classes during a single calendar week in fall and spring term because of obligations arising from participation on an athletic team. Contests may not normally be scheduled so as to require absence from a regularly scheduled course more than once a week or more than a total of five times in fall or spring term.

This policy is currently under the scrutiny of the Academic Council. Members of the Council have suggested that the ambiguity of these statements has led to conflicts between coaches and other faculty. The Council asserts that this policy is intended as a scheduling guideline and was not intended to suggest a specific number of excused absences. Some coaches seem to view this policy as the accepted norm regarding excused absences. On the other hand, most faculty members reserve the right to uphold their own attendance policies in their courses. The conflict between these presumptions is frequently reflected in some athletes' attitudes regarding class and athletic conflicts.

In response to the questionnaire distributed by the subcommittee, many coaches stated that the status of this relation is heavily dependent on individual faculty members. Several coaches commented that they found many members of the faculty very cooperative and flexible in dealing with student-athletes and the conflicts that occur.

While a relatively small but loyal group of faculty attend a variety of athletic contests, some coaches expressed concerns that there seemed to be a considerable number of faculty less supportive and perhaps even negative toward students who participate in athletics. In general, however, most coaches told the subcommittee that they believe Hamilton has achieved a healthy balance between academics and athletics and that most conflicts could be avoided through good planning and communication by all those involved.

The most recent and perhaps greatest new worry among the coaches as it relates to this issue concerns Hamilton's future increased obligation to NESCAC. Many coaches believe that frequent travel to more distant opponents in New England will further strain the already delicate academic/athletic balance at Hamilton. It is ironic that, due to our affiliation with such an academically oriented athletic conference, our potential conflicts with academics will rise significantly.

In September, 2000, President Tobin asked the Academic Council to propose to the Faculty the creation of a new Standing Committee on Athletics. Composed of elected faculty members, the Director and Associate Director of Athletics, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty, this committee will consider all matters relating to athletics at Hamilton and will advise the President about any changes in policy that it regards as desirable, including several of the recommendations mentioned below.

Recommendations

- Revise internal policies and procedures with emphasis on improving communication between the Department of Athletics and other academic departments.

- Increase efforts to create a more equitable balance between male and female coaches in both full-time and part-time positions.

- Increase the involvement of faculty in both the recruitment and evaluation of prospective student athletes.

- Craft procedures and policies that balance athletic scheduling with Hamilton's long-standing commitment to the priority of academics.

Appendix 1: Athletics Subcommittee Survey

Middle States Association Of Colleges and Schools
Hamilton College Self-study
Athletics Subcommittee Survey

Personal information

Name:_____

Number of years at Hamilton:_____

Sport(s) coached this year indicate M or W:_____

_____ Yes, you may use my name in association with my responses.

_____ No, I prefer that my name not be associated with my responses.

Please circle the most appropriate ranking. We would also like to hear your comments and/or specific examples when applicable. If you are unfamiliar with a particular topic, simply skip it.

---

1. How familiar are you with the general policies and procedures pertaining to the organization and administration of the athletics department?

know them well					not familiar at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

2. To your knowledge, how effective are those policies and procedures?

very					not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

3. How familiar are you with the general policies and procedures pertaining to the scheduling of your athletic competitions?

know them well					not familiar at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

4. To your knowledge, how effective are those policies and procedures?

very					not at all
1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

5. How much of your own resources. In terms of time and money are devoted to recruitment?

Time:	0-5%	5-10%	25-50%	50-100%
Money	0-5%	5-10%	25-50%	50-100%

Comment:

6. Please indicate whether the following adjectives characterize the relationship between admissions and athletics on campus:

	fully applies				does not apply at all
complementary	1	2	3	4	5	6
confrontational	1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

7. Please indicate whether the following adjectives characterize the relationship between academics and athletics on campus:

	fully applies				does not apply at all
complementary	1	2	3	4	5	6
confrontational	1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

8. Indicate your view of resources allocation for men's and women's sports:	Men get more					Women get more
budget	1	2	3	4	5	6
staffing	1	2	3	4	5	6
facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

9. Indicate your view of resources allocation for courses, varsity sports, club sports, and open recreation:	good balance					serious imbalance
	1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

10. Indicate your view the ways in which outside donations, fundraising and booster programs are handled:	handled unfairly					handled fairly
	1	2	3	4	5	6

Comment:

11. Other comments

Appendix 2: Athletics Subcommittee Survey Results

Question Number	Responses						
	1	2	3	3.5	4	5	6
1	3	7	1	x	4	0	0
2	1	4	4	x	2	1	0
3	13	1	3	x	0	0	0
4	5	5	2	x	1	1	1
5	1	1	1	x	5	5	x
5	6	2	1	x	2	2	x
6	1	7	5	x	1	1	0
6	0	0	5	x	1	7	0
7	0	3	5	x	2	3	0
7	1	3	3	x	2	4	0
8	0	1	3	5	4	0	0
8	1	4	4	4	0	0	0
8	0	0	6	5	1	0	0
9	1	4	3	x	2	2	0
10	1	2	2	x	2	2	3

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Communications and Development

Abstract

The Office of Communications and Development at Hamilton College is divided into three major divisions: (A) Alumni Affairs and Special Programs, (B) Communications and (C) Development. The missions of the organization are to maximize volunteer support, to maximize financial support and to enhance the College's image and reputation; all of this activity is directed towards supporting the goals identified by the senior officers and the trustees of the College.

Under the leadership of Richard C. Tantillo, hired in 1994 as Vice President of Communications and Development, the organization has undergone a number of significant changes and achieved several noteworthy accomplishments.

Alumni Affairs and Special Programs

When Hamilton College merged with Kirkland College in 1978, the undergraduate population effectively doubled to its current level of 1,700 students. Since Hamilton became a coeducational college, the number of its alumni has swelled from 5,000 to 14,000. Only one administrator and one staff member managed the alumni affairs program from the time of the merger until 1997, when the College added a second alumni affairs officer. At about the same time, the Alumni Council was reorganized to ensure a greater focus on class activities and geographic regions. To recognize volunteer efforts beyond fund-raising, a new volunteer awards program was also instituted in 1998. Reunion, Fallcoming and Family Weekend events are now more purposefully designed to showcase the faculty and the academic and extracurricular programs at the College. Finally, the administration of The Great Names Series, a new program stemming from the Residential Life Plan in 1995, resides within this division.

Communications

The Communications division has been completely reshaped and its mission refined since the College's last reaccredidation in 1991. The number of professional personnel has tripled from one in the publications area and one in the news bureau to three in each. The result has been greater visibility for the College and publications with a clearer strategy and sharper focus.

Media Relations

In 1998, Hamilton added two experienced, full-time media relations professionals to bolster the hometown news release program and increase the quality and frequency of national placements about students and faculty. A nine-month contract with a national media relations firm in 1999 also helped develop and implement a series of effective media relations tools. By the end of 1999, the media

relations program was averaging about one national media placement per week and approximately 250-300 hometown news releases per month.

Publications

With the 1994 hiring of the College's first experienced, full-time publications director, the publications office was completely reoriented. From an operation that relied heavily on outside designers, printers and other suppliers, an updated typesetting system has helped the publications office evolve into an in-house operation that provides campus clients with much more direct and cost-effective publications services that more deliberately reflect institutional themes and objectives.

The hiring of the publications director permits the College editor/archivist to concentrate more of his time on the Alumni Review. The result is an alumni magazine vastly improved in both content and appearance, with frequency of publication increased to quarterly.

Currently, the publications office oversees the printing of approximately 450 publications annually.

The President's Internet Initiative

Formed in June 1999, the President's Internet Initiative is an *ad hoc* committee charged with exploring the processes and resources necessary to create a best-in-class Internet presence for Hamilton. With the assistance of an outside consultant, the Chicago firm Lipman Hearne, the President's Internet Initiative committee has spent the past year developing strategies for more fully integrating the Internet into the educational, marketing and business operations of the College.

Working from an Internet Action Plan developed for the College by Lipman Hearne, Hamilton has invested in new hardware and software for its Web servers to support growing demand for information. The College is also finalizing a contract to develop an on-line alumni community. New site design and site architecture are under development, as is an innovative admission portal that will deliver personalized communications with prospective students. Recognizing that the dual responsibilities of keeping Web content fresh and maintaining the technological infrastructure were becoming too demanding for one person (the Webmaster) to manage effectively, Hamilton recently added a director of electronic media, reporting to the director of communications, to partner with the Webmaster in moving the College's Internet strategy forward.

Development

Since 1980, all fund-raising programs at the College have been targeted toward achieving the objectives of Project $200 Million, a 21-year effort to raise $200 million (nearly $10 million per year) by the end of the twentieth century. On

January 8, 1999, nearly two years ahead of schedule, Hamilton reached the $200 million milestone. To put this accomplishment in perspective, we may wish to consider that at the time Hamilton committed itself to the $200 million goal, the College's endowment was nearly $41 million and total gifts were approximately $3.4 million per year. Today, the endowment has grown to over $450 million (December 31, 1999) and gifts to Hamilton in 1998-99 totaled $16.2 million, the third consecutive year that contributions to Hamilton exceeded $15 million. Project $200 Million achieved $222 million on December 31, 1999, with one year remaining in the project.

To reach this point, all gifts to Hamilton since January 1, 1980, have been counted toward the $200 million goal. This includes contributions to the Annual Fund, as well as gifts to the One Hundred Seventy-Fifth Anniversary Campaign (1983-86), The Campaign for the '90s (1990-94) and currently The New Century Campaign.

The original objective for The New Century Campaign, which was announced in September 1997 and scheduled to run through June 30, 2001, was to raise $83 million. This total was to include $31 million for student support, $14 million for faculty development, $18 million for renewal of the science facilities, $5 million for the Arthur Levitt Public Affairs Center, and $15 million in unrestricted annual giving. Due to the success of the campaign, the Board of Trustees increased the goal to $100 million, and as of October, 2000, the College has received gifts and pledges of $102 million.

Hamilton's fund-raising program has been both effective and efficient. The national average development cost per dollar-raised is 16-17 cents; over the past five years, Hamilton has spent between 8 and 11 cents to raise each dollar.

The College has also invested in its development program through realignment and additional personnel. Since 1995, Hamilton created administrative positions for development research and stewardship and added an assistant in planned giving. An additional secretary was hired in the Information Systems Division. The major gifts program, with an additional development officer, was reorganized to focus on top-end development prospects, with all seasoned staff now managing their own regional portfolios.

Overall, during the past five years, the development office has been reorganized and redeployed to enhance internal communications across the various functions and to focus on major gift prospects. Total giving, which was about $10 million per year in 1995 has reached a new base of approximately $15 million today.

Annual Giving

Hamilton continues to pursue both a high participation rate and annual increases in its unrestricted annual giving program. After a drop-off of 4 percentage points in participation (but not dollars) immediately following the Residential Life decision in March 1995, the College has rebounded to 56 percent alumni participation, which represents the highest alumni participation since 1994.

In addition, the College has more than doubled unrestricted annual giving since the last Middle States review, as a result of a three-year Unrestricted Challenge of $1.5 million. Unrestricted annual giving now exceeds $4 million annually, with an impressive 25 percent of the total coming from trustees. A new top prospect Annual Fund program and the implementation of the 10^5 club (donors of $100,000 in unrestricted dollars every year for five successive years) have kept this program growing. In addition, the College runs what is believed to be the most successful Senior Gift Program in the country, with graduating classes consistently achieving over 90 percent participation. The Parents Fund adds to the overall success of the Annual Giving program with over 1,000 donors.

Foundations

Since the last Middle States report, Hamilton added its first full-time foundation officer. This move has led to extensive interaction with faculty and a steady flow of new proposals to foundations. A government relations professional with parallel responsibilities was appointed in May, 2000.

Planned Giving

An aging population, coupled with an enormous amount of new wealth created in the past 10 years, presents new opportunities for planned giving. Recognizing that this area represents the fastest-growing potential for philanthropy, Hamilton added a second planned giving officer in 1996. The College also established the Joel Bristol Society in 1996 for those alumni and friends who indicate that they have included Hamilton in their estate plans. To date, there are nearly 350 members in this group, and part of the growth can be attributed to new marketing and promotional materials. In a typical year, Hamilton secures about 40 percent of its receivables from planned gifts.

Principal and Major Gifts

The major gift program focuses its efforts on identifying and cultivating the next generation of leadership donors. To this end, this program has been reorganized, with a development researcher, a stewardship coordinator and an additional development officer focusing on gifts of $1 million and above. Through these efforts, nearly 1,500 alumni and friends of the College have been identified for high-level cultivation. The current capital campaign has secured the largest gifts in the College's history, both from living alumni and bequests.

Future Plans and Developments

As outlined above, the Office of Communications and Development has achieved enormous successes over the last decade. The extent to which the successful work of C&D is shared with, and understood by, other segments of the campus community it serves needs to be strengthened. The involvement and inclusion of these other segments in decisions of C&D would benefit all constituents. Intra-campus communication between C&D and the faculty, most notably, could be improved with the institution of an advisory committee for the

Vice President of Communications and Development. The role of the committee would parallel that of advisory committees of the other senior officers. As co-chair of the committee, the Vice President of Communications and Development would have access to formal input on various issues such as publications originating in the office. With broad committee representation of administrators, staff, and faculty from different disciplines, there becomes a cadre of individuals on campus who can serve to lessen the sometimes-perceived separation and distinction between C&D and the rest of the community.

Other ways to foster relationships between C&D and the faculty have begun to be explored, but need further development. Combining faculty travel to conferences with visits to alumni gatherings in the same or nearby cities is a cost-effective way of using faculty as ambassadors for the College. Faculty members are generally willing to become involved in the work of the Office of C&D, and more creative use of faculty would be beneficial. An annual report by the Vice President of Communications and Development at a faculty meeting would also serve to bring together these two components of the College.

Improved communication and relations between the Office of C&D and the Department of Athletics is another area requiring attention. In particular, the role and place of the Sports Information Director has become less clear over the years. Hamilton does not rely on its sports teams to gain institutional recognition, nor does Hamilton build its reputation around its sports teams. Nonetheless, the successes of the athletic program present numerous opportunities throughout the year to place Hamilton's name in local media. Sports coverage should include the Syracuse media. Already an impressive number of concerts are broadcast from Wellin Hall on WCNY 91.3 Classic FM, and Emerson Gallery Events are regularly promoted there as well. More publicity for Hamilton athletics would continue to bring the College's name to the Syracuse media market, complementing the exposure in those other areas.

Another area of overlap between the Office of C&D and the Department of Athletics, and another requiring attention, is the issue of booster money. There needs to be clearer procedures for, and better communication about this development strategy, and then clearer guidelines for allocation of these resources. (For more information, see the Athletics section of this self-study.)

The relationship between C&D and the Business Office is another that calls for improvement. There appears to be confusion and misunderstanding around campus about the various responsibilities of each of these offices. It would be helpful if the Business Office provided simpler and more detailed reports of various accounts. In addition to clearing up some of the existing confusion, such reports would also clarify the purposes of these funds, who has access to them, and how they are being used. Such proper stewardship is crucial to C&D's continued work with donors. Generally, the systems between C&D and all departments that benefit from philanthropy need sharpening.

As the College seeks to present itself effectively in various media, the need for a consistent graphic identity deserves more attention. At present, hundreds of publications of all kinds are produced by campus organizations, and often each

looks very different from the others. There seems to be no "official" Hamilton insignia, format, or logo. Some groups have developed individualized designs for letterhead, newsletters, etc. More recognizable and consistent visual markings for publications of College organizations would benefit the effort as a whole.

The World Wide Web is quickly emerging as one of the primary media outlets for the college. Currently, neither ITS nor C&D has set forth design parameters for departmental or program web pages. ITS is responsible for maintenance of the server, access and software associated with the Hamilton College web site(s). By default, ITS originally assumed control of how the College web site was created and presented.

The World Wide Web represents a highly visible medium for dissemination of College-related information. It seems natural that responsibility for the content of the general Hamilton College web site reside in the Communications office, where related media imaging strategies are developed and implemented. The Communications office does not intend to manage the content of sites designed by departments, programs or individuals. However, it will continue to assist any of these groups or individuals in their efforts to communicate their activities by means of this rich medium.

Recommendations

- Establish a standing Faculty Committee on Communications and Development, to advise the Vice President and to improve communication between Communications and Development and the rest of the campus community.

- Schedule an annual report by the Vice President for Communications and Development at a faculty meeting

- Continue and expand the use of faculty as ambassadors for the college at alumni gatherings

- Improve communication between the Office of Communications and Development and the Department of Athletics

- Clarify procedures for the raising and expenditure of athletic "booster club" moneys

- Improve communication between the Office of Communications and Development and the Business Office

- Consider establishing a consistent graphic identity for Hamilton in publications, letterhead, newsletters, and other media

- Use the Office of Communications and Development as a resource for implementing strategies involving the World Wide Web

Appendix 1: C&D Organizational Chart

Appendix 1 to the Report on Communications and Development is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment

Abstract

The College has recently completed a five-year effort to revise the curriculum to 1) eliminate distribution requirements in favor of intensive advising to help students meet goals in the liberal arts, 2) establish a series of low-enrollment, interaction-intensive student seminars (the Proseminar program), and 3) create a required Sophomore Seminar program. Interdisciplinary programs continue to play an important role in the academic program of the College, but additional development of interdisciplinary programs is unlikely to occur without a further commitment of resources. Assessment of departments, programs, and faculty takes place in the form of external reviews, annual reviews, and individual tenure and promotion reviews. Evaluation of student performance occurs in the context of courses and senior programs. Although every concentration at Hamilton includes a culminating experience in the senior year, we do not yet have a systemic, college-wide, end-of-program assessment on the progress of individual students over four years. The College has in place a number of programs to promote and enhance use of technology and to provide learning support services for students and faculty.

Curricular Review: Process and Progress

In this section we provide a brief narrative account of the long curricular review process begun in 1995, a summary of the pieces of the newly approved curricular package, and an overview of faculty perception of both the reform and its major components.

During the early 1990s, faculty disgruntlement with student performance and classroom climate was on the rise. When President Tobin assumed the presidency of the College in 1994, the faculty felt a sense of excitement and energy concerning the future of Hamilton. It was understood that once the Residential Life Decision had been made, the College would turn attention to academic life.

During 1995-96, the Committee on Academic Policy (CAP) put together the following list of areas of the curriculum needing faculty attention: 1) cultural diversity [goal #3 in the existing curricular requirements]; 2) advising; 3) senior programs; 4) foreign language competency; 5) writing-intensive courses; 6) quantitative literacy; 7) ethical issues [goal #4]; 8) distribution requirements; 9) first-year seminars; 10) oral proficiency; 11) study abroad; 12) internships; 13) the academic calendar.

That spring, President Tobin circulated a document that came to be known as the "white paper," which argued that two focal points of Hamilton's curriculum -- citizenship and communication, including both oral and written proficiency -- should remain the foundations of the institution's curricular

identity for the foreseeable future. Although many faculty members welcomed the President's leadership in articulating a vision for the future of the College, most agreed that because the faculty holds authority over the curriculum, it must undertake any review or revision of the curriculum.

In 1996-97, President Tobin charged the Dean of Faculty, Bobby Fong, with the task of leading the faculty through a major curricular review effort that would involve as many faculty volunteers as possible. The faculty was urged to think boldly and creatively about a curriculum for the twenty-first century. During the fall of 1996, the Committee on Academic Policy (CAP) created seven subcommittees that attracted sixty-five faculty volunteers and met throughout the remainder of the 1996-97 academic year. The reports of these subcommittees considered all thirteen areas of the curriculum listed above and suggested a large number of possible changes.

During the summer of 1997, the CAP digested these reports and from them produced the first version of a Proposal for Curricular Change at Hamilton College (see Appendix). This proposal recommended two major initiatives: goal-based requirements and a restructuring of students' education on a year-by-year basis that introduced required First-Year Seminars and a Sophomore Tutorial program, the latter considered the keystone of the proposal. By focusing on programs and goals for the first two years of education at the College, the proposal sought to create a more coherent and well-balanced four-year program.

The Faculty met as a whole at the beginning of the academic year 1997-98 to respond to this proposal. After considering the Faculty's responses, the CAP in February, 1998, offered a revised proposal (see Appendix) which addressed several issues of implementation and provided a rationale for the three-part proposal: 1) goals, 2) limited enrollment in first and second year classes, and 3) the "Sophomore Gateway requirement." In the spring of 1997, the faculty cautiously voted to approve the spirit of the curricular reform proposals elaborated by the CAP, withholding final approval until the following year when language would be refined and resource issues would be clarified. The Faculty made clear that it did not wish to put any new programs in place unless the resources to implement them would be available.

In meetings of the CAP and faculty during 1998-99, the wording of the goals was refined. Limited enrollment classes would be recommended and not required of first and second year students. Finally, the "Gateway experience" evolved into an interdisciplinary seminar for sophomores with a public presentation as one of its outcomes. There was more support for interdisciplinary courses, team-taught or taught in clusters, than for the administratively difficult task of running a sophomore tutorial and providing extensive outside assessment. Many faculty members expressed excitement about the possibility of teaching with other colleagues across disciplines. The academic year closed with a faculty vote of approval for the three areas of the proposal. However, the faculty again charged the CAP to gather more information about the resource implications of any changes, especially those concerning the proposed language requirement and sophomore seminars.

Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment

In January, 2000, it became clear that Hamilton would not have the resources necessary to staff both the language requirement and the sophomore seminar program. President Tobin told the faculty that the trustees would support five new FTE to be used to support sophomore seminars only. Shortly thereafter, the faculty voted to eliminate distribution requirements in favor of a much strengthened advising system and a clear statement of goals of a liberal arts education for the college catalogue.

The faculty voted the following curricular components:

1) The Proseminar Program: Proseminars emphasize active participation and engagement in learning. Proseminars offer intensive interaction among students, and between students and instructors, through emphasis on writing, speaking and discussion, and/or other approaches to inquiry and expression that demand such intensive interaction.

2) The Writing Program: Students must pass three writing-intensive courses, each taken in a different semester. At least two of these courses must be writing-intensive Proseminars taken during the first two years of study. This requirement should be completed by the end of the junior year.

3) The Quantitative Literacy Requirement: Students must demonstrate basic quantitative literacy by passing a quantitative skills examination given during Orientation, or by passing a designated quantitative course or by completing a non-credit tutorial.

4) The Sophomore Program: Students must pass a sophomore seminar that emphasizes inter- or multidisciplinary learning and culminates in an integrative project with public presentation. A common, public presentation period for projects is held each semester, and individual sections are encouraged to participate.

Beginning with the class of 2005, the College will encourage all students to participate in at least four Proseminars and require all students to complete the Writing Program and the Sophomore Program. The CAP will provide for faculty approval both catalogue copy containing new language for recommended goals and new guidelines for the advising system. At the April faculty meeting, the faculty authorized the formation of an *ad hoc* committee to study how to make the advisory process consonant with the new curriculum. The Committee will report back by the October 2000 faculty meeting with recommendations and, if necessary, legislation.

Faculty sentiment regarding the curricular review process has run both hot and cold since 1995. Most who served on the seven subcommittees were enthusiastic about curricular change, sensing its potential for improving intellectual rigor and student engagement. However, the conflict that was inevitably part of such a process dampened enthusiasm for some parts of the program even as others, such as the sophomore program, retained more support. Questions about resources made the faculty wary of undertaking major innovations. In early discussions, President Tobin had indicated that the

Trustees might support adding an additional six to ten FTE to the faculty. By the spring of 2000, they agreed to add five. An additional three to five FTE will be added to the faculty over the next several years as campaign commitments to endowed chairs are fully funded.

Because any curricular review involves compromise and even the discarding of certain proposals, some were disappointed in the results. The requirements for courses focusing on cultural diversity and ethical issues that were part of our previous curriculum were discarded, together with distribution requirements, in the new curriculum. Foreign language study, one of the areas identified as needing attention in our last Middle States evaluation, has not been addressed in this review, since a proposed language requirement was rejected along with all other distribution requirements. On the other hand, a major in Chinese and a study abroad program in China have been added in the last few years, and there may be future opportunities for language residence halls and other on-campus support mechanisms that will promote global perspectives. Many aspects of the new curriculum are generating enthusiasm and support. A half-day conference in May on the proseminars and sophomore seminar drew sixty faculty. Considerable discussion has been devoted to ways of improving advising, and this year's pre-college conference incorporated an extensive discussion of advising.

The Senior Program

Because the most recent curricular review turned its focus to general education and the first two years of the college experience, the Senior Program has not been changed. This program, initiated with the class of 1991, requires each senior to demonstrate relative mastery in his or her field of concentration through the writing of a thesis, doing field or lab research, performing or staging an artistic exhibition, or passing a comprehensive examination.

Although many departments see their current senior projects as a valuable capstone experience for their majors, others are less satisfied. Faculty in the sciences and arts are most proud of their programs, even though they entail a high cost in faculty labor. Students in the sciences conduct laboratory research in close collaboration with individual faculty members and present the results of their research in writing and orally, usually during one evening in the spring semester. Students in studio arts work closely with individual faculty members in their respective fields (painting, sculpture, ceramics, and printmaking) and present their art works in an exhibition in the Emerson gallery at the end of the year. Whether in acting, directing, choreography, or playwriting, each student in theater and dance also works closely with a faculty project supervisor to prepare, produce, and perform a public theater or dance performance in Minor Theater. In addition, each student writes a 20-30-page thesis. Students in music perform recitals in the spring semester.

Departments in the humanities and social sciences follow a variety of models, most of which entail a substantial research or critical paper. In some departments, this work is conducted independently with a faculty advisor; in others, a student completes the work within the framework of a course. Senti-

ments about the project are mixed. Members of one interdisciplinary program feel that students coming from a variety of disciplines have no collective experience and produce uneven work in the Senior Program. Unfortunately, this particular program does not have the resources to offer a Senior Seminar. Several humanities departments feel that their Senior Programs represent compromises between available resources and what they would really like to do if they could.

Our survey confirmed our sense that the Senior Program means different things to different disciplines and, to work well, as it does in the sciences or the arts, demands faculty time that other departments find difficult to take away from other course offerings. This is an area the faculty might wish to consider more carefully as we focus attention on the design and implementation of the sophomore program as a capstone experience of a student's general education. We should remember to examine the two capstone experiences in relationship to each other.

Academic and Interdisciplinary Programs

At Hamilton, courses of study are offered both in departments and in interdisciplinary programs. The departmental disciplines in which students may concentrate include Anthropology (Cultural Anthropology or Archaeology), Art (History of Art or Studio Art), Biology, Chemistry, Classics (Classical Languages or Classical Studies), Comparative Literature, Computer Science, Dance, Economics, English (Literature or Creative Writing), French, Geology, German, Government, History, Mathematics, Music, Philosophy, Physics, Psychology, Religious Studies, Russian Studies, Sociology, Spanish, and Theatre. Interdisciplinary programs offering concentrations include Africana Studies, American Studies, East Asian Studies, Biochemistry/Molecular Biology, Communication Studies, Foreign Languages, Geoarchaeology, Neuroscience, Public Policy, Women's Studies, and World Politics. In addition to those listed above, the College offers interdisciplinary minors in Environmental Studies, Latin American Studies, and Medieval and Renaissance Studies.

A problem for interdisciplinary programs everywhere is the fact that by definition they have few resources of their own and must draw on the resources of academic departments. Faculty responses to our survey suggest that the relationship between departments and interdisciplinary programs is subject to the uncertainties of strategically positioned personalities and policies in departments on which the programs' survival depend.

Learning Support Services and Programs

Hamilton College has several centers and programs that assist student learning and support the curriculum. They include The Nesbitt-Johnston Writing Center, The Quantitative Literacy Center, The Peer Tutoring Program, and The Language Learning Center.

The Nesbitt-Johnston Writing Center

To support writing in courses throughout the curriculum, the Writing Center offers individual writing conferences with peer tutors and, in some cases, with the Director of the Writing Center. Writing conferences may be required as part of writing-intensive classes or based on an instructor's referral or recommendation. Many students request conferences on their own to discuss writing at any stage of its development, whether or not it is part of a course.

The Writing Center employs 24 student peer tutors from disciplines throughout the Hamilton curriculum and conducts over 1,000 hour-long peer writing conferences each semester, about 2400 each year. Between 40 and 50 faculty members require writing conferences for their courses. Over half of the students who schedule conferences do so voluntarily, rather than through faculty referral or suggestion. In addition, the Writing Center offers faculty consultation and planning, word processing facilities and a resource library on writing in a variety of disciplines. External reviews have noted the exemplary nature of the Writing Center, which has served as a model for other institutions.

The Quantitative Literacy Center

The Quantitative Literacy Center offers peer tutoring in any introductory level course that has a mathematics component. Staffed by students majoring in Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Economics, Mathematics, Physics and Psychology, the Center provides assistance on a drop-in basis. Peer tutors in each discipline are regularly available in the evenings and on Sundays. Other programs offered by the Quantitative Literacy Center include a ten-session (non-credit bearing) tutorial for students who do not pass the quantitative literacy exam, a review for the mathematics portion of the Graduate Record Exam, and workshops to accompany specific courses. The Quantitative Literacy Center employs about 17 peer tutors and logs over five hundred tutorials per year. A founding member of the Quantitative Literacy Consortium of the Northeast, Hamilton's Center helps to foster the development of quantitative literacy programs at other institutions.

The Peer Tutoring Program

The Peer Tutoring Program provides academic support for students by arranging one-on-one tutoring in various subjects, providing information regarding help offered by other programs, and offering assistance in the improvement and application of study skills and time management. Students may be referred to the program by faculty members or may seek assistance on their own. Tutors are students who have taken the courses for which tutoring has been requested and who have been recommended by each department. The tutor and the Academic Support Coordinator, through written evaluations and conferences, monitor student progress. The program normally has about 60 tutors on call and arranges about 400 tutorial sessions a year.

The Language Learning Center

The Language Learning Center supports the teaching and learning of languages by providing access to a broad range of traditional audio and video technologies as well as to advanced informational and instructional multimedia computing facilities. Staffed by a director and an administrative assistant, the Center encourages and promotes interactive, technologically sophisticated teaching and learning. Language faculty have adopted many computer-enhanced materials, including Internet-based activities, into their courses and pedagogies. All first- and second-year language courses, and most third-year courses, involve regular use of the Center; appropriate technology-based programs have been integrated in all levels of the foreign language curriculum.

The Center has 21 networked computers: 18 Power Macintosh units for students; two faculty development computer workstations equipped for scanning, digitizing, and editing; one student development computer workstation likewise equipped; two printers; CD- ROM; four laserdisc players and video viewing stations; 15 audio carrels; and a data projector enabling faculty to project programs while holding class in the Center.

Technology in the Curriculum

In the last ten years, digital technology has affected curricula in nearly every discipline. Aside from particular disciplinary uses of technology in the form of specialized equipment and machinery, technology is used in instruction at Hamilton in the following areas: 1) software; 2) the World Wide Web; 3) course management; 4) listservs, e-mail, and newsgroups; and 5) video conferencing using the Remote Collaboration Facility.

Students use software in courses varying from anthropology to physics. For example, students in economics courses use market simulation games, and astronomy students use a program to observe planetary motions. Biochemistry students use molecular visualization software, and music students do theory exercises online. Physics and math students use programming languages, and humanities students are offered a wide array of resources. Listservs, e-mail and newsgroups promote cross-cultural, cross-disciplinary communication and facilitate the exchange of ideas among students in the same class or among classes.

