



"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

November 1, 1994

WARTBURG AAUP MEMBERSHIP REACHES ALL-TIME HIGH

Twelve Wartburg faculty joined the AAUP for the first time this fall, bringing the total number of national members to 28, approximately a third of the full-time teaching faculty. Members include both tenured and untenured faculty and represent all but three of the college's 15 academic departments.

"A number of events in the last several years have caused Wartburg faculty to take a keener interest in the principles that AAUP stands for--academic freedom, due process, and faculty participation in institutional decision-making," said chapter president Warren Zemke.

Wartburg AAUP is now the biggest AAUP chapter in Wartburg history and one of the largest chapters in the state, surpassed only by the University of Iowa, with 125 members, and Iowa State, with 66. As recently as two years ago, no AAUP chapter existed on campus.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT WOULD RESTORE "REASONS" TO FACULTY HANDBOOK

The Faculty Review Committee is considering a compromise amendment to the faculty handbook that restores the policy allowing for reasons to be given to tenure-track faculty who are not reappointed. Though the handbook contained such a provision when the faculty first approved the draft version in the spring of 1993, it was later removed by the Board of Regents. When the faculty reinserted the policy in the fall of 1993, the Regents removed it again.

Authored by Wartburg AAUP secretary Greg Scholtz, the proposed amendment addresses the major concern voiced by opponents of the original policy: namely, that such a policy would force the college to demonstrate the validity of every negative reappointment or tenure decision. The proposal addresses this concern by (1) spelling out the difference between nonreappointment and dismissal for cause and (2) making clear the distinction between explaining the basis of a nonreappointment decision and proving just cause when dismissing a tenured faculty member.

The amendment would replace the current wording of section 2.10.3.2.1 with the following:

Nonreappointment is not the same as dismissal for cause (Section 2.10.4). Dismissal for cause imposes a heavy burden of proof upon the College in justifying the termination of a tenured faculty member. Nonreappointment, on the other hand, applies only to nontenured faculty, whose status is probationary. During the probationary period, nontenured faculty are reappointed only if they demonstrate a level of achievement consistent with the standards listed in Sections 2.7.4.1 (Standards for Reappointment) and 2.7.5.4 (Standards for Tenure) of the Faculty Handbook. In other words, the burden of proof for reappointment and tenure rests upon the nontenured faculty member.

Therefore, when a nontenured faculty member is not reappointed, the College is not obliged to demonstrate the validity of the decision, as it is in the case of a tenured faculty member. Nor should the provision of reasons be equated with such a demonstration.

However, the faculty member does have the right to an explanation, if desired, of the basis upon

which the decision was reached. Thus, a faculty member who is not reappointed shall be advised, upon request, of the reasons which contributed to the nonreappointment decision. And, if the faculty member so requests, those reasons shall be confirmed in writing.

The rationale for the amendment emphasizes the benefits to the college:

1. To Make Clarification Possible
When providing reasons, the college can clarify the criteria upon which the nonreappointment or tenure decision was based and thus indicate the appropriateness of its action.
2. To Reduce the Number of Challenges to Nonreappointment Decisions
Faculty will tend to accept a decision when an explanation is given, especially when that decision is the outcome of the yearly evaluation process now in place. However, when reasons are withheld, faculty are more likely to presume that the decision was made on an inappropriate basis and, consequently, that an appeal or lawsuit will be successful.
3. To Make Correction Possible
Openness about the basis for a nonreappointment decision can furnish the faculty member with an opportunity to correct any erroneous information that might have been introduced, however innocently, into the process.
4. To Comply with Widely Accepted Professional Standards
According to Jordan Kurland, associate general secretary of the AAUP, more than 90% of American colleges and universities (nearly 3,000 institutions) now have a policy of giving reasons to faculty who receive negative reappointment or tenure decisions.

In Iowa, at least 29 institutions provide reasons, upon request, to faculty who are not reappointed. Of the 29 ELCA colleges, only six do not follow such a policy.

