



"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

November 24, 1997

ART DEVELOPING PROCEDURES FOR ROUTINE EVALUATION OF DEAN OF FACULTY

The Appointment, Rank, and Tenure committee (ART) is developing recommendations on procedures for evaluating the dean of faculty.

In evaluating the dean and the president, the college has in the past followed procedures that accorded in most respects with AAUP standards. These standards entail three essential recommendations: (1) that evaluation occurs at regular intervals, (2) that faculty should play a central role in the evaluation, and (3) that the administrator in charge of the evaluation should release a summary of the results.

These recommendations are found in AAUP's 1981 *Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators*, which states that "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."

The committee is also developing recommendations for evaluating other administrative officers, including the dean of students and the associate academic dean. Faculty members should address any suggestions to their representatives on ART.

1996-97 FACULTY SALARIES DECLINE IN REAL TERMS, REVERSING 3-YEAR TREND

Average academic salaries increased by only 3.0% in 1996-97, a decrease of 0.3% when adjusted for inflation. This decline reverses a three-year trend of increasing real faculty salaries, as reported in the annual salary survey published by the American Association of University Professors in the March-April issue of *Academe*.

Average salary levels for 1996-97 are \$59,851 for doctoral-level institutions, \$49,259 for comprehensive institutions, \$43,650 for general baccalaureate institutions, \$43,016 for two-year colleges, and \$41,322 for colleges without academic ranks.

This year's *Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession* lists more than 2,200 college and university campuses and provides comparative institutional rankings by both salary and compensation.

Dr. Linda Bell, professor of economics at Haverford College and author of the report, concludes that conditions over the past year were "not so good." Bell finds that the average faculty member saw a real increase in 1996 salary of only 0.2%, the smallest in 15 years. Moreover, Bell notes that "academic real salaries remain below early 1970s levels and 37.8% behind [those of] similarly educated professionals."

Faculty salaries continue to vary by institutional category, type, and prestige. Full professors at doctoral-level universities receive salaries 25% higher than those at masters-granting universities, 40% higher than those at four-year institutions, and 44% higher than those at community colleges.

Full professors at private institutions earn substantially more than their colleagues at public universities. Additionally, full professors at prestigious or "highly rated" universities and colleges receive higher salaries than their counterparts at less prestigious institutions.

The report documents two additional areas of continuing salary disparities: gender and discipline. Women's salaries remain lower than those of males at corresponding ranks and institutions, especially at the higher paid rank of full professor and at doctoral institutions. The average salary for a full professor is \$68,884 for men and \$60,702 for women. Some of the disparity can be attributed to the number of years in rank and differences in discipline.

In comparing salary among disciplines the data show that the gap between the highest and lowest paid disciplines widened for all faculty ranks since 1986-87. Salaries for professors in the 20 top paying disciplines increased 65.6% over the 10 year period since 1986-87 compared to 31.2% in the 20 bottom-paying disciplines over the same period.

CHRONICLE PUBLISHES FIVE TOP WARTBURG SALARIES FOR 1995-96

The Chronicle of Higher Education published in October its yearly survey of top salaries at selected private colleges and universities. *The Chronicle* obtains these figures from the institutions, which are required to report the five highest salaries to the IRS on form 990. This information is available to the public.

	<u>94-95 pay</u>	<u>95-96 pay</u>	<u>% increase</u>
Robert L. Vogel, president	\$122,836	\$130,503	6.24%
James L. Pence, VP, academic affairs	\$81,130	\$84,522	4.18%
Ronald F. Matthias, VP, administration and finance	\$77,525	\$80,933	4.39%
Richard L. Torgerson, VP, development	\$72,227	\$75,252	4.17%
Alexander F. Smith, VP, student life	\$70,264	\$73,208	4.18%
Lynn J. Olson, professor, mathematics and computer science	—	\$59,248	—

For comparison, average **Wartburg faculty salaries** and average increases, by rank, are given below (these figures are from the 1995 and 1996 AAUP salary reports).

<u>Faculty, by rank</u>	<u>94-95 pay</u>	<u>95-96 pay</u>	<u>% increase</u>
Professor	\$46.7	\$48.6	4.6%
Associate professor	\$38.5	\$38.4	4.7%
Assistant professor	\$32.6	\$33.4	5.1%
Instructor	\$29.4	—	—

Further salary information will be distributed at Wartburg AAUP's annual salary meeting, to be held next month.

IS WARTBURG GIVING THE CORRECT INFORMATION TO THE AAUP SALARY SURVEY?

In AAUP's *Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession* (published annually in the March/April issue of *Academe*), salaries and salary increases according to rank and gender are reported for public, private independent, and church-related institutions of higher education. For many in academic circles, these reports provide the only public information about the makeup of an institution's full-time teaching faculty.

I was therefore disappointed to discover, when I saw the 1997 salary report, that, for the second year in a row, the dean's office had only reported the salaries of ranked faculty to the AAUP and that eight titled faculty had been omitted.

