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A Note on Documentation

As a quick visit to the Resource Room will attest, thousands of pages of documents have gone into the long process of strategic planning and self-study. Since many of the documents do not have (or do not list) a specific author, and many of the titles would provide insufficient differentiation, we have developed an independent system of documentation for the purposes of the self-study.

In order to make the reading experience as smooth as possible, we have chosen to use in-text parenthetical citations using unique accession numbers. The accession numbers are indexed at the end of the self-study, and clearly-labeled exhibits are available in the Resource Room and on-line. We hope that this system will guide readers to ample and interesting documentation for points they wish to follow up without disrupting the reading of the self-study itself.
Introduction

Times of intense change are all about energy: stressful energy, pent-up energy, gloriously released energy, productive energy – good energy. Wittenberg University finds itself in the midst of just such a time of change, and bursting with all that concomitant energy. In some ways, the change is indeed breathtaking; in the last year and a half we have welcomed new President Mark Erickson, a new Secretary to the University and Executive Assistant to the President, a new Vice President for Enrollment Management, a new Director of Admission, and a new Vice President for Advancement. In the last ten years, we have built new buildings and demolished old ones. We have added academic programs and even entire departments and degrees. We have just completed a new strategic plan and rephrased mission and values statements. Sometimes that level of constant change, growth, innovation, and risk-taking can be draining, can even make us apprehensive. But more often, and certainly now, this barrage of changes that could have threatened the stability of a less cohesive community has instead generated a new energy, a new assessment of our deepest essence, a reaffirmation of our sense of purpose and community, and a vision of our future. Amid all this change, what confluence of events has brought us here?

History and Profile

Founded in 1844 by “English” Lutherans and chartered by the Ohio General Assembly in 1845, Wittenberg University has a long-standing commitment to the liberal arts and sciences. The “Americanist” Lutherans who created the university even then favored knowledge and faith made relevant by social engagement (in their case, the use of the English language to promote national inclusiveness) – a view still prevalent at Wittenberg over 160 years later. While the evangelical
zeal of the founders may have been tempered by time, the desire to educate well-rounded, ethical citizens has not been. Today, Wittenberg remains connected to the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (the largest Lutheran body in North America) while promoting an atmosphere of critical inquiry, intellectual honesty, and social consciousness.

As with anything special, the essence of a Wittenberg education is hard to explain, but one constant is surely the strong personal relationships among students and faculty. A survey of our alumni conducted by consulting firm Hardwick-Day in 2001 indicated that an astonishing 87% of them had a close, mentoring relationship with at least one faculty member (7.3B). The university prizes the intimate and lasting connections that can develop when student-faculty ratios are kept small, and the academically well-qualified faculty (89% held the terminal degree in their fields during 2005-2006) evinces an unusual dedication to teaching, advising, and mentoring students. A number of faculty members have also been honored for their teaching and scholarship in the past fifteen years, including three Ohio CASE Professors of the Year and one national bronze medal recipient – more than any other private Ohio university. Eight Wittenberg professors since 1995 have been awarded Fulbright fellowships, including three in academic year 2004-2005, a feat unmatched by any other Ohio college in the last ten years. Wittenberg’s faculty is well-respected for its passion for teaching.

Situated on 95 rolling acres in Springfield, Ohio, Wittenberg currently enrolls approximately 1900 students pursuing degrees in more than 28 major fields of study. In addition to the bachelor of arts degree in many traditional areas of liberal study, Wittenberg is also authorized to confer the bachelor of science degree, the bachelor of fine arts degree, the bachelor of music degree, the bachelor of music education degree, and the master of arts degree in education. Hearkening back to those Lutheran founders, we still love learning for its own sake, but also seek to cultivate that love through active engagement, application, and education.

Wittenberg University has been accredited by the North Central Association since 1916, and is also recognized by the American Association of University Women. Specific Wittenberg programs are accredited by the American Chemical Society (ACS), the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), and the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). Furthermore, we are affiliated with a wide range of educational organizations, including the American Council on Higher Education, the Association of American Colleges and Universities, the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities, the Ohio College Association, the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges, the Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio, the National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education, the National Association of College and University Business Officers, the College Board, the Council on Undergraduate Research, and EDUCAUSE. Wittenberg also benefits from membership in a number of consortia, both local and international. These include the Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education (SOCHE), the Marine Science Educational Consortium, the World Affairs Council of Greater Cincinnati, the International Educational Association of Ohio Colleges and Universities, library systems OhioLink and the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), the Institute for the International Education of Students, the International Student Exchange Program, the Council of International Educational Exchange, and
Denmark’s International Study Program. The United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa granted our chapter, Omicron of Ohio, in 1991.

Our students exemplify a rich record of achievement and diversity of all kinds. A high percentage of our students go on to graduate studies; Wittenberg ranks in the top 10% of undergraduate colleges nationally in the number of graduates earning doctoral degrees between 1972 and 2003 (Baccalaureate Origins of PhDs from Liberal Arts Colleges, 7.3A), and also for the most recent decade for which data are available, 1994 to 2003. Our student body is diverse in many ways measured by traditional demographic data. Women students outnumber men 57 per cent to 43 per cent among traditional students, similar to the situation at many liberal-arts colleges today. Approximately 5% of our traditional students are African-American, 1% Hispanic, 1% Asian-American, and 3% international. A handful of Native American and physically-disabled students also matriculate at Wittenberg. A significant percentage of students come from homes in which one or both parents do not hold a college degree. And in keeping with the bellwether nature of Ohio itself, we have a rich mixture of urban, rural, and suburban students. Wittenberg today surely embodies that spirit of inclusiveness and excellence that inspired its founders so long ago.

The Last Ten Years

While facing both challenges and triumphs in the last decade, Wittenberg has reaffirmed its core values. We will evaluate many accomplishments and initiatives of the last ten years throughout the self-study, but we want to highlight a few emblematic ones here in order to create a context for understanding the ongoing evolution of the university since the last self-study.

Shortly after our last re-accreditation, Wittenberg undertook a successful major campaign known as Defining Moments, which then served as a springboard for several important building initiatives, including the new state-of-the-art humanities classroom building Hollenbeck Hall (2000) and the massive addition and laboratory upgrade to what is now the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center (2003). These two new buildings, designed to promote active learning and out-of-class interaction among students and faculty, have greatly expanded opportunities for innovative teaching and applications of learning technology across campus, not just in those buildings.


Shortly after the completion of Hollenbeck Hall, certainly a proud part of her legacy, Provost Sammye Greer retired in 2000 and was succeeded by Professor of Geology and Provost Ken Bladh. Provost Bladh has helped to actualize not only the Kuss Science Center and the new programs already named, but also a new model
of first-year student experience, the Wittenberg Seminars (WittSems) and a student-centered Honor Council.

At the time of our last accreditation by the North Central Association (1997), Wittenberg was also launching a new strategic plan, the development of which had been interwoven with the self-study process. The same partnering of efforts has occurred with this self-study and the new strategic plan, *Distinctively Wittenberg: A Vision for Excellence*, adopted in February, 2006. The plan was the product of a series of widely inclusive task groups originally convened in mid-2003 by a Strategic Planning Commission named by then-President Baird Tipson. By fall, 2003, ten task groups were working on a variety of areas, and a very important subcommittee was charged with surveying the community concerning the mission statement and its uses.

The Strategic Planning Commission received the reports of these eleven task groups in early 2004; ideas and initiatives started to coalesce around six major themes: academic programs, student success, stable enrollment, operations, facilities, and the Wittenberg community. A second series of task groups accepted the challenge of winnowing down the wealth of ideas from the first round of brainstorming into action plans for those six areas. Numerous forums, focus groups, and electronic surveys invited informal participation by faculty, students, administrators, support staff, alumni, community leaders, and board members, as well. By the end of this process, over 80 faculty and staff had served as members of task committees.

Near the end of the original planning process in July, 2004, President Tipson announced his resignation to assume the presidency of Washington College in Maryland. While the timing of such a change could have thrown the implementation of the still-cumbersome plan into disarray, Interim President William Steinbrink (now the Chairman of our Board of Directors) and members of the executive staff seized the opportunity to start implementing some of the key goals immediately, even as the inchoate plan formed a focal point of discussion with candidates in the national search for a new president.

That presidential search (running shortly after, shortly before, or concurrently with searches for the Vice President of Student Development, the Vice President of Enrollment Management, the Director of Admission, and the Vice President for University Advancement) culminated successfully in spring, 2005 with the announcement that Dr. Mark Erickson would begin his duties as the thirteenth President of Wittenberg University on July 1, 2005. Shortly after assuming office, President Erickson appointed a Strategic Planning Advisory Committee to examine the 2005 plan. He charged the committee to “build on the excellent work of the Strategic Planning Commission by 1) reassessing the guiding assumptions of the plan; 2) sharpening the focus of the plan; 3) setting clear priorities; and 4) shifting the plan’s language from that of an internal document to a document ready for public use.” While the arrival of a new president typically initiates an affirmation of institutional mission and the articulation of how to achieve that mission under new leadership, Wittenberg also experienced several significant changes that made review and refocusing of the plan essential: enrollment declined for two successive years, several new people took over top administrative positions, and many members of the community felt that the plan as it existed was still too broad to be implemented efficiently.
The President’s new Strategic Planning Advisory Committee, made up of administrators, faculty, and students, some of whom had taken part in the earlier task groups and some of whom had not, discussed and weighed rationales and expected outcomes for the stated goals and objectives. Ultimately, they streamlined and realigned the objectives with a focus on student success, rewriting the document as a visionary expression while relegating some of the more detailed metrics of implementation to internal documents for various offices.

The strategic plan, *Distinctively Wittenberg: A Vision for Excellence* (appendix A), affirms the university’s essential characteristics: its primary relationships with the Springfield community and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; its fundamental academic commitments to liberal learning, to selected pre-professional majors, and to both traditional and nontraditional students; and its historic values of a small college – personal attention to individual student needs and opportunities to develop the whole person. Simultaneously, the plan commits Wittenberg to significant changes consistent with these values: slightly smaller entering classes with improved profiles; expansion of the global reach of our student body and of our curriculum; extensive enhancements to the support systems that ensure student success; and major building and renovation efforts.

The empanelling of a university-wide Curriculum Review Committee to examine our educational program in light of the strategic plan and the unveiling of a breathtaking new marketing plan that reveals and reveres the essence of Wittenberg are only the most recent in an exciting series of events that continue to transfix and transform Wittenberg University as it builds its future.

**Response to Concerns Raised by the 1997 Visit Team**

The 1997 visit team of the North Central Association recommended continuing accreditation of Wittenberg University, with special appreciation of its strengths in a committed faculty of teacher-scholars, a diverse and thoughtful student body, solid academic leadership, an attractive campus, well-managed financial resources, and strong support for both faculty development and curricular assessment. We are happy to assert that these same things remain strengths today.

The visit team also noted, however, some areas of concern, most quite specific, that the university has addressed and is addressing in a variety of ways. Furthermore, another section of the visit team’s report offered a number of observations and suggestions for institutional improvement. This section will address both the concerns and the suggestions for improvement and explain the university’s ongoing response to each one.
The 1997 Visit Team’s Concerns

1. **The current tuition discount rate, which is likely to reach 55% for the fall of 1997 incoming students, is too high.**

Because of the wealth of institutions of higher education in Ohio (The Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Ohio has 52 members, and the Ohio Board of Regents identifies 15 public universities and medical schools; these numbers do not even include Ohio’s array of community colleges and branch campuses), the state has been a highly competitive college enrollment market for more than 25 years. Well aware of the financial perils ahead if we did not better control our participation in the “discount wars,” Wittenberg engaged Bill Hall of Applied Policy Research in 1997 to help manage and strategize our financial aid packages. Over the years of Hall’s consultation, the tuition discount rate did drop somewhat, as shown in the table below, but remained over 50 per cent:

**Table 1**
Net Tuition Per Student and Tuition Discount Rate
Wittenberg University Traditional Four-year Student Discount Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gross Tuition/Fees</th>
<th>Institutional Aid</th>
<th>Endowed Scholar</th>
<th>Net Tuition</th>
<th>Discount Rate</th>
<th>&quot;Unfunded Discount&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>32,660,573</td>
<td>13,764,471</td>
<td>1,274,652</td>
<td>17,621,450</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>31,548,836</td>
<td>13,080,804</td>
<td>1,733,109</td>
<td>16,734,923</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>35,607,993</td>
<td>17,965,297</td>
<td>2,127,543</td>
<td>17,438,341</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>37,676,112</td>
<td>18,524,918</td>
<td>2,199,669</td>
<td>17,143,066</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>43,107,067</td>
<td>20,276,812</td>
<td>2,225,462</td>
<td>17,925,732</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>44,350,412</td>
<td>19,902,037</td>
<td>2,012,032</td>
<td>20,818,223</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>47,255,908</td>
<td>20,979,175</td>
<td>2,354,995</td>
<td>21,893,380</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>48,646,914</td>
<td>21,992,973</td>
<td>3,281,205</td>
<td>22,925,324</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>49,480,068</td>
<td>22,495,330</td>
<td>3,111,320</td>
<td>23,372,736</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>50,121,278</td>
<td>23,031,886</td>
<td>2,719,973</td>
<td>23,873,418</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Erickson affirmed a move toward an enrollment management paradigm of admission and financial aid strategy that had begun in the last year of President Tipson’s tenure. President Erickson concluded the consulting relationship with Hall and engaged Brian Zucker of Human Capital Resource Corporation to apply more sophisticated approaches to admission and pricing consistent with Wittenberg’s current enrollment management strategies.

2. **Student enrollment has declined by about 20% since 1990-91.**

After the last NCA visit in 1997, Wittenberg’s overall enrollments remained quite stable for three years, then increased noticeably between 2000 and 2003 (see Figure 1).
During that time, Wittenberg maintained ambitious budget enrollment goals. The philosophy behind these aggressive goals was to continually stretch ourselves, but without consistency, the goals had the opposite effect of suddenly curtailing plans when enrollment numbers and the associated revenue were smaller than expected. After successive years in which student enrollment did not match budget expectations, senior administrators decided in 2005-2006 to revise Wittenberg’s enrollment strategy and reduce the employee base to meet the reality of a smaller student population (see Figure 2).
In other words, we decided to resize Wittenberg intentionally, as called for in the strategic plan (Goal A), a process which will continue as we consider curriculum and academic programs over the next couple of years, as well.

Provost Ken Bladh engaged the Educational Policies Committee, the Faculty Executive Board, the Budget and Compensation Advisory Committee, and academic department and program chairs in a collaborative process that analyzed the consequences of the elimination of selected faculty positions. The plan developed through these conversations preserved several signature features: the faculty sabbatical leave program; all probationary tenure-track appointments; the first-year seminar program (WittSems), which diverts around 30 faculty members annually from departmental course offerings to this interdisciplinary university requirement; and the current curriculum, pending a thorough review in the 2006-2007 academic year. Almost half of the full-time visiting positions cut were in departments serving foundational learning goals required of all students; a smaller student body translated to a proportionally smaller demand in English composition, foreign languages, and mathematics. The remainder of the faculty line reductions was attained by shifting some teaching from full-time to part-time instructors and reducing the overall number of courses taught by adjunct instructors.

Without the guidance of the curriculum review required by the recently-adopted strategic plan (Goal B), the elimination of tenured or tenure-track faculty members would have been premature, speculative, and perhaps misdirected. In order to keep the cuts to a minimum, Provost Bladh decided to use this opportunity to move the student: faculty ratio to the 13:1 figure recommended in the strategic plan. In these ways, Wittenberg is poised to add faculty members in strategic disciplines and programs as we stabilize the size of the student body at an optimal number. The net result of these staff reductions was the loss of some course options to satisfy general education learning goals and the elimination of a few advanced elective courses.

Senior administrators ultimately identified 7.26 FTE staff positions that were also eliminated. Some of these goals were met through attrition; retirements and resignations of some employees set the stage for restructuring of duties within offices to streamline and focus workload and productivity and to reflect new professional philosophies in some offices. The student: administrator ratio, 17.95:1 in 2000-2001, was 15.83:1 in 2005-2006.

3. The current hesitation to make tenure-track faculty appointments, while understandable from a financial management perspective, runs the risk of weakening the core faculty and jeopardizing the continuity of some aspects of the academic program.

During this past decade, Wittenberg has made some strategic tenure-track appointments even as visiting appointments were approved in other areas of the university. In 2000, Provost Bladh initiated a collaborative process by which all proposed faculty positions, whether vacated by retirement or resignation or entirely new, are reviewed by the Educational Policies Committee to establish the curricular implications of filling the positions as proposed, filling the positions as redefined, filling the position with a visiting instructor, or not filling the position. The following table illustrates the trend that we have maintained or raised the numbers of new tenure-track appointments, while the number of full-time visiting instructors has declined (see Table 2).
Table 2
Tenure-track and Visiting Appointments, 2002-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New tenure track</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total visiting</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment fluctuations of the past decade have required us to maintain some multi-year visiting faculty appointments to provide a degree of staffing flexibility without undue reliance on adjunct appointments. The faculty manual identifies five circumstances in which it is appropriate to make a visiting faculty appointment: in the event of a failed tenure-track search; in the event of a vacancy that occurs too late in the year to permit a proper search; to replace a tenured or tenure-track faculty member who has been granted a sabbatical or leave of absence; to enrich a department with an established teacher-scholar when the opportunity arises; and when it has not been decided to establish or continue a faculty position as leading to tenure.

While the visit team’s concern about Wittenberg’s use of visiting faculty seems to hinge on the last circumstance (a “hesitation to make tenure-track faculty appointments”), in fact our current visiting lines are much more frequently created as visiting lines for one or more of the other reasons mentioned. For instance, in the English Department, whose members teach the first-year composition course required of every student, and which graduating a large number of majors, staff planning evolves from the number of first-year students; the department also is large enough that someone is on sabbatical every year, and the faculty members are active participants in extra-departmental programs and administrative and governance roles, so that several have some course release time. In a situation such as this, we would argue that bundling some lower-level courses for full-time visiting faculty is actually a preferable alternative to having many adjunct instructors teach only two or three courses apiece. Adjunct instructors represent only 11 of 156 faculty full-time equivalents (FTE) in 2005-2006, or 7%, and many of those are experts in particular fields that enrich the curriculum, such as African-American history, poetry writing, ornithology, and musical instruction in a number of lesser-taught instruments. Without the judicious use of such adjunct instructors, our curriculum would be impoverished.

4. Since there has not been a major campaign for more than fifteen years, the success of the current capital campaign, which is in its ‘quiet’ phase, is essential.

The Defining Moments campaign exceeded its $75 million goal in 1998-2000, allowing for the completion of two major academic building projects (Hollenbeck Hall and the Keil Wing of the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center). Support for the campaign was solid: forty-nine per cent of living alumni donated, and more than 6,000 others contributed to the campaign. Additionally, a more focused $1.8 million fund-raising project for improvements to the stadium and the construction of a new, popular, and highly visible fitness center was completed in 2005.

New Vice President for Advancement Bill Cloyd has already reorganized the office’s staff and refined its philosophy to prioritize major gifts. Reorganization of the annual gift program will also improve alumni participation and turn around
the recent decline in gifts. Finally, Wittenberg has slated another major campaign, currently in the planning phase. President Erickson is clearly making effective efforts in advancement a top priority early in his presidency.

5. There is widespread disregard among students related to completing the current community service requirement.

Given the strong support for this requirement as a direct outgrowth of our mission, members of the Wittenberg community were distressed and frustrated by the behavioral patterns noted not only by the 1997 visit team, but by academic advisors and the Community Service Workshop. Thus, several changes in the administration of the requirement have been implemented to excellent results. Students must now enroll in a faculty-approved (2001) non-credit course (Community Service 100) while completing their service in one semester; the previous format allowed students to carry service hours over several semesters, which tended to diffuse the reflective aspects of the experience. It also made the volunteer services less helpful for the service sites, since students sometimes didn’t follow through on their schedule, knowing they could simply add more hours later. The new course provides a structure for more continuity and reflection in the service experience of each student. A new director, Kristen Collier, has brought energy and creative outreach to the student body and to community organizations, continuing a great tradition of many opportunities for engagement between students and their adopted community. These changes have proved very effective: Keil Professor of Psychology Jo Wilson’s psychology research class designed, administered, and analyzed a recent survey of students that showed widespread support for the requirement and satisfaction with the experience among students (7.2F). In recognition of its outstanding program of service, Wittenberg University was named to the first President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll, an honor co-sponsored by the Corporation for National and Community Service, the Department of Education, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, USA Freedom Corps, and the President’s Council on Service and Civic Participation. Among the nearly 500 colleges and universities on the first honor roll, Wittenberg was included in a more elite group of 140 schools recognized for “distinguished service.”

The 1997 Visit Team’s Suggestions for Improvement

1. The current asset allocation policy for the endowment is quite conservative and should be reexamined.

The story of Wittenberg’s endowment growth over the past decade has been mixed. On the positive side, the endowment has more than doubled between 1994 and 2005. Comparatively, though, the average endowment of our comparison group (members of the North Coast Athletic Conference minus Hiram and Wabash and plus Gettysburg and Depauw) has tripled in that same time frame, and the average for that peer group was already at our current level in 1994 (see Figure 3). Clearly, growing the endowment is a central concern for Wittenberg.
In 2003, the Investment Committee of the Board of Directors increased the allocation to alternative investments (index funds with concentrations in real estate and healthcare) and international and small-cap equity portfolios. In February 2004 the Investment Committee expressed a willingness to carefully add slightly more risk to the portfolio in order to grow the endowment. As of March 31, 2004, the endowment had an annual return of 24.2%. The allocation of investments in December 2004 was 40% domestic equities, 10% international equities, 30% alternative and real estate, and 20% cash and fixed income. The following table shows how Wittenberg’s endowment assets were allocated in 2002 and average allocation percentages reported by members of the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO); clearly, Wittenberg has elected to put more of the endowment into alternative and real estate investments (see Table 3). The current statements of investment policy and asset allocation are available in the resource room (4.1D.i, 4.1D.ii).

Table 3
NACUBO Endowment Asset Allocation Study (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NACUBO</th>
<th>Wittenberg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equities</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>53.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed income</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative &amp; other</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As of June, 2006, the university’s total endowment market value stood at $108,786,157. Overall, the rate of return on the endowment is up significantly since the 1997 visit: for fiscal year 2006, the endowment’s annual rate of return was 11.7%.
2. *Decision-making processes at the university might be improved through the systematic collection and analysis of institutional research data, including inter-institutional comparisons.*

For most of the past decade, Wittenberg has distributed duties for gathering and analyzing data among vice-presidential divisions of the university, with the assumption that each group was in the best position to understand and interpret data related to its own functions. Such assumptions, however, were not always borne out. As faculty committees tried to examine data in the performance of their duties, for instance, they were sometimes put in the position of having to put together their own data or finding that the data they could get from more official sources was inaccurate. The Faculty Executive Board and Vice President for Student Development, for example, discovered important flaws in reporting of new students’ academic profiles (this will be discussed more fully in the chapter on Criterion One). Similarly, the Strategic Planning Commission noted that the peer group traditionally used by the Office of Business and Finance for comparison of faculty salaries was not the most appropriate group to be used for comparisons involving student expenses, tuition, and other related elements of planning, and that a different comparison group made more sense for those purposes. Some progress has been made in identifying a number of appropriate comparison groups for various purposes, but a fully-staffed institutional research office will no doubt wish to refine and justify such choices more formally.

In response to such concerns about flawed or irrelevant data, university leaders have taken several important steps. To deal with the specific problems with admission data, then-President Tipson made major organizational and personnel changes in the Offices of Admission and Student Development in 2004. Furthermore, in 2005, Interim President William Steinbrink assigned an institutional research function to the Registrar’s Office under the supervision of Associate Provost Gary Gaffield. In consultation with William D. Berg, Director of Planning and Institutional Research at Furman University, the nascent institutional research staff and staff members from Computing Services spent much of 2005 defining Wittenberg’s common data set and assembling an institutional data warehouse. President Erickson requested streamlined “dashboard” reports (one-page summaries of key numeric indicators from each segment of the university) for each Board of Directors’ meeting. These “dashboards” have been based on the initial fact book completed in fall 2005. Although the data warehouse and its supporting software are still being refined, President Erickson approved a new position, Director of Institutional Research, who will report to the provost. The search for the director is underway.

3. *Additional work is needed to clarify the criteria and procedures for decision-making related to tenure.*

After a period of intense faculty discussion and frequent input, the Faculty Personnel Board proposed revised language and clarified procedures to the faculty, which adopted the new policy statements (approved by President Tipson) in academic year 1997-98. In 2001-2002, similarly clarified criteria and processes regarding promotion in rank were adopted and approved. The new processes also codify options for individual faculty members whose departments fail to nominate them for promotion and for departments in cases in which the Faculty Personnel Board’s recommendation concerning an individual’s tenure does not match their own.
4. Additional information is needed to clarify the rich array of faculty development opportunities and to streamline the process for seeking faculty development support.

The faculty retains control of its professional development activities through the Faculty Development Board and its faculty administrator, the Director of Faculty Development. Provost Greer created the administrator position (with eight semester hours of work release from teaching annually) in response to concerns raised by the faculty and the 1997 visit team. Since that time, regular e-mail and paper communication, a web page, and the high visibility of the Director of Faculty Development have all made development opportunities more widely known to faculty members. The various grants and awards are all geared to specific, mission-related goals. The director also runs the orientation program for new faculty members and a weekly lunch for faculty discussion of topics of interest. The strategic planning task group on faculty needs noted that dollar amounts of awards should be increased to keep up with rising costs; Professional Enrichment Grants were increased from $500 to $700. In other respects the task group found that the Faculty Development Board and Director of Faculty Development are doing an excellent job (3.2A).

5. Support for information technology should be increased as rapidly as possible.

In the past decade, Wittenberg has successfully funded major technology projects (wiring all residence halls, technology upgrades to classrooms, wireless connectivity, and a hardware replacement cycle) through designated gifts, unrestricted bequests, and monies for new construction and renovation. The opening of Hollenbeck Hall (2000) and the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center (2003), which included $2.1 million in technology infrastructure, and a $100,000 grant from the Alden Foundation for technology upgrades in five classrooms in other buildings (2002) have created technology-rich learning environments across campus; 62 classrooms currently have the configuration now known on campus as the “Hollenbeck standard”: networked computer, monitor, DVD and VHS players, ceiling-mounted LCD projector, and document camera. In 2005-2006 major renovation and technology upgrades were extended to the Shouvlin Center for Lifelong Learning and in the primary lecture hall in Koch Hall (housing the Art Department), thanks to a $600,000 federal grant.

In 2000, the Board of Directors established their Technology Committee (2.1C.i) and adopted a ten-year capital projects plan that includes an upgrade of campus electrical infrastructure to support technology demands. Since the 1997 team visit, the campus fiber backbone connecting all buildings was completed (2001), internet bandwidth increased from 1.5mb to 18mb, all residence halls have been networked for in-room connections, and we have gone from having no centrally-managed file servers in 1997 to 4,800GB of general storage in centrally-managed file servers today. Between 2000 and 2002 a new campus high voltage substation was installed to provide operational economies and greater electrical capacity to support the new and anticipated buildings and expanded computing infrastructure.

Technological improvements have been felt not only in the ubiquity of hardware, but in the use of computer capabilities to make both crucial and mundane applications more effective. Many professors have used WebCT to organize and enrich their classes; the university recently completed the process of switching from
that program to Moodle. Other important functions, such as tracking of budgets and accounts, course registration, grade reporting, library account information and ordering, and generation of degree audits and transcripts for students and their advisors, are now routinely and simply accomplished on the computer through the WittLink Portal, which allows access to customized, private sets of functions for each individual member of the campus community.

And of course, as the hardware and software capacity have grown, so has the support staff. In the past decade, the Computing Center has grown from eight to nineteen staff members. Since 2001, their offices, previously scattered around campus, have been consolidated in Synod Hall, vacated when the humanities departments moved to Hollenbeck Hall. The central location and dedicated space has improved morale and function within the Computing Center.

Some specialized areas of computing have also grown in recent years, such as the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) lab used by the Departments of Geology and Geography (2001), a parallel-processing computer cluster in the Kuss Science Center (2004), and a partnership with the Ohio Supercomputer Center (2004). Pilot projects in wireless networking have also been inaugurated in the Kuss Science Center, Thomas Library, student center and Zimmerman Hall, home of the Psychology Department.

Funding the cost of building and maintaining a robust and current technology infrastructure has been and will continue to be challenging. In spite of the amazing strides we have taken in ten years, we still have an ambitious agenda of further innovations that will require an estimated $2 million: an information commons blending computer and library research services; wireless network access in all academic buildings, completion of the fiber ring for disaster recovery, a video-conferencing facility, and additional classrooms equipped to the “Hollenbeck standard.” The 2006 strategic plan and campus master plan embrace technology as an important part of renewing the historic and beautiful buildings of the campus core; the innovative use of and support for technology is now an ingrained part of Wittenberg’s planning. Accepting membership in the National Institute for Technology in Liberal Education (NITLE) and ongoing faculty participation in its workshops is but one early sign of the commitment.

6. To continue its mission as a church-related institution, the university needs to reach decisions quickly regarding the restructuring of the chaplain’s office.

The last team visit in 1997 came at a time of some controversy related to the composition of the chapel staff. Pastor Michael Wuchter and Associate Pastor Larry Houff left the university to answer other callings in 1997, motivated partly by unhappiness with an administrative reconfiguration that would have cut the total number of appointments in the chapel from three (two pastors and a director of church relations) to two. As when any personally popular members of a community leave, there was widespread dissatisfaction at the time, especially since the position of Director of Church Relations had been allowed to remain vacant for a time. The situation was, however, successfully resolved with the hiring of Bob White as the new Director of Church Relations in 1998 (in an appointment divided between the Office of the President and the Office of Advancement) and the installation of co-pastors Anders and Rachel Sandum Tune in spring of 1999. The Tunes have created a very positive profile of chapel activities during their tenure, including well-attended and
moving contemporary worship services on Sunday evenings in addition to the more traditional chapel services.

In recognition of the importance of constant consideration and refinement of the university’s relationship with the ELCA, the Board of Directors authorized a comprehensive review of the church relationship and discussed a preliminary draft of its recommendations at its May 2006 meeting. After inviting comments from the Wittenberg community on an additional draft, the Board of Directors accepted the commission’s final report in October, 2006 (1.5D). The report’s recommendations will be assigned to appropriate strategic planning implementation teams for further review and appropriate action.

7. The international education program needs to improve its outreach to students and the information it provides to them.

The International Education Office has undergone a series of changes and challenges in the past decade, not least among them the nationwide dip in study abroad after September 11, 2001. Positive changes in campus visibility and rebounding numbers both of Wittenberg students studying off-campus and of international students attending Wittenberg (up 300% between fall 2005 and fall 2006) have positioned this program for its central role in the new strategic plan.

When Hollenbeck Hall opened in January 2001, the International Education Office enjoyed an inviting new office suite on the first floor. Director JoAnn Bennett offers information sessions to both prospective and enrolled students during the school year and as part of major admission events. Additionally, the International Education Office’s website offers succinct information on student qualifications, a rich array of affiliated programs, and procedures for application. Currently, a task force is working on ways to build our international student body; new guidelines will improve the assignment of housing, the housing of students over breaks, and electronic communication with prospective international students. A person dedicated to recruitment of international students was added to the admissions staff in 2006.

Renewed interest in study-abroad opportunities for our students has led to a more intentional attempt to provide additional ways to make overseas study a viable option for more students. In 2005, Provost Bladh reassigned oversight responsibility for developing Wittenberg-run courses off-campus from the Dean of the School of Community Education to the Director of International Education with the express charge to facilitate faculty efforts to design new courses and to improve existing courses to bring them into compliance with standard workloads, comparable credit hour computations, and consistent policies on such issues as housing, student:teacher ratio, safety, etc. The Educational Policies Committee and the faculty also approved a faculty committee to administer these policies and approve new off-campus courses. The provost appointed a task committee of faculty and staff to develop strategies for implementing the 2006 strategic plan goal of increased opportunities for study abroad for all Wittenberg students. The intentional cultivation of locally-developed, reliably affordable summer programs has resulted in a good variety of programs and robust student participation in them. Table 4 below illustrates the exciting variety of off-campus study in recent years. These reconfigurations by the provost and the Office of International Education position us well for the exciting ambitions of the 2006 strategic plan vis-à-vis global citizenship for our students.
Table 4
**Wittenberg Off-campus Study Programs, 2002-2006**
Number of participants follows program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cuernavaca, Mexico</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lesotho, Africa</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Moscow, Russia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Northern Forests</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lutherstadt, Germany</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. *The university should examine the present and potential role of the community education program.*

The School of Community Education (SCE) has increased options and enrollments steadily over the past decade. In addition to being the point of entrance for non-traditional students seeking to complete traditional majors requiring “day schedule” courses, the school offers students degrees in liberal studies, organizational leadership, and health care leadership. In recognition of the competing responsibilities and busy lives of non-traditional students, the SCE has developed a hybrid distance-learning format called @witt@home that combines fewer face-to-face classroom meetings with on-line discussions, scheduled chats, and assignments. Enrollments have grown steadily among degree-seeking adult students, from 89 in 1999 to 140 in 2006. To continue to attract high-achieving transfers from community colleges, we have also created a scholarship for members of Phi Theta Kappa, the national non-traditional student honorary.

In addition to growth in non-traditional students seeking degrees in the specially-designed SCE programs, the summer terms operated by the SCE have also developed substantially in the last decade. When Wittenberg University moved to a semester calendar in fall of 1995, it set the stage for an expanded and revised summer class schedule with two distinct terms and an overlap term. Numbers of students taking classes during the summer have grown steadily over the decade since the last team visit in 1997, and have generated significant income. With smaller entering classes of traditional students in the last few years, though, summer enrollments also suffered their first enrollment setback in summer 2006.

In order to fulfill its role in the strategic plan, the SCE has also just administered a broad assessment survey, which provided very positive feedback, and has also completed a marketing study to help establish a brand identity in the regional market distinct from that of the college. In sum, then, the School of Community Education has expanded its offerings, its market, its innovative teaching systems, and its summer programs in the last decade; they are now taking on additional duties (see below) and are preparing to fulfill the important role designated for them in the 2006 strategic plan (Goal A, Objective 4).
9. **Serious consideration should be given to generating additional revenue through the use of campus facilities for educational and recreational activities during periods of low campus activity.**

President Erickson recently authorized reorganization that led to the entrepreneurial staff of the School of Community Education taking responsibility for summer conferences development and marketing. Given their long association with successful summer academic programs, this reassignment should result in a more organized and coherent approach to summer activities on campus. With a beautiful new residence hall immediately adjacent to the Benham-Pence Student Center and the Shouvlin Center for Lifelong Learning, as well as extensive and attractive renovation of campus dining facilities, we hope to leverage these new assets into increased revenue in periods of low campus activity.

**Summary of the 1997 Visit Team’s Concerns and Suggestions**

While the 1997 visit team was favorably impressed with Wittenberg overall, their incisive analysis did reveal some troubling inconsistencies and untapped potential. In our responses to these individual concerns and suggestions for change, we have shown how Wittenberg has acted in ways both immediate and ongoing to create positive change and make use of our resources well. In the following chapters addressing the five criteria, we will find some of the same challenges; more importantly, though, we will see how Wittenberg has responded to and built upon the areas of strength identified by the last visit team as well to the areas of concern. This continuous assessment and action, both reactive and proactive, creates the dynamic institution that is “distinctively Wittenberg.”
Chapter One: Mission and Integrity

Wittenberg operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff and students.

As a church-related liberal arts college, Wittenberg University has focused for over 160 years on goals of academic excellence and moral growth, as evinced in mission documents in place for decades and reaffirmed and refined in 2006. This current version, approved by the faculty, the president, and the Board of Directors, serves as the fitting epigraph of this self-study.

Core Component 1A

Wittenberg’s mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization’s commitments.

The university mission statement adopted in 1977 attested at some length to Wittenberg’s goals to educate the whole person – intellectually, spiritually, aesthetically, socially, and physically. In 2001, the Board of Directors adopted for its internal use a “concise statement of purpose” organized around the major benefits of a Wittenberg education. Students were expected to “respond with understanding to the depth and complexity of human experience; recognize, define, and solve problems; develop a sense of vocation; assume leadership; and take moral responsibility.” Then-President Tipson used these phrases many times in presentations to varied constituencies within and without the university. They also informed the orientation of new faculty and in general served as a primer on the Wittenberg student’s essential traits.

Although these statements, and the 1977 mission statement from which they were derived, served the institution well for many years, surveys completed as part of the
strategic planning process in 2003 persuaded the Strategic Planning Commission to recommend the appointment of a task force to refine and state more succinctly the institutional mission. This process, although at times arduous, created thorough, lively discussion among varied groups of stakeholders; this level of engagement led to renewed awareness and affirmation of the reworded mission statement and its attendant statements of values.

Wittenberg University Mission

Wittenberg University provides a liberal arts education dedicated to intellectual inquiry and wholeness of person within a diverse residential community. Reflecting its Lutheran heritage, Wittenberg challenges students to become responsible global citizens, to discover their callings, and to lead personal, professional, and civic lives of creativity, service, compassion, and integrity.

The University’s Values

**Liberal Arts**

Since its founding in 1845, Wittenberg’s curriculum has centered on the liberal arts as an education that develops the individual’s capacity to think, read, and communicate with precision, understanding, and imagination. We are dedicated to education in the core disciplines of the arts and sciences and in pre-professional education grounded in the liberal arts.

**Intellectual Inquiry**

Wittenberg embraces the life of the mind. We promote high standards of artistic, scholarly, and scientific inquiry among our students and faculty. Teaching and research at Wittenberg emphasize the discovery of new knowledge as well as the learning of received wisdom. Intellectual inquiry is enhanced by the thoughtful participation of diverse peoples with diverse perspectives. We are committed to bringing to the lives of our students an enduring passion for learning, which requires risk-taking, persistence, reflection, and high ethical standards.

**Wholeness of Person**

Members of the Wittenberg community support each other in the personal search for balance that characterizes wholeness of person. To promote leadership, confidence, and community engagement, we help every student develop in harmony intellectual capabilities, aesthetic sense, physical well-being, spiritual identity, and social relationships.