The World Wide Web provides access to foreign newspaper and radio sites from all over the world. It has revolutionized the way language pedagogy approaches the visual and print culture of the target language. Countless art, history, and literature sites have developed in the last five years, making accessible previously hard to obtain editions of literature, archives, and museum holdings. Students also learn to evaluate the source and quality of information they find on the Web.

Instructors have developed a variety of course materials online. Course syllabi and reserve lists may now be found online. With a software server and course management software, students may also take quizzes, share drafts of

papers, view digitized slides from class, and submit homework. Although digital curricular materials provide valuable opportunities for course enrichment, their development requires substantial faculty time. In order to encourage this kind of work, the College must ensure that it is properly evaluated and rewarded.

Grants from the Mellon and Culpeper foundations have been instrumental in promoting the use of technology in foreign languages at Hamilton. In 1995, Hamilton College was awarded a grant of $121,000 from the Charles E. Culpeper Foundation to upgrade its Language Learning Center through the addition of computing technology. In addition to funding the acquisition of the hardware, the grant supported the addition to the Language Learning Center staff of a part-time laboratory supervisor. It also was used to support faculty workshops in the use of the technology. The fact that it funded not only the purchase of equipment but also the support staff to help faculty use it was crucial to the establishment of a language learning program based in information technology.

Since the Culpeper grant expired in 1997, Hamilton College has supplied internal funding to continue the initiatives begun under the grant. The supervisor's position is full-time for ten months per year and part-time for two months. The computer equipment is replaced on a regular cycle as part of the all-college computer replacement plan, and an equipment line has been added to the budget of the Language Learning Center.

In 1995, Hamilton College and Colgate University were jointly awarded a grant from the Mellon Foundation to develop the use of technology in the teaching of both classical and modern languages. The goals of the grant were (1) to develop and support a suite of software tools that strengthen instruction of foreign languages at Colgate University and Hamilton College; (2) to educate language faculty in the application of these and other such materials in their teaching; and (3) to promote sharing of personnel and resources between the campuses. Over 40 faculty participated in the consortium, and four faculty members, two at each campus, completed software development which is used in Hamilton's and Colgate's language programs as well as other institutions. Projects ranged from using an e-mail listserv to enhance discussion to advanced uses of multimedia software.

Hamilton's Remote Collaboration Facility, constructed under the Mellon grant, has been used to offer courses in both Italian and Computer Science between Hamilton and Colgate as well as a course in Classics between Hamilton and Skidmore. Faculty in such departments as Physics, Economics, Government, and Geology, to name a few, have used the RCF with other institutions (Williams, Denison, Kenyon, Lafayette, Oxford, Stanford, NYU) to conduct video conferences and interviews, to present experts, and to provide outside examiners. During the 1999-2000 academic year, 175 video conferences were held by means of the RCF.

Faculty members who would like to use advanced technology in their classes have urged that Information Technology Services hire support specialists with expertise in disciplinary divisions -- e.g., arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences -- to help faculty identify and adapt resources for their

courses. ITS has now been authorized to hire four such support specialists and is actively hiring.

Since computers by nature are not always reliable, it is important that faculty be able to rely on ITS student employees for assistance. Good training and supervision of student employees is vital. Because of the widening influence of technology on all disciplines in recent years, careful assessment of its value is increasingly important. This is true particularly when students use the World Wide Web or other forms of technology as sources of information.

Other kinds of non-digital technology used in the classroom deserve attention. Beginning in January, 2000, the College will provide televised access to foreign language broadcasts. The Media Library has a number of fixed video stations but only one that can play VHS/Secam. Portable videocassette players that could play recordings made in non-US formats would make it much easier for faculty to use such materials in their classrooms.

Because disciplines in the sciences and arts rely heavily on high-technology machinery and sophisticated equipment, it is important that this equipment incorporate the latest improvements in design and maintenance, so that students, faculty, and staff can use it with safety. In the spring of 2000, at the request of President Tobin, the Trustees authorized the creation of a new position, that of a Director of Environmental Protection and Safety. The person hired in this position will oversee environmental and safety programs encompassing a broad range of state and federal regulations, including those that require the safe maintenance and operation of machines used in instruction.

Curricular Support Programs

Since the last accreditation of the College in 1990, the Arthur Levitt Public Affairs Center has significantly expanded its programs and activity, and a new organization, the Kirkland Project for the study of Gender, Society, and Culture, has been established. Support for the curriculum is also provided by the Emerson Gallery, the Performing Arts Series, departmental and College lectures, and symposia.

Arthur Levitt Public Affairs Center

The Arthur Levitt Center, originally established in 1981, assists faculty members and students in examining public affairs. As part of President Tobin's initiatives to strengthen relations between Hamilton and the local region and to focus on education for citizenship, the Levitt Center established several new programs: the Levitt Scholar Program, the Alumni Fellows Program, the Oneida County Human Services Resource Center, and the Speakers Program. In addition, the Levitt Center offers competitive grants to faculty members for course development, sponsors field trips as part of courses, and fosters faculty-student collaborative research. Most of these initiatives involve some kind of hands-on field work, such as giving a talk, doing research for a local agency, or doing surveys.

Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment

Kirkland Project for the Study of Gender, Society and Culture

The Kirkland Project, established in 1995, assists students and faculty in addressing questions and issues of gender, diversity and social justice. Administered by a faculty Director and faculty Coordinating Council, the Kirkland Project seeks to build a diverse community respectful of differences and to prepare students to live and work in a complex multiracial and multinational world. The Project has developed the following initiatives: a Brown Bag Lunch Series, reading groups, a student associates program, a lecture series, residencies, and an Institute on Diversity and Curricular Transformation. A new course, College 130, Coming of Age in America: Narratives of Difference, originally developed in a Kirkland Project seminar, has been offered in four to five sections during the fall semester for the past three years. The Kirkland Project also maintains an active association with Kirkland College alumnae.

Emerson Gallery

The Emerson Gallery exists because of the College's belief that experience of the visual arts and material culture is integral to a liberal arts education. The Gallery is home to the Hamilton College Collection, which numbers over 3200 objects, including college portraits, works of art in all traditional media and examples of material culture. The Gallery maintains a computerized catalog and supports exhibition and publication programs to make the collections accessible for study. Objects from the collection are regularly used as source material for classes in art history and the studio arts as well as in such other disciplines as anthropology, sociology, history, and American studies.

Performing Arts Series

At Hamilton, the arts are both an integral part of a student's education and an important indicator of the cultural pride and vitality of a community. Each year, Hamilton College presents Contemporary Voices and Visions and Classical Connections, two series of world-class professional performances at Wellin Concert Hall in the Schambach Center for Music and the Performing Arts. Both series offer a variety of live performances ranging from the classical art forms of symphonic and chamber music, ballet and solo recitals to the more contemporary arts of world music, drum ensembles, jazz groups, and modern dance troupes.

Lectures

The college hosts about thirty special lectures a year in addition to the many departmental lectures. Some of these, such as the Great Names series (which has included figures such as Archbishop Desmond Tutu, Lady Margaret Thatcher, and Elie Wiesel) are sponsored by the college as a whole, some by individual departments, some by various student organizations; some by campus groups such as the Levitt Center and the Kirkland Project. Topics of recent lectures have included "Faulkner's Legacy: a Centenary Observance," "The Battle Against Breast Cancer: Who's in Charge," "The Economy: Reading Simonides with Paul Celan," and "New Immigrants and Bilingual Education."

Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment

Assessment

Like most institutions of higher education, Hamilton College conducts many different kinds of assessment. Faculty members routinely assess students' performance and assign grades. Similarly, senior faculty and administrators regularly assess junior faculty for reappointment, tenure and promotion. These methods of evaluation are integral to the routine functioning of an academic institution and are well tested and developed.

Mechanisms of assessment of other areas of the academic enterprise are less well developed. Hamilton College is typical of most academic institutions in having an uneven approach to assessment of performance at different levels. We will describe the methods of assessment currently employed at the College and department level, including faculty perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of these procedures, and suggest future developments.

The performance of academic departments and programs (read "and program" every time the term "department" is used) is routinely evaluated in two ways. First, there is an annual internal evaluation. The chair of every department submits an annual report to the Dean of Faculty's office. These reports include self-assessments composed by individual faculty members in each department, the chair's assessment of individual faculty members, and the chair's summary of developments in the department. These reports are an efficient mechanism for keeping the Dean of the Faculty informed. In addition, departments are scheduled for assessment by a team of outside evaluators approximately every ten years. These external reviews provide the Dean and the Committee on Academic Policy with an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of a particular academic department and can form the basis for changes.

Departments are externally reviewed on a rolling basis, approximately once every ten years. Three departments are reviewed each year. Occasionally a particular department or program is not reviewed for a longer period of time; the extended interval has usually to do with the internal affairs of the department concerned and whether it is deemed ready, or its members feel themselves ready, to be reviewed. If a department, or, as more often happens, an interdisciplinary program, is going through a period of instability (for example, the turnover of a substantial portion of its faculty, or a change of department or program chair), the college waits to invite an external team until the appropriate time when the program or department is most able to benefit from that review.

The procedures for departmental evaluation are reasonable and work well when they are complied with in good faith. The usefulness of both annual reports and external evaluations depends on both the honest effort at self-assessment of the department and the fate of the report once submitted. In guidelines sent to departments undergoing external reviews, the Dean of Faculty's office asks that departments submit a self-study six weeks prior to the review and, within six months following the review, a written response to the suggestions of the review team and a plan for the future of the department. The Dean of Faculty then meets with the department to discuss the response and plan.

Assessment is most useful when specific consequences follow both external reports and individual annual reports. Good performances should be recognized, and remedial action should be taken when necessary. This part of the process has not always been well implemented at Hamilton College. Feedback on performance assessment has sometimes been so vague, delayed, and muted that it has had little effect on performance at either the individual or departmental level. When department chairs submit annual reports but do not share their comments with faculty, the assessment does not lead either to reward or to the chance to take remedial action. Steps have been taken to make the assessment procedures more rigorous and consistent for the future.

Several interdisciplinary academic programs have encountered difficulty finding the support and resources necessary to maintain a coherent program. Because of the interdisciplinary composition of these programs, program committees are made up of faculty from several departments. It is even more important to get the strength of the opinion of outside scholars in assessing programs than it is for departments. The College should be diligent in maintaining the schedule of external reviews and pay particular attention to the needs of programs through this process.

Beyond these established measures of performance, some departments report that they regularly review their courses and curricula internally. The senior program, for example, as it requires individual students to demonstrate proficiencies, provides a mechanism for measuring the performance of the department as a whole. In French and Spanish for example, a required oral proficiency exam is conducted by outside evaluators from the American Council of Teachers of Foreign Languages. In science departments, public presentations of research projects provide a similar opportunity, as do senior performances in music, theatre, and dance, and senior exhibitions in studio art.

One mechanism for assessing and maintaining standards within a department is through visitation and evaluation of junior faculty by senior faculty. However, unless junior faculty participate in reciprocal visitations and extensive discussions with the senior faculty, such a program may allow junior faculty less voice in shaping the offerings of the department.

Our survey suggests that a substantial fraction of the faculty is troubled by indications of grade inflation. Unfortunately, this problem is not confined to Hamilton. Data compiled by Jane Liotta, Registrar of Franklin and Marshal college, indicate that grades at Hamilton are somewhat less inflated than at many of our peer institutions. The Hamilton faculty cannot act suddenly, decisively, and unilaterally to correct the problem without putting our graduates at risk. Still, some faculty members suggest that with the leadership of the Dean and President, the faculty could initiate a program to deflate grades gradually, with an accompanying notation on students' transcripts to indicate the change in policy.

The College has begun some initiatives to help faculty address these issues. It was recently awarded a small planning grant from the Mellon Foundation to investigate methods of assessing liberal arts education. This grant funded a

committee of faculty members to gather material prepared by the College and interview more than one hundred alumni of the classes of '89 and '93 in an attempt to identify the "experiential elements of their education." This committee was broadly charged with trying to identify the most effective aspects of liberal arts education and the most effective mechanisms for assessing that education. Its report was issued in October, 2000. The key findings of that report are found in an appendix to this section. The full report may be consulted in the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty.

Another grant-funded initiative to aid in wide-ranging educational assessment is the creation of a one-year Visiting Scholar position for the 2000-2001 academic year, funded by a grant from the Emerson Foundation. Douglas Eder, Professor of Biology and Director of Assessment at Southern Illinois University, will be the Emerson Scholar this year. Among his tasks will be developing means for assessing Hamilton's curricular changes, particularly with respect to advising.

With these steps, the College has begun to implement a comprehensive program to assess whether we achieve the goals we set for ourselves at the faculty, department or program, and college levels. Once assessment has been completed, the results need to be communicated clearly to those involved, so that they can react accordingly. In order to achieve this level of assessment and communication, more time must be given to evaluation of existing procedures and less to innovation. Now that the curricular review is complete, the Committee on Academic Policy can turn its attention to assessing and maintaining the standards of curricular excellence that Hamilton has long striven to uphold.

Recommendations

- Revise and strengthen the advising system and create a new description of liberal arts education goals for catalogue

- Provide greater support for cultural diversity and foreign language study

- Review the Senior Project as capstone experience in relation to sophomore seminars

- Increase institutional commitment and financial support for interdisciplinary programs and multicultural and cross-cultural courses

- Develop a more consistent approach to assessment of performance at different levels

- Share the annual reports of department chairs with faculty, recognizing superior performance and initiating remedial action where needed

- Make procedures more consistent for external review, annual reports, and internal review

Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment

- Establish guidelines for departmental internal review and course development policies

- Use assessment efforts to address issues of rigor in courses

- Establish procedures for assessment of our learning support services and new curricular proposal

- Improve the reliability of ITS student help and of in-class hardware

- Review recent ITS hires with respect to academic divisional expertise

- Provide released time for faculty as incentive to invest in curricular development with technology

- Increase support for the maintenance and repair of sciences' and arts' equipment

- Increase sciences' and arts' budgets for technology

- Provide Audio-Visual Services with movable VHS/SECAM machines for foreign language classroom

Appendix 1: Faculty Questionnaire

Monday
November, 22, 1999

Dear Colleagues,

On behalf of the Middle States Sub-Committee on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment, I would like to ask for your help as we begin to draft a report for the Steering Committee which in turn will produce a self-evaluation report for our upcoming Middle States Evaluation. Our particular committee has been meeting since mid-October and would like to pose the following questions to you. While we know that you probably don't relish the thought of filling out yet another questionnaire, please keep in mind that your answers to this one will be reflected in the self-study Hamilton will do for Middle States Reaccreditation. Enclosed please find a questionnaire which focuses on the three areas we have been directed to consider: Curriculum, Academic Programs (both departments and programs), and Assessment. Answer all the questions or only those about which you feel most strongly. We appreciate your candid responses and will try our best to represent them to the Steering Committee in charge of producing the self-study document.

We would very much appreciate receiving your comments before the start of December vacation.

Thanks again for your attention,

Cheryl Morgan, on behalf of

Jinny Garrett
Vincent Odamtten
Carole-Bellini Sharpe
Steve Goldberg
Barbara Tewskbury

Appendices - Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment

Middle States Sub-Committee on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment
Faculty Questionnaire
Please respond to Cheryl Morgan (cmorgan@hamilton.edu)

I.   CURRICULUM

1. Does the current curriculum reflect an appropriate balance between depth and breadth in the study of liberal arts? Please explain.

2. To what extent do students and faculty understand the connection between courses and curriculum on the one hand, and the goals of the college on the other?

3. How effective are you as an adviser in helping students achieve and understand the goals of the curriculum? How effective do you think the overall advising process is?

4. If the current curricular proposal passes, to what extent will the changes help the College better realize the goals of a liberal arts education? Please comment on each aspect of the proposed curricular reform.

5. Comment on the process of curricular reform at the College. Has it been effective? If not, why?

6. Comment on the significance of an ethics component to the curriculum.

7. What are the most significant challenges facing departments, faculty, and the College in general if the current curricular proposal were implemented?

8. How often do you and/or your department effect curricular innovation? Are such efforts facilitated, acknowledged, and even rewarded by the College? What are the incentives for such innovation?

9. In the last curricular reform, departments initiated the Senior Project. Briefly describe your senior program. To what extent do you believe that the Senior Project/Program in your department is an effective culminating experience for your concentrators?

10. How often do you direct students to one or more of the following learning-support services: the Language Center, the Writing Center, the Quantitative Literacy Center and the Peer Tutoring Center. To what extent do your students use the resources of the Levitt Public Affairs Center and the Kirkland Project?

II. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

1. Does the current departmental structure facilitate implementation of the curriculum, especially with regard to the relationship between departments and programs?

2. In the last ten years, what has changed most about the ways in which you teach? What have you found most effective?

3. To what extent do your courses include a multicultural, cross-cultural, or global perspective?

4. What opportunities for interdisciplinarity and even inter-institutional work exist for you? If none do, and you would like the opportunity, what would it be?

III. ASSESSMENT

1. How does your department conduct review and assessment of its courses and programs (aside from the external review process)? At what frequency does this occur? Is departmental assessment adequate?

2. Does your department or program engage in establishing overall goals and objectives for students beyond successful completion of individual course work for the major? If so, how do you evaluate whether students have met these goals?

3. To what extent does your department or program set standards for the level of intellectual challenge in individual courses?

4. Do you think there is a problem with grade inflation on a college-wide level here? If so, what steps could we take to address it?

Appendix 2: Curriculum Changes

Appendix 2 to the Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Appendix 3: Curriculum Proposal (T. Kelly Memo)

Appendix 3 to the Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Appendix 4: Salmon Document

Appendix 4 to the Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Appendix 5: Technology Memo

Appendix 5 to the Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Appendix 6: Colgate-Hamilton Mellon Consortium Memo

Appendix 6 to the Report on Curriculum, Academic Programs, and Assessment is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Appendix 7: Key Findings of Mellon Report

Key Findings of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Assessment Project at Hamilton College

Report for the Year 1999-2000

- Hamilton offers a liberal arts education, in which specific courses or concentrations matters less than critical/analytic thinking, breadth of exposure, and communication skills.

- Writing skills are what Hamilton teaches most successfully. These skills are both very useful and relatively uncommon.

- Oral communication skills, crucial to post-college success, are not taught systematically, either at Hamilton or at peer colleges. Our historical competitive advantage in this area has almost, but not quite, disappeared.

- The high level of student/faculty contact is a highly valued, competitive advantage. For students who come to know professors well, the impact can be long-lasting.

- Junior Year Abroad (JYA) programs provide the most clearly positive experiences that participating students have at Hamilton.

- In the eyes of alumni, the best teachers combine challenging standards with genuine care for the well-being and development of their students.

- Both former and current students are widely disappointed with the lack of consistent rigor in the academic program. "Sliding through" is quite common, to the regret of sliders as well as of serious students.

- Academic advising, a longtime weakness, could become a major problem area as the requirements-free curriculum begins.

- Alums cite lasting friendships as perhaps the greatest benefit of their Hamilton years, and many value the lasting sense of community and "the Hamilton network."

- The campus's geographical isolation, while obviously limiting social life, produces a number of surprising benefits.

- There is widespread expressed dissatisfaction with social life on campus, much more than at other colleges. This may be in response to the Residential Life changes.

- Aside from JYA, few students experience major changes in their intellectual or personal outlooks while at Hamilton, nor, it seems, are they looking for such transitions.

- Alumni clearly support a strengthening of the academic/intellectual focus of the college.

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Faculty and Governance

Abstract

Since the last Middle States accreditation of Hamilton, the faculty has grown by about 20%, and representation of minorities and women has increased, but further progress is needed. Although Hamilton's standards for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service are widely understood and accepted, individual faculty members would benefit from better communication concerning their progress in meeting these standards. New policies governing the employment of adjunct and part-time faculty are now being developed. Recent initiatives placing more budgetary authority with the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty and establishing a Faculty Committee on Budget will improve faculty governance.

Introduction

This report was written in consultation with a subcommittee on Faculty and Governance, with standing committees of the faculty, and with selected faculty, administrators, students and staff during the academic year 1999-2000. The subcommittee conducted a written survey of the faculty in January, 2000. The survey elicited 88 responses; its questions and a summary of the numerical responses are included in the appendix to this report. The report addresses a number of questions relating to the composition, evaluation and support of faculty as well as the structure and effectiveness of governance structures at the College.

Faculty

Composition of the Faculty

Since our last Middle States review, the size of the Hamilton College faculty has grown by almost 20%. In 1988-89, the Hamilton faculty included 141 tenured and tenure-track members. In 1999-2000, it has 168. Although the number of students at Hamilton has also increased during the past decade, this growth of the faculty has effectively reduced the student-faculty ratio from 10:1 to 9.5:1. Since 1990, the standard teaching load for faculty has been five courses per year.

In some other respects, the composition of the Hamilton College faculty has changed only slightly since the last review. In 1999-2000, the percentage of Hamilton College faculty with tenure was 62%, up from 58% in 1990-91. Of the entire faculty, 36% hold the rank of professor, 28% hold the rank of associate professor, 25% hold the rank of assistant professor, and 10% are instructors. Hamilton College's full-time faculty remains a predominantly white (86%) and male (63%) faculty. (The appendix to this section contains the most recent

affirmative action report for 1998-99 as well as figures back to 1990-91.)

Although there has been an increase in the presence of faculty of color on campus from 9% in 1991-92 to 14% in 1999-2000, there are still only 28 minority faculty members at Hamilton. There are eight faculty of color at the assistant professor level, seven at the associate professor level, six at the full professor level, and seven instructors. Many of our faculty of color are visitors (teaching fellows or one-year replacements) rather than continuing members of the faculty; the percentage of tenured faculty of color stands at only 5%. In addition, faculty of color are not spread proportionately throughout the various disciplines. The languages contain 33% of the tenured or tenurable faculty of color in only 9.5% of the tenured or tenurable faculty positions.

Recruitment and retention of faculty of color needs to be a priority for Hamilton. The College has been thinking creatively about ways to recruit and retain faculty of color, and over the past two years it has initiated a number of efforts to do so. Recent initiatives include Hamilton's joining the Consortium for a Stronger Minority Presence (see the Admissions and Financial Aid section of the self-study for more information); advertising positions in publications with a predominantly minority readership, such as *Black Issues* and *Hispanic Outlook*; making opportunity hires (we have converted three short-term positions to tenure-track in order to attract or retain faculty of color); providing course releases and development funds for junior faculty of color; appointing a Diversity Taskforce for 2000-01, composed of faculty, students and administrators; and working toward applying for a Hewlett grant on Pluralism and Unity.

The percentage of women in the Hamilton College faculty, which was at 37% in 1991-92, has risen to 40% in 1999-2000. Although there are seventeen more female faculty members than in 91-92, there are also thirteen more male faculty members. Currently, eighteen full professors, twenty-two associate professors, twenty-seven assistant professors and twelve instructors are female. Despite hiring male and female faculty in entry level positions at an approximately equal rate, Hamilton has been able to increase the percentage of women on the faculty by only three percent. Of special concern are the numbers of tenured and tenure-track women who have left the College for a variety of reasons. Hiring equal numbers of women and men cannot balance the gender ratio in the faculty if women continue to leave at a higher rate than men do. The subcommittee suggested that the college initiate a study of the causes of female attrition in recent years, with a view to improving conditions that might encourage the retention of women faculty.

Evaluation and Support of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

The college's expectations for and mechanisms for evaluation of teaching, scholarship, and service are presented in the *Faculty Handbook*. The subcommittee surveyed faculty members to solicit their opinions on the effectiveness of these procedures. As indicated in Appendix A, eighty-eight faculty members responded, including 64 tenured faculty, 10 tenure-track faculty, 12 non-tenurable faculty, and 2 who did not indicate their position. Unless otherwise noted, responses did not vary by rank and are reported below in the aggregate.

Although a small group of respondents stated in their discursive responses that standards for tenure and promotion should be raised, the majority of the faculty who responded (77%) believe that the "College's expectations regarding teaching, scholarship, and service are appropriate." By contrast, many faculty report dissatisfaction with the communication of our standards and with the mechanisms currently used to evaluate and reward teaching, scholarship, and service.

Under Hamilton's reappointment procedure, each department sends the Committee on Appointments and the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty a recommendation that includes an evaluation of the candidate's strengths and weaknesses in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. The Committee on Appointments receives this recommendation, investigates the case independently, and sends a recommendation to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty. The VP/Dean weighs the recommendations of the department and Committee on Appointments and makes his or her own recommendation to the President. After the President's decision, the VP/Dean writes a letter to the individual faculty member summarizing the evaluations made by the department and COA and identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty member's performance. Under our current procedures, the COA does not communicate directly with individual faculty members. Although some departments or department chairs communicate their concerns directly with candidates for reappointment, the College as a whole has no guidelines requiring such direct communication.

Suggestions by respondents and the COA for improving the communication of our expectations included ensuring that new department chairs and program directors are clear about the *Faculty Handbook* guidelines and procedures, having the VP/Dean provide more guidance to department/program chairs concerning the criteria for reappointment and methods of providing feedback to junior faculty members, and making letters of evaluation from the department or program and the COA available to candidates after each review. The subcommittee recommends that the faculty consider requiring that all three letters of evaluation -- those of the VP/Dean, the COA, and the department or program -- be sent to the candidate after each of these reviews.

A significant number of faculty who completed the survey indicated that the criteria for determining raises and the process for making decisions about merit increases are unclear. The subcommittee recommends that the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty provide fuller information to individual faculty members in their salary letters as to how their raises have been determined.

Three years ago, the Dean of Faculty's office completely revised the orientation program for new faculty, and last year it initiated a systematic mentoring program under which new tenure-track faculty are matched with two senior faculty mentors, one from the individual's academic department and one from another department. Perhaps because of these initiatives, the survey shows a sharp difference in responses between senior and junior members of the faculty on questions of mentorship: whereas 66% of tenured faculty members and 70% of

non-tenure-track faculty stated that the College is ineffective in mentoring, only 38% of the junior tenure-track faculty agree. Comments indicate that many faculty believe that the quality of mentoring varies widely by department or program. Improving the flow of information to junior faculty at times of reappointment, as recommended above, would complement the mentoring process.

The College is generous in providing support for a variety of faculty activities. For example, faculty have access to excellent library services and computer hardware. Each tenure-track faculty member receives a leave of absence from teaching in the fourth year, as an opportunity for full-time scholarly work. After tenure, faculty members are eligible for regular leaves of one semester after each ten semesters of teaching. Hamilton offers annual travel support, maternity and paternity benefits, and portable dependent tuition benefits, although the latter benefit was reduced substantially for new faculty members beginning in 2001, at the same time these benefits were extended to staff members. Further, the College has recently raised the faculty salary budget to bring average salaries in line with AAUP 1-star standards.

Hamilton's policy on funds for research and travel, as iterated most recently in the 1999 edition of the *Faculty Handbook*, states that every non-adjunct faculty member, whether a visiting or continuing member of the faculty, is entitled to support for one professional meeting a year, but that the College will attempt to assist with more such travel for those who participate in the programs of meetings. Recent practice has been to fund all requests for research and travel up to a limit of $2,500 per faculty member. If there is not enough money to meet all requests, decisions are made on the basis of whether a faculty member is a continuing member of the Hamilton community and whether he or she is participating professionally in the meeting he or she wishes to attend.

If the office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty adhered strictly to the *Handbook* policy, more funds could be made available to support travel and research for colleagues with active research programs, while less active members of the faculty could still expect to attend one professional meeting a year. This change in emphasis would not require a change of policy, merely the active use of the policy already in place.

The College also offers faculty competitive grants for collaborative work with students, professional development, and pedagogical work on sabbatical leave, but it has no competitive funding for faculty research or non-periodic leaves. Hamilton should consider providing funds for competitive grants for faculty research.

The newly defined position of Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty will exercise responsibility over academic and instructional budgets and will not be required, as the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty was in the past, to submit academic budgets to the approval of the Vice President for Administration and Finance.

Until recently, Hamilton College has had only one full time academic grants officer, whose primary duties involved securing grants for the institution,

rather than for individual faculty members. Last year, however, the College appointed a full-time associate director of foundation, corporate, and government relations whose primary responsibility is to work directly with individual faculty members for the identification of grant opportunities and the preparation of proposals, with particular emphasis on federal grant programs. The associate director reports to the director of foundation, corporate and government relations whose primary responsibility is the identification, cultivation, and solicitation of grant opportunities that have College-wide scope. (For more information, see the Communications and Development section of this self-study.)

Additionally, the College established a systematized policy of providing matching funds for equipment grants. Indirect cost recovery from successful grant applications is placed in a discretionary fund that the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty uses to support the government relations program, equipment matching, and other grant-related activities.

The College has recently made a commitment to substantial renovations and additions to science facilities, and science faculty have been closely involved in the planning process. The college still needs renovations of and additions to other academic spaces, particularly classroom and office space. These renovations should be a priority for the College in the next decade, and faculty and departments/programs should play a central role in the planning of any new facilities, as they have been with the science facilities. The College is currently engaged in a comprehensive three-to-five-year strategic planning process with special attention to facilities needs.

The recent curricular review, lasting four years and enlisting widespread participation from every department and division of the faculty, has increased dramatically the amount of service work. Although 40% of survey respondents said that, in general, faculty are "participating appropriately in service/governance" at Hamilton, 30% responded that faculty are overburdened. Further, a number of numerical and narrative responses articulate the perception that some faculty are overburdened while others opt out of service and governance. The subcommittee recommends that the faculty explore ways in which the burden of service can be distributed more equitably and also evaluate the overall amount of faculty time that is currently being allocated to service relative to teaching and scholarship.

Policies Concerning Visiting Professors

Hamilton generously supports the visiting faculty it hires. Their salaries (although not their benefits) start at the same level as those of tenurable faculty hired in the same year and the same general area. Hamilton provides travel funds to visiting faculty, generally for one trip a year.

Policies Concerning Lecturers and Adjunct Faculty

Hamilton's use of adjunct faculty and lecturers has increased in recent years. The increase is partly a consequence of our more generous and regular

leave policy: as more members of our faculty receive research grants which take them away from our campus, we need to hire more faculty on a temporary or part-time basis to replace them.

It is difficult to get a precise picture of the use of adjuncts in teaching both because this information is not comprehensively tracked and because of the variability of the purposes for which adjuncts are hired. The category of adjunct includes individuals who teach regular credit-bearing courses, individuals who teach or assist in lab sections, as well as individuals who teach partial credit courses. An estimate provided by Institutional Research of the percentage of actual teaching FTE currently held by adjuncts is 5.5%; however, this estimate does not include faculty who are teaching partial credit courses, as many adjuncts are, nor does it include any adjuncts hired after August for spring courses. Therefore, this estimate probably underrepresents our use of adjuncts. The College spent close to a quarter million dollars in salaries for adjunct faculty members in 1999-00. The College should avoid increased reliance on adjuncts, and policies governing the use of adjuncts should be in conformity with AAUP standards.

Salaries for lecturers are negotiated on an individual basis with the VPAA/Dean of the Faculty. Adjunct salaries, even for those who have taught part-time for the College for years, are usually on a per-course basis. Salary for adjuncts varies widely, from $3500 to $10,000 per course, depending upon levels of experience and expertise. Most adjunct faculty teach two or fewer courses a year. Some are reappointed on a regular basis, but few of these undergo the evaluation for reappointment mandated by the Faculty Handbook.