Proponents of this amendment believe that providing reasons to tenure-track faculty who are not reappointed not only serves the long-term best interests of Wartburg College but demonstrates a commitment to fairness and decency consistent with our identity as a college of the church.

SUSAN VALLEM DEMYSTIFIES DEPARTMENTAL ASSESSMENT

The draft of the *Wartburg College Educational Outcomes Assessment Plan*, reviewed during faculty workshop, provided an excellent picture of where we have been. And the sample program goals were also very helpful. What follows are some practical suggestions on how to implement that plan on the departmental level.

Developing goals is a critical first step. Goals represent envisioned aims toward which cognitive, emotional, behavioral, and situational actions are directed. As the title of a popular book by David Campbell suggests, *If You Don't Know Where You're Going, You'll End Up Somewhere Else* (1974).

The Wartburg AAUP Newsletter is published monthly during the academic year. Members of the editorial staff include Warren Zemke, Moira McCluney, Susan Vallem, and Greg Scholtz. Signed submissions from members and non-members are welcome, though the editors reserve the right to edit for length

Effective goals are (1) described as accomplishments rather than processes, (2) clear and specific, (3) stated in verifiable terms, (4) realistic, and (5) congruent with college and department statements.

Departmental goals thus need to flow from the College's mission statement and academic vision while reflecting the department's mission. The easiest way to attain congruency is to use some of the same language, e.g., "service," "leadership," "ethics," "participation," etc.

Verifying or measuring goals (although goals are not always precisely measurable) does not necessarily require elaborate research designs. You probably have many measures already in place. Examples include regular examinations, student papers and presentations, student evaluations of courses and instructors, employment and graduate school admission rates, student research projects, pre- and post-tests, alumni surveys, practicum and internship supervisor evaluations of students, and outside evaluations of student work or performance. Since faculty have the credentials to make professional judgements, faculty evaluation of students and program outcomes is also acceptable. All of these activities should be worded in a way that is congruent with the departmental goals.

Additional measures include faculty development activities, professional activities, community and campus involvement, advising, networking, and assistance in finding employment. For example, are most of your students graduating in four years and successfully finding employment or pursuing graduate study in their fields? Again, terminology congruent with the goals should be used.

Boiled down to essentials, writing an assessment plan is simple: Name your goals, describe how you have been successfully meeting them, state how you know when the goals are met, and list areas for continued growth and development. Many have found this format useful: "Students will (goal) __, which will be demonstrated by (verification) ."

--Susan Vallem

IS YOUR DEPARTMENT ABOVE AVERAGE?

Grade Point Averages 1993-94 by Academic Area
(The Wartburg average is 3.121)

3.841 RC	3.391 HE	3.143 ART	2.926 PSY
3.810 LS	3.333 FL	<u>3.132 EN</u>	2.916 HI
3.796 IC	3.332 PHY	3.114 PH	2.875 PS
3.743 FR	3.263 CA	3.056 ID	2.819 BI
3.693 GER	3.244 RE	3.053 BA	2.781 CH
3.582 ED	3.191 SW	2.967 FS	2.745 MA
3.439 SP	3.186 AC	2.962 SO	2.700 WS
3.408 MU	3.173 CS	2.954 PE	2.522 EC

CHAPTER CHOOSES NEW TREASURER

At its October meeting, Wartburg AAUP elected Susan Vallem chapter treasurer, filling the vacancy left by Heimir Geirsson when he resigned this summer to join the philosophy department at Grinnell. Vallem is chair of the Department of Social Work.

HEIMIR GEIRSSON APPOINTED TO IOWA COMMITTEE A

Iowa AAUP president Mearl Kilmore has announced the appointment of former Wartburg philosophy professor Heimir Geirsson to the Iowa Conference Committee A. Members of Iowa Committee A offer assistance in matters of academic freedom and due process to any Iowa faculty who request it, regardless of whether or not they are members of AAUP. (Wartburg professor Greg Scholtz also serves on Committee A.)

"I am happy to have the opportunity to help colleagues in trouble," said Geirsson. "Perhaps in this way I can put last year's experience to a useful purpose." Geirsson, who now teaches ethics at Grinnell, left Wartburg last year after his tenure-track position was eliminated because of a lack of "institutional need," his appeal of that decision having been unsuccessful.

