



WARTBURG AAUP

"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

April 29, 1997

NEXT YEAR'S SALARY BOOST SECOND HIGHEST IN SIX YEARS

The administration has announced that the faculty average salary increase for AY1997-98 will be 5.00%. This is an across-the-board increase of 5% for each faculty member regardless of rank. In both real and nominal terms, the increase is the second highest since AY1992-93.

The table shows Wartburg salary percentage increases compared to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for recent years, including next year's across-the-board increase.

| <u>Year</u> | <u>CPI*</u> | <u>Wartburg Nominal</u> | <u>Wartburg Real</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1992-93 | 2.9 | 4.2 | 1.3 |
| 1993-94 | 2.7 | 3.25 | 0.55 |
| 1994-95 | 2.7 | 5.1 | 2.4 |
| 1995-96 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 1.6 |
| 1996-97 | 3.3 | 4.5 | 1.2 |
| 1997-98 | 3.0** | 5.0 | 2.0 |

*Consumer Price Index from December to December

**projected

For 1997-98, equity adjustments for individuals were determined by Dean Mary Margaret Smith. The dean informed the Appointment, Rank, and Tenure Committee that approximately 10% of the teaching faculty received equity adjustments to their 1997-98 salaries.

—Warren T. Zemke

EPC REACHES FINDINGS ON ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

After completing a review of current admissions policies and procedures, the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) reported the following findings in its February 11 minutes: (1) "[Committee case] procedures for the Fall 1996 incoming class were not followed with some students." (2) Since 1991, "the proportion of committee cases enrolled" has been "increasing." (3) The proportion of this year's freshman class who qualified as committee cases was "nearly 17%."

According to the college catalog, committee cases are applicants whose ACT composite scores fall below 19 (the 35th percentile nationally) or who have graduated in the bottom half of their high-school class. They are supposed to be admitted only after an evaluation and a positive decision by the Admissions and Scholarship Committee.

In regard to the first finding that not all committee cases were properly reviewed by the Admissions and Scholarship Committee, the EPC minutes state that "The Director of Admissions has been made aware of this and has indicated that [the appropriate] procedures . . . will be followed in the future."

The committee also made several recommendations: First, that the Admissions and Scholarship Committee broaden its criteria for committee cases to include students with predicted GPAs of 2.2 to 2.4. (The current cut-off is 2.2.). Second, that Admissions and Scholarship "consider the

resource and strategic planning implications of enrolling” a high number of “at-risk students.” And third, that Admissions and Scholarship and Student Life and Retention “undertake efforts to improve the College’s ability to identify at-risk students.”

EPC had undertaken its review of admissions policies and procedures at the request of Faculty Council (see “EPC to Review Admissions Policies/Procedures in Response to Concerns” in the January *AAUP Newsletter*).

TWO ERRORS FOUND IN JANUARY AAUP NEWSLETTER ARTICLE ON ADMISSIONS

The editor has identified two factual errors in the January 22 *AAUP Newsletter* article entitled “EPC to Review Admissions Policies/Procedures in Response to Concerns.” First, 24 of 69 committee cases enrolled in the fall of 1996 ended up on academic probation after fall term—not 35 of 69, as the *Newsletter* stated. (Thirty-five was the total for the whole freshman class.)

Second, the number of first-year committee case students earning a fall GPA of 0.00 was not 4, as the *Newsletter* claimed. However, the *Newsletter* will not publish the correct number since Associate Dean Edie Waldstein has cautioned that doing so “risks putting AAUP and the College at jeopardy in terms of [Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act] violations.”

Finally, Admissions Director Doug Bowman has stated that he possesses more authoritative documentation about the 1994 incoming class than that referenced in the article. However, he has not shared that documentation with Wartburg AAUP, despite several written requests.

COURTS DEEM COLLEGE’S SEX HARASSMENT POLICY UNCONSTITUTIONAL

(The following is excerpted from the March 18 Chronicle of Higher Education.)

“The U.S. Supreme Court on [March 17, 1997,] let stand a lower court’s ruling that threw out a community college’s sexual-harassment policy for being unconstitutionally vague.

“The case, which pitted the issue of sexual harassment against the First Amendment, had been watched by many educators because the college’s policy was similar to those used at many other institutions.

“The case involved San Bernardino Valley College and Dean Cohen, an English professor whose explicit classroom discussions were found by college officials to constitute sexual harassment. A faculty panel, the college’s president, and its governing board found that Mr. Cohen had . . . ‘created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive learning environment.’

“Mr. Cohen challenged the college’s decision, and in August a three-judge panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruled unanimously that the college had violated Mr. Cohen’s free-speech rights.

“Writing for the panel, Judge Robert R. Merhige called the college’s sexual-harassment policy ‘unconstitutionally vague’ as applied to Professor Cohen. The college’s policy is nearly identical to the one stipulated for employers by the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. . . .

“The Supreme Court denied a petition filed by the San Bernardino Community College District asking the Court to review the case. . . .

“Stephen F. Rohde, Mr. Cohen’s lawyer, argued that the Supreme Court’s decision not to hear the case served as ‘a wake-up call,’ telling colleges that they must tailor their sex-harassment policies to a university setting and not just borrow them from the business world. . . . He added, ‘It’s now the job of universities to roll up their sleeves and to craft effective policies that pass constitutional muster.’”

