



"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

November 6, 2002

PRESIDENTIAL EVALUATION ACCORDS WITH AAUP STANDARDS

In a November 5 letter to Board of Regents chair Fred Hagemann, Wartburg AAUP president Warren Zemke expressed the chapter's appreciation for the board's efforts to follow widely accepted academic standards in its recent evaluation of President Jack R. Ohle. These standards, as articulated in the AAUP's 1981 statement on *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators*, require periodic evaluations, faculty participation, and the issuance of a summary report of the outcome, including any actions taken. In a September 19 letter to Faculty Council, Hagemann reported that the "periodic review" of the president had occurred, that it had been "very favorable," and that, as a result, the board had given the president a five-year contract extension.

ENROLLMENTS BREAK RECORD AGAIN; BUT ACADEMIC PROFILE SAGS

This fall's total enrollment of 1,695 is the highest ever, surpassing last year's record of 1,649. Wartburg has now produced seven years in a row of record enrollments and nine consecutive years of enrollment growth. But top-10% class rankings and ACT scores of this year's incoming class are among the lowest in the last eleven years. Only 29% of this year's class graduated in the top ten percent of their high school class, tying the 1998 incoming class for last place. And this year's ACT composite average of 23.8 is the third lowest in the eleven-year period.

<u>FALL</u>	<u>% in top 10% of grad class</u>	<u>Wartburg ACT composite avg.</u>	<u>National composite avg.</u>	<u>Iowa composite avg.</u>
1992	33%	24.2	—	—
1993	34%	24.2	—	—
1994	42%	24.6	20.8	21.9
1995	35%	24.3	20.8	21.8
1996	33%	23.6	20.9	21.9
1997	38%	24.3	21.0	22.1
1998	29%	24.1	21.0	22.1
1999	35%	24.2	21.0	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

On the positive side, it should be noted that the percentage of the incoming class graduating in the *bottom* half of their high-school class is 13%, down from last year's nine-year high of 15%. But whether the five-year trend noted by Fred Strickert in the November 2001 *AAUP Newsletter* ("Bottom End of Academic Profile Is Spreading") is permanently reversed remains to be seen.

AAUP DINNER: WALDSTEIN DEMYTHOLOGIZES ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT

Dr. Edith Waldstein, vice-president for enrollment management, discussed the opportunities and challenges of her new position at the October 11 AAUP Fall Faculty Dinner. After exploring some definitions of enrollment management, Waldstein noted that one of the most important influences on student attitudes toward the institution—and therefore on student retention—is the faculty. The intersection between enrollment management and institutional governance, Waldstein pointed out, occurs on three committees: Admissions and Scholarship, Retention, and the Enrollment Management Council (consisting of the president, the dean of faculty, the dean of students, the dean of admissions and financial aid, and the vice-president for enrollment management).

Waldstein also shared some enrollment goals for the coming years. These include increasing total enrollment at a rate of 1-2% a year "until we reach 1800 students" and at the same time improving the academic profile. Achieving these objectives, she said, will involve retention as well as recruitment efforts. In recruitment, the focus will be on improving financial aid strategies; retention efforts will concentrate

on increasing the percentage of returning second-year students. The current first-year retention rate, said Waldstein, is around 77%, but the long-range goal (from Commission Wartburg) is 90%.

"CHARLIE, CHARLIE, CHARLIE": AN IRASCIBLE PROFESSOR ON ASSESSMENT

The following memo from San Diego State University professor Jerry Farber to California State University Chancellor Charles B. Reed, a strong advocate of outcomes assessment, was originally posted November 29, 1999, on "The Irascible Professor" website: <<http://irascibleprofessor.com/>>

Charlie, Charlie, Charlie, please Charlie, we don't do enough evaluating, we don't do enough ranking. Neither, dearest Charlie, do we ourselves get ranked enough—get evaluated enough. Charlie, Charlie, hear my plea: there's not enough accountability in our lives!