During the 2000-01 academic year, new policies and procedures to govern Hamilton's use of adjuncts and to regularize the situation for part-time faculty will be drafted and discussed.

Currently, part-time tenured or tenure-track faculty teaching more courses than specified in their contracts negotiate salary and benefits individually with the Dean. The new policies should also address the situation referred to of continuing part-time faculty who teach such overloads and are paid on an adjunct basis for them.

Governance

Structure and Effectiveness of Faculty Governance

The faculty participates actively in the governance of the college. Monthly meetings, which are held during the academic year and chaired by an elected member of the faculty, address curricular, pedagogical and professional matters brought by eleven standing committees or by petition.

Effective faculty governance requires a combination of a sound constitutional structure and effective leadership by committee members, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty and the President. Interviews with key committees and survey results indicate that the majority of faculty are either

satisfied with the overall governance structures at Hamilton or are skeptical that major structural changes would be productive. For example, 64% of those responding in the survey agree that "the current system of decision-making, based on majority vote of all those present at faculty meetings, serves the faculty well," and 65% respond that "the current set of faculty committees adequately serves the needs of the College." However, faculty identify a number of problems with the current workings of faculty governance which may merit some structural changes.

Standing Committees of the Faculty

The principal standing committees and their responsibilities are described in the Faculty Handbook. The most important faculty governance committees are the Academic Council, the Committee on Academic Policy and the Committee on Appointments. The section below also includes comments on the Vice President's Advisory Committee and the Planning Committee.

Academic Council

The Academic Council acts as the executive committee of the Faculty. It sets the agenda for the faculty meetings, prepares slates of nominees for committee vacancies, advises the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty on matters of policy and procedure, and sets the college calendar.

Current members of the Council believe that the structure for the committee is adequate. In theory, the Council could be split into two separate committees, a Dean's advisory board and a faculty executive committee. However, it is not clear that the benefits of doing so would merit an expansion of the number of faculty committees.

Committee on Academic Policy

The Committee on Academic Policy (CAP) is Hamilton's educational review and oversight committee. It plays a central role in the academic mission of the college, recommending curricular reforms to the faculty, supervising the establishment, modification, or deletion of courses, concentration, and degree requirements, and advising the VP/Dean on a range of matters including the allocation of faculty positions.

As the college has moved to develop a more diversified curriculum, including the writing program and interdisciplinary courses that fall outside the purview of individual departments and programs, the role and influence of the CAP has necessarily expanded. The key questions that present and former members of the CAP raised to us concern the gap between the constitutional and actual roles of the committee. Both habit and lack of information inhibit the CAP from fully exercising its responsibilities, particularly concerning allocation. The CAP has seldom had clear guidelines for the (re)allocation of resources for FTE's and programs; at times, decisions concerning new FTE's have been made without

consulting the CAP. However, changes made in the past year, particularly in the process of allocating new FTEs for curricular reform, should lead to the CAP exercising its *de jure* authority in this area.

An additional problem currently facing the CAP concerns its formal and informal composition. In addition to the six elected faculty on the Committee, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty and the Associate Dean of Students are *ex officio* members. During 1999-2000, the two Associate Deans of the Faculty had standing invitations to attend, and two student observers also attended meetings regularly. This represents a recent proliferation of non-elected members and observers. During 2000-2001, only the VPAA/Dean will sit with the committee *ex officio*. The subcommittee recommends that the faculty reevaluate the role of student observers on this committee. The faculty should also reevaluate the merits of the current policy of allowing junior faculty to be elected to the committee, as its work is often both intensive and controversial.

Committee on Appointments

The Committee on Appointments (COA) is the faculty's personnel committee. It advises the President in matters of appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, faculty development, and the awarding of Faculty Fellowships.

Two key questions concerning the role of the COA can be identified: first, the allocation of funds to support research and teaching and the signals this sends to faculty concerning the appropriate mix of teaching, scholarship, and service; second, the participation of the COA in tenure and reappointment decisions.

a.) The allocation of resources: Liberal arts colleges traditionally exhibit some tension between teaching and scholarship. Hamilton College provides a relatively supportive environment for scholarship. However, some members of the COA have expressed concerns that the college does not send enough signals to the faculty concerning the importance of scholarship and that the resources devoted to faculty scholarship are substandard in comparison to those at top tier liberal arts colleges. The subcommittee recommends that the College conduct a systematic comparison of research support at peer institutions and clarify the need for additional support at Hamilton

b.) Tenure and reappointment: In 1994 the role of the COA in the tenure and reappointment process was changed so that files would proceed directly to the COA before review by the Dean of the Faculty. With this change, the COA believes that its charge and contact with members of the administration are appropriate. Members of the committee made two specific recommendations about the process of tenure and reappointment. First, junior faculty need to be given clearer signals at the time of reappointment, and the VP/Dean should provide more guidance to department/program chairs concerning the criteria for reappointment and methods of providing feedback to junior faculty.

Second, new formats for the appeals process should be considered. At the present time the VP/Dean and President play significant roles in both the tenure/reappointment and appeals processes. This can create the appearance that the VP/Dean and President fill the dual roles of judge and appellant. The subcommittee recommends that COA investigate the appeals procedures at other institutions and report to the faculty about possible modifications in the process.

The COA is composed of six tenured members of the faculty. No administrators or additional observers sit with the Committee. Associate professors can and do serve on this committee, and the subcommittee recommends that the faculty periodically evaluate the role of associate professors on the committee.

Budgetary and Planning Processes

A central problem of faculty governance at the College has been that the faculty lacks both information about and influence over budgeting and planning decisions at the College. This is true at the level of faculty committees, departments and programs, and the Dean of Faculty's office.

To remedy this problem, President Tobin has proposed two new initiatives: First, the position of Dean of the Faculty has been redefined as Vice President for Academic Affairs /Dean of Faculty, with authority over institutional budgets. Second, the President will ask the Academic Council to bring to the faculty a proposal for a new standing Committee on Budget and Finance. This committee, chaired by a faculty member, will supersede the present Vice President's Advisory Committee on Administration and Finance and will advise the administration and report to the Faculty on, among other things, development of the annual budget, institutional priorities, and capital expenditures, faculty and staff compensation and benefits, criteria and procedures for allocation of resources, and financial and budget projections.

The Planning Committee advises the President on long-term planning for the College. Its membership includes three faculty members in addition to senior officers of the college and two students and has, in recent years, included broader institutional representation. The committee is a subcommittee of the Trustee Planning Committee. The subcommittee recommends that faculty members from this committee report to the faculty on a regular basis.

When President Tobin returned in December, 1999 from a six-month sabbatical, the Board of Trustees charged him with developing, with the assistance of the officers of the College, a draft of a strategic plan for the next three to five years and to present it to the Trustees in September, 2000. A draft of this plan has been shared with the three faculty members of the On-Campus Planning Committee. After the Trustees review the draft, they will send it to the On-Campus Planning Committee, which is to discuss it and present it to the larger community for a broader discussion during academic year 2000-2001. The subcommittee is concerned that the Trustees directed that the draft be developed without the involvement of the community. President Tobin has assured the faculty and all members of the campus community that the strategic planning process will provide ample opportunity for discussion and consultation.

This section incorporates recommendations from the subcommittee that the faculty and College consider a number of structural changes to the governance processes. In considering such changes, however, the subcommittee warned against a further proliferation of the number of committees and layers of administration. It did not, for example, advocate adding a Provost as an additional layer of administration between the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty and the President.

The Faculty Meeting

The faculty meeting is the core academic decision-making arena of the college. All decisions are based on the vote of the faculty members present at the faculty meeting. This essential function has remained unchanged from the time when the Hamilton College faculty numbered less than 50 and could meet around a large table. Both the faculty survey and interviews with committees indicate that most faculty members oppose substantial structural changes to the present system, such as replacing the current system of faculty meetings with a Faculty Senate. Still, many have criticisms of the faculty meetings. Members of committees complain that months of work are often undone in a single meeting. A significant minority of survey respondents (25%) do advocate a move to a Senate structure, and 33% of respondents included a Senate as one of their preferred choices. (The latter percentage includes the 15 surveys with multiple marked answers to this question -- those responses are not reported in the tables in the appendix to this section.)

The Faculty of Hamilton College has traditionally had a strong participatory ethos. The advantage of the faculty meeting is its ability to promote participatory rather than representative democracy: all members of the faculty represent themselves and each has a voice as well as a vote. Although the College is large enough to make faculty meetings cumbersome, it may not be not so large as to necessitate a faculty Senate or other form of indirect representation, and there appears to be insufficient interest among the faculty to recommend that such a change be seriously considered. A survey conducted by the Dean of Faculty's office last fall indicates that our system of faculty meetings is typical among peer institutions of our size.

Some of the disadvantages of the faculty meeting, as noted by survey respondents, are its cumbersome nature, its tendency to demoralize members of elected committees by negating their work, and the fact that attendance is necessary to vote. Some faculty members approve of this latter requirement, but others complain that it unfairly punishes those who feel they are too busy to sit through lengthy and tedious floor debates. (The *Faculty Handbook* [III.C] enumerates attendance at faculty meetings among the duties of members of the faculty.)

Departments and Divisions

Some faculty perceive that there has been a qualitative expansion of the role of administrators in the governance of the College in recent years and a corresponding de-emphasis on the role of departments. During the 1998-99 and 1999-

2000 academic years, monthly chairs' meetings were sporadic and *pro forma*. Many faculty members believe this is a positive trend because it encourages a more interdisciplinary curriculum. Others expressed concerns, citing the traditional importance of disciplines in protecting academic freedom and faculty autonomy.

There is some interest among the faculty in moving to a more divisionally organized governance structure for the purposes of long-term budgeting and planning. However, there is also considerable resistance to the addition of new layers of administrative bureaucracy, and the subcommittee did not find widespread support for the creation of formal administrative divisions.

The Board of Trustees

The Board of Trustees is the final authority for all decisions at the College, including tenure, reappointment, and fiduciary matters. The trustees work closely with the President and senior officers of the College and in conjunction with the faculty to establish general policies to govern residential life, athletics, communications and development. Members of the faculty and students serve on every standing committee of the trustees. In addition, faculty members are offered opportunities to interact periodically with trustees. The composition of the board would be strengthened by the inclusion of more educators, minorities, and women; President Tobin and the trustees themselves share this view.

Communications and Development, and Admissions

The Office of Communications and Development supports the college's educational mission through its fundraising efforts, by publicizing Hamilton's academic programs, and by increasing public awareness of the research and publications of faculty members. Since the appointment of Richard Tantillo as Vice President for Communications and Development, the office has become increasingly effective in this activity. Among the initiatives supported by the Office of Communications and Development are the establishment of twelve new endowed faculty chairs and the establishment of two new faculty prizes for excellence in teaching: the Lang Prize, given annually to a senior member of the faculty, and the Hatch Prize, given annually to a faculty member with five or fewer years experience. Funds have also been raised for a Presidential Fund for Faculty Innovation, which enables the President to support innovative curricular ideas. A total of $35 million in new endowment funds has been raised to support student scholarships. The Office of Communications and Development has also helped to publicize faculty achievements, including significant recent publications by and awards to members of our faculty.

Because the desire for favorable publicity and for funds from granting agencies can potentially distort the academic and scholarly agenda, it is important that the faculty maintain its independence in shaping the curriculum and setting individual scholarly agendas.

Faculty involvement in the admissions process has improved dramatically in recent years under the current Dean of Admissions and Financial Aid. The Office of Admissions has worked closely with members of the faculty over the past six years in an effort to recruit a more academically talented, engaged and diverse student body to Hamilton College. This relationship has involved faculty at every level of the recruitment and selection process. From speaking at on-campus open house programs to off-campus receptions; from writing letters to top applicants to selecting scholarship winners; to serving on the Faculty Admission Committee and providing input on policy decisions, faculty have been instrumental in the steady progress the College has made in improving the academic and personal credentials of our incoming students.

Student Governance

The Hamilton College student government is called the Student Assembly. It is comprised of three branches: the Judicial Branch, consisting of the Judicial board, the Honor Court, and the Appeals Board; the Community Forum Branch, consisting of the Community Conference Committee (CCC); and the Executive Branch, consisting of the Central Council. The Student Assembly has five main functions: to provide a directing force for activities that are not directly under the control of the faculty and the administration; to provide the governing bodies of the college with an understanding of student sentiments; to develop a sense of responsibility for the College and its welfare among students; to encourage and coordinate essential student services; and to pass legislation in accordance with the desires of the student body.

There is some concern among the student body that the student government is not maintaining strong and open lines of communication with its constituencies. There were several suggestions from the student body on ways to remedy this problem. They included increasing public relations between the Central Council and the general student population through a New England Town Meeting format held in a central location on campus and a regularly published newsletter informing students of the activities of the Central Council and offering information on how to contact representatives. Another concern deals with the representation of students present in the various branches, specifically, the lack of minority students involved. In order to enhance the image of the student government, the general feeling was that the elections needed to be given a higher profile in order to engage a wider range of students in the process and increase voter participation.

Although the general feeling was that students are appropriately included on college-wide committees, many students and faculty members have expressed concern that the same students were chosen as representatives on every committee, so that governance draws from a small percentage of students and does not benefit from the widest possible range of student involvement. In order to fix this problem it was suggested that recommendations for student representatives be taken from the faculty and evaluated by the chair of the committee.

Staff

The College benefits from the services of a talented and dedicated staff. Under President Tobin's administration, a Staff Advisory Committee has been established to relate staff concerns to the administration. Although this represents an improvement in the relationship between the staff and administration, members of the Staff Advisory Committee would like to see a change in the structure of the committee. They would prefer to have an elected staff member chair the meetings, with a member of the administration sitting as an *ex officio* member. In addition to meeting with the President once each semester, the Staff Advisory Council would also like to meet with the senior officers of the College at least once a year to voice their concerns.

Although the relationship between the administration and staff has improved in recent years, a survey of staff members by Professor of Sociology Dennis Gilbert pointed to widespread dissatisfaction with compensation. Staff salaries were said to be inadequate, to have failed to keep up with increases in the cost of living, and to rise slowly with work experience.

In response to these concerns, President Tobin charged the Personnel Office to develop strategies to address the overall level of staff salaries at Hamilton, to differentiate levels of merit, and to recognize long-term service to the college. In July, 2000, staff starting rates were increased by an average of 7%. To assure internal equity and provide recognition for service to the College, a commitment was made to provide equity adjustments for approximately 65% of the staff. Merit increase guidelines were tightened to provide increased differentiation based on performance. In July, 2000, staff merit increases ranged from 2% to 6%.

Another major initiative in the year 2000 was the equalization of tuition benefits for dependent children. Staff members are now eligible to receive financial support for dependent children attending schools other than Hamilton. This change came about as the result of longstanding efforts of the staff and of several years of work by President Tobin, senior officers, and members of the faculty Vice President's Advisory Committee.

To help build an increased sense of community, the Personnel Office has also organized seminars, recreational events, and a trip to New York City. The Staff Advisory Committee is considering other suggestions for recognizing service to the College.

Staff members have been asked to serve on various college committees in the past few years. This is a positive trend, and the College would benefit from soliciting more input from staff on ways to improve the day-to-day workings of the College. The staff also feel that in order to be contributing members of the community, it is important that they continue to be involved in matters that affect the college as a whole.

Report on Faculty and Governance

Recommendations

Faculty and Teaching Staff

- That improved strategies for recruitment and retention of faculty of color and women be a priority for the College

- That the College study of the use of adjunct faculty and develop written guidelines to govern the hiring, evaluation, and support of adjuncts.

Academic Resources and Support

- That the College, in close consultation with the faculty, set as a priority the investment of resources into the improvement of academic facilities

- That the College conduct a review of research support at peer institutions and examine the need for additional support at Hamilton

College Governance

- That the Board of Trustees evaluate its membership with attention to ensuring the presence of educators, minorities, and women

- That the faculty periodically evaluate the procedures of its faculty meetings to ensure that the work of faculty committees reporting to the faculty is considered in the most constructive manner and that, since the faculty favors a participatory model of governance, meetings attract as broad a representation of faculty members as possible

- That the College evaluate the use of faculty time invested in service, in comparison to teaching and scholarship, and explore ways in which service responsibilities can be streamlined and distributed more equitably

- That the College consider mechanisms for increasing staff involvement in governance processes

Committee-Related Issues

- That the Committee on Academic Policy periodically evaluate the participation of student observers on the committee

- That the Committee on Academic Policy be consulted in a timely fashion about any decisions regarding new or changed FTE's.

- That the Committee on Appointments conduct a review of the appeals process at peer institutions and report to the faculty on alternative models that ease the current conflict in the roles played by the VPAA/Dean and the President in the reappointment and appeals procedures

- That the Staff Advisory Committee be chaired by an elected staff member, with a member of the administration sitting as an ex officio member

Compensation and Rewards

- That the College review the structures of compensation and reward for administration, faculty and staff; the criteria by which increases are made; and the mechanisms by which this information is communicated to its constituents

- That the College invest whatever resources are necessary to ensure that salaries and benefits for staff members be equitable with those of local markets and reward long-term commitment to the College

Student Government

- That the student government consider ways to expand the diversity of its membership and its representation on College-wide committees, and that it open more widely the lines of communication with its constituencies

Appendix 1: Faculty Survey

Faculty Survey from the Middle States Subcommittee on Faculty and Governance, January 2000: Questions and Responses

---

Survey Questions:

A: Personal Information:

1. My current status is
   a. non-tenure-track faculty
   b. junior tenure-track faculty
   c. tenured faculty

2. My appointment is
   a. full time
   b. part time

B. Questions Concerning Faculty Governance:

1. The current system of decision-making, based on majority vote of all those present at the faculty meeting, serves the faculty well.
   a. agree strongly
   b. agree
   c. disagree
   d. disagree strongly

2. What system of faculty decision-making do you think would be most effective at Hamilton College?
   a. the present system of faculty meetings
   b. voting on some issues by ballot of the whole faculty (e.g., by mail)
   c. a faculty senate (committees elected by the senate; voting by the senate)
   d. committees appointed by the Dean (voting by the whole faculty)
   e. other

3. The current set of faculty committees adequately serves the needs of the College.
   a. agree strongly
   b. agree
   c. disagree
   d. disagree strongly

4. In general, faculty at Hamilton are
   a. not sufficiently involved in service/governance
   b. participating appropriately in service/governance
   c. overburdened by demands of service/governance

C. Questions Concerning the College's Evaluation and Support of Faculty:

1. The College's expectations regarding teaching, scholarship, and service are appropriate.
   a. agree strongly
   b. agree
   c. disagree
   d. disagree strongly

2. The College's expectations regarding teaching, scholarship, and service are clearly communicated to its faculty.
   a. agree strongly
   b. agree
   c. disagree
   d. disagree strongly

3. The College's mechanisms for evaluating teaching, scholarship, and service are effective.
   a. agree strongly
   b. agree
   c. disagree
   d. disagree strongly

4. The mechanisms for rewarding teaching, scholarship, and service are effective in promoting excellence.
   a. agree strongly
   b. agree
   c. disagree
   d. disagree strongly

5. The College mentors its faculty effectively.
   a. agree strongly
   b. agree
   c. disagree
   d. disagree strongly

Appendix 2: Survey Responses

The numbers of responses noted on the bottom row are the numbers of responses for each question. For each question, the responses reported here do not include responses with multiple answers circled, so a number of responses less than 88 on a question indicates blank or multiple answers by some respondents.

all faculty: (88 responses)

	A1	A2	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
a	12	77	12	27	11	13	11	7	3	0	2
b	10	5	42	20	44	35	53	38	41	23	23
c	64		20	17	21	26	13	29	25	47	40
d			11	2	8	0	6	8	9	12	11
e				2							
# of responses	86	82	85	68	84	74	83	82	78	82	76

tenured faculty only: (64 responses)

	A1	A2	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
a	0	59	9	24	8	11	10	7	3	0	2
b	0	3	29	9	31	21	34	26	30	16	15
c	64		14	13	17	22	13	23	20	34	30
d			11	1	7	0	3	4	6	11	9
e				2							
# of responses	64	62	63	49	63	54	60	60	59	61	56

junior tenure track faculty only: (10 responses)

	A1	A2	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
a	0	8	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
b	10	0	7	5	5	5	8	5	4	3	5
c	0		2	1	2	2	0	2	3	6	1
d			0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2
e				0							
# of responses	10	8	9	7	8	8	10	9	8	9	8

non tenure track faculty only: (12 responses)

	A1	A2	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
a	12	9	3	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
b	0	2	4	4	7	8	10	6	6	3	3
c	0		4	3	2	2	0	4	2	7	7
d			0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
e				0							
# of responses	12	11	11	10	11	11	11	11	9	10	10

faculty who did not report on tenure/tenure-track status: (2 responses)

	A1	A2	B1	B2	B3	B4	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5
a	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
b	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
c	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
d			0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0
e				0							
# of responses	0	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2

Appendix 3: Affirmative Action Report on Faculty Hiring for 1999-2000

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION REPORT ON FACULTY HIRING FOR 1999-2000

Hiring was completed in 1998-99 to fill 32 openings for 1999-00: 8 tenurable positions; 4 term positions; 17 leave replacements or late resignations; 3 visitors. The tenurable positions included positions in Biology, Comparative Literature, Computer Science, English, Math, Physics, Romance Languages (Spanish) and Sociology. Four men and four woman were hired for the tenure-track positions.

Progress in hiring women and minorities during the decade since 1985-86 has been strong: in that year, women held 13% of the tenured (T) and 24% of the tenured plus tenure-track positions (TT); and minorities held 3% of the tenured and 7% of the tenured plus tenure-track positions. The comparable figures for 1999-00 will be 30% and 35% for women, and 5% and 11% for minorities. The chart below illustrates that, over the period from 1991-92 to 1996-97, there was a slow but fairly steady increase in the percentage of women and minorities who were tenured or tenure-track. In that period, the percentage of women as total of full-time faculty varied by 1% (from 37% to 38%). The percentage of faculty of color who were tenured or tenure-track rose slightly from 1991-98.

In the years 1997-98 and 1998-99, however, we saw the first decrease in the percentages of tenured and tenure-track faculty for both women faculty and faculty of color. There was a 1% decrease in tenured and tenure-track women faculty in 1997-98 and a 2% decrease for women in all three categories (tenured, tenure-track, and percentage of all full-time faculty in 1998-99). In 1999-2000, the percentage of tenured positions for women held at 30% with a slight increase of 1% in the combined tenured and tenure-track category, and a fairly large jump of 3% in the total full-time faculty.

<div align="center">Women</div>

Year	T	T/TT	all full-time faculty (includes visiting)
91-92	24%	32%	37%
92-93	25%	34%	38%
93-94	27%	35%	38%
94-95	27%	34%	38%
95-96	31%	36%	39%
96-97	31%	37%	38%
97-98	32%	36%	39%
98-99	30%	34%	37%
99-00	30%	35%	40%

The figures for faculty of color are not as encouraging. In 1997-98 faculty of color increased by 1% in the tenured category and 2% for tenure-track (overall they decreased by 1%). The good news is that faculty of color now represent 14% of

the total faculty (up 3% since 1998-99). But the percentage of tenured faculty of color is down to 5% (from 8% in 1997-98) and the percentage of tenured and tenure-track faculty of color is also down 2% since 1997-98 to 11%. Many of our faculty of color (at least one-third) are visitors (teaching fellows, one-year replacements) and are not stable and continuing members of the faculty. Others have left the College for a number of reasons.

We need to be even more vigilant in our efforts to <u>recruit</u> and <u>retain</u> both women faculty and faculty of color (but especially faculty of color). We are putting in place various strategies to accomplish this and hope to make this a high priority in the coming years.

<div align="center">Minorities</div>

<u>Year</u>	T	T/TT	<u>all full-time faculty</u>
91-92	04%	07%	09%
92-93	06%	10%	10%
93-94	07%	10%	11%
94-95	07%	10%	11%
95-96	07%	10%	12%
96-97	07%	11%	12%
97-98	08%	13%	11%
98-99	06%	10%	11%
99-00	05%	11%	14%

Appendix 4: Staff Survey Conducted by Professor Dennis Gilbert, Department of Sociology

Dear Hamilton Staff Member:

This month the Staff Advisory Committee will be meeting with Acting President Thomas Schwarz to discuss salary, benefits, and other issues of concern to staff. In order to better represent you, the Council is conducting this survey to learn more about the concerns, opinions, and current compensation of staff members.

This an anonymous survey. Do not put your name on this questionnaire. Your responses will be combined with others and analyzed statistically by Professor Dennis Gilbert of the Sociology Department. After this is done, the questionnaires will be destroyed. No individual responses will be released in any form.

We would appreciate your taking a few minutes to fill out this questionnaire. We need responses from the vast majority of staff members in order to obtain statistically valid results. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope by Friday November 5.

Thank you

Important: check only ONE answer to each question.

Q1 Which of the following items is MOST IMPORTANT to you in the discussions between the Council and the College.

1[ ] SALARY

2[ ] TUITION BENEFITS

3[ ] HEALTH BENEFITS

4[ ] VACATION/SICK TIME BENEFITS

5[ ] RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Q2 Here is the same list. Check the item that is the SECOND MOST IMPORTANT to you in the discussions between the Council and the College.

1[ ] SALARY

2[ ] TUITION BENEFITS

3[ ] HEALTH BENEFITS

4[ ] VACATION/SICK TIME

5[ ] RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Q3 A tuition remission benefit would help parents pay tuition for their children studying at other colleges. If this benefit were available for staff with children in college, would you be likely to use it within the next five years?

1[ ] YES

2[ ] NO

Q4 It has been suggested that a full cost of living increase for everyone should be the first priority in setting staff salaries. Whatever additional funds are available for salaries could be devoted to merit raises and other kinds of salary adjustments. Do you agree or disagree with this approach?

1[ ] AGREE

2[ ] DISAGREE

3[ ] NOT SURE

Q5 Aside from any cost of living raise, how should the College spend funds available for salary increases?

1[ ] MAINLY FOR MERIT INCREASES

2[ ] MAINLY FOR ACROSS THE BOARD INCREASES

3[ ] FOR ACROSS THE BOARD AND MERIT INCREASES, MORE OR LESS EQUALLY

Q6   The College should emphasize
1[ ] RAISING STARTING SALARIES
2[ ] RAISING SALARIES FOR EXPERIENCED EMPLOYEES
3[ ] RAISING SALARIES AT THE SAME RATE FOR BOTH STARTING AND
    EXPERIENCED EMPLOYEES

Q7   What is your current grade level?
1[ ] J
2[ ] K
3[ ] L
4[ ] M
5[ ] N
6[ ] STAFF ASSISTANT

Q8   What is your current hourly wage?
$_____

Q9   How many hours a week do you work
1[ ] 35 HOURS
2[ ] OTHER (please specify):_____HOURS

Q10   How many months a year do you work?
1[ ] NINE
2[ ] TWELVE
3[ ] OTHER

Q11   How long have you worked for the College?
1[ ] LESS THAN A YEAR
2[ ] ONE TO FIVE YEARS
3[ ] FIVE TO TEN YEARS
4[ ] OVER 10 YEARS

Q12   How many years of equivalent work experience did you have before you came
    to Hamilton?
1[ ] LESS THAN A YEAR
2[ ] ONE TO FIVE YEARS
3[ ] FIVE TO TEN YEARS
4[ ] OVER 10 YEARS

Q13   What is your highest level of education or training?

1[ ] LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL

2[ ] HIGH SCHOOL

3[ ] NON-DEGREE SECRETARIAL TRAINING

4[ ] 2-YEAR ASSOCIATES DEGREE (INCLUDING SECRETARIAL OR BUSINESS)

5[ ] SOME COLLEGE, BUT DID NOT RECEIVE ASSOCIATE OR 4-YEAR DEGREE

6[ ] 4-YEAR COLLEGE DEGREE

7[ ] GRADUATE TRAINING OR DEGREE

Q14   Approximately what percentage of your family's income is provided by your work at Hamilton?

1[ ] UNDER 25%

2[ ] 25 TO 50%

3[ ] 50 TO 75%

4[ ] OVER 75%

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements

Q15   Your current salary is consistent with your experience, qualifications and job proficiency.

1[ ]STRONGLY AGREE

2[ ]MOSTLY AGREE

3 [ ]MOSTLY DISAGREE

4[ ]STRONGLY DISAGREE

Q16   Staff salaries at Hamilton are generally reasonable by standards in the Utica-Rome area.

1[ ]STRONGLY AGREE

2[ ]MOSTLY AGREE

3 [ ]MOSTLY DISAGREE

4[ ]STRONGLY DISAGREE

Q17 Staff salaries at Hamilton suggest that the College does not truly respect or value its employees.

1[ ]STRONGLY AGREE

2[ ]MOSTLY AGREE

3 [ ]MOSTLY DISAGREE

4[ ]STRONGLY DISAGREE

Q18 The Staff Advisory Committee provides staff with an effective system of representation.

1[ ]STRONGLY AGREE

2[ ]MOSTLY AGREE

3 [ ]MOSTLY DISAGREE

4[ ]STRONGLY DISAGREE

Q19 Hamilton staff should explore the possibility of forming a union to represent them.

1[ ]STRONGLY AGREE

2[ ]MOSTLY AGREE

3 [ ]MOSTLY DISAGREE

4[ ]STRONGLY DISAGREE

Q20 Hamilton staff do not need a union.

1[ ]STRONGLY AGREE

2[ ]MOSTLY AGREE

3 [ ]MOSTLY DISAGREE

4[ ]STRONGLY DISAGREE

Q21 The College would not fire or otherwise penalize staff who attempted to organize a union.

1[ ]STRONGLY AGREE

2[ ]MOSTLY AGREE

3 [ ]MOSTLY DISAGREE

4[ ]STRONGLY DISAGREE

Thanks again for your help. Please return this questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Appendix 5: Faculty Handbook

Appendix 5 to the Report on Faculty and Governance is not available in electronic form. Hard copy can be found as part of the entire Middle States report in the Dean of Faculty Office (K-J 216) and Burke Library (on Reserve) and may be consulted there.

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Financial Condition

Abstract

Hamilton College completes the decade of the 90s in a very strong financial condition as a result of sound budget management, the successful Campaign for the 90s and New Century Campaign, above-average investment performance, continuing improvement and expansion of facilities, and the strategic use of tax-exempt debt. The challenge for Hamilton in the first decade of the 21st century is to build on its enviable financial strength in order to fulfill its ambition to be one of the nation's preeminent liberal arts colleges. Careful financial planning, as an outgrowth of an overall strategic plan, will continue to insure financial stability and provide ongoing support for the major programmatic initiatives of the College.

Budget Management

The College concluded the 1998-99 fiscal year with a modest operating surplus relative to budget, continuing a long tradition of balanced budgets.

Total revenues for the fiscal year 1998-99 were $72,646,000, up from $45,002,000 in fiscal year 1990-91. During this period, total revenues have grown 82.8% in nominal dollars and 42.0% in inflation-adjusted dollars.

This growth has not been uniform across all of the College's revenue sources. Since 1990-91, tuition and fees as a percentage of the College's total revenues fell to 58.5% in 1998-99 from 61.1% in 1990-91. In addition, government grants and contracts as a percentage of total revenues have decreased to 1.2% in 1998-99 from 3.4% in 1990-91. During the same period, the percentage of total revenues derived from investment return and unrestricted gifts have increased. Investment return (governed by the Board authorized endowment spending policy) as a percentage of total revenues increased to 13.0% in 1998-99 from 10.8% in 1990-91. Unrestricted gifts as a percentage of total revenues increased to 5.4% in 1998-99 from 3.2% in 1990-91.

