



**WARTBURG
AAUP**

"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

April 28, 2005

MEASURED IN REAL DOLLARS, WARTBURG FACULTY SALARIES CONTINUE TO DECLINE

The table below shows average teaching faculty *salary increases* (for all ranks combined) in percentages, compared to the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the most recent 5 years.

<u>Year</u>	<u>CPI¹</u>	<u>Wartburg Nominal</u>	<u>Wartburg Real</u>
2001-02	1.6	4.0	2.4
2002-03	2.4	2.0	-0.4
2003-04	1.9	2.0	0.1
2004-05	3.3	2.5	-0.8
2005-06	(4.3)²	2.5	(-1.6)

¹Consumer Price Index from December to December.

²Based on the CPI for the 1st quarter of 2005, as reported by the Labor Department, since that time period more closely fits the projection of the cost of living for the rest of the year (e.g., the recent rise in gasoline prices).

PRESIDENTIAL SALARIES OUTGROWING FACULTY SALARIES AT EVER HIGHER RATES

For the first time, the AAUP's annual report on faculty salaries, published in the March-April *Academe*, takes a look at presidential salaries in relation to those of professors (pp. 23-24). According to the AAUP, presidential salaries have been increasing relative to faculty salaries at a significantly higher rate in the last decade than in previous years. The table compares growth in presidential salaries with growth in average faculty salaries at Wartburg for the most recent ten-year period for which figures are available:

Growth in Presidential Pay Compared to Growth in Faculty Pay at Wartburg, 1993-94 to 2002-03

	<u>Avg. Faculty Salary (in 1000s)</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>	<u>Presidential Salary (in 1000s)</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
1993-94.....	35.8	-	117.1	-
1994-95.....	37.4	4.5	122.8.....	4.9
1996-97.....	38.8	3.7	130.5.....	6.3
1997-98.....	40.2	3.6	151.4*.....	16.0
1998-99.....	43.5	8.2	137.5 [#]	-9.0
1999-00.....	45.6	4.8	158.4.....	15.0
2000-01.....	46.8	2.6	167.5.....	5.7
2001-02.....	47.0	0.4	179.0.....	6.9
2002-03.....	48.8	3.8	188.0.....	5.0
All Years	36.0	61.0

*President Vogel's last year

[#]For eleven months

sources: *Chronicle of Higher Education*, AAUP salary reports

Commenting on the national trend, the authors conclude, "A more corporate organizational hierarchy is emerging in colleges and universities, in potential conflict with the mission of institutions of higher education to operate for the benefit of society as a whole."

WARTBURG EMPLOYEES NOW BEAR GREATER SHARE OF HEALTH-INSURANCE BURDEN

At the last faculty meeting, I asked the Dean of Faculty why my payment for Alliance Select is going up more than 39 percent next year while the cost to the college is increasing only 16 percent. The Dean said she would get back to me.

Tabulated below are dollar amounts taken from the Wartburg College Flexible Benefit's Menu, distributed by Human Resources to employees over the last three years. (Although *premiums* for the two options not included in the table—"employee" and "employee + children"—differ from the two options in

the table, the *percent increases* for 2005-06 are the same as for the “employee + spouse” and “family” options: up 39.2 percent for Alliance Select and up 53.8 percent for Blue Advantage.)

Wartburg College Medical Insurance Plans (figures in dollars except for percentages)

WELLMARK ALLIANCE SELECT (Employee pays 25 – 30 % of premium)^a

Year	Premiums: “Employee + Spouse” Option				Premiums: “Family” Option			
	Total	Percent Change	Empl.	Percent Change	Total	Percent Change	Empl.	Percent Change
2003-04	486.00	-	121.50	-	702.00	-	175.50	-
2004-05	613.66	+26.3	153.42	+26.3	886.40	+26.3	221.60	+26.3
2005-06	711.82	+16.0	213.55	+39.2	1028.19	+16.0	308.46	+39.2

^aEmployee paid 25 % of total premium for 2003-2004 and 2004-2005; employee pays 30 % of total premium for 2005-2006