Let us have more assessment! Let there be more ranking, more committees, more meetings, more forms, more dossiers, more charts, more tables. And let there be less time—less time pissed away, Charlie, pissed away in libraries, in classrooms, in laboratories. Let there be less thinking, Charlie Reed! Less thinking and more—many more!—year-end reports, clean, bound, thick. Thick, Charlie. Let there be thick reports, reports bristling with charts, reports weighing ten pounds each and with fine gold logos on their vinyl spines, stretching on shelves in Long Beach, Sacramento, Washington, stretching for miles, Charlie! And let them be dusted. And grant that there be committees to assess the dusting.

Save me, Charles Reed! I spent four hours yesterday afternoon preparing for class, when I could have been reading thirty colleagues' applications for merit raises. I spent an afternoon the day before in the library, Charlie—reading when I could have been in an assessment meeting assessing things. And had I not already wasted that morning in classrooms teaching students, when it would have sufficed merely to certify their outcomes instead? Charlie, liberate our students from seat time, from real time. Let seat time become screen time. Phase out face-to-face, and let place become no place.

And forgive us, Charles Reed, for not being assessed enough, for never being assessed enough. Forgive us those moments in our lives when we were not accountable.

Forgive us for only having been assessed by scores of professors, by national testing services, by examination boards, by admission boards; forgive us for only having undergone the scrutiny of implacable, dark-robed doctoral committees.

Forgive us for only being assessed by our students in every single one of our classes. Forgive us for only being assessed by colleagues and administrators:

- when that we are hired,
- when that we come up for retention,
- when that we come up for tenure,
- when that we come up for promotion,
- when that we apply for a sabbatical or research grant,
- when that we undergo post-tenure review—

for only being assessed by members of our profession whenever we submit anything whatsoever for publication, apply for a fellowship, apply for a grant;

for only being assessed in our departments by teams of faculty from other universities, and for only being assessed in our universities by accreditation teams.

And forgive us, Charles Reed, for not assessing enough. Forgive us for only assessing every student in every course day by day, week in, week out

- for only assessing graduate theses, comprehensive exams, senior projects, credential applications
- for only assessing the work of teaching assistants
- for only assessing paltry dozens of students who ask each year for letters of recommendation
- for only assessing each other every time any one of us seeks retention, tenure, post-tenure, or promotion, for only reading each other's scholarly work, visiting each other's classes, poring over each other's teaching materials and student evaluations
- for only sitting on search committees assessing the dossiers of hundreds of applicants
- for only doing yearly assessment of part-time colleagues
- for only sitting on committees that assess the work of administrators
- for only being editors and referees who assess manuscripts submitted for publications.

It's not enough, Charlie. It won't do! Let there be more! Let there be more! Let there be more evaluating, let there be more ranking. Let there be more mission statements. Let there be more outcomes statements! And let us spend months of our working lives devising those outcomes statements. Let there be more bullshit, Charlie, and let it be everywhere. And let us have outcomes committees, Charlie, and committees to assess the outcomes of the outcomes committees, and let there be committees to assess those committees, Charlie. And let them all produce reports, Charles Reed. Thick reports. And let no one read those reports. But let them be delivered by the truckload into the hands of administrators hired solely to receive them—and to assess them.

Let there be assessments of the assessments of the outcomes of the outcomes. And let every one of us, too, be assessed perpetually by perpetual assessment committees. Oh, and please, Charles Reed, grant us that there be an abundance of committees, a plenitude of committees: committees on committees, stacked in towering hierarchies.

Charlie, let there be form without content. Words without thought. Save us from thinking. Keep us hopping, Charles Reed. Keep us implementing, keep us finalizing, fly us to Long Beach for plenary sessions, breakout groups, packets of coffee creamer, vegetables and dip. Put name-tags on us, Charlie.

Reward us. Punish us. Control us. Manage us. In-corporate us. Free us from our calling. Deliver us from all intrinsic motivation. Drive us henceforth with extrinsic motivation. Release us from passion; lead us toward greed. Lift the heavy burden of integrity from us.