**Community of Learners**

A purposeful and intentionally diverse community, centered on a residential campus, sustains education in the liberal arts and the exploration of complex and competing ideas within an ethos of accountability and support. From this community, we serve and engage our urban home of Springfield and the broader communities around the globe. By affirming the dignity of every person and fostering a spirit of respect, we create and expand opportunities to pursue knowledge in and out of the classroom.
Lutheran Heritage
Wittenberg expresses its Lutheran heritage through its continuing relationship with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, its welcome to people of all beliefs and backgrounds, its commitment to academic freedom and excellence, its exploration of the relationship between faith and learning, its promotion of campus worship life, its encouragement of reflection upon religious views and values, and its commitment to service to the community and the world.

Global Citizenship
A Wittenberg education prepares students for the challenge and responsibility of global citizenship. Through our curriculum, study-abroad opportunities, and the enriching presence of international students, we engage the complexity of the human experience, learning about and from cultures around the world. We are committed to providing opportunities for students to interact with others of widely different backgrounds, seeking common solutions to problems facing our world.

Calling
Wittenberg values the unique contributions each individual can make in responding to the needs of neighbors both near and far. We encourage all students to discern their vocations and to understand the meaningful connection between self-fulfillment and service to the world.

Creativity
Creativity is central to the study of the arts and sciences and to problem solving in all areas of inquiry. Creativity requires the free and open exchange of ideas, the ability to value and imagine different perspectives, and the intellectual tools necessary to make personal contributions in any area of study. We are committed to providing opportunities for students to explore new areas of knowledge and to form the intellectual associations supportive of the creative life.

Service
Service provides an intentional opportunity to give back to the world and to promote social justice. Service requires us to learn about community needs, about who we are, and about what we can contribute. We are dedicated as faculty, staff, and students to advancing the common good as local citizens and as members of the global community.

Compassion
Compassion requires a broad knowledge of ourselves and of others, and of all our joys and ills. It combines an awareness of suffering with a desire to respond. At Wittenberg, we educate the mind to understand and we educate the heart to care.

Integrity
Integrity means honesty and fidelity to the highest ethical standards, which are fundamental to teaching, learning, and personal growth. We encourage our students to pursue knowledge and truth with moral courage and reflection, and so to live their lives.
The mission and values statements feature prominently in the *Academic Catalog*, as well as on a direct link from the university’s main web page. Other documents that articulate and disseminate aspects of the mission include the 2006 strategic plan, *Distinctively Wittenberg: A Vision for Excellence* (Appendix A); the report of the 2005-2006 Lutheran Identity Study Team (1.5D); and the description and learning goals of our general education program, available on-line in the *Academic Catalog* and as Appendix B. All of these documents are available to the general public in easily-accessible electronic form.

Both the strategic plan and the general education learning goals stress high academic standards, intellectual curiosity, and diverse educational opportunities and learning environments. These expectations are clear in the breadth of requirements in the general education program and in the many goals of the strategic plan concerned with enhancing academic programs (five of the seven major goals). Wittenberg clearly communicates to students that their academic development comes first in many policies noted in the *Academic Catalog* and the *Student Handbook*. Student-athletes are expressly reminded that “the student’s primary responsibility is to academic coursework” in the Athletics Policies and Procedural Manual (9.3B).

President Tipson’s resignation indirectly prompted formal, extended reflection on Wittenberg’s relationship with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA); in order to attract the strongest possible pool of candidates, the board ultimately changed the university’s by-laws in order to make non-Lutherans acceptable as presidential candidates. In the wake of this decision, the board also unanimously voted in 2004 to conduct an in-depth study of the relationship between the ELCA and Wittenberg. The two documents mentioned earlier were presented as draft reports to the board in May of 2006 and reaffirm Wittenberg’s commitment to central values of Lutheran education, including open intellectual inquiry, commitment to service and leadership, celebration of diversity, and education of the whole person. The mission in its various forms has always emphasized intellectual excellence in the liberal arts and the development of the whole person in a context of community. The current mission documents continue to uphold and explain those principles, and are available in forms that make clear Wittenberg’s desire to claim and celebrate those cherished values.

**Core Component 1B**

*In its mission documents, Wittenberg recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.*

While “diversity” has become a central concept in American higher education and, indeed, in American public life in the last twenty years, Wittenberg’s own history of respect for diversity goes back much further. As a Lutheran-founded institution, Wittenberg has embraced since its inception the idea of diversity of opinion, of free inquiry, and of openness among its learners and between itself and the communities it serves. The recent Wittenberg Lutheran Identity Commission has noted that the Lutheran faith itself demands dialogue with and respect for people of diverse faiths, backgrounds, and beliefs:

The Lutheran concept of grace provides one of the origins of Wittenberg’s commitment to diversity in the broadest sense at all levels of the institution. Fulfilling this commitment requires that Wittenberg be inclusive and inviting
to all students, faculty, and staff within the University community and that Wittenberg actively promote an institutional culture and practices that nourish and sustain this diversity. (1.5D)

Likewise, religious diversity is a key value, even as Wittenberg itself celebrates a tradition that is specifically Lutheran and Christian.

Nor are such statements merely conclusions arrived at recently, in light of current social practice. The original constitution of the university (2.2B) made no limitations on the race of students to be educated here, a fact reinforced by a resolution of the Board of Directors in 1874 upholding and restating that policy in order to quiet a controversy when one Broadwell Chinn, a man of color, applied to the university. Mr. Chinn then began his Wittenberg career in 1875, only one year after the Board had also voted to admit young women to the college. Ezra Keller and Samuel Sprecher, the first two presidents of the college, both took public stands against the institution of slavery in the early years of the college.

Thus, it is not surprising that the current Constitution of the Board of Directors of Wittenberg College, as amended in 1999, explicitly states that the university “shall be open to all men and women without regard to race, creed, color, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, sex, or age who submit evidence of satisfactory character and scholarship” (Article I, section 2). Furthermore, more than a decade of campus conversations on the meanings of “diversity” have led to significant attention to the concept in the newly-revised mission and values statements, especially in the understanding of “community” embraced by those documents. The value statement on “community of learners” defines this crucial element of the university thus:

A purposeful and intentionally diverse community, centered on a residential campus, sustains education in the liberal arts and the exploration of complex and competing ideas within an ethos of accountability and support. From this community, we serve and engage our urban home of Springfield and the broader communities around the globe. By affirming the dignity of every person and fostering a spirit of respect, we create and expand opportunities to pursue knowledge in and out of the classroom. (italics for emphasis)

The concluding three values statements – on service, compassion, and integrity – again underline the challenge Wittenberg offers to all members of its community: to understand and serve others locally and globally while maintaining the highest standards of integrity.

Likewise, the strategic plan (Distinctively Wittenberg) highlights diversity in one form or another in nearly all of its major goals. Goal A calls us to “infuse the curriculum with an international perspective”; Goal B to “attract outstanding students … who reflect the diversity of the world”; Goal D is to “build, support, and celebrate a more diverse campus community”; Goal E reminds us of divisions among social classes and between rural and urban students when it calls on us to “foster, support, and celebrate our unique urban location and the benefits it provides to both students and the community.”

Incontrovertibly, both the institution’s history and its current mission documents invite and celebrate diversity of many kinds. But what, we may ask, have we actually accomplished? Happily, many concrete instances exemplify real celebration of diversity at Wittenberg, although we certainly continue to strive to improve the
representative nature of our various constituencies. In response to students who asked that the university demonstrate its historical and ongoing commitment to a diverse community, Wittenberg formally dedicated an anti-discrimination plaque during the college’s combined Homecoming/reunion celebration in October 2004. The plaque, placed prominently at the center of the alumni gathering mall near the Benham-Pence Student Center, displays the following statement, crafted primarily by students and adopted by the university’s Board of Directors:

Wittenberg University values the totality of the human experience. We strongly support an atmosphere of racial harmony and diversity. We are a community committed to fostering a culturally diverse environment, free of discrimination. As an educational community, Wittenberg recognizes that a society where cultural differences are understood and appreciated is essential. We believe that each individual is unique, and is thus entitled to genuine respect, personal dignity, and the pursuit of academic excellence. The University accepts its obligation to ensure a diverse environment for all individuals, regardless of race, gender, religion, nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, physical ability, or disability. Thus, Wittenberg University deplores racism and will not tolerate any expressions of discrimination on University premises at any time.

It is not surprising that students wished to make such a statement literally central to their campus. For many years, Wittenberg students have expressed their consciousness of and appreciation for diversity in many ways, and particularly through a large number of student organizations dedicated to learning about difference within the social fabric of the university.

Many such student groups focus specifically on areas of difference that constitute kinds of diversity. For over thirty years, Concerned Black Students (CBS) has promoted cultural awareness and campus unity through programs featuring multicultural speakers, theatrical groups, and concerts. Annual activities include the Unity March, which promotes interracial unity between Wittenberg University and the City of Springfield, and co-sponsorship of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Convocation of the Wittenberg Series. Build a Better Wittenberg, coordinated by CBS and Student Senate, encourages awareness of diversity and multiculturalism. Founded in 1999, the Wittenberg Gay-Straight Alliance (GSA) seeks to provide a safe and accepting environment for gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered (GLBT) students, as well as to raise awareness about important social issues affecting the community. Voices, a campus women’s group, sponsors speakers, discussion groups, and community-mentoring events for high-school age girls. A rich collage of faith-based groups offers a campus spiritual home to many through the Weaver Chapel Association, Athletes for Christ, Chapel Choir, Imani Gospel Choir, the Jewish Culture Club, Lutheran Student Movement, the Newman Club, PrimeTime, and such faith-based service groups as Habitat for Humanity. Perhaps one of the most telling – and most uplifting – signs that appreciation for diversity is real among our students is that widely different groups can and do come together to sponsor events that all deem important to support. For instance, a 2003 lecture by Judy Shepard on her son Matthew and the hate crime that took his life was co-sponsored by the Offices of Student Development, Residential Life, and Multicultural Programs, but also by the student groups Student

The student body supporting this generous variety of organizations is itself diverse, although increasing representation of different ethnicities and cultures remains an important goal. Women students outnumber men 57 per cent to 43 per cent among traditional students, similar to the situation at many liberal-arts colleges today. Approximately 5% of our traditional students are African-American, 1% Hispanic, 1% Asian-American, and 3% are international students. A handful of Native American and physically-disabled students also matriculate at Wittenberg. Although we face strong competition for students from area historically-black institutions such as Wilberforce University and Central State University, as well as from Ohio’s excellent system of state universities and community colleges and its many outstanding private baccalaureate institutions, we continue to work to improve the diversity of our student body.

Building diversity is also a continual work in progress among other important constituencies at Wittenberg. Over the past decade, at least five African-Americans have joined the administration, two in positions of top leadership (Director of Athletics, Secretary of the University and Executive Assistant to the President). The number of women in top administrative positions has unfortunately not kept up with the growth in the number of women faculty. Among faculty members with more than ten years of service, older patterns still leave their imprint: men outnumber women 2:1. But among faculty members with ten years of service or fewer, men account for 49 per cent, women 51 per cent, demonstrating the near-seismic transformation of the professoriate in the last decade. Although the percentage of women on the faculty has increased greatly, the percentage from other historically under-represented groups has essentially stayed stable or dipped slightly, as demonstrated in the Table 1.1.

Table 1.1  
Comparative Demographics of Faculty, 1996-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>American Indian</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Total minority</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>F/M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-1997</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>67/120</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>89/118</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The strategic plan, reflecting awareness of the need for diverse points of view, backgrounds, and role models for students, calls for the development of strategies to attract and retain faculty and administrators of color (Goal D).

The Board of Directors itself has also enjoyed some landmarks in diversity in the past decade. In September 2001, Ingrid Stafford, Wittenberg Class of 1975 and Associate Vice President for Finance and Controller of Northwestern University, became the first woman elected as chair of the Board of Directors. Because of the limited number of members of the board, small absolute numbers can create somewhat misleading percentages; even with that caveat, however, it is true that the percentage of women and minority board members has increased slightly in the last decade (see Table 1.2).
Table 1.2
Comparative Demographics of the Board of Directors, 1996 to 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29 (85%)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22 (81%)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7 (26%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, then, in both the words and aspirations of its mission documents and in the concrete striving and achievement of its goals, Wittenberg University shows a deeply-felt and perseverant pursuit of and respect for diversity in all its aspects.

Core Component 1C

Understanding of and support for the mission pervades Wittenberg University.

Embracing and Articulating the Mission

The most striking evidence that mission is important to members of the university is the lively discussion and debate involved in crafting the newly-refined mission statement. The specially-appointed Task Force on Mission and Values, a body made up of faculty members and administrators, worked for over a year not only to find more concise expression for the mission statement, but also to verify that the statement reflects key constituencies’ conceptions of what Wittenberg actually is and what it does. The task force went to heroic efforts to glean as much feedback and as many ideas as possible; their methods included a survey, small focus group sessions with various representative campus bodies, forums, and detailed discussion of drafts at three official faculty meetings (see minutes for January 17, 2006; December 6, 2005; and September 6, 2005). The discussions demonstrated clearly a sense of passion about the mission and about its precise and vivid expression.

Furthermore, a number of external surveys and consultancies have come to similar conclusions about the zeal with which members of the university promote its mission. When Johnson, Grossnickle and Associates (September 2004) interviewed 24 administrative staff members and university directors as part of its analysis of Wittenberg’s readiness for a major comprehensive campaign, they concluded that “Wittenberg University, its mission, traditions, and people are held in high regard by interviewees” (2.1H).

Also in 2004-2005, Wittenberg faculty members participated in the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey. The findings for several of the questions show very directly that faculty goals are aligned with the mission. Eighty per cent of Wittenberg faculty members declare that their values are congruent with institutional values, higher than the national average percentages of 72 per cent and 76 per cent (for liberal arts colleges and religious colleges, respectively). Academic aspects of the institutional mission rank highly, as one would expect, and are consistent with results for other liberal arts colleges with respect to critical thinking, writing, and mastery of a discipline. Non-academic elements of Wittenberg’s mission that distinguish it from some other liberal-arts colleges (development of moral character, spiritual development, seeking purpose in life, and responsible citizenship) also claim strong support as important values Wittenberg faculty members hope to encourage our students to develop (see Table 1.3).
Finally, our recent (2006) consultancy with Mindpower, Inc., an Atlanta-based branding firm hired by President Erickson, (with research support from The MSR Group of Omaha) crystallizes not only the pervasive sense of mission owned by all connected with Wittenberg, but the powerful sense of institutional ownership felt by all major constituencies. This proprietary sense that “we know Wittenberg” led some in the community to be wary of attempts to “brand” Wittenberg. But that sense of ownership and unity came through strongly in the many phone interviews (with board members) and intimate focus groups with faculty, students, administration, and staff conducted by Mindpower personnel. Quotations recorded in those discussions noted particularly Wittenberg’s openness, its dedication to critical inquiry, its support for seeking purpose, its encouragement to stretch oneself and serve others, and its embrace of all facets of a person’s being. Students clearly understand the concept of “wholeness of person” central to their undergraduate education, and perceive their own growth, intellectual and otherwise, even as they are in the midst of that growth.

Mindpower’s initial presentation of their branding and marketing concepts for the university has created an unprecedented outpouring of support for and affirmation of the university mission. It is clear from the standing ovations, from the talk in the hallways, and from the strong emotional responses, that even some of those most resistant to the idea that an outside marketing firm could capture Wittenberg’s essence have recognized in Mindpower’s recommendations that, in fact, people who have never known Wittenberg before can get to know us and see us clearly for what we are – simply from talking to students, faculty members, administrators, members of support staff, and the directors of the university. There can be little doubt that the major constituencies of the university not only understand and embrace the mission, but articulate it compellingly and consistently to the world at large.

Table 1.3
HERI Faculty Survey, 2004-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Goals for Students</th>
<th>Wittenberg</th>
<th>Liberal Arts Colleges</th>
<th>“Religious” Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thinks critically</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastered a discipline</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to write well</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate the liberal arts</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared for employment</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed moral character</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced spiritual development</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seriously seek purpose in life</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible citizen</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Realizing the Mission through Planning

The strategic plan (*Distinctively Wittenberg: A Vision for Excellence, Appendix A*) makes clear that the mission and values statements set the agenda for planning and resource allocation:

> The plan *affirms the university’s essential characteristics*: its fundamental academic commitments to liberal learning, to selected pre-professional majors, and to both traditional and non-traditional students; its primary relationships with the Springfield and Miami Valley communities and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; its rich athletic tradition; and its historic values of a small college, personal attention to individual student needs, and opportunities to develop the whole person. (“Introduction”) (italics for emphasis)

A quick perusal of the main goals of the plan verifies that these values of learning, student-centeredness, diversity, and community are indeed central tenets of the document.

Likewise, recent changes in both the Office of Advancement and the Office of Enrollment Management have re-directed and re-affirmed the university’s key priorities in student recruitment and retention and in the targeting of specific strategic-plan-generated goals for major gifts. Given that the central mission is, of course, providing an excellent educational opportunity for students, it is fitting that nearly two-thirds of the institution’s employees are in the academic programs and institutional areas overseen by the provost (such as athletics, academic services, etc.).

Departmental and Administrative Missions

While members of the Wittenberg community understand and enact the mission of the university regularly, they also engage with it more energetically by adopting mission statements for academic and administrative sub-units that relate the overall institutional mission to the specific area of responsibility. Since the mid-1990s, all academic programs have crafted mission statements for their offices. These missions are often related to learning goals in the case of academic departments, and to institutional function in the administrative units. These mission statements and learning goals can be found in the resource room (6.2B). A number of departments’ mission statements (the Departments of Education and English are recent examples) have been praised by external reviewers, as well.

Likewise, groups of faculty members proposing new majors or minors must offer an analysis of how the proposed program contributes to Wittenberg’s mission and its liberal education objectives. This analysis, along with the rest of a detailed proposal, is then reviewed by the Educational Policies Committee (made up of faculty and student members) and forwarded to the faculty as a body, where it is reviewed, discussed, and voted upon. In this way, any new programs, and the resources dedicated to them, use Wittenberg’s mission as an essential touchstone.

Clearly, then, Wittenberg’s various constituencies not only understand and support the mission of the university, but also delineate the ways in which their own work aligns with that mission.
Core Component 1D

Wittenberg’s governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

Composition and Functioning of the Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of Wittenberg University currently comprises twenty-eight members (with a goal to seat thirty this academic year), a majority of whom must belong to the Lutheran church, including one Lutheran representative from each of the six supporting synods. Constitutionally, the actual number of members may vary between thirty and forty; beyond the requirement for majority Lutheran membership, representation is assured to alumni, Clark County and regional residents, and persons with an interest in helping Wittenberg fulfill its mission. Each year, several new members are elected to replace those leaving; the members serve three-year terms and may be re-elected to serve a total of twelve years. The President of the University is also considered a voting member of the Board of Directors. Despite – or perhaps because of – the considerable professional and personal accomplishments and responsibilities of the board members, their relations with faculty, staff, students, and administrators are characterized by regular formal and informal interactions that underscore each director’s commitment to the mission of the university.

A number of standing committees of the board hear reports from and entertain policy on various areas of the university; standing committees include committees on academic affairs, advancement, audits, board affairs, building and grounds, finance, and honors. The board recently added ad hoc committees on technology, marketing, and student development. Wittenberg operates in a true culture of shared governance; many committees of the Board of Directors extend voice and vote to student and faculty members of their committees. Appropriate administrative officers also serve on the committees. Board committee chairs and administrative liaisons work together to prepare meeting agendas and to report their work to the full board membership.

The board meets three times a year on campus; the meetings generally take place across two or three days, with a schedule that attempts to allow time for committee meetings and reports, informal socialization among board members and with faculty members, students, and administrators, and important university-related events such as lectures, performances, and sporting events. In this way, the meetings are crafted to imbue the directors with a personal connection to the life of the university while allowing them ample time for official deliberation and action.

In order to provide flexibility of response in the times between scheduled board meetings, an Executive Committee of the Board (made up of the President of the University, the officers of the Board of Directors, and the immediate past chair if that person is still a member of the board) can act for the board between meetings and advise the president and the chair.

The Constitution of the Board of Directors clearly describes and differentiates the spheres of control of the Board and the faculty, granting the faculty the primary role in matters of curriculum and granting faculty groups central participation in matters of hiring, tenure, and promotion. The Faculty Manual, as well as the Constitution of the Board of Directors, notes that the detailed assessment of individuals’ credentials for rank and tenure lies in the hands of the faculty, provost, and president; the board is to examine individual cases themselves only in unusual instances (Board of Directors
By-laws, Article IV, Section 5). While the board certainly is interested in academic programs, the faculty seems to enjoy the confidence of the board that they will design and implement a superior educational program in accord with the highest academic standards, while the board itself takes a more central role in financial and business decisions of the university.

The Board’s needs to understand issues at Wittenberg and in the world of higher education in general have been assessed and addressed in both formal and informal ways. In the last decade, the assessment of board needs has been derived mostly from informal communications among the president, board chair, board committee chairs, and senior administrators. As gaps in contextual information have become clear, or as important events on campus have demanded concentrated consideration, the president and his staff have offered board development opportunities in a variety of forms: sharing of relevant reports and research from within the literature on higher education; presentations by senior administrative staff members, and focused conversations among interested board members and appropriate administrators.

Because of their important responsibilities as directors, they are also provided regular updates on current issues in higher education through statements and position papers published by the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). It is perhaps a measure of the excellent operation of our board that the immediate past president, Ms. Ingrid Stafford, currently serves on AGB’s Council of Board Chairs. President Erickson and Board Chair Steinbrink attended the AGB Conference for presidents and board chairs in January 2006.

Board members are acculturated to their roles in many ways. New board members participate in an orientation program each year, and each new member is assigned a mentor from among the continuing members of the board. Board members also have campus e-mail accounts to facilitate communication among members and between the board and the campus; each board member automatically receives the electronic newsletter Around the Hollow (published bi-weekly during the school year), which highlights new programs, initiatives, issues, and accomplishments on campus. Board members may also meet informally with the president and other top administrators in their travels, and they are often asked to participate in university events, both in Springfield and in their own communities.

Although these informal methods of assessing and meeting the needs of board members have served the college well in the last ten years, President Erickson hopes to deepen further levels of engagement and communication with the board. To that end, he appointed Dr. John Marr, Class of 1981, to the position of Secretary of the University and Executive Assistant to the President in May 2006. This position is in some ways similar to that of General Secretary of the University held by Dr. Richard Veler in the late 1990’s; Dr. Marr will coordinate timely communication and engagement with board members, as well as working closely with the college’s senior administrators and the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors in assessing the needs of Board members and providing timely and appropriate development opportunities to address identified needs.

In addition to the structured interactions of board members with faculty and students on the elected board committees noted above, students, faculty members, and administrative staff work with board members on special committees, projects, and task forces as needed. Two important recent examples include the work of the Wittenberg Lutheran Identity Study Commission and the Strategic Planning Task Force. Just such a representative committee worked together to hire President
Erickson. Board members also have opportunities to meet with students socially in relation to such traditions as the “100 Days to Graduation” reception, the annual “Cram Jam,” at which directors serve students late-night snacks at the beginning of spring final examinations, and at the reception for Board members hosted by Student Senate at the January board meeting. Every board meeting includes a lunch to which representatives from various student groups are invited to eat and talk informally with Board members. Board members are also encouraged to volunteer in the Tiger Career Network, which offers opportunities for current students to correspond and talk with alumni in various careers about the demands and rewards of that vocation in order to help define their own goals.

Given the constitutional and institutional paradigm of board diversity, the ample opportunities for board development, the open communication between the board and the president and his cabinet, and the continuous efforts to connect the board members to the everyday realization of the university’s mission of educating the whole person, the board functions effectively in its interactions with other constituencies within the university.

The President and Senior Staff

In the last ten years, the configuration of the group called the President’s Cabinet or Senior Staff has been somewhat fluid in its composition. At the time of the 1997 visit, the cabinet consisted of the provost, the vice president for institutional relations and advancement, the vice president for business affairs, the pastor to the university, the dean of admission, the dean of students, and the general secretary, but the director of public relations and others also advised the president. Over the years, at times the cabinet meetings included the director of computing, the director of publications, and the director of human resources. The dean of students’ title was expanded in 1999 to become also vice president for student development. For a time there was also a vice president for university relations. The current configuration of senior staff includes only those at the vice-presidential level: Provost Ken Bladh, Associate Vice President for Student Development and Dean of Students Carolyn Perkins, Vice President for Business and Finance Darrell Kitchen, Vice President for Enrollment Management Doug Swartz, Vice President for Advancement Bill Cloyd, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Special Assistant to the President Maureen Massaro, and Secretary to the University and Executive Assistant to the President John Marr. This group meets weekly to discuss key initiatives and ongoing projects and issues. While five among this group of eight top administrators (the president plus these vice-presidential level officers) have worked at Wittenberg three years or less, the newer members of the administration have been chosen in painstaking processes for their enthusiasm for Wittenberg’s mission and for their record of success in their fields. Of the eight, President Erickson, Provost Bladh, and Secretary Marr hold doctoral degrees; Associate Vice President Perkins, Associate Vice President Massaro, and Vice President Swartz hold master’s degrees, and Vice Presidents Kitchen and Cloyd hold the bachelor’s degree. A combination of education and experience qualifies them for their positions of responsibility.

Senior Staff members have clear areas of supervisory responsibility and multiple employees and/or areas reporting to them (2.1A.i). In keeping with the mission of the university, approximately 64 per cent of the university’s employees report ultimately to Provost Bladh as the leader of the academic program. Still, in recent years of tight
budgets and staff cuts in areas directly connected to enrollments (e.g. faculty, student development), some faculty members are uneasy with what they see as a proliferation of administrative positions, especially high-ranking, highly-compensated ones. Reorganization in the President’s office to support Dr. Erickson’s work, the change from a traditional admissions operation to an enrollment management model and the expansion of professional staff in the advancement office to support a major gifts focus account for most of the administrative growth Wittenberg has experienced over the last half of this self study period. As we move (laudably) toward a more data-driven culture of accountability in such areas as advancement and enrollment management, additional research and technical support staff will most likely also be necessary. Regular progress reports from the administrative leadership to the campus about progress in implementing the strategic plan will allow all an opportunity to be convinced that the university’s mission of educating students remains at the center of planning, policy, and resource allocation.

While President Erickson’s practice of addressing the monthly faculty meetings and taking questions has been very helpful in establishing a sense of open communication, and the Office of the Provost receives generally high marks for both collegiality and accessibility, opportunities for communication with other members of the senior staff are more limited. Some faculty committees, Budget and Compensation Advisory for example, note that it is sometimes difficult to obtain some financial and other basic information from appropriate offices to inform their work. Others, such as the Admission and Financial Aid Policies Committee, note that they no longer perform some important functions described in their charges because of their reassignment to the enrollment management committee. Over the past decade, several institutional processes (enrollment, retention, budget, work priorities for physical plant and computing services) have been assigned to teams that cross vice presidential areas and, thereby, increase intra-organizational communication and cooperation. We expect that communication will improve as all areas of the university work together to enact the strategic plan’s exciting vision for Wittenberg.

Administrative Staff
While the administrative staff at Wittenberg does not have a governance system as such, the Human Resources Advisory Committee, appointed by the President, does suggest for consideration issues relating to personnel and workplace policies, as well as recommending members of administrative staff to sit on task forces and committees as called for. They also act as a liaison between Senior Staff and the many dedicated people they represent.

Faculty Governance
Wittenberg’s faculty enjoys a robust and participatory faculty governance system supported by monthly meetings of the faculty and 35 standing boards and committees. The monthly faculty meetings, presided over and recorded by elected faculty members, also give voice and vote to eight members of Student Senate. An agenda is distributed to all faculty members at least three days before any meeting, and the meetings are run according to *Robert’s Rules of Order*. Motions approved by the faculty are then accepted or rejected by the president after each semester. Attendance is usually between sixty and seventy, with a high of 101 for the 2005-2006 academic year.
Key faculty committees include the Faculty Executive Board, the Faculty Personnel Board, and the Educational Policies Committee. Each of these committees comprises six elected faculty members; the Educational Policies Committee also includes the provost and up to four students appointed by Student Senate. The Faculty Executive Board sets the agenda for faculty meetings, conducts elections, proposes the calendar, and advises the president and Board of Directors for the faculty, especially on matters of strategic planning. The Faculty Personnel Board crafts procedures and policies regarding hiring, tenure, and promotion and makes recommendations on the cases of individuals eligible for tenure and promotion, as well as annually reviewing faculty salaries for equity. The Educational Policies Committee analyzes and makes recommendations on new and revised academic programs, new and revised courses, new academic policies, the addition or non-continuation of full-time faculty positions, and all changes in the curriculum. The full list of standing faculty committees and boards appears in the *Faculty Manual* (on-line and in the Resource Room, 2.3A).

The faculty of Wittenberg University very actively seeks participation and collaboration with each other and with administrative offices in helping Wittenberg fulfill its mission and goals. Through their management of the academic program, as well as participation on committees and task forces that seek fair and equitable treatment of contract workers, develop progressive benefits such as parental leave, and participate actively in admission and advancement efforts, the faculty of Wittenberg University supports the mission of the university and upholds the integrity of its operations.

Student Governance

Students at Wittenberg enjoy participation in the governance of the institution to an unusual degree. The Student Senate, consisting of eighteen members representing a number of specific constituent groups or duties, can consider and vote on policies relating to student life. The Student Senate also recognizes official student organizations, allocates student activities fees (currently $296,000 a year), and appoints student members of standing faculty committees. Student Senate Hearing Board hears and adjudicates student disciplinary cases. Student members make up the majority of the university’s Honor Council and participate on many major faculty committees. Student Appellate Board hears appeals on findings of the Honor Council, the Dean of Students, and the Student Senate Hearing Board. Eight student senators also have voice and vote at monthly faculty meetings. The student governance system works well with the faculty and with the Vice President for Student Development and Dean of Students. Student leaders have offered invaluable insights on groups such as the various strategic planning groups, the Lutheran Identity Commission, and the Presidential Search Committee; students tend to feel especially touched by the university’s mission and dedicated to upholding it on campus and in their decision-making processes.

Evaluation of Wittenberg’s Governance and Administrative Structures

Structures are in place to provide ample representation and voice for all campus constituencies. Strategic goal F calls us as a community to expand and maintain healthy channels of communication and monitor their ongoing effectiveness. We are confident that under the leadership of President Erickson and Provost Bladh, that can
and will happen. Each major constituent group, from the Board of Directors to the Student Senate, feels strongly its investment in Wittenberg’s mission and traditions, and strives to uphold them with integrity.

Core Component 1E

*Wittenberg upholds and protects its integrity.*

Wittenberg builds on its shared system of governance and its dedication to openness to conduct itself as an institution that deals fairly with all internal and external stakeholders.

**Integrity in Financial Functions**

Wittenberg sustains its financial integrity through strict adherence to generally accepted accounting practices and through annual audits by an independent certified public accounting firm. In addition, the Board of Directors, through its Finance Committee and Audits Committee, maintains close oversight of the institution’s financial condition, operating budget, and the reporting thereof. Periodic evaluations by national bond rating firms such as Moody’s provide yet another independent confirmation of the institution’s financial condition and integrity of operation. Wittenberg responds quickly to recommendations of our auditors on practices for improving data or operational integrity, such as assigning responsibility for the Information Security Plan to specific positions. Internally, board members and senior administrators receive annual audits of the financial conditions, and President Erickson has instituted the use of “dashboard” summaries of critical operating criteria at meetings of the Board of Directors and his Senior Staff. Several of these criteria provide direct measures of progress toward strategic goals and thus help hold our operations accountable to the strategic plan.

**Integrity in Legal Compliance**

Wittenberg complies with all applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations, which has meant regular updating of policies and procedures as laws have changed and evolved. Some of the key changes made to remain in compliance with legal responsibilities in the last decade include:

- implementation of the provisions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (1998)
- creation of an Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee to assure that the care and use of all live, nonhuman, vertebrate animals used for research, research training, biological testing activities, or related uses meet current standards (1998)
- reporting of stipends and honoraria as taxable earnings to the Internal Revenue Service (1999)
- assignment of coordination and execution of the Information Security Plan to the Controller and the Director of Computing Services
- revision of the policy statement and procedures for sexual harassment and misconduct
• compliance with requirements of the Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS) (2002)
• revision of the firearms policy and campus signage to comply with new Ohio “open carry” law (2004)
• immediate revision of campus smoking policy to conform with the Ohio “Smoke Free Workplace Act” (2006)

Wittenberg continues its use of an Institutional Review Board (IRB) to enforce federal regulations on the use of human research subjects.

Wittenberg also offers many opportunities for faculty and staff members to educate themselves on current legal issues that affect their duties. All campus employees do on-line training on how to recognize and prevent sexual harassment. Staff members from all operational areas have attended NCAA diversity workshops, and both faculty and staff members have had opportunities to attend workshops on legal issues in higher education, including compliance with the Family Education Right to Privacy Act (FERPA). Supervisors receive training on performance management, and security and police officers receive special training in first aid, cultural diversity, response to incidents of sexual assault, and handling chemical and radioactive materials. The university believes that upholding the law is a shared responsibility most effectively met through education and action.

Demonstrating Integrity toward Internal Groups

As part of its mission to educate young people as responsible global citizens seeking moral growth, a number of policies create an environment of fairness, privacy, and mutual respect in which such an education can occur. Many contributing policies affect faculty, staff, and students equally or in different ways, such as policies on affirmative action, commercial solicitation, disabilities, dissent and disorder, the Family Education Right to Privacy Act, firearms, Martin Luther King Day observance, medical leave, political activity, political use of student funds, employee safety and health, sexual harassment and misconduct, consensual sexual relationships, smoking, and substance abuse. Enhancing the fair treatment such policies seek to codify is their easy accessibility in the student, staff, and faculty manuals available on our website.

Students and staff members are trained in the expectations the university has of them during such orientation programs as New Student Days, New Faculty Orientation, and staff orientation sessions. The idea that Wittenberg is a community based on everyone doing their work in an environment of mutual caring and respect is paramount to these programs. Rights and responsibilities form an important part of the training.

All members of the faculty and student body are held to clearly-delineated ethical standards published and disseminated widely. The faculty subscribe to the American Association of University Professors’ (AAUP) statement on professional ethics. The complete statement appears in the section on tenure and promotion in the Faculty Manual, and is specifically included in the discussion of expected behavior. The emphasis of the statement is on intellectual honesty, the pursuit of excellence, and the promotion of conditions of free and open inquiry, all of which align with the university’s mission.

Students also have clear-cut codes of conduct touching on many areas of their lives, from residential regulations detailed in the Student Handbook to the honor
statement adopted with the Wittenberg Honor Code in 2003: “I affirm that my work upholds the highest standards of honesty and academic integrity at Wittenberg, and that I have neither given nor received any unauthorized assistance.” The Honor Council itself, a group made up of predominantly students, with faculty and administrative members as well, educates the campus on matters of academic integrity and also hears and adjudicates cases of academic dishonesty. A general “Code of Expected Conduct” is included in the Student Handbook, although it should be given a more prominent position in a general revision and organization of the handbook.

Wittenberg also has in place clear paths for report and resolution of situations in which expected behavior is breached. These policies are clearly spelled out in the various manuals, and each contains detailed information on process, timing, and appeals. Standing committees of the faculty included in this judiciary function in some way are the Faculty Hearing Board on Academic Freedom and Tenure, the Faculty Personnel Board, the Sexual Harassment Grievance Board, and the Honor Council (which includes students as well).

As noted in the section of the introduction in which we respond to suggestions from the 1997 visit team, the processes and criteria for both tenure and promotion have been reviewed and thoroughly revised in the last ten years. The current policies offer a list of types of professional activity, for instance, intended to be expansive and inclusive to reflect the very different kinds of accomplishments appropriate to various disciplines. Clear, standardized policies were developed to cover even unusual situations, such as a department’s refusal to nominate a candidate who desires to stand for promotion or the president and provost’s dissent from the recommendations of the Faculty Personnel Board, or the FPB’s dissent from the departmental recommendation. Clear timetables, procedures, and patterns of notification have been established. Lines of appeal to the Faculty Hearing Board on Academic Freedom and Tenure have been clarified, as well.

Students help to uphold standards pertaining to themselves in a number of ways. Students take the dominant role on the Honor Council, which hears and adjudicates cases of alleged academic dishonesty when a student wishes to appeal a professor’s finding or sanction (between 2003 and 2005 the Honor Council heard on average 37 cases a year). Greek letter organizations operate under standards of expectation enforced by the student-staffed Greek Standards Board; in 2004, one organization was suspended for violations of the hazing code, and in 2005 two programs were placed on probation for violations of policy. Residence halls are also governed and rules of behavior enforced by student standards boards, with the goal of promoting respect for community and personal responsibility. The Polis House is a small self-governed living unit that sets and enforces its own democratically-created rules.

Overall, then, Wittenberg University makes clear its expectations and community standards to all internal groups, offers training to help meet those expectations, and offers clear, fair, and timely mechanisms for the resolution of problems.

Demonstrating Integrity toward External Groups

As noted earlier in this chapter, Wittenberg follows scrupulously the laws and regulations regarding educational and non-profit enterprises. But true integrity and fair dealing go beyond the mere letter of the law. Wittenberg takes very seriously its role as an important contributor to the good of Springfield and Clark County, as demonstrated powerfully in the inclusion in our current strategic plan of a goal to “foster, support and
celebrate our unique urban location and the benefits it provides to both students and the community” (Goal F, *Distinctively Wittenberg*). Although we will provide much more detail in the chapter on Criterion Five, a brief summary of our community engagement will suggest how we act with integrity as members of our larger community.

Our mission-driven graduation requirement of community service for every student enables Wittenberg to deploy many, many hours of youthful energy directed toward the public good. Wittenberg students volunteer thousands of hours every year in all kinds of community service; even after their required hours of service and reflection are completed, many students continue to help at their service sites. Many faculty and staff members also volunteer or make contributions to the community in other ways. The long-time Mayor of Springfield is Professor Warren Copeland of the Wittenberg Religion Department. Professor of Philosophy Don Reed is the president of the Springfield City School Board, as was Professor of History Jim Huffman before him.

President Erickson brings a particular passion for community relations with him, as that was one of his primary areas of focus at Lehigh University before assuming the presidency of Wittenberg. The president is included in a group of community leaders currently planning for a re-emerging downtown, including a “college town” area between the university and the planned downtown hospital campus. Community leaders of Springfield and Clark County clearly see Wittenberg as an entity crucial to the vitality of the community and its future.

Just as Wittenberg wants to contribute to the growth of Springfield, we also invite Springfield to join us in our own explorations. Our Wittenberg Series brings renowned artists, intellectuals, and policymakers to campus throughout the year; all performances, lectures, readings, and residencies are free and open to the public (a ten-year compilation of Wittenberg Series events is available in the resource room, 9.1B). Community members likewise support Wittenberg athletics events and attend other cultural events and performances at the university. Wittenberg professors are often called upon to comment on events of the day for the *Springfield News-Sun*, and many professors have shared their intellectual enthusiasms with local residents through the Clark County Public Library, city and local school districts, the Clark County Historical Society, the Westcott House Foundation, the Rocking Horse Center and many other community groups. Wittenberg strives to be a good neighbor.