WELLMARK BLUE ADVANTAGE (Employee pays 15 – 20 % of premium)^{a,b}

Year	Premiums: “Employee + Spouse” Option				Premiums: “Family” Option			
	Total	Percent Change	Empl.	Percent Change	Total	Percent Change	Empl.	Percent Change
2004-05	508.54	-	76.71	-	734.56	-	110.80	-
2005-06	589.90	+16.0	117.98	+53.8	852.08	+16.0	170.42	+53.8

^aIn 2003-04, Alliance Select was the “core plan,” and Blue Advantage was not available (it was called the “buy-down Alliance Select” plan)

^bEmployee paid 15.1 % of total premium for 2004-2005 and pays 20.0 % for 2005-2006

It is good news that total medical insurance premiums paid by the college moderated a bit for next year, down from a 26-percent increase in 2004-05 to a 16-percent rise for 2005-06. But employee payments, which last year increased to the same percentage as that paid by the college, next year go up significantly more than the 16 percent increase in cost to the college. The reason? In the past, the college paid 75 percent and the employee paid 25 percent of the premiums (75-25 split). Next year, however, the split is 70-30 for Alliance Select. For Blue Advantage, the split changes from 85-15 to 80-20.

Human Resources identified Alliance Select as the more popular plan this year for faculty (51 percent), though only 40 percent of employees campus-wide favored it. However, many faculty who currently use Alliance Select will undoubtedly turn to Blue Advantage for next year because its premiums are about half what employees will pay for Alliance Select.

The faculty meeting was March 31, and to date neither the dean nor the president has responded to my question.

—Warren T. Zemke

WHAT? ME WORRY?

Because of my sunny disposition and unflagging optimism, anxious colleagues and students often ask me what, if anything, in this best of all possible comprehensive baccalaureate colleges worries me. Scratching my ample skull, I pause to think. Hmmm, what indeed? Well, maybe there are a few things . . .

- while friendly and supportive, and at times generous, the administration has adopted an increasingly corporate management style that has the effect of undermining shared governance (however defined);
- while supporting the idea of a faculty handbook and investing it with institutional legitimacy, the administration also shows a selective disregard for it as the guarantor of the faculty’s primary responsibilities regarding faculty appointments and curricula;
- while being involved in faculty processes and in good communication with them, the administration seems too eager to control both processes and outcomes;
- while providing benefits, the administration has been less than open and honest about cuts in the medical area;
- while helping the faculty to provide students with excellent and varied educational opportunities, the administration shows a lack of real empathy for our beleaguered students and their families when it raises tuition and other fees over 9%;
- while willing to speak about issues, especially off the record, there is pervasive lack of openness and transparency regarding institutional decision-making;
- while there is almost a fanatical support of the mission statement, there is a real confusion as to who and what comprise the “college” and how this college must *live* out educational ideals (imagination, criticism, change, risk, caring, rigor, etc.), not just talk about them;

- while Wartburg seems to want to try all that is trendy in academics, there is a confusion regarding what, among the too many things we do, is really important and can be done well and with integrity.

So, there, just a few things. Now, let's get back to work. And this is the good news—there is much good work to do for our fair college, good students, and noble profession.

—Paul Hedeem

COMMISSION WARTBURG CITED IN NATIONAL MAGAZINE

The April issue of *University Business*, "the magazine for college and university administrators," contains tips on effective strategic planning from President Jack R. Ohle. In an article entitled "From Plan to Action," author Matt Villano summarizes the strategic-planning philosophies of a number of successful college and university CEOs. He describes Ohle's under the heading "First, Think Big":

At Wartburg College (IA), for instance, President Jack Ohle says the only things that had hindered planning at his institution were the limits of imagination. So, after previous planning experiences left him frustrated by stakeholder shortsightedness, Ohle told committee members that they were "not permitted" to discuss whether their recommendations were financially feasible. In this way, says Ohle, he could motivate committee members to "think big," and eliminate the caps on their imaginations. The no-holds-barred approach is a central tenet of constituent-based planning, says Ohle—a process in which the needs and desires of all constituents are stirred into the pot before a planning document can emerge. That kind of up-front planning can not only forestall problems down the road, he maintains; it can mean the difference between a good strategic plan and a great one.

To read the full article, point your browser to <<http://www.universitybusiness.com/page.cfm?p=573>>.

