



WARTBURG AAUP

"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

May 1, 2004

WARTBURG RAISES BARELY KEEP PACE WITH COST OF LIVING

The table below shows average instructional faculty salary increases in percentiles in relation to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the most recent 8 years. Also included are AAUP salary rankings based on national statistics (1446 reporting institutions for 2003-04): 1 = 80th, 2 = 60th, 3 = 40th, and 4 = 20th percentile. CPI and salary rankings figures can be found in the annual March-April issues of AAUP's *Academe*.

Year	CPI ¹	Wartburg		Salary Rankings			Instr. ²
		Nominal	Real	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	
1997-98	1.7	5.0	3.3	3	3	3	
1998-99	1.6	3.5	1.9	3	3	2	
1999-00	2.7	3.0	0.3	3	3	2	
2000-01	3.4	3.5	0.1	3	4	2	
2001-02	1.6	4.0	2.4	3	4	2	
2002-03 ³	2.4	2.0 ³	-0.4	3	4	3	1
2003-04	1.9	2.0	0.1	3	3	2	1
2004-05 ⁴	(2.9) ⁵	2.5 ³	-0.4	-	-	-	-

¹ Consumer Price Index from December to December.

² Rankings are omitted when there are insufficient faculty in a rank to get a meaningful salary average.

³ For 2002-03, the ranks of Professor and Associate Professor received adjustments (automatic additions) of + \$1,000.

⁴ For 2004-05, the rank of Associate Professor will receive an adjustment of + \$1,000.

⁵ Based on the CPI for the 1st quarter of 2004 since that time period more closely fits the projection of the cost of living for the rest of the year (e.g., consider the recent rise in gasoline prices).

Clearly, assistant professor and instructor have the strongest salary rankings. In 2002, salary adjustments were made for the top two ranks of professor and associate professor to improve the relative ratings of these upper ranks, as well as to address the problem of compression occurring between the top three ranks. Based on national rankings, these adjustments seem to have worked: the associate professor rank moved out of the lowest ranking of 4, up one notch to a ranking of 3 (from 20th percentile to 40th percentile). Again this year salary adjustments have been given to the associate professor rank. It is hoped that these adjustments will strengthen the position of Wartburg associate professors on a national basis. Only the full professors has been left behind; they find their salaries barely able to meet the cost of living rise.

—Warren T. Zemke

IN AY 2001-02 TOP WARTBURG ADMINISTRATORS GET AVERAGE RAISES OF 5.1%

Below are Wartburg's top five administrative salaries for the 2001 and 2002 fiscal years (the most recent for which figures are available). This information is taken from Wartburg's IRS Form 990s (available at <<http://www.guidestar.org>>).

	00-01 pay	01-02 pay	% change
John R. Ohle, president	167,500.....	179,000.....	6.9%
David Ostrander, VP, development.....	99,000.....	103,000.....	4.0%
Ferol Menzel, VP, academic affairs	98,000.....	103,000.....	5.1%
Alexander F. Smith, VP, student life	90,000.....	94,000.....	4.4%
Edith Waldstein, VP, enrollment management	—.....	85,000.....	—

(In AY 2000-01, Wartburg administrators received average raises of 6.3%.)

WARTBURG FACULTY SALARIES/COMPENSATION RANKINGS HOLD STEADY

AAUP's 2003-04 *Report on the Economic Status of the Profession* reveals that this year's average salary and compensation rankings for Wartburg instructional faculty "go nowhere" from last year.

The results below come from the March-April issue of *Academe: Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*. The published data (in *Academe* as well as *The Chronicle of Higher Education*) are for only the 80 ranked faculty members at Wartburg; data on 13 instructional titled faculty salaries/compensation for 2003-04 are not part of the information provided to AAUP by Wartburg.

All schools in the table belong to Category IIB, which contains institutions whose primary emphasis is general/undergraduate baccalaureate-level education. All figures are in thousands of dollars, rounded to the nearest hundred. Average salary/compensation figures are available for each rank, but listed here are the "all ranks combined" figures. Compensation is salary plus institutional contribution to benefits (i.e., not the amount received by the faculty member, but the approximate "cost" to the institution). Benefits are major fringe benefits that include contributions for (1) social security, (2) retirement, (3) medical and dental insurance, (4) group life insurance, (5) disability income protection, (6) unemployment and workers' compensation, and (7) tuition for faculty dependents.