Total expenditures (inclusive of scholarships) for the fiscal year 1998-99 were $72,612,000, up from $44,586,000 in fiscal year 1990-91. During this period, total expenditures have grown 84.5% in nominal dollars and 43.3% in inflation-adjusted dollars. As with revenues, expenditure increases have not been uniform across all of the College's expenditure categories.

The expenditure category that has grown most significantly relative to total expenditures is scholarship aid. As a percentage of total expenditures, scholarships have grown to 18.5% in 1998-99 from 14.5% in 1990-91. Over the same period, the College's tuition discount rate has grown to 31.6% from 23.6%.

Debt service and benefits have also grown relative to total expenditures. Debt service as a percentage of total expenditures has grown to 4.1% in 1998-99 from 2.0% in 1990-91. This percentage was as high as 5.6% in 1995-96, and decreased from that point due to normal amortization and a subsequent refinancing. Benefits as a percentage of total expenditures have grown to 9.2% in 1998-99 from 8.3% in 1990-91. This percentage peaked at 9.9% in 1993-94 and has been managed downward from that point.

Instruction costs, relative to total expenditures, have remained fairly constant (21.9% in 1998-99 versus 22.5% in 1990-91). Academic support expenditures have decreased in relation to total expenditures (7.7% in 1998-99 versus 9.2% in 1990-91).

Expenditure categories that have decreased significantly relative to total expenditures include maintenance and operations and renewals and replacements. Maintenance and operations as a percentage of total expenditures decreased to 9.4% in 1998-99 from 12.6% in 1990-91. Renewals and replacements as a percentage of total expenditures decreased to 1.1% in 1998-99 from 2.1% in 1990-91.

In most categories of revenue and expenditure Hamilton does not depart significantly from the means of its comparison group. For example, despite the fact that scholarships have grown as a percentage of expenditure over the last decade the discount rate at Hamilton (32%) is only slightly above the mean (31%) for the peer group.

The college's total assets were $534,307,000 as of June 30, 1999, an increase of 159% over the June 30, 1989 level of $206,365,000. The College's net assets (formerly referred to as fund balances) were $436,003,000, an increase of 135% over the June 30, 1989 level of $185,703,000.

Investments

The Board of Trustees, through its Committee on Investment, establishes and monitors adherence to asset allocation and other guidelines for the investment management of the College's endowed funds. The objective of these guidelines is to maximize total return from interest, dividends and capital appreciation over the long term while managing risk within acceptable limits.

Both investment return and endowment gifts made through the Campaign for the 90s and the New Century Campaign have contributed to the growth of the College's endowment. As a result, the market value of the College's investments (endowment and similar funds plus pooled life income and similar funds) has grown to $401,643,000 at June 30, 1999 from $124,947,000 at June 30, 1989 for an increase of 222.2% in nominal dollars and 124.7% in inflation-adjusted dollars.

Overall, the College's long-term return on its investments has been excellent when measured against market and industry standards. Through the year ending June 30, 1999, the College's one, three, five, and ten-year endowment returns have been 18.4%, 17.0%, 19.7% and 13.5% respectively. Ranked against

the colleges and universities which participate in the NACUBO Endowment Study, these one, three, five and ten year returns place the College in the 95th, 63rd, 90th and 70th percentiles, respectively.

Physical Plant

The College takes particular pride in the maintenance of its physical plant. With a rich and varied architectural heritage, the College's facilities are situated on 1,250 acres of woodland, open fields and glens overlooking the Oriskany and Mohawk Valleys of Central New York.

The 62 campus buildings located on 350 of the 1,250 acres comprise 1,471,000 gross square feet of space maintained by 94 FTE maintenance and operation employees. Over the last ten years, the College has constructed or acquired 16 new buildings, adding 126,000 square feet to the annual maintenance schedule, an increase of 9.4%. During the same time, the College has increased the number of employees devoted to maintaining campus buildings and grounds by 12, an increase of 15%. The College makes every reasonable effort to minimize deferred maintenance, realizing that in the long term this is the most efficient and cost-effective maintenance strategy.

Debt Financed Capital Projects

During the past ten years the college has undertaken an ambitious capital projects program, centered on the renovation and expansion of the campus's residential, social and academic facilities. Major projects during the period of 1991 to 1994 included the construction of the Beinecke Student Activities Village, significant renovations to the Science Building and Sage Rink, and renovations to several residence halls and academic buildings. Major projects during the period 1995 to 1997 included the development of the campus communications network, the renovation and expansion of the Delta Upsilon house, and renovations to several residence halls. Major projects in 1998 and 1999 included a significant renovation to the Soper Hall of Commons dining facility, the construction of a new social space annexed to the Beinecke Student Activities Village, and the acquisition, renovation and expansion of several former fraternity houses. The College is in the planning phase of a $45,000,000 expansion and upgrade of its existing science facilities, the largest single capital project ever undertaken by the College. Planned projects in the near future include the acquisition and renovation of additional former fraternity houses and renovation and construction for the social sciences and the Arthur Levitt Public Affairs Center.

Capital projects undertaken in the past ten years have been financed primarily with long-term tax-exempt debt. During this time the College has issued three series of tax-exempt municipal bonds; the Series 1991 bonds (original issuance of $20,408,000 at 6.5%), the Series 1995 bonds (original issuance of $10,780,000 at 5.0%), and the Series 1999 bonds (original issuance of $52,160,000 at 5.0%). The 1999 Series bonds included the refinancing of approximately $20,000,000 under the Series 1991 bonds, with the remainder to be used for new construction and issuance costs. Of 1999 Series bond proceeds, approximately

$14,000,000 has been earmarked for the Science facility expansion. The College expects to finance the remaining cost of the Science facility expansion through a combination of major gifts and an additional debt offering.

The tables in the Appendix to this section highlight the capital projects associated with the series 1991, 1995 and 1999 series bond issuances.

Analysis

It is clear from the previous discussion that the College's financial health is sound. The budget has always been in balance, the endowment has experienced a healthy growth, the employee base has expanded gradually, and the Capital Campaign is about to reach a successful conclusion. This fundamentally healthy financial picture continues even as institutional ambitions and projects have expanded. In the past decade, the College has supported greater levels and more aggressive use of financial aid, increases in faculty salaries to the AAUP 1* level, several facilities renovations associated with the residential life decision, including the renovation of three residences (225 beds) since 1995, and growth (approximately 15%) in the employee base. In the near term there will be even more expenditures for facilities, particularly for major science construction, and additional faculty in support of curricular reform.

Not surprisingly, there have been occasional frictions associated with these developments, and the continuing pressures on the budget require some attention and planning. This need became most evident during the 1998-99 academic year, in which the College took more of a draw ($3.8 million) from endowment earnings than it otherwise would have. The extra draw on endowment was required because a variety of demands had accumulated—for improved faculty salaries, aggressive financial aid, debt service, and added personnel in a variety of areas—such that revenue needed to be expanded accordingly. However, because of robust growth of the endowment, the average yearly draw over the decade was less than the 5% norm (capped at 108% of the previous year's figure). Moreover, with careful management, the College returned to its "normal" formula for the draw for 2000-2001 and ended the 1999-2000 fiscal year with a substantial surplus (as reflected in the audited financial statements in the appendix to this section).

Hamilton is a sound, financially well-managed institution. The challenge for the College in the next decade is to manage and use this financial strength to achieve its strategic goals, goals that will involve significant investments in faculty, programs, and facilities. Careful financial planning, as an outgrowth of an overall strategic plan, will continue to insure financial stability and provide ongoing support for the major initiatives of the College. Sharing financial information and plans with interested and involved constituencies -- in particular, the faculty -- is an important and necessary objective as we plan for the next ten years.

Recommendations

- That the College continue its development of a three-five year budgetary plan as part of its planning process.

- That there be more frequent and substantive sharing of financial information with a variety of constituencies, particularly the Faculty, through its Committee on Budget and Finance

Appendix 1: Debt Financed Capital Projects

HAMILTON COLLEGE
Debt Financed Capital Projects
1991 Series Bonds

Project	Use	Financed Cost
Student Activities Village	student services	3,700,000
Martin's Way (1st phase)	land improvement	800,000
Science Building	academic	2,650,000
Sage Hockey Rink	academic	2,700,000
Kirner Johnson	academic	1,200,000
List	academic	1,100,000
Bristol Campus Center	student services	1,950,000
Carnegie	dormitory	2,600,000
South	dormitory	2,900,000
Total		19,600,000

HAMILTON COLLEGE
Debt Financed Capital Projects
1995 Series Bonds

Project	Use	Financed Cost
Renovations and Additions to:		
Bundy Apartments		
Griffin Road Apartments		
TDX House		
Root Farmhouse		
Rodgers House		
Sanders House		
Dunham Hall		
		5,950,000
Campus Communications Network		1,450,000
Delta Upsilon Renovation and Expansion		3,000,000
		10,400,000

HAMILTON COLLEGE
Debt Financed Capital Projects
1999 Series Bonds

Project	Use	Financed Cost	Status
Former Fraternity Houses			
Chi Psi	social space	1,200,000	In progress
Delta Kappa Epsilon	dormitory	1,550,000	In progress
Psi Upsilon	dormitory	1,150,000	In progress
Alpha Delta Phi	dormitory	0	In progress
Emerson Literary Society	academic	300,000	In progress
Sigma Phi	office space	1,600,000	Planning
Commons Dining Hall	dining hall	3,250,000	Completed
Rudd Health Center / Martin's Way	student serv	500,000	In progress
Renovate Science (1st Phase)	academic	14,000,000	Planning
Modernize Benedict, Couper, Christian Johnson	academic	1,000,000	In progress
New Social Space	social space	2,000,000	Completed
Levitt Center	academic	3,000,000	Planning
New Office Space	office space	500,000	In progress
Total		30,050,000	

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Library and Information Technology Services

Abstract

The Hamilton College Library, in its relationship with Information Technology Services, is the Special Topic of the Middle States Accreditation Report. The Library and ITS Subcommittee was guided by a charge from the Steering Committee to consider nineteen questions addressed to how well the Library and ITS meet the needs of faculty and students now and in the foreseeable future. These questions were placed under four broad headings as follows: (1) evolving print and electronic media; (2) adequacy of facilities and human resources; (3) evolving division of labor between the Library and ITS; (4) effectiveness of Library and ITS services delivered to users.

Highlights

- The recent search for a new librarian has highlighted the increasing importance of the Library and ITS support for the educational mission of the College.

- The Library and ITS not only provide support for faculty and students but also have become increasingly integral to the curriculum; for example, recent curricular reforms highlight the need to recognize and integrate library and ITS personnel at levels of governance that affect their operations.

- The recent curricular reforms highlight an increasing demand on Library and ITS human resources for instructional as well as normal operational support functions; this demand is driven partly by new technologies and partly by the evolution of the library as a center for the intellectual life of an academic community.

- Facilities for print media, film, videotape, special collections, archives, rare books, staff offices, instruction classrooms, and equipment are inadequate; for some uses the scarcity of library space approaches a crisis; the configuration of Burke Library makes solutions to space problems more difficult.

- Print media will continue to be important in the foreseeable future; there will be a continuum of print and digital media that evolves in response to the particular needs of departments, programs, and individual users; digital media have made inroads in online periodicals, for example, but remain problematic for monographs; the Hamilton Library, and libraries in general, face difficult choices due in part to the increasing commercialization of print media and the aggressive drive for corporate profit.

- Innovation and growth in digital media will continue unabated; Library and ITS will continue to be guided in their selection of technologies by the changing

needs of users; the general strategy is to err on the side of tested and proven products.

- The demand for faculty and student remote access to librarians, collections, and library resources will continue to grow in importance, raising provocative questions about how the physical spaces of the library will be used in the foreseeable future; new pedagogies, including those which embrace group projects and collaborative learning, suggest new configurations of space in addition to those that meet the demand for solitary spaces for individual learning in carrels.

Basic Description of Operations

The Hamilton College Library and Information Technology Services are separate administrative organizations that cooperate to make current services more effective while expanding services to meet new faculty and student needs. Both organizations recognize their shared role in keeping Hamilton competitive with peer institutions that offer excellence in liberal arts education. Over the last two decades, the Library and ITS have forged an increasingly interdependent relationship on an *ad hoc* basis. Library and ITS staff together provide for the operation and maintenance of essential computer systems and facilities. They cooperate in the selection of, and access to, print, video and electronic information resources. They train faculty and students in the use of bibliographic resources, both print and electronic, support faculty and student research, support classroom instruction, and plan in order to meet the growing demand for print and electronic media.

The Hamilton College Library is composed of the Daniel Burke Library, Media Library, Music Record Library, and Science Library. Information Technology Services is located primarily in the Library. The Library provides its services through five Divisions. They are Public Services, Technical Services, Classroom Services, Systems, and Specialized Faculty Support. Public Services comprise Reference, Circulation and Reserves, Interlibrary Loan/Document Delivery, and the Science, Music and Media Branch libraries. Technical Services comprise Acquisitions and Fund Accounting, Serials, Processing and Binding, and Cataloging and Classification. Classroom Services provide audiovisual support. Systems provide planning, development, installation and maintenance of the Library online infrastructure. Specialized Faculty Support includes a Graphic Artist and Photographer for faculty publications, departmental promotions, and exhibits. The Library organization is made up of 9.5 librarians, 4 other profess-ionals and 22.5 support staff (see Appendix 3 for organizational chart). The system is under the direction of the College Librarian, who reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty.

Information Technology Services (ITS) delivers its services through six teams. These include Instructional Technology Services, Helpdesk Services, Consulting Services, Network Services, Administrative Computing Services, and Telephone Services (see Appendix 1 for organizational chart). ITS currently has 19.6 staff providing support for computing, networking, and telephone services in addition to forty-five students who work part-time in a variety of capacities. ITS is

headed by the Director of Information Technology Services, who reports to the Vice President of Administration and Finance.

Recent History

This year marks a critical juncture in the joint cooperation of the two organizations as the Library and ITS have become more important in campus intellectual life. Today the Library and ITS face challenges that require sustained attention to working more closely together and with those for whom they provide support.

The growing importance of electronic media to the Library dates from 1974 when it joined the On-line Ohio College Library Center (OCLC), a bibliographic utility. This enabled the Library to reclassify its collections, acquire machine-readable records, and utilize OCLC Cataloging, Serials Control and Interlibrary Loan systems. More generally, it created an environment in which the Library could begin to draw upon an array of electronic technologies that have affected an on-going transformation of its management procedures, educational and re-search resources, and instructional services. In 1989, the Library implemented the VTLS Integrated Library System including the on-line catalog, circulation, cataloging, serials control, acquisitions, and fund accounting, authority control, and a document request and delivery system.

The installation of the library Novell network, the campus data network, and Internet access has significantly changed.how the Library fulfills its role as an information provider. When bibliographic tools such as FirstSearch and e-mail access became available, these tools gave Library users direct access to monographic and journal citations, book reviews, dissertations and other resources. This access occurred first in CD-ROM databases such as Public Affairs Information Service, Sociofile, Econlit, America History and Life, and Newspaper and Periodical Abstracts. In the early 1990s, major upgrades were made to accommodate growth in collections and in usage of the system, to streamline acquisition processes, and to facilitate resource sharing in the region. As on-line information services increased in sophistication, Library staff increas-ingly worked with database vendors to provide online searching and other electronic resources to patrons. Formerly, a librarian mediated the searching of databases with the faculty member or student present. During 1998-1999, new servers were installed that provided file and print services to staff and public workstations, information on CD-ROM databases, an acquisitions system, Library home pages, electronic reserves, and Real audio and Video services. Hamilton libraries currently have twenty-five networked public workstations providing access to 131 full text, and bibliographic databases, the Internet, the online catalog, multimedia resources, and electronic reserves. In addition, the library now provides access to all CD-ROM databases in offices and residence halls. Through an outside vendor, Obvia, the library also provides members of the Hamilton community with remote access to all Internet-based databases anywhere in the world from their home computers, as well as offices and residence halls.

During the last two decades, ITS moved from providing limited computer support for administration and selected faculty to taking on responsibility for a wide range of services that bear directly on Hamilton's academic mission. These services include the management of the hardware and software owned by the college but used by faculty and students, support for the widespread faculty deployment of electronic media and information technology in connection with courses, and the creation and maintenance of a stable and reliable information technology infrastructure.

The use of electronic media in educational settings increased significantly during the last decade. ITS currently supports 120 computers in public-access laboratory-classrooms. In collaboration with Audio-Visual Services, ITS also maintains twenty classrooms with ceiling mounted data projectors that are equipped with computers to enable faculty and students to use digital images and have access to Internet resources. There are also three portable projectors, scheduled through AV, and laptop computers, available through ITS, to support them. These are in constant use by faculty in non-equipped classrooms. In 1997, Hamilton created the Remote Collaboration Facility (RCF), jointly supported by ITS and AV. The RCF not only supports teaching off-campus students, but it also brings off-campus experts into contact with students through videoconferencing. ITS also manages and maintains 100 printers and 1100 college-owned computers that are in use by faculty, students, and administrators. A decade ago the number was 350. In 1998, at President Tobin's request, the Trustees approved an annual operating budget for the regular replacement of desktop computer hardware and network servers and electronics. As a result, Hamilton enjoys one of the first fully funded replacement plans for computer and network equipment in a liberal arts college.

In the fall of 1995, the creation of a high-speed campus data network marked the most important change in ITS operations, one that is further reshaping the role of the Library and its methods of providing services. The campus network provides 3,000 connections, one in every classroom, public space, office, and one for each student in residence hall rooms. All faculty and staff and more than 90% of students currently have their own computers connected to the network. Access to the network from off campus, both electronic mail and the Internet, is now available to faculty and staff. Networking of the campus and its increasing use from off-campus have encouraged the entire Hamilton community to develop a greater dependence upon a variety of electronic technologies such as networked printing and copying services, file and software sharing, and the resources made available by the Library. The network has been upgraded recently to increase speed by a factor of ten to meet the growing use by students, faculty, and staff from both on and off campus.

Issues

The Library and ITS entered the academic year 1999-2000 armed with an extensive array of educational and research tools for meeting challenges in a number of key areas. These include the rapidity of the development of these resources, the trial and error character required of some innovations, and the

shifting budgetary and personnel needs accompanying the growth of the print and electronic environment.

Materials and Collections

The Library's collections include books, journals, newspapers, magazines, maps, films, videotape recordings, music records, tape recordings, CD-ROMs, and musical scores, as well as rare books, archives, and special collections. They exist in variable and mixed media, such as print, digital, and microform, the forms reflecting the preferences of their users. Scientists, for example, generally have led others in transforming their journals from print to full text online, whereas humanists find that monographs and anthologies retain their primary value in print. Most disciplines have settled into a mix of different media. The question is not whether or when print will give way to digital media, but how different media continue to meet the needs of particular departments, programs, faculty, and students.

The Library maintains a remarkably comprehensive print collection in support of the undergraduate curriculum and faculty research. There are 556,033 volumes in the print collection, to which about 12,500 are added each year. The Library maintains subscriptions to 2,540 current periodicals. Periodical expenditures per student in FY 1999 were $734. The Library also maintains accessible and notable special research collections in the following areas: a Civil War Collection; the Beinecke Lesser Antilles Collection; the Munsell Collection; the Ezra Pound Collection; the Communal Societies Collection (including the Brooks notable books collection); an Early Utica Imprints Collection; the Hamilton Collection (including faculty publications); and the Alumni Collection.

Beyond questions of convenience to patrons and their preferences, a number of variables influence the evaluation of print and electronic resources. These include accessibility of format and costs that vary considerably and are in flux due to the current trend toward the commercialization of information databases. The cost of electronic and print journals, especially those in the sciences, is now the single biggest item in the Library's operating budget. This dual acquisition process places new demands on librarians, who must devote increasing amounts of time to the evaluation and comparison of available material, negotiating annual arrangements with consortia to gain access to electronic databases at discounted rates, negotiating licenses with vendors, and monitoring the College's compliance with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act of 1998. The increased reliance on electronic resources requires specialized cataloging and collection management expertise, knowledge of software, search and retrieval techniques, and new methods of inventory control. There is a pressing need to engage in continuous retraining of library support staff.

The digitization of some collections or parts of collections made available by the Library to the Hamilton community has increased in number each year, which underscores the need to continue to increase its operating budget to acquire new print and electronic media. This dual acquisitions process is likely to persist for the foreseeable future.

Technological Infrastructure

Digitization of some collections requires an increase in ITS operating budgets to strengthen and improve the campus network. Chief among the technology infra-structural requirements is the charge to ITS to guarantee the availability, reliability, and efficiency of the campus network. By the "network" we mean three things: (1) the inter- and intra building *wiring and electronics* that move electronic resources to and from the user; (2) *college servers* (computers) that house the electronic resources; (3) our *connection* to the Internet. The annual operating budget allows for the regular replacement of desktop computer hardware and software and network servers/electronics, which insures the consistent upgrading of key components of the network. A number of system-wide upgrades have just been completed, including an increase in the speed of the campus network and Hamilton's connection to the Internet. Upgrading the network infrastructure on a regular basis will be essential for keeping up with the increased transmission of multimedia materials.

In addition to system-wide upgrades, the Library must acquire and replace standard library technology such as servers and microform readers on a regular basis. This becomes a problem when the current equipment needs of the Library, other than computers, are not generally a part of its annual operating budgets. Equipment budgets throughout the Hamilton campus, including the Library, have not been allowed to grow in recent years. The role of the Library as electronic information provider has also created a need for the replacement of newer kinds of equipment, such as scanners, data projectors, and DVD players.

Instructional and Other User Services

Both the Library and ITS provide instructional and other services to faculty and students that are critical to the College's educational mission. These services, though administered separately, and distinct in character, complement and reinforce each other in addressing new demands that have arisen with the increased sophistication of the electronic environment at Hamilton.

The growing access to the Library through the network has stimulated demand for its services during evenings and on weekends, placing an additional burden on its technicians and technical systems. The College has recently approved satellite reception of foreign language broadcasts (begins January 2001) and down-linking for teleconferencing (Summer 2001). These services will place new demands on the Library's audiovisual team.

Librarians continue to be much in demand to assist faculty and students in creating research designs, running bibliographic searches, verifying citations, and other services generally associated with reference departments. At the same time, the increased capacity for on-line database searching, whether in the library or remotely, has made possible an increased degree of self-reliance on the part of patrons and an expanded need for access to databases at all hours. This shift has meant that reference librarians must devote greater amounts of time to educating users about electronic search techniques, a task undertaken both in the library and, at a faculty member's request, in the classroom. Services provided by

the Library's audiovisual team have also changed significantly. Older, simpler, and inexpensive instructional technologies such as slide projectors and VCRs are quickly being complemented or replaced by new, more complex, and more costly ones, such as DVD players and data projectors, the uses of which often require instruction and elaborate support capabilities. The Library's graphic artist and photographer continue to support faculty publishing and the promotion of departments and programs with the development of exhibits and brochures, but the scope of their services has broadened in response to higher expectations to provide multimedia, streaming sound, video production, and digital photography services. The network also places demands on library staff to provide sophisticated methods of reference assistance, reserve reading, and acquisition and interlibrary services delivered on-line. Library staff numbers have not increased in proportion to the user demand for their services and the additional demand on their time associated with managing information technologies.

ITS provides a range of instructional services critical to the technology-based components of Hamilton's educational mission. ITS staff has primary responsibility for maintaining the technological infrastructure in classrooms, which in the case of data projectors it shares with the Library's audiovisual team. Beyond this, it is charged with encouraging faculty in their use of technology in the classroom, assisting them in determining their technology needs, and instructing them in the use of software and hardware for education and research. Training services are performed in a variety of ways, including short courses offered by outside companies, workshops offered by ITS staff, small-group and individual training by appointment, and self-paced training materials available on the web. ITS has implemented web-based course management systems (WebCT and Courseinfo) and Listserv discussion groups for classroom use. These tools are now indispensable to many faculty members. The demand for them will grow as faculty members learn about the capability of such software to enhance classroom learning. Generally speaking, the increased importance of the campus network to the college's educational mission has placed a demand on ITS similar to that placed on the Library--to foster the attainment of a higher degree of technological self-reliance on the part of all members of the Hamilton community.

Facilities

The growing integral relationship between the Library and ITS in Hamilton's educational mission is reflected in the fact that the two operations currently must share the inadequate space available to them in Burke Library. Some ITS staff members use faculty carrels on the third floor of Burke library as offices, while space allotted to library staff is cramped and fully utilized. Because shelving space for print collections is all but depleted, the Library was recently forced to remove two bays of seating - a total of 32 seats - from student use to create new shelf space. Under current plans for the new Science facility, the collections of the Science Library, itself at capacity for a number of years, are to move to Burke, where they will further exacerbate the shortage of space. A storage facility is being planned, which will house selected materials in all disciplines, including the sciences. although the facility will help alleviate some of the space constraints, it is only an interim solution, until an addition to Burke Library can

be built some time in the future. The Media library, housed in Christian Johnson Hall, is also near capacity. The Music Library has space for some music scores to be removed from Burke, but its space is also limited.

The rapid growth in the use of technology in support of Hamilton's educational mission has placed a strain on classroom facilities both campus-wide and in Burke Library. Almost 50% of Hamilton's classrooms now have computers and data projectors (upgraded during summer of 2000), but their use has increased so quickly that additional classrooms must be equipped immediately. This shortage will become acute when the new curriculum, with its emphasis on interdisciplinary learning and public presentations, is implemented. The increased importance of instructional services by librarians and ITS staff has created a new demand for classroom space for use by these staff. Despite the critical importance of their instructional services to Hamilton's educational mission, there are currently no classrooms equipped with computers and data projectors available exclusively for training use by Library and ITS staff on a regular basis.

An increasing number of faculty make use of film and other video media in the classroom. While most classrooms are equipped with video monitors and VHS tape players, new formats such as DVD are becoming common. Classrooms will have to be equipped with the equipment to play video in these formats. There is a need for an increased number of classrooms of appropriate size, ones that have high quality sound and lighting to show advanced video formats.

Planning and Advisory Structures

Library and ITS staff must devote a good deal of time to planning in order to maintain and strengthen the infrastructure and resources at the heart of Hamilton's education mission. This entails a range of activities from keeping abreast of new developments in educational and information technology to negotiating contracts and developing policy on security, copyrights, and privacy. Planning is informed by institutional priorities and budgetary constraints and must also be done in such a way as to address the extremely wide range of needs, skills, and interests of students and faculty. The College Librarian and the Director of ITS have primary responsibility for planning in their respective organizations. Their efforts intersect on two standing committees composed of faculty, administrators, and students, the Committee on the Library and the Committee on Information Technology. There is an *ad hoc* quality to the relationship between the library and ITS. This collaboration needs to be strengthened to avoid the duplication of efforts and to streamline systems that provide classroom support.

Given the emerging integration of library and IT services, it is advisable to combine the two faculty committees with oversight in these areas into one committee with advisory responsibility for all electronic and information resources. This would result in effective use of faculty time while still involving all key constituents represented on the current library and IT committees.

A stronger connection needs to exist between planning for academic programs and planning for support services. Programming changes and

additions to the curriculum have an impact on the Library and ITS services, collections and staffing. This information needs to be shared and the impact assessed prior to implementation of any major new programs or new courses. Having representatives of ITS and the Library sit on academic planning committees would enhance planning for support services.

A more formal integration of Library and IT planning should be developed along one or more of the following lines: change the reporting lines for ITS to the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty; place the Director of the Library and the Director of ITS on major academic policy committees; develop a joint Library/ITS planning group that includes the librarians and team leaders from ITS.

The College needs to strengthen the links between curricular planning, which is the province of the faculty, and planning for the academic support services necessary to implement curricular initiatives and reforms. One way to do so might be to make library and/or ITS staff *ex officio* members of the Committee on Academic Policy. The changes in the College's curriculum recently voted by the faculty will require extensive support from the library and ITS. The proposed Sophomore Seminars, for example, are intended to be interdisciplinary in character and have a public presentation component. These seminars will place substantial demands on Library and ITS budgets and staffs. To take another example, the Library requires advance notice to research, evaluate, and acquire print and electronic resources needed to support new programs such as those in Chinese languages. The Library and ITS should participate in all aspects of the education mission that affect it and are affected by it. This might take the form of procedures, such as requiring impact statements on their operations, or it might take the form of including them in appropriate aspects of governance, such as sitting on curriculum committees. The faculty and administration should also consider the benefits that might accrue to the education mission of the College were librarians and computer specialists to hold the status of non-tenured faculty. Hamilton's new librarian, Randall Ericson, will be charged with integrating the professional librarians and library staff more fully into the campus conversation.

Staffing the Growth in Library and ITS Services

There is a shortage of Library and ITS staff needed to address the increased demand for a range of new services that have accompanied the rapid growth of the Library/ITS technological environment. In the Library, there is no provision for staff backup in case of absence, too few research librarians to staff the reference desk, especially for additional weekend hours, and not enough personnel available to devote their time and attention to development and planning. The Library also needs additional help for its Systems Manager, who is responsible for all library computing from personal computers to the library network and remote access. The increased demand for technological support services in the classroom, whether in the form of instruction in electronic researching from reference librarians or the delivery of classroom equipment by the Library's audiovisual team, has placed unprecedented demands on the current staff of the Library.

Although comparative statistics indicate that Library staffing levels are on par with those of peer institutions, our own statistics include AV staff, the Graphic Artist, and the Photographer, all of whom report to the Librarian but are not involved in the actual operations of Burke Library or the branches. Additional staffing is needed in Systems, Circulation, AV, Cataloging and Reference. In addition, evaluating, selecting, acquiring, and maintaining print and electronic formats have added workload for library staff who have experienced extended hours with no staff increases. One area that has felt the pressure is Circulation, where the addition of electronic reserves has doubled the workload. Print reserves must be entered into VTLS and processed. This involves scanning, cropping and entering the electronic reserves into a database that is then placed onto the web. This has been done with no additional staffing and has affected Circulation, Systems and Reference.

The staffing needs of ITS are driven in part by our success in creating the campus network, upon which most Hamilton offices and departments, academic and otherwise, now depend. To maintain and strengthen these operations, and to monitor them on a twenty-four hour basis, ITS requires additional staff. In addition, the growing use of technology by faculty in their courses requires additional technical assistance.

Technology support will require additional staff who will need office, meeting, and work spaces. Current spaces are inadequate in the Burke Library for both Library and ITS staff. As planning proceeds for the Science facility and the redistribution of departments on campus, it will be important to factor in the improvement of spaces for support staff. In light of national shortages of qualified IT staff, and internal constraints on hiring, it is likely that support staff levels will always lag behind rising needs. It will therefore be essential that clear expectations be developed for which services must be delivered by academic support services organizations (baseline support), which will be the responsibility of the user, and which will not be supported. This is an important role for campus advisory committees. Technology is of little use without investment in the support staff to explain and maintain it. Library resources are made accessible through highly trained reference and support staff. As the use of electronic resources grows in the academic program, additional staff will be needed in many areas. This need for additional staff is, however, complicated by a shortage of qualified information technology support personnel nationally and, in particular, in the central New York region. The inability to attract and retain qualified staff is likely to remain in the foreseeable future an important factor in the development of technological resources for education at Hamilton.