In addition to our physical community of Springfield, one of the key external groups to whom we are bound is, of course, the higher education community. Here as well we strive for integrity, even when the cost is high. As alluded to in the section responding to the 1997 visit team’s suggestions, an independent study by the Faculty Executive Board and the Vice President for Student Development at the time (2003-2004) revealed inconsistencies in the data on academic profiles of incoming students. Because the gathering and processing of institutional data was de-centralized at that time, the mistakes made in the Office of Admission had affected our reporting on student profiles to some external bodies such as the *U.S. News and World Report* College Ranking Survey. As we investigated the matter fully, it became clear that we had, indeed, reported erroneous information. Then-President Tipson formally notified *U.S. News and World Report* of the errors, corrected the information, and made major personnel and organizational changes in the Offices of Admission and Student Development in 2004. This event was very distressing to all members of the Wittenberg community precisely because we pride ourselves on integrity and honesty. Still, we could and would make no other choice but to publicly admit our mistakes – to do so is, after all, at the very heart of integrity.
Summary Assessment of Criterion One

The evaluative consideration of the evidence presented in this chapter confirms that Wittenberg University meets the criterion of articulating its mission clearly and operating with integrity. To an institution less grounded in its own values and traditions, the nearly concurrent changes heralded by the Task Force on the Mission Statement; the Commission on Lutheran Identity; the new president, vice president for advancement, vice president for enrollment management, director of admissions, and secretary to the university in just the past year and a half; and the ambitious strategic plan, *Distinctively Wittenberg*, might prove unsettling, if not disastrous. And yet excitement and optimism run high; though even positive change will inevitably cause stress, the Wittenberg community welcomes a special kind of change that reconfirms and validates its core values and challenges us to embody the university’s mission with renewed energy and vigor – to capture the light and pass it on to others, as our motto declares.

As we look to the future, then, we will strive to actualize our mission-driven strategic plan and its call to enrich our already-excellent academic programs, seek diversity and excellence in our student body and faculty, globalize our curriculum and outlook, and strengthen our relationship to the community. The elaborate and inclusive processes leading to our current mission statement, Lutheran identity statements, and strategic plan have begun the work by setting our institutional course and goals. Still, we will need to continue working to meet those goals by standardizing institutional research, maintaining regular communication and transparency of operations in top administrative offices, and respecting the primacy of the academic mission of the university. By thus building community and continuing to operate with integrity and transparency, Wittenberg is uniquely prepared to achieve its strategic goals for the future.
Chapter Two: Preparing for the Future

Wittenberg’s allocation of resources and its processes for evaluation and planning demonstrate its capacity to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its education, and respond to future challenges and opportunities.

As we have shown in the preceding chapter, Wittenberg University takes the fulfillment of its mission as a solemn and invigorating responsibility and makes every effort to offer outstanding academic programs and services to its student body. But underlying all such efforts must be resources, human and financial, to translate lofty goals into reality, and those resources must be managed well and deployed strategically to nourish high-quality educational programs and to encourage our continual striving for improvement.

President Erickson, in his first year in office, has energized and streamlined the final stages of strategic planning, hired new vice presidents for advancement and enrollment management, and engaged the Atlanta-based firm Mindpower Incorporated to create new branding and marketing strategies for the university. President Erickson models openness of communication and expects the same from all units of the university.

Yet for all the change in the last ten years, Wittenberg continues in a forward-looking mode. The changes that could have overwhelmed have instead presented us with an opportunity; this unique confluence of events (new president, new strategic plan, accreditation self-study, revised mission statement, new statements of Lutheran identity, new faces in top administrative positions) poises us to chart our course and carve out a new channel where necessary.
Admittedly, the impetus for some of these changes has been reactive rather than proactive. In the last decade, for instance, Wittenberg has experienced enrollment instability, resulting in several years in which faculty and staff positions were cut and salary pools were too small to keep up with the cost of living, much less advance faculty salaries relative to those at peer schools. While the 1997 strategic plan called for “providing a salary structure competitive with those of sister institutions,” salaries of professors, associate professors and assistant professors rank last or next to last among our peer group over the last three years of the decade (5.4A) and the dollar gap to reach the midpoint had reached $1,026,000 by 2004. The Office of Business and Finance, in its annual report to Moody’s, offers a somewhat more sanguine interpretation: that enrollment has been relatively stable until the last three years; they are no doubt considering overall enrollment rather than the wide variations in entering class sizes. In any case, this enrollment instability, along with the irregularities in student data reporting in the Office of Admission, led to major changes in the organizational design and philosophy of the office, as well as in personnel. Such challenges have also led to the creation of a centralized institutional research office.

In spite of the challenges we face from demographic changes in the college-age population, our own shifting institutional perspectives, tuition-driven financing, and a very competitive environment in which to attract top students, Wittenberg is eager to plan realistically yet enthusiastically for our future, and to continue refining our fidelity to our mission.

Core Component 2A

*Wittenberg realistically prepares for a future shaped by multiple societal and economic trends.*

Current Capacity and Aspirations

Realistic planning, before setting any goals at all, must begin with a clear picture of the current institutional situation and capacity. Just such a philosophy necessitated the creation of the Strategic Plan Task Group on Size and Mix (3.2A). This group examined the ramifications of several potential target sizes for the university’s student body, taking into account academic program size, number of faculty, size of classes, capacity of facilities, fixed costs, and desired selectivity and tuition discount rate. While the group, in its final report, was unable to choose between 2,000 and 2,200 as target enrollment figures, it did dismiss the extremes of 1,800 and 2,400. Although there were concerns that we would dip close to that bottom number this year, a larger-than-expected first-year class and an impressive increase in first- to second-year retention has in fact placed us at 1,937 students as of October 15, the fall 2006 census date.

Enrollment stability has been the single biggest planning challenge of the past decade. The enrollment goal of 2,200-2,300 high-quality students pinpointed in the 1997 strategic plan is one of the few objectives of that plan that now seems off the mark; the new strategic plan takes into account coming demographic shifts among the college-age population and sets more modest enrollment goals, aiming for a full-time equivalent student population of 1,950 by 2013, with a 13:1 student: faculty ratio more in keeping with our peer institutions. Pursuant to this goal, the enrollment management team set a goal of 580 new students (including transfers and
international non-degree-seeking students) for fall 2006, which we exceeded with an entering class of 626 new students despite a spring crisis in the Office of Enrollment Management and the ensuing departure of the then-vice president for enrollment management and director of admissions. Acting Director (now Director) of Admission Brad Pochard and his staff, aided by a cadre of concerned faculty members, students, and alumni, went to heroic lengths to make sure we brought in the class— but perhaps did the job too well.

Having planned for the smaller class projected by the enrollment management group and acknowledging the multi-year effect of two successive small classes on a tuition-driven institution such as ours, the provost, with the advice of the Educational Policies Committee, did not renew the contracts for nine visiting positions in order to stay near a 13:1 student: faculty ratio (with respect to full-time faculty). The process was extremely stressful for the affected departments and, in some cases, the incumbents of the lines marked for non-renewal (Wittenberg typically limits the length of such full-time visiting appointments to three years, so some individuals were not eligible for renewal). The larger-than-anticipated entering class size has, of course, sent department chairs scrambling to supply extra course seats appropriate to first-year students, resulting in added sections taught by adjunct instructors—not part of the plan—and in one case, rehiring a visiting instructor whose line had been cut. Thus, while various planning processes have identified sensible goals for enrollment, the actual numbers have been inconsistent, thus disrupting other elements necessarily based on enrollment numbers, such as student housing plans and departmental staffing plans. So while current capacity of the university’s facilities and faculty are considered in planning, the implementation of some plans still does not reliably support annual operations.

Fortunately, new Vice President for Enrollment Management, Doug Swartz, has a strong track record of consistency in first-year class size and also of improving student persistence—both key ingredients in a more stable student body size and thus more successful implementation of planning. Vice President Swartz’s efforts will complement the improvements in retention already achieved under the leadership of Assistant Provost Lisa Rhine and the Safety Net committee. President Erickson also contracted with a new admission and financial aid consultant, Brian Zucker of Human Capital Research Corporation, in fall 2005. Zucker’s methodology is cutting-edge and data-driven; recommended changes currently being implemented cover a much wider range of factors in both recruiting and operations. For instance, recruiting is now targeted to specific clusters of high schools who are seen as feeder schools or who have been or could be feeder schools based on demographic data. Likewise, an “affinity factor” is now included in the complex decision-making around acceptance and financial aid. An array of sophisticated tools helps us focus on students who will most likely be a good fit for Wittenberg and who will succeed here.

Demographic Changes: Diversity and Globalization
As everyone involved in higher education knows, shaping a student body involves more than simple numbers. Actual numbers of college-age students will level off in a few years, and more importantly, many of the potential college students will come from income brackets and ethnic groups who more traditionally attend public universities, or they may be first-generation college students. The 1996 strategic plan did not address demographic changes or diversity centrally, but our current strategic
plan does. As Goals B and D of the plan make clear, we plan to target a wider range of diversity in geographic origins, in ethnic identification, in class and educational background, and in religious creeds. New strategies and newly-defined and targeted admission territories should help us recruit more diverse students; we have realigned the roles of several admission counselor positions so that one counselor will take on international recruiting as her primary responsibility, while new counselors have been added specifically for the Chicago area and the East Coast to re-establish ties with former “feeder” schools located in regions with richly-diverse populations.

Concomitantly, we recognize that the students of tomorrow will seek more diverse campuses and academic programs (Goal D). Pursuant to our hopes to attract high-achieving and diverse students, based on a review of current research and analyses of variance (ANOVA), we will strengthen arts programs, allied health programs, and the Honors Program. To help attract high-achieving students of color, we will work to create a welcoming atmosphere, to field a more diverse faculty and staff, and to offer more support for first-generation college students. While these strategies will likely help keep us competitive among African-American students, we have less explicitly addressed the needs of a potential wave of Hispanic college students, although some of the same strategies will prepare Wittenberg to be a good campus home for all students of color.

Just as we seek a more richly-complex mix of economic backgrounds, ethnic and racial identifications, religious creeds, gender, sexual orientation, and regional origin, Wittenberg also seeks to educate the global citizens of tomorrow. Wittenberg has long been proud of its ability to attract international students, especially from northern Europe, South Africa, and Asia. After the events of September 11, 2001, our numbers of international students dipped, as they did nationwide, but we have begun to gain ground again with this year’s cadre of thirty-three new international students (an increase of 300%). The strategic plan reiterates Wittenberg’s desire to create a more diverse community by bringing the world to Wittenberg, and also to widen Wittenberg students’ horizons by encouraging them to experience other cultures through study abroad, as well as through our long-standing interdisciplinary studies programs such as East Asian studies, global studies, and Russian area studies. While these goals enjoy enthusiastic support from almost all faculty members, full achievement of the goals of globalization in the strategic plan (Goal A.2 and Goal B) will ultimately require substantial financial resources and/or restructuring of the funding for study abroad, as well as increased administrative and support services for international students.

The Technological Climate

Likewise, tomorrow’s students will assume the widespread availability of technological support for research, writing, and computation; our planning also places a high priority on just such continuing improvements in technological access (Goal G). The staff of the Computing Center and Thomas Library echoes and elaborates these technology goals of the strategic plan with its own report to the provost, “Transforming Technology and Information Services” (4.4A). Some of these goals include continuing technology upgrades to campus classrooms, presence of a computer-lab classroom in each academic building, an information commons, and wireless network access across campus. Wittenberg has also begun the investment in people necessary to keep abreast of the rapidly changing environment of learning
technologies in liberal education by accepting an invitation to join NITLE (National Institute for Technology and Liberal Education) in 2006 and by allocating faculty development funds through the Provost’s office to support faculty and staff participation in NITLE workshops.

Awareness of Trends: Environmental Scanning

As recommended by the 1997 visit team, Wittenberg has been moving toward in a central administrative structure for collection of institutional research and data (as described in the introduction) and has used consultants to provide environmental analyses to inform our admissions efforts (Bill Hall and Brian Zucker). Even though the recent search for the person to lead an office of institutional research at Wittenberg failed, senior administration is committed to the establishment and nurturing of an operational culture reliant on measured outcomes and that eliminates sometimes inconsistent or isolated information collected by dozens of scattered people, departments, and offices. The position description and reporting structure for institutional research has been modified (now reporting directly to the Provost) to be more reflective of the job’s importance and to be attractive to highly qualified candidates. The search has been restarted as this self-study is being written.

In the intervening decade, however, what we could learn about the environment in which we operate was distorted sometimes by the decentralized approach we took to institutional research. The right person interested in the right project might be able to put together a wonderful analysis of opportunities, but because of the unsystematic approach to data, other chances for positive engagement no doubt sometimes went unheeded. On the positive side, for example, we have attempted to address the needs of a growing body of non-traditional students interested in professional skills, and enrollments in the School of Community Education have grown as a result. In other cases, a combination of general trends and anecdotal information has encouraged the development of majors and minors desired by students, such as communication, Africana studies, creative writing, and journalism, and those programs are thriving.

But in some cases, such informal environmental scanning can have more ambiguous consequences. We were convinced after the State of Ohio mandated a new requirement for licensed teachers to earn a master’s degree within five years of their first licensing that a master’s program in education would fill a clear need in the community and in the region. Yet several years after the establishment of the program, enrollments remain relatively small, and it is uncertain whether the program covers its own administrative and instructional costs. The associate provost is examining the operations and viability of the master of education program at the provost’s request after concerns were raised during the analysis of faculty lines cut last year. Other universities’ programs with fewer requirements and lower costs may be undercutting our efforts to provide a quality master’s-level experience to local teachers, and our own fine undergraduate education program may be strangled as a result.

Wittenberg participates in a number of standard national surveys of students and faculty members to gauge the current climate on campus, as well. Students complete, in alternating years, the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (SSI) and the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Students have also participated in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program’s Freshman Survey (CIRP). Trends gleaned from these surveys inform work in academic programs, academic services, and student development (see Chapter Three). Faculty members also participated in the
Higher Education Research Institute’s Faculty Survey in academic year 2005-2006. These external and comparative surveys complement a wide range of internal surveys on specific issues (faculty calendar surveys, general education survey, faculty childcare survey, academic climate survey, just to name a few), and provide an ongoing sense of faculty and student needs, wishes, attitudes, and priorities. Associate Provost Gary Gaffield notes that, as his office prepared for the hiring of a central director of institutional research, Wittenberg renewed its involvement with Higher Education Data Sharing (HEDS) and began completing a majority of the shared surveys. Assistant Registrar Janine Dogan has also been instrumental in implementing some standard institutional research procedures and reporting conventions. Assistant Provost for Academic Services Lisa Rhine notes that the shaping of retention and other goals in her office will be aided by the results of the alternating SSI and CIRP surveys.

Given the prime value placed on being grounded in its community, Wittenberg reviews and updates its campus master plan regularly. Art Lidsky, President and Senior Consultant with Dober, Lidsky, Craig and Associates, Inc., a well-established firm of campus planning specialists, helped to develop the current campus master plan of 1996 and has visited campus periodically since then to review and update it (2001 and 2006), each time including a broad spectrum of campus constituents.

Wittenberg recognizes that the campus master plan must grow organically from the strategic plan, and that the clear articulation of both plans is crucial in identifying compelling projects for a major capital campaign such as that now in the planning stage. *Distinctively Wittenberg*, the strategic plan, identifies preservation of the historic campus core (located around the east-west pedestrian corridor) as a top priority. Preliminary engineering studies and inventories of the renovation needs in four historic academic buildings (Blair, Koch, Carnegie, and Zimmerman Halls) have been completed since the 2001 update in anticipation of the upcoming comprehensive campaign.

The guiding principles of the current revisions to the campus plan maintain the basic design of the 1996 plan, which stresses integration of academic and social life and seeks to celebrate tradition and community. Two of the historic pathways through campus, one east-west and the other north-south, provide the dominant design framework. The historic entrance to campus on North Wittenberg Avenue is to be re-emphasized through patterns of traffic flow, landscaping, and signage. The historic core of campus will be renewed and the south end developed through a mixture of new construction and restoration of historic buildings as the primary location of housing for upper-class students.

Some elements of the 2001 update have already been accomplished. The plan suggested closing the blocks of Woodlawn Avenue and Stoughton Place adjacent to the Benham-Pence Student Center for improved pedestrian safety and to create a vehicle-free campus focal point for student recreation and campus events; Stoughton Place was converted to an open lawn and Woodlawn to a pedestrian mall (Alumni Way) by 2004. The landscaping of the new residence hall (2006) provided an opportunity to extend Alumni Way one more block north on Woodlawn. These projects increased green space adjacent to residence halls as well as providing a new outdoor stage at the student center for speakers and campus events. Decorative features like the pavers bearing the names of the recipients of alumni awards further emphasize the concept of Alumni Way: a bronze plaque bearing Wittenberg’s statement on racial harmony and diversity takes pride of place near the stage on Alumni Way, and a set of flagpoles given by the Class of 2002 as a gesture of grief and
hope following the September 11 attacks, flank the southern entrance to the student center adjacent to this new pedestrian mall. Alumni Way aligns with the major north-south connection between the academic and co-curricular parts of campus, the eastern edge cluster of residence halls, and the area on the south designated for upper-class student housing. By all measures, the Alumni Way project has created a vibrant outdoor gathering space.

A recent designated gift from a board member allows the renovation of Commencement Hollow into a visually stunning year-round multi-use amphitheater adjacent to the traditional main entrance to campus. This space will have electrical power, a permanent platform area with removable “back-shell,” and landscaped tiered seating for 1500 people that is respectful of the natural beauty of the space.

Planned upgrades in student housing options are already well on their way, as well. Over the past five years, two 48-bed student apartment complexes designed around 3-4 bedroom suites (Keller Place 2002, Sprecher Place 2004) were built just south of campus in accordance with the planned focus on upper-class student housing in that location. Plans to demolish South Residence Hall and Hanley Hall (constructed in the early 1960s) were implemented upon completion of the new residence hall (2006) and have resulted in the creation of a large, naturally sloped green space adjacent to Alumni Way. These demolitions, in conjunction with the removal of a high, thick hedge near the historic main entrance, have created dramatic new views of central campus, Commencement Hollow, and the Kissing Bridge, emphasizing some of Wittenberg’s most beloved traditions.

Also in keeping with the plan to renew the area south of campus, two important historical residences in that neighborhood, the Geiger House and the Benjamin Prince House, have undergone restoration over the past decade in accordance with priorities in the campus plan. The Geiger House (ca. 1858) roof and exterior have been stabilized and returned to near-original design; the interior awaits restoration. The story of the Geiger House was featured in the spring 2005 issue of Wittenberg Magazine. The Benjamin Prince House (ca. 1857) has been refurbished and serves as the residence of President Erickson and his family and as the site of numerous campus functions.

President Erickson has also worked enthusiastically with local leaders to reinforce Wittenberg’s place in the community, and several priorities of the plan deal with management of the areas immediately surrounding the university. The merger of two hospitals and the construction of a new downtown healthcare campus by around 2010 could provide opportunities for positive development on both the south and north ends of campus. Current campus planning is coordinating with the City of Springfield on projects beyond the south end of campus in the downtown redevelopment corridor around the new hospital. Meanwhile, the potential availability of the large parcel of land just north of campus to be vacated by the present Mercy Medical Center provides a one-time opportunity to add green space and playing fields to Wittenberg’s land-locked urban campus. Furthermore, the deterioration of the residential district immediately east of campus has led senior administrators (notably the president and vice president of business and finance) to investigate partnerships with private developers and the City of Springfield modeled after the strategies pursued by Macalester College in Minnesota to stabilize and develop its surrounding neighborhoods. Philosophically and physically, Wittenberg University is very aware of its presence within a community, and how Wittenberg and Springfield can help each other develop their potential.
Supporting Innovation While Valuing Tradition

The strategic planning process, with its many small, focused groups, invited brainstorming about new ways of doing things, new ways to combine courses into exciting areas of study, new ways to showcase student learning and to recognize the contributions of all members of the university. Many technological innovations of the past decade have made it much easier to perform our jobs in support of the mission, from e-mail to on-line student registration and records. Realizing that sometimes small ideas can create major impacts, President Erickson announced in his first address to the faculty that he would be setting up a small “seed” fund with his own annual gift to enable members of the community to offer innovative programs a trial run. The response from faculty quickly exhausted the initial fund, but helped identify many good ideas that either await funding under the strategic investment fund or were funded from other sources.

But change was not proposed as an attempt to break with the past. The new marketing and branding plan is based on fresh research about what is important about Wittenberg – about what sticks with students who have attended or even visited Wittenberg. The campaign will take as its departure point the long-time motto of the university, “Having light, we pass it on to others.” The motto, which could be viewed as uncomfortably condescending in some contexts, has been rejuvenated by the emphasis on light as energy made visible, and by connecting that central image to many key aspects of today’s Wittenberg (1.2B.xv). Other new traditions echo the idea of updating our understanding of our own heritage. In 2003, the university award Alma Lux was created, at the request of student government, to honor a junior man embodying the highest values of scholarship, leadership, and service held by the university. This award complemented the longstanding designation of a junior woman as Alma Mater. The Alma Mater, while certainly held as a high honor, threatened to become sexist at worst and quaint at best; by designing the Alma Lux Award, the university redirected attention to the values and aspirations valorized by both awards. Students themselves (the Class of 2006) have underlined Wittenberg’s traditions and heritage by commissioning a beautiful sculpture of a torch to be literally passed from the graduating senior class president to the next year’s class president at commencement. It is no small testament to the deeply-ingrained heritage and traditions of Wittenberg that the class officers developed this idea in complete ignorance of the concurrent Mindpower plans to make the torch the central theme of our new logo and branding strategy!

Finally, the values of both innovation and veneration find ample voice in the goals of the strategic plan. Respect for tradition pervades the call to renew the liberal arts core of the academic program, to seek openness and diversity, to enhance Wittenberg’s sense of community, and to renew and sustain the historic buildings of the heart of campus. But by the same token, the plan demands fresh goals and innovative strategies in its calls for pedagogical technology, a four-year developmental model of student success, an information commons, and distinctive academic programs. No matter how we may change to address a changing world, our goal is always to remain “distinctively Wittenberg.”
Organizational Environment
As has already been highlighted in other contexts in the self-study, the three presidencies of Tipson, Steinbrink, and Erickson, along with the important strategic planning processes and mission and values studies that overarched them, have led to many changes in the organization of administrative offices and their functions, as well in the actual personnel filling those roles in the last ten years. As has been detailed elsewhere, the Constitution and By-Laws of the Board of Directors, as well as the By-Laws of the Faculty, make clear that the faculty have primary control over the curriculum and academic matters, while the board, president, and senior staff have more control over operational aspects of the university – though always with the provisos that the academic is the defining mission to which all else contributes and that the faculty has a constitutional right and obligation to participate in decision-making. The president and the provost, then, remain the two key decision-makers, informed by accurate data and advice from the other members of senior staff. As we embark on fulfilling the goals of the strategic plan, it will be imperative that we are mindful of the primacy of the academic programs as the central bearer of responsibility for the university’s mission, and thus of the primacy of meeting academic needs as represented by the provost and faculty.

Core Component 2B
Wittenberg’s resource base supports its educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Wittenberg University is blessed in many ways in terms of its resources, and especially in a very talented and loyal group of faculty and staff members. We have also made strides in transforming the physical and technological environment of the campus in the past ten years. But in order to reward that employee base as we would like and to stay attractive to new students, Wittenberg also faces financial challenges in terms of endowment growth, budget deficits, fundraising, and setting priorities among our strategic goals. Ideally, we would implement all our strategic plan goals as soon as possible. Realistically, that is impossible; we must prioritize with vision as we prepare for our next major campaign. As we acquire additional funds, we also need to allocate resources in strategic mission-driven ways and to sustain open communication and consultation among major university constituencies.

Financial Resources
While Wittenberg has recorded many impressive accomplishments in the past ten years, and vision and enthusiasm for the future is running strong, some fiscal indicators have remained either stagnant or unstable, making it more difficult to plan for the future and realize our vision. The strategic plan recognizes in its goals that we need financial resources and fiscal responsibility in order to provide the kinds of educational programs and opportunities to which we aspire. The mood on campus is positive that we can achieve these goals, as we’ve achieved most of our past strategic planning goals, but we also realize that the Offices of Enrollment Management, Advancement, and Business and Finance will need to work seamlessly with each other and the broader campus community, all working to realize the mission by implementing elements of the strategic plan.
The *Defining Moments* campaign was successful in exceeding its original 75 million dollar goal in pledges. This major campaign has not only netted tangible results in the form of beautiful new educational buildings, but has also primed Wittenberg for another campaign in the near future. The Board of Directors has authorized more aggressive investment strategies since the 1997 team visit (see the introduction of this self-study and also the “Statement of Policy with Respect to Investment Assets of Wittenberg University” [4.1D.i] and current allocation model [4.1D.ii] in the resource room for more details) and it has paid off in an endowment market value that has increased 70%, from $63.9 million in 1996 to $108.8 million in 2006. Still, Wittenberg needs to fortify its endowment in order to create a more stable planning and operational environment and to compete on a more even playing field among its peer institutions. Table 2.1 shows the three groups of peer and aspirant colleges against which Wittenberg measures its operations.

### Table 2.1

**Comparative Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modified NCA</th>
<th>Select ELCA</th>
<th>Near 75th US News Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denison</td>
<td>Muhlenberg</td>
<td>Muhlenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus</td>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan</td>
<td>St. Olaf</td>
<td>Lewis and Clark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooster</td>
<td>Luther</td>
<td>Thomas Aquinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin</td>
<td>Susquehanna</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gettysburg</td>
<td>Gettysburg</td>
<td>Knox</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlham</td>
<td>Augustana</td>
<td>Spelman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePauw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham-Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sweet Briar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The modified NCAC group (our athletic conference plus and minus some members) was adopted over a decade ago to track our progress on competitive faculty salaries. Based on various criteria such as relative endowment, regional similarity, and direct competition for students and faculty members, the group against which we currently compare ourselves drops Hiram College and Wabash College as less similar to us and replaces them with Gettysburg College and DePauw University.

Additional comparison groups were defined from institutions more like us in mission (ELCA) or near the national rank aspired by the strategic plan as it became clear through two rounds of strategic planning over the past decade that the modified NCAC group did not advance institutional planning in a number of key categories. The following figure (2.1) shows Wittenberg’s relative endowment value compared to these three comparison groups. Among the NCAC group, our endowment places us at a distinct disadvantage, with the lowest actual endowment value per student FTE in the group, especially relative to the institutions with smaller student bodies whose endowments are similar to ours. The NCAC-based group, while in some ways an aspirant group, is a realistic comparison group in terms of the quality of teaching, faculty qualifications, liberal-arts-based curriculum, and regional competition for students.
The select ELCA comparative group, on the other hand, offers a group of colleges with similar missions, comparable endowments, and ready access to shared financial information. Given the prominence in our strategic plan of cementing a solid berth in the second-tier *U.S. News* ranking, a third group based on colleges near the 75th position in that ranking was adopted to supplement our traditional benchmark institutions. As figure 2.1 shows, these institutions near the 75th ranking are very similar to Wittenberg in endowment per FTE and raise the possibility that studying that group will widen the array of operational choices considered as we implement the strategic plan. Overall, then, this set of three comparison groups, while imperfect, provides realistic goals and benchmarks for ultimately attaining one of our strategic goals: to find a secure place in the second quartile of national liberal-arts colleges.

While a revised investment policy has indeed increased endowment growth, the improvement has also been slowed by other factors, especially exceeding our goal of limiting endowment expenditure to an amount equal to 5.5% of the three-year average of the endowment market value. When Wittenberg’s operating revenue has seen a shortfall in the last decade, it has usually been because of an unexpectedly small incoming class or high tuition discount. While overall enrollment has remained relatively stable, the fluctuating size of first-year classes and the concomitant impact that numbers of new students have on planning have been an area of concern. The institution responded to enrollment fluctuations by applying more disciplined student aid awards (assisted by professional consultants) and by the adoption of an enrollment management organizational structure that recognizes the dual roles of recruitment and retention in maintaining a stable enrollment, optimal in size and quality.

Wittenberg’s operations remain heavily tuition-driven, with an estimated 77% of total revenues coming from tuition and auxiliaries. Our Moody’s bond rating was lowered to Baa1 on April 1, 2005, due somewhat to the fluctuation in the size of incoming classes and a weak operating performance (the operating margins have been negative, although the operating cash flow margins have been small, but positive). The revised bond rating has, of course, increased our cost of borrowing, and we have no margin for additional debt.
By board action, endowment spending should be 5.5% of market value on a three year average. However, as the most readily available source of cash to balance the operating budget when net tuition and gifts fall beneath budget expectations, endowment spending has had to exceed that limit several times in recent years. The current five year budget model approved by the board includes the annual removal of a fixed dollar amount from the endowment for several years (that exceeds the 5.5% limit) as the endowment itself grows until the amount spent will fall within the goal of 5.5%.

Other strategies for funding necessary projects include increasing gifts and funding some special projects outside the regular operating budget. The Board of Directors has recently, for instance, authorized an allocation of funds for high-profile projects to increase the public appeal of Wittenberg; some such improvements include renovations of admissions-related public spaces in Recitation Hall and more open and picturesque landscaping around the historic entrance to campus. A similar arrangement was used to secure the services of Mindpower, Incorporated. The student apartment complexes Sprecher Place and Keller Place were financed by the builders and leased back to Wittenberg through an agreement negotiated by Darrell Kirchen, Vice President for Business and Finance, achieving an important institutional need for alternate housing for upper-class students without incurring new debt. The current board and the president see these kinds of special allocations as strategic investments in helping Wittenberg to project accurate images of our quality and core values, and they expect to see real returns in the areas of enrollment and advancement.

The percentages of the budget allocated to various functional areas of the university reinforce the centrality of the educational mission (Figure 2.2).

**Figure 2.2**

**Composition of Expenses 2006 (in thousands of dollars)**

In fiscal year 2006, instruction, academic support and student services accounted for 49% of spending excluding the costs to maintain the physical plant in which those activities occur. Although tuition, fees, and room and board have risen
modestly but steadily each of the last ten years, the revenue from these sources typically provides less than is required to fund actual operating costs (Figure 2.3).

**Figure 2.3**
Gap between Revenue and Expense per FTE

![Figure 2.3: Gap between Revenue and Expense per FTE](image)

The extremely competitive recruiting atmosphere among Ohio liberal-arts colleges makes it difficult for Wittenberg to raise tuition too much to reduce the gap between revenue and expense. Some of those peers (see Table 2.2) use their larger endowment per student and a larger contribution from unrestricted gifts to offset the difference between operating revenues and operating expenses.

**Table 2.2**
Non-tuition Sources of Revenue (Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Endowment Spending</th>
<th>Gifts/Grants (Unrestricted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ohio Wesleyan</td>
<td>4,285</td>
<td>6,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denison</td>
<td>9,904</td>
<td>2,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wooster</td>
<td>9,772</td>
<td>4,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenyon</td>
<td>14,708</td>
<td>2,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin</td>
<td>5,680</td>
<td>2,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wittenberg</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,337</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,540</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementing the strategic plan will require investment funds to fuel the first round of initiatives to start the institutional shift toward a self-sustaining financial model. While the faculty is doing its part by revising the curriculum to align with the strategic plan and sustain Wittenberg’s mission, in October 2006 the board of directors approved a three-million-dollar transformation investment fund to be spent
over the next three years under the approval of President Erickson (4.1E). Well aware that Wittenberg must make significant operational progress toward a sustainable financial model over the next decade, senior administration and the board also recognize that some of the changes necessary will require immediate investments in people and programs carefully selected through the lens of the strategic plan. A process for reviewing proposed expenditures of the investment funds and criteria upon which proposals will be judged are in place. Each proposal must demonstrate alignment with the strategic plan, highlight the extent of expected collaboration on campus and outreach beyond campus, project the impacts of the proposal, and include a financial plan with metrics for evaluation of outcomes. The strategic plan implementation committee will review proposals and advise the president on final allocation of investment funds to the best among the expected many worthy projects that could propel us toward changes that will transform the place, attract top students, and inspire our base of support.

Advancement Philosophy and Planning

With a new Vice President for Advancement and a newly-energized and reorganized Office of Advancement, we have increased the focus on major gifts to bolster the endowment, to allow funding of special projects outside the regular operating budget, and to allow less spending of endowment income for annual operations. We will also be working to increase the percentage of alumni participation in the annual fund: although it has increased from 21.3% in 1996-1997 to 23% in fiscal year 2006, we will strive to inspire our alumni to support Wittenberg’s future financial health at even higher rates. We have set a goal of 30% participation for 2006-2007 and $10 million in total gifts for the year. The improved assessment and accounting practices of the office are discussed in more detail below. Improvement in the amount of unrestricted gift dollars obtained annually is essential as the third element of increasing revenue to support operations.

Perhaps the most exciting development in the Office of Advancement is a planning culture not only focused on major gifts, but driven by the strategic plan and its priorities. As noted in Chapter One, the plan is still broad and quite ambitious, but an implementation team including members of Senior Staff and the Faculty Executive Board, is assigning priorities and defining major projects with cooperation from the vice president for advancement to ensure not only that our plans inspire generous giving, but that gifts support the university’s identified priorities.

The Office of Advancement has also retained the services of top-tier consultants to aid in the process of planning for the next campaign. Peter Buchanan and Karin George of Washburn & McGoldrick both have impeccable credentials in fundraising for the liberal-arts institution; George was formerly the Vice President for Development at Smith College and at Vassar College, while Buchanan is the former vice president at both Columbia University and Wellesley College and the president emeritus of the Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE). With their expert advice on the board’s role in fundraising and organizational structures appropriate for our needs, our own clarification of priorities, and the energy and professionalism of our restructured Office of Advancement, Wittenberg is in an excellent position to open a very successful major campaign within the next few years.
Managing Tuition Resources

With a new vice president for enrollment management and, indeed, a new model for enrollment management, Wittenberg plans to stabilize our new class size and overall enrollments over the next few years while controlling tuition discount. Even though we are a heavily tuition-dependent institution, we must manage the amount of tuition revenue carefully so that we are also able to attract and retain a student body whose size and mix uses Wittenberg’s educational and facilities resources optimally.

Wittenberg first tackled the problem of growing tuition discounts in the late 1990s, after a 55% discount rate was noted as a concern by the 1997 visit team. As explained in the introduction, at that time, Bill Hall of Applied Policy Research was hired to help manage financial aid packages to reduce our tuition discount rate and increase net revenue per student. By about 2000, that rate was between 50% and 52%, typical of a private, liberal-arts college in our region. As we moved toward a more complete enrollment management approach, however, it became clear that targeting financial aid alone would not give us the control and stability we desire for elements of admission such as class size, diversity, academic profile, geographic diversity, “fit,” and yield, all of which are crucial to Goals B and D of the strategic plan. As mentioned above, we recently initiated a consultancy with Brian Zucker of Human Capital Resources to design a more holistic approach to marketing (based on the Mindpower Incorporated branding concepts), recruiting, making admission decisions, and constructing financial aid packages. In coming years, as we become more accustomed to producing the data required for this sophisticated modeling, we have every confidence that the tuition discount rate will decrease; more importantly, we look forward to a more reliable and consistent forecast of revenue from tuition and auxiliaries.

Wittenberg’s Wealth of Human Capital

President Erickson is fond of saying that he was drawn to lead Wittenberg because of its people, and most people who have dedicated any length of time to the place would doubtless concur. Significant numbers of Wittenberg employees dedicate tremendous energy to making Wittenberg a better place, and they do so persistently and loyally. Over the last five years, for instance, a steady 38 to 40 per cent of the employees, including faculty members, have been at Wittenberg ten or more years (5.4A). The faculty has grown from 143.16 in 1997-1998 to 155.84 in 2005-2006, with a high point of 160.25 in 2002-2003. The change in numbers of faculty has been related to a fluctuating enrollment, to be sure, but in that time the university has also attempted to seize the opportunity to lower the student: faculty ratio. In academic year 1997-1998, the actual student: faculty ratio was 14.01:1, while today’s lower enrollments and reduced number of full time faculty have resulted in a 12.4:1 ratio in 2006-2007, more in line with our nearest comparison group of schools. Since one of Wittenberg’s real and perceived strengths is the opportunity for students to have a close relationship with a faculty mentor, this lower ratio seems appropriate to its mission, and the 13:1 student: faculty ratio is indeed among the earliest-met goals of the new strategic plan.

The same ten years have seen a significant growth in the number of administrative appointments, from 109.63 FTE in 1997-1998 to 120.7 in 2005-2006. The student: administrative staff ratio has thus gone from 18.3:1 to 15.83:1. Many of the additional appointments may be accounted for by the necessary addition of administrative positions to support technology, fundraising and admissions, but those are also
somewhat offset by the removal of professional librarians from the administrative category in the 2000-2001 school year (they now occupy a singular category, though they hold faculty rank). Thus, the administrative staff has grown more quickly than the faculty relative to the size of the student body. Support staff has remained nearly identical in its ratio to students during the last decade: 19.35:1 in 1997-1998 and 19.33:1 in 2005-2006.

The workforce of Wittenberg has also made gains in diversity of some kinds while remaining roughly the same in others. For instance, gender diversity among the faculty has increased dramatically over the last ten years, going from 36 per cent women in 1997-1998 to 43 per cent women in 2005-2006. The demographic shift in gender increases even more dramatically when one considers length of service at Wittenberg; in 2005-2006, faculty members with more than ten years of experience were roughly 33 per cent women and 67 per cent men, while among those with ten years of experience or fewer, women make up 51 per cent of the faculty and men 49 per cent. The overall gender distribution of the total employee base has remained stable during the decade: the workforce was 50.4 per cent women and 49.6 per cent men in 1997-1998, while the distribution in 2005-2006 was 52.8 per cent women and 47.2 per cent men with lopsided distributions among support staff (95.5 per cent women), physical plant (96.3 per cent men), and security (93.3 per cent men).

Ethnic diversity, on the other hand, has enjoyed only modest increases over the past decade. In the 1996-1997 school year, 6.4 per cent of the workforce identified themselves as a member of a minority ethnic group. By the 2005-2006 school year, however, that percentage was 8.04 per cent. This increase, though small, represents progress; the strategic plan, however, challenges us to increase representative diversity even more in order to create a truly global learning environment and to attract top students eager to inhabit and learn in such an environment. Our planning suggests that the more diverse a group of people is, the more it will attract diverse new members.