All but Augsburg, Augustana (S.D.), and Grinnell are schools that Wartburg uses as 'benchmark' institutions. The table includes eight ELCA schools and also eight Iowa colleges; omitted from this year's list is Buena Vista because its figures were not included in this year's March-April *Academe*. Last year Buena Vista ranked 5th in salary and 6th in compensation.

<u>Salaries (\$1000s)</u>	<u>Compensation (\$1000s)</u>	<u>Benefits as % of Salary</u>
Grinnell.....73.3	Grinnell 93.3	Coe.....34.5
*St. Olaf.....58.0	St. Olaf..... 73.7	Luther31.7
*Augustana, IL56.1	Coe71.7	Wartburg.....30.1
*Gustavus55.8	Augustana, IL70.7	Central29.8
Coe.....53.4	Luther.....69.6	Grinnell27.2
Cornell52.8	Gustavus69.1	St. Olaf27.1
*Luther52.8	Wartburg67.4	Augustana, IL.....25.9
Simpson52.1	Cornell.....65.6	Simpson25.8
* Wartburg51.8	Simpson65.5	Augustana, SD25.0
*Concordia, MN.....50.9	Central.....62.9	Augsburg24.6
Loras.....48.9	Concordia, MN.....62.8	Cornell24.2
Neb. Wesleyan48.7	Augustana, SD.....60.7	Gustavus24.0
*Augustana, SD.....48.6	Augsburg.....60.1	Concordia, MN23.5
Central48.4	Loras60.0	Neb. Wesleyan23.2
*Augsburg48.3	Neb. Wesleyan.....60.0	Loras.....22.7

* ELCA institutions

Little change has occurred with Wartburg's rankings, compared to last year: Wartburg moved from 11th to 9th in salary ranking (excluding Buena Vista), stayed at 7th in compensation ranking, and moved from 2nd to 3rd in benefits-as-percentage-of-salary ranking. Among the top six institutions in salary and in compensation rankings there have been no newcomers, although several relative rankings have changed. That is, Wartburg has not moved up into the highest ranked schools in salary or compensation. Moreover, last year Wartburg ranked second in Benefits while this year it fell to 3rd (with a significant drop from 34.2 % to 30.1 %).

—Warren T. Zemke

OPINION: THE UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES OF HIGHER ACADEMIC QUALITY

Since I have arrived at Wartburg, I have frequently heard a desire for students with a higher academic profile. I have heard faculty, administrators, and even Commission Wartburg say it. I have tended to agree. It is certainly easier and more fun to teach students who are bright and high achievers.

Yet I have recently been wondering if there might be an unintended consequence to having a student body with a higher academic profile. My concern is that higher academic quality may mean more high-income students and fewer students from lower economic classes. We know that high-school performance and standardized tests have a correlation with income and wealth. If academic profile rises, it shouldn't surprise us if economic diversity declines.

The VP for enrollment management has told me that almost 30% of our students receive Pell Grants. On average only 22% of undergraduates in the U.S. receive Pell Grants, indicating that we have more than

our "fair share" of these students. The most selective liberal arts colleges have poor records when it comes to low income students. For example, Grinnell College has only 13.7% of its students who receive Pell Grants.

As an ethicist, this concerns me. I would certainly like Grinnell-quality students in my classroom, but the "cost" may be too great. It also bothers me that Wartburg, as a college of the Lutheran Church, might become a place just for the wealthy with no room for the middle class or poor. Finally, for all these reasons, I wonder whether a commitment to social justice may require me to oppose effort to increase academic quality. At the very least, I hope that any further discussion of increased academic quality will be coupled with a commitment to clear, measurable affirmative action based on economic class.

—Lake Lambert

U of IOWA RAISES ADMISSIONS STANDARDS TO IMPROVE RETENTION

According to the April 10 issue of the *Des Moines Register*, the University of Iowa is making it more difficult for students who graduate in the bottom half of their high-school class to be admitted. Iowa will now only admit students whose "admissions index" is 95, a 5-point increase. The admissions index is calculated by doubling the student's composite ACT score and adding it to her *percentile* class rank. Thus, a student who graduated 90th in a class of 200 would be in the 55th percentile. If her ACT score was a 20, she would add 40 to 55 and just barely qualify for admission with a total admissions index score of 95. Iowa State and UNI have similar, though slightly less significant, policies.