It is vital that staff levels in Library and ITS operations be maintained in a period of increased demand on services vital to curricular reform and to student and faculty research. The College must continue to monitor levels of staffing and compensation as part of Hamilton's efforts to achieve academic excellence.

Five Years Out

Library collection development will face two major challenges in the next five years. First, electronic formats need to be integrated into traditional print

collections in an environment of constrained budgets and rising prices. Second, the development of library collections faces an uncertain future with reference to scholarly publishing, intellectual property rights, and alternative publication avenues for scholarship.

Fewer than five percent of the electronic library resources on the Internet are free. Prices are escalating 7-15% annually, and the growth of scholarly materials, print and electronic, continues. The librarians must help to select, purchase and license databases, provide access to them, instruct users in retrieving and developing electronic publications, and develop methods for archiving electronic publications. Additionally, space is needed for the special equipment to digitize, store and read electronic publications. At the same time, librarians must continue to evaluate, select, acquire and catalog print materials and to maintain and preserve them for users. Storage needs for print materials continue to increase along with the increase in electronic publications.

Beyond creating electronic reserves that support courses, the Library must decide whether creating electronic resources is an activity appropriate to its mission. Digitization of collections is something often more readily undertaken by larger research libraries, due to the costs involved in such an undertaking. Some of the Library's special collections and faculty publications could be digitized and made available on the Web. Such an undertaking, however, carries with it significant staffing and equipment implications.

The next five years will see a change in the nature of scholarly communication, intellectual property rights and alternative publication outlets. New technologies, new business strategies, and new intellectual property laws are changing publishing. These allow huge improvements in speed and accessibility of information, but also increased costs. The Library seeks to contain costs while improving access to information. Higher education will remain dependent on print collections while simultaneously increasing its reliance on electronic resources. The costs to provide access to these electronic resources will likely continue to increase. In spite of negotiated consortium discounts for license agreements and full use of alternative means of document delivery and interlibrary loan, without an increase in library operating budgets Hamilton will experience a decrease in the level of print acquisitions. These materials may not be available for purchase in the future. If so, the development of complete collections in several fields of study that are parts of a Hamilton undergraduate program will be affected.

The use of print and electronic media will continue in a state of transition. Electronic resources, burgeoning in their numbers, complement, rather than replace, materials that are not feasible to digitize. Electronic storage and distribution over the Web are most appropriate for short units of information, such as abstracts, journal articles, commentary and reviews. Ease of use will almost certainly guarantee a high general popularity of the print format for many years to come. Electronic book markets, still in an early stage of development and uncertain of reader response, will not be used as a widespread replacement for print materials in the next five years.

Scientific journals are increasingly consolidated under a few publishers, who make enormous profits. Serial costs have gone up an average of nine percent a year since 1986, and libraries spent 152% more to purchase seven percent fewer titles in 1998 than in 1986. In addition, given the high cost of serials and constraints on operating budgets, libraries are purchasing 25% fewer monographs today than were purchased 15 years ago.

Faculty publication in peer reviewed journals has long been essential to reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Traditionally, journals expect the authors of scholarly articles to sign over their copyright as a condition of publication. With rising serial costs, faculty must consider the budget implications of giving away their copyright. There are alternative mechanisms for retaining copyright on campus while allowing first publication rights in scholarly journals.

Hamilton is part of a national initiative, called Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), to highlight these issues to faculty and administrators. Begun in conjunction with the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), SPARC seeks to transform the system of scholarly communication by persuading faculty, deans, and presidents to reconsider standards for promotion and tenure. The initiative will urge its member institutions, which include hundreds of colleges and universities, to consider accepting publication in non-refereed, electronic journals; to refuse to publish articles in the higher priced journals that are being cancelled by libraries due to costs; and to work with professional organizations to support libraries and faculty in their efforts to control costs by creating more competition in the publishing world.

Expanded support services will be needed to help faculty and students master the library's vast and growing print and electronic resources available for teaching and learning. A recent librarian candidate put the case well when he stated that "Knowledge of the bibliographic structures of scholarly communication and their cognate technologies is surely the birthright of every undergraduate and the badge of the lifelong learner." In addition to mastery of library resources, in the next five years we expect to see substantial growth in the use, by faculty, of all forms of electronic media and information technology in the classroom. The largest growth areas are likely to be among faculty in the social sciences and humanities, affecting the largest number of courses and students. Although the impending curricular changes do not speak directly to the mastery of bibliographic structures of scholarly communication and their cognate technologies, we expect that this will become an issue for many disciplines. It is likely that the staffs of the Library and ITS will be asked to assist in this process.

As the number of technology-enhanced classrooms increases, expanded support services will also be needed to assure that these classroom environments are reliable and utilize up-to-date hardware and software. A more integrated approach needs to be considered for supporting the use of technology in the classroom. The current division between the support provided by audio-visual services and ITS does not adequately serve the needs of faculty. It is time to consider a more formal classroom support team made up of members of these two organizations or the merger of these two organizations.

Given the multifaceted support that faculty and students will need for using electronic resources, it makes sense for the Library and ITS to consider further integration of the services they provide. Developing a cross-department team that includes members from the ITS Instructional Technology Services Team, reference librarians, the Graphic Artist and the Photographer will provide more comprehensive and timely support. Establishment of a multimedia lab with appropriate state of the art equipment and software would provide a much more efficient and helpful way to assist faculty in learning new technologies to develop classes that facilitate classroom learning and help students to prepare their presentations. Such a lab could be housed in a future addition to the library and supported by a subset of this team together with student assistants.

The integration of the Science Library collection with the main collection in Burke, and the correlative need to provide electronic desktop delivery of library resources to the new Science Complex, suggests the need to develop an efficient and customized approach to document delivery. Similar needs will exist in all disciplines as faculty and students rely more heavily on electronic resources in support of the academic program. Through customized web pages librarians could create a gateway to the most useful information resources in various disciplines. For example, a product such as My Library could provide a biology professor with the ability to develop his own web page of resources i.e., Biological Abstracts, as well as off -campus sites licensed by the library. The implementation of such services will have staffing implications.

The most important infrastructure challenge for the next five years will be the continual improvement of our campus network. The network is central to enabling the use of electronic resources in connection with the academic program. Current electronic resources are largely text and still images, but the network will increasingly become the main conduit for distributing all variety of media (e.g., voice, text, images, video). Many of these materials will be part of our electronic library collections. As faculty integrate the use of video, voice, and images into their courses, it will be necessary to distribute these materials to students across the network at all hours of the day and night. Increased use of the network by faculty and students, coupled with more intensive demands for distributing voice and video, will require faster servers, faster electronics, and a faster connection to the Internet.

Current plans for the new science facilities suggest an expanded role for technology in science courses. In the next five years we will need to connect to Internet2 -- a specialized network now being developed and used by the scientific community at large universities -- to support Hamilton's science faculty and students. Internet2 requires even higher speed connections and more specialized hardware that will permit scientists to share large databases and to access specialized scientific resources at other institutions. Internet2 is not a replacement for the current Internet but rather an additional service that will create an even more challenging environment to support.

With rapid changes in the use of electronic equipment in the classroom and in support of the academic program, it will be important to develop a plan for the regular replacement of this equipment. Items such as high quality scanners,

data projectors and all varieties of digital audio/visual equipment will be heavily used and will need regular replacement. Creating operating budgets for this replacement, similar to the computer/network replacement plan, will assure that classroom technology environments will be modern and reliable.

As we move to greater use of electronic resources there will be an increased need to assure that copyright restrictions are observed. The most common approach to doing this is to maintain a proxy server. This computer determines whether the user of electronic resources has the necessary permissions to do so. ITS and Library staff should determine the most cost-effective approach to providing such proxy services.

In the short run, an offsite storage facility to house lesser-used materials is essential and in the planning stages. In the long run, an addition to the library is very much needed, to provide adequate shelving space for a growing collection, to expand the Rare Book Room and to display properly the Library's Special Collections. There is a need to build an electronic classroom and multimedia lab, to improve staff space in Circulation and Interlibrary Loan, and to improve space in the Media Library and for the Graphic Artist and Photographer. Small work spaces for collaborative projects are needed. The music scores should be moved from Burke to the Music Record Library where they belong and preparations must be made for the move of the Science Library collection to Burke and storage.

Facility needs in the next five years include the creation of suitably equipped classrooms with sufficient space to house a growing print and electronic library collection. Provision will need to be made for office and workspace for additional support staff. Classrooms are where instruction begins at Hamilton. It will be necessary to equip classrooms with all varieties of technological support, including computers, data projectors and technical support help. In the classroom of the next five years and beyond, the computer and data projector will become as commonly used as the television and VHS player have been in the last decade. Students and faculty will regularly make presentations that integrate electronic resources from college sources with those from the Internet. To meet this projected demand, the percentage of classrooms equipped with computers and data projectors must increase rapidly in the next five years.

President Tobin and the members of the Board of Trustees have identified the Library and Information Technology Services as the central focus of the next capital campaign. Planning for that campaign will begin during the next eighteen months.

Recommendations

Staffing

- Eliminate the shortage of Library and ITS staff in order to address the increased demand for a raft of new services that have accompanied the rapid growth of the Library/ITS technological environment

Report on Library and Information Technology Services

- Continue to monitor the level of compensation for library and ITS key personnel to ensure that Hamilton College can attract the talent it needs to support its education mission

Facilities

- In the short run, create spaces for current and future Library and ITS staff and for expanded Library and ITS functions mentioned throughout this report

- In the long run, plan for additional space to accommodate the growth in the collection and other expanded uses and ensure the use, display, and enjoyment of the Rare Book Room and Special Collections

- Equip additional classrooms for computers and data projectors immediately

- Create instructional space for Library and ITS staff to meet the demand for new technologies in the classroom as a consequence of recent curricular reforms and innovative learning in the classroom

- Establish a multimedia lab with appropriate state of the art equipment and software that can provide a more efficient and helpful way to assist faculty in learning new technologies that facilitate classroom learning and help students to prepare their presentations

- Increase the number of classrooms of appropriate size, ones that have high quality sound and lighting to show advanced video formats

Budgets

- Increase library operating budgets to ensure that the costs of electronic resources, which no doubt will continue to increase, will not result in a reduction in the level of print acquisitions

- Increase library equipment budgets to meet current equipment needs other than computers and to replace equipment such scanners, data projectors, and DVD players

- Increase ITS operating budgets to strengthen and improve the campus network by means of a number of system-wide upgrades, including an increase in the speed of Hamilton's connection to the Internet

Operations

- Find ways to strengthen Library and ITS collaboration to avoid the duplication of efforts and to streamline systems that provide classroom support

- Consider a more formal classroom support team made up of members of audio-visual services and ITS personnel or the merger of these two organizations

- Develop an inter-departmental team that includes members from the ITS Instructional Technology Services Team, reference librarians, the Graphic Artist and the Photographer that will provide more comprehensive and timely support services

- Combine the now separate Library and IT services faculty committees with oversight in these areas into one committee with advisory responsibility for all electronic and information resources

- Include Library and ITS key personnel in considerations of all aspects of the educational mission that affect them and are affected by them

**Appendix 1: Organizational Chart – Information Technology Services
(10/31/2000)**

Administration and Telephone Services
- David Smallen, Director, ITS
- Marylyn Nassimos, Technology Support Assistant
- Colleen Holliday, Telephone Coordinator

Network Services
- Joseph Karam, Associate Director, ITS, Network Services (Team Leader)
- Dave Roback – Network/Systems administrator
- <Vacant> - Network/Systems administrator

Administrative Computing Services
- Joan Hathaway, Associate Director, ITS, Administrative Computing Services (Team Leader)
- Linda Lacelle, Systems Analyst
- Karin Noggle, Systems Analyst
- <Vacant>, Systems Analyst
- William Ball, Coordinator of Computer Operations

Instructional Technology Support Services
- Nikki Reynolds, Associate Director, ITS, Instructional Technology Support Services (Team Leader)
- Elizabeth Miller, Lab Services Manager
- Luis Luna, Classroom Technology Support Specialist
- Deborah Reichler, Instructional Technologies Specialist
- Janet Simons, Instructional Technologies Specialist
- <Vacant>, Instructional Technologies Specialist, Computer Science Lab Assistant

Helpdesk Services
- Debby Quayle, Associate Director, ITS, Helpdesk/E-mail (Team Leader)
- Scott Paul, Helpdesk Specialist
- Gretchen Schultes, Helpdesk Specialist

Consulting Services (Training, Install-Repair, Web)
- Karen Schaffer, Associate Director, ITS, Consulting Services/Installation/Repair (Team Leader)
- Lisa Rogers, Assistant Director, ITS, Training
- Michael Sprague, Webmaster

Appendix 2: The Current Information Technology Setting – Some Details

Technological Infrastructure:

- Campus network consists of a gigabit ethernet backbone connecting 58 College buildings.

- Intra-building connectivity is totally switched 100 mbs ethernet, completed in summer of 2000.

- There are 3000 information outlets that provide data access from every classroom, office, residence hall room (one per student), and public space.

- Unix, Novell, Windows NT, and Appleshare servers provide access to central electronic services including electronic mail, web services, Usenet news, web-based course management, domain name and DHCP services, etc.

Facilities:

- Twenty classrooms equipped with data projectors and computers (Macintosh and Windows) for faculty/student presentation.

- Four classrooms equipped with computers at each station for student use (2 in Burke, 2 in Kirner-Johnson).

Planning and Advisory Structures:

- Committee on Information Technology (Four elected faculty, one from each division of the college, two students appointed by Student Assembly, Director, ITS, VP for Administration and Finance, Director of the Library, Registrar, Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty (or representative).

College plans, policies and standards can be found at the following URLs on the web site:

- Plans and Policies: http://www.hamilton.edu/college/its/policies.html
- Strategic Plan for IT (1995):
  http://www.hamilton.edu/college/its/plans_policies/strategic_plan_95.html

Hardware and Software Standards:

- http://www.hamilton.edu/college/its/plans_policies/hardware.html
- http://www.hamilton.edu/college/its/plans_policies/software.html

Staffing:

- (See Appendix 1)

Appendix 3: The Library Organization Chart

Hamilton College Library

Randall Ericson, College Librarian

Avalie Spak, Assistant to the Librarian

Sharon Britton, Director Public Services

Frank Lorenz, Archives Head 1/2 FTE
- Waltraut Wuensch

Tim Hicks, Director of AV/Classroom Services
- Marilyn Huntly
- Stefany Lewis
- Chip Hadity

TBA, System Manager

M. Arndt (Picton) / Cindy Doll (Grants/Arts), Special Facility Services

Trish Strovik, Director Technical Services

Reference
- Glynis Asu *
- Julia Dickinson *
- Lynn Mayo *
- Kristin Strohmeyer *

Interlibrary Loan
- Glynis Asu *
- Marge O'Aprix
- Joan Wolek

Circulation
- Catherine Miller
- Phil Gisondi
- Ian Hughes
- Kelly Rose

Science
- Joan Clair

Music
- Kathryn Stenstrom * 1/2FTE
- Cinthia McKelvey

Media
- Jeanne Marki

Materials/Shipping
- Linda Hodinger

Serials/Bindery
- Cynthia Stern
- Ruth Melvin
- Genevieve Davis

Acquisitions/Fund Accounting
- Barbara Swetman *
- Abigale Morton
- Mary Whittaker

Cataloging
- Jean Williams *
- Shelley Godfrey
- Donna Malone
- Lucinda Savage
- Rebecca Seifert

Processing
- Joanne Snover

Legend:

* - Librarian
** - Other Professional

Appendix 4: The Library Systems Chart

Hamilton Library Network

HP 9000 D350
VTLS 99.3.1 Web GW 2.2
Oracle 7.3.4
Apache Web Server 1.2b8
PERL 5.003
See Note 1

DTC01- Supports serial connections to VTLS for catalogers and 3 public terminals

CD Towers (6)

Dell Poweredge 4200
NT4.0, IIS,SCSI
Express 4.5, Filemaker
Pro 4.0, VTLS Acq
See Note 2

Dell Poweredge 4100
NT Terminal Server 4.0
CITRIX Metaframe 1.0
See Note 3

INTERNET

Campus LAN

RDAS Server
See Note 4

T-1 Inbound
T-1 Outbound

10 Mbps
10 Mbps
10 Mbps
10 Mbps
10 Mbps

Serial connection
(cataloger only)

10 Mbps

Public and staff PC's:
Minimum P100 w/win95

NOTES:
1. VTLs library catalog (telnet and web access).
2. File and print server for staff and public PC's. CD ROM Server for CD databases. VTLS Acq server. Web server for Library home page. Filemaker pro database server (e-reserves, databases, cataloging, and AV). Real Server audio and video server.
3. Windows NT terminal server Citrix metaframe for on campus remote access to CD ROM databases and server for public "thin client" terminals.
4. RDAS (remote database access server) acts as an authentication server to provide off campus service to commercial database vendors (silver platter, lexis nexis, etc)

October, 99

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Planning

Abstract

Planning at Hamilton has changed in focus over the past decade between comprehensive and targeted planning. The College's planning process would improve with clarification of the role of the On-Campus Planning Committee and, subsequently, review of this committee to ensure that its composition matches its role. Improved communication of ideas from all constituencies towards decision-makers and of reasons for decisions back out to the different constituencies of the College would improve understanding of the decisions that affect the College community. The current initiative to develop a three-to-five year strategic plan provides an opportunity for the College to involve a number of constituencies in clarifying its aims for the near future.

Introduction

During the last ten years, Hamilton has met tremendous challenges in implementing a new residential life program, including the acquisition and renovation of several buildings on the campus; deploying an aggressive admission and financial aid program; and completing an exhaustive review of the curriculum.

Throughout this decade, the planning process at the College has alternated in focus between the development of broad guiding principles and the examination of specific problems in detail. The College begins the twenty-first century by developing a new curriculum, a master facilities plan, and a new strategic plan for the future. Through these activities, the College is poised to continue as one of the top liberal arts colleges in the nation. The success of the College depends, however, on thoughtful planning.

Definitions

To be certain that the language used in this report is clear, we begin with some definitions. First, it is useful to distinguish between planning and governance. Planning, in our view, is the process of identifying and exploring options, predicting and tracing their implications, and choosing among alternatives. Governance, on the other hand, is the process and the structures by which planning is put into effect. Of course, the same bodies and procedures are often used for both planning and governance; the distinction, in our view, lies in what is being done.

It is also useful to distinguish among types of planning. First, there is a distinction between developing broad principles and focusing on specific problems. The former process can result in a short set of guiding principles but can also lack sufficient detail to be of value when confronting specific issues. The

latter targets specific problems and projects but may ignore the broader institutional context. We refer to the former activity as **comprehensive**, and/or **strategic** planning and to the latter as **tactical** or **targeted** planning. Less significant distinctions involve differences in temporal horizon -- planning for the immediate future vs. planning for the long run -- and in the locus of planning -- local planning, generally enacted by a narrowly defined constituency (a program, a committee, an office) vs. systemic planning, generally reflecting the input and interests of a variety of constituencies. Although there can be many variations on these themes, the key difference is between a broader, more encompassing approach to planning, on the one hand, and a narrower, more topical approach on the other. A brief history of the planning process at Hamilton over the last decade indicates that the College has moved back and forth between these two approaches.

Resources for Planning at Hamilton

There are two planning committees at the College: the On-Campus Planning Committee and the Trustee Committee on Planning. The Trustee Committee on Planning is a standing committee of the Board of Trustees charged with considering long-range planning as it pertains to the future of the College and its educational purposes. The On-Campus Planning Committee, which is formally a subcommittee of the Trustee Committee on Planning, formally consists of the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of the Faculty, the Dean of Students, the Vice President for Administration and Finance, a representative of the Office of Communications and Development, three elected members of the Faculty, and two students selected by Student Assembly. Currently five additional administrators, one additional faculty member, and a staff member also sit on this committee. The function of this committee is to advise the President on advanced planning for the College.

Recent History

Planning at Hamilton in the past decade began as a "rolling" strategic process (Middle States Accreditation Review, 1990) and appeared to shift from short-term to long-term and from strategic to tactical. Early in his tenure, President Tobin identified as one of his primary goals improving Hamilton's market competitiveness among the nation's most distinguished liberal arts colleges. As part of the process of bringing about this improvement, the President and Board of Trustees set about creating more targeted plans.

The first of these involved admissions. To generate a plan to increase selectivity, diversity, and yield, the On-Campus Planning Committee was directed to assess key strategic areas of the College, including admission, pricing, budget share and financial aid. Key strategic indicators were developed based on the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges' guidelines entitled "Strategic Decision Making: Key Questions and Indicators for Trustees." These key indicators were expanded to form the College's Planning Notebook, which has become an annually updated historical database.

These admissions studies made it clear to the planning committee that many prospective students perceived social life at Hamilton as being dominated by fraternities and that this perception limited our ability to attract the best students. In order to change that situation, the on-campus and trustee planning committees began a review of the residential life program at Hamilton. Ultimately, this planning process led to the March, 1995 residential life decision, requiring all students to live in college-owned housing. After that decision was announced, planning turned again to broader issues. A June 1995 report from the On-Campus Planning Committee contained a recommendation to increase financial support for academically promising students, a timetable for the implementation of the new residential life program, suggestions for ways of realizing the President's vision for a new curriculum, and lastly, a recommendation to improve the budget modeling process to reflect the commitments to financial aid, residential life, academic resources, and personnel development. Each of these recommendations has been implemented. Most important, Hamilton has substantially strengthened its reputation for academic rigor and intellectual excellence, as demonstrated by the performance of each new incoming class over the past four years.

The next important component of the improvement in Hamilton's market competitiveness was to be the curriculum. In the spring of 1996, President Tobin published a document, known as the "white paper," identifying communication -- with particular emphasis on the fundamental skills of speaking and writing -- and citizenship as the salient characteristics of Hamilton's curricular identity. Under the leadership of Dean Bobby Fong, the faculty in the fall of 1996 began a review of the curriculum, which was concluded in the spring of 2000.

In its 1996 report, the On-Campus Planning Committee offered several recommendations for actions within the strategic areas of focus. The committee recommended stabilizing the enrollment and employee base, increasing financial aid, monitoring the review of the curriculum, and, as recommended by the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty, conducting a facilities audit.

George Keller, a strategic planning consultant invited to our campus in the fall of 1996, advised that the College should pursue some tactical planning that would assist in pursuit of its strategic aims without more comprehensive discussions or measures. One consequence of that suggestion was the creation of a plan for a periodic cycle of renewals and replacements of computing equipment. Another consequence was to move the focus of the On-Campus Committee to facilities issues, which have occupied it for the past three years.

The facilities audit was completed by Dober, Lidsky and Associates in 1997-98 and was reviewed by the Committee in 1998-99. The Committee devoted the 1999-2000 academic year to initiating the creation of a master facilities plan, soliciting ideas from the community on facilities use, with architectural consulting from Ewing, Cherry, Cole, and Brot. The master facilities plan will include the use of the acquired fraternity houses and space that will become available after the science facilities are renovated.

When President Tobin returned in December, 1999 from a six-month sabbatical, the Board of Trustees charged him with developing, with the assistance of the officers of the College, a draft of a strategic plan for the next three to five years and presenting it to the Trustees in October, 2000. After the Trustees review the draft, they will send it to the On-Campus Planning Committee, which will discuss it and present it to the larger community for a broader discussion during academic year 2000-2001.

Issues

Following upon our investigation of the planning process at Hamilton, the members of the Subcommittee on Planning have identified several key concerns. These include an appearance of discontinuity in planning; problems of the structure and composition of the planning committee and a danger of redundancy between it and standing committees in the governance of the College; and the danger that planning may take place, or be perceived to take place, outside the formal structures intended to facilitate and govern it. To some degree, all of these concerns may be intrinsic to planning in any institutional context.

As the above history demonstrates, the On-Campus Planning Committee has played various roles throughout the last ten years and has employed several approaches to accomplish its goals. The way in which these approaches are related to the overarching goals has not always been clearly communicated across the college's multiple constituencies. The appearance of discontinuity has affected the ways in which the process has been perceived by all concerned. One important lesson learned in this self-study is the importance of continually reminding the various constituencies of the overall strategic context of specific targeted planning.

Among those we have interviewed, there is widespread agreement that the Committee has been most effective when engaged in targeted planning (e.g. discussing admissions policies). Targeted planning provides a sense of focus and accomplishment, though it does run the risk of ignoring the larger institutional context. We believe that the most successful years were characterized by tactical rather than comprehensive planning. But despite its strengths, this method of planning has its drawbacks. A targeted approach to planning may not be appropriate for the current period in higher education. For this reason, the Trustees, as noted earlier, have asked President Tobin and the college officers to draft a three-to-five year strategic plan that covers a broad range of strategic considerations. The feeling on the part of the Board is that for the planning process to be effective on campus, it must derive from a shared strategic vision.

A related problem is the appearance, or the perception, of discontinuity between the activities of the On-Campus Planning Committee and those of the Trustee Committee on Planning. Despite the fact that the On-Campus Planning Committee is formally a subcommittee of the Trustee Committee, the two bodies have not met together over the past three years, except in joint meetings with other committees. If the On-Campus Planning Committee and the Trustee Committee on Planning are to continue their existence, their functions need to be

more clearly defined, and their composition needs to be rethought in light of those functions.

A second concern with the On-Campus Planning Committee lies in the danger that its work will be perceived as redundant with, or encroaching upon, the work of standing committees of the faculty, such as the Committee on Academic Policy, the Faculty Committee on Admission and Financial Aid, and the Vice President's Advisory Committee. An example of the problems that can arise with overlap is the considerable amount of time spent by the On-Campus Planning Committee in 1994-95 discussing comprehensive academic planning. Among the ideas discussed were first-year seminars, shared research, and internships. (See Periodic Review materials, June 1995 Planning Committee report, p. 6). Although members of the On-Campus Planning Committee found these discussions quite exciting, some faculty members not on the committee expressed concerns, believing that ideas for curricular initiatives should be the purview of the CAP.

As with other apparent problems, a partial solution here is better communication. Members of the On-Campus Planning Committee and other members of the faculty should bear in mind that the suggestions of the Committee are to be reported to the appropriate standing committees of the faculty, and, when appropriate, to the Faculty as a whole for action.

Yet another problem with the On-Campus Planning Committee is its composition. As noted above, it is a large group, undoubtedly too large for productive discussions of priorities and guiding principles. If, in addition, the President wants the On-Campus Planning Committee to examine a collection of diverse initiatives, it is not clear that the constitution of the Committee should remain the same as tasks, and the requisite expertise, change. In September, 2000, recognizing the need for a more streamlined committee, President Tobin reconfigured its non-student membership to include only those officers and administrators working on the strategic plan.

A final problem derives from several of those mentioned above. The different and shifting roles of the two committees charged with planning and the uneven relationship between them can create the perception that planning at the College is less a product of design than of the perceptions of those interested in planning at any given time. As a relatively small institution, Hamilton takes pride in the tradition and distinctiveness of close relationships among students, faculty, staff, alumni, and trustees. However, these informal relationships are not a substitute for the activities of formally charged committees that need to work and communicate with the full range of constituencies at Hamilton. When done well, a successful strategic planning process reaches out to as many constituencies as possible, with the goal of fairly weighing all concerns and needs (Barker and Smith, 1997). President Tobin's intention to reestablish a close working relationship between the Trustee and On-Campus Planning Committees represents an important step towards achieving this goal. The President's most important challenge is to engage the entire campus community in a comprehensive, iterative planning process that leads to consensual support and implementation of Hamilton's strategic goals. In the course of reviewing this self-study, the

President has acknowledged the importance of working within established planning and governing structures as a precondition for building consensus.

As the foregoing discussion has implied, clear and accurate communication is necessary to good community planning. Three main purposes of clear and open communication regarding decision-making at the College are: 1) transmitting information to those operationally affected by the consequences of a decision; 2) explaining the rationale for a decision to the college community; 3) engaging the college community productively in the process of planning.

Because planning at its best is an iterative process that moves from initial statement to commentary and critique to modified statement to a second round of commentary and so on, clear communication from leaders to the campus and from campus constituencies back to the leaders is crucial. Indeed, ideas should flow from all constituencies up to decision-makers, and explanations of decisions should flow easily back to all members of the community. The ultimate decision-makers, the senior officers of the College, must ensure that those lines of communication remain open. Long-term planning at a relationship-intense institution such as Hamilton College needs to involve trustees, administration, faculty, students, and staff (including maintenance and other workers) in such a way that they can communicate easily and frequently with each other.

Recommendations

- Examine the role and composition of the On-Campus Planning Committee in order to make it a more functional advisory body; articulate the differences and overlap in the roles of the On-Campus Planning Committee and the Trustee Planning Committee

- Examine options for putting structures in place that will ensure timely communication within and between constituencies on issues relevant to planning and decision-making at all levels

References.

Barker, Thomas S. and Smith, Jr., Howard W. "Strategic Planning: Evolution of a Model." *Innovative Higher Education* 21:4 (Summer 1997): 287-301.

Hamilton College. Middle States Periodic Review. 1996.

Hamilton College. Middle States Accreditation Study. 1990.

Hamilton College On-Campus Planning Committee. Planning Task Forces: A Report from the On-Campus Planning Committee. June 1997.

Hamilton College On-Campus Planning Committee. A Report from the On-Campus Planning Committee. June 1996.

Hamilton College On-Campus Planning Committee. Toward a Strategic Plan. June 1995.

Shirley, Robert. "Strategic Planning: An Overview." In Douglas Steeples, ed. *Successful Strategic Planning: Case Studies. New Directions for Higher Education*, 16:4 (1988): 5-14.

Middle States Self-Study

Report on Student Life

Abstract

Through a large variety of programs and services, the Division of Student Life fosters a campus environment that supports the educational mission of the College. This report describes the central principles that ground the work of the Division. Departments that have experienced significant changes in the last ten years are discussed, with a major emphasis on the implementation and impact of the 1995 Trustee Decision on Residential Life. Questions on a variety of student life issues raised in the self-study document are addressed. The report concludes with recommendations for the future.

Introduction

In this section of the self-study we describe the mission and goals of the Division of Student Life within the context of Hamilton College's mission. We address in detail the effect of the decision in 1995 of the College's Trustees to reorganize residential life at Hamilton. Because the Residential Life Decision of 1995 was the most significant change in student life at Hamilton in the last ten years, the central section of our report focuses on an assessment of the implementation of the recommendations set forth by the Trustees. Finally, we address the general charges that are identified for student life in the Middle States Self-Study design.

Division of Student Life: Mission and Goals, Significant Changes

The Division of Student Life at Hamilton College operates a comprehensive program of residential life, extracurricular activities, and services for students. The Division is comprised of the following departments: Campus Safety, Career Center, Chaplaincy, Counseling and Psychological Services, Residential Life, Student Activities, Student Health Services, the Adventure Program, and the Dean of Students Office, which includes the Associate Dean of Students for Academics, the Coordinator of Study Abroad, and the Assistant Dean of Students for Multicultural Affairs. The Division's objective is to create an environment that supports the educational mission of the College and encourages each student to mature and to appreciate that personal growth is a lifelong undertaking.

From the residence halls to the many clubs and interest groups facilitated by the Office of Student Activities, from Student Health Services to the Office of Campus Safety, from the Counseling Center to the campus radio station and student newspaper, the Division of Student Life works to provide opportunities for students to be self-directed, to develop a coherent set of core values, and to use those values when making choices. In particular, we want students to strengthen their ability to use responses that are more flexible and continuous, and less dualistic, when setting and modifying personal goals (including

academic and vocational goals), when handling disappointment and failure, and when negotiating interpersonal conflicts.