Diversity in age and experience is a double-edged sword as Wittenberg faces the future. The high (and stable) percentage of employees with over ten years in service at Wittenberg (hovering around 40 per cent since 1999) suggests a wealth of institutional knowledge and great personal commitments to the university. But with a good number of those long-serving individuals headed for or already past the traditional retirement age of 65, the institution must intentionally engage in broad conversations that will pass institutional culture between generations.

**Compensation**

Attracting and retaining an outstanding faculty is extremely important to Wittenberg – so much so that it constitutes one of the major goals of the strategic plan. Since long before the period covered in this self-study, raising the relative level of faculty compensation has been an elusive goal – one discussed by numerous task forces and planning groups over the years. During much of the 1980s, for instance, the university’s administration and board aspired to AAUP faculty salary ratings of 1+. It became increasingly clear in the 1990s, however, that regional cost of living and financial realities made that goal less relevant. At that time, we shifted our comparison group to include members of the North Coast Athletic Conference (NCAC), which we joined in 1989. Also in the 1990s, Wittenberg underwent significant belt-tightening, falling routinely to the bottom or near the bottom of the salary rankings even within the NCAC.
In the wake of recent strategic planning, we have expanded our number of comparison groups for future planning (selected Lutheran colleges, for instance, or those near our aspirant position of mid-second tier in the Carnegie rankings of national liberal-arts colleges). A number of factors make such groups difficult to define and track in terms of faculty compensation, though, including access to reliable data, differences in regional cost of living, and typical admission base. So while efforts to identify additional comparison groups continue, our current strategic plan still references the NCAC-based comparison group in its goals for faculty compensation.

Within that context, Wittenberg has languished near the bottom of the NCAC-based group in terms of faculty salaries at all ranks. We have ranked eighth, ninth, or tenth in all categories since at least 1999; one can easily argue that Oberlin, with its enormous endowment, is something of an outlier in this financial comparison, but even without its presence at the top of the salary rankings, Wittenberg has significant ground to make up to reach our goal of being solidly placed in the second tier of national liberal arts colleges in the *U.S. News and World Report* rankings. All of the other colleges in this NCAC-based group are in tiers one and two; certainly Wittenberg’s faculty offers professional credentials and dedication to their students comparable to those of the other institutions in the group, so that our aspirations, both in terms of salaries and in the values that salaries signal, are attainable and desirable.

Because of the centrality of the faculty to the university’s educational mission and the public ways in which that centrality is recognized (in determining college rankings, etc.), Wittenberg has targeted raising faculty salaries relative to appropriate comparison groups. Toward that end, for the 2005-2006 academic year, faculty members and non-faculty workers were awarded different salary increases, with faculty members enjoying a five per cent increase and non-faculty employees a four per cent increase. This differentiation departed from recent past practice, but was an attempt to shore up lagging faculty salaries (the across-the-board increase in the two years previous had been two per cent in 2004-2005 and three per cent in 2003-2004). After the one-time boost in 2005-2006, the standard increase again dropped to three per cent across the board. A merit-based pay system (part of the salary pool awarded across the board, with the rest distributed in higher percentages for merit, high merit, and highest merit) was briefly revived in the late 1990s, but was ultimately abandoned on recommendation from the faculty because of both the scanty salary pools available in some years and the difficulty of determining levels of merit (or non-merit) for individuals without damaging morale.

While our salary scale has not so far kept Wittenberg from hiring a truly impressive, deeply committed faculty, some departments have not been able to convince their top candidates to come to Wittenberg in the face of other offers. On the other hand, other departments have still been able to hire junior faculty members away from more lucrative posts because of the value Wittenberg places on strong pedagogy and collegiality. And certainly some disciplines will find the competition from private sector jobs and public universities more challenging than others. But whether we privilege the optimistic or pessimistic outlook, we find ourselves at a tipping point in terms of how our salary scale positions us in relation to competing institutions. Raising the salary scale is an important part of the strategic plan to claim our place among our peers (Goal E, objective 2).

Compensation for non-faculty workers at Wittenberg is examined every three years by external compensation consultants and adjusted to stay competitive with the local market. Some workers, such as those in physical plant and security, do
enjoy collective bargaining contracts and thus derive their levels of compensation from negotiation in the specific environment of Springfield. The Office of Human Resources also considers market forces, as well as the requirements of particular jobs, in setting the classification and pay level for administrative and hourly employees; such classifications are determined by a team appointed by the president. Pay ranges for administrative staff are set at the 50th percentile of the local market. Finally, the highest-level administrative positions offer individually-negotiated compensation packages benchmarked to the national recruitment market and CUPA salary data. For all kinds and levels of compensation, of course, the marketplace helps to determine a fair level of compensation and, as demonstrated in an earlier section, employees do express their loyalty to Wittenberg with their longevity of employment.

Benefits

Wittenberg University offers a wide array of employee benefits, including health care, retirement, child care, tuition scholarships and waivers, and relocation benefits. Although some of the benefits do not answer all employees’ needs, in general the plans are reliable, and staff members in the Office of Human Resources are helpful in dealing with problems or special situations.

Approximately 79 per cent of Wittenberg’s employees participate in the university’s health care plan, a percentage that has remained roughly similar for at least the past five years. However, since the number of full-time employees has grown over that period, the number of people enrolled in the plan has grown by about eight per cent in the last five years. Wittenberg sponsors a wellness program (of which the two most popular and effective elements are the annual health screenings at no cost and Weight Watchers) that contributes to our favorable claims experience. And, as is the case across the country, health care costs have risen in recent years; health care costs for fiscal year 2004-2005 totaled $2,363,000, making it the single most costly benefit. In 2005, ELCA University and College Health (ELCAUCH) recommended a 13.4 per cent health plan cost increase and a staggering 29.4 per cent increase in 2006. To minimize the shock of cost increases and track the actual local rate of increases more accurately, Wittenberg’s Human Resources and Business offices have adjusted rates twice annually, rather than once; furthermore, because of a positive claims history, we have been able to maintain acceptable fund balances in our trust even without the full increases recommended by our claims administrators. For instance, the university was able to forego a scheduled increase in fall, 2004 because of positive claims experience in preceding months and a redesign of the plan in 2003. Rates were raised by two per cent in spring, 2005 and again by 5.5 per cent in the fall for a total increase of 7.5 per cent in calendar year 2005. It is likely that we will continue to re-evaluate health care costs and adjust contributions on a biannual schedule. Not infrequently, the university has made a supplemental contribution to maintain the required health trust reserves (as recently as 2006).

Furthermore, our current generous retiree health-care benefits will continue to lead to ever-larger post-retirement benefit obligations (approximately $1.65 million), even though the rate has not increased for retirees for ten years. Retirees basically receive a Medicare supplemental plan and the standard Wittenberg prescription plan. In addition, the financial statement of activities reflects an annual periodic cost adjustment of $1.8 million that contributes directly to the annual loss in our statements of financial condition. Because of this, the university is exploring various
options (including the fixed contribution program for professors emeriti) to reduce this obligation and its corresponding liability, including the option of eliminating the current fixed benefit program for those hired in the future.

But though the health-care benefit is costly, it also is generally appreciated by employees. The benefit involves a preferred provider organization (PPO) which numbers among its participant providers a very high proportion of area doctors and care providers, so most health care visits can be easily attended to with a simple, fifteen-dollar co-pay. The plan also covers major medical costs for hospitalization and surgery, as well as a lab benefit. The plan, despite ever-rising rate increases and periodic adjustments, is designed to be user-friendly and to minimize red tape and paperwork. For example, the insurance program provides significant discounts for all prescriptions locally and deeper discounts through the mail-order prescription benefit for maintenance medications. The prescription benefit, with its simple flat-fee structure for generic and name-brand drugs, is appreciated for its convenience and cost-efficiency.

Wittenberg’s also offers an attractive defined contribution retirement program through TIAA-CREF. The employee is required to contribute five per cent of his or her gross pay in order to receive a contribution equal to ten per cent of gross pay from Wittenberg. Of the 394 faculty and staff members who are eligible for the program, 357 participate, representing a 90.6 per cent participation rate. During the 2004-2005 school year, Wittenberg spent $1,669,917 in funding this benefit.

Wittenberg also pays the insurance premium on life insurance and accidental death and dismemberment for eligible employees. The benefit is equal to 1.5 times the employee’s annual salary, and the benefit carries into retirement. The approximate cost for 2004-2005 was $72,000 for active employees and retirees. Faculty and staff may also purchase supplemental life insurance.

In addition to these standard insurance and retirement-related benefits, Wittenberg offers a number of very attractive benefits to support its employees in their attempts to balance family life and professional life. Wittenberg subscribes fully to the requirements of the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA), and Provosts Greer and Bladh have worked creatively to adapt the requirements of the act to faculty members whose primary teaching obligations come in blocks of fifteen to seventeen weeks rather than the plan’s six. The administration and faculty have also shown creativity and leadership in crafting a cutting-edge parental leave benefit that covers both birth parents and adoptive parents. Childcare is another area in which Wittenberg tries to provide a valuable benefit, but the delivery of that benefit is not always as successful as might be hoped. The university subsidizes thirteen slots at nearby Mercy Hospital’s Bright Beginnings childcare facility. But because those thirteen slots are further subdivided by age groups, at times there are not enough spaces for one group while spots in other age groups go unused. In 2005-2006, the faculty appointed a childcare task force to assess availability of and need for childcare and make recommendations. The task force’s report (5.3D) is currently under review by Strategic Planning Implementation Group E.

Perhaps the most valuable benefit in keeping excellent faculty and staff members at Wittenberg is our program of tuition scholarships and waivers. Full-time employees are able to take up to 16 semester hours of credit per year without paying tuition. The spouses of employees are also eligible to take two courses per year tuition-free. The most popular element of the plan, though, is that dependent children of employees are eligible for full tuition waiver at Wittenberg (for faculty members and administrators’
children, upon employment; for hourly staff, after one year of employment). In addition, dependents of tenured faculty members and administrators employed for at least five years are eligible for a tuition scholarship to another college for up to the full amount of current Wittenberg tuition or the tuition of the college attended, whichever is lower. The cost of this benefit may vary quite a bit annually based on the number of dependents enrolled and the tuition costs of the schools attended. Since 2000, the annual cost ranged between $200,000 and $600,000. The knowledge that their children will be provided for educationally is a decisive factor in keeping some faculty members here despite potentially higher salaries elsewhere, and thus, it is a well-placed investment in keeping a well-qualified, loyal, and productive faculty and administration. The analogous tuition remission benefit for the children of staff to attend Wittenberg attracts equally well-qualified and dedicated individuals to serve the institution at all levels.

Finally, Wittenberg invests generously in professional development opportunities for faculty and staff alike, spending nearly $34,000 in 2004-2005 on travel grants, tuition reimbursements, and computer training for administrative and hourly staff. Administrators employed for a minimum of six years may also request an administrative study leave for three months at full pay or for six months at half-pay. These requests, which must contain detailed plans for professional growth, are addressed to and decided upon by the president.

The faculty sabbatical program is generous and highly valued. Tenured faculty members are eligible for sabbatical leave every seventh year of their service; they may take one semester at full pay or two semesters at three-quarters pay, and those two semesters may be in the same academic year, the same calendar year, or spaced through the seven-year cycle. If one chooses the “split” sabbatical option, the pay cut can be spread across twelve paychecks rather than just one semester, cushioning the financial impact somewhat. Applications for sabbatical leave include planned projects in appropriate professional activities and pedagogical development and are made to the Faculty Personnel Board (FPB), which then recommends the granting (or not) of sabbatical leave to the provost and the president, who make a final decision. In special circumstances, the provost may ask a faculty member to take an administrative deferral of sabbatical leave, so that the faculty member can take the leave in a year other than the seventh in order to adumbrate the impact on departmental staffing, for instance. If such a deferral is arranged, it does not alter or re-set the individual’s seven-year sabbatical cycle. Faculty members write a report on their sabbatical accomplishments to the FPB and Provost after returning from the leave.

The faculty deeply values the university’s sabbatical program; in the provost’s deliberations on how to trim the academic budget for the shortfall in 2005-2006, he presented alternatives to the department chairs and program directors for debate; almost unanimously, they preferred to not renew some visiting lines or to do without some adjunct appointments rather than freeze sabbaticals. It is a costly and generous program: in 2004-2005, salary paid to faculty members on sabbatical totaled $1,348,000, while three full-time visiting professors to cover courses for those faculty members on sabbatical were paid $172,187, including benefits. Still, the sabbatical program, along with the parental leave policy and the tuition scholarship and waiver programs, allow Wittenberg to recruit and retain excellent teacher-scholars even though our average salaries are lower than those at most colleges with whom we compete for faculty members. The faculty very much appreciates that the administration is willing to look for other ways to lower costs so that the sabbatical program is preserved.
Deploying Human Resources

As is the case at many small liberal-arts colleges, many Wittenberg faculty and staff members feel overwhelmed by the sheer amount of work they have to do. For instance, although some offices (Office of the Registrar, School of Community Education) have slightly increased staffing in the last ten years, others, such as Thomas Library, the Office of Student Development, the Physical Plant, the Office of International Education, and the Office of Career Development, are concerned that they are not able to carry out some of their most creative initiatives because staffing is so tight. As we move toward objectives of the strategic plan, the staffing in some areas may need to be increased or current tasks removed in keeping with the emphases of the mission and the strategic plan (larger roles for international education and career development, for instance, are emphasized throughout the plan).

A number of administrative offices are also undergoing, or have recently undergone, redefinition of reporting lines and organization as a natural outcome of new leadership. Even when the interim director does an excellent job, the changes in leadership can slow down or stop progress on other administrative goals. Increased staffing within strategically more important areas that would allow some duplication of institutional knowledge and capacity would increase our ability to adapt quickly to new challenges and opportunities. But with staffing stretched thin, some areas will have to accomplish their unique tasks without the luxury of knowing the other functions and procedures of the office, let alone of other offices.

The role and responsibilities of faculty, as well, continue to expand. While excellent teaching is central to Wittenberg’s identity, faculty members are also expected to be professionally active in their fields, to participate in faculty governance, to assume quasi-administrative roles such as department chair and program director, and increasingly, to be involved in student recruitment and university public relations and advancement. Yet these multiple roles are not distributed evenly among faculty; faculty workload and the way it is figured can sometimes contribute to seasonal malaise on campus. Faculty workload is figured in terms of teaching credits, which are calculated based solely on contact time in class, with labs generally credited one hour for each two in lab (but not all departments that teach labs follow the same formula). Variables such as numbers of students, conferencing time, and detailed feedback on papers in writing-intensive courses are not taken into account, for instance. Administrative appointments such as service as department chair or program director are generally carved out of teaching workloads in units of four credits, since most departments offer only four- and five-credit courses. But this system is a fairly blunt instrument; while multiple course units may make sense for time-consuming jobs such as chairing a large department with a complex schedule, many majors, and frequent hiring and personnel processes, some administrative appointments may not equate very well to the work of a four-credit course. And while a faculty task force reviewed the workload and responsibilities of department chairs and determined the amount of their course releases, other appointments for which release time is received have not been reviewed systematically, but have grown from sometimes arbitrary or unique arrangements to become expected perquisites over time. A thorough review of workload issues, though it would no doubt be controversial, might ultimately aid faculty morale.

Another aspect of using faculty resources wisely involves the employment of full-time visiting instructors in some situations other than one-to-one sabbatical
replacements. For instance, in a large department such as English, many professors may have some course release time for administrative duties, and the department contributes many sections to interdisciplinary programs such as the Wittenberg Seminars (WittSems) and the Honors Program. Additionally, a large proportion (half to two-thirds) of an individual’s course load may be in 100-level courses. Combined with the fluctuating numbers of first-year students, these elements may dictate that full-time visitors can supply excellent first-year composition courses, for instance, to fill out the large number required for the entering class. Thus, some visiting instructors are covering a variety of general courses because of a combination of semester-long sabbatical leaves, course releases, and contributions to interdisciplinary programs. Such visitors are most common in departments that teach a high proportion of general education courses, especially foundational ones, such as English, foreign languages, and mathematics. The use of visiting instructors rather than a pool of adjuncts, while more costly, also gives departments more control over the quality of teaching and the visiting instructor’s availability to students.

Furthermore, the use of visiting instructors and adjuncts has allowed flexibility in times of uncertainty. In the case of new programs or departments, for example, including a full-time visiting position in the staffing mix initially allows time to assess the relative demand for the new program so that permanent staffing can be matched to student needs. When the communication major was inaugurated in 2000, it began with three tenure-track positions authorized and a fourth visiting position. Based on the number of majors declared and the heavy demand for both courses and advising, the fourth line was recently redefined as a tenure-track position. In an environment in which many smaller departments are composed of only tenured faculty members, visiting positions may help gauge the need for replacements when a retirement occurs. The university has successfully avoided the danger of having a two-tiered faculty; visiting instructors still make up only 5% of the faculty and are well-integrated into the lives of their various departments.

Other Investments in Educational Quality

While human capital is surely Wittenberg’s most significant asset in delivering an excellent liberal-arts education, its facilities, technology, and academic services provide a vitally important environment within which that education takes place. As with compensation and benefits and other measures of healthy resource allocation, Wittenberg has made significant progress in the past decade, but has still loftier goals in its sights.

Under the leadership of Assistant Provost for Academic Services Lisa Rhine, both our Math Workshop and our Writing Center have been reviewed and have received International Certification by the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA), endorsed by the National Association for Developmental Education, Commission XVI of the American College Personnel Association, the American Council of Developmental Education Associations and the National Tutoring Association. Certification recognizes the validity of the skills and training of our student tutors and rewards them for their successful completion of the approved training. Other new programs in the Office of Academic Services, though modest in cost, are improving support services for learning. Some of these programs include a web-based early warning system for students struggling academically or socially, summer on-campus pre-orientation programs to allow entering students to design their own first-year
fall schedules and grow accustomed to the campus, and an academic intervention program, RITA (Realizing Improvement Through Action) for students on probation. Early indications, though not conclusive, suggest that these programs may be having an impact; retention from first to second year improved almost three percentage points this past year. Although it is impossible to pinpoint yet which factors may have contributed to that increased retention, the combined effects of more support and self-help programs and increased intentional staff attention to finding and helping students at risk for whatever reason most certainly contribute to the recent improvements in retention. Our challenge is both to sustain these improvements and to create new ones.

A number of projects called for in the strategic plan to improve academic support services will continue to require investment, including the development and eventual certification of our new Foreign Language Learning Center, more intentional and assessable academic and career advising systems, a more comprehensive first year program and continuing improvements to the implementation of existing programs for academic support.

Wittenberg has made significant progress on its goals for learning technologies (see responses to the 1997 visit team in the introduction), but the quick pace of change in both hardware and software constantly challenges our budgeting for technology. Despite a large growth in the number of staff members in the Computing Center, the office still is not able to offer all the services it would wish to, and although the Board of Directors has approved a funding cycle for desktop and server computers to be replaced every three years, audio-visual equipment every five years, and network infrastructure every seven years, the recommended cycles have not been funded in the annual budget. Just as we are challenged by our large backlog of deferred maintenance to buildings (discussed in more detail below), we are also finding that technological resources often are outdated long before they can be replaced.

Despite tight budgets in many areas, Wittenberg has continued to invest in new and updated facilities in recent years. The Defining Moments campaign laid the foundation (literally as well as figuratively) for the two new major academic facilities, Hollenbeck Hall and the Keil Wing of the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center. New or updated student residences such as the Keller Place and Sprecher Place Apartments (2002, 2003), the renovation of historic Myers Hall (ongoing), and the new residence hall (2006) have been designed not only to be more attractive to students, but to offer easy access to technological services, provide a variety of social and study spaces, and integrate students’ living and learning more fully. Other major facilities constructed or overhauled in the past decade are largely related to athletics. The David B. and Georgiana S. Albright Tennis Complex was dedicated in 1997. Updates to the surface and facilities at Earl F. Morris Track and Edwards-Maurer Field were completed in 2005, as was construction of the Bob Rosencrans Fitness Center, open to students and faculty. The Heinzen Strength Center also received new equipment and aesthetic improvements. All of these, with the exception of the athletic facilities, were specifically identified as major priorities in the 1996 strategic plan; the 2006 strategic plan identifies clear goals for continuing enhancement of facilities and infrastructure, as well as for academic programs, student cultivation, and faculty development.

But despite the success of these new facilities, Wittenberg faces challenges in allocating resources for physical facilities, as well. While President Erickson is optimistic that a university benefactor will come forward to name the new residence hall, the building was commissioned in 2004 with funding obtained from a bond.
While board members would no doubt have preferred to have leadership funding for the building from the start, they felt that the impact of a new, state-of-the-art residence facility would be so great as to outweigh any qualms about this method of financing it. Estimated costs for deferred maintenance on existing buildings remain daunting, tallying approximately $17,112,910 as of May 2006.

Past Achievements and Future Goals
Wittenberg has a record of achieving the campaign goals it sets. Since the late 1970s, the university has completed three major campaigns, each exceeding its goal. The Campaign for Wittenberg (1978-1982) set a goal of $16.7 million and eventually brought in $20.1 million. For approximately ten years following that successful campaign, the university pursued project-by-project fundraising rather than traditional multi-year campaigns, until the 1994-1995 Sesquicentennial Challenge, which exceeded its $15.5 million goal by $3.2 million, for a total of $18.3 million. Most recently, the Defining Moments campaign from 1998-2002 received pledges for $5.5 million beyond its $75 million goal. Clearly, Wittenberg can meet its fundraising goals and has stretched its target with each successive campaign, and current plans for another major comprehensive campaign no doubt lay the groundwork carefully for another such success.

Summary
While our endowment has grown substantially in the past decade, and new facilities and technology enhance the learning environment and the beauty of the campus, financial challenges remain the single biggest obstacle to the achievement of our strategic goals. But a more professionalized Office of Advancement focused on major gifts and a more integrated enrollment management approach to admission, financial aid, and retention promise to stabilize and grow revenues from tuition, fees and auxiliaries and also increase the number and dollar amount of gifts. We also need to make sure that our endowment is managed prudently but profitably in order to supply the secure foundation we need for the innovative programs outlined in the strategic plan.

Core Component 2C
Wittenberg’s ongoing evaluation and assessment processes provide reliable evidence of institutional effectiveness that clearly informs strategies for continuous improvement.

Planning for assessment of academic programs gained special mention from the 1997 visiting team for Wittenberg’s forward-looking stance. Likewise, clear and fair processes for annual review, tenure, and promotion of faculty members rely on transparency and consistent feedback from multiple sources regarding expectations and evaluation. Administrative offices, however, have been slower and less consistent in embraces a culture of formal individual assessment. In most cases, however, recent changes within administrative offices will lead to a more unified, goal-oriented process of assessment across the university. It is clear that President Erickson and senior staff are committed to positive change in this area at all levels of the organization.
Assessment of Academic Programs

The 1997 Higher Learning Commission Visit Team identified as a strength the fact that “there is strong faculty support for an excellent assessment plan which relates closely to the learning goals of the general education curriculum.” The development of learning goals and assessment plans followed closely on the heels of a change from ten-week trimesters to fifteen-week semesters, and a concomitant adjustment of course offerings and requirements. In the early years of the past decade, assessment focused on learning outcomes in academic majors and on refining the process for oversight by the Committee on Assessment of Student Learning. The first cycle of reporting included only departmental majors and set up a structure of three groups of departments, each group submitting a report every third year (based on information gathered annually). Exemplary processes, instruments, and report formats were shared with department chairs to guide them in this first cycle of information gathering, evaluating, and reporting. The Assessment Committee responded to each report thoroughly, with both laudatory recognition and suggestions for continued improvement. After the first full cycle of reporting, interdisciplinary programs (some offering majors, some minors) were also required to participate in program assessment; in 2000, to provide for timely review by the Assessment Committee, the newly-enlarged list of programs was divided into four groups and a new four-year cycle of reporting set. While more detailed discussion and analysis of the results of these assessments will feature prominently in Chapter Three, it is important to emphasize here that the learning goals model is more than simply a matter of style; it reflects a conscious commitment to the centrality of student learning to our mission.

Assessment of the general education program, residing, as it does, in many courses across all departments, has not been as easy to implement as program assessment, but we nonetheless have gained valuable insights. Revisions to the Departmental Assessment Plan in 2000 clarified the roles of the departments and programs in assessing foundational general education outcomes in two courses, those assigned to specific departments (foreign language, math, writing) and four learning goals expected to be met within majors (computing, diversity, research, speaking). In 2004, the general education learning goals not already assigned in one of the aforementioned categories became the focus of analysis by the Assessment and General Education Committees. Keil Professor of Psychology Jo Wilson led in developing and administering a local survey instrument on the attainment of general education learning goals to members of the class of 2006. Again, analysis of this indirect assessment will be featured in Chapter Three.

The university has embraced opportunities for cooperative and comparative external assessments, as well. In 2004, the faculty voted to replace our locally-developed teaching evaluation instrument with the IDEA (Individual Development & Educational Assessment) system from Kansas State University; the system allows for professors to define and rank their learning goals for their students as a context for students’ evaluation of the course and their progress in it. Thus, diagnostic and comparative analyses focus intentionally on alignment of student learning with the professor’s expressed learning goals, and the summary analyses provide instructors with suggestions for teaching strategies to continue use of or to consider using. Although we are still relatively early in the process of learning fully the advantages and special requirements of the system, it clearly has the potential to give us very good
indirect assessment information on a number of different learning goals central to both departmental and general education effectiveness.

In 2005, Wittenberg and five other selective, Phi Beta Kappa, liberal-arts institutions in the Midwest (Augustana University, Luther College, Gustavus Adolphus College, Illinois Wesleyan University, and Alma College) earned a grant from the Teagle Foundation to participate in the national Collegiate Learning Assessment project. We just completed the first year of a three-year study on measures (including the CLA exam) that demonstrate the improvement in critical and analytical thinking over the course of an undergraduate liberal-arts education. As stated in the grant proposal,

We will explore skills and dispositions central to college education and to the liberal arts: writing, critical thinking/analytic reasoning, and civic engagement. Though the consortium institutions state these goals in different ways, we all aim to educate students to become clear and effective thinkers, to communicate effectively, and to productively engage with the world. This connection between intellectual development – particularly consideration of multiple perspectives – and awareness of larger moral and social issues has long been addressed in the literature (Perry, Belenky, Clincky, King, et. al.) and will be a major emphasis of our research.

In June, 2006, faculty members from each campus met at Alma College to develop and evaluate rubrics for the evaluation of student writing; these rubrics were then applied to first-year and junior-year writing samples from all six campuses. The scoring of these writing samples will be correlated with the outcomes of the CLA exam administered on each campus. The group also had preliminary conversations on critical thinking in preparation for a meeting in September 2006 at Illinois Wesleyan. The data produced during the course of this grant-supported study will no doubt both verify that we do a good job of developing basic intellectual skills and values in our students, and suggest ways that we can do so even better.

In addition to ongoing assessment within academic departments, Provost Bladh has instituted a program of targeted external program reviews. Each department must formally propose any new full-time faculty line, even if that line would replace a retiring or resigning tenured colleague. This approach allows the university to examine changes in students’ interest in the disciplines and to target university growth toward those areas that need it most, as well as encouraging departments to consider changes over time within their own discipline as to specialties and how they might be defined. In order to bring a wider perspective into the discussion, departments are required to submit as part of their proposal a formal external program review (funded by the Office of the Provost) that has taken place within the preceding five years. Since the implementation of this system, fourteen departments have participated in such an external program review, often with results and recommendations that department members found encouraging and liberating. Five more departments will receive such a review this academic year, as will Thomas Library.

In sum, a multi-layered approach to assessment of academic programs, teaching effectiveness, and student learning affirms that Wittenberg delivers the central thing that its mission promises: an outstanding liberal-arts education.
Assessment in Administrative Offices

Office of the Provost

As the vice presidential officer in charge of the academic areas of the university, the provost is of course involved in and familiar with the kinds of assessment noted above. That familiarity with a culture of assessment clearly affects the operations of the many administrative offices reporting to the provost, as well. The provost receives reports evaluating the performance of individuals (annual reviews of untenured faculty members and members of his staff), departments and programs, faculty committees, and offices administering academic support programs and learning resources, including the Office of Academic Services, the Office of Academic Programs, the Office of the Registrar, the Athletics Department, the School of Community Education, the Office of Community Service, the Office of International Education, the Computing Center, Thomas Library, and the Office of Career Services. The particular goals, needs, achievements, and assessment outlooks of most of these offices will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three, but it is clear that the Office of the Provost assesses performance of both individuals and reporting units regularly and productively.

In their annual reporting process, the administrators managing these areas are asked to set specific goals and identify strategies for achieving them. The Assistant Provost for Academic Services, for instance, has identified specific percentage-point targets for improvements in our student retention in particular situations; the first incremental goal was met and exceeded spectacularly when our first- to second-year retention improved by approximately 3% in 2006 over 2005. The Offices of Community Service and International Education both recently targeted improved oversight processes and worked with their faculty advisory committees to put in place policies that will help them reach their goals. The Computing Center sets clear goals in terms of installation and replacement of hardware and network systems. Thomas Library notes specific goals for implementation of new information technologies and their accessibility to Wittenberg’s students, staff, and faculty. Of course, not all these goals always receive the financial support necessary (continuing needs will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three), but the offices reporting to the provost do engage in goal-setting and annual reporting of their progress toward those goals.

Most of these offices also report frustration with the de-centralized, sometimes ad hoc state of institutional research and data availability. While many of these offices and many academic departments note improvements in technological access to such processes as registration and to student information such as informal transcripts arranged by either semester or department, they also note frustration that the very capable and genial assistant registrar who has been assigned to help with institutional data requests in the last couple of years does not have adequate time or structural support to do the job as it should be done, as she is also still responsible for many routine registration tasks. Many of these offices have begun to develop their own internal assessment instruments and surveys, but the lack of regular, dependable university and comparative data still forces them to consume valuable time trying to construct their own data sets. The current search for a director of institutional research and a plan to identify more reports to be generated routinely and regularly will certainly help with this concern.
Office of Student Development

As the other vice-presidential-level office most closely associated with the educational mission of the university, the Office of Student Development operates comfortably within an environment of assessment and feedback loops. As noted earlier, our students participate in a number of national surveys (NSSE, SSI, CIRP) that provide valuable feedback on services and provide a fuller picture of our student body and their particular needs and gifts. The office administers some local evaluations of its programs as well, such as parent and student evaluations of the New Student Days orientation program each fall. Such responses, as well as verbal and written feedback from faculty members, student development personnel, and student orientation assistants involved in the programs, regularly generate improvements in cyclical programs. Furthermore, residence life staff members receive student evaluations at the end of spring semester.

Weekly staff meetings for various teams within the division (residence coordinators and the Health Center, for example) keep lines of communication open at all times and encourage ongoing assessment, intervention, and improvement. Some senior staff members in the division also serve on key faculty committees and task groups, where their interaction with other constituencies in the university provide invaluable feedback and perspectives.

While information gleaned from NSSE and other national surveys (8.3B) has been shared with directly-concerned bodies such as the president’s senior staff, the Faculty Executive Board, and committees working on retention and enrollment management, the division is concerned that some areas of the university may not realize the wealth of information that these surveys can hold regarding student perceptions of their services. More routine reports highlighting these data will be generated and shared with the entire administration by the Office of Student Development or by a director of institutional research when one is hired.

Office of Business and Finance

During the first part of the self-study period, the Office of Business and Finance assessed performance and accuracy through the required annual auditing process, but internal organizational assessment was much less formal. Since about 2000, though, under the leadership of Vice President Kitchen the office has participated more fully in the Office of Human Resource’s performance management process, which includes goal-setting for individuals and for operational areas, regular assessment, and adjustment of goals and strategies. The office also prepares monthly financial reports, reviewed by senior staff and by the board at their thrice-yearly meetings. The Business Office and Computing Service developed on-line tools that allow supervisors real-time monitoring of budgets (“Budget View,” available through the password-protected internal web portal WittLink) and the tracking of proportionality of spending (budget variance reports); such tools help budget managers and their vice-presidential supervisors to follow the posting of revenue and expenses and assure accuracy. Vice President Kitchen instituted an informational newsletter (Business and Finance Office Notes, 4.1F) in 2000 to share timely financial and operational information with the board, senior staff and broader campus. These notes have been well received by faculty and administrators who must consider financial matters in their work.

Finally, the faculty Budget and Compensation Advisory Committee offers some measure of accountability and assessment, although their function is practically
limited by the materials they are given. While their charge, according to the faculty by-laws, includes the responsibility to “participate with the appropriate members of the University administration and the Board of Directors in the formulation of the University budget,” some members report that they do not see the entire university budget, and so do not feel that they participate in its formulation. Committee members report that sometimes they do not have relevant materials in time enough before meetings to perform their duties by consulting with the faculty before votes or endorsements of decisions in the committee. The current chair of the committee concludes that the advisory and assessment climate of the committee in relation to business and budgeting functions will improve if faculty members are aggressive in their requests for information and access; otherwise, he concludes, “the administration will set the agenda by default” (response of the Budget and Compensation Advisory Committee to the Self-Study Steering Committee, 3.2B).

The Office of University Advancement

The Office of University Advancement has, since the retirement of a long-time vice president and the subsequent (2005) hiring of Bill Cloyd in that role, made sweeping changes in personnel, job descriptions, defined goals, operating procedures, and regular assessment, all in pursuit of continuous improvement of their fund-raising for Wittenberg.

For most of the decade, the advancement philosophy was to cultivate donor prospects widely but to be fairly conservative in soliciting large donations. The staff members in the office, while very loyal and dedicated to Wittenberg, did not function within a clearly-defined process of concrete goals and regular assessment and accountability. During that period, assessment of the office’s functions came mostly from external consultants hired periodically to examine the workings of the office, thus leading to reactive rather than proactive policies at times.

With little routine assessment of progress toward shared goals, individual staff members could become isolated in their own ways of doing things; this tendency created problems with the sharing and even compatibility of important data sets, for instance. Important threshold definitions (such as naming rights, endowed chair or scholarship) were not aligned with widely-held professional standards, and practices of recording and accounting for gifts and pledges could be confusing and inconsistent. Not surprisingly, one of the most recent external consultancies (Johnson, Grossnickle and Associates, 2.1H) found that the office was not performing as well as it might because of a general lack of clear expectations and regular assessment – a lack of accountability, in other words.

Vice President for University Advancement Bill Cloyd brought with him from his work at the Ohio State University deep experience with just such a culture of accountability and assessment. He also had spearheaded significant development efforts in the areas of pure academics, health care, and athletics at Ohio State.

Although searches for several key positions in the office are still in process as of late 2006, Cloyd has already implemented major changes that have set the stage for a fresh approach to the work of advancement. Job descriptions have been redefined and specific goals and expectations communicated to each member of the team. Working teams have been formed within the office, such as the major gifts team or the management team, and members of the teams communicate daily. A weekly full staff meeting begins with updates from each team, thus ensuring that everyone is up-to-date and on task. Performance evaluations, adapted for specific jobs from the Office of
Human Resources’ template, will be done at mid-year and at the end of the fiscal year. This regular assessment contributes to the foundation for a culture of accountability in this area so crucial to the long-term health of the university.

Unit-wide goal-setting is, of course, as important as individual goals; the top priority of the office is increasing our net receipts and new pledges acquired to $10 million in fiscal year 2006-2007. The second priority will be improving our alumni participation rate to 30%; to this end, for instance, the formerly distinct positions of Director of Alumni Relations and Director of the Wittenberg Fund were merged to create the position of Director of Alumni Engagement, with an assistant director, a coordinator, a staff assistant, and an office assistant in support of that area. The third top priority is simply to present Wittenberg positively. While this third priority is less tangible in some ways, there are concrete strategies in place. The Office of University Communications and the position of University Editor report to the Office of Advancement, and the 2004 Johnson, Grossnickle and Associates report noted that interviewees were universally impressed with the quality of documents coming from the Office of University Communications. Furthermore, the new brand identity campaign devised by Mindpower, Inc. will be utilized for advancement purposes, creating excitement and inspiration for supporting the university in its aims. The effective performance and goal achievement of the office is ultimately assessed by the Board of Directors’ Committee on Advancement and, of course, President Erickson. Vice President Cloyd reports to the board committee at each scheduled meeting of the board and meets with President Erickson and senior staff weekly.

The Office of Advancement has also instituted new professional procedures, forms, accounting practices, and reporting lines in the last year and a half, many of them directed at creating a focus on major gifts, defined as $25,000 or more. The new practices will contribute to consistency and integrity in data-gathering and record-keeping, which Vice President Cloyd feels will enhance not only the staff’s ability to assess their own performance, but also external constituents’ trust in and regard for the operations of the office.

Overall, then, although reactive and infrequent assessment of the Office of Advancement was a major challenge for much of the previous decade, the last two years have seen the implementation of clear assessment structures and instruments, clarified duties and lines of communication, and a culture of accountability. These new structures will provide a foundation for a successful major campaign targeted toward our strategic plan goals.

The Office of Enrollment Management

In the early years of the past decade, the concept of goal-setting was straightforward and powerful: everything revolved around the number of students targeted for the incoming class. As the 1997 visiting team noted, recruiting in a very competitive Ohio market had led to tuition discounts higher than we could afford. Even though a new financial-aid model begun in the late 1990s helped to stabilize the discount, when the targeted class size looked out of reach, we offered more generous financial aid packages in order to meet the goal. Since moving toward an enrollment management approach to admission, the Office of Admission has developed more nuanced goals and strategies, even though that class size number is still the primary goal.

Currently, in addition to an overall class size target, each admission counselor covers a specific territory and has individual goals for numbers of applications,
acceptances, and matriculants. Progress on these concrete goals is measured biweekly, and persistent lagging behind goals may lead to focused training and personal mentoring. To maximize teamwork and incentive, the class size goal is still the top priority for everyone, but each member of the team has guidance in self-assessment. Furthermore, the designation of individual schools within territories will capitalize on one of our young admission counselors’ strengths: their ability to make connections and nurture relationships over time.

Each member of the admission team also has an important secondary area of responsibility, such as training and monitoring tour guides, minority recruiting, and so on. In these areas, too, the staff asks for regular feedback from prospective students and their parents on such things as their responses to the tour, the interview, and other elements of the recruitment process. Currently, the feedback instruments are coded so that supervisors can see which tour guides, coaches, and admission counselors the respondent is evaluating. These responses will be a powerful tool for staff training and development. Less formal avenues of feedback are also heard and welcomed by enrollment management staff; for instance, when faculty members along the first floor of Hollenbeck’s admission tour path complained that tour guides were explaining the faculty’s accessibility in ways that had an unintentionally negative effect, the admission counselor who had just taken over as director of tour guides retrained the guides with a much more accurate and professional articulation of faculty members’ openness to working one-on-one with students.

