Hamilton College
Self-Study Design

Submitted to:
The Middle States Commission on Higher Education
September 2009

Table of Contents

I.   Introduction

Institutional Profile

Originally founded in 1793 as the Hamilton-Oneida Academy and chartered in 1812, the third oldest college in New York State, Hamilton College is today comprised of just over 1,800 students from nearly all 50 states and approximately 40 countries. It is distinguished by a continuing faculty of 180 members dedicated to teaching and scholarship, innovative academic programs, a commitment to diversity in its broadest sense, outstanding modern facilities, and by talented and motivated students. The College is located on a wooded 1,350-acre hilltop campus overlooking the Village of Clinton, New York. The campus is within a 4–5 hour drive of New York, Boston, Toronto, and Philadelphia, and there is a variety of cultural opportunities on campus and in nearby Utica (10 minutes drive), Syracuse (45 minutes), and Cooperstown (55 minutes).

The College offers courses from 30 departments, and provides students the opportunity to select from 40 concentrations (majors) and 37 minors, including 15 interdisciplinary programs. Hamilton also sponsors study abroad programs in Spain, China, and France, and domestic study-away programs in Washington, D.C. and New York City.

College Governance

Hamilton College is chartered by the Regents of the State University of New York. The College's governing Board of Trustees consists of 24 Charter and 12 Alumni Trustees, plus 28 non-voting but active Life Trustees. The President votes as a Charter Trustee. Alumni Trustees are appointed by the Alumni Council to non-renewable four-year terms, with three in rotation each year. Charter Trustees serve six-year renewable terms but must step down from the Board before age 70. The Board addresses matters of broad policy and acts on recommendations from

its 11 standing committees: Admission; Audit; Budget and Finance; Buildings, Grounds, and Equipment; Development; Honorary Degrees; Instruction; Investments; Nominations; Planning; and Student Affairs.

Seven senior staff members report directly to the President: Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Faculty; Dean of Students; Vice President and Dean of Admission and Financial Aid; Executive Assistant to the President and Secretary to the Board of Trustees; Vice President, Administration and Finance; Vice President for Information Technology; and Vice President, Communications and Development. The Board of Trustees delegates authority for the academic program to the Faculty. All faculty members employed for half-time or more have the right to vote at faculty meetings, which normally occur once a month during the academic year.

II.   Scope of the Self-Study

The Hamilton community has spent considerable effort in strategic planning since our last accreditation review in 2001. The College has developed two five-year strategic plans, the first implemented from 2002 through 2007, and the second, developed in 2008, currently being implemented. Many of our strategic initiatives were informed by the findings of the 2001 review, but Hamilton has made dramatic changes in many facets of campus life in the last ten years, well beyond the last accreditation review recommendations.

One focus of our efforts has been diversity of the campus community. The ethnic and racial diversity of our students and faculty members has significantly increased in the last ten years (see Table 1). Examples of programs and policies the College has undertaken to improve and enhance diversity of the student body and student life include participation in POSSE, re-directing merit scholarships to need-based financial aid, and recent establishment of a Cultural

Education Center. Faculty recruitment and retention efforts have included more thorough

analysis of faculty diversity and retention, increased starting salaries, opportunity hires, more

strategic recruitment procedures, and the creation of a diversity initiatives position in the Dean of

Faculty's Office.

Table 1. Percentage of full-time students and faculty members of color,* from 1999/00 to 2008/09.