PRESIDENT: CAPITAL CAMPAIGN MAKING SIGNIFICANT PROGRESS

According to President Ohle's March 3 e-mail summary of the February Board of Regents' meeting, Campaign Wartburg had raised \$76,128,443 in gifts and commitments as of February 20, 2005.

IOWA COLLEGES BENEFIT FROM INCREASED GIVING IN 2004

After two years in which there was no growth in donations to higher education, charitable contributions to U.S. colleges and universities increased last year by an average of 3.4 percent. According to a report released March 2, 2005, by the Rand Corporation, donors gave a record \$24.4 billion to higher education in 2004. A comparison among Iowa schools (see table) shows Wartburg running in the middle of the fund-raising pack. It also reveals that Wartburg is among the twelve Iowa schools reporting a *decrease* in contributions between 2003 and 2004, in Wartburg's case a decline of 40.4 percent.

The table shows donations (including deferred gifts at present value) received by Iowa institutions in 2003 and 2004, along with the percent change between the two years. The two-year Wartburg total was \$11,616,019.

Iowa College Giving, 2003-2004

<u>School</u>	<u>2004 Amount</u>	<u>2003 Amount</u>	<u>Pct. Change</u>
University of Iowa.....	\$85,979,856	\$93,017,276	-7.6
Iowa State University	53,776,544	47,364,799	13.5
University of Dubuque.....	17,471,428	8,445,497	106.9
University of Northern Iowa	11,310,944	8,761,165	29.1
Central College.....	10,406,482	8,008,744	29.9
Cornell College	8,795,617	6,445,861	36.4
Grinnell College.....	7,937,417	9,603,390	-17.3
Buena Vista University.....	7,004,525	7,057,459	-0.7
Luther College.....	6,568,906	9,602,029	-31.6
Coe College.....	5,835,260	5,710,727	2.2
Morningside College	4,625,886	4,962,564	-6.8
Northwestern College	4,464,899	6,037,202	-26.0
Kirkwood Community College	4,425,435	NA	NA
Wartburg College	4,336,144	7,279,875	-40.4
Clarke College	3,976,304	4,075,259	-2.4
St. Ambrose University	3,787,559	5,682,379	-33.3
Dordt College	3,625,969	6,089,099	-40.4
Graceland University.....	3,417,940	NA	NA
Loras College.....	3,087,503	4,052,218	-23.8
Simpson College	2,724,506	4,477,902	-39.1
Briar Cliff University	2,684,270	NA	NA

Iowa Wesleyan College	2,373,196	NA	NA
Palmer College of Chiropractic	2,220,692	NA	NA
Mount Mercy College	1,941,859	NA	NA
William Penn University	1,819,902	NA	NA
Grand View College	1,489,179	NA	NA
Northwest Iowa Technical College	142,443	NA	NA
Drake University	NA	11,628,780	NA
Waldorf College	NA	4,036,283	NA

—source: *Waterloo Courier*, March 3, 2005, p. A4

WARTBURG GRADUATION RATES HIGH COMPARED TO OTHER “COMPREHENSIVES”

“Quality, quality, quality” has been a focus on our campus since President Ohle’s remarks at the opening faculty meeting in September. *U. S. News & World Report* lists fifteen indicators of academic quality, including: graduation rates, freshmen retention rates, class size, student-faculty ratios, and student selectivity (ACT scores, acceptance rates, and high-school class standings). The following graduation rate data were found in College Results Online (www.collegeresults.org) for the year 2003.

The table compares Wartburg graduation rates with those of other Iowa colleges and Midwestern ELCA schools.