As I noted in the December 1996 *AAUP Newsletter* ("Is the Number of Wartburg Faculty Growing?"), AAUP asks for the salaries of all "instructional faculty." According to the AAUP rubric, instructional faculty are full-time faculty whose major regular assignment is instruction. Administrative faculty,

coaches, and librarians are excluded from the category. But full-time lecturers, visiting faculty, specialists, and executives-in-residence who spend most of their time teaching do fit the category. Hence, I believed that, when reporting 1995-96 and 1996-97 salaries to the AAUP, the dean's office should have included eligible titled faculty (see the fourth column in the table).

I spoke with Dean Mary Margaret Smith about my concerns. She agreed that what she had done last year, her first year as dean, was different than what had been done prior to two years ago. Last year she had simply done what Dean Pence had done the year before—submitted figures for only ranked faculty.

However, she pointed out (correctly) that this procedure was consistent with AAUP instructions, which make it optional to report salaries for titled faculty. Since I had never seen the form in which the salaries are submitted, I was not previously aware that this option existed.

Nevertheless, we discussed possible ramifications of reporting only ranked faculty. Even though more than a third of the titled faculty are "instructional faculty," she convinced me that reporting the additional eight salaries for 1996-97 would have changed the college's salary statistics little, if at all.

However, we also noticed that if this year's nine eligible titled faculty would be included in our upcoming report to the AAUP and therefore in AAUP's next salary survey, the reported percentage of women faculty at Wartburg would increase, since more than half of this year's titled instructional faculty are women.

Dean Smith assured me she would include the appropriate number of titled faculty in her December 1997 report to the AAUP. "Since these data for titled faculty are reported elsewhere," she said, "we will report them to AAUP this coming year as well."

Below is a table of numbers of instructional faculty at Wartburg. It compares the numbers of instructional faculty reported to AAUP and the actual numbers of instructional faculty. The right-hand column contains the nationally published information we want seen by our colleagues at other colleges.

Number of Full-time Academic Faculty at Wartburg 1993-1997

<u>Year</u>	<u>Titled Faculty</u>	<u>Ranked Faculty</u>	<u>Reported Instructional Faculty</u>	<u>Actual Instructional Faculty</u>
93-94	19	73	79	79
94-95	18	70	75	75
95-96	17	73	72	77
96-97	23	67	67	75
97-98	25	68	??	(77)

—Warren Zemke

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH FIRM GETS HIGH MARKS

E-mail queries to AAUP staff and officers about Academic Search Consultation Service (ASCS), the presidential search organization assisting in the search for Wartburg's new president, yielded two favorable responses.

A national staff member wrote, "I don't know anything about Barbara Taylor. [But] ASCS is supposed to be the most benign of these services ... in the sense that ... they are nonprofit and don't really thoroughly manage the whole search procedure but offer advice and, I believe, some assistance (through a database) in locating candidates."

AAUP president Jim Perley wrote, "I have some good news for you. Academic Search Consultation Service is the firm we used here [Wooster College in Ohio] for two searches, one of which produced an excellent Vice President."

Recent presidential searches conducted by ASCS include those at Bethany, St. Benedict, Grand View, Luther, Macalester, and Westminster colleges.

CHAPTER SENDS BOARD CHAIR AAUP DOCUMENTS ON PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES

On October 13, Wartburg AAUP sent two statements on presidential searches to board of regents chair Frederick Hagemann. The decision to send these documents to the board was made October 9 when the chapter met to discuss the presidential search process with representatives from Faculty Council and Dean Mary Margaret Smith.

The two statements were the 1981 AAUP policy document "Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators" and a report entitled "On the Use of Executive Recruiters in Presidential Searches," published in the October-November issue of *Academe*. The following comments about the statements were included in a cover letter:

"'Faculty Participation in the Selection, Evaluation, and Retention of Administrators'" contains three basic principles pertaining to presidential searches: first, that the faculty, along with the governing board, should play a 'primary' role in the search process; second, that representatives to the presidential search committee should be elected by their constituencies; and third, that all search committee members should participate in setting up the search procedures.

"['On the Use of Executive Recruiters in Presidential Searches']" addresses, more particularly, the use of consulting firms in the search for college and university presidents. Though the use of such firms is widespread and often helpful, some consultants have tended to exclude important constituencies from the search process.

"[According to this statement,] institutions that wish to obtain the broadest possible mandate for a new president ... would do well to heed the following advice:

- Governing boards should consult with faculty representatives before hiring a presidential search consultant.
- The firm selected should be one with 'particular experience in higher education' and staff that appreciates the value of faculty participation in academic governance.
- Faculty should be centrally involved in presidential searches because faculty members are more likely to recognize qualities tied to effective educational leadership. Faculty members are also best able to assess the educational strengths and weaknesses of their own institution and, consequently, the style of presidential leadership needed.
- The work of presidential recruiting firms should be limited to assisting in 'structuring the search, locating good candidates, and checking references.'"