	99/00	00/01	01/02	02/03	03/04	04/05	05/06	06/07	07/08	08/09
Students of color	10.6	11.8	12.7	13.4	13.2	13.5	14.5	16.0	16.5	16.5
Faculty members of color	11.9	12.2	13.6	13.8	14.4	13.1	13.1	16.2	17.7	19.0

*Black non-Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander; Hispanic, Native American

A second area of notable change has been the curriculum; a new curriculum, adopted in

2001, removed disciplinary distribution requirements and placed the responsibility for breadth in

the liberal arts on the individual student and academic advising. In conjunction with the new

curriculum, but also in response to the 2001 review, the College revised pre-concentration

advising. New students are now paired with a faculty advisor on the basis of their academic

interest, and only with faculty members scheduled to be on campus for the entire, two-year, pre-

concentration period. As a result, we have seen a dramatic rise in student satisfaction with first-

year advising. Recognized as a critical factor in the success of Hamilton's open curriculum, the

Strategic Plan called for an Advising Task Force, which examined the advising system through

Spring 2009 with a view to further improvements. Several new degree programs have also been

initiated, including Chinese, Communication, and Environmental Science. A cross-discipline

sophomore seminar program was initiated, and then eliminated; while many were disappointed

with its demise, the decision to end the program was a best-practice example of rigorous

assessment informing a critical academic decision.

Facility development and improvement has also been a priority at Hamilton over the last ten years. In 2005, a new 209,000-ft^2 Science Center was opened, followed by the Blood Fitness Center (2006), the Siuda Admission House (2007), the Kirner-Johnson Building for social sciences (2008), and currently, the Emerson Hall student center (expected completion, Fall 2010). The College also continued to renovate residential buildings during this period, an effort started in the mid-1990's when a new residential life policy converted fraternity houses to general residential accommodations and other College uses.

Hamilton College has established itself as an assessment leader among liberal arts colleges. Through the leadership of Professor of Sociology Dan Chambliss, the Hamilton Project for the Assessment of Liberal Arts, funded by the Mellon Foundation, has undertaken a series of research initiatives in the assessment of liberal arts education. A central component of the project was a panel of 100 students, randomly selected from the Class of 2005; they have been interviewed through their college careers and for two years post-graduation on a wide range of topics, including dormitory accommodations, social life, advising, classes, programs, professors, co-curricular activities, study abroad, and athletics. A total of 340 interviews have been collected, transcribed, and analyzed, and a new round of interviews is underway to capture their experiences four years after graduation. The Mellon Project also focused on writing outcomes; over five years, more than 1,100 course writing assignments were collected from panel members and other samples of students. Outside evaluators read the papers and rated them according to a rubric established by the Hamilton College Writing Center. Their results demonstrated significant improvement in writing during the first three years of college. These assessments of the residential liberal arts experience at Hamilton have informed decision-making across campus and have helped assessment practitioners identify best practices nationwide.

Hamilton prepares for its next accreditation review in this context of significant accomplishment in the recent past while cognizant of challenges ahead. Having just completed a strategic plan, campus leaders and the Hamilton community have a road map for the next five years; however, the paths we choose, and our rate of progress, will be influenced by the global economic downturn and subsequent resource constraint. For the next few years, Hamilton will have to balance support for the high quality programs and personal academic experiences we offer against declining endowment values and greater needs for student financial aid. With this in mind, the Steering Committee selected a "Comprehensive Model with Emphases" for our self-study report, which we think will be the most effective in furthering the objectives of our strategic plan, examining our priorities in an environment of fiscal constraint, and reviewing the wide range of institutional activities and practices encompassed by the Middle States' publication *Characteristics of Excellence*.

III.   Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of the self-study process is to evaluate Hamilton College's programs and activities under Middle States accreditation standards, and assess our success in meeting our aims and objectives in the context of institutional priorities. The Steering Committee has decided on three areas of emphases for the self-study, with which examination of the standards, or *Characteristics of Excellence*, will be integrated:

1. Our recent strategic planning process confirmed our support of the open curriculum. There is, however, a strong desire to increase review and assessment of its impact on important general education outcomes, such as student course breadth, and how related activities, such as advising, are influencing those outcomes. The success of the open

curriculum also depends upon the individual department and program curricula, which complement and enhance general education. In order to understand our open curricular outcomes and future curricular path, the self-study will review both the general education and concentration curricular goals.