Comparison of College Graduation Rates after 6 Years (data for 2003)

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Enrollment (2003)</u>	<u>Percent Graduated</u>
Grinnell [†]	1498	85.2
St. Olaf [†]	2951	81.2
Luther [†]	2524	78.7
Gustavus Adolphus [†]	2560	77.4
Augustana, IL [†]	2288	77.0
Wartburg	1728	71.5
Augustana, SD	1727	70.6
Coe [†]	1215	70.1
Central	1514	67.6
Cornell [†]	1109	67.5
Concordia, MN [†]	2796	65.7
Simpson	1603	64.0
Loras	1573	64.0
Nebraska Wesleyan [†]	1582	63.6
Buena Vista	2522	54.8

[†]Carnegie Baccalaureate-Liberal Arts

The good news is that Wartburg ranks very well compared to other Iowa colleges in the *U.S. News* category “Best Comprehensive Colleges-Bachelor’s (Midwest).” In graduation rates, Wartburg may indeed be the “best comprehensive college in Iowa,” as stated at recent Regents and Presidential Scholars banquets. But our standing is not so high among our sister ELCA schools in and around Iowa or among those schools that the Carnegie Foundation classifies as liberal arts colleges—the schools that *U.S. News* includes in its list of “Best Liberal Arts Colleges (National).”

—Warren T. Zemke

WARTBURG AAUP ELECTS NEW OFFICERS

In a hotly contested election held at the April 7 chapter meeting, four candidates emerged victorious: Josef Breutzmann was elected vice president and Paul Hedeem treasurer; Paula Survilla was re-elected secretary and Greg Scholtz president. Terms of office are two years and can be renewed only once.

CHAPTER MEETS TO DISCUSS GOVERNANCE ISSUES

On April 7, 2005, the Wartburg chapter of the AAUP met to discuss three issues, all related to the state of shared governance at the college. The first was an out-of-court settlement of *Armstrong v. Wartburg* that occurred on March 16, the second was the reduction in health benefits without prior consultation with the faculty (as required by college policy), and the third was the recent experience of faculty governance bodies in their dealings with the administration. As reported in the minutes of the meeting, “Members of key governance committees described how the Ohle administration has ignored college policies and procedures, treated faculty and faculty recommendations with disdain, violated the principles of shared governance, and turned the hard work of some committees—primarily Faculty Council—into exercises in futility. According to some, the president has stated that he is not bound by college policies and procedures. Speakers described the condition of shared governance at Wartburg College as deplorable.”

Members approved a resolution authorizing the executive committee of the 49-member chapter to write the members of the Board of Regents to express “the chapter’s concerns about the condition of shared governance at Wartburg College.”

SO WHAT IS SHARED GOVERNANCE ANYWAY?

Like motherhood and apple pie, shared governance is an ideal that everyone seems eager to endorse and defend. In fact, shared governance is invoked as frequently in the documents of administrator-dominated organizations like the Higher Learning Commission (formerly known as the North Central Association) as it is in the reports and statements of faculty groups like the AAUP. Like many catch-phrases, however, shared governance seems to mean different things to different people.

Most commonly, shared governance is used to convey the idea that lots of conversation ought to take place within and among various campus groups—board, administration, faculty, staff, students, etc.—before the people in power make the final decision. This conception might be labeled the “stakeholder” version of shared governance. All the stakeholders should have a place at the table; everybody, within reason, should be consulted. Once everyone has talked things over, those in charge make the final decision, presumably after having given serious consideration to the full range of opinions and recommendations.

This understanding of shared governance incorporates two suppositions: (1) the only real decision-making power belongs to top college officers and (2) all subordinate voices are equal, regardless of function and expertise (the insidious implication of the term “stakeholder”).

This brand of shared governance, which resembles corporate quality-improvement programs like Total Quality Management (TQM), is certainly preferable to tyranny or dictatorship. In fact, on many campuses—especially those on which presidents routinely make decisions without consulting anybody—the implementation of the stakeholder understanding of shared governance would constitute a great leap forward.

Nevertheless, the stakeholder notion of shared governance falls well short of the classic understanding of the concept articulated in the 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*—the urtext of academic governance. (The full statement is available at <<http://www.aaup.org/statements/redbook/govern.htm>>.) Jointly formulated by the Association of Governing Boards of American Colleges and Universities (AGB), the American Council on Education (ACE), and the AAUP, the *Statement on Government* conveys a more sophisticated—and collegial—understanding of academic shared governance.

While the *Statement* recognizes that final institutional authority resides ultimately in the governing board and that the board entrusts day-to-day administration to the president, it does not conceive of the college or university in starkly hierarchical terms—as a power pyramid with the president and board perched at the apex. On the contrary, it portrays the well-run institution as one in which decision-making authority is truly shared among the various components.