Hold back what is rightfully ours that we be accountable, that we attain total and perfect accountability—that there be no moment when we are not accountable. Dangle merit raises over our heads. Keep us hopping.

Give us released time. Release us. Give us all released time. Grant us all nothing but released time. Release us from teaching. Release us from learning. Grant that we enter into administration with you, Charles Reed. Let there be no teaching. Let there be no time for teaching. Let us enter into the Golden Shores with you in an outcome of permanent, perpetual assessment.

NUMBER OF F-T FACULTY HIGHEST EVER; BUT RATIO OF F-T FACULTY TO STUDENTS SAME

The table below shows that in the last seven years Wartburg has been adding full-time faculty in an effort to keep pace with rising enrollments. In fact, since AY 96-97 15 full-time “instructional” faculty¹ positions have been added, bringing this year’s total to a record 91. The table also shows that tenure-line (“ranked”) faculty positions increased by four this year, for a total of 80, another record. As a result, tenure-line appointments make up 88% of the instructional faculty, a high percentage relative to national trends (recent data indicate that today fewer than 40% of faculty positions in four-year institutions are tenure-line²). Despite these increases, however, the ratio of full-time instructional faculty to total student enrollment has remained fairly constant, especially in the last eight years.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Titled Faculty</u>	<u>Instructional¹ Titled Faculty</u>	<u>Ranked Faculty³</u>	<u>Total Instructional¹ Faculty</u>	<u>Total FTE</u>	<u>Ratio: Instruct. Fac per Student</u>
93-94	21	8	73 (90%)	81	1342	1/16.5
94-95	20	8	70 (90%)	78	1347	1/17.2
95-96	19	4	73 (95%)	77	1356	1/17.6
96-97	24	9	67 (88%)	76	1410	1/18.5
97-98	25	10	68 (87%)	78	1469	1/18.8
98-99	23	8	70 (90%)	78	1499	1/19.2
99-00	21	7	73 (91%)	80	1509	1/18.8
00-01	25	13	75 (85%)	88	1561	1/17.7
01-02	23	14	76 (84%)	90	1602	1/17.8
02-03	20	11	80 (88%)	91	1652	1/18.1

¹In its annual salary survey, the AAUP counts as full-time faculty only what it calls “instructional faculty,” defined as “those members of the instructional-research staff who are employed on a full-time basis and whose major regular assignment is instruction....” This category excludes those “with titles such as dean of students, librarian, registrar, coach, and the like, even though they may devote part of their time to classroom instruction and may have faculty status.” Hence, some titled faculty appointments are not “instructional faculty.” E.g., in AY93-94, only 8 of the 21 titled faculty fit the criteria for instructional faculty.

²Valerie Martin Conley, “Supplemental Table Update” (to tables in the report of the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty, “Part-Time Instructional Faculty and Staff: Who They Are, What They Do, and What They Think”) National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C., April 2002, Table 13.

³In parentheses is given ranked (i.e., tenure-line) faculty as a percentage of instructional faculty.

PENCE APPOINTED PROVOST AT PACIFIC LUTHERAN

Pacific Lutheran University in Tacoma, Washington, appointed James L. Pence provost on August 1. Pence was vice president for academic affairs at Wartburg from 1990-1996 and at St. Olaf from 1996 until May of last year. When Pence announced his resignation from St. Olaf last April, he indicated that he was leaving to dedicate more time to his search for a college presidency.

EASY GRADERS GET BETTER STUDENT EVALUATION SCORES, SAYS STATISTICIAN

The following is the conclusion of an article entitled “Teacher Course Evaluations and Student Grades: An Academic Tango” by Valen E. Johnson, published in the Summer 2002 issue of *Chance*, a publication of the American Statistical Association.