2. Diversity, as expressed in a multitude of ways, was an important priority of the last two strategic plans and is an ongoing commitment at Hamilton. The self-study will critically review all aspects of diversity in the community, encompassing student, faculty, administration, and staff constituencies, and including issues of access, retention, climate, and curriculum.

3. At the time this report is being written, the national economy is in crisis and there is little indication that it will improve soon. This challenging environment provided chastening context as we completed our current strategic plan, and pervades our thinking as we undertake this self-study. While resource management is as important as ever, a sharper focus has been brought to our choices for their deployment; we will use the self-study to inform us how reduced resources may impact our strategic priorities.

IV. Organization of the Self-Study Process

In October 2008, the Associate Dean of the Faculty and the Assistant Dean for Institutional Research attended the Middle States Self-Study Institute. In January 2009, the College established an eleven-person Self-Study Steering Committee consisting of faculty members and administrators. Since the Middle States liaison would be conducting her on-site preparation visit in April, the Steering Committee went immediately to work developing goals, emphases for analysis, research questions, and working groups.

Co-chairing the Steering Committee are Patrick Reynolds, Associate Dean of the Faculty and Professor of Biology (and Acting Dean of the Faculty for Spring 2009), and Gordon Hewitt, Assistant Dean of the Faculty for Institutional Research. Pat Reynolds was appointed to the Hamilton Faculty in 1992, and has served as Associate Dean since July 2007. Gordon Hewitt has worked at Hamilton since 2001, directing institutional research activities on campus. Members of the Steering Committee are:

- Meredith Bonham, Executive Assistant to the President
- Jinnie Garrett, Professor of Biology
- Jennifer Irons, Associate Professor of Sociology
- Shoshana Keller, Associate Professor of History
- Timothy Kelly, Associate Professor of Mathematics
- Karen Leach, Vice President for Administration and Finance
- Sam Pellman, Professor of Music
- Dave Smallen, Vice President for Information Technology
- Julio Videras, Associate Professor of Economics

Eight working groups have been formed, each with two co-chairs (one of whom is a member of the Steering Committee), to address one or more Middle States standards as outlined in *Characteristics of Excellence* (see Appendix A). Working group membership, through broad invitation and targeted appointment, was determined by balancing broad campus representation with experience appropriate to the working group charge; one of these members will co-chair with the Steering Committee member. Students were invited to serve, and selected by their governance structure, the Student Assembly.

V.   Charges to Working Groups

Working groups will be charged with addressing specific questions representing college issues prioritized by the Steering Committee and guided by the standards in the *Characteristics*

of Excellence. Each group will review relevant college documents, solicit input from various constituencies, and write a section of the self-study report.

The co-chairs of the Steering Committee will meet with each working group early in the process to provide them with their respective charges; working groups will arrange their own meeting schedules but will be guided by the timeline developed by the Steering Committee. All members will have access to an online inventory of support documents. The Steering Committee, through its co-chair members, will provide resource and planning support as needed, and clear all plans for any new data collection to eliminate redundancy and oversampling of campus populations.

The Steering Committee will periodically request drafts of working group reports to monitor progress, and final drafts will be due by end of Spring semester 2010. The Steering Committee will then develop the final self-study report during the Summer and Fall 2010.

Each working group will begin its deliberations by addressing the following research questions, but we expect that the nature of such inquiry will lead to modified or new questions. In developing these research questions, the Steering Committee was asked to pay particular attention to the three emphases we have identified, and to assessment efforts within the standards.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals

1. What does the College consider that a liberal arts education, in general, prepares students to do or become, and how do we know this occurs?

2. What are the overall goals of each academic department and program in preparing its students for life after college? Do their alumni/ae report activities and experiences that align with those goals?

3. What do we consider that students gain (or lose) from the experience of residential life, participation in student organizations, and other student life programs? How do we know that they do in fact gain or lose from this?

4. What do we consider that students gain (or lose) from participation in athletics?

5. In what ways can we expect Hamilton to change as it becomes more diverse? How will we measure the degree to which Hamilton's efforts to become more diverse are successful?