AAUP TO DISCUSS FACULTY SALARIES

Wartburg AAUP meets 7:30-8:30 p.m., Thursday, November 10, in the Conference Room of the Student Union to talk about faculty salaries. After a discussion of salary comparisons, the chapter will make its annual recommendation on raises to the Budget and Building Committee. All faculty are welcome.

COLLEGE RANKINGS: HOW DO WE STACK UP AGAINST THE COMPETITION?

The September 17 *U.S. News and World Report* ranked Wartburg in the 4th tier (the 121st to 160th) of the 164 "national liberal arts colleges," institutions that award more than 40% of their degrees in the liberal arts.

Rankings were based on six attributes: reputation, selectivity, faculty resources, financial resources, graduation rate, and alumni satisfaction, weighted most heavily by faculty resources (20%) and reputation and student selectivity (25% each).

The table below compares Wartburg with its chief competitors among Iowa and ELCA colleges. All data are from the *U.S. News* article, except 1993-94 tuition and fees. (Peer institutions which failed to make the rankings were Buena Vista, Simpson, and Augsburg. Augustana-Sioux Falls was listed with the top 10 midwestern "regional liberal arts colleges," a category reserved for schools awarding less than 40% of their degrees in the liberal arts.)

	Avg. SAT/ ACT	Frosh in top 10%	Accept Rate	Fac ¹ with Ph.D	Student/ Faculty Ratio	Total ² Expenditure per FTE	Alum ³ Giving Rate	Grad ⁴ Rate (6 yr.)	Academic Reputation (ranking)	1993-94 ⁵ Tuition & Fees
Augustana (IL)	26	36%	88%	83%	13/1	\$9,220	40%	68%	109	\$12,942
Central	24	31	87	90	14/1	8,444	29	65	124	\$10,365
Coe	1045	29	74	86	13/1	10,141	32	65	99	\$12,805
Concordia (MN)	910	30	90	69	13/1	8,129	46	66	129	\$9,700
Cornell	1080	33	86	76	12/1	10,340	31	62	68	\$14,228
Grinnell	1265	56	68	92	10/1	18,979	54	80	10	\$15,404
Gustavus	1110	36	81	89	13/1	9,907	58	77	68	\$13,435
Luther	1110	38	90	85	14/1	8,949	38	74	99	\$12,375
St. Olaf	1110	38	74	88	10/1	12,502	31	80	36	\$13,560
Wartburg	1045	34	87	91	12/1	7,735	37	64	129	\$11,080

Notes: (1) Includes faculty with terminal degrees. (2) The total expenditure per full-time-equivalent student is the amount the institution spent during AY 1993-94 for instruction, student services, administration, and academic support, including libraries and computers. (3) Represents the average percentage of living alumni who donated to their alma maters' fund drives during 1992 and/or 1993. (4) The average percentage of freshmen enrolled in 1984-87 who graduated in six years. (5) From the October 5 *Chronicle of Higher Education*.

While Wartburg compares favorably in several categories, it is clear that two areas will require attention if the college is to remain competitive: (1) **Wartburg must continue to strive to be more selective in student recruitment, a strategy which should improve retention and enhance academic reputation**, and (2) although faculty quality and student-faculty ratio are strong, **Wartburg needs to increase its expenditures per FTE** (e.g., on faculty salaries, library support, etc.).

FROSH A.C.T. AND CLASS RANK HIGHEST EVER

The average ACT composite score for the Class of 1999 is 24.6, about the 80th percentile nationally and an all-time high at Wartburg. (The national average this year is 20.8; the Iowa average 21.9.)

In addition, a record 42% of this year's freshmen graduated in the top 10% of their high school class, up from 34% last year.

It is not surprising that, with the academic profile rising steadily over the last three years, retention has also improved: 85.8% of last year's students returned to Wartburg this fall (another record).

The Department of Admissions is to be commended for its efforts to recruit students whose academic preparation improves their chances for success at Wartburg College.