



WARTBURG AAUP

"Committed to Academic Excellence"

NEWSLETTER

September 25, 2000

DEAN MENZEL TO SPEAK ON "THE ETERNALLY SUCCESSFUL COLLEGE"

All faculty members and their spouses are invited to the eighth annual AAUP fall faculty dinner, to be held at Martin's Brandenburg, Monday, October 2, beginning at 6:15 p.m. In an after-dinner speech, Dean Ferol Menzel will reveal what it takes to be an "eternally successful college." Attendees are also invited to a postprandial reception, featuring more food and drink, at the home of Barbara and Warren Zemke.

Reserve a place at the table by communicating your choice of chicken Kiev, glazed ham, or vegetarian wrap to Warren Zemke by high noon, September 27. The cost of the dinner is \$10.

ZEMKE: WILL CARNEGIE RECLASSIFICATION HURT WARTBURG?

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has revised its classification system for American colleges and universities, the final version having gone to press in mid-September. As a result, Wartburg College, which the foundation formerly classified as a "BA (Liberal Arts) I" college, is now classified as a "BA-General" institution.

According to the foundation, the reason for the revision was to restore the classification to its original status as a descriptive research tool. Never intended to measure the quality of an institution, today "it is often interpreted as a ranking . . . and . . . has led institutional leaders in some cases to adopt 'moving up the Carnegie Classification' as an explicit goal" (<<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/whatsnew/docs/press.htm#classification>>).

Under the old classification system, colleges which awarded 40% or more of their bachelor's degrees in liberal arts fields and were restrictive in admissions were classified as BA (Liberal Arts) I. This group of 164 mostly private liberal arts colleges is the basis of *US News's* list of "national liberal arts colleges." The foundation classified the nation's other 461 liberal arts colleges as BA II.

Under the new system, liberal arts colleges are still divided into two categories: BA-Liberal Arts and BA-General. To be classified BA-Liberal Arts, a college must award at least 50% of its bachelor's degrees in liberal arts fields. "Selectivity" is no longer a criterion. Colleges that award less than 50% of their degrees in liberal arts fields are classified as BA-General.

The foundation lists the following as liberal arts fields: English language and literature/letters; foreign languages and literatures; biological sciences/life sciences; mathematics; philosophy and religion; physical sciences; psychology; social sciences and history; visual and performing arts; area, ethnic, and cultural studies; liberal arts and sciences, general studies, and humanities; and multi/interdisciplinary studies.

Although Wartburg has supposedly been able to meet the old BA (Liberal Arts) I criterion of 40% liberal arts degrees awarded, it has never been able to meet the new BA-Liberal Arts criterion of 50% (see "Carnegie Classification Changes May Affect Wartburg," *AAUP Newsletter*, January 2000).

It should be noted that, even without the selectivity criterion, the new BA-Liberal Arts category looks a lot like the old BA (Liberal Arts) I group. And most of the schools classified under the old system as BA (Liberal Arts) I institutions have been retained in the BA-Liberal Arts category. Similarly, most of the former BA II institutions remain in the BA-General category.

It may therefore seem unfortunate that Wartburg was not among the retained schools. Certainly, the Ohle administration seems to think so, since it appealed Wartburg's reclassification to the Carnegie Foundation, arguing that we should have been classified as BA-Liberal Arts, not BA-General. .

However, as the table below indicates, Wartburg is not alone among Iowa and nearby ELCA schools in losing its liberal arts designation. The table shows the 1994 and 2000 Carnegie classifications for the 14 colleges in the Midwest with which Wartburg is most often compared.

Change in Carnegie Classifications of Select Midwest College (1994 to 2000)

<u>IOWA</u>			<u>ELCA</u>		
<u>Institution</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>2000</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>1994</u>	<u>2000</u>
Buena Vista	BA II	BA Gen	Augsburg	BA II	MA II*
Central	BA I	BA Gen	Augustana, IL	BA I	BA LA
Coe	BA I	BA LA	Augustana, SD	BA II	BA Gen
Cornell	BA I	BA LA	Concordia, MN	BA I	BA Gen
Grinnell	BA I	BA LA	Gustavus Adolphus	BA I	BA LA
Luther	BA I	BA LA	Luther	BA I	BA LA
Simpson	BA II	BA Gen	St. Olaf	BA I	BA LA
Wartburg	BA I	BA Gen	Wartburg	BA I	BA Gen

*The MA II school awards annually 20 or more master's degrees in one or more discipline.