6. Hamilton aspires to be a "school of opportunity" that is accessible for the education of gifted students of any socioeconomic, ethnic, or racial background. What are the benchmarks we can identify that will signify progress towards realization of this aspiration?

7. How do we define the legacies of Kirkland and Hamilton Colleges? To what extent is it desirable that these legacies continue to inform our priorities and operations?

Standards 2, 3: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal;

Institutional Resources

1. Establishing and communicating priorities:

   a. How do Hamilton's assessment initiatives inform and shape the College's priorities?

b. In what ways are the diversity of campus constituencies and their views taken into account when establishing priorities?

c. What evidence is there that Hamilton's priorities are clearly stated, understood, and supported by its constituencies (faculty, students, and alumni)?

d. How well have resource constraints been taken into account in the planning process?

2. Allocation of resources:

a. Is resource allocation at Hamilton aligned with goals and objectives that stem from the priorities?

b. How has the College responded to a time of increasingly constrained resources?

c. Are policies and procedures in places that assure appropriate stewardship of resources?

3. Assessment:

a. How is ongoing assessment used to determine the effectiveness of resource allocation?

b. What are the results achieved by allocation of resources to priority initiatives, for example, the educational program?

c. What is the evidence of process improvement and innovation?

Standards 4, 5: Leadership and Governance; Administration

1. What is the evidence that the roles of the Board of Trustees, administration, and faculty are sufficiently clear in the governance of the College? How well do they work together

to further Hamilton's mission and ensure the effective use of resources? Are there issues that hinder effective decision-making?

2. How are decisions by the Board of Trustees made appropriately transparent to key constituencies? Does the Board ensure that diverse opinions are heard? How is trustee service assessed?

3. How does the current structure of college committees sufficiently support the shared governance model? Are faculty, students, and staff involved appropriately? Are there gaps or redundancies in committees?

4. How well do Hamilton's written documents (Board Bylaws, *Faculty Handbook*, etc.) describe the College's governance policies and procedures?

5. What changes have occurred with respect to governance and administration since the 2001 Middle States reaccreditation? Have they been effective?

6. How do our faculty and staff recruitment practices align with our desire to be more diverse? Are we doing enough to retain diverse faculty and staff members?

7. How well is employee performance assessed and feedback provided by supervisors?

Standard 6: Integrity

1. How effectively do Hamilton College's institutional policies and practices promote personal integrity, dialogue and debate, and an inclusive community?

    a. Students:

        i. To what extent does the Honor Code promote personal integrity and trust among students?

ii. In an increasingly diverse environment, how does the open curriculum influence students' intellectual engagement with and respect for others?

iii. How effectively does Hamilton's Code of Student Conduct promote and support dialogue and debate in and outside the classroom?

b. Employees:

i. What are the policies and practices that promote ethical professional behavior in the workplace (e.g., IRB and intellectual property rights policies)?

ii. How effectively does the institution support academic and intellectual freedom?

iii. What does the evidence from campus-wide opinion surveys indicate about the level of dialogue and debate and commitment to academic freedom among employees?

2. How successfully does Hamilton College communicate its goals and expectations? How does the institution ensure the availability, clarity, and transparency of its policies and practices? In what ways does Hamilton College ensure the dissemination of factual information about the institution to its community, alumni, and the general public?

a. Students:

i. How effectively does Hamilton College ensure student grievances are addressed equitably and consistently?

ii. How does Hamilton College communicate to prospective and current students factual information about the composition of the student body, educational opportunities and outcomes, and required standards of

conduct? In particular, how does Hamilton College communicate to prospective and new students factual information about the open curriculum?

b. Employees:

    i. What systems of grievance and dispute resolution are in place? To what extent do these systems ensure fairness and transparency?

    ii. How clearly does the institution communicate to employees its expectations about performance and evaluation (e.g. reappointment, tenure, and promotion guidelines; annual review process)? How well does the institution implement these policies?