"[T]he results from this analysis provide conclusive evidence of a biasing effect of student grades on student evaluations of teaching.... From a policy viewpoint, the findings of this study are important. As an increasing number of universities use student evaluations of teaching in administrative decisions that affect the careers of their faculty, the incentives for faculty to manipulate their grading policies in order to enhance their evaluations increase. Because grading policies affect student enrollment decisions and the amount students learn in their courses, the ultimate consequence of such manipulations is the degradation of the quality of education in the United States."

NATIONAL SURVEY POINTS TO CAUSES OF POOR FACULTY MORALE AT WARTBURG

Last fall, 32,840 full-time faculty took part in the 2001-02 national faculty survey conducted by the UCLA-based Higher Education Research Institute (HERI). The responses of the 53 Wartburg faculty who participated suggest that the college right now is not an ideal place to work, but that poverty and ill-prepared students are not to blame. Instead, dissatisfaction seems related to excessive demands on time, heavy teaching loads, relations with other faculty, and ongoing conflict with the administration.

According to the survey, almost one out of three (28.8%) Wartburg faculty members is not satisfied with his or her job, as contrasted with one of five (20.8%) faculty members at all private four-year institutions. Similarly, almost half (46.2%) of Wartburg faculty have considered leaving academe in the last two years, contrasted with only a third of those surveyed at other four-year privates.

Many of the sources of dissatisfaction seem related to demands on time: ninety-four percent of Wartburg faculty named "time pressures" as a source of stress in the past two years (compared to 85.4% at other private four-year schools) while 92.3% cited "lack of personal time" (compared to 79.7% at other four-year schools). Other stressors are household responsibilities (82.7%), teaching load (80.8%), and "child care" (50%), with an 18% difference between Wartburg and the other categories on the last item.

One of the most laudable activities that Wartburg faculty report spending more time on is "preparing for teaching," of which half reported spending 13-20 hours a week, as opposed to faculty at other privates, only 34% of whom spend that much time on class preparation. Less justifiable perhaps is the time spent on administrative duties: almost 40% of Wartburg faculty report that they spend 5-12 hours a week on such tasks, compared to only 19% at other privates.

Among the more disconcerting responses are those that suggest that faculty relations are not the best. Sixty-nine percent of Wartburg faculty named "Colleagues" as a source of stress, as compared to only 52.6% of faculty at other privates. Only three of four (73.1%) of Wartburg respondents gave "professional relations" with other Wartburg faculty a satisfactory or better rating, in contrast to 81.4% of the faculty at other private institutions. And, only one of three (32.1%) Wartburg faculty surveyed indicated that the assertion "Faculty here respect each other" was "very descriptive" of the college. Almost half (47.1%) of faculty members at other privates were able to affirm this proposition.

Most troubling, however, is the fact that administration-related items are the ones which exhibit the largest differences between Wartburg and the other private four-year institutions. Nearly nine of ten (88.5%) Wartburg faculty report that "institutional procedures and red tape" (see "Charlie, Charlie, Charlie," above) have been a source of stress in the past two years, a 24% difference with the faculty at other four-year private colleges. Almost as huge a gap (19.2%) exists on "relationships with administration," an item that less than half (46.2%) of the Wartburg faculty listed as a "satisfactory" aspect of their job (in contrast to 65.4% of all private-college faculty). And there is nearly a 20% gap between Wartburg faculty and colleagues at other four-year privates on whether the phrase "Faculty typically at odds with campus administrators" is "very descriptive" of their colleges. Only 14.6% of other private-college faculty felt this statement was true at their colleges. One of four Wartburg faculty indicated that it was true here.

—Greg Scholtz

ONE OF EVERY TWO WARTBURG FACULTY MEMBERS BELONGS TO THE AAUP

The American Association of University Professors now has 45 members at Wartburg College, an 8% increase from last year. As a result, 50% of the teaching faculty now belong to the AAUP. Fifty-two percent of tenure-line ("ranked") faculty are members, and 57% of tenured faculty are members. Nationally, such a high percentage of AAUP membership on any campus is rare.