Of the 14 colleges in this peer group, Central, Concordia-Moorhead, and Wartburg were moved from BA (Liberal Arts) I to BA-General. Like them, we no longer share a classification with Coe, Cornell, Augustana (IL), Grinnell, Gustavus, Luther, and St. Olaf, but are associated with schools like Upper Iowa and William Penn in the BA-General category.

Should Wartburg adjust its admissions policies (e.g., recruit to certain liberal arts majors) to strive to attain the BA-Liberal Arts classification by 2005, when the Carnegie Foundation will make a major revision of the entire system?

Or should it commit more resources to departments that produce liberal arts majors in the hopes of increasing the number of BA's in Carnegie-defined liberal arts fields? Does the new Essential Education plan lock us into the BA-General category, or does it provide hope that Wartburg will be able to reach the BA-Liberal Arts category? It is certain that, if the Essential Ed program does not affect the number of students majoring in liberal arts fields, it will have no effect on our Carnegie classification.

Decisions will have to be made in the near future, both by the administration and the faculty, about which classification Wartburg will accept. The one undeniable fact for now is that the college can no longer advertise its Carnegie BA I ranking in its student and faculty recruitment efforts. The question is, How will that change impact student enrollments and the quality of our educational program?

—Warren Zemke

AAUP GENERAL SECRETARY MARY BURGAN: "DISCIPLINING THE DISCIPLINES"

Whenever reformers get together to worry about the failure of universities to engage students in the larger issues of citizenship, they have to deal with the fact that add-on and add-in programs on civic responsibility cannot be fostered without the devotion and activity of professors. The conversation circles back again and again to the fact that the academic value system rewards research.

Faculty members maintain that aspiring deans and presidents are the villains in the piece; it is they who ratchet up standards, question academic work that has not yielded refereed publications, and second-

guess recommendations based upon balanced contributions to service (or teaching) as well as research. The administrators' lip service to a wider range of activity seems window dressing.

On the other hand, many university and college presidents who sponsor civic renewal as a mission on their campuses assert that the faculty is at fault. They maintain that the professors are so tied to disciplinary success that their own tenure and promotion committees will not reward colleagues who set out to explore beyond the settled boundaries. It is the faculty that impedes the university's identification with the practical issues of our society by marginalizing the "practitioners" in their ranks.

The research-reward system is so central to the faculty's status in higher education that discussions of changing it may shift into suspicion of the research enterprise itself. Under such suspicion, research tends to be seen as narrow in specialization, short on practical application, and intent on individual, personal advancement. So also, faculty who devote themselves to research can be seen as "the problem." I have heard one advocate of service learning, in a momentary loss of charity, castigate the faculty at large as "mandarins."

Another strategy, when the tensions become so personal, is to deflect blame from the faculty by seeking to redefine research.

Since Ernest Boyer's *Scholarship Reconsidered* was published ten years ago, there has been a strenuous effort to redefine service (and teaching) so that it can look more like research. Thus working with the community in planning open spaces, engaging with the public school system in setting up computerized instruction, and finding ways to get college students involved in local diversity initiatives might be classified as "field" research.

This strategy is an intriguing one, but it can misfire by maintaining the need for the "deliverable" of paper currency to prove the worth of the activity. Thus in some institutions, credit will be given only if the faculty would expand their practices, count their effects, and write about them.

Call me a contrarian, but I must confess that I begin to grow restless with the trend of these arguments, even as I agree with their critique of the reward system. Applauding the move to expand the range of excellence in faculty work, I still want to put in a good word for research.

The generation and interpretation of knowledge are as much our mission as are their application to our public lives. I have witnessed the bad results of efforts to reduce our teaching or service to texts that can then be weighed for proper reward. I have seen abstractification grow out of hand as disciplines of skill and practice make ever more overwrought efforts to legitimate themselves theoretically. I have seen presentations about teaching substitute for teaching itself. I have also watched some of the most critical university service departments—social work, criminal justice, clinical psychology, nursing—lose their grip on student loyalties as they have tried to become data-heavy enough to be acknowledged by sociology, political science, psychology, and medicine. Instead of redefining our practice disciplines, we need to become more adept at judging process as well as we judge product.