Standard 7: Institutional Effectiveness

1. How effective is Hamilton in assessing our diversity efforts?

2. How effective are we in bringing together assessment data to inform College decision-making?

3. How effective are we in making connections between assessment outcomes, planning, and budget allocations?

4. *This working group will evaluate and summarize the assessment findings and evidence utilized by other working groups to answer the question:*

How successful are we in assessing institutional effectiveness for each standard?

Standards 8, 9: Student Admission and Retention; Student Support Services

1. How are we at ensuring that the liberal arts education offered at Hamilton is relevant to a new generation of students?

    a. Faced with a shrinking traditional market, is a liberal arts education attractive and relevant to students in markets that are growing? Is our curriculum flexible enough to accommodate the needs and expectations of students from these new markets?

    b. Under the open curriculum, how do we advise students so that they fully benefit from a liberal arts education?

2. How effective are we at admitting, retaining, and serving students in ways that foster an inclusive campus community?

    a. Are our programs to increase student diversity fulfilling their objectives?

    b. What support services do we provide to meet the needs of diverse student populations, and how do we measure their effectiveness and address weaknesses?

    c. What are the ways in which student support services facilitate dialogue and debate in an increasingly diverse campus community?

3. How do we assess and respond to the retention of different populations of students?

    a. In addition to racial/ethnic or geographic diversity, what other factors impact student success and retention (i.e., are we effectively retaining our most academically gifted students)?

    b. What are the most effective avenues through which students are integrated into the campus community?

4. How do we assess and amend practices of recruitment, admission/financial aid, and retention in light of resource constraints?

5. What are the ways in which students receive an education for self-direction, through faculty advising and other support services?

    a. How do we encourage personal responsibility and civic engagement among our students?

    b. How do we ensure that students are aware of the different options for support services on campus?

    c. How are resources allotted to maintain and develop support services in response to changing demographics?

Standard 10: Faculty

1. How effectively do we assess the quality of teaching in all areas of instruction? [includes coaches, adjuncts, instructional technology services, small programs such as Critical Languages and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL), and Writing, Oral Communication, and Quantitative Literacy Centers].

    a. Has the move from paper to on-line teaching evaluations improved instructors' ability to assess their own and others' teaching?

2. What has been the impact of recent increases in research support for junior faculty?

3. How effectively has the college broadened the diversity of teaching professionals in recent years?

    a. How does the college support "diverse" faculty members once they come to Hamilton?

4. Are support services and equipment effectively allocated to meet teachers' needs?

5. How do departments hire and supervise adjunct and temporary faculty members?

6. How is the college preparing to maintain the quality of its teaching professionals in the face of the coming wave of retirements?

Standards 11, 12, 13, 14: Educational Offerings; General Education;

Related Educational Activities; Assessment of Student Learning.

1. The College catalog states that a "Hamilton education is characterized by academic rigor and intellectual engagement." How effective are current curricular structures in providing this rigor and engagement to all students?

2. The goal of general education, that is relevant to students in the 21st century, includes the acquisition of specific competencies (written and oral communication, scientific and information literacy) and the fulfillment of the broader goals as stated in Hamilton's "College Purposes and Goals" (creativity and flexibility, respect for intellectual and cultural diversity, critical thinking).

    a. Does the faculty have an adequate overall vision of what a general liberal arts education should be at Hamilton and are curricular decisions made in light of that vision?

    b. How effective are College programs in enabling students to become competent in the essential skills of oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency?

    c. How effective is the College in developing the broader habits of mind, for example respect for cultural and intellectual diversity, and inter-disciplinarity?

    d. Are there resource constraints that limit student opportunities in any of these areas? Is faculty background and training a constraint to fulfilling any of these goals?

