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FOREWORD

Transmitting the report of Wofford College's "Year of Planning" to the college's Board of Trustees seems almost superfluous.

The trustees established the task-force for planning in the first place, then lent it over half of the trustees as active members, and in official actions of the full board in its October and February meetings anticipated and acted upon the recommendations which were being formed for May.

Even before this final report was written, therefore, the planning task-force was hard pressed to keep pace with the enthusiasm and the investments of the trustees in moving forward in improving quality in the college.

The trustees have already begun the improvement process. For two years they have provided extra salary increments for faculty towards reaching the goal of regional faculty comparability. They have built a new front window to the campus, in the stately Papadopoulos Building. They have added an unexpected $200,000 to the 1987-88 budget for faculty development, athletics, scholarships, orientation, student life, alumni networking, student
recruitment, and fundraising. They have laid out grounds beautification improvements to be made as early as this summer of 1987. They have initiated faculty efforts to improve freshman retention. They have authorized the college to become eligible for NCAA athletics membership. They have added two faculty members, bringing the fall faculty size to 62 full-time-equivalents and beginning the process of having more personalized attention for a student body of increasingly aggressive academic and leadership abilities.

This report is about Wofford College moving up in the academic world. The trustees of the college have already begun to make that move. Things won't be quite the same. The college can be better. It will be better.

What possible difference does little Wofford College— with its thousand students, sixty faculty members, and $11 million budget— make in a higher education universe of 12.5 million students, 3,300 campuses, and $100 billion in expenditures?

Those who contend that "big is beautiful" may never be convinced that some of the brightest lights in the solar system are among the smallest of stars and planets or that David actually slew Goliath. Some small things—Wofford is one— make differences out of proportion to their size.

Wofford's modesty is sometimes
unbecoming to it. Hidden in the heap of higher education like a diamond in the rough, Wofford has for the past twelve months been studying how best to maintain and brighten a reputation for quality which places it on most lists of the top ten percent of America's best undergraduate colleges.

For a full year now, intensive planning to make Wofford better has been the work of a large task-force of trustees, alumni, students, faculty, staff, and friends meeting monthly. The task-force was established at the end of a three-day retreat at Springmaid Beach in May 1986 at which the board of trustees reviewed the positive Southern Association and United Methodist higher education accreditation ten-year reaffirmation studies for the college.

Encouraged by planning grants of $50,000 from a major foundation and $75,000 from a trustee, the college planning task force swung into arduous work in research, analyses, and comparisons, organizing itself into six committees and several focus groups to look carefully into what Wofford does, what other colleges do, what Wofford should be doing better, and what Wofford wants to do well.

Wofford College does things well.

Maybe too well.

The most difficult problem facing the college is complacency among Wofford
constituents who ask quite naturally, "If it's not broken, why fix it?"

Doing things well doesn't mean they can't be done better.

Wofford constituencies take justifiable pride in Wofford's age, admissions applications, academic standards, fiscal efficiency and effectiveness, student performance, faculty excellence, physical appearance, peer-college approval, singularly-undergraduate mission, donor support, alumni and trustee distinctions, and classical liberal arts model.

But Wofford College, like any organization or institution, can be better, and the best time to move from "doing well" to "being better" is while the college has no crises diverting its attention from improvement. Happily, survival is not an issue for Wofford and hence not the focus of the college's planning. The strategic focus of the task-force's planning is upon the opportunity for dynamic progress implicit in the very fact that there are grounds for complacency.

The very best moment for Wofford to get up and go is right now, when it could easily sit still.

Specifically, Wofford College has extraordinarily rich potential for adding new quality atop existing quality. Using its firm foundation of "doing well", Wofford can act now to "be better".
In academic terms, the difference between what Wofford is and what it can easily become is the difference between an A-minus and an A-plus.

Wofford College is justified by faith, by the sure and certain faith that it "makes a difference" and will continue to do so. This report addresses ways by which Wofford College can earn an A+ in making a difference in, for, and through the lives of its students.

The Wofford classical college formula—well-selected students working with well-selected professors in liberal learning, in-residence and round-the-clock—will not change, but the college's internal program and external visibility can change.

As the college's plans are implemented, Wofford will gain improved quality control and wider geographical marketing and recognition. Most importantly, students who pass through the Wofford four-year experience in the next decades will get increased personal attention and improved learning quality that will more than justify in value-received the price differential between public and private higher education.

Wofford College's president Joab M. Lesesne, Jr., and board chairman Russell C. King, Jr. served as co-chairmen of the planning process. Their Charge paraphrases the Parameters for Planning set by the trustees:

"Their Charge paraphrases the Parameters for Planning set by the trustees:"
I. Purpose of the College: The purpose of Wofford College is to be a liberal arts college of superior quality in the best tradition of church-related higher education.

2. Goal of the College: The goal of Wofford College is to be a community of learning which provides an undergraduate experience of high quality. This experience should encourage and enhance values and capabilities appropriate for productive students and alumni who are ethically sound, service motivated, capable of constructive thinking, and characterized by strong traits of leadership and ongoing learning.

3. Purpose for Planning: The purpose for planning is to advise the Board of Trustees in setting for the college a clearly understood direction with measurable objectives, in developing strategies to achieve these objectives, and in determining how to measure the achievement of those objectives.

4. Parameters for Planning: As a starting point for planning, hypothesize that Wofford College will be liberal arts, undergraduate, co-educational, residential, church-related, with approximately 1,000 students, primarily in the 18-23 year-old group and coming primarily from the southeastern region. The college will be essentially debt-free and have a balanced budget annually. Planning will include both quantitative and qualitative measurements. All planning should include strategies for funding for any recommendations. The college will seek national recognition for its quality of people and programs.

The results of this year of study are now being shared with those who care about Wofford being better.

Over a hundred trustees, alumni, faculty, students, staff, and friends of the college devoted more than 200,000 hours in depth to this introspective process in 1986-87. The preliminary studies for routine ten-year accreditation reviews which preceded this study in 1984-86 involved even more people and hours in assessment and planning for Wofford College.
This was a year of extraordinary self-education which required task-force members to do heavy homework on how Wofford is structured and managed, what it believes its mission and role ought to be, and how higher education in this nation operates. Attention was given to dozens of internal details, but always the study called the planners back to seeing Wofford as a whole within an even larger context of American higher education which also had to be studied and understood.

The planners were not tinkering with minor screwdriver adjustments to a self-propelled machine; they were searching for major change-agent impacts that would produce quality-control and consumer-service satisfactions. They wanted to change a few aspects of Wofford College significantly enough to make it a campus for which no one need apologize. They especially wanted to find and strengthen Wofford's most fundamental focus.

Analysis and planning are not new to the college. In the last thirty years alone, four planning documents have been conceived and used by trustees and staff. In fact, one of these—approved in 1980 and revised in 1982—is still operative, even as this more exhaustive study proceeds. It called for increased operating budget support from the Annual Fund, increased endowment funds
(especially for scholarships), and campuswide renovations. At the end of the first four years of this plan, $12.5 million (45 percent) of the ten-year goal of $28 million had been secured. The momentum in gift support for Wofford is one reason more why thorough planning and forceful action for Wofford were enthusiastically endorsed.

This current and more comprehensive planning study, however, did not ask first what resources could be found. That question was deferred until the end of the year. It assumed the college needed to know where next to move before asking how much moving would cost, or else moving might have been too intimidating to consider.

By contrast to the 1982 gift-resource-needs plan, this 1987 plan more closely resembles in comprehensiveness plans from 1948 and 1961. It seeks deeper understanding of Wofford's purposes and practices, and more careful justification for them.

In intensity of study and in its extension of the planning process to include many college constituents as inventors, investors, and owners in Wofford's future, this plan is unlike any of its predecessors.

Almost every college in the 19th century was the shadow of one person, whether president or primary donor, but Wofford College is the
collective enterprise of many otherwise individualistic women and men possessing many and varied interests and talents. Just as the Mayflower brought a whole community to Plymouth Rock, Wofford College's year of planning was a voyage of many, not just a few—and the college's future is in the hands of a large community of people who hold Wofford as a commonwealth in trust.

Having so many members of the Wofford community invested in this planning effort creates consensus and avoids confusion. Planning done quickly by a handful of people in a vacuum of internal information unrelated to understanding external environments is often counter-productive. The divorcing of planners from doers, of theoreticians from agents, and of idealism from realism frequently dooms such plans to be stillborn or misshapen.

Authors and inventors are owners of their creations, and this Wofford College planning process has broadened the number of stockholders appreciably. Beyond the critiques, comments, and recommendations lies the commitment of the planners to make their plan work. Some of these planners are listed herein, but each name represents yet other networks of Wofford constituents who are unnamed. Perhaps they all should have been listed, because then the plan
would have been self-explanatory—a few thousand people came together to testify that Wofford has made a difference, to look into making a better difference as a new century approaches, and to join in seeing that necessary good things come to Wofford.

Wofford's age, physical facilities, and fiscal sensibility are loudly and often applauded, as they well should be. But the task-force's most important finding is that Wofford is really its people.

Well-selected students share four years of liberal arts learning with well-selected faculty and staff and turn out well for so doing. Wofford is people-intensive.

This plan suggests that what now turns out well at Wofford can turn out a bit better. Many good people have paused to study what Wofford does, how it does it, how others do similar things, and what steps likely would make a good college better. This is their report.

In seeing what Wofford should do better, the first step is to know and agree upon what Wofford does now. What does Wofford say about itself; what is its "Message"? How does Wofford act with, for, and upon its students; what is its "Work"?

Nature and religion teach that the ending of things is only a beginning. Transformations begin where trails end. Dorothy doesn't travel her yellow-brick road through four years on the
campus of Oz without the transition at the end of the road as a goal; Dante doesn't follow Vergil through nine circles of Hades without the faith that Beatrice waits at the end of the pilgrimage.

Thus, planning works for a college if it succeeds in making visible something greater which has lain invisible just ahead and if planning is transformed into energies and projects of significance. Planning "ends" with a schedule of "ends"--and of means to those ends. Omega is Alpha, the end is the beginning.

Planning ends, and ends begin. But there are ends that transcend ends, and it is proper to linger a moment on the hinge of transition between planning and action to ask a metaphysical question that data and statistics never address adequately. Put bluntly, "What does all this planning mean?" "What good is it?"

That sort of inquiry lifts planning out of the frozen realm of rationality into the fiery furnace of faith. That sort of question has been implicit throughout the whole planning process which began in May 1986 and about which the planners were charged to report to the Wofford College trustees one full year later.

Many "best and brightest" people have contributed pieces of their minds, expenses, time, and energy to developing these plans "to improve quality". It is utterly inconceivable that they
would have given so much so willingly only for the
sake of an institution—even if the institution is
Wofford. No institution has the right to exist
sheerly for its own perpetuation and
aggrandizement, for no institution has the right to
be an end unto itself. An institution is justified
only as a means to some end other than—and
higher than—perpetual motion.

From its very beginning, the Wofford College
planning task-force knew the end it wanted: the
very best undergraduate education possible for
Wofford students. Throughout the year, it never
wavered in that focus. All the means it
conceived—and all those others it reluctantly has
had to shelve temporarily—were consistent with
that end.

But even that end was transformed as the
planning process plodded onward, for it became
clear that education for education's sake, while
noble and certainly higher than most ends, is not
enough. All colleges ought to share that end, and
Wofford does not claim exclusive eminence in its
service.

What can make education for education's sake
distinctive and dynamic are the elements of faith
and commitment. The planners demonstrated in
their attendance and attentiveness a faith that
graduates of Wofford will not hide their lights
under bushels, but will use their education in ways
useful to others and not just for themselves alone. In short, good is expected from those to whom good education has been given. "Good" is more than material goods; the good life is more than making good money; a good college, to be good, has to do something about defining and promoting "good".

The good Wofford does—and can do more fully with improvements in quality—is that good its students do because of having been infected and affected by Wofford. Those who labor in and around Wofford see that higher end rather clearly, and they get satisfactions from seeing their students doing well, both in their vocations and beyond them, in what they do for their families, communities, and posterity. Here, in the reputation of former students, faith and reason come together, for this faith in today's students becoming tomorrow's successor generations gives reason for commitments made to a better Wofford.

The student with the potential for developing a good mind and a good heart is what Wofford means when it says it wants to recruit good students for admission. Good professors and staff members with the good minds and good hearts to do good by such students are the people through whom Wofford does good work with people. The six steps for improving quality at Wofford are merely good means to get and support good
mentors who will mean the most to good students who will get good done better for the world.

If indeed a Wofford student is learning to be a "whole person", it follows that wholeness includes attributes of "imagination", "initiative", "leadership", "civic virtue", "community building", "service", and "spirituality" which ought to be as characteristic of each graduate as are self-esteem and success in the employment market.