The Hamilton College Student Handbook, On the Hill, identifies the primary goal of the Division of Student Life as "promoting and enhancing opportunities for education and personal growth beyond the formal classroom setting." Each department within the Division has its own clearly articulated mission statement that supports this goal, as well as the College's mission of providing "education in all its forms..... to enable young men and women of unusual gifts to realize their fullest capacities, for their own benefit and that of the world in which they live" (Hamilton College Catalogue, page 5).

As part of the Middle States Self-Study, the Division of Student Life has reviewed its mission and goals within the context of the College's mission and the standards set forth by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) in Higher Education. Although CAS standards do not exist for all areas that are part of the Division of Student Life, they provide a structured format for assessing services and relative strengths and weaknesses for those departments they cover. Although the individual assessments are not included here (they are available for review through the office of the Dean of Students), the Division of Student Life fares well when measured against the CAS professional standards.

Six departments that either have been created or have experienced signifi-cant change in the last ten years include the Chaplaincy, Student Health Services, Campus Safety, the Career Center, the Adventure Program, and Residential Life. Residential Life changes will be discussed in depth in the section that deals with the Residential Life Decision. The Presidential Coalition on Alcohol and Other Drugs, another important initiative, is also discussed.

The Office of the Chaplaincy oversees all student volunteer efforts. Jeffrey McArn, Protestant Chaplain and Coordinator of the Chaplaincy, is advisor to the umbrella volunteer organization HAVOC (Hamilton Action Volunteers Outreach Coalition). For the 1999-2000 academic year, the third floor of the College Chapel has been extensively remodeled to provide office space for the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish chaplains, as well as a seminar room, a meditation center, a library of the world's great religions, and offices for student religious groups.

In 1993, Student Health Services was changed from a 24-hour infirmary with a physician/director to a clinic model with a nurse practitioner-director, offering health care by appointment between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. A team of New York State-certified student Emergency Medical Technicians now provides after-hours emergency care. The EMT's are supervised by a registered nurse who is part of the Health Services staff. The Central Oneida County Volunteer Ambulance Corps handles assessment and transportation to local emergency rooms when hospital care is necessary. Two physicians, contracted through a local health care provider, are available by appointment for six hours a week.

Although this change met with some initial resistance, the College administration determined that comparable services could be provided at a significantly reduced cost by using EMT's for after-hours emergencies. Students still receive the emergency care they need, and the nurse practitioners, in conjunction with contract physicians and appropriate referrals, are able to provide both the clinic care and health education that are essential for students.

Campus Safety has also undergone significant changes in recent years. Having previously reported to the Vice-President for Administration and Finance, Campus Safety is now a part of the Division of Student Life, reporting to the Dean of Students. Moving from a tiny office that housed switchboard, dispatch, and campus safety, Campus Safety acquired an expanded facility that helps to promote a higher level of professionalism. On the recommendation of a consultant hired in 1996 to review the Campus Safety operation, a number of additional changes have been implemented in recent years. An Assistant Director position was created to provide additional support and supervision of officers, particularly on nights and weekends. Officers now receive more comprehensive training and provide better reporting and follow-up of incidents that occur on campus.

The Career Center has also been the subject of intense review and significant change in recent years. When the former director accepted a position at another institution in the spring of 1998, an advisory group composed of faculty, trustees, administrators, and students was assembled to assess the current operation and recommend changes. This group determined that a greater emphasis on early preparation of students for the job search and expanded linkages with potential employers, including supportive alumni, was necessary. A new director was hired in August of 1999, and the process of rebuilding and expanding Career Services is now well under way. In addition to building a larger and broader base of potential employers, the Career Center seeks to bring career development issues to students' attention early in their college experience, promote greater awareness of career development among faculty, and provide services for alumni who seek career advice in greater numbers every year. An additional full-time counselor and a part time recruiting assistant have been added to the staff in order to accomplish the goals that have been established for the Career Center.

The Adventure Program was created in 1997, following the Class of 1997's gift of a high ropes course. A survey conducted as part of the Trustee Study of Residential Life indicated that students have a strong interest in outdoor activities like the Adirondack Adventure program, a wilderness orientation program that takes place the week prior to orientation for new students. The Coordinator of Adventure Programs, whose position was created in 1997, advises the Outing Club, coordinates Adirondack Adventure, and administers the High Ropes Challenge course that was constructed in the woods behind the South side of the campus. This course is used extensively by academic classes, athletic teams, student organizations, and outside groups, with the Adventure Program Coordinator providing leadership and with the assistance of trained student facilitators. This program has been a wonderful addition to Hamilton and

certainly meets the goal of providing opportunities for education and personal growth beyond the formal classroom setting.

In an effort to continue to address campus issues that have been affected by the Residential Life Decision, the President appointed administrators, faculty and students to a Presidential Coalition on Alcohol and Other Drugs. This Coalition is completing its second year of work. The stated mission of the Coalition is to reduce the impact of excessive alcohol and other drug use on the Hamilton campus. Building upon the work of last year's coalition, the coalition has established three major initiatives. The most obvious area of concern continues to be policy issues with respect to the impact of alcohol. The other two initiatives will center on the fairly new and exciting research that is generally referred to as the Social Norms approach.

The coalition's final report for 1999-2000 recommended restricting locations and available evenings for parties on campus, in order to reinforce the expectation that our campus and our residence halls are places where students can sleep and study without interruptions. Recommendations include adding study space to residence halls, restricting the evenings during which parties can occur, and other specific policy changes. The Coalition recommended other changes to insure that future social events with alcohol will be responsible, safe, and legal.

The Social Norms approach to education is based on the strong and consistent finding that college students everywhere over-perceive the level of use of alcohol and other drugs on the campus around them. Last year, the coalition collected and analyzed data for our campus, which were consistent with national findings. For example, our students believe that the typical Hamilton student consumes alcohol three days per week when in fact, 63% drink once per week or less. Providing such information to students in a way that ensures their retention and belief in its accuracy has been shown to result in significant reductions in excessive drinking and its undesirable effects. We have begun a social marketing campaign designed to provide this kind of information to the student body in the form of printed material on dining tables, information in the Daily Bull (the campus bulletin of events), and posters with statistical information. This campaign will continue through the 2000-2001 academic year. The second initiative within this approach has been to conduct workshops within the residence halls discussing information consistent with the Social Norms approach.

Preliminary expectations for the Coalition's work next year include plans already in place to inundate the campus community with publicity focused on statistics generated by the Social Norms theory, and to offer more workshops. Student leaders will be trained to offer these workshops in order to make them more influential. Furthermore, plans are already underway to survey the campus again to determine student behavior and expectations with respect to alcohol and other drugs. These data, to be collected in February, 2001, will enable us to measure our progress toward our ultimate goals. The data analysis will also serve as a basis for the next publicity campaign.

In July, 2000, President Tobin announced that the search for a new Dean of Students had been concluded with the appointment of Florence Mitchell, Vice President of Student Affairs at the State University of New York at Morrisville. Dean Mitchell, who was Associate Dean of Students at Hamilton from 1978 to 1981 and has also served at Colgate University and Grinnell College, returned to Hamilton on August 1 as our new Dean of Students.

The Residential Life Decision of 1995 and Its Consequences

Over the past twenty years, Hamilton College has undertaken three major reviews of residential life. The first review was undertaken in 1978, when Hamilton College, an all-male institution, merged with Kirkland College, which enrolled only women. A second review was undertaken in 1987, with a view toward the integration of the social and academic environments.

The third and most comprehensive review was initiated in 1994, when the Board of Trustees appointed a special task force consisting of trustees, administrators, faculty, and students to study all aspects of student life at the College. The mission statement of this committee is reproduced below:

> The Committee sees as its goal the formulation of a set of recommen-dations to improve residential life at the College. Our work will be guided by three objectives. We seek to create a residential life system that will:
>
> - Ensure greater integration of academic and residential life to better promote the College's educational mission.
>
> - Provide equality of social and residential opportunity for all students.
>
> - Offer all students a rich variety of on-campus activities that encourages student involvement in campus life.
>
> In reaching these recommendations, the Committee will evaluate Hamilton's current system of residence halls, off-campus options, and private societies, taking into consideration the experiences of comparable institutions and the views of students, faculty, staff, prospective students, and alumni.
>
> The ultimate end to this process will be the establishment of a social and educational environment that is attractive to the students of quality we seek.
>
> (Residential Life Report, 1995)

The final report of the Committee on Residential Life was presented to the Hamilton community in March, 1995. In the report, the Committee identified four statements of general principle that formed the basis for a number of specific recommendations:

- Hamilton is a residential college. All students will live in College housing, and all residential spaces will be available to all students.

- Dining, an integral part of the residential experience, provides an opportunity to build community, connect in-class and out-of-class activities, and enhance student satisfaction. All Hamilton students will participate in one of the College meal plans in accordance with rules established by the College.

- The College will continue its tradition of permitting students to associate freely and form organizations.

- The opportunity to utilize College-owned social space will be governed by rules and regulations established by the College, and the student government will administer the use of College-owned social spaces in accordance with the powers granted to it by the College.

The majority of changes were to be implemented and completed over a period of 18 months, from March 1995 through August 1996.

The 1995 Committee on Residential Life report and implementation plan has served as the foundation for many of the most significant social and academic changes in the institution's history. Although the plan reaffirmed the right of private societies to function at Hamilton, its requirement that all students live in College-owned housing rendered Hamilton fraternities non-residential. Because a fair amount of student social life took place in events sponsored by the private societies, which could no longer be held in the fraternity houses, it was necessary to create a number of social spaces available to all students, regardless of affiliation. The concept of the Common Meal, which will be discussed later, emerged from the principle that a well-organized and implemented program of dining can contribute to a strong sense of community. These principles and concomitant recommendations reflected the Committee's firm commitment to equality of access for all students to all housing, dining, and social opportunities. Although the goal has not yet been completely achieved, this commitment has gone further than any initiative since the merger of Kirkland and Hamilton Colleges to make Hamilton a truly co-educational institution.

This self-study, nearly five years after the Residential Life report was issued, provides an opportunity to evaluate the results of this ambitious plan. In the remainder of this report we use the foregoing discussion of the mission of the Division of Student Life (Section I) and the Residential Life Decision (Section II) as a context for evaluating our progress in several key areas.

Integration of Academic and Residential Life

One of the major objectives of the 1995 Residential Life Report was to create a residential life system that would "ensure greater integration of academic and residential life to better promote the College's educational mission." A dynamic and vital campus community depends largely upon the extent to which learning extends beyond the formal classroom and into the residence and dining halls. To help achieve this goal, the Residential Life Committee proposed that the College implement new policies and programs in six different areas of student life. We provide a brief review and assessment of these initiatives below.

The Rogers Estate Distinguished Guest Series

The Rogers Estate is a renovated mansion that houses 17 sophomores, juniors and seniors. Its location, beauty, and academic focus have made it conducive to hosting special guests, occasional small classes, and training programs. A guest room is available for distinguished guests (visiting lecturers, artists and educators) of the College community. These guests often dine with and provide special presentations for the student residents of the Estate.

In addition to the guests, faculty members are invited once or twice a month to join the residents for dinner. This has become a popular program and has helped make the facility more accessible to the campus community.

The meal plan, which allows students the ability to eat together every evening, has been successful, especially this year, as a chef is now on-site for all dinner meals. Students participate in the Common meal for lunch and prepare their own meals in the house for breakfast.

Despite these benefits, the distance of the house from the main area of the campus has been a major disadvantage. Some students who might enjoy this type of environment feel that the Rogers Estate is too far removed from the rest of the campus, even though a daily jitney service is provided. This housing option is often the last to fill at the housing lottery. Students who do select the Estate often start the year sluggishly. However, once residents begin to benefit from the opportunity to interact with distinguished guests, the Rogers Estate provides a stimulating and enriching experience not found in other residences.

The Common Meal

The Residential Life Committee recommended that the College subsidize noon-time meals for faculty and staff in order to encourage their participation in a "common meal," where various campus constituencies would come together to "share ideas and create a more lively academic environment on campus."

We have had some limited success in establishing this program. Informal luncheon gatherings of students and faculty occur frequently at Cafe Opus, the Backus House, and the Little Pub. Faculty seldom join students for lunch in the dining halls, however, for several reasons: because the environment in Soper Commons and McEwen Hall is too noisy for the kinds of conversation such

lunches are intended to encourage; because faculty members use the noon hour for a variety of other purposes, including meetings, working at their desks, or exercising; and because many faculty members prefer not to each a large lunch every day.

The Academic Advising Program

The Committee on Residential Life recommended that the College place renewed emphasis on academic advising in order to "reaffirm our commitment not just to a student's intellectual growth, but also to his or her personal maturation." The committee envisioned a system in which the faculty advisor would be more of a continuing mentor rather than primarily a monitor of a student's selection of courses.

To carry out this recommendation, the college has created a new system for assigning academic advisors to students. Before first-year students arrive for new student orientation, each student is assigned an "orientation advisor" whose role is to guide the student through the initial course selection and registration. A second advisor, selected from among the student's first-term course instructors, works with the student through the declaration of concentration in the spring of the sophomore year. Once a student declares a concentration, he or she is assigned an advisor in the department of concentration.

The faculty has now begun a new review of the advising system, recognizing that the move away from academic requirements mandated by the recent curricular review will require an even stronger advising program. Currently, the degree of involvement in and commitment to the advising process and relationship varies widely among individual members of the faculty. In order to strengthen the advising system the institution must make advising a priority, and must regularly assess and reward good advising. For the 2000-2001 academic year, the faculty has appointed an *ad hoc* committee to make recommendations to strengthen advising.

New Student Orientation

The Committee on Residential Life supported moving orientation for first-year students from the week before classes begin in the fall back to late spring. They believed that such a move would "provide a greater opportunity to set academic expectations, advise, register for classes, and build enthusiasm for the student's first-year and beyond."

A thorough review by a committee of faculty, students, and administrators led to the conclusion that to carry out this recommendation would create insuperable logistical and staffing problems. Currently, first-year orientation still occurs the week before classes begin in the fall. Opportunities for faculty and student interaction have been expanded during orientation week with the addition of a common reading with faculty-led discussion groups, a faculty-advisee barbecue, and a longer period of time for advising. Although additional faculty involvement is desirable, it has been difficult to achieve across the board. As part

of the review of the advising system, consideration should be given to increasing the role of advisors during orientation.

Faculty in Residence

The Residential Life report suggested that faculty could live in residence halls or become "associates" formally affiliated with a residence hall in order to integrate academic and residential life more directly. Until this year, enrollments have made it impossible to add faculty in residence. Now, with the addition of a renovated fraternity house -- Samuel Eels Hall --to the housing stock, we will for the first time invite a faculty member or family to live in a residence hall on the south side of campus. Specific expectations for faculty in residence have yet to be defined and may depend in part on the interests of the faculty member choosing this option. We hope for informal interaction between faculty and residents that could be achieved in any number of ways.

Special Programs for First- and Second-Year Students

The College 100 program at Hamilton College was established to provide students with the opportunity to participate in an interdisciplinary course that emphasizes writing, classroom discussion, and out-of-class interaction among the students. Several sections of the course are offered each Fall Term. Each section is taught by a different faculty member, and students from the different sections are brought together regularly to interact with students from the other sections. In addition, guest faculty frequently attend the class and participate in discussions. Students in the course are offered the opportunity to select housing that places them in proximity to one another.

The recently passed curricular reform package includes a sophomore seminar that emphasizes inter- or multidisciplinary learning and culminates in an integrative project with a public presentation. A common, public presentation period for projects will be held each semester, and individual sections are encouraged to participate.

Summary

Members of the Hamilton College faculty are intimately involved in the life and education of students. Increased student-faculty interaction would be beneficial to both faculty and students and would help create the cultural climate and academic community that we all desire. Unfortunately, attempts to legislate faculty-student interaction have had only limited success. Nevertheless, the College should not abandon this goal; instead it should continue to create the physical and organizational structures that will foster student-faculty interaction, and it should support and promote programs and structures that are successful, regardless of where or how they originate.

Housing

Perhaps the most dramatic change that has taken place since the 1995 Residential Life Study has been in student housing. In order to move toward the goal of requiring all students to live on campus, the College created over 125 additional bed spaces during the summer of 1995. These bed spaces, created by renovating several existing structures, include a large mansion (the Rogers Estate), the Theta Delta Chi fraternity house (now Woollcott House), a former private home (the Saunders house), and two faculty/staff apartment areas (Root Farmhouse and the Griffin Road apartments).

The College's significant investment in these initial renovations has produced five beautifully designed residences. All have been well received by students and, with the exception of the Rogers Estate, are the first buildings to be selected during the housing lottery.

Designed with juniors and seniors in mind, these houses provide more independent living and fewer restrictions than in the more traditional residences. For example, students in the apartments and in the Saunders House prepare their own meals and are required to participate only in a 5-meal lunch plan. Student residing in the Rogers Estate and Woollcott House are served from satellite dining halls. Although they are fairly successful, these meal plans are currently being assessed. We expect to make modifications to provide students with more flexibility to choose when and where to eat.

In addition to these areas, the College has since renovated the former Delta Upsilon house, now known as Ferguson Hall, to house 60 students. An additional 25 students live in the recently purchased, yet not fully renovated, DKE house. Finally, the College has renovated the Alpha Delta Phi fraternity house, which opened for 63 residents in the fall of 2000. Fifty seniors have received permission to live off campus in the village of Clinton.

Over the course of the past five years, the College has acquired the following fraternities: Alpha Delta Phi, Chi Psi, Delta Kappa Epsilon, Delta Upsilon, and just recently, Emerson Literary Society and Psi Upsilon. In July a federal judge dismissed Sigma Phi's lawsuit against Hamilton, but that fraternity has as yet no agreement with the College. Although AD, DKE, and DU have been used for student housing, Chi Psi, ELS, Psi Upsilon, and Sigma Phi (if and when acquired), will be used for academic, administrative, and cultural programs.

The Residential Life report identified a need for additional residence hall study spaces. However, in two of the last four years since the study was completed, large entering first-year classes have necessitated the use of some residence hall study spaces for student rooms. With the addition of Eels Hall to the housing stock, this problem should not occur in the future. It would be useful to assess the need for additional study space across the campus.

The Committee also recommended that an Interest Housing Task Force be established to assess the possibility of providing housing for small groups of students based on both academic and extracurricular interests. This committee

met in the fall of 1995 and consisted of student representatives from the student Residential Life Committee, faculty serving on the Student Activities Committee, the Director of Residential Life, and other interested faculty, students, and administrators. In light of the difficult transition for Greek-letter societies who had recently lost their housing, the idea of providing other groups of students with specialized housing was not at all popular. Students and faculty agreed that, although the idea of interest housing had merit, the timing was not appropriate. This idea should be revisited in the near future.

The final recommendation related to student housing was that a major renovation of Dunham Hall, our largest and most traditional residence hall (housing 245 students on corridors with rooms on either side) was in order. In the summer of 1997 Dunham received a $500,000 renovation of bathroom facilities and interior painting. It received another significant investment in the summer of 2000 for electrical, mechanical, and fire alarm system upgrades.

Dining

The 1995 Residential Life decision dramatically altered many aspects of student life. The decision's effect on dining was outlined in the Implementation Plan of 1995. At this time, the Student Life Committee intended to improve student dining by taking the following actions:

- Renovating Commons Dining Hall

- Establishing Continuous Dining at McEwen

- Establishing a Committee to Identify Kitchens in Residence Halls Needing Upgrading

- Establishing a Common Meal Plan

- Improving Meal Plan Options

By August of 1996, most of these goals were either reached or changed. Renovations to Commons Dining Hall were completed; continuous dining was established at McEwen. The Committee's original intention to establish the Common Meal Plan has not been as successful as had been hoped. We will continue to try to find ways to encourage faculty/student interaction over meals. The Committee's goal of improving meal plan options is still being realized.

For the past five years, Bon Appetit, a management company, has provided dining services under contract to Hamilton. Because Bon Appetit works for the College, its operations must support the College's mission. Bon Appetit does so by preparing foods with fresh ingredients, listening to student needs, and providing quality service.

The College's current goals for dining are as follows:

- Reviewing the Common Meal Plan

- Improving dining options

- Increasing access to dining facilities

- Improving satellite dining options

Several meal plan options are currently available to students: Students living in apartments, both on or off campus, may select the 5-lunch plan (Monday-Friday) or the 7-meal plan (any seven per week). Juniors and seniors living in other residences may select either the 14 meal plan, or the 21 continuous dining meal plan, which allows a student to enter the dining hall as frequently as desired in any given day. First-year students and sophomores are required to be on the 21 meal continuous dining plan.

Bon Appetit and the College agree that a successful food service continually responds to student needs and desires. In order to do this, the offices of Contract Operations and Residential Life work closely with the student food committee, meeting frequently to assess the quality of food and service being offered. The food service contract was re-evaluated during the 1999-2000 academic year. After careful study and consideration, the committee decided to renew the contract of Bon Appetit.

The College also realizes that it needs to increase the number of hours during which students can eat, specifically at dinnertime. One of its goals, then, is to extend dinner equivalency in the Howard Diner. Currently, students can eat dinner in the Diner until 10:00 p.m. After that time, they must pay with cash or use bonus meals. But because a large number of students wish to eat meals after 10:00 p.m., one of the present goals is to extend dinner equivalency in the Diner until at least midnight. In response to student requests, the College is considering staffing the Diner until 2:00 a.m. on weekends. After a late movie or performance, students need a place on campus to get a bite to eat.

The College's last goal is to improve satellite-dining options. This year the Rogers Estate was assigned a chef who prepares dinner at the house every evening. This has been very successful, providing students with high quality meals, along with the opportunity to come together as a community each evening. In the Woollcott House, students eat together twice a week with meals prepared by Bon Appetit. This has helped to build a stronger residential community.

Social Space and Programs

The Residential Life Report states:

The Committee acknowledges and reaffirms its support for the significant number and variety of social opportunities currently sponsored by the Campus Activities Board and other campus organizations. The Committee further recognizes the social opportunities that have been provided by private societies in the past, and while it reaffirms the principle that no Hamilton-owned social

space may be permanently controlled by any organization or group, it recommends the creation of spaces -- reserved on an equitable basis -- where individuals and organizations may host events, including events where alcohol may be served, consistent with College guidelines.

The Implementation Plan of 1995 recommended that the following projects be completed to meet the ends of the Committee's findings:

1.   Renovate Bundy Dining Hall into an On-Campus Pub.

2.   Create New Social Spaces

3.   Increase On-Campus promotion of Current Programs

4.   Big-Name Events

5.   Guidelines for Reserving Space

Although the Committee recommended converting the former Bundy Dining Hall into an on-campus Pub, students feared that Bundy was too far from the center of the campus to be successful. Instead, the former Bundy Dining Hall became a large social space that could be reserved by students for events. The Little Pub, in a former "salt barn" to the east of the Beinecke Student Center, opened in February, 1996, as a social gathering place where alcohol was available for students and others of age but was not the central focus. Cable TV and a satellite dish were installed so that sporting events could be broadcast. Bar food is served, and soda and coffee are provided free to non-drinkers. The Pub Lunch, introduced as a way to use the facility better during the day and to relieve some of the noon crowding in the other dining halls, has become a very popular option for students, faculty, and staff. Fall 1998 saw the addition of a music program; it began with a strong jazz emphasis but has broadened its musical offerings. The construction of the new Annex, a social space now located behind the Pub, added a full kitchen, which will enhance the range of food available at the Pub. The Pub is open Sunday through Thursday from 8 p.m. - 2 a.m. and Friday/Saturday from 4 p.m. - 4 a.m. No alcohol is served after 2 a.m.

A number of social spaces available for student use were created during the summer of 1995. The Hub, a former snack bar on the first floor of the Bristol Campus Center received a sound system, sound paneling, staging and counter space for catering needs. North Court, the former Mail Center, was completely refurbished and received a sound system, staging, new floors, the addition of a kitchen for catering needs, and new furniture. A new and substantially larger social space, the Beinecke Annex, was put into service during the spring of 2000; the North Court is once again used for faculty offices.

The basement of the former TDX fraternity, a residence hall since the fall of 1995, and a lounge in the basement of Dunham were slated to become reservable social spaces. Students felt, however, that large events in those spaces would disrupt the life and studies of the residents of those facilities. A lounge for

residents was created in the basement of TDX, and Dunham received a sound system for use by the residents. Additional space became available in February of 2000 with the completion of the Annex to the Beinecke Student Center. This large, user-friendly space which can accommodate up to 700 people, is used for student-sponsored social events and a wide range of student activities. Commons Dining Hall was used as a social space for a short time; however, when setting up and cleaning up for events proved to disrupt meal preparation and service, this use was discontinued.

The Committee recommended increased on-campus promotion of current programs, which has been accomplished as a result of several initiatives. First, a technical internship evolved into the position of the Program Coordinator for the Student Activities. The Program Coordinator has worked closely with all student organizations to help develop programs for the campus, but has focused on the Campus Activities Board, now an award-winning student programming body. In addition, Student Assembly received increased funding from the College and through establishment of a student activities fee as recommended by the Committee. The increased funds for programming enabled students to find new ways to enhance their extracurricular life. According to the Director of Student Activities, the number of active student organizations has grown from 47 in 1994-95, to 69 in 1995-96, to 83 in 1999-2000.

Since the Residential Life decision, Hamilton has dramatically increased the number and nature of major speakers and concerts. The Campus Activities Board has made a point of organizing at least one major concert each year, held at the Stanley Theater in downtown Utica. Students are transported via buses, and the concerts are open to the public. They have been quite successful. Another great success has been the addition of the Great Names Series, made possible through the contributions of five major donors. Since the series began in the fall of 1996, Colin Powell, James Carville and Mary Matalin, Elie Wiesel, F.W. DeKlerk, B.B. King, Lady Margaret Thatcher, and Archbishop Desmond Tutu, have appeared at Hamilton. The Great Names events, held in the Field House, are free of charge to the Hamilton community and the communities surrounding the campus, so that they help to improve town-gown relationships. The College community benefits from the opportunity to be invited to public and private receptions, and students often meet the artist/lecturer in a classroom setting in addition to the major public lecture.

The Social Programming Guidelines Committee, chaired by the Director of Student Activities and composed of students and faculty, was created to establish the policies that govern the reservation and use of social spaces. Its task remains in progress as new spaces are added and policies fine-tuned.

The Residential Life Committee also recommended the establishment of a student activities fee, the restructuring of student governance, and the development of residence hall councils. The student activities fee was implemented in the fall of 1996. The Student Assembly completed a thorough review and revision of their constitution in the same year. Residence Hall Councils have been organized, but they have not been particularly successful to

date. The Residential Life Office continues to work with students on this initiative.

Consequences of the Residential Life Decision

The Residential Life Decision has affected Hamilton in many ways. Although some students still harbor resentment over the closing of fraternity houses, all students now have access to a wide array of safe and attractive housing options. The benefits of resolving the equity and safety issues that had been associated with fraternity houses are significant. The number and diversity of social options for students have increased, although some students still say, "There is nothing to do." The nature of events has changed in that fraternity house parties are no longer the primary social outlet. Still, social space events, organized in large part by Greek organizations, continue to dominate student social life.

One of the greatest benefits of the Residential Life Decision is that it has reduced the debate over whether or not Greek organizations should exist at Hamilton. Between the time of the Hamilton and Kirkland merger in 1978 and 1995, this debate had been heated and extremely divisive. While some would still argue either that the College should have invested in Greek organizations or that it should have banned them, at least the decision has been made and has had a number of positive results.

Specific Questions

1. *What steps does the Division of Student Life take in assessing student needs and interests?*

A variety of means are used, depending upon the department. For example, the Office of Residential Life relies heavily on the Resident Advisor staff to represent student needs and interests to the office. In addition, the Residence Hall Council, an organization of student volunteers, advises the residential life office on the allocation of residence hall rooms in the housing lottery and other general issues related to student housing. Another student committee provides feedback to the food service operation, and students serve on faculty and trustee committees, including the Committee on Student Activities, which advises the Dean of Students. In addition to relying on the opinions of the numerous students who are involved in various aspects of the student activities operation, the Office of Student Activities and the Campus Activities Board employ surveys to assess student interest in various types of activities. In summary, assessment is both formal and informal and is recognized by the Division of Student Life as vital to its operation.

2. *To what extent does the residence hall environment support serious students?*

Because students' study habits and preferred modes of living vary greatly, it is impossible to define, much less create, the ideal residence. However, the College has worked to provide a wide variety of diverse housing options ranging from suite-style housing and apartments to small houses and large traditional

style residences. It is our hope that students will find suitable housing that supports their individual educational needs.

Study lounges are available in many of the halls. Network jacks provide all students the ability to connect to the Internet directly from their rooms. And much of the room furniture provides the large work areas necessary for computers and printers. The College continues to offer quiet housing and substance-free housing. Ten years ago we offered two small suites for 12 students each. Today we offer over 100 spaces in substance-free housing. Students participating in first-year seminars may choose to live together.

The residence halls, however, can be noisy, particularly the larger halls where first-year students and sophomores live in "quads." Students often lack the skills or confidence to confront peers who cause disruptions. Therefore, Resident Advisors are provided with training in setting limits and in mediation to help build community on their halls and to resolve disputes. Campus Safety is responsive to students who may require assistance with noise complaints. And disciplinary action is taken when students are found responsible for creating an environment that is not conducive to sleep and study in the halls.

3. *How do we measure the effectiveness of our resident advisor system?*

Resident Advisors are evaluated each semester both by the students they serve and by their supervisors. The evaluation process is fairly intense, staff members being evaluated in a number of areas including skills in community building, counseling, limit setting, programming and the ability to carry out administrative functions. Resident Advisors also meet frequently with their supervisors and receive commentary, suggestions and support throughout the semester.

The majority of Resident Advisors do exceptionally well on their evaluations. But when a staff member is struggling, appropriate action is taken to support that individual, or, when necessary, to release that individual from the position.

4. *What are the benefits and issues related to offering academic interest housing blocks?*

Such blocks would provide an opportunity for students to work more collaboratively on various class projects and lessons. Students would be able to extend their learning about various academic disciplines beyond the walls of the classroom. And the presence of these blocks might provide a more studious environment in the residence halls. For language students, the opportunity to use the language in everyday living would strengthen speaking and listening skills and add richness to classroom discussions.

At the time of the Residential Life Decision, the Residential Life Committee concluded that the campus climate would not support the creation of academic interest housing. If interest in academic housing continues to grow, and if the commitment remains to keep housing equity-based, it might be possible to allow

students to form groups tied to specific academic departments. Appropriate spaces could be allotted for those groups in the campus housing lottery.

5. *To what extent does first-year orientation support and promote the academic mission of the College? How can we ensure that the program has a continuing academic and residential focus throughout a student's entire first year?*

Opportunities for faculty and student interaction have been expanded during orientation week by the additions of a common reading with faculty-led discussion groups, a faculty-advisee barbecue, and an extended advising period. Additional faculty involvement is desirable, although it has been difficult to achieve. As part of the review of the advising system, consideration should be given to increasing the role of advisors during orientation.