3. Concentration goals and the Senior Program:

    a. What student products or practices do individual departments/academic programs identify as indicators that the learning objectives of the concentration have been met?

    b. Acknowledging that different fields have different forms of communication, inquiry, and practice, how effective is departmental assessment of student achievement through the Senior Program?

    c. How effective are departments and programs in communicating their learning objectives beyond the department?

4. Academic Support. The College curriculum provides for several "Foundations" in support of student achievement in both their general education and the concentration, e.g., The Writing Program and Quantitative and Symbolic Reasoning requirements; the College also provides several academic support services towards several cross-curricular competencies, such as the Writing, Quantitative Literacy, and Oral Communication Centers. In each case:

    a. What student products or practices does the College consider to be indicators of competency in these areas?

    b. How effective are the mechanisms that are in place to support students with particular challenges e.g., ESOL students' writing competency?

      c.   Given current resource constraints, how will the College sustain the level of assessment of competencies?

5.   The College provides a growing array of educational experiences outside the traditional classroom: service learning, off-campus study, and a few internships for credit.

      a.   Are these opportunities well integrated with the College's overall curricular goals?

      b.   Do we offer adequate opportunities in each of these areas?

      c.   How effective are these programs in enabling students to fulfill the broad liberal arts goals of the College?

VI.   Support Documents

The Office of Institutional Research will work with each working group to provide data and information, as needed. Materials that are currently available include, but are not limited to:

Standard 1: Mission and Goals
Hamilton College Charter
Hamilton College Catalog
Hamilton College Goals and Objectives
2008 Strategic Plan
2002 Strategic Plan

Standard 2: Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal
Five-year Budget Forecast
2009–10 Budget Proposal
Campus Master Plan
Sightlines Facilities Benchmarking Reports
Planning Notebook
Technology Operating Plan
Classroom Utilization Study

Standard 3: Institutional Resources
2007–08 Audited Financial Statement
2006–07 Audited Financial Statement
Five-year Budget Forecast

2009–10 Budget Proposal
Cambridge Survey of Financial Indicators Report
NACUBU Endowment Survey Report
Audited Financial Statements of Peer Institutions

Standard 4: Leadership and Governance
Bylaws of the Board of Trustees
Faculty Handbook
Faculty Red Book
Constitution of the Student Assembly
Bylaws of the Student Assembly
Hamilton College Organizational Chart
Hamilton College Trustee Directory

Standard 5: Administration
Administration Handbook
Maintenance and Operations Handbook
Staff Handbook
Employee Reference Guide

Standard 6: Integrity
Faculty Handbook
Student Handbook
Financial Misconduct Reporting Policy
Affirmative Action Policy
Harassment Policy
Judicial Board Reports
Honor Court Reports
Faculty Affirmative Action Report

Standard 7: Institutional Effectiveness
Planning Notebook
Dashboard of Strategic Indicators
Common Data Set
Equity Scorecard
Middle States Institutional Profile
CIRP Freshman Survey Reports
National Survey of Student Engagement Reports
CIRP Senior Survey Report
HEDS Senior Survey Reports
HERI Faculty Survey Reports
COACHE Faculty Survey Reports
Admitted Student Questionnaire Reports
ECAR Technology Survey Reports
Periodic Department Reviews
Middle States Accreditation Self-Study Report, 2000

Middle States Team Visit Report, 2001
Middle States Periodic Review Report, 2006
Middle States Periodic Review Evaluation Report, 2006

Standard 8: Student Admissions and Retention
Admission Brochures
Admission Updates
Planning Notebook
Admitted Student Questionnaire Reports
Comparative Admission Study
Retention Study
Adirondack Adventure Assessment Report
Academic Performance of Athletes Report

Standard 9: Student Support Services
Student Handbook
Alcohol Coalition Report
Judicial Board Reports
Honor Court Reports
Working with Students with Disabilities Handbook
Equity Scorecard
CHAS Survey and Interviews Reports
Career Outcomes Reports
Campus Safety Annual Reports
Housing Guide
Housing Reports
Student Assembly Minutes
NESCAC Reports
NCAA Self-Study