Finally, the Office of Enrollment Management works with two main committees who offer advice and some measure of performance assessment and policy adjustment. The Enrollment Management Committee, a long-standing task force originally appointed by President Tipson in the late 1990s and retained as an appointed committee made up primarily of administrators and two faculty members, receives frequent periodic tracking reports on admission process and considers mid-course corrections or modifications when necessary. The faculty’s Committee on Admission and Financial Aid Policies offers a less successful venue for assessment. Although its stated charge in the Faculty By-Laws is “to make recommendations regarding admissions requirements, to make recommendations regarding scholarships, financial assistance, and other financial aid given to students, and to report annually to the faculty on admission standards,” the committee has functioned nearly exclusively as a selection committee for the top merit-based scholarships at least since 1990. The new vice president for enrollment management, Doug Swartz, has increased regular involvement of this committee as a potentially powerful feedback loop between the Office of Enrollment Management and the faculty.

Core Component 2D
All levels of planning align with Wittenberg’s mission, thereby enhancing its capacity to fulfill that mission.

While many previous examples of planning and resource allocation have already demonstrated the centrality of the mission and the strategic plan, a few additional points illustrate not only the inclusive nature of planning at Wittenberg, but also the interdependency between the mission and university planning.

The introduction to this self-study delineates the extensive participation of all constituencies in the strategic planning process, and a number of examples of resource allocation and planning goals have already shown the interconnections between
strategic planning goals and the mission. But the Herculean task of prioritizing the
goals operationally is still to be finished. President Erickson noted at the September,
2006 faculty meeting that strategic plans, because of their lofty goals, are often in
danger of remaining just that – lofty goals. One important item of planning remains:
planning how to implement the goals of the strategic plan. To that end, President
Erickson appointed an implementation team made up of administrators, faculty and
students under the leadership of John Marr, Secretary of the University and Executive
Assistant to the President. They will first prioritize goals and objectives within a
relative timeline, and they will also assign specific objectives to offices and individuals
who are responsible for implementation, whenever that may be for an individual goal.
This strategic plan is important as an expression of our mission, but it only honors
our mission if it becomes reality. The team will be considering factors similar to those
discussed earlier in this chapter: what goals could be begun now? What ones need to
be fleshed out and presented as key projects for the planned major campaign? Which
are dependent upon others? The implementation team will look not only at current
realities, but also note contingency plans surrounding some goals to allow us to take
advantage of currently unforeseen opportunities.

As we have shown in earlier discussions of the planning and assessment
environment in key administrative offices, major goals directly embody the strategic
plan, which in turn seeks to honor and facilitate the mission; some of the examples
discussed at length include increasing the diversity of the student body, faculty, and
staff; enhancing compensation to recruit and retain a top-notch faculty of teacher-
scholars; building facilities that enhance both pedagogy and community-building;
and creating an environment in which students can become engaged adults.

Wittenberg’s current budgeting strategies offer a final example of the alignment of
mission and planning. While currently the budget is set each year, and its conscious
pursuit of goals through resource allocation may be constrained by the realities of
the bottom line, Wittenberg has been moving toward the goal of a five-year budget-
planning model to provide a more proactive and realistic planning outlook.

Wittenberg’s budgeting process involves many levels of participation, including
the president and senior staff, the Budget and Compensation Advisory Committee of
the faculty on some matters, department and unit leaders, and the Board of Directors.
From the unit leaders up, goals derived from the mission are targeted in budget
requests. But in annual budgeting, certain assumptions could prove wrong and create
a situation in which we were reacting to unrealized revenue expectations and their
concomitant impact. For instance, in a number of recent years, budgeting was based
on an assumption of a higher number of new students than were really expected to
enroll, so that even when we reached our matriculation goals, we found ourselves
reacting rather than planning. In years when we did not reach our goal for entering
class size, the situation was, of course, worse. This budgeting practice has been
discontinued under President Erickson, which should help us plan more responsibly.
But even more interesting is a longer-range (five-year) budgeting plan that runs
concurrently with annual operational budget planning.

One example of how this might change Wittenberg’s budgeting strategy could
involve the way that bequests are accounted for in the budget. Before 2000, when the
five-year budgeting model was introduced, an assumed average amount of expected
bequests was figured into the operating budget; if bequests fell below that level in a given
year, our plans were already out of our control. Now, bequests are outside the operating
budget, so that whatever amount we receive in bequests in a given year can be applied to
ongoing needs such as deferred maintenance, debt service, and technology replacements. This planning method honors the mission and the strategic plan in two ways; it forces us to account for operating expenses with known operating revenues – to pay for what is central to the mission and valued – first of all. Yet it also means that, rather than playing catch-up in years with fewer matured bequests, all bequests can truly be felt as gifts and applied to relieving long-term and continuing financial burdens.

In closing, one cautionary note should be sounded. While planning is certainly mission-driven and inclusive, sometimes implementation is not as transparent as it should be; we must be constantly vigilant as we move forward into new operational models and implementation of the strategic plan. Timely and forthright communication between the Offices of Business and Finance, Enrollment Management, and Advancement, among others, and the faculty will enhance a sense of the community’s shared vision of the institutional mission. Likewise, key administrative areas which have an associated advisory faculty committee need to provide sufficient information, context, and time for the committees to fulfill their mandated charges and to act as liaisons between the administration and the faculty, and the committees must keep the broad faculty informed of their work.

Summary Assessment of Criterion Two

With an ambitious strategic plan and a recently refined and reaffirmed mission statement, a faculty dedicated to excellence both in their disciplines and in their pedagogy, and student and learning support services of increasing sophistication, Wittenberg is indeed able to provide the dynamic educational environment it promises. Our primary challenge, of course, is finding adequate resources to meet current needs and fund innovative change. In order to provide a more robust fiscal base for Wittenberg, we need to build the endowment, build our reputation in the market place, cut the discount rate, develop a more consistent enrollment profile, and complete a successful major campaign in the next few years.

The present moment is widely perceived by the board, administration, and faculty as an inflection point for Wittenberg; we could stagnate in missed opportunities or rise to claim our highest potential. With current high morale regarding the strategic plan, new professional staffing and strategies in key offices such as advancement and enrollment management, and continued high quality in the education we provide, this is a moment of potential for Wittenberg, and we must seize it.
Chapter Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

Wittenberg University provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

Excellent teaching that facilitates student learning is the center of Wittenberg University’s mission – it is truly our *raison d’être*. The top priority in considering colleagues for tenure and promotion, reaffirmed in procedural revisions in the past decade, is effective, student-centered teaching. We recognize outstanding teaching with major university awards, and our teachers are recognized in turn by external groups as well. The faculty takes its responsibility for the curriculum seriously, both through the power vested in the Educational Policies Committee and in the faculty’s final votes on curricular matters, ranging from the approval of individual courses to the creation of entire new majors and programs. The faculty publishes on pedagogy, talks pedagogy in the hallways and at department parties, eats and drinks pedagogy at Faculty Development Board lunches and workshops. Most of all, faculty members enact pedagogy in the classroom. Wittenberg faculty members take their responsibilities as teachers very seriously, and expectations are high.

Likewise, Wittenberg strives for and celebrates student success. Not only do students have multiple opportunities to demonstrate their progress in every class they take, but they also confirm their mastery of departmental learning goals by successfully completing a senior assessment in their major. Our alumni
are prepared for graduate study, and they attend graduate programs in large numbers; Wittenberg ranks in the top 10% nationally among undergraduate colleges in the number of graduates earning doctoral degrees between 1972 and 2003 and also between 1994 and 2003 (7.3A); that doesn’t even account for the thousands of master’s and professional degrees that prepare our graduates for careers in law, medicine, business, education, journalism, writing, information sciences, and other fields for which the appropriate degree is not the Ph.D.

Here on campus, student learning is fostered and supported by excellent teaching and a supportive environment; achievement is celebrated through many means. Our students display their knowledge not only in their classes, through discussions and presentations, but also through poster sessions, public performances, and academic presentations at on- and off-campus conferences and symposia. These students’ success – their fulfillment of intellectual curiosity, their cultivation of thought and logic, their mastery of technique and skill – demonstrate every day that Wittenberg is making a difference and honoring its mission.

Core Component 3A

Wittenberg’s goals for student learning outcomes are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.

When Wittenberg moved from a tri-term calendar to its present semester calendar in 1995, we also revolutionized our curriculum in one important way: we instituted the concept of identifying learning goals for all levels of the curriculum, from individual courses to the general education program to major courses of study. While certainly the faculty had goals for pedagogy before, the new curricular imperative forced us to be more intentional not only about our pedagogical choices and strategies, but about our assessments as well. Processes and kinds of learning goals vary between the two major educational programs that all students encounter: the general education program and departmental major and minor programs.

General Education Goals and Assessment

The general education curriculum in place since 1995 is built around the concept of identified learning goals. Three categories of goals provide a structure for the curriculum: foundations, arts and sciences, and co-curricular activities. The curriculum (appendix B) is described in detail in the Academic Catalog (1.2A); a summary follows.

Foundations

The foundational goals of the curriculum are writing, mathematics, languages, speaking, research, and computing. Three of these learning goals are met by successful completion of a course (writing, mathematics, and languages), while the other learning goals are to be met in some general education and elective courses and in courses in the major. All students must also take one additional math-intensive course (so designated by an expert committee) and successfully complete a total of seven writing-intensive courses (so designated by a faculty committee) in order to graduate. Each major must contain at least two required writing-intensive courses.
Arts and Sciences
This category builds on the foundations by moving towards an appreciation of how different academic disciplines approach knowledge and the world. Students take courses that emphasize understanding the natural world through scientific inquiry; understanding human behavior, relationships, and institutions through empirical and analytical methods; understanding the aesthetic experience and how the arts enrich and express the human spirit; understanding the histories of the peoples and cultures of Europe and/or the post-Columbian Americas; understanding how central questions about reality, knowledge, and value are pursued in religious and philosophical traditions; and understanding non-Western cultures through study of the history, institutions, or traditions of one or more of these cultures. Additionally, students are required to take one course that emphasizes integrated learning, the connection between or among differing modes of inquiry; nearly all students satisfy this integrated learning requirement through the completion of a Wittenberg Seminar (WittSem) in fall of the first year. One additional over-arching goal, the appreciation for and understanding of the role of human diversity in contemporary culture, is not attached to any one course, but is addressed in all arts and sciences general education courses and through courses in the majors.

Co-Curricular
The co-curricular components of the general education program consist of two required physical activity courses to reinforce the relation between physical activity and personal well-being and a non-credit course of community service in order to gain an understanding of the role, responsibility, and challenge of service in community life. The community service course requires an orientation session, twenty-seven hours in service with a carefully-selected group or agency, and three hours of guided reflection on the experience.

Implementation and Assessment
Professors and departments must apply for a general education designation to be applied to their courses. They must explain how their planned course design will address the learning goals, including the diversity of human experience goal, and how progress toward these goals will be assessed in the course. The General Education Committee considers and acts upon course proposals that are then forwarded to the faculty for final approval at their regular meetings.

Assessment of student progress toward goals and of the efficacy of the curriculum takes a variety of forms. As mentioned above, instructors must include in their application for general education designations a rationale for how assignments will forward the learning goals of the program in the class. The first and most concrete line of assessment is, of course, assessment of assignments within the class. Additionally, Wittenberg’s recent (2004) adoption of the IDEA system of course assessment provides important information on both student learning and effective pedagogy at the course level and, through comparative and cumulative analysis, at the departmental level. The IDEA system (Individual Development and Educational Assessment), headquartered at Kansas State University’s IDEA Center, focuses on learning goals identified by the instructor of an individual class as essential or important. The form also links certain questions about pedagogical style to those goals and offers feedback to professors on keeping or increasing certain strategies.
in their teaching. Each class is also evaluated on how well students felt they had progressed on the identified learning goals. While there have been some problems with early use of the form (logistics, completing the Faculty Information Form for each class, etc.), many results show promise that this can be a valuable assessment tool for both students and professors.

An especially useful feature of the IDEA forms for general education evaluation is the linking of clusters of questions to specific learning goals designated by instructors as important. Thus, the instructor of a religion class designated as fulfilling the goal of understanding how central questions about value are pursued in religious traditions would be particularly interested in how students responded to the questions relating to objective 10, “developing a clearer understanding of, and commitment to, personal values.” Twelve broadly-applicable objectives defined in the IDEA system provide some items fairly congruent with the learning goals of the general education program.

Furthermore, in 2000, the three foundational goals fulfilled by specific courses were referred to the most-affected departments (Mathematics, Foreign Languages, English) for assessment in addition to their regular departmental assessments. This assignment was not adequately communicated in all cases, but nonetheless, those departments are now aware of their extra responsibility.

In 2005-2006, Keil Professor of Psychology Jo Wilson designed an on-line survey to assess indirectly the effectiveness of the general education program (7.2D). The survey was completed by approximately 48% of the Class of 2006, and, since some majors required their students to complete the survey during a senior class, representation of various majors was not necessarily proportional to the body of respondents as a whole. Still, the overall results showed that students felt that their general education courses had fulfilled the learning goals set forward by the program, usually averaging between 3.5 and 3.7 on a five-point scale.

A few deviations from that pattern are worth mentioning: students expressed a decided lack of enthusiasm for Common Learning, the course previously used to fulfill the “integrated learning” requirement. The lower scores for that course were not unexpected; in fact, the course had already been retired and replaced by the WittSem model in which many different sections are designed by the instructor to reflect an interdisciplinary approach to learning based on the instructor’s own intellectual passions. The other three foundational goals satisfied by a single course also scored lower than the arts-and-sciences courses norm, possibly because students had little or no choice in them, and also because those courses might be less remembered by seniors, often having been taken during the first or second year. The gap seems especially suspect regarding English 101E, the required first-year composition class. While the seniors rated its effectiveness with an average just under 3 on the 5-point scale (2.94), students who had just completed the class in spring 2006 agreed or strongly agreed that it had improved their skill in written and oral expression over 90% of the time. The co-curricular goals were also seen to be meeting their goals, with the community service requirement doing so more decisively than the physical activity courses (see also the response to the concerns of the 1997 visit team, in the introduction). But overall, this survey showed that seniors felt that Wittenberg’s general education program had indeed helped them to meet its stated learning goals.

While this survey did help us to confirm that students recognize the value of their classes in meeting general education goals, and reaffirmed our decision to change from Common Learning to the WittSem model of integrated learning, we will not administer the survey in May 2007, since the specially-appointed and
Criterion 3

The elected Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) is currently reviewing our general education curriculum in order to propose new recommendations for consideration next academic year; their timeline aims to have formulated proposals by the end of this academic year, too late for another year’s worth of data to be considered. The CRC is, of course, taking into account the survey results, among many other pieces of information, learning theory, and data, framed by our new mission statement and strategic plan.

Finally, an alumni survey conducted in 2001 by Hardwick-Day, Inc. (7.3B) offers additional confirmation that some of the “intangible” goals of our curriculum are being met. Among other intriguing findings that will be discussed elsewhere, alumni credited their Wittenberg education with helping them to develop an appreciation of the arts, to place problems in social or historical perspective, to develop political and social awareness, to research independently, to develop their writing skills, to find a sense of purpose in life, and to become involved in community service activities. Alumni credited Wittenberg with these impacts at higher rates than other ELCA colleges, other more selective private colleges, and flagship public universities in Ohio and the region. This testament of our alumni is a thrilling affirmation of our mission and the effectiveness of our academic program.

Departmental Goals and Assessment

Each major course of study, whether departmental or interdisciplinary, has crafted a set of learning goals that have been considered and approved, not only by the faculty members directly involved, but by the faculty as a whole. Whenever revisions are proposed to such a curriculum, the proposal must contain a modification or reaffirmation of the overarching learning goals, as appropriate. A complete set of departmental and program learning goals are available in the resource room (6.2B). Many departments coordinate their learning goals and required courses to make sure that crucial skills and knowledge will be included in certain courses no matter which faculty member is teaching the course in any given semester. Departmental learning goals, plus those general education learning goals assigned to majors, also can have a direct impact on the design of senior assessment instruments and capstone experiences. For instance, the English Department requires multi-faceted “senior exercises” of its majors that involve polishing and revising a substantial researched critical paper (goals: research, writing, computing, analytical thinking, revision) for presentation at a senior symposium open to the public (goals: analytical thinking, writing, speaking). Students also write a long essay exam on questions involving a “common text” from outside the classroom (goal: independent analysis), close reading, and historical and thematic synthesis (these skills are learning goals). Finally, they submit a reflection on the major that offers indirect assessment of their attainment of the learning goals through their own perceptions. Such a process can assess not only student learning, but also programmatic strengths and weaknesses based on patterns of success.

Just as each department has identified learning goals appropriate to the discipline, so have they chosen assessment methods appropriate to their needs. Some departments use individual or group projects in the context of a required senior seminar (for example, history, communication, sociology, foreign languages). Others, such as psychology, chemistry and biology, administer a national standardized test designed to see in which areas of the discipline their students excel or struggle (the required Praxis exam functions similarly for the Education Department). Still others administer a
locally-designed senior comprehensive exam (political science, theater and dance), and some departments require a retrospective portfolio (geology, management). Students are informed of faculty assessment of their performance on such examinations, performances, presentations, and portfolios, and the departmental record then informs future decisions about curricular requirements, course design, and shared emphases.

As described in Chapter Two, departments then use these assessments to improve student learning by discussing assessment outcomes annually and reporting results and planned changes to the Committee on Assessment of Student Learning on a four-year cycle. The committee reviews the reports and advises the department of further measures they might take, changes they might consider, and data they might wish to seek. Many departments also use their various senior assessment instruments as an opportunity to measure and recognize student achievement by celebrating students who perform “with distinction” on their exams, presentations, papers, portfolios, and performances.

Our lone graduate program, a master’s degree in education, has operated largely outside of these structures, functioning as an autonomous unit in many ways, even though some courses for the degree are taught by regular faculty members. The program does identify its own set of learning goals, and they follow internal assessment processes as well as external assessments directed toward standards set by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Since departments receive from the IDEA program a summary evaluation of all departmental courses each semester, it is possible to use those to track student progress on departmental learning goals, as well. For instance, some identified objectives of the IDEA system may relate directly to departmental learning goals, as “gaining factual knowledge” (objective 1) relates to the Biology Department’s stated learning goals. The IDEA departmental report from Spring 2006 shows that over 95% of biology classes averaged at least a 4 (out of a possible 5) for questions related to this goal. Similarly, the Philosophy Department, not surprisingly, all indicate that “learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas” (objective 11) is essential to them, and 100% of their classes averaged at least a 4 of 5 on that objective. The IDEA forms can also reveal unknown strengths: a faculty member might indicate a certain goal as “important” rather than “essential,” but find that in fact, all students noted their improvement in that skill. As individual faculty members become more accustomed to this new tool and more department chairs interpret results, the IDEA form, in addition to being used as an evaluation of teaching, could become a valuable instrument for indirect assessment of departmental learning goals, as well. A binder containing the departmental summaries is available in the resource room (7.5Ai).

Course Design and Assessment
The emphasis on departmental learning goals since 1995, as well as current training in many graduate programs from which new faculty members hail, has encouraged a more deliberate approach to learning goals in course planning, and many syllabi now contain, along with the usual procedural rules, lists of learning goals. While syllabi are still, of course, the province of the individual professor, teachers are encouraged to be more intentional in explaining the function of course activities and assignments in relation to the overall objectives. The Faculty Development Board and other programs (WittSems and Writing-across-the-Curriculum, for example) regularly offer workshops, lunches, and roundtable discussions on syllabus design, learning goals, keying assignments to desired course outcomes, and other related pedagogical issues.
Assessment within individual courses rests, of course, mainly on assignments within that course: papers, exams, presentations, problem sets, exercises, quizzes, performances, portfolios, productions, and projects. But again, the IDEA forms, when used properly, can offer interesting feedback on students’ perceptions of their own progress on specific objectives and also on various pedagogical strategies used (or not used) in the class. Furthermore, the Student Questionnaire, an informal, open-ended form administered at the same time as the IDEA evaluation in each course, offers students an opportunity to describe (to an assumed peer audience) their experience of the course. Many times these questionnaires elicit only enthusiastic or petulant monosyllables, but because of their solicitation of discursive responses, they often also provide thoughtful or detailed feedback on types of assignments, appeal of readings, value of discussion, and other key formative elements of the course. Though focused mainly on the instructor and the course, they can provide some sense of student perceptions of their own learning and on the learning environment, and therefore act as instruments of indirect assessment as well. Scanned copies of these Student Questionnaires (known informally on campus as “buff sheets” from the color of paper on which they are printed) are available on-line to students, the faculty member being evaluated, and the faculty member’s department chair.

Ownership and Oversight
As explained above, faculty members design the learning goals for their courses, guided at times by shared goals in departments or in the general education program. And of course, faculty developed and voted on the goals of the general education curriculum at its inception. Departmental learning goals and methods of assessment are developed within departments as well; qualified faculty members take ownership of the academic program and its learning goals at Wittenberg.

Furthermore, a faculty committee (Assessment of Student Academic Achievement Committee) offers oversight of and advice on program assessment activities. While departments and programs gather and discuss assessment data annually, chairs submit a summary assessment report once every four years to the committee. The committee reviews the report and offers feedback and suggestions to the department for follow-up action, if any. In many cases, the committee has found that departments follow and/or revise their original assessment plans and make changes in their programs as a result of information learned from the assessments; assessment instruments are often noted in the rationale for changes in programs submitted to the Educational Policies Committee, for instance. Not all departments, however, have followed through on their originally approved assessment plans, and some have been somewhat tardy or vague in their reports. The committee does send repeated reminders or ask for more and better information from departments or programs whose assessment reports are flawed or absent. The departmental reports are stored centrally in the Office of the Provost, and a set is available in the resource room (7.2).

Summary
Through a variety of direct and indirect assessments at multiple levels, then, the faculty of Wittenberg University evaluates student learning and the effectiveness of educational programs. Learning goals are designed and assessed by those best suited for the job – the faculty whose expertise informs the educational programs. Based on these structures, it is clear that Wittenberg values and promotes student achievement and strong academic programs.
Core Component 3B

_Wittenberg values and supports effective teaching._

Wittenberg’s strategic plan, _Distinctively Wittenberg_, recognizes the centrality of effective teaching to Wittenberg’s mission and indeed, to its existence. Goal E of the plan expresses the determination to “recognize, reward, and invest in outstanding faculty and staff.” The faculty, in a very real sense, defines the educational program of the university, and they see that role as a sacred trust.

Wittenberg’s faculty determines curricular content from the level of the individual course to the general education program and major and minor programs, all of which must be approved by faculty vote. Likewise, each faculty member is responsible for designing her or his own course and syllabus. The faculty is highly-qualified to perform these duties not only because of excellent academic preparation in their fields (89% of full-time faculty hold the terminal degree appropriate to their field), but also because of their excellent record of teaching (at least a third of Wittenberg faculty members have won an award for teaching at some point in their careers, from Wittenberg or some other institution). A passion for teaching is the first requirement for prospective faculty members, and that passion is recognized, developed, and rewarded during one’s career at Wittenberg.

**Evaluation of Effective Teaching**

All professors are required to administer IDEA course evaluation forms (examples and explanatory material available in the resource room in binder 7.5). As discussed above, some features of the IDEA form lend it to indirect assessment of student learning, but the form is also designed to assess and ultimately enhance teaching effectiveness. Because professors assign priority in learning goals for each course, the feedback is specifically directed toward students’ progress on those goals, with information on how students perceive their professors’ pedagogical strategies and advice on whether to sustain or redirect certain approaches depending on the desired outcomes. For instance, if a faculty member is rated about average on a teaching strategy highly correlated with one of her desired learning goals, the IDEA report would suggest keeping or increasing the use of that strategy. If, however, a faculty member seemed not to be using strategies that might contribute to greater progress toward desired learning goals, the report would suggest trying that pedagogical strategy in the future. The IDEA reports replace a much less flexible and adaptable locally-devised teaching evaluation form used until 2004; it is the hope of the Committee on Teacher Effectiveness that as professors become more familiar with the IDEA system, we will be able to exploit its potential for pedagogical development to the fullest.

One drawback of the IDEA form is that the small space available for written comments does not encourage discursive responses. Partly in recognition of this reality, and partly because of a tradition of openness, Wittenberg also continues to administer Student Questionnaires (also known as “buff sheets”) that ask three open-ended questions about the class and teacher; scanned images of these questionnaires are available to all students, to the faculty member, and to the faculty member’s department chair. Historically, they are used by students considering enrollment in a class or with a teacher, but they may also be used in personnel decisions if and only if the instructor under consideration for tenure or promotion chooses to include the buff sheets either in addition to the IDEA forms or instead of them in the rare instance
when IDEA forms go missing. The current procedure of scanning them for on-line availability came in response to concerns over security and intactness of the forms when they were kept in open file drawers in the library.

In addition to being evaluated in each class by their students, probationary faculty members’ teaching is evaluated at least once a year by a peer reviewer. These reviews vary in rigor by department, but always involve minimally a classroom visit. Some departments also expect syllabus analysis, multiple classroom visits, and examination of artifacts of teaching such as graded copies of student papers, as well as pre- and post-visit discussions with the professor under review. Written peer reviewer reports are then shared with the professor under review, the professor’s department chair, and ultimately with the Faculty Personnel Board and Provost as part of the third-year review and tenure review processes. Recent peer evaluations of teaching are also required for faculty members being considered for promotion to full professor later in their careers as well.

The Faculty Personnel Board, in fact, offers the crowning evaluation of faculty teaching effectiveness (if not the most timely or developmental). As described in the Faculty Manual’s criteria for earning appointment to permanent tenure, embodied in the statement “Professional and Ethical Responsibilities of the Faculty,” “good teaching is a sine qua non for tenure and advancement in rank” (1.1, “Faculty Appointment”). The statement goes on to detail elements of “good teaching,” such as

- Effective classroom performance (clear expression, organized presentation, current content),
- Rigorous content and performance standards,
- Opportunities for teacher/student consultation outside the classroom,
- Prompt feedback to students on their performance,
- Teaching methods appropriate to class size and level, and
- General concern for the student’s well-being.

Also included in consideration of teaching is the professor’s participation in curriculum development and knowledgeable, caring advising.

Candidates for tenure and promotion are evaluated as teachers and advisors through a variety of means, including review of all IDEA forms, Student Questionnaires, peer evaluations of teaching, and solicited and unsolicited letters from students and advisees. These materials figure in the evaluation by the department chair and tenured members of the department as well as by the Faculty Personnel Board members, the provost, and the president; expectations are rigorous, and at times, concerns over the quality of teaching and advising have led to negative decisions on tenure or promotion, or warnings during the third-year review process. The faculty and academic administration of Wittenberg University take the central vocational responsibility to teach well very seriously.

Development of and Support for Effective Teaching

The Faculty Development Board and its director (with a budget of between $120,000 and $130,000) are charged with supporting faculty development in a variety of dimensions, chief among them excellent teaching (“Bylaws,” Faculty Manual, 1.1A). The director, granted two courses’ worth of release time per year, not only arranges programming for workshops, brown bag lunches, and an annual faculty social event, but also, as the chair of the board, presides over the awarding of a range of
generous and stimulating small grants aimed at improving pedagogy and encouraging participation in the professional activities of professors’ disciplines.

The programs sponsored by the Faculty Development Board (FDB) in the past ten years are listed in a document in the resource room (5.1F.i). The annual Quest and Question dinner, which encourages collegiality and recognition of current work, will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Four. Two other programming series of the FDB, the FDB lunches and workshops, relate more directly to the support of teaching excellence. Even a quick perusal of the list of lunch topics for the past ten years indicates that many of the topics involve teaching strategies, technologies, and contexts. A quick selection reveals lunch topics on incorporating research into course designs, incorporating technology in the classroom, teaching writing and speaking in the classroom, learning styles, learning disabilities, academic integrity, using peer mentors, and living/learning communities. Still other topics highlight practical issues of advising and helping students to access academic support from academic services. These lunches, which include a subsidized buffet meal, are attractive and well-attended development programs.

The workshops sponsored by the Faculty Development Board offer more substantial programs and involve more hands-on learning and discussion. While the lunches are most often presented by Wittenberg faculty members and administrators, the workshops may also be presented by external consultants and experts; some of the workshops are also directed at making in-house policies and services accessible. A number of workshops since 1999 have focused on new technologies available in the classroom and out, as well as issues of advising, education and the law, service learning, mentoring, and assessment. Again, the workshops are well-attended, and at times have carried small stipends in recognition of the commitment of time involved (although that is not currently the practice).

The FDB also awards a number of different small grants, some directed toward supporting excellent teaching and some toward supporting professional activities. Faculty members can apply for New Course Grants and Course Revision Grants from the FDB to cover costs of books and other materials needed to prepare for a new or substantially revised course; New Course Grants award up to $500 and Course Revision Grants up to $200. In fiscal year 2006, the FDB awarded nearly $10,000 in New Course and Course Revision Grants. The availability of such funds encourages innovation and fresh, up-to-the-minute disciplinary knowledge. One sign of a vital curriculum – and a lively faculty – is surely variety in the ways we approach our disciplinary knowledge and convey the excitement of the specific to students. While these grants are most often used to purchase books and materials for course preparation, the funds could also be requested to offset the cost of attending appropriate teaching and professional workshops, as well.

The Faculty Development Board also manages Faculty Redirection Grants and Faculty Growth Projects. Though these options are seldom used, they could be helpful for professors wishing to expand their disciplinary or interdisciplinary knowledge and preparation for teaching. The Faculty Redirection Grant, for instance, might fund professional study to allow a faculty member to move to another related department, while the Faculty Growth Projects are meant to help those faculty members desiring to update or enhance their training in their discipline or add a new expertise that fills a departmental or institutional need.

The Faculty Aides Program, also administered by the Faculty Development Board, offers funds for hiring qualified students to help free professors’ time to
concentrate on their teaching and professional activities. While faculty aides are not allowed to grade assignments nor do merely clerical work, they may, for instance, assist in compiling bibliographies of potentially useful books and articles, aid in executing a major project such as a small conference or community project, organize research and pedagogical materials, provide student feedback on proposed course materials, and other meaningful tasks. This program not only frees professorial time for pedagogical planning, but also enhances the student’s budding professional skills.

The Faculty Development Board’s programming and grant opportunities are ubiquitous and well-appreciated. Recent and current directors have ingrained a routine series of deadlines for proposals into the collective faculty consciousness – but the dates are reinforced with regular memos and e-mail reminders. The FDB also maintains a web page with information, deadlines for proposals, and links to external information on grant opportunities and other kinds of faculty development sites.

In addition to the on-campus support for development offered by the Faculty Development Board, Wittenberg offers other opportunities for pedagogical development through a variety of consortial and grant-supported workshops. Faculty members receive regular communication from the provost and from various grant liaisons about opportunities for workshops on various aspects of teaching and education. For instance, the Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education (SOCHE) offers several workshops and conferences a year to which Wittenberg will provide access for faculty members. Exemplary topics might include strategies for active learning or improving peer review of teaching. Other such opportunities include our participation in the Lilly Fellows Program in the Humanities and Arts; this national program for small, church-related colleges not only supports the mentoring of recent graduate students in post-doctoral teaching situations, but also offers a range of conferences and seminars on pedagogical topics. Wittenberg supports a number of attendees to such events each year. Wittenberg has also been able to partner with other organizations to offer grant-supported workshops on topics such as computational science and service learning. Departmental budgets also include funds for memberships to professional organizations that offer such opportunities in a discipline-specific context. The Office of the Provost sometimes funds attendance at professional and pedagogical conferences in support of particular initiatives, such as work on the general education curriculum, first-year educational experiences, or assessment.

Each full-time faculty member enjoys a personal development account of $600 per year (accruable to $1,200) for professionally-related travel. While these funds may more often be used to supplement grants for attendance at disciplinary conferences, they can also be used toward pedagogical and other developmental workshops and conferences, as well.

These formal development opportunities provide one measure of the interest among Wittenberg’s faculty in innovative pedagogical techniques. Many of the supported workshops involve pedagogical issues and techniques such as active learning, learning styles, improving class discussion and presentations, and other alternatives to straightforward lecture. The Writing and Speaking Committee and the WittSems (through its development workshops and also its lunches where WittSem teachers share productive strategies and ideas with each other) have also offered many practical suggestions for developmental assignments and various kinds of projects to stretch beyond one or two learning styles. The WittSems (and, to a lesser extent, the seminars of the University Honors Program) have offered an environment for some experimentation over the years with team-taught courses, learning communities,
living-learning units, service-learning and interdisciplinary classes. WittSems might offer a rich mix of kinds of assignments, from typical analytical papers to poems, drawings, “lost chapters and other “creative” assignments,” first-person presentations, group projects and more. Furthermore, the Wittenberg curriculum vitae format, ideally updated annually and used in all personnel decisions, designates a separate category for “innovations in teaching,” which both validates and encourages the importance of innovation.

In addition to the cornucopia of development opportunities available from the Faculty Development Board and the Office of the Provost, the university attempts to offer current technological training. As has been described elsewhere, audio-visual and computing technology has been integrated fully into the two newest classroom facilities, Hollenbeck Hall and the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center. Additionally, some classrooms in other buildings have also been brought up to the technological standards of Hollenbeck and Kuss. And as we have seen, the Faculty Development Board and other entities have offered instruction and ideas about potential pedagogical uses for the technology.

There has also been active support from the Computing Center staff in the past decade for various pedagogical support programs. Until recently, the university used Web CT for class management functions, such as class chats, postings of readings, notes, and other materials, and an on-line grade book. Wittenberg has just switched from Web CT to Moodle, a program which many new users are praising as flexible and timesaving. The Computing Center has offered a series of workshops for faculty members interested in learning Moodle, with some follow-up support.

The Committee on Academic Computing, whose charge is to act as a liaison between the Computing Center and the faculty and to advise on policies affecting academic computing on campus, was recently upgraded from a faculty task committee to a policy committee in order to give it more authority and to recognize the burgeoning importance of technologies in the academy. They report that while they are heartened by the addition of available technology on campus, two main obstacles prevent the full realization of their envisioned goals. One is a lack of financial resources (as discussed elsewhere) to achieve goals (all classrooms to the Hollenbeck standard, more memory, wireless networking, shorter replacement cycles) they and the strategic plan have identified as important.

The other, perhaps more troubling, challenge is a lack of responsiveness from the staff and leadership of the Computing Center. Faculty members and students are too often frustrated by poor or nonexistent communication from the Computing Center, on topics ranging from technical support to procedure to policy. Many of these same themes are touched upon by department chairs, especially the complaint that the allocation of disk space and resources does not recognize the differences between academic departments and administrative departments (many individual, confidential, proprietary files versus large sets of shared data needing cooperative access, for instance) or the differing needs among academic departments (number of faculty, specialized programs, storage of images, etc.). Furthermore, the Committee on Academic Computing reports that in an environment of limited financial resources, the Computing Center is often inflexible in its approach to problem-solving (seeking universal rather than user-specific solutions) and not always responsive to the widely different memory, drive-space and security needs among academic departments. Full benefit of the transformation of the group from a task committee to a policy is not yet realized (3.2B).
The university also supports the faculty’s serious engagement with pedagogy by subscription to and distribution of various teaching newsletters and other professional publications. The Faculty Development Board maintains a pedagogy bookshelf in the library designed to collect current books on hot topics in higher education and teaching. Within the disciplines, the university offers a wide variety of support for professional activities, which will be described more fully in Chapter Four.

Wittenberg endorses pedagogical innovation and excellence in its mission and strategic plan, but more importantly, it provides concrete means and support to achieve that excellence. Personnel decisions, departmental planning, the programs of the Faculty Development Board, the WittSems, and the University Writing Program (Writing-across-the-Curriculum), as well as special funds and projects of the Office of the Provost, offer development and support to Wittenberg’s teacher-scholars as they strive to excel.

Recognition of Effective Teaching

As mentioned earlier, Wittenberg’s emphasis on effective teaching is so strong that achieving tenure or promotion is, in itself, a recognition of effective teaching, given the importance of pedagogical achievement in the decision-making process. However, many would feel that after tenure, professional activity, while not supplanting teaching in importance, becomes more important in other promotion decisions. And in any case, the academic hierarchy of tenure and rank offers opportunities for recognition much less frequently than in many other professions.

Because it is based on performance in the same three areas considered in personnel decisions – teaching, professional activity, and service – merit pay can function in some ways as recognition of and reward for excellence in teaching. At the beginning of the self-study decade, Wittenberg still delineated a system for offering merit pay when the salary pool was sufficient for both an across-the-board raise and some additional merit pay, but had not been able to offer merit pay since 1994-1995. Throughout the early 1990s, merit pay, even when awarded, was a relatively small percentage of pay compared to merit pay increases of the 1980s. In 1997-1998, there was a real threat of a salary freeze; fortunately, however, there was a modest across-the-board increase. In 2000, with the prospect of a large enough salary pool to offer a solid across-the-board raise and some merit pay, the faculty revisited and revised the issue and crafted a new policy on merit pay, moving from a percentage of base salary to incremental dollar amounts (to assure that raises at the same level of merit were the same regardless of rank).

Merit was awarded by this system for academic year 2000-2001, but many were dissatisfied by what some regarded as disproportionate recognition of professional activity (although excellent teaching was still noted as the top priority). It had also been so long since merit pay had been awarded that a very long period of time was being considered; in five years, many felt, everyone had performed meritoriously to some extent. Both because of dissatisfaction with the procedures for assigning merit pay and because of smaller salary pools, the faculty has declined to include merit pay in the compensation scheme since 2001, although the policy remains in the Faculty Manual should we decide to activate the process once again.

More consistent recognition of outstanding teaching inheres in the awarding of major university awards for excellence in teaching and some other, more localized ones. For instance, the Greek system and even some individual Greek houses recognize their favorite teachers both with individual awards and with inclusion in and invitations to Greek scholarship events. More publicly, though, two major teaching awards
announced each year during the university’s Honors Convocation are recognized as crowning achievements in the career of a Wittenberg faculty member. Wittenberg’s chapter of Omicron Delta Kappa, a national leadership honorary society, recognizes a junior faculty member each year ( untenured, with no more than five years at Wittenberg) for their excellence in teaching. This plaque is a treasured piece of office décor for those fortunate enough to have won it. The highest recognition for a faculty member, however, is the Alumni Association Award for Distinguished Teaching. Although any full-time faculty member with more than five years’ experience at Wittenberg is eligible, this award usually comes later in a career; the announcement of the award is a high point of each Honors Convocation. In addition to the honor, the award carries with it a stipend of $2,000, and past winners of the award are honored in the Benham-Pence Student Center with a plaque and a gallery of portraits.