Living the good life is the American Dream. Wofford's work is that of helping students define and find "the good life". Wofford starts and ends with Socrates' admonition: "The unexamined life is not worth living," and leads each student to see life as Self, as Society around Self, and as Soul and Spirit in and above Self and Society.

For finally, let it be noted, the work of Wofford College has always been and will continue to be educating for responsibility. There is nothing "good" nor "whole" about an education that does not include learning to be responsible for oneself and for others. Responsibility means "the ability to respond". We learn only in relation to something other than ourselves. An educated person responds to context and to others.

Such education has as an acceptable end the educating of hewers of wood responsible for the jungles of employment and for the thickets of community. Such education certainly also must
have the traditional end of learning to relish education for its own sake.

But ultimately even those ends are penultimate ends, and therefore still but means. Ultimately--which is all that really matters in the first and in the last analysis--responsibility means seeing more clearly and responding more responsibly to the Grace of an Omega who is eternally Alpha. Wofford wants such vision for its graduates. Wofford College plans--and this report on planning implicitly always assumes it plans--to take the improvement steps necessary to provide just such education.

The many members of the planning task-force listed here, and all the others whom they have consulted and whom they represent, are proud of the work they have done in clarifying the ends for which Wofford exists and in addressing the means by which the college can move forward toward turning ends into realities. With a collective spirit of pride in Wofford's past and present and with much optimism that "the best is yet to be", they transmit to the college's governing board this report on improving quality for Wofford College.
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Other antebellum colleges have changed as time has passed. Harvard, Yale. Princeton, and Columbia set the primary pattern for master-schools by becoming comprehensive universities, a pattern followed in the south by Duke, Emory, Tulane, and Vanderbilt: an old undergraduate college is surrounded by graduate schools, professional schools, and research centers, making the campus multi-missioned.

Wofford does not disparage such a transformation: indeed, the transformations at Vanderbilt and at Duke were led by Wofford alumni and former faculty members. Wofford itself, however, has survived and gained its own recognition by steadfast championing of the classical liberal arts college experience: not by diversifying nor by large growth.

There are only 254 private four-year colleges in the list of 3,331 U.S. campuses. They enroll only 360,000 of the 12.5 million American college students. But all campuses have some form of liberal arts education. Wofford's
WOFFORD'S MESSAGE

Of America's 3,331 colleges and universities, fewer than five percent were founded before the Civil War. Wofford College, founded in 1854, is among the 200 oldest colleges in the nation.

Some distinctive colleges in the southeast with Wofford's age and survivor status are Washington & Lee, Centre, Transylvania, Rhodes, University of the South, Millsaps, Hampden-Sydney, and Davidson, sister institutions with which Wofford shares a sense of age, mission, and standards. Several of these, and others such as Birmingham-Southern, Rollins, and Southwestern University, served as "benchmark campuses" examined in great depth, from which were drawn enormously useful comparative data and good improvement ideas.

Other antebellum colleges have changed their natures as time has passed. Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and Columbia set the primary pattern for metamorphosis by becoming comprehensive universities, a pattern followed in the south by Duke, Emory, Tulane, and Vanderbilt: an old undergraduate college is surrounded by graduate schools, professional schools, and research centers, making the campus multi-missioned.

Wofford does not disparage such a transformation where clear markets and funds exist for such universities. Indeed, the transformations at Vanderbilt and at Duke were led by Wofford alumni and former faculty members. Wofford itself, however, has survived and gained its own recognition by steadfast championing of the classical liberal arts college experience, not by diversifying nor by large growth.

There are only 254 private four-year colleges in the list of 3,331 U.S. campuses. They enroll only 360,000 of the 12.5 million American college students. But all campuses have some form of liberal arts education. Wofford's
uniqueness has been its singleminded preservation of the liberal arts model as a measure against which other campuses, whatever their sizes or ages or programs, can gauge their faithfulness to the liberal arts.

The quality of Wofford's witness to the classical undergraduate model has been confirmed by its peers. Wofford is one of only 237 campuses nationally with a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, the nation's most prestigious honor society. Wofford's chapter is one of only three in South Carolina.

Polls of college presidents for *U.S. News & World Report* ranked Wofford second in 1983 among liberal arts colleges in the south and 14th in 1985 among 189 colleges nationwide with liberal arts dominance and regional students. The *New York Times* education editor, Edward B. Fiske, selected Wofford as one of the 221 campuses in *The Best Buys in College Education*. Wofford is one of only 369 campuses in *Barron's Guide to the Best, Most Popular, and Most Exciting Colleges*.

Wofford College's reputation rests upon persistence in refining and retaining the classical liberal arts campus model as a viable option in the midst of widespread and mounting educational pluralism.

*The main mission of Wofford College remains what it has been for 133 years: to foster a romance, courtship, wedding, and lifelong marriage between each student and the liberal arts.*

Wofford "makes a difference" because it selects and then nurtures students for whom the liberal arts, 'round-the-clock, residential, classical, undergraduate model, increasingly rare, has significance. As the records of its past and present alumni attest, Wofford has successes out of proportion to its size in graduating students who become leaders in every sector of society, from statehouse to home, from nation to neighborhood, and from corporate board rooms to backroads of the Third World. Caring to "make a difference" is the first requisite for membership on the Wofford faculty and staff.

Having the ability to make a difference is the second
requirement. Ninety-nine Wofford faculty and staff members hold 240 degrees from 86 campuses. Ninety-one percent of the Wofford faculty hold Ph.D. or other terminal degrees. Campuses most represented are Emory, Yale, South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke, Vanderbilt, and Clemson. The average faculty age is 46 in a steady continuum that spreads from 25 to 69 with no large clusters of any age group. The average class size is 20 students. The faculty/student ratio is 1/17.

Supporting the 18 academic departments and 19 majors are a 172,000 volumes library open 92 hours a week, widespread computer access, a media learning center, tutoring programs in English and mathematics, an ROTC program that has been entirely voluntary since its inception in 1919, and a comprehensive student activities program that emphasizes students "learning by doing" in athletics, social life, self-government, publications, drama, chorus, academic clubs, service programs, religious life, residence halls, and work programs.

Wofford students are usually "self-starters". Eighty percent of them live on campus, and 96 percent enroll full-time. Two-thirds of them were in the top 20 percent of their high school classes, and 90 percent in the top half of their classes. A third are women, a tenth are minority students, three-quarters are receiving financial aid ($4.7 million from all sources), 56 percent are either Methodists or Baptists, four-fifths are from public schools, and three-fourths of them are from South Carolina.

Wofford students entering in 1986 had a composite SAT score average of 1032--above the national average by 122 points and above the South Carolina average by 202 points.

Each Wofford student takes courses in English composition, foreign language, natural science, history, religion, philosophy, basic humanities, fine arts, and physical education, plus a major. Most take mathematics and social science courses as well. A high number have double-majors; a few even elect triple-majors.

Over 40 percent of Wofford's graduates have done advanced study beyond their Wofford baccalaureate years. A
national study ranks Wofford 8th among 110 southern liberal arts colleges and 106th among 931 colleges nationally in the percent (3.5) of alumni (306) receiving Ph.D. degrees between 1920 and 1980. Heads of departments in major medical colleges at Vanderbilt, Duke, Virginia, Tulane, Chapel Hill, and MUSC are Wofford alumni. Over a thousand alumni own or are partners in their own firms or are presidents and chief executives of companies.

Wofford's 10,053 living alumni are scattered among 37 other countries and in all the states (except Wyoming), with 60 percent of them in South Carolina and 25 percent in Georgia, Florida, and North Carolina. Among them are 338 college professors and administrators, 905 other educators, 493 clergymen, 692 government officials, 430 lawyers, 349 bankers, 769 doctors, dentists, and other health professionals, 860 manufacturing professionals, and 1,289 sales-fields alumni. Eight alumni are college presidents, and 41 have been college presidents over the years.

Wofford alumni have included four governors, two U.S. senators, nine U.S. congressmen (including Samuel Dibble of the Class of 1856, Wofford's first graduate), fifteen generals, a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, four admirals, twelve Woodrow Wilson Fellows, four Truman Scholars, five Rhodes Scholars, and kinfolk of a fifth of the current student body.

The immediate past president and the president-elect of the South Carolina bar, the immediate past chief justice of the S.C. supreme court, and the current S.C. attorney general are alumni. The president of C&S National Bank of S.C., the owner and chief executive officer of Kindel furniture company, the founders of Spartan Food Systems, the president of VF Corporation, and the head of Southern Bell in Georgia are typical of the successful business alumni so numerous that Wofford ranks 352nd in the nation among the college alma maters of the top 70,000 corporate presidents, vice presidents, and directors (according to STANDARD & POOR's and the FINANCIAL & ECONOMIC INFORMATION COMPANY survey).
Wofford has an annual budget of about $12 million, an endowment with a market value of $13 million, a physical plant that (as of February 1987) is debt-free, and a campus of 75 contiguous acres located near the intersection of I-85 and I-26 and only an hour from I-40, with four major airports within a hundred mile radius. It is only a half an hour drive from the Smoky Mountains, four hours from the Atlantic Ocean, three hours from Atlanta or North Carolina's Research Triangle, an hour from Charlotte, and easily accessible from Florida and Washington. Peach groves and textile plants encircle it, along with one of the nation's largest collections of international industries.

Gift income for support of the college has shown significant growth, averaging $3.1 million a year the last four years, with gifts of $4.4 million in 1986 compared to $1.3 in 1982. A portion of the income is from the Annual Fund, which forms a part of each year's current budget and which has produced over $1 million a year the last three years, the equivalent of a yearly scholarship of $1,000 for each Wofford student. Room, board, and fees for 1987-88 will still be under $10,000, compared to a national average the previous year of $10,100 and to costs at comparable colleges of $11,000 to $15,000.

One advantage of defining Wofford College as an undergraduate campus is that the fee income from undergraduates is used for undergraduates. As the Yale Program on Non-Profit Organizations has found, the common practice in universities is for undergraduate fees to subsidize graduate and advanced professional schools.

Wofford has received national recognition by being selected in 1985 by the Hewlett, Mellon, and Arthur Vining Davis Foundations to receive challenge grants for endowment funds for academic improvement innovations and faculty renewal. In 1984, the college was one of the first 100 colleges selected to compete for, and one of only 28 colleges receiving, the first CAPHE (Consortium for Advancement of Private Higher Education) incentive awards, for a project to build ties between Wofford professors and their best teaching counterparts in area
high schools. In 1985, Wofford's president was the first southerner to head NAICU (the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities).

The college has been affiliated since its founding in 1854 with the United Methodist Church, through its South Carolina Conference. It is governed by a board of trustees of 27 persons selected for two-year terms and a maximum of six consecutive terms who are approved by the Conference. Among the board's members are the president of Emory University, the head of Milliken Company, a member of the U.S. Congress, the minister to the university at Duke, the presidents of VF Corporation, Spartan Food Systems, and Ballenger companies, a vice president of Southern Bell, and eight distinguished clergymen. Alumni, minorities, and women are all represented on the board as well.

The Wofford Scholars Program is the best evidence of quality in Wofford's adherence to its mission. Each year nearly 2,000 high school teachers and administrators are invited to nominate their most outstanding students to compete for Wofford Scholars merit scholarships, awarded for academic achievement and demonstrated leadership abilities. Of those nominated in the past four years (1983-86), 972 visited Wofford for orientation and competitions, and 447 (or 46 percent) of those attending actually enrolled in Wofford.

Of the 1,218 freshmen enrolling at Wofford from 1983 through 1986, 37 percent were Wofford Scholars participants, representing the top students in the region. The average composite SAT score for the winners from 1975-86 was 1283, the average high school grade-point-average was 4.06, 16 selected scholars were National Merit Scholars, 39 were high school valedictorians, the average grade-point-average upon graduation from Wofford was 3.62, 18 graduated with 4.0 grade-point-averages, 44 went on from Wofford for further study, and 15 graduated with double majors.

The program demonstrates the regard held for Wofford by top high school teachers and by superior students. It also shows consumers-approval of the
standards upheld by the college in its singular adherence to high liberal arts principles.

Recent and highly-publicized national studies advocating reform in undergraduate higher education, all of which emphasize standards and practices that Wofford has upheld consistently in the midst of changes in higher education, appear to confirm Wofford's mission and work. "Back to the Basics" is too simple a summary of the current higher education reform movement, but it is not unfair to say that the national commissions confirm Wofford's position on undergraduate education:

--strong liberal arts curriculum;
--rigorous academic discipline;
--reading, writing, speaking, discussing, and listening communication skills;
--extensive faculty and student interaction;
--extensive student-peer interaction and activity;
--residential learning;
--teaching scholarship, performance, and renewal valued more highly than publication;
--"education" defined as whole-person learning in and outside classroom;
--core curriculum;
--general education structure;
--strong academic advising;
--leadership learning;
--financial, career, health, and personal counselling support;
--intercollegiate athletics kept in perspective;
--religion, ethics, and service inquiry; and
--facilities and equipment learning-support systems.