—Courtney Leatherman

AUTHORS CRITIQUE THE STUDENT-AS-CONSUMER METAPHOR

"[Academic administrators are] business-minded predators who [have] corrupted the scholarly mission of a real university by packaging education in salable units, weighing scholarship in bulk and market-value, promoting the growth of a corps of bureaucratic functionaries, treating faculty as hired hands, firing controversial teachers, raiding other institutions, measuring a university by the size of its bank statement, and selling higher education to the public by paying obeisance to the rule that the consumer always knows best."

Sound familiar? Though they may seem to have come from yesterday's speech by some AAUP radical, these complaints were voiced in 1918 by American political economist Thorstein Veblen (*Theory of the Leisure Class*). Veblen is quoted by Jill J. McMillan and George Cheney in their article "Student as Consumer: Origins and Limitations of a Metaphor," published in volume 45 of *Communication Education* (January 1996).

Veblen's statement illustrates one of the main points of McMillan and Cheney's article: that the now-dominant metaphor of student as consumer not only "suggests undue distance between the student and the educational process"; it undermines "other organizational relationships: notably, those between faculty and administrators."

When the educational enterprise is viewed as an economic transaction between the student-customer and the college-retailer, the authors argue, "the role of the 'customer' becomes inflated" and "a greater degree of managerial interference" takes place. Faculty autonomy is not valued in such a system. "Thus, the cost-conscious, market-wise college president . . . may become more heavy-handed in surveillance over all aspects of academic life."

Besides alienating students from the educational process and administrators from faculty, the student-as-consumer metaphor, according to McMillan and Cheney, produces three other harmful effects:

- It "excessively fosters the self-promotional activities of professors and at the same time promotes the entertainment model of learning." The authors blame the student-as-consumer metaphor for the now-common expectation that professors should present material in a simplistic and entertaining fashion.
- It "inappropriately compartmentalizes the educational experience as a product as opposed to a process." The metaphor, the authors claim, has led to the widely accepted instrumental view of higher education as off-the-job training rather than the cultivation of the skills and capacities necessary for life-long learning and responsible citizenship.
- It "reinforces individualism at the expense of community." McMillan and Cheney suggest that the self-centeredness of the consumerist metaphor, with its emphasis on success and winning, leads to competition and individualism ("meism") rather than cooperation and community.

While acknowledging the value of student-as-consumer metaphor in stressing "responsiveness and accountability," McMillan and Cheney see that benefit as being grossly overbalanced by these detrimental effects.

—thanks to Dani Thomas for a copy of the article

GOOD STUFF ON IOWA AAUP WEB SITE

One of the best of the many AAUP Web sites is the homepage shared by the Iowa State University chapter and the Iowa Conference. Designed and maintained by ISU philosophy professor Heimir Geirsson, a former Wartburg faculty member, this site contains a number of links to other sites of faculty interest as well as to postings related to academic freedom and tenure issues. Set your Web browser to <<http://www.public.iastate.edu/~aaup/>>.

IOWA AAUP ELECTS ZEMKE TO SECOND TERM AS PRESIDENT

The Iowa Conference of the AAUP has elected Wartburg chemistry professor Warren Zemke to a second two-year term as president. The election occurred at the conference's spring meeting, held April 5 at the University of Iowa.

Before electing Zemke, conference-goers heard national AAUP president Jim Perley give a keynote address about recent faculty victories at Adelphi, Minnesota, and the University of Texas (see forthcoming issue of *Iowa Academe* for a synopsis).

The Iowa Conference comprises just under 400 members, dispersed among 29 higher education institutions in Iowa. Of the ten chapters in the state, Wartburg is the third largest, after the University of Iowa and Iowa State.

FACULTY PARTICIPATE IN FIRST-YEAR EVALUATION OF DEAN MM SMITH

In a March 18 memorandum/evaluation form, President Robert Vogel invited selected faculty to participate in a "developmental review" of Dean Mary Margaret Smith. According to Warren Zemke, chair of the Appointment, Rank and Tenure Committee (ART), the review was initiated at the dean's request.

The evaluation form, which was to be returned by April 4, asked participants to assess the dean's performance in relation to the published position description, to list strengths, and to suggest areas of improvement and possible priorities for the next two years. Among the faculty asked to participate were department chairs; the chairs of Faculty Development, Faculty Review, and the Educational Policies Committees; last year's dean search committee; the director of assessment; and the members of ART and Faculty Council.

Dean Smith was not given the individual responses. Instead, President Vogel summarized the results before sharing them with the dean and with the members of the dean search committee—Dan Black, Ann Henninger, Ted Reuter, Dani Thomas, Larry Trachte, and Susan Vallem—who assisted in conducting the review.

"In subsequent years," wrote President Vogel, "I will work with the Appointment, Rank and Tenure Committee in a more formal evaluation. . . ."

ART is currently discussing details of the future evaluation process with Dean Smith. The committee is also working on the construction of a model evaluation questionnaire.

Routine evaluation of academic administrators, with significant faculty involvement and a published summary, is recommended in the AAUP's 1981 statement on *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators*: "Institutions should develop procedures for periodic review of . . . academic administrators. . . . [A]dministrators, faculty, students, and others should participate in the review according to their legitimate interest in the result, with faculty . . . accorded a primary voice in the case of academic administrators. The . . . appointing administrator should publish a summary of the review, including a statement of actions taken as a result of the review."

AAUP FACULTY KEGGER SET FOR MAY 22

The fourth annual AAUP-sponsored faculty picnic will be held Thursday, May 22, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at a still-to-be-determined location (any volunteers?). The menu will feature fried chicken, chips, salads, desserts, and beverages (including tap beer). All Wartburg faculty and their families are welcome free of charge.