



**BURG
AAUP**

"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

December 4, 2008

PRESIDENT HAMM ADDRESSES FALL AAUP DINNER

On Saturday, September 24th the Wartburg chapter of the AAUP met for its annual fall dinner. After an elegant meal served by Wartburg dining services in the Castle Room, interim President Bill Hamm addressed the AAUP membership on the topic "Dancing on the Capitol Steps." Several attendees commented that this was the first time they could remember that a Wartburg president had spoken to a gathering of the AAUP. In his talk, President Hamm described the higher education scene in Washington, D. C., both its evolution and its present state. He focused on the three associations in DC that are primarily responsible for representing private colleges: the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU); the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC); and the Foundation for Independent Higher Education (FIHE). Over the past decade, Hamm served on the board for all three organizations and as president of the FIHE, and from this vantage point he spoke about the present and future challenges facing private colleges. He drew attention to five areas of challenge:

1. The price of a private-college education is increasing faster than inflation, and this has drawn attention from members of Congress who believe that the privates are increasing costs carelessly.
2. As a result of increasing attention from Congress, private colleges can expect greater regulation.
3. Private colleges will feel pressure to adopt more efficient delivery systems, including larger class sizes and lower pay for instructors. In addition, they can expect increased pressure to offer on-line courses.
4. The for-profit education sector will continue to grow and challenge private education. Both Kaplan University and the University of Phoenix have lobbied politicians aggressively (\$\$).
5. Raising funds from large corporations is becoming more difficult. The number of organizations seeking funds from corporations has quadrupled in the last twenty years, and the money is distributed less according to the personal preferences of corporate leaders and more for the purpose of cultivating a positive public image for the corporation. Corporations are increasingly funding public sector institutions, including elementary and secondary schools. Wartburg's Waterloo Teachers Project is the type of program favored in the current climate. In addition, as corporations become increasingly multinational, so does their philanthropy.

Hamm concluded by noting that Wartburg's absolute highest priority has to be on cooperating to deliver what it promises in the most effective way possible. "The difference between good and great schools is focus. Part of our challenge, then, will be to maintain our distinctiveness."

The AAUP wishes to thank President Hamm for his wise and witty address to the members.

LAMBERT: COM INVOLVES FACULTY IN STRATEGIC PLANNING

Editor's comment: *In its chapter on shared governance, AAUP's Policy Documents & Reports ("the Redbook") states, "Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college... The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community" (p. 181, 1995 edition). According to Professor Lake Lambert, the Commission on Mission strives to embody that ideal.*

Commission on Mission has been underway for approximately 10 months, and the work of faculty, staff, alumni, students and members of the Board of Regents is already bearing fruit. Three events sponsored by the Faith Task Force and a series of events sponsored by the Leadership Task Force have already occurred, and symposia by the Service and Learning Task Forces are in the final stages of preparation.

The Board of Regents designed Commission on Mission as the College's next long-range planning process, and it was formally announced at homecoming last year. The departure of President Ohle raised several questions about the future of Commission on Mission. When board chair Fred Hagemann announced Ohle's resignation, however, he affirmed the continuation of Commission on Mission. My conversations with members of the Board of Regents since then, including extended conversations with Commission on Mission chair Mike McCoy, have confirmed the on-going importance of Commission on Mission to Wartburg's future.

Each Commission on Mission task force is co-chaired by a member of the faculty and a member of the Board of Regents, and faculty constitute 7 of the 14 members of each task force. Janeen Stewart and I serve as the Commission's directors. The Steering Committee, chaired by Regent Mike McCoy, assists in the guidance of the overall process, and it includes each of the co-chairs, members of the Cabinet, and a member of Faculty Council. Task forces have also received input from several internal constituencies, including student life professionals, administrative staff, and clerical and maintenance staff. Faculty offered input as part of the fall faculty workshop when small groups of faculty worked at tables to respond to questions posed by each of the four task forces.

Deliberations by task forces will continue throughout the academic year using information gathered from faculty, staff, and national summit meetings with alumni and friends. The task forces have been charged to make their recommendations by next summer, and these will be formally submitted to the Board of Regents at its October 2009 meeting. The Board and our new president will then begin their deliberations on these recommendations. Go to <http://www.wartburg.edu/yom/> for details on Year of Mission activities and for a link to the Commission on Mission web site.