In addition to the teaching awards that Wittenberg itself grants, professors have, of course, won other teaching awards: in the past twenty years, three Wittenberg professors have been named the CASE Ohio Professor of the Year, a record not matched by any other private Ohio university. The Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education (SOCHE) also recognizes excellent professors in the region; Wittenberg professors are routinely included. All such awards are announced to the campus at large by the Office of the Provost and are recognized during the annual Honors Luncheon before commencement, at which that year’s Alumni Association Distinguished Professor delivers a parting speech. While recognition might come more regularly and frequently to signal appreciation for a job well done, the kudos that faculty members receive now carry much tradition and draw immense respect.

Summary
Through its “Statement of Professional Responsibilities,” its web of faculty development opportunities and support systems, its hiring and personnel decisions, and its historic awards and recognitions, Wittenberg demonstrates in concrete terms the importance claimed for teaching excellence in its mission statement and its strategic plan. Our self-imposed challenge (strategic goal C) moving forward will be to expand support and recognition for excellence attendant with successful realization of other resource-intensive strategic goals.

Core Component 3C
Wittenberg creates effective learning environments.

Wittenberg strives to offer physical, technological, and psychological environments conducive to student success. In response to assessment processes and environmental scanning, we revise and update academic programs and support innovative learning strategies. We recognize the diversity of learners and provide learning environments to suit many needs. Most of all, we work constantly to improve the academic climate and opportunities for learning for all Wittenberg students. But while we feel we have been very successful in many ways in providing positive learning environments, the strategic plan’s Goal C seeks to “transform the undergraduate educational experience by adopting a comprehensive and integrated approach to student learning,” including increased attention to academic advising, support services, and a four-year developmental model of learning.
Improvement through Assessment

As has been detailed earlier in the report, a number of assessment measures are used at all levels of the curriculum. While some important changes have already been made in the general education program (the transition from Common Learning to WittSems, for instance), the faculty and administration, inspired by the strategic plan and informed by assessment measures and other research about national efforts to improve liberal learning, have created and charged the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) with proposing a new approach to general education. The committee is working not only with known results of assessments, but is also conducting its own surveys and forums and is maintaining a web page of resources and minutes of its deliberations to stimulate campus discussions, as well. The committee members’ deliberate, thoughtful, and dedicated approach to this question reflects the best of Wittenberg’s commitment to constantly improving learning environments.

At the department level, many changes, large and small, have been driven by assessment findings and more informal environmental scanning of students’ attitudes. In the past ten years, the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) has handled 25 major curricular revisions in majors, minors, and degree programs, in addition to a number of smaller revisions brought to the committee annually. Many of these changes are in response to assessment of student interests and needs as learned through assessment activities (some of these are noted in department assessment reports, 7.2A, 7.2B, 7.2C). For instance, the Biology Department first modified its introductory biology course and ultimately created a specific entry-level sequence for potential majors and a separate cluster of general education courses for non-majors in response to assessment information. The Communication Department, likewise, in response to student accomplishments and needs detected through assessment, revised its curriculum to focus more directly on core concepts in communication after the first several years of its existence as a major.

Overall, both the general education curriculum and major and minor curricula are influenced regularly by assessment data, from course evaluation results to national surveys such as CIRP and NSSE.

Creating Effective Learning Environments through Advising

Academic advising is an important duty of the faculty, aligned with the teaching function in our statements of professional responsibilities and in our criteria for tenure and promotion. And in general, students are quite satisfied with the advising they receive; in the spring 2006 administration of the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (8.3D), Wittenberg students reported at a higher-than-average rate that their advisor is knowledgeable about requirements, available, approachable, and caring. Yet until recently, little thought has been given to more direct assessment, and the primary advising models have been prescriptive and developmental (reflected in the strengths identified by students above). Academic advising, its learning goals, responsibilities, philosophy, and procedures are defined at length in the Faculty Manual; Wittenberg won the National Academic Advising Association’s (NACADA) award for rejuvenating the first-year advising program in 1985. That system, in which first-year students were in a first-term class with their advisor as professor, has been in place ever since; students then move on to be advised by a professor in the major department at the time of declaration. While the system creates unavoidable inequities among departments or individuals in terms of advising loads, the benefits of first-year
students’ being advised by someone who sees them in class regularly and who can get to know them outweighs this disadvantage.

A similar desire for student-advisor interaction led to one of many innovations in the Office of Academic Services in recent years; before 2004, newly-accepted students indicated a potential major and some subjects of interest on a mail-in registration form, and the individual schedules for each member of the class were constructed by one person (usually the registrar or a faculty member). In an effort to foreground academics, create personal connections, ease anxiety during New Student Days (first-year orientation), and allow students some choice in their first class schedule, the Office of Academic Services and the Office of the Registrar implemented a series of one-day pre-orientation sessions each summer before New Student Days. In this way, an introduction to the academic program, math placement testing, and registration can take place outside the charged emotional atmosphere of the first days at college. Students also meet in small groups with an experienced faculty advisor to help them select courses and schedules appropriate to their goals and needs. Assessment questionnaires have been administered at each pre-orientation through the first three summers, and while impressions are generally favorable, the questionnaires have identified specific areas for improvement, and changes have been implemented based on the feedback. Further refinements are being made to the 2007 pre-orientations as well to help with equitable distribution of popular classes and appropriate placement of students with Advanced Placement credit. A change to online math and foreign language placement completed by students from home before summer pre-orientation was also implemented over the past two years in response to feedback from faculty advisors and students.

Given increased attention to retention in recent years, the academic advising system itself has come into focus as a site of intentionality. The Enrollment Management Team in recent years has tried to identify ways in which we can affect retention of students, and this inquiry in part has led to the inclusion of improved and integrated advising in the strategic plan (Goal C). In response, the Provost appointed the Academic Advising Study Team in spring 2005 to develop recommendations regarding changes in the advising system in regards to expectations, goals, logistics, assessment, incentives, and recognition. That group met regularly between spring 2005 and spring 2006; during that time, they decided that a move toward educative advising would be in keeping with Wittenberg’s mission and strategic plan. They also recommended a new policy assigning first-year advising for each WittSem class to the instructor. That policy was passed by the faculty in spring 2006.

The Academic Advising Study Team is in agreement at this point that the new model should be educative as well as prescriptive, and that we will need some method of assessment in order to support and reward good advising. The early work of the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) has led them independently to similar conclusions; since the CRC will be working on a new general education program and an integrated four-year developmental model of student learning (with implications for the advising system), the CRC and the Academic Advising Study Team have agreed that the study team will suspend its work until the CRC has made some preliminary determinations that can be incorporated into its deliberations, or their mutual deliberations.

In discussing a transition to an educative model that focuses on the learning goals of the general education program and the shape of the undergraduate curriculum, the Academic Advising Study Team felt that many advisors’ immediate need was for a
streamlined advising handbook to help with the nuts-and-bolts questions about policies and procedures. To that end, the assistant provost for academic services redesigned just such a handbook with input from the study team and from experienced advisors (5.1E). When a new general education curriculum and educative advising system are in place, this policy handbook can be supplemented with materials appropriate to the new goals of the advising system. In this way, the new general education curriculum, four-year developmental model, and educative advising system will be designed as an integrated whole and implemented as such. With the caring, available, approachable, and knowledgeable advisors Wittenberg now fields in the faculty, a transition to a new system will be challenging but attainable.

Learning Environments for Diverse Learners

**Academic Services**

The Office of Academic Services, in the very nature of its responsibilities, offers support to students with the most divergent academic profiles; the office coordinates a number of services for learning-disabled students, at-risk students, and honors students, as well as working with the Honor Council as the office of record for all proceedings. With its emphasis on student needs and support services, the office embodies Wittenberg’s recognition of the needs of diverse learners.

While the Office of Academic Services has had primary responsibility for these various student cohorts, some changes in responsibilities and in programs offered have occurred during the self-study period. Three people have held the position since 1997, with many changes occurring since 2004, when the present incumbent, Assistant Provost Lisa Rhine, joined the Wittenberg community. Since then, the role of the office has expanded to include direct-service programming to meet the needs of first-year students and at-risk students; policies and procedures for documentation and accommodation of learning disabilities have been implemented, and a number of assessment and retention measures have been instituted. Responsibilities for some off-campus programs (Career Center and internships), which were under the aegis of a third assistant provost area at the beginning of the study period, have now returned to their original reporting structure in academic services; responsibility for the Office of the Registrar, on the other hand, has been transferred to the Associate Provost. This realignment, though it does place much responsibility in the Associate Provost area, groups functions appropriately, and the transfer of the Office of the Registrar alleviates workload issues and better supports institutional research functions.

One important achievement of the office in recent years has been the standardization of policies and procedures relating to learning-disabled students. To improve compliance with relevant statutes and align Wittenberg with current best practices in higher education, the office developed new materials in three areas: a policy statement was crafted on eligibility determination; documentation guidelines were created; and the process for students to self-identify was modified. These statements and guidelines are available in the resource room (8.4B).

At-risk students have also been targeted for additional support through an online early warning system, special programming for first-year students on academic warning and academic probation, and what is now the Students Taking Academic Responsibility (STAR) Program, a summer bridge program for conditionally admitted students. The Early Warning System gathers information from three sources – an online alert system available for faculty, staff, and parents to report students exhibiting
troubling behaviors (such as not attending class, not preparing for class, etc.), mid-term grade deficiency reporting for faculty, and parent concern cards distributed to all parents of first-year students. The Office of Academic Services follows up with referrals to appropriate support areas so that university staff can proactively reach out to students to offer support. Since spring 2004, the Realizing Improvement through Action (RITA) program has been a required intervention for first-year students on academic warning or probation. Students are required to meet one-on-one with the assistant provost to create a personal success plan and to participate in a series of online modules on time management, learning styles, locus of control, and strategies for success. Based on results from the first two years of the program, RITA does seem to improve a student’s chances of returning to good academic standing. A table of results is available in the resource room (8.4C).

For many years, Wittenberg has offered a summer bridge program for conditionally-admitted students, the Study Skills Seminar. Twenty years ago, the seminar was a four-day academic boot camp with units on note-taking skills, test-taking skills, grammar, and other discrete elements of academic engagement. In 1997, the program was significantly expanded to two weeks, with four professors teaching interrelated mini-classes, assigning papers, homework, and tests, taking field trips; students also worked several hours each week on campus projects to help them engage with at least one other person on campus and to simulate the time-management situation college life would present. Nearly every year, new policies and approaches have been added to try to identify the most appropriate candidates for the course and to provide the most meaningful and effective introduction to college life for those students. In 2006, the program was further modified as the STAR (Students Taking Academic Responsibility) Program, which followed the formula of three related mini-courses with serious academic expectations and significant support apparatuses, but granted the experience more weight by actually awarding two semester credits for the program. The current course, developed by three winners of the Alumni Association Award for Distinguished Teaching, still suffered from a student group disproportionately made up of male athletes rather than students most academically at-risk (convincing the Office of Admission to use faculty-established guidelines in identifying appropriate candidates has been a continuing challenge), but most of the students did receive a passing grade and two credits toward their Wittenberg degree, helping them to start their first semester confident that they had a head start in understanding expectations of college life.

The Office of Academic Services serves the entire diverse spectrum of learners by also offering a number of services and programs to high-achieving students as well as to learning-disabled and at-risk students. This office coordinates the traditional Honors Luncheon the Friday before Commencement and the annual Honors Convocation, at which university-wide and departmental awards for outstanding scholarship, leadership, and service are bestowed. Furthermore, the Office of Academic Services helps to coordinate the work of the Student Scholarships and Fellowships Committee, a group of faculty members who select the university’s nominees for major graduate fellowships and scholarships such as the Rhodes, the Truman, etc. This group interviews interested candidates and offers advice on preparing their applications and interview strategies.

This selection of major programs and initiatives of the Office of Academic Services demonstrates the range of the office’s support for diverse learners. As new programs are developed and old ones updated, the assistant provost brings to the process a commitment
to setting clear goals and assessing how well those goals are met. She is also creative and flexible in trying to adapt and shift programs in response to assessment feedback.

**WittSems and the First-Year Experience**

In fall 2004, the Wittenberg Seminars (WittSems) replaced Common Learning as the required first-year course designed to introduce students to college-level academic expectations in such central skills as critical thinking, writing, and mathematics, help students become engaged in academic inquiry, and enable students to work through transitional issues in moving from high school to college. After two successful iterations of the WittSems, in fall 2006, first-year advising was also attached to the WittSems exclusively.

The director of WittSems coordinates programming for faculty development of WittSem instructors, such as a syllabus workshop and a series of weekly lunches throughout the fall semester (when WittSems are taught). The WittSems have also been experimental sites in using student peer mentors in classrooms to introduce first-year students to older students who successfully blend academic excellence with other activities; the use of peer mentors is optional, but has become more popular as faculty members have shared their experiences with their peer mentors. Although not technically part of the WittSem Program, the university is also piloting supplemental instruction for some classes aimed primarily at first-year students; much like the peer mentors in WittSems, these upper-level students attend class and offer special study sessions for members of the class. The strategic plan calls for a “comprehensive first year” program that will likely result in an expansion of present resources and efforts in this area.

With assessment data from individual sections’ IDEA forms, collective performance on certain objectives identified by the IDEA system, the Your First College Year (YFCY) survey, and focus group meetings between students and the director, the WittSem Program will continue to grow and add features as student needs and program strengths and challenges become clearer; its current reception is much improved over Common Learning, the first-year course it replaced.

**The University Honors Program**

At the other end of the spectrum from support services for at-risk students, Wittenberg also fields a University Honors Program to aid in attracting high-achieving students (see the strategic plan’s Goal A) and offering them one option for a community of similarly-motivated peers. While the relationship of the Honors Program to various admission scholarships has changed over the years, the central features of the program have not: students with a cumulative grade point average of 3.50 are eligible for the program, and members can opt to participate in a number of features. They are eligible to take Honors Seminars, small (limit fifteen), discussion-based, writing-intensive classes that fulfill general education requirements while taking a more focused, experimental approach to an entry-level topic. For example, some popular seminars of recent years have included Bioethics, Hitchcock’s Cinema, Existence or Essence, and Images of the Divine. To earn University Honors upon graduation, a member of the Honors Program must complete at least two honors seminars and complete and defend a senior honors thesis or project in her or his major. Students qualifying with a 3.50 grade point average who are not in the Honors Program may also complete an honors thesis to earn departmental honors, but they will not be eligible for University Honors.
Twenty years ago, Wittenberg offered a relatively small number of Wittenberg University Scholarship Awards (WUSA), and those students were enrolled automatically in the Honors Program. Early in the self-study period, the number of WUSA’s awarded had grown substantially, and a significant number of those students did not complete the required senior honors thesis (and therefore the program). The uncertainty of participation made planning course offerings each semester difficult, as well, and counteracted some of the desired effects of a community within a community for which the program aimed. For several years, then, no one was enrolled automatically in the program; all interested students who had achieved a 3.50 grade point average after at least one semester at Wittenberg were eligible to apply. While this procedure did increase the commitment of students to the program and made for a more coherent group, the lack of automatic membership made the program less attractive to some potential students. With two new layers of merit scholarship now above the WUSA, the program was revised again to include automatic membership to holders of Matthies and Smith Scholarships; the development of these more selective merit scholarships and the attachment of automatic Honors Program membership to them has been a winning combination, attracting strong students and offering them an intellectual community from their first days on campus. Students not originally admitted with a Matthies or Smith Scholarship but who achieve a 3.50 grade point average may still apply for admission to the program.

Another important part of that sense of community is the Matthies House, the central physical space connected to the program. The early twentieth-century Arts-and-Crafts style house was designated to the program, wired with a small computer lab, decorated in a comfortable, residential style in keeping with the house, and dedicated in 1997. Use of the Matthies House is limited to members of the program, who have access 24 hours a day. Students enjoy a variety of study spaces for individuals and groups, as well as snacks, games, and a television set up for DVD and VHS viewing. The Matthies House is deeply appreciated and well-used by students in the program.

The strategic plan (Goal A, 4) calls for a stronger Honors Program and more effective marketing of it to enhance Wittenberg’s attractiveness to top-achieving students. The president’s Strategic Planning Implementation Team will offer guidance on this matter, but the program is overseen by both a faculty director (who receives one course release per year) and an advisory committee made up of faculty members and student members of the program. With a strong program of merit-based scholarships, faculty members eager to work with qualified seniors on honors theses, and an attractive physical space, the Honors Program promises to become an even more attractive component of Wittenberg’s diversity in the future.

**The School of Community Education**

As detailed in the response to the 1997 visit team in the introduction, the School of Community Education has burgeoned in many ways in the past decade. One chief reason has been the calendar move to semesters, which allows two distinct summer terms and an overlap term, thus making more classes available in this profitable program of the School of Community Education (SCE). In some ways, because the SCE has offered an educational program fitting the mission and academic values of the university overall, it has not competed directly with Clark State Community College in some programs. After all, many continuing education units have...
steeply modified general education requirements, especially for mathematics and foreign language; Wittenberg’s School of Community Education, although it has commissioned some special courses tailored to the language and math needs of its typical students, still requires those classes. While SCE students may, if they can schedule daytime classes, major in any Wittenberg discipline, those students whose schedule requires them to take class only in the evenings have fewer options: most such students graduate with a Liberal Studies major, and they may also complete concentrations in Organizational Leadership or Health Care Leadership.

The School of Community Education recognizes the diversity of learners in several ways. Because of carefully-planned articulations of transfer classes with local community colleges, policies to accept military educational credit when appropriate, @witt@home courses designed for partial web delivery, and a vigorous program of need-based financial aid such as the Adult Access Award, the Summer Incentive Grant, and scholarship pools for summer camp programs, Wittenberg is attracting many students of non-traditional college age, students of color, first-generation college students, and students of quite modest financial means. Although many of these people take evening classes and interact with only a few of the traditional students, their presence and the efforts of the SCE have certainly broken down barriers to a Wittenberg education for many, and traditional and non-traditional students alike have benefited. The evening schedule, specially-designed language classes and professionally-oriented concentrations, web-supplemented course formats, and need-based financial aid all are programs that create an effective learning environment for these very motivated students, and the strategic plan (Goal A, 4) notes the need to “strengthen, differentiate, and promote our School of Community Education.”

Expanding the Environment: Off-Campus Learning

Service Learning and Community Service

Wittenberg’s mission and values statements give unusual prominence to service, and Wittenberg was among the earliest colleges to institute a community service requirement in the late 1980s. At the time of the last NCA visit in 1997, the logistics of completing the requirement were unwieldy, but in 2000, that problem was solved by creating Community Service 100 as a non-credit course to be completed in one semester. Following the hiring of the current director, Kristen Collier, in July 2002, additional positive changes ensued: duties and expectations of Community Service Scholarship Award winners were refined; a tracking report showed that the new Community Service 100 model had improved the timely completion of the requirement; and a set of desired learning outcomes for the CMSV 100 experience was defined. The new CMSV 100 program was reviewed in 2003-2004 and found to be successful based on its meeting its goals.

Another major initiative of the office recently and for the future is the implementation and nurturing of service learning in conjunction with credit-bearing classes. The Office of Community Service, together with the Office of the University Pastors, received a $50,000 grant from Thrivent Financial for Lutherans to develop and implement programs in service learning. As part of that process, the office and its supporting Community Service Committee proposed and established new policies relating to adding service learning components to existing courses. They have also sponsored several workshops for faculty development of service learning components appropriate to their courses, and distributed seed money to seven faculty
members from the Departments of Sociology, Psychology, Geography, History, Languages, English, and Economics.

With its location in a small urban setting, Wittenberg offers diverse opportunities for service, whether that means working with the old, the young, the poor, the mentally ill, the environment, animals, the sick, or the incarcerated. The Office of Community Service maintains a strong web of over fifty established community service sites, plus a willingness to work with groups doing concentrated emergency service, such as hurricane relief efforts and Habitat for Humanity spring break builds. These efforts, as noted in the Introduction, earned Wittenberg national recognition on the first President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll in October, 2006. This excellently-run program offers many students a chance to connect with others unlike themselves and to fulfill several key goals of Wittenberg’s mission, both inside and outside the classroom.

**Internships and the Career Center**

The last decade has seen a concerted effort to make students more aware of the potential and the advantages of adding internship experiences to their education. During most of this period, a reorganization in the Office of the Provost had placed a third assistant provost position over off-campus studies, which included the Office of International Education, the Office of Community Service, and the Career Center. The recent retirement of the assistant provost for off-campus learning realigned organizational structure so that the director of community service now reports directly to the provost.

But although the organizational structure has changed, the drive in the Career Center to prepare students for life after Wittenberg has not. The new director, Karen Reynolds, claims experience in both business and educational settings, and plans to raise awareness of the need for uniform and rigorous expectations for student interns. Currently, some departments have quite clear academic expectations for credit-bearing internships, while others do not. One goal for the near future is to regularize expectations across the university and to offer help to faculty members, who currently supervise internships and assign grades for them with no workload credit, and, in some cases, with inadequate support. The Career Center will also be continuing and enhancing some existing programs, such as Don’t Cancel Class, an outreach program to provide career and internship programming for faculty members when they attend conferences or are otherwise unable to be in class.

The Career Center routinely offers workshops to students on topics such as writing résumés, preparing for job interviews, dressing appropriately for professional settings, and identifying careers for the individual. The center also hosts off-campus recruiters from a number of firms throughout the year as they interview students on campus. Students must register in order to use these placement services, and raising seniors’ awareness of registration and its perquisites will be another early goal of the new director.

With an emphasis in the mission statement on students’ discovery of their “callings,” and the strategic plan’s call to “expand, coordinate, and market offerings of internship experiences” (Goal A, 3), the Career Center’s role in Wittenberg’s success in the next decade will be crucial. An important step in this direction will be the hiring of an assistant director this year.
The Office of International Education

One of the central values of Wittenberg’s mission is fostering global citizenship, and while many academic and co-curricular offerings can further that goal, the strategic plan especially notes the value of providing a study-abroad opportunity for every student (Goal A, 2). The plan also recognizes that Wittenberg’s American students will be touched and changed by knowing students from other countries studying at Wittenberg, also named as an important target of the plan (Goal B). While the Office of International Education has shouldered the responsibility for both Wittenberg students studying off-campus and international students coming to Springfield, as we progress toward these goals, they will need additional resources or reassignment of some responsibilities elsewhere.

The most significant change in operations in this office during the self-study period has certainly been the transfer of development and oversight of off-campus summer programs from the School of Community Education to the Office of International Education. With summer study becoming a more and more attractive option for a variety of reasons (financial reasons probably chief among them), a need for more uniformity in the workload expectations, expenses, and credits granted became apparent; the office’s experience with some of the professional standards of student: faculty ratios, acceptable housing arrangements, legal liability, and international travel also made them the logical place to charge with development and oversight of Wittenberg’s own summer programs.

To aid in this new duty, a second faculty committee (an International Education Committee already existed) was proposed to the Educational Policies Committee and approved by the faculty, specifically charged with helping to develop guidelines for designing, planning, and implementing summer programs abroad (or even summer programs in the U.S. but off-campus). Those guidelines are in force now, and several successful trips have already been completed.

Students continue to study abroad in many countries around the globe during the school year, as well. Over 20% of Wittenberg students enjoy an international experience at some point in their college careers, whether for a summer, a semester, or a year. The Office of International Education approves programs for academic viability; the Office of the Registrar determines the actual numbers of credits transferred, and individual departments and programs approve the specific articulation between courses for transfer. It seems that Wittenberg students become more and more interested in going off the beaten path, with recent students studying development projects in Sierra Leone and Jamaica or studying in China or Argentina as well as visiting more traditional choices such as Britain and France. Returning students provide enthusiastic feedback on their time abroad, and their stories often inspire other students to seek the unknown, as well.

Another added responsibility within the self-study period has been compliance with the government’s Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS). While, ironically, the complications of the system have been somewhat offset by the national drop in international students after September 11, 2001, as numbers begin to climb again, the legal details, both for international students and for students going abroad, can not be overlooked. These students also need special attention in university policy-making, such as rules regarding housing during school breaks, special registration needs, and advising.
The key challenges facing the Office of International Education in the next decade will be twofold: staffing and resources. With only one full-time administrator and one assistant, the many paperwork-intensive processes of the office are difficult to cover adequately, and will only become more so as numbers of both international students and study-abroad students rise. The other chief obstacle to the realization of the strategic plan’s goal of a study-abroad experience for every student will be resources; a team including Director of International Education JoAnn Bennett is weighing a number of creative possibilities for resolving the tension between Wittenberg’s need to bring in revenue and the desire to provide the often-costly option of international study to all students. Several intriguing potential approaches, such as more Wittenberg-run summer programs and more exchange programs with foreign universities, have been identified, however, and will, we hope, bear fruit in the coming years.

Learning Environments, Living Environments: Student Development

Wittenberg’s student development area works hard to provide a vital, diverse, transformative campus environment for student learning and growth. In addition to the usual duties of managing residence life, programming, and Wittenberg’s many co-curricular student activities, the office also cooperates extensively with the Office of Academic Services on issues such as new student transition, counseling and health needs, and students at risk. The office also sets goals and seeks feedback for assessment, striving for improvement throughout its programs.

The Office of Student Development has undergone many changes in the past decade in terms of subsidiary duties and reporting lines; the sheer volume of these changes has sometimes created challenges. Beginning in 1999, the dean of students was also the vice president for student development and enrollment management; the director of admission reported directly to the dean of students. In addition, a number of assistant and associate deans split multiple duties within the student development area, including offices such as the motor pool. A swift sequence of events created an opportunity for a rethinking of administrative restructuring when the director of admission resigned in 2003 and the dean/vice president for student development and enrollment management resigned in spring 2004. Following the interim leadership of a well-respected former dean, Richard Scott, from January-June 2004, current Associate Vice President for Student Development/Dean of Students Carolyn Perkins was hired in June 2004, at which time enrollment management was officially separated into another vice presidential-level area of the university’s administration. Assistant deans, directors, and coordinators oversee areas such as residential life, student rentals, student activities, Greek life, judicial affairs, multicultural student programs, and the Health and Wellness Center; the motor pool was moved to the purview of police and security services in spring, 2006. This more intuitive and streamlined organizational design has led to more opportunity for cooperative work between the dean of students and the assistant provost for academic services, leading to such important programs as the separation of pre-orientation from the redesigned New Student Days, the early warning system, and work on the first-year experience and retention, in support of strategic plan goals B and C.

Both Dean Perkins and Assistant Provost Rhine enjoy the process of goal-setting and assessing achievement and potential improvements, and would agree that a more
centralized institutional research office will help with appropriate dissemination of results of such surveys as the NSSE, the CIRP, YFCY, and the SSI. While these two offices can and do use results from these national surveys to pinpoint strengths and design remedies for areas in need of improvement, the use of this data and analyses does not fully influence the work of other offices for which they could be informative.

There is also reason to suspect that some students’ dissatisfaction with areas of student development may derive from two unpopular but necessary policies put into place before Dean Perkins’s arrival. The previous dean had banned beer kegs from Wittenberg-owned rental properties; even though most Wittenberg students are not old enough to drink legally, this was an unpopular policy. A few years later, fiscal circumstances made it necessary to enforce literally the policy relating to student eligibility to live “off-campus” (often this means merely living in Wittenberg rental properties rather than in residence halls). Both of these policies have created an environment of dissatisfaction, but the current dean and her staff are dispelling some of that negative feeling through energetic leadership and positive changes.

The office sees itself as a major stakeholder in the strategic plan’s Goal C (transform the undergraduate educational experience by adopting a comprehensive and integrated approach to student learning). One of the office’s goals is to build on strengths while monitoring student needs to inform changes and restructuring. The Office of Student Development creates opportunities for student learning in many of its programs, including residence hall programming, first-year programming, multicultural programming, student governance, gender awareness programming, judicial procedures, and oversight of Wittenberg’s astounding 139 student groups, from the Animé Club to the Weaver Chapel Association (for a complete list, see 8.1A). In addition to these diverse areas of programming and opportunities for leadership, the office also runs the Emerging and Developing Leaders Programs for selected students, offers an annual fall student leadership retreat, and works with class officers.

The Office of Student Development also advocates for well-designed, well-maintained living and learning facilities for students. The opening of the new residence hall and subsequent razing of South and Hanley Halls in summer and fall 2006 provide an excellent boost to available high-quality student housing, in addition to the Sprecher and Keller Apartment Complexes. The new residence hall, in particular, is designed with small common areas for group study, meetings, and even small classes. Additionally, there are not only in-room connections for high-speed internet access, but also small computer labs scattered throughout the hall. But even as these new residences open, the office advocates for better progress on completing deferred maintenance in other buildings, both residential and academic. Over the summer of 2006, some exterior and interior refurbishment of Firestine Hall was completed.

Another challenge is one shared with many colleges and universities nationally: rising student need for mental health care. Our Health and Wellness Center, with 1.5 FTE in counseling, does an excellent job of raising awareness and working with as many students as possible, but with more and more students arriving on campus with mental health and/or behavioral issues for which they are under a doctor’s care, our resources are strained. When one considers that many families do not make arrangements for continued individual care in Springfield, and the added pressures of college life, as well as the temptations to discontinue prescribed medications in order to imbibe (or worse yet, substance abuse while taking prescription medications), it is clear why our counseling services are used so heavily. Given national trends and local demand, we need to consider creative ways we can provide
more counseling capacity to students and also communicate to parents that their students’ needs will be ongoing as they enter college.

Finally, the Office of Student Development recognizes that one of the emerging issues in co-curricular education is cyber-security and cyber-etiquette. With large numbers of students using sites such as Facebook.com and MySpace.com, the need for guidance in posting private information in a public domain becomes more and more crucial, both to students’ immediate safety and to future viability in the job market. The Career Center began educating students about employers’ surveillance of such sites in 2006; the Office of Student Development began in fall, 2006 to include programming on cyber-safety in New Student Days programming.

On a primarily residential college campus such as Wittenberg’s, the contributions of the Office of Student Development are essential to successful recruitment and retention of good students. In an environment of goal-setting and assessment, as well as personal and caring interaction, our office is poised and ready to contribute to the strategic plan’s vision of an integrated environment for student learning.

Summary

Wittenberg’s systems of academic and co-curricular programs create effective learning environments for students of many preparation levels, interests, needs, and skills. The strategic plan emphasizes reinforcing these strengths (Goals A, B, C, F), and Wittenberg’s academic and administrative offices are more than ready to meet that challenge.

Core Component 3D

*Wittenberg’s learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.*

Wittenberg’s learning resources have flourished in the past decade, with notable improvements in facilities, certification, and technological support. The strategic plan (Goals C and G) notes particularly that further expansion and enhancement of such learning resources, including proposed Student Success Center and Information Commons projects, will be required to maintain an innovative and appealing learning community. It should be noted that the learning resources discussed in this section align with the six foundational learning goals of the current general education program: writing, mathematical reasoning, foreign language, speaking, computing, and research.

Direct Learning Resources: Skills Workshops and Centers

Wittenberg sought development of the Writing Center and the Math Workshop in the 1980s as such tutoring centers became important ways to enable an ever-more-diverse college population’s success. More recently, the Oral Communication Center was added in the late 1990s, and beginning in fall, 2006, the Foreign Language Learning Center opened to help students practice their language skills by completing computer exercises, watching films, and reading target language materials.
The Writing Center

The Writing Center’s mission is to play “a key role in validating and enhancing the importance of writing at Wittenberg” (8.4D). The center’s writing advisors (students who have taken a selective course in writing tutelage) welcome requests for help from students, staff, and faculty. While most of their consultations involve students’ papers for classes, they are also available to offer a reader’s feedback on creative writing, résumés, letters, and other kinds of personal and professional writing. Reflecting the writing advisors’ rigorous training and ongoing supervision, the center recently applied for and was granted certification as a Level II (Advanced) center by the College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA), an international society for learning centers and their tutors.

In 2000, the Writing Center moved from its previous drab location in the basement of the Shouvlin Center for Lifelong Learning to its current home on the first floor of the humanities building, Hollenbeck Hall. This move from the literal and figurative margins of campus to its center nearly doubled student use of the center’s services. A pattern of heavy usage (averaging about 3,000 visits per academic year since 2003) suggests both that the space is attractive and sensibly located within an academic building, and that the student writing advisors offer helpful and encouraging feedback as students develop their writing skills and apply them to specific projects. The Writing Center also occasionally surveys students about its services and institutes appropriate changes based on results; they added weekend and evening hours as a result of such an indirect assessment.

The Writing Center staff is made up of a professional director with a master’s degree in English (and a Pushcart Prize nomination for her poetry) and an assistant director position that rotates as excellent writing advisors graduate and prepare for the next phase of their careers. The student writing advisors, as mentioned above, must complete successfully a four-credit course on tutoring and peer-editing, which includes work not only on their own writing skills, but on appropriate tutoring styles, non-directive feedback, and maintaining academic integrity. Once they are on the job, they are routinely monitored by the director and assessed on their successful use of appropriate tutoring skills. While many of the writing advisors are English majors, the center makes a special effort to attract and employ students from a wide variety of disciplines on campus.

In addition to walk-in and scheduled student consultations, the center offers several programs focused on classes, as well. English 101E classes routinely meet with the director of a team of student advisors to learn of the services offered; another long-standing program is the Writing Fellows Program, in which one tutor or a group of tutors is assigned to a specific class. They then meet with the professor of the class to learn in more detail what kinds of writing are required and how assignments are designed. The professor may then recommend or even require that students in the class meet with one of the writing fellows. Moreover, the Writing Center director stages advisor meetings several times a semester on topics suggested by advisors or by a perceived need: topics have included collaborative learning, working with ESL students, and helping students with grammar. The center has also offered forums designed for the larger university community on writing in specific disciplines or for specific audiences.

Finally, the staff of the Writing Center has, since 1986, edited and published an impressive journal of students’ expository writing, *Spectrum* (9.2E). This annual journal publishes academic papers from a variety of disciplines, as well as the
occasional personal essay. *Spectrum* reinforces the importance of writing across the
curriculum at Wittenberg, displays top-notch student achievement in writing, and
often acts as an example to aspiring writers.

**The Math Workshop**

The Math Workshop has long assisted Wittenberg students both with making up
deficiencies in basic mathematical preparation and with keeping up in their math
classes. The long-time director resigned in fall, 2004 and was succeeded by current
Coordinator of the Math Workshop Kathy Johnson. Since that time, the Math
Workshop has been certified at Level I (Regular) by the CRLA (College Reading and
Learning Association); an external review in 2000 (2.1H) also made a number of
recommendations, several of which have since been implemented.

Tutors in the Math Workshop must have letters of recommendation from
qualified faculty members indicating their fitness to tutor other students in math,
and if they are to work with students in certain courses, they must have completed
course themselves with an A or B. After an interview with the coordinator, a
prospective math tutor will then undergo about ten hours of training in topics such as
active listening, ethical tutoring, and learning styles.

While the workshop offers walk-in service for students desiring help in the context
of a math-intensive class, much of their effort is also directed towards helping students
meet basic proficiency requirements for enrollment in required math classes. When
students enroll at Wittenberg, they must take a Math Placement Exam that awards a
skill level on “basic skills” and one on pre-pre-calculus skills. Students may not enroll
in a class whose math placement level they do not meet or exceed. Students needing
to bring their math placement level up in order to take a required course register for
a non-credit course and pay for an on-line module-based course especially modified
by McGraw-Hill for Wittenberg’s placement levels. The Assessment and Learning
in Knowledge Spaces (ALEKS) program, adopted in 2005, allows students to take
tests after a series of meeting with math tutors until the appropriate level is reached.
Assessment of this portion of their function is clear; students work on the modular
lessons until they can pass the associated test.

Another self-defined function of the workshop is advising students on university
and departmental math requirements and how they articulate with the Math
Placement Exam. Consultant Bill Thomas, in 2000, noted that this seemed to be
a function more appropriately performed by students’ faculty advisors. An external
reviewer of the Mathematics and Computer Science Department in 2005, Matthew
Richey, questioned the current system of the Math Placement Test as a needlessly
restrictive system that strains resources both in the Department of Mathematics
and Computer Science and in the Math Workshop, where resources could be better
spent working with students actually enrolled in courses for which they need support
(6.3D). The placement system is currently under review.

The number of students served by the Math Workshop has gone down since
2002. As the number of visits and hours spent on making up deficiencies identified
by the Math Placement Exam have gone down, the number of drop-in visits and
hours has risen somewhat. If this trend continues, or if modifications to the Math
Placement Exam system are recommended by the Curriculum Review Committee,
then the number of drop-ins will no doubt increase more, and tutor training will need
to include more certification in specific branches and levels of mathematics in order to help students in specific classes.

The Math Workshop is currently in the process of seeking Level II certification from CRLA. The special tutor-training designed and administered in spring, 2006 included segments dealing with adult learners and their learning styles, intercultural communication, use of probing questions in tutoring, tutoring pre-calculus, and tutoring calculus.

The Math Workshop is an effective learning resource for Wittenberg students with a friendly, helpful staff and an effective coordinator. As possible changes in the general education program occur at the recommendation of the Curriculum Review Committee, the workshop will be poised to aid Wittenberg students in meeting whatever quantitative skills they are asked to master.

**Oral Communication Center**

Founded in 1998 by an enthusiastic communication professor, the Oral Communication Center provides valuable services to Wittenberg students wishing to perform more ably in public speaking situations as well as to Wittenberg faculty members desiring to incorporate speaking skills more intentionally into their course design, as called for by the six foundational general education goals of the university. The Oral Communication Center (OCC) currently makes its home in Thomas Library, with some support from the library’s audio-visual staff, led by Lyn McCurdy. There is no full-time director or coordinator; rather, the leadership for the OCC comes from one of the members of the communication faculty also tasked with co-chairing the university’s Writing and Speaking Committee; this faculty member receives one course release per year.

The student tutors for the center are chosen based on professor recommendations; they then undergo training by the OCC director and “norming” sessions with the director and current tutors. The OCC offers help by appointment or to walk-in clients on a variety of issues such as using PowerPoint, organizing an oral argument, overcoming anxiety, and using visual aids. The OCC also offers outreach programs, sometimes appearing in classes or to special groups; for example, the OCC presents a workshop for senior English majors on preparing for their Senior Symposium presentations. The OCC director and tutors have also volunteered to help with the regional Rotary Speech Contest held at Wittenberg each spring.