According to university officials, the change in policy is designed to improve student retention and persistence to graduation. Both national research and studies done by UI indicate that "high school class rank and test scores are the best indicators of whether a student will return ... [the] sophomore year and go on to graduate."

Under the current admissions standards, 7.7 percent of the class admitted this fall to the University of Iowa had graduated in the bottom half of their high school class. At Wartburg this year, that percent was 15.

ST. OLAF PRESIDENT INITIATES ADMINISTRATIVE DOWNSIZING

Christopher M. Thomforde, president of St. Olaf College, has announced plans to cut ten administrative positions. In a January 15 message to alumni and friends of the college, Thomforde writes:

"Over the past several months, many constituencies of the college have been examining the college's programs, operations, finances and staffing. St. Olaf is not immune to the volatile economy, and I want to inform you about the next steps we have taken to create a more sustainable economic model for the college's future.

"Teaching and learning are the central life of the college. We have worked to create an administrative structure that directly and effectively supports that central theme. Members of the cabinet have assisted me in reviewing their offices and departments. Each administrative office needs to support of the academic program of the college. In light of this review, I have decided to eliminate 10 positions in a number of administrative offices across the college.

"These have not been easy decisions. These actions involve the lives of our colleagues and their families. But the decisions were made with care and contemplation, and in the context of the long-range planning accomplished by the faculty and the Board of Regents in December."

AAUP ENDORSES FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION FOR CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

At the urging of the administration, Faculty Council drafted a series of recommendations pertaining to long-range planning which were brought to the Board of Regents at their February meeting. Among those recommendations was a proposal to improve faculty-board communication by establishing a board-faculty conference committee. Recognizing the value of such a structure, the officers of Wartburg AAUP sent the following letter to board chair Fred Hagemann, with copies to all the members of the Board of Regents:

We, the undersigned officers of the Wartburg chapter of the American Association of University Professors, are writing to endorse Faculty Council's

recommendation that the Board of Regents establish a board-faculty conference (or liaison) committee. This recommendation is contained in the strategic-planning memorandum that Faculty Council has prepared, at your request, for the board's meeting in Florida this weekend.

As Faculty Council has indicated in its memorandum, efficient decision-making, especially in the realm of long-range strategic planning, requires effective communication between all segments of the campus community. But the existing structures for board-faculty conversation, such as Faculty Council reports at board lunches or presidential reports on board actions to the faculty, have not kept pace with the college's remarkable development in other areas. In recognition of this fact, President Ohle himself has frequently voiced his interest in establishing additional avenues for communication between the faculty and the Board of Regents. Indeed, President Ohle has been advocating for improved board-faculty communication since he first came to Wartburg College in 1998.

There are several structural options that colleges typically employ to effect substantive communication between the faculty and the governing board: (1) a standing liaison (or conference) committee, (2) elected faculty representatives on the governing board, (3) elected faculty representatives on board committees. (For a fuller discussion of the most pertinent issues and principles related to faculty-board communication, see the enclosed "Crossing the Great Divide: Enhancing Faculty-Trustee Communication," an article published in the October issue of *Emory University's Academic Exchange*.)

However, it is the first option—a small standing committee of board members and elected faculty representatives that meets regularly to discuss matters of mutual concern—that appears to be the most effective for substantive, unmediated conversations between faculty and board members (sample formulations from the faculty handbooks of St. Olaf and the College of Wooster are enclosed). Therefore, it is the standing board-faculty liaison (or conference) committee that the Faculty Council recommends in its memorandum, and it is this same structure that we also are strongly endorsing.

Colleges that employ board-faculty liaison committees have found that frank, educative, and productive discussions are most likely to occur when three or four elected faculty representatives meet with three or four board members. A conference committee also seems to make the most efficient use of members' time, since the committee's only business is to discuss matters of mutual concern.

For these reasons, we hope that you will give Faculty Council's recommendation your thoughtful consideration as you plan for the college's future during your meeting this weekend

Sincerely,

Gregory Scholtz	Paul Hedeem	Paula Survilla	Josef Breutzmann
President	Vice President	Secretary	Treasurer

MARK YOUR CALENDARS: AAUP PICNIC SET FOR MAY 19

The eleventh annual AAUP Faculty Picnic will take place on Wednesday, May 19, at 5:30 p.m. All faculty members and their families are invited. The purpose is simply to celebrate the end of the academic year in an informal and lively fashion. Further details to follow.