—Lake Lambert

KLEINHANS: IMPRESSIONS OF SEARCH FIRM'S "INITIATION VISIT"

Editor's comment: *Professor Kit Kleinhans was one of perhaps two-dozen faculty who attended an open forum with John McRae and David Gring of McRae and Associates, the search firm retained for our presidential search. In what follows, she offers her observations on the meeting.*

One of the principal responsibilities of the search firm is to recruit a strong pool of viable candidates for the position. The search firm actively solicits nominations, receives applications, and conducts extensive reference checks, including checking "off list" references in the later stages of the search process. According to McRae, "Checking references is the most artistic part of what we do, and the most difficult." He went on to stress that it is important to ask good questions, to listen to the answers, and to be attentive to emerging patterns in the responses.

The consultants repeatedly emphasized that it's not their job to hire our next president. They work with the search committee, which will bring a recommendation to the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents is responsible for hiring the president. At the same time, Gring expressly

identified the faculty *and* the Board as the two critical constituents, saying "You need a president who can work equally well with both the faculty and the Board." Neil Martinson-Burrell offered the helpful observation that it would be good to "connect the third side of the triangle," so that it's not just President↔Board and President↔Faculty but that there's also a Board↔Faculty connection. This observation was well received.

After many faculty had shared their thoughts about desirable qualities for the next president, Terry Letsche asked the consultants, "What qualifications will *you* be looking for?" McRae named four criteria which they planned to share with the search committee and which they hoped the search committee would endorse:

1. "Someone who believes in, embraces, and can articulate the mission of this college. That's the most important."
2. "Experience in administration and leadership in a similar or larger institution."
3. "Financial acumen."
4. "Someone who understands, embraces, and can articulate academics."

A fifth qualification was mentioned later: someone with a passion for being in this place at this time. (One might even name this as "a sense of calling.")

In response to my question, "Why do presidential searches fail?" McRae answered, "Searches fail because of poor communication." He also named the issue of "search committee fatigue;" sometimes the desire to bring the process to closure is counter-productive. He explained that their firm's policy is to work with us, for a set fee, until we have a president, even if that takes longer than a year. The search process has "a timeline, but not a deadline."

McRae and Associates anticipate that after off-site interviews with the search committee, two to four finalists will be invited for on-campus visits, to meet with faculty and other constituents. It's at the point of on-campus interviews that finalist names are made public. Should there be a candidate who does not wish a public, on-campus interview, it would be up to the search committee to decide whether or not to continue considering that candidate. (Two of the three faculty representatives to the search committee, Karen Black and Fred Ribich, attended the Tuesday afternoon session. Both expressed support for the transparency of the search process, within the appropriate frame of confidentiality.)

I asked how the search firm would respond if the search committee were split between two candidates, perhaps along Faculty-Board lines. I anticipated one of two responses: either that they would work with the committee to reach consensus on a single name or that they would bring both names forward to the Board, along with the pros and cons of each, and let the Board decide what the committee could not. To my surprise, the response was that in the case of a split recommendation they would be inclined to consider other candidates, in order to find a candidate whom the entire search committee could support enthusiastically. Rationale: this is a hard enough job without divided support from the start.

Lynn Olson asked the consultants what Wartburg's reputation is in higher education circles. I think it's safe to say that we were pleased to hear from an outsider how positively we are viewed. According to the consultants, Wartburg has "a good reputation." Several perceived strengths were named:

- A successful presidency
- A history of balanced budgets
- An impressive physical plant with little deferred maintenance

"Some debt" was acknowledged, too, but not seen as a major obstacle in attracting a qualified candidate pool and bringing the search to a successful resolution.

Bottom line: I was impressed. I heard a commitment to clear communication. I heard consultants who take faculty concerns and faculty responsibilities seriously. I think the search committee's first decision, namely, the choice of a search firm, bodes well for the future.

—Kit Kleinhans

A LOOK BACK AND FORWARD TO THE HLC ACCREDITATION VISIT

On April 19, Dr. Jack Rossmann spoke to the spring meeting of the Iowa Conference on "The Role of the Faculty in the Accrediting of Colleges and Universities: What Has Changed Since 1968?" Reading through his keynote address, I reflected on his message and the visit of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) accreditation team to Wartburg two years ago.

Rossmann chaired the four-person HLC team that visited Wartburg on November 6-8, 2006. While the team recommended there was no need for a comprehensive accreditation evaluation until 2016-2017, they required a progress report in November, 2010: "On November 1, 2010, the college must provide a progress report on the results for the previous three academic years related to enrollment, retention, and net tuition, as well as a detailed report on whether the financial projections of the Wellness Center have been met to date. If the Higher Learning Commission staff perceive significant problems related to any of these issues, a focused visit may be required." With a new administration on the horizon, I thought it worthwhile to revisit the HLC team's report of November 2006.