The structure of the current orientation program is determined in large part by the academic functions that must occur during that week, including placement tests, advising, and registration, and the dissemination of information that must be covered. Students are presented with a tremendous amount of information about a range of topics, such as course options, academic and other regulations, preventing sexual assault, and issues related to diversity. All of this occurs at a time when students are more or less overwhelmed by leaving home for perhaps the first time, settling in with roommates, and trying to feel comfortable in this new and frightening environment. It is simply too much to absorb in five days.

The Division of Student Life and the Presidential Coalition on Alcohol and Other Drugs have proposed the introduction of a first-year seminar led by a faculty member or administrator and a student partner. The seminar would meet weekly for the first semester, covering topics such as alcohol and other drugs, time management, sexual assault, and diversity issues. It would provide a safe forum within which students could adjust to many of the challenges that arise early in their first year, challenges they lack the context to understand during orientation.

6. *How are student publications monitored?*

Student publications are monitored by the Media Board, which is composed of the student editors of each of the publications (the student newspaper, two journals, and the Daily Bull [a daily campus newsletter]), as well as the general manager of WHCL, the College radio station, and the executive producer of HCTV, the college television program. It is chaired by a student and has faculty and administrative representation. The Director of Student Activities is the advisor to the student Media Board and meets regularly with the chair. The Director of Student Activities is responsible for working with each of the publications/productions in monitoring their respective budgets.

Students apply to the student Media Board at the end of the fall semester for editor, manager, and producer positions. Editor candidates are interviewed and selected by members of the board and are accountable to the board for all aspects of their publications, or, in the case of WHCL and HCTV, their programming.

Editors would benefit from additional training and support. Student editors often "come up through the ranks," learning much of what they know about publishing a student newspaper, running a radio station, or editing a journal from the students who preceded them in those positions. As a result, quality varies from year to year. Editors receive considerable supervision, both from the Media Board and from the Director of Student Activities. However, it would be desirable to have greater involvement from faculty in both the day-to-day activities as well as the setting of agendas for the various publications and programs. The student media board has a budget line for staff training and development.

7. *Should the editor of the student newspaper (The Spectator) receive academic credit or remuneration of some sort?*

The Committee on Academic Standing (CAS) and the Associate Dean of Students (Academic) are currently studying this question.

8. *To what extent does the image portrayed in the College catalogue and admissions materials accurately reflect the academic and residential environments at Hamilton?*

The College Catalogue and Admissions Office brochures serve two very different purposes. The College Catalogue is a document that describes the academic and social regulations of the institution, as well as the goals and mission of the College. Admissions Office brochures are primarily marketing devices that highlight the positive and unique features of the College.

Arguably, the images in both of these publications do not fully reflect the existing academic and residential environments at Hamilton College. They do, however, paint an image of what Hamilton College aspires to be and, at its best, can be.

9. *How can we strengthen academic advising?*

This is an important question, particularly in light of the revisions to the curriculum recently passed by the faculty. Although improvements have been made in the advising system over the past few years (see section on "Integration of Residential and Academic Life"), many faculty believe that it must be further strengthened. The Committee on Academic Policy has charged a subcommittee to study the advising system and to bring back to the faculty a list of recommendations for improving the current system.

10. *How effective are the health and counseling services we provide our students? How successful have the changes been in moving from a 24-hour infirmary to a clinic supervised by a nurse practitioner and open from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.?*

Health and Counseling Services are generally effective and receive positive evaluations from students. As indicated earlier in this report, the transition from a 24-hour service to an 8:30-4:30 operation was initially difficult but is now accepted by students.

11. *Are there adequate alcohol-free social options for students?*

There are adequate alcohol-free social options for students, but an effort is needed to attain a greater diversity of these options. Although many student groups sponsor such events, too many students believe that they are not "fun." International and multicultural student groups sponsor only alcohol-free events; the draw for these populations is good dance music and catered foods by off-campus vendors. These social events provide an alternative that appeals to those who truly seek alcohol-free events. The *a cappella*, comedy, and student-run theater groups, to name a few, receive overwhelming support from students, but these early evening events still leave a void in late-night options. As previously mentioned in our report, Café Opus has become known as a venue for alcohol-free programming.

12. *How have the changes in residential life affected campus-wide social life?*

One member of the subcommittee that wrote this report asked the six students in his class, all seniors, to submit responses. The fact that only one student responded suggests that there is no seething discontent (beyond the usual complaining that all students everywhere do).

Our sense is that the campus is more vibrant now than it was before the Residential Life decision. In particular, we seem to have a larger number of activities organized by students. Certainly some of this is due to the increased effort by Student Life in the areas of student activities. In any case, we do not sense a reduction in the volume of activity on the campus. Nor do we sense an increase in the level of dissatisfaction.

In summary, we think it is likely that the Residential Life Decision has improved social life on the campus by encouraging interaction among students without reliance on private societies, while still providing ample opportunities for private societies to survive if their members are sufficiently interested to provide the initiative and the maintenance.

13. *Is funding for student organization activities adequate?*

The student activity fee of $100 per student per year, instituted in 1996, has added $130,000 to the funds allocated to the Student Assembly. The Assembly's total budget is $275,000 per year. These funds are distributed among 47 student organizations, which serve many voices and perspectives. In addition, 36 student organizations receive funding from other sources. Additional funds are available from the President's Discretionary Fund, academic departments, the Dean of Students and the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty. Some groups also secure supplemental funds from fundraising efforts. There is not a problem with funding.

14. *Are there enough College vans available to support student activities?*

There are not enough College vans available to support student activities. Even though there are several vehicles in the College's fleet, there is a "pecking

order" for reserving them. The Athletic Department and academic programs receive preference over student activities. There is a van assigned to the Jitney service, but it must be used by the Physical Plant at certain times during the workday when its transportation needs are greatest.

The Office of the Chaplaincy oversees the volunteer efforts of the College and advises the volunteer organization known as HAVOC. This organization has received the gift of a vehicle, which it generously offers to other organizations.

15. *Is there adequate space and support for recreational activities such as intramurals and personal fitness?*

Space is generally adequate for intramurals and personal fitness. Neither activity is necessarily a central focus of the athletic department, and both would benefit from additional staff attention and support.

Recommendations

Student Activities

- Purchase additional vans to support student organization needs.

- Increase training and support of student editors.

Common Meal

- Explore more appropriate expression of common meal ideal.

- Create dining spaces that encourage more faculty/student dining.

- Find ways to encourage faculty/students to dine together, including inviting faculty with their families to dine in dormitories with students.

Advising

- Recognize the essential role of an advisor and appropriately address unevenness of advising.

Social Life

- Find ways to encourage organizations other than private societies to sponsor social events.

Residence Life

- Re-examine the feasibility of some academic interest housing options

- Make sure that each residence hall has designated study space

- Pilot a faculty-in-residence program

<u>Athletics:</u>

- Provide additional structure and administrative support for intramural sports and fitness

Appendices - Middle States Self-Study

Appendix 1: Key Indicators

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF KEY HAMILTON INDICATORS

Admission — enter fall of:	1989 '93	1990 '94	1991 '95	1992 '96	1993 '97	1994 '98	1995 '99	1996 '00	1997 '01	1998 '02	1999 '03	2000 '04	% Change 1990-2000
# Applications	3,771	3,781	3,568	3,549	3,140	3,472	3,649	4,045	4,108	3,882	3,936	3,811	0.8%
# Accepted	1,419	1,641	1,734	1,744	1,783	1,776	1,753	1,774	1,730	1,564	1,625	1,505	-8.3%
% Accepted	37.6%	43.4%	48.6%	49.1%	56.8%	51.2%	48.0%	43.9%	42.1%	40.3%	41.3%	39.5%	
# Matriculating	427	448	462	463	454	481	491	499	459	464	505	465	3.8%
% Yield of Acceptees	30.1%	27.3%	26.6%	26.5%	25.5%	27.1%	28.0%	28.1%	26.5%	29.7%	31.1%	30.9%	
% from public secondary school	56.0%	57.8%	57.8%	57.2%	55.7%	60.0%	66.0%	64.0%	62.1%	66.4%	61.2%	62.3%	
% from private secondary school	44.0%	42.2%	42.2%	42.8%	38.1%	34.0%	34.0%	36.0%	35.3%	31.0%	35.0%	32.4%	
% from foreign secondary school	*	*	*	*	6.4%	7.1%	3.0%	3.0%	2.6%	2.6%	3.8%	5.1%	
% of Matriculants in top10% of SS class	51.3%	50.2%	40.8%	42.0%	40.0%	44.0%	43.0%	46.0%	47.0%	53.0%	47.1%	55.2%	

	Non-Recentered							Recentered					
VSAT mean (matriculants)*	555	553	548	539	531	536	548	628	625	625	624	625	
MSAT mean (matriculants)*	605	610	610	602	591	603	609	626	619	625	623	623	
Range-middle 50% of accepted app.													
VSAT	530-630	530-630	520-620	520-620	500-610	480-590	520-620	600-690	590-690	600-700	600-690	610-700	
MSAT	580-690	590-690	580-680	580-680	560-670	550-660	590-690	600-690	600-690	600-700	590-690	610-700	

* Intended for internal use only. SAT's are non-recentered before the class entering in the fall of 1996. As of the class entering in the fall of 1996, all SAT's are on the recentered scale.

Enrollment	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	% Change 1990-2000
Total enrollment (headcount)	1,673	1,668	1,728	1,710	1,670	1,684	1,699	1,715	1,716	1,733	1,740	4.0%
FTE Enrollment (Fall)	1654.75	1650.00	1703.00	1692.25	1654.13	1660.00	1664.31	1699.00	1705.25	1,720	1,727	4.4%
FT Fall Enrollment	1,646	1,641	1,691	1,681	1,646	1,649	1,656	1,684	1,695	1,709	1,712	4.0%
FT Spring Enrollment	1,627	1,608	1,644	1,603	1,572	1,552	1,573	1,654	1,622	1,644	1,694	4.1%
Student/faculty ratio (Actual FTEs)	10.74	10.93	10.55	10.44	10.22	9.93	9.82	10.33	9.97	9.78	9.39	
Number of degrees conferred	422	425	463	412	474	442	419	399	407	409	439	
Number of students receiving Fin. Aid	1,038	1,021	919	924	926	902	962	927	976	1,091	1,035	
% minority (% of headcount)	8.7%	9.9%	10.5%	11.3%	11.7%	11.0%	10.0%	8.0%	8.4%	8.8%	10.6%	-0.3%
% non-resident alien (% by headcount)	4.2%	4.5%	5.1%	5.5%	5.0%	6.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.6%	2.9%	3.3%	

Retention — enter fall of 19XX/Class of 19XX	'88/'92	'89/'93	'90/'94	'91/'95	'92/'96	'93/'97	'94/'98	'95/'99	'96/'00	'97/'01	'98/'02
% of first-year students returning**	93.5%	95.1%	95.1%	95.7%	91.1%	91.8%	89.8%	90.3%	90.9%	93.0%	92.2%

enter fall of 19XX/Class of 19XX	'86/'90	'87/'91	'88/'92	'89/'93	'90/'94	'91/'95	'92/'96	'93/'97	'94/'98	'95/'99	'96/'98	'97/'99
% of students graduating in five years	89.0%	90.4%	87.1%	89.7%	92.4%	89.7%	87.2%	84.9%	84.0%	81.3%	84.2%	
% of students graduating in six years	89.6%	90.7%	88.1%	90.9%	92.4%	90.9%	88.5%	85.7%	84.9%	82.3%	n/a	

** Approved leaves and transfers not included

Source: Admission Fall Report, Registrar's Office.

Appendices - Middle States Self-Study

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF KEY HAMILTON INDICATORS (ctd.)

Faculty	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	% Change 1989-1999
Dean's Authorized FTE	142.99	145.83	150.44	155.60	153.00	155.60	158.60	153.60	159.60	159.80	168.00	17.5%
Dean's Actual FTE Count	154.02	150.75	161.35	162.17	161.80	167.10	169.55	164.50	171.10	175.90	184.00	19.5%
AAUP Full-time Faculty Count	143	124	135	148	149	149	153	147	138	148	151	5.6%
Dean's teaching faculty head count	182	186	189	192	195	199	206	201	211	217	217	19.2%
Average faculty salary ($000s)												
Assistant Professor	32.3	34.5	35.2	36.2	37.8	40.1	40.7	41.2	45.7	47.6	46.9	45.2%
Associate Professor	40.0	44.3	45.4	45.5	47.8	50.7	52.0	53.3	57.0	59.1	61.0	52.5%
Professor	53.1	58.1	61.3	60.7	63.1	67.3	68.2	70.4	75.6	78.6	80.2	51.0%

Non-faculty Staff	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99	99/00	% Change 1989-1999
Administrative	84	95	99	100	98	102	108	113	132	137	145	72.6%
Staff	173	161	162	169	157	152	150	147	147	146	145	-16.2%
Maintenance & Operations	85	86	87	87	87	89	91	93	94	94	96	12.9%
Total Non-faculty headcount	342	342	348	356	342	343	349	353	373	377	386	12.9%
Student-Non-Faculty Staff Ratio	4.89	4.83	4.89	4.75	4.88	4.81	4.87	4.86	4.60	4.60	4.51	

Library	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Number of Volumes	453,171	465,369	477,139	484,634	495,048	505,807	518,421	526,578	538,377	546,816
Total Expenditures	$1,981,039	$2,105,573	$2,209,361	$2,164,650	$2,248,241	$2,320,542	$2,358,784	$2,530,213	$2,693,048	$2,820,067

Source: Dean of Faculty's Office, Personnel, Oberlin Library Study.

162

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF KEY HAMILTON INDICATORS (ctd.)

Endowment

	FY90	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00
Market Value	6/30/90	6/30/91	6/30/92	6/30/93	6/30/94	6/30/95	6/30/96	6/30/97	6/30/98	6/30/99	6/30/00
Endowment & similar funds*	$114,519,276	$118,446,858	$128,189,639	$144,485,041	$145,704,888	$175,421,000	$222,702,097	$260,391,581	$306,222,337	$355,726,487	$432,224,807
% Change from previous year	0.5%	3.4%	8.2%	12.7%	0.8%	20.4%	27.0%	16.9%	17.6%	16.2%	21.5%
Pooled Income & similar funds+	$11,450,210	$11,868,431	$13,342,222	$16,507,395	$18,246,396	$21,000,000	$23,098,362	$27,599,220	$38,391,024	$45,916,594	$53,049,031
Total Endowment & Pooled Income	$125,969,486	$130,315,289	$141,531,861	$160,992,436	$163,951,284	$196,421,000	$245,800,459	$287,990,801	$344,613,361	$401,643,081	$485,273,838
% Change from previous year	0.9%	3.4%	8.6%	13.7%	1.8%	19.8%	25.1%	17.2%	19.7%	16.5%	20.8%

*Includes "True" Endowment, Quasi-endowment, & Clark H. Minor funds.

+Includes Pooled Income, 175th Anniversary Income, Living Trusts, Unitrusts. See definition on page 24 in the Finance Section of the Hamilton College Planning Notebook.

Endowment Performance measures

	FY90	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	FY00
	6/30/90	6/30/91	6/30/92	6/30/93	6/30/94	6/30/95	6/30/96	6/30/97	6/30/98	6/30/99	6/30/00
Endowment income earned*	$4,920,883	$4,842,284	$5,493,273	$6,972,988	$6,258,969	$6,932,500	$7,505,623	$8,114,150	$8,764,400	$9,465,500	$14,025,000
Per FTE Student (via NACUBO)	1,655	1,650	1,703	1,692	1,654	1,660	1,664	1,699	1,705	1,720	1,727
per FTE as % of total charges	9.1%	8.2%	8.0%	7.6%	7.0%	6.7%	6.4%	6.2%	6.0%	6%	6%
Endowment Market Value											
Per FTE Student (fall enrollment)	$69,206	$71,786	$75,273	$85,380	$88,086	$105,675	$133,810	$153,262	$179,576	$206,848	$250,266
Endowment & Pooled Income											
Per FTE Student (fall enrollment)	$76,126	$78,979	$83,107	$95,135	$99,116	$118,326	$147,689	$169,506	$202,090	$233,547	$280,983

*Net of Fees. Income earned on unrestricted endowment funds is recorded as revenue when earned. Income earned
on restricted endowment funds is recorded as revenue when expenditures are made for designated purposes.

Source: NACUBO Report

163

Appendices - Middle States Self-Study

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF KEY HAMILTON INDICATORS (ctd.)
Voluntary Support

	FY90 6/30/90	FY91 6/30/91	FY92 6/30/92	FY93 6/30/93	FY94 6/30/94	FY95 6/30/95	FY96 6/30/96	FY97 6/30/97	FY98 6/30/98	FY99 6/30/99
Total Voluntary Support										
Voluntary Support for Current Operations	$2,623,265	$3,149,810	$2,648,330	$2,200,054	$2,872,450	$3,490,084	$3,504,923	$4,085,367	$4,331,193	$4,222,786
Voluntary Support for Capital Purposes	$4,506,159	$5,064,406	$4,886,884	$8,583,664	$7,458,480	$7,535,432	$9,429,279	$19,181,075	$7,365,431	$8,042,591
Total Voluntary Support	$7,129,424	$8,214,216	$7,535,214	$10,783,718	$10,330,930	$11,025,516	$12,934,202	$23,266,442	$11,696,624	$12,265,377
From Individuals:										
Alumni/ae	$4,038,781	$4,446,922	$4,731,747	$8,030,496	$7,242,864	$5,946,453	$10,315,617	$20,194,371	$4,975,907	$6,052,994
Parents	$517,254	$441,603	$595,787	$396,822	$404,967	$536,697	$417,966	$282,373	$750,485	$779,039
Other Individuals*	$552,910	$980,235	$597,377	$423,541	$1,099,571	$2,829,472	$909,015	$570,514	$1,044,236	$1,486,207
Subtotal	$5,108,945	$5,868,760	$5,924,911	$8,850,859	$8,747,402	$9,312,622	$11,642,598	$21,047,258	$6,770,628	$8,318,240
From Organizations:										
Foundations	$1,322,290	$1,652,725	$1,160,630	$1,328,200	$1,066,502	$1,261,859	$884,069	$1,706,310	$4,086,885	$3,164,500
Corporations, Businesses	$669,004	$671,366	$431,611	$586,657	$505,254	$438,657	$395,326	$500,817	$830,093	$773,639
Fund-raising Consortia	$29,185	$21,365	$18,062	$18,002	$11,772	$12,378	$12,209	$12,057	$9,018	$8,998
Subtotal	$2,020,479	$2,345,456	$1,610,303	$1,932,859	$1,583,528	$1,712,894	$1,291,604	$2,219,184	$4,925,996	$3,947,137
TOTAL	$7,129,424	$8,214,216	$7,535,214	$10,783,718	$10,330,930	$11,025,516	$12,934,202	$23,266,442	$11,696,624	$12,265,377

*Includes non-alumni parents, families, non-alumni board members, and all other individual sources before 1983/84.
Source: Council for Aid to Education (CFAE) Survey of Voluntary Support of Education.

Annual Fund

	FY90	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99
Alumni Base	10,875	11,222	11,478	11,739	11,888	13,044	13,571	13,251	13,889	14,186
Number of Donors	6,691	6,620	6,858	7,053	6,663	6,686	6,404	6,786	7,164	7,466
Participation in Annual Fund	61.5%	59.0%	59.7%	60.1%	56.0%	51.3%	47.2%	51.2%	51.6%	52.6%
Total Annual Fund Gifts from Alumni	2,421,821	2,421,821	2,112,732	2,489,890	3,085,808	3,853,201	2,430,497	2,598,489	2,752,003	3,056,680
Total Annual Fund*	$3,026,532	$3,096,472	$3,179,494	$3,390,516	$3,991,935	$4,975,388	$3,002,883	$3,184,596	$3,378,022	$3,726,193

Source: Pumpkin Papers, *Hamilton Annual Fund Review.

164

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF KEY HAMILTON INDICATORS (ctd.)

Revenues

	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	Actual 1999/00	Proposed Budget 2000/01	% Change 90/91 to 00/01* (nominal $)
Tuition & Fees	27,489,192	29,867,000	30,684,483	32,119,140	33,638,040	35,452,075	38,526,750	40,202,278	42,474,996	45,926,000	45,814,000	66.7%
Investment Return	4,842,284	5,493,273	6,972,988	6,258,969	6,932,500	7,505,623	8,114,150	8,764,400	9,465,500	14,025,000	15,147,000	212.8%
Private Gifts	1,456,831	1,670,236	1,919,737	2,157,055	2,563,309	3,019,039	3,191,850	3,649,648	3,917,549	3,800,000	4,100,000	181.4%
Restricted Gifts & Grants	1,091,274	1,135,475	506,401	742,497	828,715	542,599	1,326,103	1,092,149	1,333,820	400,000	505,500	-53.7%
Government Grants & Contracts	1,510,579	1,195,703	1,247,704	1,074,161	918,806	1,039,621	986,652	814,836	870,870	1,108,000	1,005,700	-33.4%
Operating Interest Income	532,054	381,199	223,344	264,096	807,490	512,239	729,087	719,270	805,708	1,200,000	725,000	36.3%
Other Sources	402,203	389,372	726,381	676,297	662,112	556,851	650,386	681,429	708,263	825,000	614,500	52.8%
Auxiliary Enterprises	7,677,786	8,182,084	8,509,272	9,101,170	10,263,181	11,406,174	12,192,064	12,420,854	12,819,595	13,225,500	13,746,300	79.0%
Transfer from Quasi (Campaign)									250,000	0	602,300	
Total Revenues	45,002,203	48,314,342	50,790,310	52,393,385	56,614,153	60,034,221	65,717,042	68,344,864	72,646,301	80,509,500	82,260,300	82.8%

	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	Actual 1999/00	Proposed Budget 2000/01	
Scholarships & Fellowships as a % of Tuition & Fees Income (Discount Rate)	23.6%	24.3%	25.0%	24.7%	25.7%	27.1%	27.5%	27.9%	31.6%	30.5%	32.1%	35.9%

Revenues by Category as a Percent of Total Revenues

	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	Projected Actual 1999/00	Proposed Budget 2000/01
Tuition & Fees	61.1%	61.8%	60.4%	61.3%	59.4%	59.1%	58.6%	58.8%	58.5%	57.0%	55.7%
Investment Return	10.8%	11.4%	13.7%	11.9%	12.2%	12.5%	12.3%	12.8%	13.0%	17.4%	18.4%
Private Gifts	3.2%	3.5%	3.8%	4.1%	4.5%	5.0%	4.9%	5.3%	5.4%	4.7%	5.0%
Restricted Gifts & Grants	2.4%	2.4%	1.0%	1.4%	1.5%	0.9%	2.0%	1.6%	1.8%	0.5%	0.6%
Government Grants & Contracts	3.4%	2.5%	2.5%	2.1%	1.6%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	1.2%	1.4%	1.2%
Operating Interest Income	1.2%	0.8%	0.4%	0.5%	1.4%	0.9%	1.1%	1.1%	1.1%	1.5%	0.9%
Other Sources	0.9%	0.8%	1.4%	1.3%	1.2%	0.9%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	1.0%	0.7%
Auxiliary Enterprises	17.1%	16.9%	16.8%	17.4%	18.1%	19.0%	18.6%	18.2%	17.6%	16.4%	16.7%
Transfer from Quasi (Campaign)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.7%
Total Revenues (%)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

* Based on Budget 00/01

Source: Hamilton College Budget

165

Appendices - Middle States Self-Study

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF KEY HAMILTON INDICATORS (ctd.)

Expenditures

Expenditures	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	Actual 1999/00	Proposed Budget 2000/01	% Change 90/91 to 00/01* (nominal $)
Instruction	10,013,923	11,183,120	11,907,186	12,131,939	12,656,940	12,983,846	13,563,568	14,649,465	15,932,336	17,135,625	18,160,070	81.3%
Scholarships	6,483,302	7,260,247	7,658,473	7,923,198	8,628,253	9,601,211	10,588,745	11,197,629	13,420,282	14,024,300	14,684,000	126.5%
Research	577,721	572,619	448,262	250,759	580,997	590,680	855,444	669,118	662,397	855,000	1,061,700	83.8%
Academic Support	4,082,980	3,834,425	4,040,770	3,575,666	4,232,584	4,207,737	4,479,839	5,058,933	5,575,010	5,547,780	5,786,885	41.7%
Student Life	1,772,171	2,220,534	2,256,517	2,117,313	2,108,496	2,292,573	2,385,369	2,543,517	2,853,034	3,156,115	3,319,390	87.3%
Admissions & Financial Aid	755,478	803,653	817,205	866,935	1,397,512	1,334,504	1,484,645	1,416,061	1,543,975	1,593,190	1,611,150	113.3%
Communications & Development	2,517,271	2,498,156	2,871,281	2,907,769	2,293,718	2,256,387	2,830,849	3,382,391	3,463,922	3,138,855	3,355,670	33.3%
Information Technology Services	769,354	909,347	878,903	846,509	875,883	954,291	1,076,098	1,309,981	1,369,699	1,869,360	2,065,320	168.4%
Administration	1,310,580	1,391,361	1,350,872	1,642,352	1,724,046	1,595,790	1,862,974	1,880,907	1,877,339	2,084,370	2,126,370	62.2%
Maintenance & Operations	5,627,047	5,831,915	5,973,820	6,450,160	6,530,945	6,815,736	7,087,879	7,292,696	6,811,112	7,259,660	7,329,170	30.2%
Auxiliary Enterprises	3,446,025	3,495,529	3,632,399	4,231,139	5,040,469	5,502,873	5,789,525	6,041,426	6,112,857	6,113,360	6,247,800	81.3%
Debt Service	872,702	838,357	2,046,168	2,051,725	2,250,785	3,350,589	3,437,746	2,843,503	2,944,833	4,367,500	4,367,800	400.5%
Benefits	3,711,440	4,666,486	4,888,339	5,169,459	5,292,922	5,475,944	5,858,574	6,090,383	6,679,502	7,069,100	7,692,100	107.3%
Equipment	624,686	555,938	395,507	491,433	674,701	700,284	1,538,238	1,066,938	483,499	1,085,000	1,055,000	68.9%
Renewals & Replacements	958,264	919,696	599,691	530,390	818,453	1,251,308	1,117,197	1,410,047	808,125	700,000	1,000,000	4.4%
Other Institutional Expenses	1,063,403	1,161,018	911,417	1,190,054	1,377,414	1,101,565	1,367,049	1,382,576	2,073,601	2,750,285	2,397,875	125.5%
Total Expenditures	44,586,347	48,142,401	50,676,810	52,376,800	56,484,118	60,015,318	65,323,739	68,235,571	72,611,523	78,749,500	82,260,300	84.5%
Excess (Shortfall)	415,856	171,941	113,500	16,585	130,035	18,903	393,303	109,293	34,778	1,760,000	0	

Expenditures By Category as a Percent of Total Expenditures

	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	Projected Actual 1999/00	Proposed Budget 2000/01
Instruction	22.5%	23.2%	23.5%	23.2%	22.4%	21.6%	20.8%	21.5%	21.9%	21.8%	22.1%
Scholarships	14.5%	15.1%	15.1%	15.1%	15.3%	16.0%	16.2%	16.4%	18.5%	17.8%	17.9%
Research	1.3%	1.2%	0.9%	0.5%	1.0%	1.0%	1.3%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	1.3%
Academic Support	9.2%	8.0%	8.0%	6.8%	7.5%	7.0%	6.9%	7.4%	7.7%	7.0%	7.0%
Student Life	4.0%	4.6%	4.5%	4.0%	3.7%	3.8%	3.7%	3.7%	3.9%	4.0%	4.0%
Admissions & Financial Aid	1.7%	1.7%	1.6%	1.7%	2.5%	2.2%	2.3%	2.1%	2.1%	2.0%	2.0%
Communications & Development	5.6%	5.2%	5.7%	5.6%	4.1%	3.8%	4.3%	5.0%	4.8%	4.0%	4.1%
Information Technology Services	1.7%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.6%	1.9%	1.9%	2.4%	2.5%
Administration	2.9%	2.9%	2.7%	3.1%	3.1%	2.7%	2.9%	2.8%	2.6%	2.6%	2.6%
Maintenance & Operations	12.6%	12.1%	11.8%	12.3%	11.6%	11.4%	10.9%	10.7%	9.4%	9.2%	8.9%
Auxiliary Enterprises	7.7%	7.3%	7.2%	8.1%	8.9%	9.2%	8.9%	8.9%	8.4%	7.8%	7.6%
Debt Service	2.0%	1.7%	4.0%	3.9%	4.0%	5.6%	5.3%	4.2%	4.1%	5.5%	5.3%
Benefits	8.3%	9.7%	9.6%	9.9%	9.4%	9.1%	9.0%	8.9%	9.2%	9.0%	9.4%
Equipment	1.4%	1.2%	0.8%	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%	2.4%	1.6%	0.7%	1.4%	1.3%
Renewals & Replacements	2.1%	1.9%	1.2%	1.0%	1.4%	2.1%	1.7%	2.1%	1.1%	0.9%	1.2%
Other Institutional Expenses	2.4%	2.4%	1.8%	2.3%	2.4%	1.8%	2.1%	2.0%	2.9%	3.5%	2.9%
Total Expenditures (%)	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Source: Hamilton College Budget

Appendices - Middle States Self-Study

HISTORICAL SUMMARY OF KEY HAMILTON INDICATORS (ctd.)

College Costs:

	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	Actual FY00	Budget FY01	% Change FY91-FY01
Tuition and Fee Rate	15,850	16,650	17,650	18,650	19,700	20,700	21,800	22,800	23,700	25,100	26,100	64.7%
% Change from Previous Year	12.8%	5.0%	6.0%	5.7%	5.6%	5.1%	5.3%	4.6%	3.9%	5.9%	4.0%	
Room	2,200	2,300	2,400	2,450	2,550	2,650	2,750	2,850	2,950	3,200	3,320	50.9%
Board	2,150	2,250	2,350	2,400	2,500	2,600	2,700	2,800	2,900	3,000	3,120	45.1%
Total Charges	20,200	21,200	22,400	23,500	24,750	25,950	27,250	28,450	29,550	31,300	32,540	61.1%
% Change from Previous Year	11.0%	5.0%	5.7%	4.9%	5.3%	4.8%	5.0%	4.4%	3.9%	5.9%	4.0%	

Beginning in 1996/97, Hamilton includes a separate charge of $100 for mandatory "fees".