Meanwhile, we continue to work civic reforms upon our students. And once again, I feel a contrary impulse. I want to make sure that they know enough before we send them into the field.

I look at the current call for teacher preparation to concentrate less on method and more on content, and I feel my impulse fortified. How can faculty teach the fact that citizenship requires getting to class, finishing the chapter, writing the paper? How can they lead students to think broadly and critically enough to analyze a political argument?

I finally come to the answer that most faculty teach civic virtue when they teach their disciplines. It may be that a demanding course on Dickens's *Bleak House* will teach a student all she needs to know about the imagination of an ordered polity, the tragedy caused by neglect and poverty, and the persistence necessary to remedy it.

—reprinted from the July-August issue of *Academe*

U.S. NEWS'S "BEST COLLEGES 2001": WARTBURG GAINS IN SEVERAL RATINGS CATEGORIES

U.S. News and World Report (September 11) has once again included Wartburg in the fourth tier of its "national liberal arts colleges." Four categories showed improvement over last year's ratings—the percentage of freshmen who graduated in the top 10% of their high school class (+6), the six-year graduation rate for students entering in 1993 (+3), the percentage of classes with fewer than 20 students (+9), the percentage of classes with more than 50 students (-2), and the percentage of full-time faculty (+1).

As noted in Zemke's article, the "national liberal arts colleges" category is based upon the Carnegie Foundation's BA (Liberal Arts) I classification. Hence, the criterion for inclusion is the same: awarding at least 40% of their degrees in liberal arts disciplines.

Ranking into the four tiers is determined primarily by four additional "marks of quality": academic reputation (25%), faculty resources (20%), retention/persistence rates (20%), and student profile (15%).

The faculty resources criterion includes five components: class size (40%), faculty salaries (35%), number of faculty with terminal degrees in their fields (15%), faculty-student ratio (5%), and proportion of full-time faculty (5%).

The table below compares Wartburg with the other Iowa and Midwestern ELCA colleges in 10 of the 12 categories contained in the *U.S. News* article. In parentheses are shown Wartburg's changes from last year's ratings.

	Tier	SAT/ACT 25th-75th percentile ¹	Frosh in Top 10% ¹	Accept Rate	Freshman Retention Rate	1999 Grad Rate ²	% of Classes under 20	% of Classes with 50+	% F-T Faculty	Academic Reputation
Augustana (IL)	III	23-29	33%	77%	85%	71%	62%	3%	88	2.7
Central	IV	21-27	21	85	78	59	60	0	87	2.3
Coe	III	22-27	27	82	81	57	72	0	85	2.6
Concordia (MN)	IV	21-27	29	88	82	63	47	1	93	2.3
Cornell	III	22-28	31	72	77	58	74	0	80	2.7
Grinnell	I	1230-1440	52	65	92	82	65	1	99	4.3
Gustavus	II	23-29	35	79	91	79	59	2	89	3.0
Luther	III	22-28	35	87	88	77	39	2	90	2.7
St. Olaf	II	24-29	48	76	91	77	45	3	85	3.5
Wartburg	IV	21-27(0)	35(+6)	87(+3)	83(-1)	66(+4)	44(+9)	4(-2)	85(+1)	2.3(0)

¹These figures are those of last year's entering class.

²Six-year graduation rate for the class entering in 1993.

ADMINISTRATOR FIRED AFTER FAILING TO SUBMIT DATA FOR US NEWS RANKINGS

Sheila Bennet, senior vice president at Hobart and William Smith College, was asked to resign last week after she failed to get updated information to *US News and World Report* in time for the *Best Colleges 2001* issue.

Because of the absence of new data, Hobart and William Smith was demoted from Tier II to Tier III in the list of "national liberal arts colleges." Bennet will return to her tenured faculty position in the sociology department.

—reported by Andrew Brownstein in *The Chronicle of Higher Education Online*, September 21, 2000