What chiefly distinguishes this kind of shared governance from the stakeholder variety is the idea that the faculty not only have a voice in institutional decision-making; they actually possess “primary responsibility”—or authority—for reaching decisions in their areas of expertise, namely, “curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.”

The delegation of primary responsibility to faculty in academic matters is founded upon the assumption that faculty are not merely employees, but professionals with special training and knowledge, thus uniquely qualified to exercise decision-making authority in their areas of expertise. “Decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal,” for example, are the “primary responsibility of the faculty” because the faculty’s “judgment is central to general educational policy” and because “scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues.”

According to the stakeholder conception of shared governance, all voices save that of the “final authority” have equal weight in the processes of decision-making. But genuine shared governance, by recognizing that each component of the institution has its own area of primacy, grants some voices more weight

than others. Thus, even though the president and board may possess final authority, they should routinely concur with faculty recommendations made in areas of faculty responsibility, and they should reject faculty decisions only in "rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail." In short, when it comes to academic matters, a faculty decision should normally be the final decision.

Primary responsibility also implies that faculty enjoy a certain degree of decision-making autonomy in their areas of expertise—in other words, that the administration maintains a hands-off attitude when the faculty are developing recommendations in the areas of curriculum, academic policy, and appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion.

By relegating primary authority in educational matters to the faculty, genuine shared governance, as articulated in the *Statement on Government* (and spelled out in Sections 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 of the *Wartburg College Faculty Handbook*), promotes and sustains academic excellence. It doesn't take a Ph.D. in higher education to figure out why. In the plain words of one of the twentieth century's greatest university presidents, "we get the best results in education and research if we leave their management to people who know something about them" (Robert Maynard Hutchins, *Higher Learning in America*, Yale, 1936, p. 21).

—Greg Scholtz

ARMSTRONG v. WARTBURG SETTLED OUT OF COURT

On March 16, 2005, Wartburg College and Matthew Armstrong reached an agreement to settle a lawsuit filed by Armstrong in U.S. District Court on May 19, 2003. The details of the settlement have not been disclosed, but over 750 pages of documents pertaining to the case are available for public viewing in the clerk of court's office in the federal courthouse in Cedar Rapids.

Armstrong held a titled (non-tenure-track) position in the Department of Music from 1997-2002. When the college converted that position to tenure track in 2000-2001, the department conducted a national search, as required by college policy. Armstrong applied for the position even though he lacked the required credentials—specifically, being ABD in the field of music education. Nevertheless, the Ohle administration insisted that he be granted an interview. In the course of the search, the administration apparently committed a number of additional violations of college governance policies, which eventually prompted a letter of protest, dated 23 May 2001, from the Wartburg chapter of the AAUP. The letter was addressed to the administration and the chair of the board of regents.

When the position was eventually offered to the candidate recommended by the search committee, Armstrong remained at Wartburg for an additional year in a specially created position. He filed suit in the spring of the year following his separation from the college.

Basic facts of the case include the following:

- The defendants named in the suit were Wartburg College, Ferol Menzel, and Janice Wade.
- The charges were sex discrimination (2 counts), sexual harassment (1 count), defamation (3 counts), and promissory estoppel (1 count), intentional interference with contractual relations (1), tortious interference with prospective business contract (1).
- Lawyers on both sides filed some 40 motions and counter-motions, complete with extensive documentation.
- Ohle, Menzel, Armstrong, Wade, and Culton gave depositions during the last academic year.
- On April 9, 2004, Wartburg asked the judge to dismiss all counts.
- The judge did not dismiss all counts and instead allowed the case to go to trial on the two counts of sex discrimination and the last two counts relating to interference with contractual relations.
- The judge had set April 11, 2005, as the date for a jury trial.

The depositions and other documents in the case file confirm the occurrence of the governance violations that elicited the May 2001 letter from AAUP Wartburg.

MARK YOUR CALENDARS: AAUP FACULTY PICNIC SET FOR MAY 25

The twelfth annual AAUP Faculty Picnic will take place in Waverly Memorial Park on Wednesday, May 25, at 5:30 p.m. All faculty members and their families are invited. Celebrate the end of the academic year with friends and colleagues. Further details will follow in a few weeks.