The Communication Department feels that the Oral Communication Center is a large responsibility for a faculty member to undertake with only one course release. The department feels that with a professional director, the OCC could expand both its training for tutors and its services to the campus community. Perhaps as plans for a Student Success Center (strategic plan, Goal C) take shape, the OCC can receive more attention and more funding to bring it into line with the resources devoted to the other foundational learning goals. However, the current system remains appropriate for the nature of the current learning goal in speaking, which is diffuse and assigned to no particular course requirements as are math, writing, and language acquisition.
The Foreign Language Learning Center

The Foreign Language Learning Center (FLLC), inaugurated in fall, 2006, is Wittenberg’s newest learning resource. Located in Hollenbeck Hall, in the site previously occupied by the Language Lab, the FLLC expands the mandate of the Language Lab in supporting students taking language classes and those interested in other cultures.

The Foreign Language Learning Center in some ways evolved naturally from the Language Lab; that lab had been directed by a faculty member with half his load in teaching and half in offering technological help to language professors and students in the lab. The resignation of that faculty member offered an opportunity to re-evaluate how best to use faculty resources in class and in computing. Based partly on recommendations from an external reviewer in 2005 (6.3D), the current model was born. Previously, in introductory-level language classes, some classes (though not all) also scheduled additional “lab” hours when a professor might or might not be helping students with exercises, sometimes computer-based. These lab hours were not consistent across the department’s faculty, and they were not included in workload calculations. The external reviewer pointed out that a Foreign Language Learning Center accessible to students of all languages would make for a far better use of faculty time, as well as providing students some flexibility in scheduling both their classes and their study time.

Director Brenda Bertrand inherited some student workers already identified as tutors in the Language Lab; those students received additional training in basic tutoring precepts (similar to training for Math Workshop tutors) and in some of the specific tools and software available in the lab. The services offered by the FLLC include not only tutoring and lab work for classes, but also cultural offerings such as motion pictures and popular magazines and newspapers in the languages offered by Wittenberg.

The Foreign Language Learning Center will be seeking CRLA certification, and it is already supporting students and faculty members alike. As recommended by the aforementioned consultants, the faculty of the department now must be supported in a program of development activities to fully utilize the pedagogical possibilities of this new facility and approach to language acquisition.

Technological Learning Resources: The Computing Center

While we have already discussed advances in computing in several other sections of this self-study report, the important learning resources offered by the Computing Center deserve summary notice here, as well. Since 1997, the Computing Center itself has grown dramatically; from a total of eight people in 1997, the staffing rose to nineteen before subsiding to its current level of seventeen. Unlike the other learning resources discussed in this component, the Computing Center offers little in the way of open-door general assistance, although they do offer trouble-shooting help through the Solution Center phone number. Rather, their status as a learning resource resides in the technological learning resources they provide and care for.

As might be expected, technological equipment and services have grown exponentially in the past ten years. Those changes with most impact on student learning are certainly the advent of the Hollenbeck and Kuss standards for technologically-enhanced classrooms, including projectors, networked computers, DVD and VHS machines, and document camera connections. Additionally, some
classrooms also feature whiteboards with computer interface capabilities and other specialized applications calibrated to the needs of particular faculty members and their disciplines. The availability of such technology has helped not only professors, but students as well; visual learners in particular benefit from the increase in audiovisual elements in class, and many students now routinely use PowerPoint to aid in packaging their own presentations for classes. There are also now several classrooms across campus with a computer for each student; such spaces exist in the library and nearly every classroom building. There are also open-use student labs in several buildings on campus and one 24-hour lab in Hollenbeck Hall.

On-line resources have also become much more easily available to all students not only through the profusion of computer labs in classrooms, but in the upgrading of residence-hall rooms to include wired network access for two computers in each residence hall room. Students, faculty, and staff can also register their own personal computers or guest machines on the network. The creation of a campus-wide wireless network is also planned and well underway, with wireless access available in Hollenbeck, the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center, Zimmerman, Thomas Library, Synod Hall, Benham-Pence Student Center and the Shouvlín Center for Lifelong Learning. Wittenberg is also in negotiations with the City of Springfield and a number of other entities to provide wireless access across the whole campus.

One other computer learning resource that deserves special mention here is implementation of and training for class software – first Web CT and now Moodle. The Computing Center offers training sessions for professors on using Moodle to enhance classroom teaching and facilitate better time and resource management. Predictably, some faculty members are more likely to embrace this technology than others. An open review process led to the replacement of Web CT with Moodle.

The major challenges facing the Computing Center will be reliable funding for replacement cycles and other initiatives, and improving communication with the Academic Computing Committee and with the campus in general. A number of departments note poor response from the center to requests for help, a lack of creativity in offering solutions, and a lack of understanding of the specialized computing needs for some academic departments.

The Hub of Research: Thomas Library

Thomas Library looks today as it looked in 1997; other than a new director, it would seem that not much has changed. And yet the collections have grown exponentially since 1997. How? The single biggest change since 1997 is our joining OhioLink, a computer-networked alliance of over eighty Ohio academic institutions that makes the holdings of all available to any individual at a member institution at the click of a mouse. A unified on-line catalogue makes it easy to search for relevant works, and a personal identification number makes it simple to order a book. Once ordered, materials are delivered via a statewide network of couriers within two or three working days. Similarly, we enjoy access to hundreds of full-text on-line periodicals and indexes in dozens of disciplines.

The positive impact of OhioLink on student learning is difficult to overstate. The easy availability of so much material raises professors’ expectations for student research, even in first-year classes. English 101E classes dedicate one or two full class sessions to basic research skills, and most students have their first brush with OhioLink in that context. The system also has an indirect positive effect on student
learning, because our access to OhioLink is a great boon in securing excellent faculty members who might otherwise be tempted away by larger universities or those in areas with immediate physical access to research libraries. OhioLink brings an incredible storehouse of research material to our fingertips.

For all the benefits, there are some drawbacks to OhioLink membership, as well. Due to the consortium are steep and tie up a significant portion of our budget, leaving less money for discretionary purchases. That is, because a large portion of our budget is directed at OhioLink’s broad-based journal or index subscriptions, we might have less money to purchase particular, collection-specific books or journals. This effect is merely one example of the challenge faced because of flat budgeting over recent years.

Because of the advances in sophistication in on-line research resources, the library is also interested in pursuing other models of library instruction in the twenty-first century. Although the phrase “information commons” is nebulous, Thomas Library envisions (along with the strategic plan, Goal G) such a facility, perhaps in a reconfigured or expanded library building. In such an information commons, instructional technologists would aid students in finding, assessing, and using research resources on-line and understanding the role of technology in communicating and amassing knowledge.

The library is able to track client use of its facilities because of the automated circulation system in place both for Thomas Library and for OhioLink (8.4E). The library also assesses its policies and operations through the Library Policy Committee and contact between departments and their library liaisons. Furthermore, in 2002, the library participated in the Association of Research Libraries’ LibQual+ survey of service to pinpoint both areas of success and areas for improvement. The survey will be repeated every four years or so to provide a profile of changing student needs over time (8.4F).

Thomas Library, with a forward-looking acknowledgement of the ways in which research is changing for younger generations of learners, is poised to create opportunities for research and for helping students use those opportunities creatively, responsibly, and intelligently to meet their learning goals, and the goals that Wittenberg has for them as learners.

Summary Assessment of Criterion Three

Through multiple direct and indirect assessments at many levels, Wittenberg has shown that it provides a dedicated cadre of teacher-scholars designing innovative, effective programs of instruction. Likewise, student learning is supported not only by the faculty, but by an array of learning resources set in positive learning environments. Wittenberg fulfills its educational mission, with an eye on future continued growth and change.
Chapter Four: Acquisition, Discovery and Application of Knowledge

Wittenberg promotes a life of learning for its faculty, administration, staff, and students by fostering and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility in ways consistent with its mission.

Virginia Woolf famously posited in 1929 that for a woman to write, she needed £500 a year and a room of her own. She came to this conclusion based on much experience, part of it spent in comparing the rich libraries and delicious meals of Oxford and Cambridge to the penurious board and modest bookshelf of the women’s colleges. While one can correctly argue that the physical conditions conducive to scholarship do not guarantee scholarship, it is true that an institution such as Wittenberg can, through its academic programs, curricular expectations, and systems of faculty and student support and development, encourage a life of inquiry, creativity and scholarship. In fact, that is Wittenberg’s mission.

Through its recognition of free inquiry and academic freedom, through its many support and development programs, through its inculcation of academic integrity, and through its connection of learning to vocation and social responsibility, Wittenberg promotes an ideal of life as a constant source of new ideas, new skills, new responsibilities, and new adventures.
Core Component 4A

Wittenberg demonstrates, through the actions of its board, administration, students, faculty, and staff, that it values a life of learning.

Wittenberg University recognizes the inherently scholarly nature of a university, and maintains a commitment to learning, research, and public presentation of results through a broad array of internally and externally funded programs. Wittenberg not only offers support programs for faculty and student pursuit of learning, but also values and recognizes their richly-varied accomplishments, scholarly, creative, and professional.

Freedom of Inquiry and Expression

Wittenberg University’s namesake evokes indelible images of deep thought and principled dissent. In keeping with that tradition of independent thought and the search for truth, Wittenberg University abides by and upholds general principles of academic freedom and freedom of thought in general. Indeed, in the Constitution of the Board of Directors, the faculty’s academic freedom is specifically guaranteed in relation to the “freedom to discuss the faculty member’s subject in the classroom,” the freedom to research and publish, and “freedom to speak and write as a citizen, as a member of a learned profession, and as a member of the Faculty of Wittenberg University without institutional censorship or discipline” (2.2B).

The faculty, in turn, subscribes to a “Statement on Professional Responsibilities of the Faculty of Wittenberg University” and a “Statement on Professional Ethics” (endorsed by the Seventy-Third Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors). Both these documents make clear that it is professors’ right and responsibility to seek knowledge themselves and to “encourage the free pursuit of learning in their students” (the statement appears in 1.1A, “Faculty Appointment and Review Policies”). Furthermore, both faculty and staff manuals contain the university’s policy on political activity, which assures individual rights to hold political views, endorse candidates, and run for office or support legislation so long as one does not imply the university’s endorsement or support or use university resources. In fact, Wittenberg is proud to have a number of quite politically active community leaders among its employees, including Wray Distinguished Professor of Humanities Warren Copeland, who also happens to be the mayor of Springfield. Professor of Philosophy Don Reed currently sits on the Springfield City School Board, as well, and Professor of History Jim Huffman before him. Longtime employee Peggy Hanna, currently the department assistant to the Sociology Department, is a long-time peace activist, convention delegate, and memoirist. Wittenberg’s faculty and staff appreciate the academic freedom guaranteed them by the board’s policies and celebrate the spirit of open inquiry and true scholarship that such policies foster.

Students, too, as mentioned above, are encouraged to pursue learning freely; their rights are protected and an environment for civil and reasonable debate is created by several campus policies. For instance, in a still-current Vietnam-era faculty policy, students’ political views and personal beliefs that may become known to faculty members in the course of academic discussion or advising are required to be held in confidentiality by the faculty member. Other policies applying to the entire campus community, but perhaps especially intended to model civil behavior for students, include policies on peaceful dissent versus disorder, distribution of
political and other non-Wittenberg printed materials, and discriminatory behavior. These policies, couched in didactic terms, set in philosophical context various kinds of behaviors and establish an environment in which all members of the community are encouraged to share their ideas, ask questions, and enjoin debate civilly, peacefully, and for the good of the community (1.1C). The university also recognizes the right of any recognized group or body to bring a speaker to campus, as long as it is clear that Wittenberg does not necessarily endorse the speaker’s ideas by providing a forum for their discussion (1.3F.vi).

Wittenberg’s policies on freedom of inquiry and expression provide all members of the community with a safe environment in which to engage new ideas, to discuss views rationally, and to learn the arts of civil debate and dissent. This atmosphere is absolutely crucial to learning, and is a central value for the university.

Supporting Life-Long Learning for Administrators and Staff

Wittenberg University offers a number of professional and personal development opportunities to administrative and support staff members. All employees, as well as their spouses and children, are eligible to take one course per semester at Wittenberg through our tuition remission program. This valuable option not only furthers the employee’s education, but provides a unique sense of “buy-in” into the educational enterprise of the institution. Administrators or staff members in a degree-seeking program wishing to take a course not offered at Wittenberg (graduate work in a professional area in educational administration, for instance) may have their tuition for such courses reimbursed at the rate of 80% upon successful completion of pre-approved courses.

Administrative staff members are also eligible to apply for study leave after six consecutive years of full-time employment at Wittenberg. Analogous to faculty sabbaticals, the study leave program offers paid time to work on projects of professional development that benefit both the administrator and the university. Employees may apply for three months of leave at full pay or six months at half pay. The proposal takes the form of a letter to the president of the university, and must include a clear description of the project to be undertaken and an explanation of its benefits for the individual and the university. The details of the program are under review to bring them in line with practice at other institutions that offer this benefit.

Wittenberg’s administrative departments, as well as the Office of Human Resources, offer support for employee attendance at professionally-related workshops and conferences. Individual support grants are capped at $400, but if a special opportunity arises for multiple members of an administrative office, the Office of Human Resources can use its discretion in determining the amount granted.

The Office of Human Resources also routinely buys packets of vouchers for training sessions at New Horizons Learning Center in nearby Fairborn, Ohio. These vouchers are available for use on a first-come, first-served basis for employees to gain, refresh, or hone skills in specific software packages such as Word, Excel, or PowerPoint.

The university and the Office of Human Resources also sponsor a wide variety of personal development opportunities, some work-related and some simply educational and community-building. A number of health workshops, health screenings, exercise classes, and groups such as the Wittenberg Gardening Club and various reading groups and book clubs provide an opportunity for building relationships across the university while learning and sharing ideas and enthusiasms (5.2C).
Encouraging Faculty Research and Professional Development

Wittenberg faculty members and students enjoy a wide array of support for research from internal and external sources, including programs of the Faculty Research Fund Board, the Faculty Development Board, and external grants such as the Freeman and McGregor Grants in the past ten years. We have also been fortunate to earn government support for expanding some programs, such as computational science. Although teaching is the most important business of Wittenberg's faculty, they also take pride in their role as scholars, and the university supports them in their efforts to create and present new knowledge and to mentor students to do the same.

The programs of the Faculty Research Fund Board (FRFB) encourage faculty members to engage in their professional lives beyond the world of Wittenberg. Their funding efforts focus on supporting research that will lead to publication or public presentation in some form. Items funded may include travel for research or materials necessary to the research process. Awards for faculty members fall into two categories: Project Grants and Research Grants. The Project Grants, for up to $1,500, are available for such costs as publication fees, exhibition or performance costs, and purchasing equipment or materials; the culmination of the research in a peer-reviewed or invited venue is expected. Faculty members may apply as often as needed, but grants to an individual will not exceed $1,500 per year. The FRFB's Research Grants are larger and necessarily more competitive. Grants may award up to $3,000, but only three per year are awarded. The kinds of costs that are acceptable are the same as for the Project Grants, but the Research Grant simply recognizes more extensive (and expensive) projects. Because of the limited number of Research Grants, the screening is more rigorous, and a faculty member can hold only one Research Grant in a five-year period. Holders of Research Grants are also not eligible for a Project Grant within the same twelve-month period. Although these are not enormous sums of money, they certainly can provide crucial support; the eligibility requirements are designed to help make support available to the widest possible group of faculty members rather than creating a tiered faculty of those who do research and those who do not.

The Faculty Development Board (FDB) also administers several programs of support for faculty members' professional activities in addition to the programs in support of improved teaching described in Chapter Three. Professional Enrichment Grants (PEG) are a popular and well-utilized support benefit for faculty members; these grants help to pay travel expenses to academic conferences in which the faculty member is an active participant as a presenter, organization officer, panel chair, or discussant. After remaining at $500 for well over a decade, the PEG cap was recently raised to $700 in acknowledgment of ever-growing prices of lodging and airfare. In fiscal year 2006, the FDB dispersed over $40,000 in Professional Enrichment Grants. Each faculty member controls a personal travel budget, as well, that can be used to pay for costs not covered by a Professional Enrichment Grant. The account receives $600 annually, accruable to $1,200.

The Faculty Development Board also awards the Edith B. and Frank C. Matthies Award annually “to further the education of selected and worthy teachers and to strengthen the faculty.” First granted in 1978, the Matthies Award carries with it a stipend of $1,000; all faculty members (except current sitting members of the FDB) are eligible to apply, and there are no restrictions on the proposal. The money might be used for research, travel, attendance at seminars or workshops, or other educational
activities, as long as the proposal demonstrates the value of the project to the improvement of pedagogy.

Of equal importance to financial support of faculty members’ research programs is time for research. Even in the midst of fiscal challenges and increased pressure to maintain consistent enrollments and student: faculty ratios, Wittenberg has continued in its unwavering support of its sabbatical program. The sabbatical leave program strengthens the university by encouraging the intellectual and professional development of its faculty members. Full-time faculty members are eligible to apply for sabbatical leave after the equivalent of at least six full years of service; the sabbatical cycle then begins again after the year in which a sabbatical leave is taken. The faculty member must propose to the Faculty Personnel Board a compelling professional project to be undertaken during this time; often this will take the form of research, experimentation, or writing, but some time might also be spent in curricular development, planning, and research. Faculty members are encouraged to make alternative arrangements for their administrative duties while on sabbatical.

The sabbatical program is highly flexible. Faculty members may elect to take one semester per seven-year cycle at full pay, two consecutive semesters at 75% pay, or two non-consecutive semesters at 75% pay during the semesters on leave. These options not only make it more financially feasible to take sabbatical leave, but also make it easier for small departments to make adjustments in their course offerings for faculty on leave.

Wittenberg is fortunate to have several endowed chairs, thus rewarding a few exemplary professors and providing not only long-term commitment to the faculty salary pool, but also support for those individuals’ research expenses. Each recipient receives an annual stipend of $5,000 and a $2,000 award for professional travel and materials. Current incumbents of Wittenberg’s endowed or named chairs are

- Kenneth E. Wray Humanities Professor Warren Copeland (endowed chair established in 2000),
- H. Orth Hirt Professor of History James Huffman (endowed chair established 1998),
- Paul Luther Keil Professor of Psychology Jo Wilson (endowed chair established 2001), and
- George L. Greenawalt Professor of Biology David Mason (named chair without endowment established 1920).

Wittenberg’s Political Science Department also boasts an endowed faculty scholar award. The Laatsch Research Award in Political Science, established in 2005 and named for Dr. Melvin Henry Laatsch (1905-74), late Professor Emeritus of Political Science, carries with it an annual award of $2,500 to support professional development and research. The inaugural recipient of the Laatsch Research Award was Professor Gerry Hudson in 2004.

The Freeman Foundation Grant

The largest single-foundation grant ever received by Wittenberg was awarded by the Freeman Foundation in 2002 to increase, strengthen, and popularize teaching about East Asia and its cultures. Wittenberg’s venerable (founded in 1970) and distinguished interdisciplinary program in East Asian Studies won the $1.9 million grant to enable all Wittenberg students, no matter their course of study, to encounter Asian culture
and issues as part of their undergraduate experience. The grant included a number of creative components, including a Freeman Fellows Program, Travel Grants to Asia, Curriculum Development Grants, Study Abroad Scholarships, Group Travel Grants, Language Scholarships, and funds to co-sponsor a major East Asian performing arts group’s participation in the Wittenberg Series each year of the four-year grant.

The Fellows Program enriched the university’s curriculum by bringing to Wittenberg two promising East Asian Studies instructors (ABD or new Ph.D.s) each year for one-year appointments as Visiting Fellows. Each Fellow worked with an experienced faculty mentor, taught one course per semester in an area of interest, contributed to East Asian Studies program activities, and participated in the institutional life of the university. The mentors guided Fellows in appropriate course design and pedagogical techniques for undergraduate, non-specialist teaching, thus enhancing the Fellows’ professional preparation even as they enhanced Wittenberg’s curriculum. The Fellowships were open as to discipline, although some preference went to academic departments lacking a tenured or tenure-track Asianist when one might be appropriate. Fellows were subject to a national search and were compensated comparably to entry-level junior faculty positions. The eight fellows visiting during the four years of the grant (two fellows per year) were:

- Ying-Ying Chen, Ph.D., Simon Fraser University: Chinese archaeology
- Hikaru Suzuki, Ph.D. Harvard University: Japanese anthropology
- Heather Willoughby, Ph.D. Columbia University: ethnomusicology
- Shion Kono, Ph.D. Princeton University: Japanese literature
- Adam Frank, Ph.D. University of Texas: Asian anthropology
- Leo Yip, Ph.D. The Ohio State University: Japanese literature and language
- Dennis Frost, Ph.D. in progress, Columbia University: modern Japanese history
- Dawn Grimes-McLellan, Ph.D. in progress, University of Illinois: Asian educational anthropology

The Fellows Program of course furthered the professional development of the Fellows themselves, but also energized the East Asian Studies program and the academic departments in which their courses were offered, providing new colleagues and research perspectives to faculty mentors.

Short-term Travel Grants to Asia provided opportunities for faculty and administrators with no formal background in Asian studies to add an Asian dimension to their courses, their research interests, or their administrative and professional activities. By familiarizing themselves with East Asia, its cultures, and current issues, these faculty members could see first-hand the impact of curricular choices facing Wittenberg’s East Asian program. Grants were awarded for a wide range of purposes, including the evaluation of Chinese study-abroad sites, investigating economic development in China, studying traditional Japanese ceramic techniques, and learning about traditional Chinese medicine. Thus, the program served to augment potential Asian elements across the curriculum as well as to extend the focus and experience of East Asian Studies faculty members; by widening the experience of Asia across the community, the Travel Grants also created an informed environment for institutional planning and decision-making.

The Freeman Curriculum Development Grants were aimed specifically at encouraging non-Asianists to develop some Asian expertise and include it in courses.
These grants might fund language courses, graduate classes in an East Asian aspect of the faculty member’s discipline, or stipends for Asia-focused course development. Many of the Curriculum Development Grants were awarded in conjunction with Travel Grants.

Both the Travel Grants and the Curriculum Development Grants were awarded by a specially-appointed committee in consultation with the provost. Proposals were evaluated on the basis of the grantee’s commitment to incorporating Asian content into his or her teaching and to enriching Wittenberg’s East Asian Studies Program. Strong preference was given to proposals that would create, revise, or add segments to courses in disciplines (art, education, music, and management) or regional areas (Tibet, Mongolia, Korea) where our Asian curriculum is relatively weak. Both of these grants functioned to develop new areas of knowledge for faculty members, enriching both their professional areas of expertise and their course development.

**Other Major External Grants**

Wittenberg has benefited from a number of major externally-funded grants in the past decade; some of these initiatives, more closely related to program assessment or community development, are discussed in the context of other criteria, but a number relate directly to faculty development, both individual and university-wide.

Two major grants have funded scientific equipment that has had a positive impact on both research and pedagogy for a number of professors. A 2001 National Science Foundation (NSF) Grant worth nearly $100,000, matched by Wittenberg, provided funds to extend the university’s state-of-the-art geographic information systems (GIS) technology across the curriculum. Used extensively across disciplines such as geography, geology, and biology, the GIS lab has evolved into a major resource since Wittenberg provided initial seed money for the lab in 1996. In 2004, another NSF Grant of $58,000 allowed Wittenberg, a charter member of the Consortium for Flow Cytometry Education, to host a national workshop to train professors from across the country in the use of the specialized equipment to enrich undergraduate curricula.

External grants from the Columbus Jewish Foundation, the Jewish Arts Endowment, and the Ohio Humanities Council made possible an outstanding 2003 conference on the Dreyfus Affair, coordinated by Professor of Religion Rochelle Millen, Associate Professor of History Tammy Proctor, and Associate Professor of French Tim Wilkerson.

Individual faculty members have also benefited from external development grants. In addition to the group of Fulbright Award winners in the past ten years discussed in Chapter Three, Associate Professor of Philosophy Nancy McHugh received a $70,000 research grant from the National Science Foundation to support her work on a book project regarding a philosophical pragmatic approach to scientific research. The 2006 award is especially unusual for the NSF in funding a project in the philosophy of science. Wittenberg was also fortunate to be awarded a Luce Foundation Grant in 2003 to fund the first four years of an additional faculty line in Chinese language and literature.

Wittenberg’s success in winning grants is due in no small part to aid offered by the Office of the Associate Provost. Associate Provost Gary Gaffield contributes greatly in many ways to grant proposal projects on campus, sometimes assisting directly with proposal preparation, sometimes offering an office of record for administration of a grant, and sometimes locating and providing discipline-specific workshop training for
faculty interested in pursuing external grants. He often works over time with proposal planning committees (as with computational science or the Freeman Grant) and helps faculty members or groups to identify potential funding sources for their ideas or, alternatively, helps them develop their ideas into fundable projects. Gaffield has also inaugurated a series of successful in-house workshops on applying for Fulbright Awards, and helps faculty members and groups make their proposals attractive to various funding agencies. Gaffield also takes initiative for larger, over-arching projects (such as the Teagle and Culpeper proposals) that obtained support for faculty development in the use of technology, the proposal to the Alden Trust for a $100,000 grant to upgrade classroom technology in each building, or the proposal for a $100,000 McGregor Grant that initially funded student-faculty collaborative research. Through the recent addition of a Director of Government, Corporate and Foundation Relations in the Office of University Advancement, we hope to expand future support from these sources.

Although in-house grants from the Faculty Research Fund Board and the Faculty Development Board are relatively small, they are also widely available and combinable with other sources of research and professional support. A few larger and more competitive awards bridge the gap to the very large externally-funded grants that occasionally enrich the Wittenberg faculty’s professional support. While more money is needed to keep up in a world of ever-increasing costs, Wittenberg’s active, varied, and generous panoply of support opportunities conveys unequivocally Wittenberg’s support for its faculty members’ pursuit of knowledge in their disciplines.

Supporting Student Research

One of the key strengths of Wittenberg is the individual attention students receive from an engaged and dedicated faculty. While much of this pedagogical talent is engaged in the classroom, most students and alumni report important individual mentoring relationships with faculty members as well, and many of these relationships grow out of students’ feelings of accomplishments in their own independent research projects.

The opportunity for independent study for credit exists in every department, and is required, directly or indirectly, in many senior capstone experiences for majors. As described more fully in Chapter Three, these capstone experiences may take the form of classes in which each student is in essence working on an independent thesis, or may require further independent work on a research topic begun in an upper-level class.

The most rewarding (and demanding) arena for student research occurs in the senior honors thesis or project. Students must have a grade point average of at least 3.50 in order to qualify to undertake an honors thesis, and must secure the approval of a director in her or his department and two additional faculty readers, one inside and one outside the major department. Most honors theses are substantial documents of fifty pages or more; they must be defended to the student’s faculty panel. Many departments keep an archive of their honors theses over the years, and the University Honors Program has, for several years, kept a copy of the honors theses of those completing University Honors. Most recently, Thomas Library has inaugurated an on-line archive of honors theses, but the collection is spotty and unrepresentative as yet, since library staff at first did not obtain complete lists of students doing honors theses and projects, and since students may be lax about providing an electronic manuscript and completing the required waiver. Still, as this
on-line archive develops more fully, it will become a point of pride for Wittenberg students and their faculty mentors and departments (9.2M).

Of course, seniors are not the only Wittenberg students engaged in research, and other opportunities exist for underclassmen. Many junior-level classes require final research projects, and all students are eligible to present their work at regular campus-wide poster sessions for student research. These poster sessions began in 1997 as a way to showcase student work in the sciences (thus the poster-session format, typical of the sciences). Beginning in fall 2000, organizer Associate Professor of Biology Margaret Goodman has made an effort to branch out to include disciplines outside the sciences; in addition to poster presentations of natural science research, recent sessions have included work from religion, English literature, mathematics, computational science, political science, psychology and music (a list of presenters is available in 9.1E). Some majors, such as sociology, communication, English, and history, offer showcases for students’ work in the form of mini-conferences of seniors’ assessment projects. Majors in art, theatre, and music also offer senior exhibitions, plays, and recitals.

In the past decade, student research has become more high-profile, and in some disciplines, opportunities could be limited based on financial resources. In order to provide more opportunities for student-faculty collaborative research, Wittenberg submitted a proposal to the McGregor Fund in 1998; the resulting $100,000 grant was used to bolster the number of student research grants both in summer and during the academic year. Originally, student research grants were funded by the FRFB, and some departments were also fortunate enough to have small endowments for this purpose. The McGregor Fund grant, however, increased the number of summer research stipends from twelve to twenty-two and also funded $250 academic year grants. The grants, awarded by the Faculty Research Fund Board, are competitive, and students submitting proposals must demonstrate stellar academic achievement and appropriate preparation and capability for the project proposed. Both summer and academic-year grants require a faculty supervisor, and the summer research grant of $2,350 includes a $2,100 student stipend, $250 for supplies and materials, and $500 as a faculty supervisor stipend. While initially, the grants went predominantly to students in the sciences, where hands-on research makes student-faculty collaboration more feasible, students in the humanities and social sciences have increasingly won support. The academic-year grants, in particular, are helpful with buying copies of key books and covering regional library research trips. All the research grants require the culmination of the project in substantial written work, presentation, exhibition, or performance. The McGregor Fund grant reinforced the importance of student research on campus, although after the initial grant period, the university budget has absorbed the costs of the program. (For a list of student research grant awardees, see 9.1E in the resource room.)

The Freeman Foundation grant discussed earlier also included provisions for support of student learning through travel; the emphasis was on expanding the experience of Asia beyond those students majoring in East Asian studies. Individual students were eligible for Study Abroad Scholarships to encourage study in East Asia (China, Japan, and South Korea) without previous knowledge of the language. Students from all majors were encouraged to apply to study in a credit-bearing, Wittenberg-approved program for a semester, an academic year, or a summer. Perhaps even more exciting were the Group Travel to Asia grants, which fostered interest in and contact with East Asia to students of all backgrounds and academic interests. This program garnered some creative project proposals and created enormous
exhilaration on campus, as well as enthusiastic sharing of experiences. Some of the
groups awarded these grants included members of the University Honors Program,
the basketball team, and members of the Wittenberg Literary Society, who studied
contemporary Japanese literature before their trip and worked as a traveling writers’
workshop doing travel writing (9.1F).

Some students in the sciences also benefit from partnerships with area centers
of high technology. Through the Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education
(SOCHE), for example, Wittenberg students may apply for research internships at
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (WPAFB) in either the Materials and Manufacturing
Directorate or the Air Force Institute of Technology. In 2003, after careful
cultivation and negotiation, Wittenberg concluded its own Educational Partnership
Agreement with WPAFB. In 2006, we began a collaborative project with the Ohio
Supercomputer Center and WPAFB to enhance teaching, learning, and research in
computational science.

Because of the early commitment to and pursuit of these opportunities by the
Office of the Provost, Wittenberg faculty members are now actively involved in the
creation of the Ralph Regula School of Computational Science, an initiative of the
Ohio Board of Regents to create online opportunities to study computational science
(the Associate Provost is a member of the School’s policy advisory committee).

Undergraduate students also increasingly share their research projects at
conference venues. The university pays for several students a year to present at the
National Conference of Undergraduate Research (NCUR); these spots are competitive,
and the number varies depending on the location of the conference each year (and thus
the transportation costs). The Office of the Associate Provost also supplies funds for
more discipline-specific conference attendance as need and funds permit. Wittenberg
students have presented regularly at NCUR, as well as various regional and national
conferences in literature, psychology, geography, history, biology, and other disciplines.

The ultimate achievement in student research, of course, is publication, and
Wittenberg sponsors a number of well-edited, beautifully-produced publications
featuring student research. Spectrum, published by the Writing Center, publishes
annually an array of outstanding expository writing and non-fiction from all disciplines.
The past decade’s issues and a list of contents are both available in the resource room
(9.2E). The Wittenberg Review of Literature and Art has, for several decades, published
top-notch student creative writing together with fine reproductions of student art.
While some of the published works are produced for classes, many represent the
craftsmanship of students practicing their art beyond the classroom. Again, past issues
and a list of contributions for the past decade are available in the resource room (9.2D).

Several discipline-specific journals also serve as showcases of student work. Pholeos,
a biannual journal of the Wittenberg University Speleological Society, provides a venue
for student research, cave surveys, and review articles, as well as occasional cave-related
poetry and artwork. More than 500 copies of each issue are circulated to individuals,
organizations, libraries, and museums in over twenty countries (9.2I). The pioneering
East Asian Studies Journal, in its thirty-first year, publishes academic papers on East
Asian subjects from undergraduates around the world. The student-run editorial staff
selects manuscripts, helps authors prepare articles for final preparation, and circulates
the annual journal to academic professionals as well as research libraries around the
country (9.2F). The History Journal and the Political Science Journal both publish
selected papers from classes in the discipline (by majors or non-majors) annually in the
spring. The journals serve as a venue for excellent student work and also to display the variety and quality of work being done in the respective disciplines (9.2G, 9.2H).

Through requirements in regular departmental offerings, opportunities for public presentation, and the support of internal and external grants and research opportunities, Wittenberg inculcates in its students the importance of original research and contribution to the knowledge base of one’s chosen field and creates an environment in which to complete and present just such research.

Recognition of Faculty and Student Research and Learning

In a very real way, some of the support mechanisms and publication and presentation opportunities discussed above are in and of themselves recognition for outstanding work. Just as students are honored to have their work published, so are faculty thrilled to be included in the conversation of their disciplines by presenting at professional meetings and having work published. But Wittenberg also offers several ways to recognize achievement; many individuals have also won recognition from external entities.

The most central and palpable recognition for faculty achievement in professional activities remains promotion in rank, which emphasizes professional activities more than the tenure decision proper does. While Wittenberg’s standards recognize that professional activities can take many appropriate forms, all emphasize original contributions to their discipline’s endeavor. Promotion to full professor remains, of course, the ultimate recognition of professional accomplishment.

More frequent recognition and encouragement comes in the form of laudatory notices of recent achievements in Wittenberg’s bi-weekly, on-line newsletter Around the Hollow (9.2C). Around the Hollow features a “Faculty Forum” section noting current professional activities across campus. Wittenberg Magazine, in both its paper and on-line manifestations, also publishes faculty notes on recent concerts, exhibitions, publications, and presentations (9.2A). The Faculty Development Board’s (FDB) annual Quest and Question program features a faculty member’s after-dinner talk on current or recent work (5.1F); Ty Buckman, Director of Faculty Development, has recently added to Quest and Question an impressive display of faculty books, articles, and other types of professional work of the past year. The Associate Provost also recognizes faculty members submitting external grant awards with gift certificates to local restaurants. A number of faculty members, of course, earn recognition for their work from beyond Wittenberg’s walls; such national and international awards are also much-publicized and honored on campus, as well (a list of such recognitions is available in 5.1B.i).

Students are honored for their academic achievements in many ways. Wittenberg maintains and publishes a Dean’s List recognizing students each term who maintain a 3.5 grade point average for the semester. The University Honors Program and departmental honors theses, discussed above, constitute a high level of academic challenge and recognition. In addition, a number of student honor societies reward students for excellent academic performance. At least nineteen academic departments or programs boast chapters of their discipline’s national honorary society, usually recognizing junior and senior majors. These students are usually inducted in a departmental gathering and marked by a symbolic cord or sash as part of their graduation regalia. Additionally, first-year men and women who maintain high grade point averages are eligible for induction into Phi Eta Sigma and Alpha Lambda Delta, respectively. Other national honor and leadership societies include Alpha Sigma
Lambda (adult students), Chi Alpha Sigma (student-athletes), the Order of Omega (Greek men and women), Ivy Ring (sophomore women), Pick and Pen (juniors), Mortar Board (seniors), and Omicron Delta Kappa (seniors).

The crown jewel among Wittenberg’s honor societies, however, is our chapter, Omicron of Ohio, of Phi Beta Kappa, granted in 1991. Phi Beta Kappa stresses the importance of the liberal arts and sciences and lionizes the life of the mind, and thus was a long-sought recognition of Wittenberg’s own commitment to those ideals. Only about ten per cent of colleges and universities in the nation boast a chapter of Phi Beta Kappa. The chapter recognizes top students in liberal-arts majors during their junior and senior years (junior entrance requires a significantly higher grade point average for eligibility); the chapter is somewhat unusual in requiring completion of a calculus course for eligibility. The chapter also works with the Wittenberg Series when possible to include a Phi Beta Kappa lecturer among the series events.

New membership in these societies is recognized by the groups themselves in various ways, such as induction banquets, but also at the annual Honors Convocation. Celebrated in the spring, Honors Convocation is the site of recognition for many student awards. In addition to the honorary societies named above, an impressive array of departmental awards also recognizes student academic achievement, both at the Honors Convocation and at departmental functions. Additionally, a number of individual awards recognizing outstanding achievements and leadership are awarded to influential students. The Honors Convocation and its revelation of these highly-respected awards is one of the signature events of spring semester each year, complete with a special edition of the *Torch* that is withheld as top secret until immediately after the ceremony.

As with faculty members, many individual Wittenberg students have won prestigious recognition from external bodies, as well. Some examples from the past decade include Dan Stroeh’s winning the National Student Playwriting Prize in 2002 and having his play *it is no desert* performed at the Kennedy Center; Janet Hess’s earning a research grant from the Beta Beta Beta Biological Honor Society in 2000; and a number of student-athletes over the years being named Academic All-Americans. In addition, at least six students have earned Fulbright Fellowships for graduate study during the self-study decade. Our outstanding students bring attention to Wittenberg’s strong support of and encouragement of student research and academic achievement.

Summary

Wittenberg both demands and supports original research and accomplishment by faculty members and students. Furthermore, the strategic plan (goals A-E) reinforces both the high expectations of achievement in learning already in place and the determination to support and foster academic achievement.
Core Component 4B

*Wittenberg demonstrates that acquisition of a breadth of knowledge and skills and the exercise of intellectual inquiry are integral to its educational programs.*

The heart of an education in the liberal arts and sciences is a range of perspectives examined with a cultivated set of skills. In its general education program and its major courses of study, as well as in special programs such as international education and community service, Wittenberg University emphasizes the development of the essential skills for continued self-education, as well as mastery of important bodies of knowledge.

Knowledge and Skills in the General Education Curriculum

As discussed in Chapter Three, Wittenberg’s current general education program, in place since 1995, is based on a set of learning goals that reflect both the skills necessary for lifelong learning in today’s society, and certain bodies and approaches to knowledge that help students understand the complex world in which we live.