Standard 10: Faculty
Faculty Handbook
Faculty Red Book
Dean's Guidelines for Faculty Chairs
Faculty Publications Reports
AAUP Compensation Report
Faculty Affirmative Action Report
Tenure and Promotion Guidelines
Faculty Retention Study
HERI Faculty Survey
COACHE Survey of Tenure-Track Faculty

Standard 11: Educational Offerings
Hamilton College Catalog
College Calendar
Faculty Meeting Minutes

CAP Allocation Report
Course Syllabi
Academic Department Reviews
Transfer Credit Policy and Articulation Agreements

Standard 12: General Education
Statement of General Education Learning Objectives
Advising Handbook
Course Breadth Study
Teagle Open Curriculum White Paper (Brown Report)

Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
Guidelines for Study Abroad
Study Abroad Program Options
Open Doors Study Abroad Reports
NECC Overview

Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning
Mellon Project for the Assessment of Liberal Arts Reports:
      The Hamilton Plan for Liberal Arts Assessment
      Assessment—The Fundamental Problem
      A Five-Year Study of Student Writing
      Hiring Great Faculty
      Oral Communication
      Interdisciplinarity
      The First Year
      Odysseys
      Meeting of the Minds
      Academic Plans and Decisions
      Systematic Advising
      Students' Academic Decision-Making Processes and
          Their Consequences for Curricular Design
      Impact of Student-Faculty Relationships
      Panel Study Reports
      Alumni Outcomes
Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education: First-Year Report
CIRP Senior Survey Report
HEDS Senior Survey Reports
National Survey of Student Engagement Reports
Course Evaluations
Senior Capstone Report
College Sports Project

VII. Format

Working group co-chairs will be asked to develop final reports that will contribute to the self-study document as a whole. In addition to following specific style and format guidelines established for the self-study, each report should contain the following:

- An overview of the group's charge, and the questions it addressed.

- An analytical discussion of the inquiry undertaken and the outcomes of that inquiry, including strengths and challenges.

- An explanation of how the group's findings and conclusions relate to the standards.

- Discussion of the connection of the group's topic with those of other groups, and of any collaboration between groups that took place.

- Recommendations for improvement.

VIII. Timeline

Fall, 2008
- Co-chairs attend Middle States Self-Study Institute.
- Report to faculty and other constituencies on overview of process.
- Select Steering Committee members.
- Begin developing outline of design report.
- Start collecting documents, reports and data.
- Start setting up shared folders and web site.

Spring, 2009
- Meet with Steering Committee: discuss design report and working groups.
- Assign working groups and develop research questions.
- Continue and finish design report.
- Middle States liaison preparation visit.

Summer, 2009
- Compile documents, reports, and data.

Fall, 2009
- Self-study kickoff; charge to working groups.

- Working groups begin deliberations.

Spring, 2010
- Working groups develop and finalize reports.
- Drafting of self-study report begins.

Summer, 2010
- Self-study report drafted.

Fall, 2010
- Self-study circulated for comment, appropriate revisions.
- Preliminary visit by visiting team chair.

Winter, 2010-11
- Self-study report submitted to Middle States.

Spring, 2011
- Visiting team on campus.
- Middle States response to team report.

IX.   Organization of Report

Chapter 1: Introduction, description, and history of Hamilton, activity since 2001 Middle States

   review, overview of self-study design.

Chapters 2 through 10: Working group responses to standards and research questions.

Chapter 11: Future actions based on findings and recommendations.

X.   Evaluation Team Profile

Hamilton looks forward to hosting a visiting team that will examine our self-study

closely, and provide us with feedback and recommendations that will strengthen our identity and

strategic direction. We are especially interested in working with, and learning from, individuals

familiar with private, selective liberal arts colleges with no or limited distribution requirements.

Jim Swartz, Professor of Chemistry and former Dean of the Faculty at Grinnell College, has a

vast amount of experience in such a setting and has served on Middle States visiting teams in the

past. Steve Weisler, Professor of Linguistics and Dean of Enrollment and Assessment at

Hampshire College, would also be welcomed.