[Cf.: Carnegie studies by Ernest Boyer, College: The Undergraduate Experience in America; and Frank Newman, Higher Education and the American Resurgence: A A C, Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community: The Findings and Recommendations of the Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees; and William J. Bennett, To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education.]
WOFFORD’S WORK:
PLANNING FOR QUALITY

A likely metaphor for the four-year undergraduate experience is a comparison of college to the Land of Oz. Student (Dorothy) with tuition (her dog, Toto) in hand, is besieged by college recruiters (the tornado) and finally swept away to a campus (Oz), where she is accepted for admission (awarded her red shoes), greeted by fellow students (Munchkins), and pointed towards a four-year, "round-the-clock college experience (the yellow-brick road) that leads to graduation (leaving Oz). Along the way, college professors and administrators (a mindless scarecrow, a cowardly lion, a rusty tin woodman) help the student cope with courses, libraries, homesickness, and misgivings (witches, winged monsters, moats, and magic) and to find fun and satisfaction in learning (technicolored fields). The whole environment in which the experience takes place is coordinated by trustees, faculty councils, and administrative officers (the Wizard behind the curtain is a harried college president), who conduct appropriate commencement ceremonies at the end (giving diplomas and awards both to Dorothy and to her teacher-companions). Back out in the "real world", the graduate puts the lessons learned to good use in career and community and family, occasionally with some feeling of alumni nostalgia and gratitude.
Since the founding of American undergraduate colleges at Harvard in 1636, college has been democracy's dreamland. It is the primary means for students and their parents to realize their dreams. It heads the list in every public opinion survey of what parents want for their offspring and what high school students want for themselves.

The great transformation of the last quarter-century is that over half America's high school graduates now "get a shot at" college. The American faith in colleges is unmatched anywhere else. Few societies give their young people four years "to find themselves", but America annually frees some twelve million young adults from the work force to partake of the process of dreams and play. Odd as this Oz is, Americans delight in supporting it, insist upon it, and brag about it. No parent wants a pet for an heir, no company wants a robot for an employee, and the nation doesn't want drones for citizens; so in a society with a two-trillion-dollar debt, there is the paradoxical luxury of a hundred-billion-dollar collegiate system.

Wofford College is a fraction of that system. It believes in the Oz process. It exists for dreamers intent on getting out into the "real world".

Wofford College has a singular mission that is multi-dimensioned in manifestation: to provide liberal arts education of exceptionally high quality by enabling well-selected undergraduate students and well-selected educators to learn from and with each other, in and out of the classroom, in a classical college environment supportive of both.

Wofford's mission is made manifest in its educational process. The work of Wofford College is to enable each of its students to learn in stages of growth appropriate for young adults during undergraduate years. This process is a sequence of student steps: pre-college schooling, applying and being accepted for admission to college, securing the fiscal means for college, getting oriented to the college, being tested and evaluated, being properly placed in appropriate academic courses, arranging for
food and housing and health care, working out personal schedules of activities and personal disciplines for study and extracurricular life, interacting with professors in and out of the classroom, associating with sub-groups of students in social or academic or athletic or service or religious interest organizations, learning to balance personal freedom with community structure, developing leadership skills, learning practical skills, preparing for graduation and for graduate study or employment afterward, and moving from dependencies towards independence and interdependence.

The steps which contribute to this mission do not stand discretely apart from one another. They connect, mesh, and overlap with one another. In that sense, they resemble molecules or tapestry.

In their linkages, however, the steps focus always upon the student—upon how structures, procedures, immediate habitat, and community of educators and fellow students promote each student's development. More than an aimless molecule or a patch of fabric, the college is a chain, a ribbon, a river channel, a "progress-path"—a yellow brick road. In short, college is a process, one based upon the experiences and traditions of several centuries of college learning, but one also constantly re-invented to make that heritage "take" for each student.

It may appear to the superficial observer that college is many students "taking" many "courses" from many professors. Actually each student has only one course: the entire college experience—night and day, in class and out, on campus and off, with others and alone.

If that whole experience is successful, the student will have a greenhouse-effect of "blossoming".

Even that metaphor misleads. A student is animal, not vegetable—and a human animal at that. The aim of the college experience is the development of a whole person. "Developing a whole person" implies that a student is less-than-whole upon arriving at college; that the student plays a very great role—via motivation and labor and self-disciplining—in uncovering and discovering his or
her own self; and that the campus provides faculty, facilities, and fellow learners that facilitate that self-fulfilling, self-unfolding process.

The college process is not a recipe, never a formula. Each student is unique, and no one walks in exactly the same footsteps as another, no matter how many students are enrolled or how many alumni have trod there before. A good college is one that changes students in good ways, but no college unwilling to change its own ways is good.

College is about being able to see clearer. If it and its students act well their parts, college may begin over four years--and complete over a lifetime--what an optometrist can do for eyes in an hour.

What a good college does best is to insinuate itself appropriately into a student's life at a critical time. Sometimes student encounters with college learning processes are suddenly exhilarating--Pentecost-like experiences of being able to understand strangers speaking in strange tongues about strange subjects.

Sometimes student encounters with learning are slowly exhilarating--Plato's Cave crawlings out of darkness into sunlight to satisfy suppressed curiosity about causes of shadows flickering on cranium walls.

Because each student is unique, each college intervention in that student's self-discovery must necessarily be unique. Fortunately, enough experiences are similar and sharable among students for a college to be cost-efficient in many of its interventions. Otherwise, the college could enroll only one student every four years.

Quality educational intervention comes as close as possible to that "Mark Hopkins and a log" ideal of one whole college existing for only one becoming-whole student. From the singular perspective of any one student, there is always an illusion, and usually a healthy one, that the college exists solely for that one student. Active and deliberate intervention by the college in a student's development is what lends the college mystique a basis in fact.
Only good colleges bother to evaluate and to re-invent teaching in order to intercede effectively; the others run on automatic-pilot, on routines and rules and roadmaps, a deist's watch still ticking after being created centuries ago and left behind. Educating goes far beyond research and publication; it is first and foremost a commitment to attend to a student's development.

What distinguishes a college of quality from just any other college is what distinguishes tailored suits from off-the-rack and off-the-assembly-line clothing. Personalized fit and craftsmanship are interventions for quality.

Interventions are active, not passive; hand-made, not die-cut; form-fitting, not hand-me-down. When a good college boasts that it has found the final fine formula for and form of education, it is no longer a good college. A "good ol' college" just lies around like a sandbox; a good college intervenes purposefully to help a student build sand castles; Any college can be Freud's black couch upon which a student stretches out and dredges up sub-conscious childhood dreams, but a good college will intercede to give a student raw stuff--facts, knowledge, options, connections, images--for dreams they never had.

An American historian recently noted that Wordsworth's list of qualities for the artist, compiled in 1815, is the same as a list for a creative statesman. They are also the same quality outcomes for which a good college, on its own initiative but with a student's consent, intercedes in a student's life:

The first requirement on the list is Observation, "the ability to observe with accuracy things as they are in themselves," to know "whether the things depicted are actually present." Next, Reflection, which teaches "the value of actions, images, thoughts, and feelings; and assists the sensibility in perceiving their connection with each other." Then Imagination, "to modify, to create, and to associate", then Invention; and finally Judgment, "to decide how and where, and in what degree, each of these faculties ought to be exerted."

These qualities, raised to the highest level, make for genius, "the only proof [of which] is, the art of doing well what is worthy to be done, and what was never done before...."

The Cycles of History, 1986
Past and present, higher education has promised society to do its best to send into its midst graduates who know "the art of doing well what is worthy to be done, and what was never done before".

The good college interacts cooperatively with each student to find—or to make—and to raise to their highest level, those qualities of genius a good college believes it glimpses in each student it accepts for admission. If it is honest in its admissions policies, the good college will not accept any student it believes lacks the germinal genius the college is willing to cultivate. If it is honest in its work, it will not allow any student's native genius to rust undiscovered and unused.
WOFFORD'S VISION:

SIX IMPROVEMENTS FOR QUALITY

Previous chapters of this report tell how Wofford came to devote a full year and hundreds of people-hours to planning. They show what Wofford is today, and how sound a message and foundation it has upon which to plan. They show how Wofford compares with other campuses of its type and how recent studies by distinguished national commissions confirm what Wofford takes to be the marks of a good college. They trace the undergraduate college experience and find it to be a process of many parts, all of which parts are but means for providing conditions for good learning and all of which must be centered upon the student if they are to be justified.

Planning is part of that process of many parts. If undergraduate education is a contributory institution in the growth of the student, the points at which the college and the student come in contact must be continuously reviewed and renewed. In order for the college to intercede best in the student's development, a college has to intercede in its own development. It must develop and maintain a self-consciousness about what it does.

Wofford is good enough to know that it is not good enough.

Not yet, anyway.

When Wofford set up its year of planning it already knew that the college can do its work better, no matter how well it is now done. No good college ever claims perfection or self-satisfaction. The purposes of planning are to document factually and to schedule promptly what are felt intuitively to be the improvements Wofford needs if it is to be better.
What improvements will make a difference in quality for Wofford College?

BETWEEN 1987 AND 1994 WOFFORD COLLEGE WILL MAKE SIX STRIKING QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS--IN PEOPLE, PROGRAMS AND PHYSICAL PLANT:

1. **To Improve Quality in Selection and Support of Students;**
2. **To Improve Quality in Selection and Renewal of Faculty;**
3. **To Improve Quality in Academic Programs;**
4. **To Improve Quality in Student Life Programs;**
5. **To Improve Quality in Athletics Programs;** and
6. **To Improve Quality in Physical Facilities.**
WITH SIX IMPROVEMENTS,
FOUR WOFFORD GOALS CAN BE REACHED

I. Improved student and parent satisfaction with Wofford
   A. in choosing to enroll in,
   B. wanting to stay at, and
   C. helping to support the college.

II. National visibility and regional name-recognition for Wofford
   A. to broaden the applicant pool,
   B. to broaden the gift support base, and
   C. to broaden the public and academic recognition of the college's excellence.

III. Expanded space, staff, budget, and endowment fund support bases for Wofford's future
   A. to increase learning effectiveness around each student,
   B. to increase the learning impact of each professor,
   C. to increase the comparability of the college to southeastern benchmark sister campuses, and
   D. to increase the academic quality and prestige of the college.

IV. Most importantly of all, enhanced quality in learning for Wofford students
   A. in increased retention,
   B. in improved competitiveness for admissions and fellowships for further study,
   C. in improved career planning and placement options,
   D. in improved faculty/student interaction, and
   E. in improved lifelong appreciations of learning as both joyful and useful.
1. **TO IMPROVE QUALITY**

**IN SELECTION AND SUPPORT OF STUDENTS**

Wofford College has a surplus of applicants for admission each fall, but not enough applicants to be highly selective in its acceptances. About 1,000 students apply, almost seventy percent of these are accepted, and fewer than half of those accepted actually enroll. Over forty percent of those entering never graduate from Wofford, and 23 percent leave by the end of the freshman year. Comparable colleges with high retention rates have larger applicant pools from which to accept admissible students.