Analysis of College Funded Financial Aid (Scholarships):

	FY91	FY92	FY93	FY94	FY95	FY96	FY97	FY98	FY99	Actual FY00	Budget FY01	% Change FY91-FY01
Unrestricted Financial Aid	4,862,000	5,647,000	7,079,000	6,402,000	6,007,000	6,823,000	7,067,473	7,416,388	8,168,400	8,043,100	8,291,400	70.5%
Restricted Financial Aid	2,556,900	2,610,182	2,061,680	2,106,337	3,696,198	3,883,047	3,268,615	3,321,476	4,252,185	5,731,200	6,172,600	141.4%
Total College Funded Aid	7,418,900	8,257,182	9,140,680	8,508,337	9,703,198	10,706,047	10,336,088	10,737,864	12,420,585	13,774,300	14,464,000	95.0%
% Unrestricted Financial Aid	65.5%	68.4%	77.4%	75.2%	61.9%	63.7%	68.4%	69.1%	65.8%	58.4%	57.3%	
% Restricted Financial Aid	34.5%	31.6%	22.6%	24.8%	38.1%	36.3%	31.6%	30.9%	34.2%	41.6%	42.7%	
Unrest. as a % of Tuition and Fees Rev.	17.7%	18.9%	23.1%	19.9%	17.9%	19.2%	18.3%	18.4%	19.2%	17.5%	18.1%	
Annual Growth Rate in Unrest. Aid	23.5%	16.1%	25.4%	-9.6%	-6.2%	13.6%	3.6%	4.9%	10.1%	-1.5%	3.1%	
Net Tuition Revenue	21,005,890	22,606,753	23,026,010	24,195,942	25,009,787	25,850,864	27,938,005	29,004,649	29,054,714	31,901,700	31,130,000	48.2%
Net Tuition Rev. per FT Enroll.	12,931	13,557	14,023	15,038	15,626	16,002	16,729	17,488	17,372	18,733	18,374	42.1%
Annual Growth Rate in Net Tuition Rev.	10.0%	7.6%	1.9%	5.1%	3.4%	3.4%	8.1%	3.8%	0.2%	9.8%	-2.4%	
Net Tuition Rev. (in 90/91 $)	21,005,890	21,900,292	21,630,494	22,179,614	22,267,199	22,410,948	23,652,693	24,145,259	23,712,682	25,107,250	23,902,349	13.8%
Net Tuition Rev. per FT Enroll. (in 90/91 $)	12,931	13,134	13,173	13,785	13,913	13,872	14,163	14,558	14,178	14,743	14,108	9.1%
Annual Growth Rate	4.7%	4.3%	-1.2%	2.5%	0.4%	0.6%	5.5%	2.1%	-1.8%	5.9%	-4.8%	
Fall Full-Time Enrollment	1641	1691	1681	1646	1649	1658	1686	1695	1705	1712	1717	4.6%
Spring Full-Time Enrollment	1608	1644	1603	1572	1552	1573	1654	1622	1640	1694	1672	4.0%
Full Time Enrollment***	1625	1668	1642	1609	1601	1616	1670	1659	1673	1703	1694	4.3%
CPI Annual Increase (Fiscal Year: 6/30-7/1)	5.4%	3.2%	3.1%	2.5%	3.0%	2.7%	2.4%	1.7%	2.0%	3.7%	2.5%	

*** Full Time Enrollment measured by (Fall Enrollment + Spring Enrollment)/2. FY01 Enrollment figures are projections.
Source: Hamilton College Budget

167

MULTICULTURAL APPLICANTS

Class Year: Enter Year: (Fall)	1993 1989	1994 1990	1995 1991	1996 1992	1997 1993	1998 1994	1999 1995	2000 1996	2001 1997	2002 1998	2003 1999
African-Americans	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Admitted/Matriculating	18	15	17	14	15	15	13	9	13	16	20
Admitted/Withdrawn	71	55	55	57	39	64	53	51	64	61	63
Denied	51	69	57	67	58	46	35	63	58	31	55
Withdrew before Action	0	1	0	3	4	1	1	2	4	3	3
Total	140	140	129	141	118	126	102	125	139	111	141
% Admitted	63.6%	50.0%	55.8%	50.4%	46.6%	62.7%	64.7%	48.0%	55.4%	69.4%	58.9%
% Yield	20.2%	21.4%	23.6%	19.7%	27.8%	19.0%	19.7%	15.0%	16.9%	20.8%	24.1%
Hispanic-Americans	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Admitted/Matriculating	16	18	14	16	19	18	11	13	15	25	20
Admitted/Withdrawn	40	56	48	48	39	44	47	46	69	47	44
Denied	22	39	16	27	27	35	38	64	41	45	43
Withdrew before Action	1	3	0	4	3	0	1	1	6	8	7
Total	79	116	78	95	88	97	97	124	131	125	114
% Admitted	70.9%	63.8%	79.5%	67.4%	65.9%	63.9%	59.8%	47.6%	64.1%	57.6%	56.1%
% Yield	28.6%	24.3%	22.6%	28.1%	32.8%	29.0%	19.0%	22.0%	17.9%	34.7%	31.3%
Asian-Americans	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Admitted/Matriculating	15	21	18	16	19	13	11	13	16	14	24
Admitted/Withdrawn	58	74	92	98	91	88	65	72	81	83	67
Denied	96	71	61	56	44	71	49	87	49	47	49
Withdrew before Action	21	14	15	6	5	2	5	5	12	1	5
Total	190	180	186	178	159	174	130	177	156	145	145
% Admitted	38.4%	52.8%	59.1%	64.0%	69.2%	58.0%	58.5%	48.0%	61.4%	66.9%	62.8%
% Yield	20.5%	22.1%	16.4%	14.0%	17.3%	12.9%	14.5%	15.3%	16.5%	14.4%	26.4%

MULTICULTURAL APPLICANTS, con't.

Class Year:	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Enter Year: (Fall)	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999

Native Americans

	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Admitted/Matriculating	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	1
Admitted/Withdrawn	0	2	7	2	2	7	3	9	7	2	5
Denied	0	0	2	0	1	7	2	1	1	7	3
Withdrew before Action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	6	9	2	3	14	8	10	12	10	9
% Admitted	0.0%	100.0%	77.8%	100.0%	66.7%	50.0%	75.0%	90.0%	66.7%	30.0%	66.7%
% Yield	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	12.5%	33.3%	16.7%

Multicultural Students Summary

	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Total Multicultural applications	409	442	402	416	366	411	337	436	440	391	409
as % of total applications	10.8%	11.7%	11.3%	11.7%	11.7%	11.8%	9.2%	10.8%	10.7%	10.1%	10.5%
Total Multicultural admits	218	245	251	251	224	249	206	213	266	249	244
as % of total admits	15.4%	14.9%	14.5%	14.4%	12.6%	13.3%	11.8%	12.0%	15.4%	15.9%	14.7%
% of Multicultural apps. admitted	53.3%	55.4%	82.4%	60.3%	81.2%	60.6%	61.1%	48.9%	60.5%	63.7%	59.7%
Diff. from overall admits	+15.7%	+12.0%	+13.8%	+11.2%	+4.4%	+6.5%	+13.1%	+5.0%	+18.3%	+23.4%	+17.2%
Multicultural matriculants	49	58	49	48	53	46	38	35	45	58	65
% of Class	11.5%	12.9%	10.6%	10.4%	11.8%	9.6%	7.8%	7.0%	9.6%	12.1%	13.0%
% Multicultural yield	22.6%	23.7%	19.5%	19.1%	23.7%	18.5%	18.4%	16.4%	16.9%	22.5%	26.6%
Diff. from overall yield	-7.5%	-3.6%	-7.1%	-7.4%	-1.6%	-7.1%	-9.4%	-11.6%	-9.5%	-7.2%	-3.5%

RATIO OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL STUDENTS

	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Applicant pool	53/47	52/48	53/47	53/47	59/41	56/44	57/43	58/42	53/47	54/46	54/46
Admit group	54/46	55/45	55/45	56/44	60/40	63/37	63/37	64/36	58/42	63/37	61/39
Enrolled group	56/44	58/42	58/42	57/43	59/41	60/40	66/34	64/36	62/38	66/34	62/38

Source: Admission Office

GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF ENTERING CLASS

| Class Year: | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 |
Enter Year: (Fall)	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1996	1996	1997	1998	1998
	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
New England	28.2%	21.5%	24.0%	24.6%	28.2%	22.9%	29.5%	28.5%	30.7%	26.5%	31.8%
Middle Atlantic	56.8%	57.8%	56.1%	53.1%	56.4%	56.3%	52.0%	57.3%	53.4%	58.6%	55.2%
Rest of U.S.A.	10.4%	14.0%	14.3%	13.0%	9.0%	13.7%	14.8%	10.8%	13.5%	12.1%	10.6%
Foreign	4.6%	6.9%	5.6%	9.3%	6.4%	7.1%	3.1%	3.2%	2.4%	2.8%	3.4%
New York State	44.0%	42.6%	42.0%	39.6%	40.7%	41.0%	36.9%	37.7%	39.2%	45.5%	40.0%

SECONDARY CLASS RANK

Percent Breakdown of Entering Students by Quintile Rank In Secondary School Graduating Class

Males	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
1st quintile	74%	70%	89%	67%	67%	55%	66%	68%	66%	66%	57%
2nd quintile	18%	22%	25%	28%	28%	32%	25%	24%	25%	29%	30%
3rd quintile	8%	7%	5%	5%	6%	11%	7%	6%	8%	4%	11%
4th/5th quintiles	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%
Females											
1st quintile	88%	85%	75%	78%	80%	80%	81%	77%	82%	82%	85%
2nd quintile	12%	12%	19%	20%	15%	20%	17%	20%	14%	18%	15%
3rd quintile	2%	3%	5%	2%	6%	0%	2%	3%	4%	1%	0%
4th/5th quintiles	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Total											
1st quintile	80%	77%	72%	72%	73%	68%	74%	73%	74%	75%	71%
2nd quintile	15%	17%	22%	24%	22%	26%	21%	22%	19%	23%	22%
3rd quintile	5%	5%	5%	3%	4%	6%	5%	4%	6%	2%	6%
4th/5th quintiles	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%

SAT SCORES:

		1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Class Year:												
Enter Year: (Fall)		1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
						Nonrecentered Scores*			Recentered Scores*			
		88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Applicants	VSAT mean*	551	546	541	539	528	532	541	608	609	615	623
	MSAT mean*	609	608	606	603	600	602	611	614	614	621	614
		88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Admits	VSAT mean*	580	575	567	564	556	560	572	645	641	647	642
	MSAT mean*	631	634	627	624	618	624	632	642	639	647	640
		88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Matriculants	VSAT mean*	555	553	548	539	531	536	548	628	625	625	624
	MSAT mean*	605	610	610	602	591	603	609	626	619	625	623
		88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Male Matriculants	VSAT mean*	559	556	545	546	534	535	552	629	629	616	633
	MSAT mean*	629	623	624	618	607	617	625	640	638	630	620
		88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Female Matriculants	VSAT mean*	551	549	551	531	527	538	543	627	622	634	615
	MSAT mean*	578	586	593	586	569	586	593	612	601	619	626
		88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
National SAT Means	VSAT Male	434	429	426	428	428	425	429	507	507	507	509
	VSAT Female	421	419	418	419	420	421	428	503	503	503	502
	VSAT Total	427	424	422	423	424	423	428	505	505	505	505
	MSAT Male	500	499	497	499	502	501	503	527	527	530	531
	MSAT Female	454	455	453	458	457	480	463	492	492	494	496
	MSAT Total	476	476	474	476	478	479	482	508	508	511	512

SAT Score Range of Middle 50% of Admitted Students

	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Verbal*	530-630	530-630	520-620	520-620	500-610	510-610	520-620	600-690	590-690	600-700	600-690
Math*	580-690	590-690	580-680	580-680	560-670	570-670	590-690	600-690	600-690	600-690	590-690

* The College Board began reporting SAT scores on new sets of scales starting in April 1995.
The changes reestablished the average score near the midpoint of the 200-800 scale.
• SAT means are for internal use only.

Admission Report - Fall 1999

Admission Master

SAT SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF ENTERING CLASS

VERBAL

	Nonrecentered Scores*							Recentered Scores*			
Class of:	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Enter Year:	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
Male											
750-800	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	5%	9%	5%
700-749	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	13%	12%	7%	11%
650-699	10%	7%	6%	9%	4%	4%	6%	23%	26%	21%	30%
600-649	25%	21%	18%	19%	14%	15%	20%	27%	27%	22%	30%
550-599	19%	24%	20%	19%	28%	22%	27%	21%	17%	19%	11%
500-549	24%	23%	27%	27%	25%	22%	21%	8%	8%	14%	9%
450-499	14%	17%	16%	15%	15%	21%	15%	2%	4%	5%	3%
400-449	6%	4%	5%	7%	9%	9%	5%	0%	1%	2%	1%
200-399	1%	1%	5%	3%	4%	3%	3%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Female											
750-800	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	5%	7%	7%	2%
700-749	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	3%	12%	11%	14%	9%
650-699	7%	7%	10%	4%	5%	6%	6%	23%	20%	21%	21%
600-649	20%	18%	14%	10%	15%	11%	16%	29%	23%	29%	32%
550-599	25%	27%	28%	23%	23%	26%	24%	18%	22%	18%	20%
500-549	23%	27%	27%	32%	24%	28%	25%	9%	12%	8%	12%
450-499	17%	10%	16%	21%	19%	19%	18%	3%	3%	1%	4%
400-449	4%	6%	3%	5%	8%	6%	5%	0%	1%	1%	0%
200-399	2%	3%	2%	4%	6%	2%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%

* The College Board began reporting SAT scores on new sets of scales starting in April 1995.
The changes reestablished the average score near the midpoint of the 200-800 scale.

1999/00 (rev. 10/25/00)

Office of Institutional Research

Hamilton College

SAT SCORE DISTRIBUTION OF ENTERING CLASS

MATH

						Nonrecentered Scores*		Recentered Scores*			
Class of:	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Enter Year:	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Male	88/89	89/90	90/91	91/92	92/93	93/94	94/95	95/96	96/97	97/98	98/99
750-800	4%	5%	4%	2%	2%	3%	2%	6%	4%	4%	3%
700-749	12%	11%	14%	13%	11%	10%	15%	14%	17%	10%	11%
650-699	32%	25%	22%	24%	19%	26%	23%	26%	27%	28%	25%
600-649	26%	24%	26%	3%	25%	27%	32%	30%	30%	29%	27%
550-599	14%	18%	23%	19%	23%	16%	14%	16%	11%	17%	19%
500-549	8%	11%	8%	9%	13%	12%	9%	6%	7%	10%	9%
450-499	4%	3%	3%	2%	5%	4%	4%	2%	2%	2%	3%
400-449	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	2%
200-399	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Female											
750-800	1%	1%	0%	2%	0%	0%	1%	2%	2%	3%	6%
700-749	2%	8%	4%	5%	4%	5%	6%	7%	7%	8%	9%
650-699	16%	21%	18%	14%	8%	16%	16%	22%	18%	23%	21%
600-649	27%	20%	27%	22%	28%	28%	28%	33%	30%	32%	36%
550-599	28%	28%	30%	29%	28%	30%	26%	22%	25%	20%	16%
500-549	15%	14%	16%	6%	25%	16%	16%	10%	12%	10%	7%
450-499	6%	5%	5%	10%	6%	7%	8%	3%	5%	4%	3%
400-449	4%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	0%	2%
200-399	2%	2%	0%	1%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%

SECONDARY CLASS RANK OF ENTERING CLASS
(In Percentile Ranges)

Class of: Enter Year:	1993 88/89	1994 89/90	1995 90/91	1996 91/92	1997 92/93	1998 93/94	1999 94/95	2000 95/96	2001 96/97	2002 97/98	2003 98/99
Males											
90-100%	45%	42%	36%	35%	35%	31%	34%	34%	38%	47%	36%
80-89%	29%	28%	31%	32%	32%	24%	32%	34%	26%	19%	21%
70-79%	9%	18%	18%	19%	19%	17%	17%	18%	17%	16%	20%
60-69%	9%	6%	7%	8%	9%	15%	7%	8%	9%	13%	9%
50-59%	8%	2%	5%	3%	2%	8%	6%	4%	8%	4%	8%
40-49%	2%	5%	1%	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%	2%	0%	3%
0-39%	0%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	2%	3%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Females											
90-100%	59%	58%	44%	51%	46%	57%	52%	57%	58%	58%	61%
80-89%	27%	27%	31%	27%	33%	23%	29%	20%	27%	24%	26%
70-79%	10%	9%	15%	14%	10%	11%	13%	16%	9%	13%	9%
60-69%	2%	3%	4%	5%	5%	9%	4%	5%	5%	4%	6%
50-59%	2%	3%	2%	0%	4%	0%	1%	2%	3%	0%	0%
40-49%	0%	0%	3%	2%	2%	0%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%
0-39%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total											
90-100%	51%	50%	41%	42%	40%	44%	43%	46%	47%	53%	48%
80-89%	28%	27%	31%	30%	33%	24%	30%	28%	26%	22%	23%
70-79%	10%	13%	17%	17%	15%	14%	15%	15%	13%	15%	15%
60-69%	8%	5%	5%	7%	7%	12%	6%	7%	7%	8%	8%
50-59%	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%	4%	3%	3%	5%	2%	4%
40-49%	1%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%
0-39%	0%	0%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total % of Class with Rank	70%	69%	67%	63%	51%	50%	54%	58%	53%	54%	48%

COMMUNICATIONS AND DEVELOPMENT
APPENDIX 1: C & D ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

Hamilton College
Office of Communications and Development

Organizational chart boxes:

Vice President, Communications and Development — R. Tantillo
- Assistant to VP — J. Bunett
- Receptionist/Secretary — J. Eisenhut
- Editor, Review — F. Lorenz

Alumni Secretary — D. Abelson
- Staff Assistant — D. Lutz
- Director, Special Programs — J. Hays K'73
  - Staff Assistant — M. Melvin
- Associate Director, Alumni Programs — A. Paslik '96
- Director, Information Services — V. Silliman
  - Account Coordinator — L. Dixon
  - Records Clerk — M. Coogan
  - Accounts and Records Clerk — C. Amatore

Director, Annual Giving — W. Brower '84
- Associate Director, Annual Giving — C. Church
- Associate Director, Annual Giving — J. Murphy '85
  - Staff Assistant — J. Burke
- Associate Director, Annual Giving — S. Donegan
  - Secretary — L. Holihan

Director, Principal Gifts — M. Evans '62

Director, Major Gifts — L. Deardton '87
- Assistant Director, Leadership Gifts — C. Ferrone '88
- Director, Stewardship Programs — K. Hopkins
- Development Researcher — P. Whitford

Director, Foundation, Corp. & Govt. Relations — W. Billiter
- Assistant Director, Foundation, Corp. & Govt. Relations — A. Lindner

Director, Planned Giving — B. Madonia '74
- Associate Director, Planned Giving — vacant

Director, Communications — M. Debraggio
- Web position — vacant
- Director, Publications — S. Hummelberger
  - Print Production Coordinator — B. House
  - Typesetter — P. Jackson

Director, Media Relations — S. Rippey
- Assistant Director, Media Relations — H. Foster

Secretaries: Secretary — D. Durgin; Secretary — L. Spatini; Secretary — C. Fobes; Secretary — B. Laird-Leonard

Updated: 1/2000

Hamilton College Curriculum Changes
1989 to 1999

1993/94

- Ancient Mediterranean Civilization discontinued
- International/Comparative Politics changed to World Politics

1994/95

- Linguistics discontinued
- Anthropology and Archeology split
- Mathematics and Computer Science split

1995/96

New:
- Communication Studies
- Program in Teacher Education
- Environmental Studies Minor

1998/99

New:
- Medieval and Renaissance Studies
- Neuroscience

- Asian Studies changed to East Asian Studies

N.B.   The Program in Teacher Education, which was to end with the class of 2001, is now under review by the state after private institutions with teaching programs. The state had determined that programs such as ours would no longer lead to certification. However, things look promising that after a one year hiatus, the program will be reinstated.

Enrollment by Department

ENROLLMENT BY DEPARTMENT	1989/90	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	10-Year Change
Africana Studies	63.00	171.00	135.00	211.00	130.00	70.00	93.00	68.00	76.00	119.00	56.00
American Studies	26.00	16.00	21.00	28.00	7.00	62.00	26.00	8.00	32.00	51.00	25.00
Ancient Mediterranean Civ.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Anthropology	492.00	481.00	474.00	469.00	436.00	346.00	359.00	311.00	393.00	384.00	(108.00)
Archaeology	---	---	---	---	---	92.00	90.00	88.00	48.00	103.00	---
Art	907.00	965.00	907.00	912.00	971.00	813.00	950.00	1,017.00	1,116.00	1,102.00	195.00
Asian Studies	4.00	2.00	9.00	3.00	4.00	0.00	7.00	10.00	5.00	6.00	2.00
Biology	350.00	393.50	490.00	536.50	524.50	513.50	489.50	487.00	473.50	446.50	96.50
Chemistry	198.25	266.00	331.50	325.50	359.00	417.00	348.00	277.00	253.00	253.00	54.75
Biochemistry	9.00	9.50	11.00	12.00	15.50	10.00	19.00	6.00	9.50	3.00	(6.00)
Classics	193.00	231.00	169.00	188.00	172.00	173.00	168.00	220.00	242.00	218.00	25.00
Classic Studies	(115.00)	(164.00)	(108.00)	131.00	(109.00)	(133.00)	(129.00)	(180.00)	(173.00)	(152.00)	(37.00)
Greek	(21.00)	(19.00)	(11.00)	16.00	(16.00)	(17.00)	(16.00)	(13.00)	(20.00)	(27.00)	(6.00)
Latin	(57.00)	(48.00)	(50.00)	41.00	(47.00)	(23.00)	(23.00)	(27.00)	(49.00)	(39.00)	18.00
Comparative Literature	234.00	318.00	308.00	358.00	246.00	294.00	209.00	281.00	241.00	289.00	55.00
Computer Science	---	---	---	---	---	236.00	252.00	417.00	418.00	413.00	---
Colleg/Collg	---	---	---	---	---	---	165.00	170.00	196.00	160.00	---
Critical Languages	71.00	56.00	65.00	66.00	56.00	38.00	45.00	37.00	37.00	31.00	(40.00)
East Asian Languages	87.00	103.00	80.00	87.00	148.00	221.00	152.00	118.00	118.00	124.00	37.00
Chinese	(31.00)	(43.00)	(30.00)	34.00	(125.00)	(189.00)	(121.00)	(84.00)	(88.00)	(84.00)	(53.00)
Japanese	(56.00)	(60.00)	(50.00)	53.00	(23.00)	(32.00)	(31.00)	(34.00)	(30.00)	(40.00)	16.00
Economics	967.00	809.00	857.00	778.00	756.00	896.00	977.00	1,118.00	968.00	908.00	(59.00)
Education	---	---	---	---	---	---	51.75	73.00	55.00	57.25	---
English	1,030.00	1,142.00	1,033.00	905.00	983.00	992.00	901.00	948.50	878.50	913.00	(117.00)
Eng./Creative Writing	148.00	145.50	139.00	144.00	148.00	129.00	130.00	122.00	116.00	120.00	(28.00)
Environmental Studies	---	---	---	---	---	---	48.00	44.00	44.00	49.00	---

Curriculum Changes:
1993/94: Ancient Mediterranean Civilization discontinued. International/Comparative Politics changed to World Politics.
1994/95: Linguistics discontinued. Anthropology and Archeology split. Mathematics and Computer Science split.
1995/96: Communication Studies new
1998/99: Asian Studies changed to East Asian Studies. Neuroscience new.

Source: Registrar's Office

Enrollment by Department

ENROLLMENT BY DEPARTMENT	1989/90	1990/91	1991/92	1992/93	1993/94	1994/95	1995/96	1996/97	1997/98	1998/99	10-Year Change
Geology	323.75	319.00	333.50	333.50	336.00	344.00	349.50	387.50	356.50	322.50	(1.25)
German and Russian	245.00	304.00	293.00	331.00	234.00	261.00	365.00	296.00	247.00	185.00	(60.00)
German	(136.00)	(154.00)	(190.00)	144.00	(165.00)	(106.00)	(175.00)	(147.00)	(109.00)	(88.00)	48.00
Russian	(109.00)	(150.00)	(103.00)	187.00	(69.00)	(155.00)	(190.00)	(149.00)	(138.00)	(97.00)	12.00
Government	1,230.00	1,130.00	1,219.00	1,178.00	1,185.00	1,105.00	1,044.00	1,065.00	1,171.00	1,079.00	(151.00)
History	988.00	898.00	982.00	948.00	788.00	698.00	819.00	800.00	760.00	755.00	(233.00)
Linguistics	53.00	69.00	90.00	66.00	104.00	---	---	---	---	---	---
Mathematics	813.00	895.00	884.00	837.00	953.00	618.00	487.25	657.25	575.00	671.75	(141.25)
Medieval & Ren. Studies	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	6.00	---
Music	437.25	424.00	470.75	442.25	651.75	515.50	430.50	515.00	513.00	447.50	10.25
Philosophy	549.00	515.00	616.00	570.00	571.00	522.00	453.00	522.00	538.00	574.00	25.00
Physics	228.00	223.00	264.00	237.00	321.00	228.00	304.00	193.00	243.00	292.00	64.00
Public Policy	13.00	17.00	31.00	36.00	49.00	19.00	35.00	24.00	23.00	60.00	47.00
Psychology	691.00	680.00	730.00	862.00	768.00	708.00	745.00	652.00	666.00	733.00	42.00
Religion	516.00	376.00	356.00	289.00	372.00	336.00	366.00	418.00	456.00	568.00	52.00
Romance Languages	603.00	582.00	596.00	676.00	679.00	672.00	697.00	671.00	653.00	655.00	52.00
French	(334.00)	(283.00)	(273.00)	317.00	(278.00)	(260.00)	(328.00)	(301.00)	(266.00)	(257.00)	77.00
Spanish	(269.00)	(299.00)	(323.00)	359.00	(401.00)	(412.00)	(369.00)	(370.00)	(387.00)	(398.00)	(129.00)
Sociology	575.00	644.00	589.00	465.00	510.00	442.00	463.00	386.00	423.00	460.00	(115.00)
Speech/Rhet. & Comm.	171.00	195.00	297.00	318.00	248.00	251.00	279.50	392.00	313.25	330.75	159.75
Theatre and Dance	384.00	412.50	352.00	392.25	383.25	428.25	389.50	492.50	432.25	409.25	25.25
Theatre	(160.50)	(168.75)	(172.00)	198.00	(215.50)	(262.00)	(185.00)	(288.00)	(234.50)	(222.50)	(62.00)
Dance	(223.50)	(243.75)	(180.00)	194.25	(167.75)	(166.25)	(192.50)	(204.50)	(197.75)	(186.75)	36.75
Women's Studies	138.00	141.00	176.00	145.00	209.00	205.00	206.00	207.00	208.00	265.00	127.00
Writing Courses	192.00	12.00	12.00	11.00	13.00	19.00	13.00	4.00	5.00	12.00	(180.00)
Totals	12,929.25	12,945.00	13,320.75	13,180.00	13,331.00	12,674.25	12,914.50	13,498.75	11,810.25	13,575.50	646.25

Curriculum Changes:

1993/94: Ancient Mediterranean Civilization discontinued. International/Comparative Politics changed to World Politics.

1994/95: Linguistics discontinued. Anthropology and Archeology split. Mathematics and Computer Science split.

1995/96: Communication Studies new

1998/99: Asian Studies changed to East Asian Studies. Neuroscience new.

Source: Registrar's Office

Hamilton College Graduates by Concentration:

	Concentration	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	% of all Conc. 1999	Total # of Conc. '89-'99	% of all Conc. 89-'99	Pct. Pt. Chg. In Conc. '89-'99	Rankings (all Conc.) '89-'99	Rankings for 1999 Conc.
1	Africana Studies	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0.2%	5	0.1%	0.2%	40	38
2	American Studies	4	8	3	2	8	3	3	8	6	5	15	3.1%	65	1.3%	2.2%	23	12
3	Ancient Mediterranean Clv.	1	0	0	0	0	0	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	0.0%	—	42	n/a
4	Anthropology	9	11	9	9	15	16	17	7	2	6	10	2.1%	111	2.2%	-0.1%	17	17
5	Archaeology	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	4	3	0.6%	13	0.3%	—	38	29
6	Art	11	10	16	13	16	21	14	9	13	19	25	5.2%	167	3.4%	2.6%	8	6
7	Art History	7	9	15	8	3	9	7	8	6	9	9	1.9%	90	1.8%	0.2%	20	20
8	Biochem/Molecular Bio.	0	4	5	4	4	8	8	12	5	6	1	0.2%	57	1.1%	0.2%	24	38
9	Biology	7	10	9	12	17	15	26	20	26	25	26	5.4%	193	3.9%	3.7%	7	4
10	Chemistry	1	3	4	8	5	2	3	4	6	8	6	1.3%	50	1.0%	1.0%	27	24
11	Classics	2	4	3	4	4	4	2	2	4	2	4	0.8%	35	0.7%	0.4%	33	27
12	Communication Studies	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	11	12	11	2.3%	41	0.8%	—	30	16
13	Comparative Literature	11	9	10	12	12	19	21	7	6	5	8	1.7%	120	2.4%	-1.0%	15	22
14	Computer Science	4	9	4	5	9	10	8	3	11	9	17	3.5%	89	1.8%	2.6%	21	9
15	Creative Writing	17	14	14	14	6	10	9	4	7	9	3	0.6%	107	2.2%	-3.5%	18	29
16	Dance	2	2	1	2	9	0	7	2	0	5	2	0.4%	32	0.6%	-0.1%	35	33
17	East Asian Studies	4	4	2	9	3	2	2	8	9	5	5	1.0%	53	1.1%	0.1%	26	25
18	Economics	50	50	34	58	39	35	28	32	67	62	56	11.7%	511	10.3%	-0.3%	1	1
19	English	50	50	46	48	35	33	30	38	43	26	31	6.5%	430	8.7%	-5.5%	3	3
20	Foreign Language	2	3	1	3	1	1	3	4	0	2	1	0.2%	21	0.4%	-0.3%	37	38
21	French	7	6	6	7	12	6	15	17	15	19	12	2.5%	122	2.5%	0.8%	16	15
22	Geology	4	5	7	12	11	18	14	17	13	11	16	3.3%	128	2.6%	2.4%	11	10
23	German	1	4	4	5	1	5	6	4	2	3	7	1.5%	42	0.8%	1.2%	32	23
24	Government	52	55	43	42	42	41	57	34	38	41	50	10.4%	495	10.0%	-2.0%	2	2
25	History	40	41	51	51	44	40	27	31	15	31	26	5.4%	397	8.0%	-4.2%	4	4
26	Interdisciplinary	6	2	1	5	2	10	5	4	3	1	3	0.6%	42	0.8%	-0.8%	29	29
27	Linguistics	1	1	2	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	7	0.1%	—	39	n/a

milton College
us Correspondence

August 21, 1997

Dear Colleagues,

It is with great excitement that we present you with the enclosed *Proposal for Curricular Change*. As we state in the proposal, we believe that this is the moment for the Faculty to move boldly in establishing curricular structures that challenge our students to greater intellectual engagement and responsibility.

We hope that you will consider this proposal with a critical eye and an open mind. In writing the proposal, we felt compelled to offer some detail describing how the proposed structures might be implemented. Some may feel that we offer too much, while others may feel there is too little. The Faculty must agree on the structures first; only then can details of implementation be sensibly considered.

Our task in preparing this proposal has been made both easier and more challenging by the accomplishments of the subcommittees last year. Easier, because the subcommittees were so thorough in their work and articulate in reporting it, yet more challenging, because their high level of commitment to curricular change demanded from us a similarly energetic response. Our response, this proposal, is clearly a product of their efforts. We look forward to working with all of our colleagues on this initiative beginning at our discussion on August 28 and continuing throughout the year.

Sincerely,

Tim Kelly, for the CAP

Contributors to this document (* indicates current CAP membership):

* Carole Bellini-Sharp   * Tim Kelly
* Austin Briggs   * Cheryl Morgan
  Ella Gant   David Paris
* Margaret Gentry   * Patrick Reynolds
  Chris Georges   Subcommittee members (over....)
  Barbara Gold