In his address Rossmann noted since 2003 the accreditation process focused on five criteria:

1. Mission Integrity
2. Preparing for the Future
3. Student Learning and Effective Teaching
4. Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge
5. Engagement and Service

The reports from the institutional self-study and the HLC visiting team are required to address the extent to which the institution satisfied these criteria. The site visit team uses these reports to determine if an institution should be reaccredited and if there are core components of the criteria that require further action by the institution and/or the commission.

The HLC comments about Wartburg were mostly favorable. Those concerning criteria three, four and five were quite positive. Comments about criterion one (the organizational operation...through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff and students) included significant criticism, in particular:

- Faculty and staff expressed concern and frustration that they often were not included in discussions about the future of the college.
- Campus leaders must make extraordinary efforts to involve the commitment and expertise of faculty and staff in determining the strategic direction of the institution.

Some comments about criterion two (allocation of resources and...processes for evaluation and planning) were also critical (*italics mine*):

- Commission Wartburg [was] not a strategic plan in the traditional sense... As a more traditional strategic plan is developed, clear efforts should be made to align budgeting and other financial decisions with the *academic mission* and core purposes of the college.
- Decision-making in general would benefit from a *greater level of transparency and consultation*.
- Expansion of the debt load is perceived as "a risk," particularly in light of possible enrollment management challenges in this tuition-dependent college.

Before the HLC team visited campus, Wartburg AAUP wrote them a letter (September 1, 2006; published in the *Wartburg AAUP Newsletter*, October 31, 2006) containing a number of observations and suggestions that include the following:

- Concerns regarding administrative interference in and disregard for faculty actions in areas where faculty traditionally have primary responsibility.
- Administration's creation of various bodies to perform tasks that fall under the purview of existing faculty committees.
- The board should reconsider the Faculty Council 2004 recommendation of the establishment of a faculty-board conference committee.

The HLC team visit is past, and hopefully a new administration attentive to the results of the team's report will strive to improve shared governance at Wartburg. It is imperative that faculty members remain alert during this transition period and engage assertively in the selection of the new president. Our participation can improve the chances that he or she will see the benefits of a more direct board-faculty relationship and work to establish a structure to make this relationship a reality.

—Warren T. Zemke

ACT SCORES IMPROVE

The ACT composite average of this year's incoming class has exceeded 24.0 for the third time in the last decade, and for the first time in the past seven years. However, only 30 % of this year's class graduated in the top 10 % of their high school class.

The table below tracks the past ten years of scores for Wartburg, the nation and the state of Iowa. Except for this year, the only times composite ACT scores were 24.0 or higher in the decade the high school graduation percentages were at or above 35 %.

	<u>% in top 10 % of grad. class</u>	<u>Wartburg comp. ACT average</u>	<u>National comp. ACT average</u>	<u>State of Iowa comp. ACT avg.</u>
1999	35	24.2	22.0	22.0
2000	31	23.7	21.0	21.4
2001	36	24.1	21.0	22.0
2002	29	23.8	20.8	22.0
2003	31	23.7	20.8	22.0
2004	34	23.7	20.9	22.0
2005	31	23.7	20.9	22.0
2006	36	24.0	21.1	22.1
2007	31	23.7	21.2	22.2
2008	30	24.1	21.1	22.4

UNITED FOR EXCELLENCE—JOIN THE AAUP

The American Association of University Professors was founded by eminent scholars such as John Dewey and A. O. Lovejoy who believed in the honor and dignity of the academic calling and in the necessity of professional control over academic matters. To advance the profession and its central role in higher education, they saw the need for faculty to join together in one "meta-disciplinary" organization—the AAUP.

Since 1915, the AAUP has helped to make American higher education the best in the world by articulating, defending, and promoting academic standards. These standards—especially those related to academic freedom—are designed to protect academic excellence by protecting professorial freedom in the areas of scholarship, teaching, and faculty governance.

To learn more about the AAUP, visit the AAUP Web page <http://www.aaup.org>. To learn more about Wartburg AAUP visit its website <http://home.mchsi.com/~wartburgaaup/>.

You may become a member of AAUP in one of three ways. (1) go to the AAUP Web page listed above and complete the on-line application process, or (2) call the national office toll-free (1-800-424-2973) and sign up using your credit card, or (3) mail an application form and a check to AAUP, P.O. Box 96132, Washington, D.C. 20077-7020. You can find a membership application form and information about dues on the back page of the recently distributed *Iowa Academe*. If you would like more information, speak with a Wartburg AAUP officer: Warren Zemke, Tom Payne, Paula Survilla, or Brian Jones.