Given Wofford's high reliance upon enrollments from within South Carolina, expansion of the applicant pool by fifty percent would have to be a result of expanded recruiting out-of-state; of increasing the involvement of volunteers (alumni, students, faculty, churches, and parents) who nominate and cultivate students for recruitment into Wofford; of improving contacts between Wofford faculty and high school teachers; and of making available larger amounts of financial aid for students unable to afford to attend Wofford and for honors students in demand nationally who set the academic pace and tone for the entire student body.
WOFFORD COLLEGE SHOULD:

a. increase its admissions applicant pool from 1,000 students in 1986 to 1,500 by 1991;

b. increase its admissions acceptances from outside the state, especially in the southeast and in a 250-mile radius, from 22% in 1986 to 40% by 1991;

c. increase the percentage of entering freshman students from the top 20% of their high school classes from 65% in 1986 to 75% by 1991;

d. increase the average composite SAT score for entering freshmen from 1032 in 1986 to 1100 by 1991;

e. increase freshman retention from 77% in 1986 to 90% by 1991;

f. increase college-funded need-based student financial aid by $1,000,000 (averaging $250,000 per class) by 1994, with an intermediate goal of $250,000 by 1991, with availability for up to 50% of the student body;

g. increase funding for the highly successful Wofford Scholars program--from which comes over 40 percent of each freshman class, drawn from over half of those competing for the awards--by $1,000,000 (averaging $250,000 a class) by 1994 at an incremental growth rate of $140,000 a year;

h. increase minority student recruitment efforts by adding an admissions staff member for that function by 1989;

i. increase the effectiveness of alumni and parents volunteer services, by establishing student recruitment volunteers' networks directed by an alumni and parents' programs coordinator to be employed immediately, in 1987;

j. increase the coordination and productivity of the campuswide student recruitment, student resources, and student retention programs by appointment of a dean of enrollment services by the fall of 1988;
k. increase non-personnel recruitment budgets by $50,000 by 1989 for travel, advertising in college guides, entertainment, printing, publications, and postage, in order to accommodate expanded staff, wider geographical territory, and increased numbers of prospects;

l. increase the effectiveness of faculty involvement in academic services to pre-college teachers and in student recruitment and selection, by establishing networks by 1991 between each academic department and a clearly identified and carefully cultivated group of high school teachers, to be coordinated by the chairman of each department, and by increasing participation of faculty in on-campus events for prospective students and in phone calls and mailings to prospects and their parents, and in the admissions selection committee screening processes (see Improvement 2);

m. increase the college's contacts with the ministers and associate ministers of the United Methodist Church by establishing a continuing education program for ministers and laymen and a student recruitment network, coordinated by the college chaplain;

n. increase the first-impressions attractiveness of the campus by renovating and refurnishing Hugh S. Black Admissions Hall by 1988, by designing and producing a new Church Street entrance and new campus streets, walks, and parking facilities by 1988, and by improving the appearance and maintenance of the campus grounds by 1994 (see Improvement 6); and

o. increase the content and effectiveness of the orientation program for new students by the fall of 1988 (see Improvement 4).
2. TO IMPROVE QUALITY
IN SELECTION AND RENEWAL OF FACULTY

An excellent faculty meets high standards for teaching, scholarship, service, and character. Building an excellent faculty requires: (1) recruiting suitable persons to the faculty; (2) providing them with encouragement and opportunities for scholarship to maintain their knowledge and skills; (3) having enough faculty for individuals to have time to realize their potentials and to meet college needs for program development, scholarship, student recruitment, and personal involvement with students; and (4) effectively evaluating and improving performances.

Wofford College has a small, but very able, dedicated, and hard-working faculty. It experiences frustration in trying to do well everything asked of it and thus falls short of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service to the institution and to students. The faculty does not have enough time with individual students and does not have time to realize its own potential in performance. Therefore, significant enhancement of the quality of the educational experience of students will require a larger and better faculty. As the college adds new faculty, present members of the faculty will become more effective. All members of the faculty will face higher expectations for their work and for their personal concern for students.

Five or six additions to the faculty would enable Wofford more evenly to distribute student loads among departments and to strengthen certain programs. Further additions would permit time for scholarship and for specific projects (such as academic camps and teacher workshops) to enhance the visibility of the college and to recruit students. Smaller classes and fewer course preparations would also allow better course preparation.
and more personalized teaching and advising, probably the most important products of increased faculty size. Additional faculty positions would also permit the college to appoint visiting scholars of distinction for short periods.

As many as twenty additions to the faculty would be justified to provide time for those things which make for excellence, placing Wofford among "the best".

Recruitment of faculty will require planning, overcoming isolation of the faculty from colleagues on other campuses, seeking more experienced candidates, and offering a package of compensation, opportunity, and responsibility competitive with that offered at the best schools in the region.

The professional development program should include: participation in professional meetings each year; periodic attendance at workshops and seminars; an enlarged program of grants for study during the summer; release-time to take other courses at Wofford; and campus workshops on teaching, advising, testing, and other aspects of the faculty role.

More effective evaluation of faculty will require a more substantial role for the academic dean and the academic department chairmen in administration, personal development plans for faculty, and more frequent conferences for feedback and follow-up.
WOFFORD COLLEGE SHOULD:

a. increase the number of faculty members from 60 in 1986 to 80 by 1994, in order to:

1) increase the administrative focus of the sixteen department chairmen upon curriculum and upon faculty assessment and development by reducing by 1991 the number of courses chairmen teach (from nine a year to six or seven);

2) increase (with faculty release-time equivalent to two positions) faculty-designed and faculty-directed academic program grant proposals to foundations, corporations, the National Science Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the South Carolina Committee for the Humanities, and other agencies; to make Wofford known nationally as a pilot model campus among liberal arts colleges, to provide national recognition for Wofford faculty members, to secure resources for experimentation and change, to build summer programs, and to involve students as assistants in faculty teaching and research projects;

3) increase the funding and coordination for faculty renewal and development programs by designating the equivalent of six of the twenty new faculty positions as floating positions for temporary replacements and for distinguished visiting professors, to allow approved faculty leaves for renewal study and experiences;

4) increase the effectiveness of faculty-student academic advising by scheduling faculty advising workshops, by providing advisee entertainment mini-grants, by coordinating and providing timely data on advisees to advisors, by creating a council on student counselling services and by reducing the average number of courses taught per faculty member from nine to eight for demonstrably effective and conscientious faculty advisors;
5) increase faculty involvements in academic services to pre-college teachers and in the student recruitment and applicant screening processes, through departmental networks of high school teachers, admissions committee service, faculty recruitment events (e.g., on-campus programs and alumni and parents receptions off-campus) participation, and by reducing the average number of courses taught per faculty member from nine to eight for demonstrably effective and conscientious faculty admissions recruiters and high school teacher networkers (see Improvement 1);

b. increase the focus of the academic dean on faculty and curriculum by delegating student recruitment and financial aid coordination duties to a dean of enrollment services (see Improvement 1);

c. increase retention of freshmen by increasing the attention of the faculty to the crucial freshman year curriculum and experiences by selecting a cadre of faculty members already involved and experienced in freshman courses and freshman advising to design and coordinate freshman courses and freshman course placement programs;

d. increase student opportunities for study away and co-curricular learning by appointing by 1991 a faculty director and advisory board to coordinate fieldwork (e.g., study abroad, study at other campuses, internships, volunteer services, cooperative education, exchange programs, work programs, tutorships, senior student assistantships, and independent studies); and

e. increase the campus faculty salary average from the 65th towards the Level 1 percentile national average for Category II B colleges (a gap in 1985-86 of about $3,000), by an additional two percent salary gain above normal increases each year through 1994.
3. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

A dynamic faculty of adequate size is the key to quality in academic programs. Whatever its size, however, a good faculty must have support resources with which to be optimally effective. On a contemporary undergraduate campus, support will include (1) learning technology (such as computers, word processors, language labs, writing labs, audio-visual equipment and libraries, copy machines, scientific apparatus, and other learning aids), (2) clerical support, (3) student assistants (teaching assistants, research associates, office helpers, field-trip assistants) who are learning while doing, (4) library services, and (5) learning space (e.g., offices, laboratories, classrooms, student work stations, lecture halls, and demonstration areas).

6. Increase computer services by 1991 for an accessible campus-wide network open most hours to faculty and students, centered in the new academic building (see c above) at a cost of $1,000,000;

7. Increase the effectiveness of biology, chemistry, and geology departments through renovation and refurbishing of Milbank Science Building by 1992 for facilities appropriate for the renewed national interest in these fields, for maintenance of the outstanding pre-health sciences reputation of Wofford, and for the recruitment of superior faculty replacements to curtail faculty in these departments retire, at an estimated cost of $500,000 (see Improvement 6); and

8. Increase curriculum improvements, innovations, and faculty and staff renewal by awarding annual earnings from the newly established $750,000 Edge of Excellence endowed presidential discretionary fund.
WOFFORD COLLEGE SHOULD:

a. increase the central instructional support budgets for instructional and departmental (16 departments) purposes (e.g., student assistants, tutors, high school teacher networks, clerical help, faculty professional travel, visiting speakers, cultural affairs, field trips, equipment, supplies, and matching funds for project grants) by $250,000 by 1991 and by $500,000 by 1994;

b. increase the efficiency and uses of the library by 1991 by converting cataloging to the Library of Congress classification system and by computerizing library catalog and administrative processes (e.g., purchasing, shelving, research, interlibrary loan), at a one-time cost of $250,000;

c. increase faculty office and instructional space campuswide by 1991 for needed classrooms and laboratories, for the projected increase of 20 faculty members by 1994, for expanded programs of student-faculty contacts, for a campuswide computer center, and for consolidation and expansion of technological learning systems and aids, by constructing a new academic facility, at a cost of approximately $6,000,000;

d. increase computer services by 1991 for an accessible campuswide network open most hours to faculty and students, centered in the new academic building (see c above) at a cost of $1,000,000;

e. increase the effectiveness of biology, chemistry, and geology departments through renovation and furnishing of Miliken Science Building by 1992 for facilities appropriate for the renewed national interest in these fields, for sustenance of the outstanding pre-health sciences reputation of Wofford, and for the recruitment of superior faculty replacements as current faculty in these departments retire, at an estimated cost of $500,000 (see Improvement 6); and

f. increase curriculum improvements, innovations, and faculty and staff renewal by awarding annual earnings from the newly established $750,000 Edge of Excellence endowed presidential discretionary fund.
4. TO IMPROVE QUALITY
IN STUDENT LIFE PROGRAMS

Wofford College offers 'round-the-clock living and learning. Learning takes place outside the formal classroom as much as in it. This is one of the primary distinctions between Wofford and other campus models such as commuter colleges or research universities.

Great attention must be given to student residence life and student extracurricular and co-curricular programs. At the same time, in keeping with its emphasis upon student leadership learning and young adult responsibility, the college must avoid excessive paternalism. Programs which involve students have priority over those which do things for or to students. Campus life must be participatory rather than spectatorial, developmental rather than Procrusteanized.

The philosophy of the college should be to admit no student it believes unable to graduate and to see that every student enrolling graduates, even if reaching that goal can never be assured. Threats to student success are manifold: academic, social, fiscal, physical, and psychological. At the present time a little more than half of those entering Wofford actually graduate. Loss of students between the freshman and sophomore years is about 23 percent. The graduating class each year is about 60 percent of the size of the class which entered as freshmen, and is only that high because several graduates are transfer students who replaced others lost along the way.

As admissions pools increase, as selectivity in acceptances improves, as financial assistance is more
available, and as faculty spend more time with students in their classes, in their majors, or in their advisee groups, retention will improve. However, retention and student satisfaction are also attributable to student life factors such as residence hall life, religious and personal counselling, career counselling and placement services, work programs, recreation, student organizations, activities, and extra-curricular involvements.

Residence halls in general need to be headed by in-house staffing experienced in both academic and student personnel fields, comparable in status and compensation to young faculty members. Advanced students should be selected as hall counsellors on a competitive basis and paid adequately for their services, and should possess academic tutoring, student life activity, and personal counselling abilities.

Residence hall rooms need to be redecorated, wired for computer and television satellite cable accesses and security monitoring, and made more conducive to good study and citizenship habits. Attention needs to be given to housing configurations for upperclassmen which reflect small interest groups, whether academic majors, physical arts club interests, social club affiliation, volunteer service interests, or career aspirations. Freshmen need to be guaranteed on-campus freshman housing and should receive special attentions such as tutoring services and social activities in this important transition year.

Both the intramural and Greek-letter systems need more availability at Wofford. The half-time intramurals and recreation director position should be upgraded to full-time, and intramurals and recreation activities need to make fuller use of afternoons, evenings, and weekends. An intramural director can call upon part-time assistance from intercollegiate coaches and from carefully selected advanced students, and can coordinate a wellness program campuswide with the college health services. Study should be given to meeting some or all of the physical education requirement through intramurals participation, and the
college should aim at full participation by all students in intramurals, recreational clubs, and personal recreation facilities.

A new Greek-society park is needed, perhaps rented through a private developer, that provides lodges for fraternities and sororities with housing for four to six officers in each (one means by which the college could adjust to the shortage of housing without building a whole new hall). The college has the right to expect each Greek organization to be active in intramurals, to demonstrate emphasis upon academic achievement among its members, to participate in service projects, and to provide drug and alcohol education and counselling models.

Wofford is short on natural gathering places for student life. Outside of the basketball arena and football field, there are no natural community-building spaces. The intramural program can help meet some of this need if expanded, and so can convocations of both academic and entertainment types. Religious and academic convocations are needed on a more routinized basis at a definitely designated hour each week, and evening and weekend entertainment programs and places need to be provided. The role of the Campus Life Center needs to be re-examined to make the facility more oriented to student activities and leisure-time schedules, and the playing fields and Andrews fieldhouse should be considered part of that complex.