Appendix A. Composition of Working Groups.

Standard 1: Mission and Goals
Sam Pellman, Professor of Music—Co-Chair
Faculty member—Co-Chair
Randy Ericson, Couper Librarian
Jonathan Vaughn, Professor of Psychology
Cobus Van der Ven, Student
Jaime Yordan, Trustee

Standards 2 and 3: Planning and Resource Allocation; Institutional Renewal and Resources
Karen Leach, Vice President for Administration and Finance—Co-Chair
Ann Owen, Associate Professor of Economics—Co-Chair
Steve Bellona, Associate Vice President for Facilities and Planning
Bill Brower, Executive Director, Annual Giving and Alumni Relations
Marty Sweeney, Director of Central Administrative Services
Shari Whiting, Controller and Director of Budgets

Standards 4 and 5: Leadership and Governance; Administration
Meredith Bonham, Executive Assistant to the President—Chair
Jenn Andersen, Student
Jeff Little, Trustee
Ann Riffle, Staff Assistant for Advising
Sharon Rippey, Director, Alumni Relations
Faculty member

Standard 6: Integrity
Julio Videras, Associate Professor of Economics—Co-Chair
Marianne Janack, Associate Professor of Philosophy—Co-Chair
Vige Barrie, Director, Media Relations
Jeff Landry, Assistant Dean of Students
Rob Martin, Associate Professor of Government
Jeff McArn, Chaplain
Steve Stemkoski, Director of Human Resources

Standard 7: Institutional Effectiveness
Dave Smallen, Vice President for Information Technology—Co-Chair
Dick Bedient, Professor of Mathematics—Co-Chair
David Bell, Senior Associate Director of the Career Center
Matt Carr, Assistant Director of Institutional Research
John Murphy, Director, Annual Fund Leadership Gifts
Nikki Reynolds, Director of Instructional Technology Support Services
Lora Schilder, Director of Admission

Standards 8 and 9: Student Admission and Retention; Student Support Services
Jenny Irons, Associate Professor of Sociology—Co- Chair
Monica Inzer, Dean of Admission and Financial Aid—Co-Chair
Phyllis Breland, Director, Opportunity Programs
Allen Harrison, Associate Dean of Students for Diversity and Accessibility
Travis Hill, Director of Residential Life
Jon Hind, Director of Athletics
Chaise LaDousa, Assistant Professor of Anthropology
Wenxi Li, Student

Standard 10: Faculty
Shoshana Keller, Associate Professor of History—Co-Chair
Gordon Jones, Associate Professor of Physics—Co-Chair
Steve Ellingson, Associate Professor of Sociology
Collette Gilligan, Head Women's Soccer Coach and Associate Professor of Physical Education
Rebecca Murtaugh, Assistant Professor of Art
Krista Siniscarco, Instructional Technology Specialist
Steve Yao,
        Associate Dean of the Faculty for Diversity Initiatives and Associate Professor of English

Standards 11, 12, 13, 14: Educational Offerings, General Education,
                    Related Educational Activities; Assessment of Student Learning
Jinnie Garrett, Professor of Biology—Co- Chair
Tim Kelly, Associate Professor of Mathematics—Co-Chair
Steve Orvis, Professor of Government – Co-Chair
Carolyn Carpan, Director of Public Services, Burke Library
Carol Drogus,
        Associate Dean of Students for Off-Campus Study & International Student Advisor
Kristin Friedel, Registrar
Jim Helmer, Coordinator, Oral Communication Center
Tara McKee, Associate Professor of Psychology
Deborah Pokinski, Associate Professor of Art History
Margie Thickstun, Professor of English
Sharon Williams, Director, Writing Center
Keith Willner, Student
Steve Wu, Associate Professor of Economics
Gary Wyckoff, Associate Professor of Government and Director, Public Policy Program