Staff should be added to assume responsibility for coordinating all campus life activities.
WOFFORD COLLEGE SHOULD:

a. upgrade the head resident positions, particularly in the three halls housing freshmen;

b. upgrade the fall orientation program;

c. upgrade coordination of student organizations, clubs, interest groups, social and service associations, and other activities, by addition of a staff member for activities;

d. upgrade the intramural program through a full-time director of intramurals and recreation;

e. upgrade entertainment, weekend, and other student life programs budgets and facilities at $15,000 a year ($90,000 by 1994);

f. upgrade convocations, seminars, cultural affairs, and visiting speakers programs (see Improvement 3); and

g. renovate and refurbish residence halls as provided in the campus physical facilities masterplan (see Improvement 6).
5. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN ATHLETICS PROGRAMS

Intercollegiate athletics represents a large, longstanding, and complex collegiate--and public--culture. A much improved undergraduate quality can be secured through a closer tie between athletics and general campus purposes and life.

Few programs pose as many perplexing problems for American higher education as intercollegiate athletics. In the eyes of the general public, campuses and athletic programs are equated. Athletic news gets more newspaper coverage than all other higher education news combined. Of late, because of expenses and competitive practices, athletic news has not all been good news. The larger environmental context in which Wofford athletic programs must be considered is one of change, controversy, and cost, factors which confound any campus seeking to control its own athletic destinies.

In Wofford's current geographical and NAIA status, scheduling opponents from campuses of similar size, standards, mission, and athletic program is difficult--in fact, impossible. Wofford will not have dual admissions standards, one set for athletes and a higher set for non-athletes, and must find or create a schedule and conference in which standards are more equal. Wofford must find a way in which it "can play on a level field".

Wofford can increase its options through NCAA affiliation. Because it must adhere to NCAA standards for two years before being admitted, Wofford should immediately declare its intent to join the NCAA and begin to qualify for NCAA membership at the Division II level, the division currently closest in programs to Wofford's present programs. From that position, it can expand its options, such as moving into NCAA Division IAA or Division III, staying with Division II if that division should alter its membership and specifications, or moving back into NAIA if major
changes are forthcoming in that association. Much will depend on what happens in the two national associations; much will depend upon what happens among small private colleges of Wofford's type; and much will depend upon leadership initiatives taken by Wofford in getting like-minded institutions together for mutual advantages for all in the southern region. The college administration should be directed to take the leadership in identifying and convening similar colleges for discussions of conference options within existing conferences and in hypothetical new conferences.

In all this, the college must promote the ideal of the scholar-athlete and must insure that women's sports receive equitable attention. For example, at least one women's sport needs to be added immediately.

Funding under any of the options will be a problem. Athletic boosters believe gift income and gate receipts will increase by moving to the NCAA and by playing more attractive schedules. As an added incentive to athletic donors, the college should consider increasing athletic expenses by $500,000, at $70,000 a year for the next seven years including grants-in-aid funded with Terrier Club increased giving. Additional gifts will be needed for improvement of athletic facilities. A staff position for athletic fundraising and sports information services will probably need to be added from these increased funds to improve external support for athletic programs in getting them competitive within whatever option the college finds it can take in the best interests of the college's standards and reputation.
WOFFORD COLLEGE SHOULD:

a. increase support for the athletic program (grants-in-aid, coaches, travel, equipment) by $70,000 a year each year from 1987 to 1994, a total support increase of $500,000 by 1994, including increased Terrier Club gift support of grants-in-aid;

b. expand the program by adding another women's sport in 1987;

c. increase the utility and appearance of the athletic facilities, including priorities for relocation of the tennis courts, improvement of arena dressing rooms, improvement of the south stadium stands and pavement behind them, lighting, and installing irrigation systems, and restrooms (see Improvement 6); and

d. create a staff position for annual giving, ticket sales, advertising income, and sports information services in 1989.
6. **TO IMPROVE QUALITY**

**IN PHYSICAL FACILITIES**

Wofford is its people. It is also a place, and its people work within an environment. That environment can enhance or it can hamper how well faculty and students work. Space is a major support system of a college, and to neglect it is to neglect the people in it.

A good start has been made on expansions and renovations with the addition of the Campus Life Center, the Papadopoulos Building, and the Snyder House wing, and with the renovation of Wightman Hall and the forthcoming renovation of Greene and Marsh residence halls and Hugh Black admissions offices. Much attention has been given to building maintenance and adaptations, and deferred maintenance of facilities is negligible and almost non-existent.

The facilities are all debt-free.

During Wofford's year of planning, a major enterprise has been the development of a Campus Facilities and Grounds Master Plan, done in consultation with the firm of Innocenti and Webel of Greenvale, New York. Members of the planning group inspected existing facilities on campus, visited other college campuses, reviewed long-range plans of several colleges and universities, and met with campus groups as well as with city officials. After the Master Plan was outlined, recommendations for implementing it were formulated.
CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

Wofford is a four-year coeducational liberal arts college with an average enrollment of about 1000 students. Founded in 1854, Wofford is located on its historic original campus, which is listed as an historic district in the National Register of Historic Places. It is one of fewer than two hundred antebellum American colleges, and it is one of the even fewer still at their founding sites.

The Wofford campus is composed of twenty-two major buildings on a 100-acre site bordered by North Church Street, Evins Street, Memorial Drive, and Cleveland Street. Although it is only seven city blocks from downtown Spartanburg, the campus is filled with large trees and seems pleasantly removed from the city center.

This relatively small campus is bisected by Archer Circle, a busy campus road used by people entering from off-campus as well as by people driving between college buildings. Although there is only one small parking area on this road, it offers on-street parking, and the resulting congestion of traffic detracts from the appearance of the campus.

North Church Street is the main link between the city and the campus and has historically served as the "front door" to the campus. The buildings
and the landscaping along Church Street therefore establish the primary identity of the campus within the community. For years very little was done to enhance the image of this side of the campus to passing casual observers. Then in 1985, recognizing that Wofford lacked an appealing face along Church Street, the trustees' building committee took steps in response to some sizeable gifts to improve the appearance of the west side of the campus. The old ROTC building was demolished, the new Papadopoulos Administrative Complex was built, and the entrance road circle and fountain were constructed.

The Campus Master Plan builds upon the work already begun along North Church Street, and the momentum that attractive project has generated, to further improve Wofford's front entrance and to begin improving the aesthetics of the campus as a whole. The proposed Master Plan envisions restructuring the campus.
GROUND AND FACILITIES MASTER PLAN

1) The Church Street entrance would become a primary focal point where a lake catches the visitor's eye and pulls attention inward to a green and wooded mall that takes one's vision to the campus heart, a large circle at the center in front of Main Building, while looking left from the front lake leads the eye up another green vista, bordered by the new Papadopoulos Building, to a primary building site near Evins Street.

2) A landscaped mall, entered near Burwell Building and exited near the historic home of the dean of the college, edged with walkways, would connect this entrance to a circle in front of Main Building. This mall area would be closed to parking.

3) The present site of the fraternity houses is appropriate for several types of buildings and is especially attractive because of its accessibility to Memorial Drive. A landscaped vista could be created between this site and Main Building. (Note: Public parking may become available across from and for use by the Memorial Auditorium. Working through the Auditorium Commission, the College might then be able to acquire some parking space near the area of the Milliken Science Building and the fraternity houses. This additional parking area would facilitate development of the campus along Memorial Drive.)

4) Another axis would be created north of Main Building, extending from Main across Evins Street to a proposed building site north of Evins Street. This greenway would highlight Main Building and the proposed building site on the north side of Evins and would create an attractive public vista.
5) A building site would be created near the new Papadopoulos Administrative Complex in the area of the present tennis courts. A building here would enhance the Administrative Complex and would be highly visible. It would create an axis parallel to Church Street, with a long corridor connecting the new building on Evins Street to Burwell Building at the other end, the Papadopoulos Building and lake forming one side, and the recently dedicated Thomas B. Butler fountain and circle in the center.

6) The present tennis courts would be relocated on a site on the east side of the campus. This would create a sports complex composed of the football stadium, soccer field, baseball field, and tennis courts.

7) Additional property should be acquired north of Evins Street to expand the college campus, provide a buffer and protection from commercial development, and provide additional building sites.

8) The fraternity houses should be relocated north of Evins Street. (See #3 above.) In doing so, safety of the students is a primary concern. However, present houses are inadequate for students' needs, and if they are moved to a new site, they could be redesigned and enlarged to meet the present and future needs of the fraternities and sororities.

9) Proposed building sites for a new "high tech" Academic Building and other longer range projects such as dormitories or other buildings are shown on the Campus Master Plan map.

10) The final implementation of this plan will take into consideration the existing trees and plantings and will preserve as many of the large and healthy specimens as possible.
SHORT AND LONG TERM IMPROVEMENTS

The college should commit itself to a program of short term and long term campus facilities and grounds improvements. Generally, the short term projects should be undertaken within one to three years, and the longer term projects thereafter. These projects are listed below in their general order of priority. (Short term and long term recommendations for athletic facilities are discussed in a subsequent section.)

SHORT TERM IMPROVEMENTS

1. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan:
The college should adopt the proposed Master Plan and immediately undertake improvements to the Church Street entrance outlined in that Plan. Completion of the lake at the Church Street entrance and the green circle in front of Main Building would establish the concept of the Master Plan and would further improve the public image of the college.

2. Renovation of Black Hall: When the new Papadopoulos Administrative Complex was connected with historic Hugh S. Black Hall, the older building was altered as little as possible, and no renovation work was done to it. Although Black Hall is structurally sound, its mechanical and electrical systems are outdated; it lacks central air conditioning; and it needs new furnishings. Presently Black Hall does not adequately complement the beautiful new administration building, nor does it meet maximum safety standards for both buildings. Because of a generous gift, work on Black Hall can begin at once. Additional funds should be allocated to complete the project. The electrical system should be upgraded immediately. Next, a central air conditioning and heating system should be installed. Meanwhile, to the extent possible, interior furnishings should be improved, beginning on the first floor with the public spaces.
3. Improvements to Dormitories, Main Building, and Milliken Science Building:

a. Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning Systems:
A number of complaints about the adequacy of the mechanical systems, their noise and general performance lead to a recommendation that a detailed review and upgrading of these systems be undertaken by the college. This would involve review of control systems, upgrading of deteriorated equipment, implementation of a preventive maintenance program, and long-range development of a master coordinated campus plan. Professional engineers should be engaged to make this study.

b. Use of Color: There has been very little use of color in Wofford's buildings. A great opportunity exists here to exert a large impact on students and faculty with a small financial investment. Studies show that careful use of coordinated and striking colors in buildings, wall hangings, and furniture can have an impact out of scale to the cost. Planned color schemes can be introduced as buildings are routinely repainted, or the project could be undertaken as a special program. In either case, a professional designer should be selected by the college to choose paint colors, carpets, and furnishings. If the environment is kept fresh, productivity will be enhanced.

c. Lighting: Lighting in the corridors, public areas, and rooms of the campus buildings is very poor. In addition, such problems as broken and missing lighting fixture lenses, and lamps burning beyond their economic life, give a very bad impression and certainly do not enhance morale or "pride of place." Here is another opportunity for great improvement at a relatively low cost. Lighting consultants should be brought to the college for a survey and report.

d. Furniture: Some of the furniture in campus buildings is not in keeping with the image that Wofford would like to project. An improvement program should be begun; students should be involved in this program; and
an accountability system should be developed so that the furniture will be maintained in first class condition. Main Building in particular needs to be renovated and refurbished. The recent painting that has been done here is a good beginning. The seating in Leonard Auditorium should be made more comfortable, and the concrete floor should be carpeted. In addition to this work, there should be an upgrading of faculty offices.

e. 1986 Self-Study: The Physical Facilities Committee recommends that the College implement the following recommendations made in the 1986 Self-Study concerning the dormitories, Main Building, and Milliken Science Building:

Recommendation Concerning DuPre Hall
Restoration of the lounge to its original function should be studied.

Recommendations Concerning Marsh Hall
i. The service elevator often does not function on moving days; it should be repaired and an operator should be provided for moving days.

   ii. The main lobby should be redecorated.

Recommendations Concerning Main Building
i. Continuing attention should be given to leaking and condensation problems.

   ii. The tower steps are slippery when wet. Some means should be found to eliminate this hazard.

   iii. Consideration should be given to modification of Main Building to enable the handicapped to get to the auditorium.

Recommendations Concerning Milliken Science Building

   (NOTE: Work here would, of course, be affected by a decision to construct a new academic building.)
   i. Refinish lab desks and stone desk tops.

   ii. Investigate the need for improving facilities for the handicapped, including possible replacement of the freight elevator with one having automatic doors.
Recommendations Concerning Greene Hall

i. Greene Hall should be air conditioned and the heating system should have a better control system.

ii. Bathroom fixtures and bathroom ceilings should be replaced or repaired as needed.

iii. The mirrors in the bathrooms, which were installed when Greene was an all-male dormitory, should be lowered.

iv. The heavy gauge screens, which were installed over the ground floor windows to prevent break-ins, also would prevent occupant egress in case of fire. The safety hazard this poses should be investigated.

Recommendations Concerning Wightman Hall

i. Continuing attention should be given to the safety hazard presented by the open corridors, especially during times of snow and ice, when these passages can become quite dangerous.

ii. Study areas should be provided.

4. Landscaping Improvement: Improvement of the grounds (landscaping) should be a top priority for the college. While the grounds currently have attractive features, improvements need to be made. Some improvements can be made quickly and inexpensively; others will require more time and expense.

Among the current features which should be preserved are the numerous large trees. Every effort should be made to preserve the existing trees and to increase the variety of species as new plantings are made. There is no reason why the Wofford campus could not be made an arboretum with a program of conservation and gradual expansion of native and exotic species. Other current features that should be protected are the numerous flowering shrubs and smaller trees. The plantings of flowering trees and shrubs could easily be increased in certain campus areas. To summarize, the existing plants on the campus are the most important landscape resource of the college. They should be preserved, and as new plantings are made, greater diversity of species should be sought.
In addition to gradual increases in the number of species of trees and increased plantings of flowering shrubs and small trees, other improvements need to be made. One example of an improvement that could be accomplished quickly and with little expense is increased weeding and pruning during the growing season. For example, the courtyard of DuPre Hall has attractive plantings. Monthly maintenance (pruning, weeding, etc.) would improve its appearance. Similar frequent, routine maintenance would improve the appearance of the entire campus. This would involve hiring some additional help on the grounds crew.

There are some areas of the campus where more difficult and expensive work is needed. The area enclosed by Daniel Building, the fraternity houses, and Milliken Science Building is one such area. This area, largely grassless and shaded by water oaks, has an erosion problem. Because of shade, root competition, and student traffic, this area may not be suitable for either grass or groundcovers. Making this portion of the campus attractive will be a major undertaking. While this area may present the most difficult problems, there are other portions of the campus where costly work also will be required.

A present need, which will become greater as the Campus Master Plan is implemented, is development of adequate signage for the campus. This should reflect not only directions to visitors and guests, but tasteful identification of the structures and historic sites.

An irrigation system for much, perhaps all, of the campus should be the first step in any effort to improve the landscaping. This would be an expensive project, but the present resources and future improvements probably would not be permanent without irrigation.

In conclusion, an irrigation system is crucial for the long-term landscaping of the campus. Construction of such a system is recommended. Thereafter, certain problem areas should be improved. Present trees and shrubs should be preserved and additional plantings
made. The Wofford botanist should be consulted about both preservation of and additions to the college plantings. Routine maintenance should be more frequent.

5. "High Tech" Academic Building: With the increased numbers of personnel and programs anticipated the next seven years, there is great need for a significant new academic building, possibly to house science, computer science, and math departments and the Computer Center. Possible sites are shown on the long range plan. As this building is planned, long range plans for computer use on campus should be developed.

Future use of Milliken Science Building should be considered in connection with the planning and development of a new building. Since the Milliken Science Building contains no interior load bearing walls, it could be renovated for new or continued use, thereby providing badly needed space.

6. Land Acquisition: Wofford has purchased property, lot by lot, when available, on the north side of Evins Street and along the east side of Cleveland Street. The college should continue buying property in these areas as it becomes available.

From a long range standpoint, future physical development of Wofford must come north of Evins Street or north and east of Cleveland Street. The properties in these areas are a natural extension of the Wofford campus since the campus is physically confined by the railroad tracks to the east and North Church Street to the west.

It is conceivable that as property becomes available, the area between the Clinchfield tracks and Cleveland Street can be acquired within the foreseeable future. Such an acquisition would enable Wofford to have an entrance from North Pine Street.

The City Manager and other officers of the City of Spartanburg have been helpful in providing
information regarding future development in the area near Wofford's present campus. Wofford's designated staff person should maintain a continuous relationship with the City so that any future land acquisition and development can be coordinated with the plans of the City of Spartanburg.

In order to purchase property as it becomes available, a continuing fund needs to be established from which the President, with appropriate trustees' clearances, can quietly and quickly purchase property as it becomes available.

In order to develop the ownership of land, an ownership and appraisal map should be developed of the areas in which Wofford has an interest. This information can be secured from the Spartanburg County Assessor's office. The ownership map and appraisal information should be updated on at least a yearly basis.

7. Historic Image: The college should protect its historic buildings and actively promote the historic character of its campus, the core of which forms a historic district listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The college is fortunate to have five buildings dating back to its founding in 1854, two dating from about 1880, and two dating from the turn of the century. We recommend that a comprehensive plan be developed to inform and educate the general public (as well as the college community) about the historic nature of the campus. This plan would include signs, printed materials, and a slide show or videotape appropriate for use in student recruitment. In addition, some space on campus could be designed for an expanded college archives, which could become a museum for the collection of Wofford memorabilia. This space could perhaps be found in Snyder Building. (Note: During the freshman orientation program some time should be devoted to educating incoming students about the history and architecture of the buildings on campus.)
SHORT-TERM, WOFFORD COLLEGE SHOULD:

1. begin implementation of the Campus Master Plan;

2. renovate Black Alumni Building to complement the new Administrative Complex;

3. improve dormitories, Main Building, and Milliken Science Building in the following areas: Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems; use of color; lighting; and furniture. Act on recommendations made in 1986 Self-Study for these buildings;

4. plan and maintain campus landscaping;

5. build a new "high tech" Academic Building;

6. acquire property near the college within the area defined by Long Range Plan; and

7. promote the historical image of the college, and enhance it with a comprehensive, coherent plan for campus signs and printed material.
LONG TERM IMPROVEMENTS

1. First Order of Priority

a. Designate a trustee committee to be responsible for the Long Range Plan.

b. Remove all parking spaces from the center of the campus, and provide convenient new parking areas outside the central area.

c. Study improvements to dining facilities.

d. Plan suitable use of Snyder Building in keeping with its historical value and central location.

e. Relocate the fraternity/sorority buildings to the north side of Evins Street.

f. Preserve and recognize the historic character of the campus in promotional materials and future plans.

g. Encourage suitable private development of the area between the college and the medical complex.

2. Additional Long-Term Recommendations

In addition to the main priority list outlined above, the following projects should become part of the college's long-term review and improvement plans:

a. Athletic Facilities

   i. Concentration of Athletic Fields on East Side of Campus: As part of the long-range plan, athletic fields should be concentrated on the east end of the campus. Tennis courts displaced due to expansion of the College buildings near Church and Evins Street should be relocated east of Cumming Street as property is acquired. As this is done, the College should not lose sight of the possibility of closing Cleveland Street beyond the Campus Life Building to Memorial Drive. This would allow maximum usage of this area.

   ii. Snyder Field Stands and Parking: The north side stands are uncomfortable and inferior to the better designed south side stands. Consideration
should be given to expanding the south side stands gradually over a period of years so that the north stands can be either phased out or rebuilt. This work should include construction of an adequate press box.

Additional parking should be developed adjoining the soccer field to serve Snyder Field and the Campus Life Building.

iii. Andrews Field House Renovations for Personal Sports: Consideration should be given to transforming Andrews Field House into a first-class health club which could offer students, faculty, and staff aerobic classes, weight training classes, etc. This would also provide students with a fine recreational facility, something that is not available at the present time, and would provide an informal setting for students and faculty to interact away from the classroom.

iv. Campus Life Building/Benjamin Johnson Arena Dressing Rooms Improvements: One floor of the unfinished side of the Campus Life Building should become a varsity basketball complex for men's and women's teams. Since the present dressing rooms are inadequate for large basketball teams, spacious dressing rooms as well as equipment rooms, and a meeting/video room should be built to accommodate the needs of the basketball program. This would free up equipment room space for other sports and would make available two small locker rooms for "in season" use. On the floor, volleyball standards that can be moved to the side courts should be installed to provide flexibility, and the possibility of lengthening the side court should be studied.

v. Law Field (baseball) and the Lower Fields (soccer/football practice) Lights and Irrigation: Consideration should be given to lighting these fields and installing an irrigation system on the lower fields.

b. Interconnection of campus boiler/refrigeration systems

c. Property purchase and development

i. Long-term plans to acquire the Baptist Student Center and Wayside Gardens.

ii. Encouragement of private long-range development of area north of Evins and West of Cumming Street between the College and Spartanburg Regional Medical Center as a retirement community.

iii. Long-range rerouting or closing of Cleveland St. from Campus Life Building to Memorial Drive.
MAINTENANCE AND EQUIPMENT

Increasing the square footage of buildings, adding more acreage to the campus grounds and beautifying the current holdings, and intending to create a permanent environment that is both functional and enticing will require additional attention to maintenance.

A new academic building of the large dimensions needed to house the campus's technological learning core and the equivalent of twenty new faculty members will require additional budgeting of $100,000 a year in utilities, cleaning materials, and repairs. Added to existing facilities already understaffed in maintenance, the new facility and others will require two housekeepers, a mechanic, a carpenter, an electrician, and an assistant director for inspections and preventative maintenance, at approximately $100,000 more. Grounds maintenance will require yet a third $100,000, for four new grounds crew members and for plant materials and general appearance upkeep.

In addition, the college needs to establish a central equipment budget, currently funded from budget surpluses or depreciations, to which offices and departments may apply for new or replacement equipment essential to effective operations of programs. A fund of $200,000 would provide a foundation fund for such needs, quite apart from existing funds for extraordinary replacements, repairs, and emergencies.
WOFFORD COLLEGE SHOULD:

a. increase its maintenance budget by $300,000 by 1994, in increments of $100,000 for grounds by 1991, of $100,000 for upkeep of a new academic building by 1991, and of $100,000 for operation and maintenance of the general plant by 1994; and

b. establish an equipment replacement and acquisition fund of $200,000 for use by offices and departments upon justification to the president through the appropriate vice presidents.
SIX IMPROVEMENTS FOR QUALITY

SUMMARY SCHEDULE

1. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN SELECTION AND SUPPORT OF STUDENTS:

A. ADMISSIONS APPLICANTS POOL OF 1500
   By fall of 1991

B. OUT-OF-STATE ENROLLMENT OF 40%
   By fall of 1991

C. 75% OF CLASS FROM TOP 20% H.S.CLASS
   By fall of 1991

D. 1100 AVG. FRESHMAN COMPOS. SAT SCORE
   By fall of 1991

E. 90% FRESHMAN RETENTION
   By fall of 1991

F. $1 MILLION NEED-BASED AID
   1/2 by 1991, 1/2 by 1994

G. $1 MILLION WOFFORD SCHOLARS
   1/2 by 1991, 1/2 by 1994

H. MINORITY STUDENT RECRUITER
   By fall of 1989

I. ALUMNI/PARENTS RECRUITING NETWORKER
   1987 (on board)

J. DEAN OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
   By fall of 1987

K. RECRUITING BUDGET INCREASE, $50,000
   By fall of 1989

L. H.S./WOFF.DEPT. NETWORKS
   Begun, Complete By fall of 1991

M. CHURCH AND MINISTERS NETWORK, $15,000
   2/3 by fall of 1988,
   1/3 by fall of 1991

N. CHURCH STREET GROUNDS/ADMISSIONS
   BUILDING SHOWCASE (SEE #6 SHORT-TERM 1,2)

O. ORIENTATION PROGRAM (SEE #4C)

2. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN SELECTION AND RENEWAL OF FACULTY:

A. 80 FTE FACULTY; 1/13 FAC./STUDENT RATIO,$800,000
   62 FTE by fall of 1987
   65 FTE by fall of 1991
   80 FTE by fall of 1995

   1. 4 FTE=DEPT. CHM. ADMIN. TIME
   2. 2 FTE=NAT. PROJECT DIRECTORS
   3. 6 FTE=EDUCATIONAL RENEWAL TIME
   4. 4 FTE= FAC.ACADEMIC ADVISING TIME
   5. 4 FTE= FAC.FOR RECRUING TIME

B. DEAN OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT (SEE #1J)
   By fall 1987

C. FRESHMAN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
   Appoint Committee 1987

D. DIRECTOR, INTERNSHIPS/EXPERIENTIAL PROGR.
   By fall 1991

E. FACULTY SALARY AVERAGE: AAUP IIB LEVEL 1, $200,000
   By fall 1994
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3. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN ACADEMIC PROGRAMS:

A. INSTRUCTIONAL BUDGET, $500,000 1/2 by 1991, 1/2 by 1994
B. COMPUTERIZED LIBRARY CATALOG, $250,000 By fall 1992
C. ACADEMIC SPACE: FACULTY, OFFICES, CLASSES, & TECHNOLOGY (SEE #6 SHORT-TERM 5)
D. CREATE NEW COMPUTER CENTER, $1 MILLION By fall 1991
E. BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY, GEOLOGY: $500,000 By fall 1994
SCIENCE BUILDING RENOVATION, (SEE #6 SHORT-TERM 3)
F. HEWLETT-MELLON INNOVATIONS AWARDS Begin by fall 1987

4. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN STUDENT LIFE PROGRAMS:

A. HEAD RESIDENT POSITIONS, $40,000 By fall 1990
B. ORIENTATION PROGRAM, $20,000 1/2 IN 1988, 1/2 IN 1990
C. STAFF FOR STUDENT LIFE ACTIVITIES By fall 1991
D. F-T INTRAMURAL DIRECTOR, $15,000 By fall 1991
E. ENTERTAINMENT/ACTIVITIES/WEEKEND PROGRAMS INCREASE BY $100,000, ADDING $15,000 A YEAR 1987-94
F. CULTURAL AFFAIRS PROGRAMS (SEE #3)
G. RENOVATE RESIDENCE HALLS (SEE #6)

5. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN ATHLETICS PROGRAMS:

A. NCAA LEVELS, $500,000 1/2 by 1991, 1/2 by 1994
B. NEW WOMEN'S SPORT (FUNDED IN #5A) By fall of 1988
C. FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS (SEE #6) -------------------
D. FUNDING /INFORMATION STAFF (FUNDED IN #5A) By fall of 1991

6. TO IMPROVE QUALITY IN PHYSICAL FACILITIES:

1. ENTRANCE IMPROVEMENTS,$150,000 By fall of 1988
2. ADMISSIONS HALL,$307,000 1/3 in 1987, 2/3 in 1988
3. RENOVATIONS: est. $2,500,000
   A. GREEENE HALL By fall of 1988
   B. MARSH HALL By fall of 1988
   C. DUPRE HALL By fall of 1989
   D. WIGHTMAN HALL By fall of 1989
   E. SHIPP HALL By fall of 1990
   F. MAIN BUILDING By fall of 1991
   G. MILLIKEN SCIENCE BUILDING, $500,000 By fall of 1994

4. LANDSCAPING, $250,000 By fall of 1991

5. NEW ACADEMIC SPACE, $5 MILLION By fall of 1991

6. PROPERTY ACQUISITION, $600,000,
   AT $100,000 BUDGETED TO RECUR ANNUALLY 1988-94

7. SIGNS AND LOGO SYSTEMS, $22,000 By fall of 1988

8. BOARD LONG-RANGE BUILDING COMMITTEE Appoint by fall of 1987

9. PARKING AREAS AND STREETS, $750,000 By fall of 1991

10. DINING HALL IMPROVEMENTS (Contingent on further planning) ---

11. SNYDER HALL USES, ARCHIVES, $170,000 (Contingent on gifts)--

12. GREEK-SYSTEM HOUSES, $540,000 (Contingent on gifts/financing)-

13. HISTORICAL PRESENTATIONS, $50,000 (Contingent upon gifts)---

14. DEVELOPMENT BETWEEN CAMPUS & MED CENTER Begin fall of 1987

15. TENNIS COURTS, $300,000 By fall of 1989

16. SNYDER FIELD, $1,081,000 (Contingent upon gifts)----------
   RESTROOMS STAGE, $125,000 By fall of 1989

17. ANDREWS FIELD HOUSE, $500,000 (Contingent on gifts) -------

18. CAMPUS LIFE DRESSING ROOMS, $200,000 (Contingent on gifts)--

19. LAW AND LOWER FIELDS LIGHTING, $105,000 By fall of 1988

20. INTERCONNECTED BOILERS/A-C SYSTEMS, $148,000----------

21. MAINTENANCE, $300,000 RECURRING,
   ADDING $75,000 YEARLY By fall of 1991
   A. NEW BUILDING UTILITIES/UPKEEP, $100,000
   B. BUILDINGS PERSONNEL, $100,000
   C. GROUNDS UPKEEP, $100,000

22. DEPARTMENTS EQUIPMENT, $200,000 RECURRING,
   ADDING $40,000 YEARLY 1990-94
SUMMARY OF PROJECTS AND COSTS ESTIMATES

RECURRING ANNUAL COSTS, $5,285,000

1. NEED-BASED AID, $1 MILLION RECURRING
2. WOFFORD SCHOLARS SUPPORT, $1 MILLION RECURRING
3. RECRUITING SUPPORT, $50,000 RECURRING
4. FACULTY SALARY COMPARABILITY, $200,000
5. ACADEMIC SUPPORT, $500,000 RECURRING
6. DEPARTMENTAL EQUIPMENT, $200,000 RECURRING
7. STUDENT ACTIVITIES, $100,000 RECURRING
8. ORIENTATION PROGRAM, $20,000 RECURRING
9. DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT, $200,000 RECURRING
10. MAINT./GROUNDS SUPPORT, $200,000 RECURRING
11. LAND ACQUISITION, $100,000 RECURRING
12. ATHLETIC PROGRAM, $450,000 RECURRING
13. CHAPLAIN'S CHURCH OUTREACH, $15,000 RECURRING
14. ADDITIONAL FACULTY AND STAFF, $1,250,000 RECURRING
   a. MINORITY STUDENT RECRUITER
   b. ALUMNI/PARENT RECRUITING NETWORKER
   c. DEAN OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT
   d. DIRECTOR OF INTERNS/EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING
   e. STAFF FOR STUDENT ACTIVITIES
   f. 1/2 UPGRADE, INTRAMURALS DIRECTOR
   g. UPGRADE 3 HEAD RESIDENTS
   h. STAFF FOR ATHLETIC FUNDRAISING/PUBLICITY
   i. OTHER ATHLETIC (COACHES, STAFF)
   j. MAINTENANCE/GROUNDS, $100,000
   k. DIRECTOR OF PUBLICATIONS
   l. DONOR PROSPECT RESEARCHER (FUNDED 1987)
   m. PLANNED GIVING OFFICER (FUNDED 1987)
   n. 20 FTE Faculty, $800,000

ONE-TIME COSTS, $10,639,000

1. COMPUTERIZED LIBRARY SYSTEM, $250,000
2. ACADEMIC BUILDING AND COMPUTER CENTER, $6,000,000
3. SCIENCE BUILDING RENOVATIONS, $500,000
4. RESIDENCE HALLS/MAIN BLDG. RENOVATIONS, $2,000,000
5. FRONT LAKE AND MAIN CIRCLE, $150,000
6. ADMISSIONS BUILDING, $307,000
7. LANDSCAPING AND SIGN SYSTEMS, $277,000
8. PARKING AND STREETS, $750,000
9. TENNIS COURTS, $300,000
10. LAW AND LOWER FIELDS LIGHTING, $105,000
PUTTING PLANNING INTO ACTION

Systematic planning is essential for a good college, but it is effective only if it enables the college to live within its means. Planning can help a college get more efficient returns from the resources it has available, but if it also stimulates good ideas which prompt appropriate new resources for execution of good ideas, it is doubly effective.

The Wofford College year of planning has found the college in sound fiscal and program condition, but in need of incremental steps to make effectiveness match efficiency. As these increments for action were identified during the planning year, Wofford studied other "benchmark" campuses where such improvements have already taken place and have created positive institutional impacts. These studies gave Wofford planners some grasp of the gaps in resources and programs which needed most to be addressed.

One particular study consisted of a comparison of Wofford statistics with those of nine other colleges with which Wofford identifies itself. These data were drawn from 1984-85 information in the most prominent college guidebooks used by pre-college students and their parents in making college admissions choices, from compensation data for 1985-86 from an annual AAUP study, and from giving data for 1984-85 provided by CFAE's annual study.

Extrapolating to make the nine-college composite match Wofford's enrollment of 1,052 students shows Wofford behind the nine colleges in almost all categories:
The implications of such data from nine colleges and from studies of other colleges not included in that particular study are evident in the improvement steps emphasized by the Wofford planners: e.g., increasing the admissions prospect pool in and out of state, increasing the SAT average to 1100, increasing retention of freshmen to 90 percent, adding $2 million in student aid, adding twenty faculty members towards a faculty/student ratio of 1/13, getting faculty compensation competitive with other colleges, and securing a major academic building and computer network.

Equally important implications from these data have to do with fiscal responsibility. The improvements sought are
not possible without resources to support them. Whatever else Wofford does, it will not operate beyond its means, in the world of red ink.

Comparative data show that Wofford could use four means for improving its resources support:

1) Wofford must seek increases to the annual operating budget from growth in its Annual Fund;
2) Wofford must seek increases to the annual operating budget from increases in tuition charged to students;
3) Wofford must add to its endowment funds to increase earnings from endowment applicable annually to college operating budgets; and
4) Wofford must seek one-time capital fund gifts for its buildings, grounds, and equipment improvements.

All of these means are but one: people. A student-focused, people-intensive college as Wofford is needs more people sharing in its dreams and investing in its work. Those who care share. This plan has within it six reasons and ways to care for Wofford College.
*EPILOGUE: A Guide to a Good College*

*The concluding chapter of College: The Undergraduate Experience in America (New York, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1987), by Ernest L. Boyer, copyrighted by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, is reprinted by permission here because the questions it raises about assessing how good a college is, and the sequence in which these questions appear, were strikingly repeated, quite independently, by the Wofford College Strategic Planning Task Force.*

From Sophocles' Antigone to Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman, Western society expresses its most profound tensions when it affirms that men and women are not means, but ends, and yet, that the individual must, at times, be guided by community. Balancing these two values--sometimes complementary, sometimes conflicting--is the tightrope of history upon which our society walks. By leaning too much in one direction, anarchy will result; leaning too much into the other, the outcome is totalitarianism.

The tension between individuality and community has been the central theme of our study. The college is committed, on the one hand, to serve the needs of individual students, celebrating human diversity in its many forms, encouraging creativity and independence, and helping students become economically and socially empowered. A college of quality is also guided by community concerns. It has goals that are greater than the sum of the separate parts and reminds students, in formal and informal ways, that there is an intellectual and social community to which they are inextricably connected.

Is it possible for the modern campus, with all of its separations and divisions, to find points of common interest? In the prologue, we emphasized that the college is weakened by separations and divisions. The four-year undergraduate college, the institution at the center of higher education in America, is, we found, defined in so many ways and living so many lives that its identity and distinctiveness seem to have been clouded.

There is no single model of "the good college."
Missions and circumstances vary greatly from one campus to another. But there are, we believe, characteristics widely enough shared to support the suggestions made in the body of our report.

We now refer back to many of these recommendations, stating them in the form of questions to be asked of individual institutions. While the standards suggested may be high, they are, we believe, within reach and, when taken together, provide for students and their parents a guide to a good college.

The quality of the undergraduate college is measured first by the extent of its cooperation with the schools, by its willingness to smooth the transition between school and higher education. The way students are recruited helps to shape college expectations, and a good college conducts its recruitment and selection so as to serve the best interests of the student.

Prospective students should not hesitate to ask questions about any aspect of the transition from school to college. Representatives of a good college will not resist sharply focused questions. After all, in choosing a college, one of life's major decisions is being made. A lot of time, money, and effort will be involved. The shape and quality of the student's life may rest on the outcome.

Does the college present itself honestly in its promotional materials and recruitment methods? Are the criteria used in selecting students clearly described? Does the college make available to prospective students the percentage of last year's applicants who were admitted and report the percentage of admitted students who actually enrolled? If test scores are required for admissions, does the college actually use the results and also make available not just the average scores, but also the number of students admitted by quartile, so that the range of student aptitudes can be taken into account? Also, does the college provide its regional accrediting association with regular reports on attrition and retention?

When all is said and done, the procedures colleges
use in the selection of their students cannot be divorced from institutional goals, nor can they be separated from the social context in which colleges carry on their work. Colleges and universities have an urgent obligation to maintain diversity on campus, and we ask: Does the college strongly reaffirm, as a central objective, its commitment to educational opportunity for historically bypassed students? Are black and Hispanic students well represented on the campus?

A quality college is guided by a clear and vital mission. The institution cannot be all things to all people. Choices must be made and priorities assigned. And there is, we believe, in the tradition of the undergraduate college, sufficient common ground on which shared goals can be established and a vital academic program built.

An essential test is this: Does the college have clearly stated goals that relate directly to the undergraduate experience? Do these objectives recognize the need to serve individual students while also giving significant attention to community concerns? Do students know about college purposes and what use is being made of them, both in academic planning and in campus life?

Most students come to college with high hopes. The transition is a major rite of passage. First impressions are often lasting impressions. The first weeks on campus will probably have a significant influence on the entire undergraduate experience. This is a time when prospects for community are diminished or enhanced and yet, undergraduates are often largely uninformed about the values and traditions of higher learning.

Here are key questions: Is the freshman year viewed as something special? Does the college offer a well-planned orientation program, perhaps with a new-student convocation, and a course that features the academic as well as the social and personal aspects of campus life? Is the orientation program actively supported by the faculty? Does the president give as much attention to incoming students as he or she does to alumni?
Because students need guidance, a college of quality has a year-round program of academic advising and personal counseling, structured to serve all undergraduates, including part-time and commuting students. But is the faculty available to freshmen to talk about their disciplines, and do faculty give guidance to young students as they consider choices for careers? A college worthy of commendation works as hard at holding students as it does at getting them to the campus in the first place. What has been the retention rate at the college during the past five years? Is it more than 50 percent? Does the college have a program to help identify students who are having trouble and give them guidance?

One of the great barriers to success in college and later life is deficiency in language. While the mastery of a second or even third language is vitally important, the reality is that students will not be prepared for American life if they cannot communicate effectively in English.

In identifying the academic goals of a college we must ask: Does the institution give priority to language? Is the reading and writing capability of each student carefully assessed at the time he or she enrolls? And are those who are not well prepared in written and spoken English placed in an intensive, noncredit course that meets daily during the first academic term?

Further, does the college offer for all students, not just those in need of remediation, a freshman-year language course where both written and oral communication are stressed? And, are these skills emphasized in every class? Does the college have a program of collaboration with surrounding schools that strengthens language teaching? Language is the skill central to all others. And proficiency in the written and spoken word is the first prerequisite for a college-level education.

The special challenge confronting the undergraduate college is to shape a common learning curriculum that will express the claims of community. Students must have freedom to follow their own interests,
develop their own aptitudes, and pursue their own goals. But truly educated persons must also gain perspective, see themselves in relation to other people and times, understand how their own origins and interests are tied to the origins and interests of others.

The specific questions are these: Does the college have a coherent general education sequence—an integrated core—something more than a loosely connected distribution arrangement? Does this core program provide not only for an integration of the separate academic disciplines but also for their application and relationship to life?

The integrated core we have in mind would be spread throughout the entire baccalaureate experience—from the freshman to the senior years—and be pursued not only through courses, but through informal seminars and all-college convocations.

Further, at a good college, the academic major will broaden rather than restrict the perspective of the student. We ask: Does the major not only allow the student to explore a subject in depth, but also to put such study in perspective? Does it present, in effect, an enriched major?

An enriched major, as we have defined it in our study, will respond successfully to three essential questions: What is the history and tradition of the field to be examined? What are the social and economic implications to be pursued? What are the ethical and moral issues within the specialty that need to be confronted? Rather than divide the undergraduate experience into separate camps—general versus specialized education—the curriculum at a college of quality will bring the two together.

A coherent curriculum is only the beginning. Good faculty are essential to a good college. Members of the faculty determine the quality of the undergraduate experience. And the investment in teaching is a key ingredient in the building of a successful institution.

Questions about the faculty include these: At
research institutions, is good teaching valued as well as research, and is it an important criterion for tenure and promotion? Is superior teaching rewarded through recognized status and salary incentives? Do other institutions have a flexible policy, recognizing that some faculty are great teachers, others great researchers, and still others offer a blend of both? Are all professors, even those who are not publishing researchers, encouraged to be scholars, remaining on top of their discipline?

There are other matters to be examined: Does the college support faculty renewal and professional growth in such practical ways as making leaves available and providing funds for teachers to improve their pedagogical practices? Is teaching evaluated by students, and does the college offer, to faculty, a program to improve their teaching?

Part-time teachers are beneficial economically and can enrich the campus. There are, however, central questions to consider. What is the impact of part-time faculty on the spirit of community on campus? Does the college restrict the use of part-time teachers? And is their employment educationally justified?

The satisfaction of seeing students develop intellectually while participating in the building of an institution of higher learning should offer faculty members a sense of satisfaction as great as seeing their names in print in a professional journal or hearing the applause of fellow scholars at a professional meeting.

The undergraduate experience, at its best, also means encouraging students to be active rather than passive learners. In measuring the quality of a college one should ask if the institution has a climate that encourages independent, self-directed study. Is priority given to the required lower-division classes? Is teaching more than lecturing? Do general education courses have small discussion sessions in which students work together on group assignments? Are undergraduate courses taught by the most respected and most gifted teachers on campus? Because much learning occurs outside the classroom, it is
important to know how accessible faculty are to their students, through office hours, to be sure, but also elsewhere on the campus—for some, at athletic or cultural events; for others, in the student center, for example, over a Coke or coffee.

Other important questions to be pressed are these: Is good teaching encouraged through student evaluation? Does the college help faculty learn how to reach more effectively as well as to measure the progress of their students, not only separately but through group projects, too?

When all is said and done, the central qualities that make for successful teaching are the ones that can be simply stated: command of the material to be taught, a contagious enthusiasm for the play of ideas, optimism about the potential of one's students, and—not least—sensitivity, integrity, and warmth as a human being. At a good college this combination is present in the classroom.

A quality undergraduate college also is a place that gives high priority to independent study, to learning resources outside the classroom. The library is often called the "heart" of the institution, and yet we often found it to be underfunded and underused.

One must ask: Is the library more than a study hall? Are students encouraged to spend at least as much time with library resources as they spend in classes? Do students, in their use of the library, seek out original sources and contemporary writings? Does the college ensure that a minimum of 5 percent of the total operating budget is provided for library support? And does the library's acquisition policy resist domination by narrow scholarly interests, serving also undergraduate education? Are those who direct the library also considered teachers?

Today another teaching tool—the microcomputer—offers great potential for learning on the campus. Does the college have a comprehensive plan for computer use before it purchases the hardware? Are campus terminals linked to wider networks? And does the
college connect technology, the library, and the classroom, letting each resource do what it does best and encouraging students to engage in creative, independent learning?

Students spend most of the undergraduate years outside the classroom, and what they do during this time profoundly shapes the form and quality of their experience. From lecture series and concerts to sports and student organizations, students learn important lessons.

The college that deserves support is one that sees academic and nonacademic functions as related. Because college is intended to prepare students for life, the lessons of the classroom should be applied first in the college community itself.

Therefore, in measuring the quality of the college one should ask: Are there well-supported campus-wide activities--lectures, symposia, debates, concerts, and the like--that encourage community, sustain college traditions, and stimulate both social and intellectual interaction? Are these events well attended by both faculty and students? Are college athletics kept in proper balance, with the college ensuring that its educational purposes are never sacrificed? Does the college actively promote a broad intramural program for all students?

There are health matters to be considered, too: Are students at the college educated about the importance of nutrition and exercise and encouraged to participate in a regular program of physical activity? Does the college cafeteria provide a healthful diet? Do college administrators back local and state laws regarding the use of drugs and alcoholic beverages? Does the college sponsor programs to help deal with these problems? In short, does the college have standards not just in academic matters but in nonacademic matters, too--expectations that help to define the college as a community?

Residential living can be one of the most chaotic parts of campus life, and yet it has the potential of being one of the most rewarding. It is appropriate to ask: Are residence halls not only a place for sleeping and parties
but for education, with seminars, colloquia, and informal learning? Does the college president receive regular reports on both problems and programs inside the residence halls? And does he or she occasionally visit the halls to meet with students as well as with resident assistants? It is our position that, at a good college, students discover that all parts of college life are measured by high standards, and that educated people are guided in their behavior by civility and decency.

In evaluating campus life, careful attention also must be paid to the growing number of nonresident students: Are commuters simply tolerated or are they full-fledged members of the community? Does the college meet the needs of such students by providing them first-rate educational, social, and recreational services?

If co-curricular life can be linked to classrooms, if the college sponsors convocations and celebrations, and if there are opportunities for sharp intellectual exchanges and reflection—then a college is united, not by routine requirements and procedures, but by a concern for consequential issues, by respect for lively debate, and the clarifying of convictions. At such a place, the total campus, not just the classroom, is viewed as a place for learning.

Today's students have been labeled the "me generation," concerned only about private ends. But we found that this generation of undergraduates has hopes and aspirations that reach beyond themselves. Still, undergraduates are torn by ambiguous feelings—idealism on the one hand, and on the other, the temptation to pursue private interests that would leave them politically and socially disengaged. Like people everywhere, they are searching for identity and meaning.

A good college affirms that service to others is a central part of education. The questions we pose are these: Are students encouraged to participate in voluntary service? Does the college offer the option of deferring admission to students who devote a year to service before coming to campus? Are the service
projects drawn into the larger educational purposes, helping students to see that they are not only autonomous individuals but also members of an intentional community? And does the faculty set an example and give leadership to service?

The vision of service is also reflected in the quality of campus governance. A good college has effective decision-making arrangements. The distance between faculty and administrators is reduced and students become active participants as well. College and community citizenship is affirmed. We ask: Are the faculty senate and student government respected, well-supported organizations? Does the college work to keep open the lines of communication that cut across student, faculty, and administration structures? Is there an all-college forum to address common educational questions and consider campus-wide matters? Do trustees participate in shaping priorities for the college? Finally, in affirming the central role of the college president, we pose this question: Does the president offer the college an inspired vision?

In the end, governance is to be measured not by the formality of the structure but by the integrity of the participants, by the willingness of individuals to work together in support of shared objectives.

Throughout our study, we were regularly reminded that new educational patterns are emerging. New types of students are enrolling, and the location of learning has moved beyond the campus--to the home, the workplace, and around the world. A college of consequence avoids isolation and develops programs that meet new patterns.

The tests are these: Are traditional students encouraged to look beyond the campus, either through a semester of work or internship? And does the college have foreign study that offers careful introductions to another culture? Do nontraditional students participate in campus life in ways that help them overcome their isolation and become part of a community of learning? An effective college designs creative ways to both extend
and encourage diversity on the campus.

A quality undergraduate college is concerned about outcomes. It asks questions about student development that go beyond the evaluation. But a good college, in its college-wide assessment, will avoid measuring that which matters least. We speak here of the need of students to think clearly, to be well informed, to be able to integrate their knowledge, and to apply what they have learned. We have suggested that each student might participate in a senior seminar in which he or she presents a thesis orally and critiques the papers of fellow students. Does the college encourage such a project, which would relate some aspect of the student's major to historical, social, and ethical concerns?

The impact of college extends beyond graduation, and a quality college will provide placement guidance to its students and follow their careers. Students at such a college will be well equipped to put their work in context and also be adequately prepared to move from one intellectual challenge to another. The graduate will continue to read and think, study and reflect throughout life. The undergraduate experience also has prepared students to see beyond the boundaries of their own narrow interests and discover connections that are global.

In judging the quality of a college these questions should be posed: Do graduates understand the dignity of work and, at the same time, are they prepared to venture beyond technical skills in their education? Do students see the connection between what they learn and how they live, looking for the deeper significance, for the moral dilemmas and the ethical responses? The college succeeds as its graduates are inspired by a larger vision, using the knowledge they have acquired to form values and advance the common good.

This brings us, again, to the heart of our report. Throughout this book we have talked about the two great traditions of individuality and community in higher education. Colleges, we have said, should help students become independent, self-reliant human beings, yet also
they should give priority to community. In implementing these two priorities, a balance must be struck.

But here we insert an important word of caution. To draw the line too sharply between these two traditions may, in fact, mask a more fundamental truth: To serve private priorities while neglecting social obligations is, ultimately, to undermine self-interest. And it is more than mere sentiment to suggest that altruism richly benefits the self as well.

In *Habits of the Heart*, Robert Bellah and his associates say, "Perhaps the notion that private and public lives are at odds is incorrect. Perhaps they are so deeply involved with each other that the impoverishment of one entails the impoverishment of the other. Parker Palmer is probably right when he says that 'in a healthy society the private and the public are not mutually exclusive, not in competition with each other. They are, instead, two halves of a whole, two poles of a paradox. They work together dialectically, helping to create and nurture one another.'"

This point, properly understood, brings us to our vision of the undergraduate experience. It warns against making too great a distinction between careerism and the liberal arts, between self-benefit and service. We more comfortably embrace the notion that the aim of the undergraduate experience is not only to prepare the young for productive careers, but also to enable them to live lives of dignity and purpose; not only to generate new knowledge, but to channel that knowledge to humane ends; not merely to study government, but to help shape a citizenry that can promote the public good.

The undergraduate college in America has never been a static institution. For 350 years, it has shaped its program in response to the changing social and economic context. As we look to a world whose contours remain obscure, we conclude the time has come to reaffirm the undergraduate experience and, in so doing, help students move from competence to commitment and be of service to their neighborhoods, the nation, and the world.