The foundational learning goals relate to specific skills that will prepare the autodidact for whatever future challenges and learning situations she or he may encounter. The foundational learning goals involve training in the skills of writing, mathematical manipulation, language acquisition, oral communication, computer use, and research. The first three of these foundational goals – the acquisition of writing skills, quantitative skills, and foreign language skills – are met by successful completion of specific courses. Facility with writing and awareness of one’s audience are much-sought-after skills in any professional career. Eighty-six per cent of graduates say that their Wittenberg education was very effective in developing their writing skills (1.2B.xiii). Quantitative skills are essential to understanding a world often presented in statistical and mathematical formulae, of course, but also develop reasoned approaches to problem-solving. A central skill for encountering diversity on its own terms is acquisition of a second language and refinement of one’s communication skills in that target language. Experiencing the world from a de-familiarized perspective of otherness opens students up to diversity in unforeseen and intangible ways.

The remaining three foundational goals are not met by a single specific course, but are addressed in various ways in many courses across the curriculum, both in courses designed for general education and in courses in the major. Speaking well within and before groups of people helps students to refine their points of view and to work together to learn and accomplish things. Computing skills will, in many ways, be defined by their context, but certainly, students need to be prepared to use computers to communicate, create, learn, and teach as they enter the world after Wittenberg. And finally research, the sixth foundational goal, is the mark of the truly educated person, the person who can define important questions and go about answering those questions while drawing on the wisdom and scholarship of others. Certainly, the foundational learning goals of the general education curriculum in place during the entire self-study period are centered in Wittenberg’s mission and in its devotion to the concept of a liberal-arts education.

If the foundational goals identify key skills for learning, the arts and sciences goals define the world broadly and invite the student to take the plunge into knowledge both for its own sake and in order to understand the world around them from multiple perspectives. All but one of these learning goals is met by completing a course
addressing the designated learning goal, with the remaining concept – the diversity of human experience – embedded in all courses meeting the arts and sciences goals.

Students in their very first semester at Wittenberg all take a WittSem (Wittenberg Seminar) that fulfills the integrated learning goal by examining a subject through several disciplinary perspectives – for instance, art, history, cultural semiotics and horticulture in The Language of the Japanese Garden, or literature, art history, and history in Romanticism and Revolution. The integrated learning goal attempts to break down artificial barriers to learning and create excitement about a more sophisticated range of academic disciplines than many students know from high school. This goal also prepares students for a world in which problems are not neatly packaged with the relevant data already identified, but in which many things that seem irrelevant in fact illuminate problems and make them soluble in counterintuitive ways. The current Curriculum Review Committee is examining ways to extend integrated learning more intentionally across the curriculum and the four-year program.

Students must gain an understanding of the natural world in two different courses, at least one of which must contain a lab experience. Clearly, this exposure to the scientific method and to hands-on learning is a valuable experience for future learning, but these courses are also designed to engage questions that even non-majors have about their responsibilities of environmental stewardship, the promises and limitations of chemical solutions to problems, and practical innovations in technology.

Students are required to take two courses addressing the Western historical perspective and a non-Western cultural perspective. Understanding the past of their own culture as well as the outlooks of another culture provides a sense of both the common and the divergent views, values, and meanings of diverse cultures. Two additional courses meeting the goal in social institutions, processes, and behavior provide additional breadth in considering the ways in which humans create societies in order to work together. Seventy-three per cent of alumni report that their Wittenberg education enables them to place problems in social or historical perspective (7.3B).

Two courses in the fine, performing, and literary arts aim to help students develop their aesthetic sensibilities and appreciate and enjoy how the arts express the human spirit and create beauty and meaning in the world. And finally, a course in religious or philosophical inquiry helps students to formulate the big questions about reality, knowledge, and values and offers some insight into the way that various traditions and cultures have answered those questions, as well as developing in the student an inquisitive and thoughtful approach to life. Sixty-seven per cent of alumni say that the university was very effective in developing moral principles that guide their actions; seventy-seven per cent say that their education was highly effective in helping them find a sense of purpose in life (7.3B).

The final element of the general education program is a pair of co-curricular activities. These two requirements link directly to elements in the university’s mission statement: service to others and “wholeness of person.” Students are required to perform a semester of community service accompanied by reflection on the experience; two-thirds of Wittenberg graduates say that their education helped them develop political and social awareness, and more than 70% of graduates have been involved in volunteer or community service activities (7.3B). The two physical activities courses, which may include such subjects as dance, sailing, fitness walking, or weight-training, in addition to traditional team and individual sports, help place value on physical well-being and personal stewardship of one’s health.
In addition to the course requirements generally thought of as constituting the general education program, each student must complete at least one major course of study, as well. Parallel to the general education program, each major also has stated learning goals that link to the various course requirements in the major and to senior capstone experiences and assessments. Many majors identify a set of goals and note which courses or kinds of courses will emphasize which goals; some majors (political science, biology, and history, for example) define broad content areas within the discipline and require coursework in each area. Major programs of study are also responsibility for following up on the foundational goals where appropriate: all majors must require at least two writing-intensive courses, and all majors must address oral communication skills, computing skills, research skills, and diversity in ways appropriate to the discipline. It is important to note that all Wittenberg undergraduates, even those completing majors not in the liberal arts, complete the same general education requirements, thus creating a context of liberal education even for more applied skill sets. (A set of departmental learning goals is available in the resource room: 6.2B.)

The Curriculum Review Committee

In 2005-2006, as the refined mission statement and the strategic plan were moving towards completion, Provost Ken Bladh suggested to the Educational Policies Committee (EPC) that a thorough-going look at the curriculum might be in order; EPC responded by recommending to the provost that he call for the formation of a limited-term task committee to provide just such a curricular review. This cause was also picked up by the Faculty Executive Board (FEB), which organizes faculty governance; they met with EPC to work out a suggested charge for the committee, ultimately designated the Curriculum Review Committee (CRC). This group, made up of a combination of members elected by the faculty and appointed by the FEB, has been charged thus:

- Review the curriculum, including the general education program and learning goals; majors, minors, and programs; their interrelationships; and propose revisions in light of the recently adopted strategic plan
- Examine 4-year developmental models and determine if and how such an approach might enhance the University’s curriculum
- Initiate conversations with and gather facts from departments, programs and relevant committees; and employ subcommittees composed of, and chaired by, additional faculty volunteers in fulfilling its charge.
- Submit the following reports:
  - A plan for curricular review and a timeframe to the Faculty Executive Board, the Educational Policies Committee, and the Provost by August 18, 2006.
  - Curricular recommendations to the Educational Policies Committee by May 1, 2007. (Faculty Meeting Attachment 1, April 4, 2006)

The Curriculum Review Committee completed research and reading assignments and met regularly over the summer of 2006, capping the summer with an intensive three-day retreat. Taking the mission statement and the strategic plan as their starting point, they are assuming nothing about the curriculum except that it should reflect the values expressed in the strategic plan and be assessable. To assure the transparency of the process, they have set up a website on which faculty members can follow
their progress, check the dates of upcoming forums, and communicate suggestions about the curriculum. The CRC conducted an open-ended faculty survey to gather suggestions about curricular structures and parameters, and they are now in the midst of a series of open forums for the faculty, each devoted to a specific topic. The faculty as a whole places a great deal of trust in this group; they, in turn, are clearly working hard and thinking creatively.

As noted, their charge calls for them to bring recommendations for a new curriculum to the Educational Policies Committee by May, 2007. While their goal is for the new curriculum to be in place by autumn of 2009, that might be optimistic, depending on the amount of change involved and the logistics of the transition. We are confident that the curriculum will answer the call of the strategic plan to enhance and make distinctive our academic programs, to build a four-year developmental model of student learning, and to provide experiential learning experiences and a global curriculum, as called for in the strategic plan. The new curriculum will be designed with assessment in mind from the bottom up, as well.

The Master of Arts Program in Education

In 2001, Wittenberg ventured into graduate education with a single degree program in education. The Master of Arts program in education was designed not to provide certification, like an M.A.T., but to serve the regional community of practicing P-12 teachers wishing to develop their professional skills and to incorporate research and reflection into their practice of education. The program is designed around a set of learning goals that reflect knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. The program features several core courses appropriate to teachers no matter what their content area or certification level; these courses focus on subjects such as professional and ethical issues, the sociology of educational change, and teaching students from diverse backgrounds. Master’s candidates also complete coursework in human development, pedagogical practices, and curriculum appropriate to their content area and level. Finally, all master’s candidates complete a methodology course and a directed research project. All courses are in education; teachers with secondary school licensure do not, for instance, take graduate level courses in their content area.

The curricular requirements are clearly aligned with the program’s mission, which is in turn informed by Wittenberg’s mission and the outlook of a liberal-arts institution. The program was reviewed and approved by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) in 2003, but it has not yet been formally reviewed or assessed within the context of the university’s own procedures, as is normal for new programs. Financial aspects of the program are currently under review. The program’s relationship to the university’s Educational Policies Committee (EPC), however, is somewhat cloudy; some courses are submitted for approval, but others are not. Partly because of this lack of clarity, the EPC and the master’s program in education are currently in conversation about various aspects of the program. Such clarification of the relationship of the program to normal faculty governance and assessment procedures will no doubt be healthy and helpful to all concerned.

Service Learning

Wittenberg helps its students connect the classroom to the world beyond with opportunities for service learning, which integrate a service experience with an academic course in order to consider the relationship between course content and real-
world applications and to foster social responsibility. In 2005, the university received a $50,000 grant from Thrivent Financial for Lutherans for a project titled “Sowing Seeds of Servant Leadership: A Campus-Wide Integration of Service-Learning, Social Justice and Spirituality”; the project sought to enrich the engagement between Wittenberg and the Springfield community. Building on the established place of community service in the general education program, the service learning program aims to empower faculty members and students to plan and implement their own diverse service-learning experiences. In January 2006, the grant awarded three Wittenberg professors $1,000 each as course development stipends to create service-learning components for their courses. The Office of Community Service has also run a number of workshops to help faculty members envision how service learning might work with some of their classes. In the spirit of breaking barriers, Wittenberg’s chapter of Beta Beta Beta, the national biology honorary society, received an award, making it the first student organization to do so. Beta Beta Beta will help educate area youth about the natural sciences and related social questions through a program with Roosevelt Middle School.

As the Thrivent grant enhanced development opportunities, the Office of Community Service also worked with the Educational Policies Committee to design a more user-friendly policy for adding credit-bearing service-learning opportunities to existing classes, at the option of the professor and student. The policy needed to retain clear and high standards for the granting of credit and the relationship of the service experience to the academic work, while not stifling creativity. Such a balance was found; the new policy was passed by the faculty in 2005-2006.

Core Component 4C

Wittenberg assesses the usefulness of its curricula to students who will live and work in a global, diverse, and technological society.

As outlined in the previous section, Wittenberg’s Curriculum Review Committee (CRC) is in the midst of a thoughtful process of assessing and redesigning a curriculum to match the goals of our strategic plan, Distinctively Wittenberg; given the plan’s emphasis on preparing citizens for a diverse global community, it is safe to say that these very considerations will be central to the new general education program. But major programs are also reviewed and revised regularly, and our alumni testify to the usefulness of their education in preparing them for the world outside Wittenberg. Students build diverse skills not only in the curriculum itself, but in student activities.

Changing Academic Programs

While Wittenberg’s academic departments and majors are attuned to the institutional culture of Wittenberg and to the needs and wishes of their own students, it is sometimes helpful to gain additional perspectives on varying practices and innovative ideas within the pedagogy of one’s discipline. Additionally, with Wittenberg seeking to optimize faculty staffing plans to provide equitable workloads for faculty members while offering a good variety of high-quality classes to students in all disciplines, each new faculty line must be evaluated for its impact on the overall balance of both the program and the university. The hiring of new tenure-track faculty members is an inflection point, and in order to ensure that such major decisions are made in
an environment of information and ideas, Provost Ken Bladh developed a policy that requires recent (within the past five years) external program reviews whenever a department requests a tenure-track faculty line, even because of retirement or resignation. Interest in a field may have shifted, for instance, affecting the need for faculty members in a given department or a specialty within a discipline. But though the hiring of faculty is the event that precipitates the external program review, the evaluation itself is used in far more diverse ways. External consultants are asked to consider the following questions by the provost; the department will, of course, have its own questions:

- Are the departmental learning goals appropriate for an undergraduate program?
- How well does the departmental curriculum support its learning goals and mission? How do we know this (comment on departmental assessment strategies)?
- What is the department doing well?
- Does the department overemphasize any aspect of the curriculum?
- Are there essential courses in the undergraduate curriculum that are not being offered? How were these norms determined?
- Does the department participate appropriately in area studies programs?
- Does the department participate appropriately in supporting other majors and minors?
- Does the proportion of departmental contributions to general education seem appropriate?
- Does the departmental contribution to general education reflect the shared nature of institutional learning goals?
- Is the discipline in transition nationally? What are the choices and tradeoffs?

Since this program of curricular consultations was created, these external program reviews have been completed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Month and year</th>
<th>Consultant(s) or evaluating organization</th>
<th>Reason for review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Studies</td>
<td>October 1999</td>
<td>James Scott, Yale University and Timothy Cheek, Colorado College</td>
<td>To support grant proposals to the Freeman Foundation for program enhancement and Luce Foundation for a second Chinese position. (Both proposals were successful.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>April 2000</td>
<td>National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)</td>
<td>10-year cycle of NASM reaccreditation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>Diethelm Prowe, Carleton College</td>
<td>Redefined a faculty line; revised curriculum with a world history core course adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>May 2002</td>
<td>Dana Dunn, Moravian College</td>
<td>Reviewed the role of animal conditioning experiments as a factor in a new faculty hire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>Catherine White Berheide, Skidmore College</td>
<td>Redefined and hired for a faculty position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>June 2003</td>
<td>Catherine White Berheide, Skidmore College</td>
<td>Curriculum revisions under discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)</td>
<td>Initial accreditation under revised Ohio requirements for teacher preparation. Successfully completed and provided the basis for four faculty hires to replace retirees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>August 2003</td>
<td>Susan Kress, Skidmore College</td>
<td>General curriculum review in anticipation of three faculty hires related to retirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>February 2004</td>
<td>Sandy Maisel, Colby College</td>
<td>General curriculum review in anticipation of two faculty hires related to retirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>May 2004</td>
<td>Susan Chapman, University of St. Thomas</td>
<td>Department proposed the conversion of a visiting line to tenure track in the field of molecular biology. Position approved and search underway 2006-2007.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Fitness, Sport</td>
<td>September 2004</td>
<td>Angela Lumpkin, University of Kansas</td>
<td>Department wanted to re-institute a minor and hire a new tenure track professor. Both were denied by Educational Policies Committee based in part on the external review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>September 2004</td>
<td>Joseph MacDaniels, Hope College</td>
<td>Completed one faculty hire; curriculum revisions approved by the faculty in fall 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>October 2004</td>
<td>William Johnson, University of Arkansas</td>
<td>Completed two faculty hires; curriculum links to biology under study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>December 2004</td>
<td>Mathew Richey, St. Olaf College</td>
<td>Completed one faculty hire; curriculum revisions under discussion; review of placement tests and math workshop underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>February 2005</td>
<td>Joel Goldfield, Fairfield University (language lab) and Wendy Allen, St. Olaf College (language curriculum)</td>
<td>Completed two faculty hires; redesigned the language learning center and revised the tutor program to campus standards; modified pedagogy to require more independent work in the language learning center by students in introductory courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>September 2005</td>
<td>Herb Dershem, Hope College</td>
<td>Curriculum review and guidance on redefinition of a position soon to be vacant through retirement to support computer science and computational science programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Area Studies</td>
<td>February 2006</td>
<td>Robert Williams, Davidson College</td>
<td>General program review and recommendations on how to develop a Russian and Eurasian Studies program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In some cases, the external reviews provide affirmation and validation of the department’s own goals and ideas. But often the external reviewer, even while finding many strengths in the department, may also suggest new directions or new strategies that ultimately result in revised curricula or changed definitions of faculty responsibilities. The external reviews in general have been invigorating and expansive for the departments, and have supplied interesting and useful information to the provost and the Educational Policies Committee as they try to help departments find the perfect balance between departmental needs and institutional responsibilities.

Many departmental reviews also focus on student needs, and in particular on programs, specialties, and pedagogical strategies that will enhance student learning and prepare students for graduate study or for a profession. For instance, recent external consultants have suggested changes in the way that language lab learning was handled, taking advantage of technology and making students responsible for their own learning to a greater extent. Similarly, another reviewer suggested that using the Math Workshop to tutor students in the context of specific classes and questions would enhance their math skills more effectively than the current emphasis on certifying readiness for courses based on the Math Placement Exam. Other changes have come about more indirectly; by shifting one faculty line away from medieval literature (when medieval literature was still covered by a remaining faculty member) to a professor highly skilled in both creative writing and journalism, the English Department was able to act on their perception that students would benefit from having separate minors in journalism and creative writing, rather than one writing minor.

Some departments are resistant to external reviews, but the provost works hard to identify a reviewer acceptable to both the department and the provost. Negotiations have been underway to find an appropriate reviewer for the Management Department; a substantial review was already completed by a strategic plan task force working specifically on suggestions to improve the Management Department. While the group did not hire an external consultant, they did themselves review current scholarship on business pedagogy and education, identify best practices in the field, survey current and prospective management majors, talk with Wittenberg alumni with careers in business (including students with majors other than management).

The review of the strategic plan task force found the current program outdated and less mathematically sophisticated than it ought to be. They also suggested creating several interdisciplinary majors, such as international business or financial economics, rather than having a one-size-fits-all major. Work on finding ways to implement some of these recommendations is currently underway.

The program of external reviews, combined with the regular cycle of assessment reports detailed in Chapter Three, provide opportunities for evaluation and reflection of departmental curriculum design. These reviews, often including alumni focus groups or surveys and current scholarship on employers’ perspectives on desired skills, keep the focus on learning and skills sharp within Wittenberg’s academic programs.

Preparation for a Diverse, Global Workplace

In discussing Core Component 4B, our foundational learning goals were aligned with skills needed by all educated people as they prepare to make a difference in the twenty-first century. But beyond those skills such as writing, oral communication, mathematical reasoning, second language skills, technological skills, and research, particular content areas of our academic programs emphasize a global, international perspective.
While majors and minors in East Asian studies, languages, Russian area studies, global studies, American studies, and Africana Studies provide intentional content in global diversity, even students who elect to study none of these subjects may well take several individual courses allied to these programs, and all are required to take at least one, in the form of the course requirement in non-western cultures; courses fulfilling this requirement are offered by nearly every department in the humanities and social sciences, and guarantee that every Wittenberg student is challenged to understand and respect a cultural tradition utterly different from his or her own. Like the experience of studying abroad, the study of other cultures allows students to see the familiar in the alien, and – perhaps even more importantly for personal growth – the alien in the familiar. These educational experiences make Wittenberg students more adaptable to new situations and help them see how their skills can apply in new situations. As detailed in Criterion Three, a study-abroad planning committee, operating under the auspices of the Curriculum Review Committee, is devising proposals for implementing the strategic plan goal of providing an international experience for every Wittenberg student.

Cultivating Social Responsibility

Academic programs that foster social responsibility, such as the community service requirement, service learning, and many general education and major requirements, have already been discussed above, but while Wittenberg’s curriculum and general education program are unusually intentional about developing global and social awareness and a reflective approach to service, the contribution of the campus’s rich array of student activities should not be forgotten in this respect.

Wittenberg supports over 140 academic clubs, student organizations, and honorary societies that provide a venue in which students can exercise initiative, coordinate teamwork, and provide leadership outside the classroom. While some groups pursue shared enthusiasms such as Japanese animé or swing-dancing, others develop leadership and coordinate philanthropic efforts (Greek organizations), create collaborative art (the Wittenberg Choir, Dance Company, Pocket Lint, an improvisational comedy troupe), support student academic and creative achievements (the student-run journals), or raise social awareness (Gay-Straight Alliance, STAND, Habitat for Humanity, Student Democrats, College Republicans). STAND, for instance, has traveled to Nicaragua to build houses, attended protests at military training schools, and conducted open discussions on environmental issues, sweatshops, and campus activism. Our Habitat for Humanity chapter leads a service trip to build houses each year during spring break. These many campus activities provide not only friendships and recreation for Wittenberg students, but also environments in which to develop workplace skills such as cooperation, initiative, organization, and leadership.

Our alumni’s experiences bear out the importance of Wittenberg in preparing them for the world after college. According to 2001’s Hardwick-Day alumni survey, Wittenberg graduates report that they can place problems in social perspective (77%), that their education helped them to develop social awareness (66%), that they developed teamwork skills at Wittenberg (72%), that Wittenberg helped them find a personal sense of mission (77%), that they held a leadership role in an extracurricular activity (85%), and that they are involved in volunteer or service activities (72%). In each of these areas, the Wittenberg graduates reported this result of their education
at a higher rate than did alumni of a group of “more selective” private colleges, Ohio flagship public universities, and regional flagship public universities.

These socially responsible behaviors and skills lead Wittenberg graduates to continue in service explorations even after graduation. A January 2004 report from the Peace Corps showed that in 2003, Wittenberg made their list of top volunteer-producing small colleges, with seventeen Wittenberg alumni serving at that time; we tied for 22nd in the rankings with Smith College, Colby College, and Rice University. Wittenberg students have also been accepted into the Americorps/VISTA program, the Lutheran Volunteer Corps, and the highly-competitive Teach for America program. Wittenberg students have shown themselves more than ready to step into any situation and make a positive difference.

Core Component 4D

*Wittenberg provides support to ensure that faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover and apply knowledge responsibly.*

While Wittenberg prizes intellectual achievement highly, they hold intellectual integrity equally dear. Several key groups and policies ensure that the entire campus community adheres to the highest standards of academic integrity.

The Institutional Research Board

Wittenberg formed its first Institutional Review Board (IRB) to monitor human subject research in 1992, in support of a faculty members’ proposal to the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The NIH required Wittenberg to file an Assurance of Compliance with HHS Regulations for Protection of Human Research Subjects. The committee consists of three faculty members appointed by the provost, a public member, and the associate provost.

Wittenberg’s IRB has followed the terms of relevant federal regulations (45 CFR 46), but has defined its sphere more broadly. Whereas many colleges have concluded that student research is exempt from IRB review, since student research is rarely subject to peer review and is not presumed to contribute to generalizable knowledge, Wittenberg’s IRB has decided that student research falls under its jurisdiction, unless the research was devised solely and explicitly as a lab exercise or to teach principles or techniques. Wittenberg’s board made this decision to assure that protection for human subjects is extended as broadly as possible, to assure that Wittenberg is in compliance with federal regulations, and to enable faculty members to use the IRB approval process to teach their students about ethical standards in human subject research.

The responsibilities of the IRB are well-publicized. At the beginning of each year, the IRB reminds all faculty members of Wittenberg’s human subject research policies and procedures and describes the IRB, its jurisdiction, its authority, the review criteria, and the review process. The reminder also includes a bibliography of publications and web sites related to human subject research. The associate provost also does classroom presentations on the IRB and ethical human subject research in some social science methodology classes, as requested.

Almost all of the IRB’s work is conducted via an expedited review when a proposed research project presents no more than minimal risk to its subjects and uses one of a prescribed list of procedures defined by the Secretary of Health and Human
Services. In the most recent academic year, 2005-2006, the IRB conducted forty-six expedited reviews and one regular review. Six of these were projects conducted by faculty members, eight were class projects, and the rest were conducted by individual students or teams of students. Proposals were submitted by students or faculty members from seven academic departments (psychology, sociology, management, communication, economics, biology, and foreign languages) and by one person not affiliated with Wittenberg.

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee

In 1996-97, the provost appointed a committee to develop standards, policies, and procedures for the care and use of animals on campus and to develop a charge for a permanent faculty Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) to be given responsibility for monitoring compliance with university policies and relevant government regulations. The group was convened despite Wittenberg’s neither holding nor using any covered species, as defined by the Code of Federal Regulations. However, the provost had been advised that some science faculty members had renewed interest in using laboratory animals in their teaching and research and had hopes to compete for external research grants, which would require both an IACUC and compliance with federal regulations. Wittenberg’s animal facility in the Science Building had been licensed by the United States Department of Agriculture as recently as the 1980s, but the license lapsed roughly fifteen years ago. In 1996, when the new committee was appointed, it had been many years since the university had held any animals that required the possession of a USDA license.

After a year of study, the committee submitted a report and recommendations for action to the faculty meeting of April 29, 1997. After several vigorous debates involving intellectual freedom versus animal rights, as well as several major revisions of the original proposal, the faculty adopted the committee’s recommendations on September 15, 1998, including policies to govern the care and use of animals on campus and the creation of a permanent IACUC to monitor compliance.

Wittenberg chose to extend its IACUC’s jurisdiction over all live, nonhuman, vertebrate animals, not just those species covered by the federal Animal Welfare Act (federal regulations, for example, have never included laboratory rats (*genus rattus*), which constitute most of the vertebrate animal holdings at Wittenberg). Wittenberg adopted the following standards for animal care and use:

- The Animal Welfare Act of 1966, as amended
- Implementing regulations in the Code of Federal Regulations
- *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, 1996* (National Research Council)

As for the IRB, the university periodically reminds all faculty members of the IACUC’s animal care and use policies, the procedures required for gaining IACUC approval to use animals, and a list of references for those wishing to become familiar with relevant laws, policies, guidelines, handbooks, manuals, and websites. Animal protocols are submitted to the IACUC for its review, and the IACUC has the authority to approve or disapprove a proposed use. The IACUC tours all campus animal facilities once each semester to monitor compliance. The IACUC consists of
seven members appointed by the provost, including two members unaffiliated with Wittenberg, one of whom is a veterinarian.

All new members of the committee receive the following materials:

- Wittenberg’s policy on the care and use of animals
- The Public Health Services Policy on Humane Care and Use of Laboratory Animals
- The National Research Council’s *Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals*
- A checklist for animal facilities, produced by the National Institutes of Health (Semiannual Program and Facility Review Checklist)
- *Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee Guidebook*

Until 2003-2004, animals under the jurisdiction of the IACUC were housed either in a facility in the oldest part of the science building (constructed in 1967), in Weaver Observatory, or in Zimmerman Hall (home of the Psychology Department). None met current standards. In 2003-2004, a state-of-the-art animal facility was opened in the new Paul Keil Wing of the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center. The old facility in the science building was closed, although the Psychology Department continues to use the spaces in Weaver and Zimmerman. Also in 2003-2004, a part-time animal facility administrator, who reports to the Provost, was appointed to oversee animal care in the Kuss Science Center.

All departments that use animals are charged with responsibility for instructing their students in the ethical and legal principles governing their use.

The Academic Honor Council

Wittenberg has always had policies related to the prevention and punishment of cheating and plagiarism; the policy in place for many years required a professor to confront the student with evidence of misdeeds, invoke an appropriate sanction, and write a report to the Dean of Students, who kept records of academic dishonesty in the student’s disciplinary file. Appeals could go to the academic department chair, the Board of Academic Standards, and the provost.

In 2002-2003, however, Wittenberg debuted a new approach to this problem—an approach that framed academic dishonesty as a violation of intellectual principle and sought to educate students away from it. While the current Honor Code (1.3E) is not one that requires students to turn in other students whom they might suspect are cheating, it does make each student responsible for his or her own work. Students sign their work, an acknowledgement that they affirm the Honor Statement: “I affirm that my work upholds the highest standards of honesty and academic integrity at Wittenberg, and that I have neither given nor received any unauthorized assistance.” Students are reminded of standards of academic integrity in most class syllabi, and new students are introduced to academic integrity as a community value in programming during New Student Days.

Not only does the new policy emphasize education about intellectual integrity, but it investigates and adjudicates violations through a different, student-centered process. The process of dealing with a violation still begins with a talk between the professor and the student, which is described in a report. If the sanction is deemed acceptable by both parties, the case is considered resolved and a record of it is kept in the student’s academic files, rather than his or her student disciplinary file. This
change in jurisdiction reinforces the connection of cheating and plagiarism with academics rather than with such typical student violations as possession of alcohol or having an illegal toaster-oven.

Furthermore, if students wish to appeal the sanction, they do so to the Academic Honor Council, composed of students, faculty, and administrators (but with the majority of positions held by students). The members of the Honor Council have undergone special training in issues of academic integrity before serving. They have the option of validating the existing sanction or making it either more or less severe. While some faculty members were at first concerned that a student-run Honor Council might be too lenient on cheaters, the opposite has turned out to be true. The Honor Council takes their responsibility of upholding academic integrity at Wittenberg quite seriously. In addition to hearings requested by students charged with violations, hearings can also be triggered if a student receives a second report of a violation in his or her file. Such a hearing can have as its result separation from the university – suspension or expulsion.

While there are still disheartening instances of plagiarism and cheating, the Academic Honor Council has brought integrity to the forefront as a Wittenberg value, and the university is better for it.

Summary Assessment of Criterion Four

Wittenberg University, while it educates the whole person, reveres learning for its own sake. But far from inhabiting an ivory tower, Wittenberg also recognizes the connection of knowledge and academic pursuits and skills to the skills of the “real world” as it is changing each day around us. Its academic programs, extracurricular activities, and institutional bodies support learning, research, skills, and integrity, clearly fulfilling the goal of promoting a life of learning and supporting inquiry, creativity, practice, and social responsibility expressed in Criterion Four.
Chapter Five: Engagement and Service

As called for by its mission, Wittenberg identifies its constituencies and serves them in ways both value.

Wittenberg’s mission statement refers specifically to our residential community, and moreover, to our students’ duties as global citizens to contribute to civic life with creativity, service, compassion, and integrity. While the heart of those goals lies in our educational programs and the impact they have on students’ lives, as we have shown in previous chapters, nonetheless it is important to model just such engagement and service in institutional and individual efforts.

Much of the report has detailed important ways in which Wittenberg engages with its board, its students, and its faculty and staff. In this chapter, we will turn our attention toward how Wittenberg, its administration, faculty, staff, and students engage in meaningful communication and mutually beneficial activities with external constituencies such as alumni, local schools, and the Springfield community, as well as how some important offices, such as Weaver Chapel, model compassionate service to both internal and external groups. Our mission valorizes such engagement, and Wittenberg certainly exhibits it at every turn.
Core Component 5A

Wittenberg learns from its constituencies it serves and analyzes its capacity to serve their needs and expectations.

The needs of and institutional response to key internal constituencies has already been considered at length in earlier chapters: the needs of students in Chapters Three and Four, the needs of the Board of Directors in Chapter Two, the needs of administration in Chapter Two, and the needs of faculty and staff in Chapters Two, Three and Four. We have also examined ways in which Wittenberg enacts its mission and its value statements and how all these constituencies are considered by and participate in planning processes. But what of our relationships beyond Wittenberg’s campus? In what ways do we celebrate not only the institution of which we are all a part, but that institution’s place in the larger communities of Springfield, Ohio, the United States, and ultimately, the world?

One of Wittenberg’s signature values is community service. Service and global citizenship are both given places of prominence in our statement of values, and the presentation of those values emphasizes finding common ground, interacting with respect and compassion, and contributing to an environment that promotes social justice. A core requirement for meaningful service is learning what needs to be done, or what needs must be met.

A clear understanding of the external constituencies served by the university is critical to any review of the depth of our engagement and effectiveness in partnership activities. While the process of identifying constituent groups for possible engagement is not necessarily formal or linear, the university’s history, facilities, faculty areas of research and teaching, and known areas of community need have evolved toward a clear list of external constituents over time. This list includes the church (ELCA); nonprofit human services organizations; K-12 students, teachers, and administrators; select adult learners; and patrons of the arts.

Not surprisingly, a number of key offices and programs direct much of their efforts toward managing partnerships with these constituents, including Weaver Chapel, the Office of Community Service, the Office of Student Development, the Office of International Education, Upward Bound, and the School of Community Education. These groups and offices exist as tangible university commitments to the values of service and global engagement embedded in our mission. The balance of this chapter will provide brief explanations for a sampling of partnership activities and evidence that Wittenberg’s involvement is indeed valued by these constituents.

Weaver Chapel

Although Weaver Chapel might be said to serve mainly internal constituencies, especially students, it also serves as the key link to our important founding constituency in the ELCA. In turn, the chapel brings together the church, the students, and acts of faith, service and compassion in a variety of communities, as well as in their own lives. In all these functions, Pastors Andy and Rachel Tune and Director of Church Relations Bob White act as skilled listeners and perceptive agents in responding to the needs of others. These responses may be as small as providing the cheer of free lemonade on a hot day or as large as developing a contemporary interdenominational worship service to fit student interests and schedules. This service, led by Pastor Rachel Tune, occurs weekly on Sunday evenings in a small auditorium.
in Hollenbeck Hall. The music, often acoustic, is played by students, and the service is typically attended by over forty students.

Weaver Chapel also holds traditional Sunday services and two weekday chapel hours that feature not only the pastors, but also speakers from among students, faculty and staff, as well. These chapel talks are often reflections on personal events and values inflected by faith. The chapel services also feature prominently a varied musical ministry, from the large Wittenberg Choir to the Imani Gospel Choir to individual performances during chapel hour. The Weaver Chapel Association also coordinates daily devotions for the seasons of Advent and Lent for the whole campus. These devotions are written by faculty, staff, students, alumni, parents, and members of the Board of Directors, and are sent online to a list-serve of those who have asked to receive them (about 250 people). In spring 2006, responding specifically to student requests, Rev. Anders Tune taught a course in the Religion Department on Luther and Lutheranism.

In addition to Lutheran services and constituencies, the chapel supports students of all religious backgrounds in their spiritual and cultural pursuits. When Roman Catholic students wanted to locate an on-campus advisor in addition to the off-campus priest who serves them, the pastors helped them in this endeavor. They have also been supporters for the Jewish Culture Club, which sponsors events such as an all-campus dreidel party for Hanukkah and a Passover seder.

Furthermore, the pastors have recognized the need for pastoral counseling by students of many faith backgrounds, and in many life situations. They learn about students’ concerns directly from the students, whether those concerns be about transition issues, academics, relationships, anxiety, or grief and loss. They have their finger on the pulse of campus life in ways few other people in the institution can or do. Their recognition of the stressful lives of students and their own compassionate response to those students has led to the formation of the Peer Helpers program. The program, coordinated by the Director of Church Relations based on a grant received in 2003, trains students to be caring, skilled listeners who can act as confidential resources on campus to their peers. With about twenty-five trained peer helpers, the statistics on student use of the program are somewhat astonishing: in fall 2005, for instance, peer helpers had over 2,300 conversations with nearly 600 different students – well over a quarter of the student body. Clearly, the constant counseling of the pastors and the heavy use of the Peer Helpers Program illustrate that this program has recognized and tapped into a strong student need successfully.

The Weaver Chapel staff also receives requests from other groups for help in their own programs. For instance, the residence hall staff has requested workshops and talks on topics such as dealing with loss, getting along with roommates, and building healthy relationships so that they can then use wise tactics as they help students. Student organizations also often request advice and help from the pastors when planning vigils, prayer services, and other similar activities of social consciousness.

Wittenberg is indeed fortunate to have such dynamic, giving professionals in the chapel, representing, on the one hand, the important ELCA constituency to the campus, and on the other, ascertaining the needs and opportunities for service among students, staff, and community members.
The Office of Community Service

Not only do such groups as the offices named above embody important elements of Wittenberg’s mission, but they interact with target constituencies in ways that help develop reflective models of cooperation and mutual benefit. Wittenberg’s Office of Community Service is a case in point. Founded in 1988 to support and enrich the then-new graduation requirement of community service, the office has worked over the years to identify meaningful service sites in the community, cultivate relationships with leaders at those sites, guide and oversee students to help them make significant contributions with their service, and create and implement policies that will underscore the value of the services provided and the educational benefits gained. This has been a successful venture, creating many positive partnerships in the Springfield community and making Wittenberg a major force for positive change in Clark County.

Increasingly, though, the role of the office has expanded to provide a multi-faceted interface with community constituents and the university. In addition to identifying sites desirous of receiving help from students, the office now also solicits special project requests from local organizations and publicizes those needs to the campus community. An AmeriCorps*VISTA volunteer also works part-time with community service sites on special projects. The office’s student coordinators (who have already fulfilled their own service requirement) are required to continue in service during their time as coordinators. Another element of their responsiveness to community requests is their coordination of collections of items such as clothing, school supplies, and non-perishable food, as requested by various local groups and agencies. And finally, the Thrivent Financial for Lutherans Grant of $50,000 (co-written by Director of Community Service Kristen Collier and Pastor Rachel Tune), discussed in Chapter Four, has created an expansive environment in which to develop service learning opportunities in relation to academic class work. This innovative and energetic group of people represents the best of Wittenberg to the Springfield community.

The Office of Student Development

The Office of Student Development also acts as a point of contact between Wittenberg and the Springfield community. The Good Neighbor Program, restructured and active again since 2004, contacts the College Hill Neighborhood Association in order to gauge community questions, concerns, and needs involving students living in rental properties near the borders of campus. A team of people including a city councilwoman, students, and Wittenberg security officers went door-to-door to update our neighbors on clean-up endeavors and safety and security issues; a program brochure also outlines relevant city services, campus contacts, and general information.

Many individual student groups and organizations field wonderful service programs; some of those will be discussed in Core Component 5B. The student body in a more general way, though, coordinated through the Office of Student Development, also finds ways to make a difference. For instance, based on arrangements with the university dining service, students donated unused meals from their dining plans to the Ark Center, an after-school program for at-risk children. In 2006, students donated over 350 meals, enough to help the center provide meals for all students while staying within their budget. The Class of 2009 has also as a whole identified Forging Responsible Youth, an after-school program for older children, as a priority for them, and they have sponsored fundraisers as well as offering direct volunteer help.
The Office of Multicultural Affairs within the Office of Student Development fields a number of requests involving diversity programming, as do a number of the academic departments. In addition to requests from area Muslim groups for support information, local government officials often call upon the Office of Multicultural Affairs to assist them with diversity training and other projects. The Office of Multicultural Affairs also sponsors programs on diversity of many kinds, from hip-hop culture to damaging body-image to the challenges of religious tolerance. These programs are well-attended by both students and the community. In sections 5B and 5C, we will highlight other facets of the Office of Student Development’s work with the community.

The Office of International Education

The Office of International Education, too, must respond to changing student situations; even as students desire study abroad as never before, financial constraints and uneasiness about the safety of travel in many parts of the world make traditional year-long or even semester-long programs infeasible for many families. In response to the growing popularity of summer programs abroad, the Office of International Education, as explained more fully in Chapter Three, has taken the lead in providing clear standards and parameters for faculty members designing their own Wittenberg summer programs. They are also trying to conclude more agreements with foreign universities for exchange programs. In helping international students studying at Wittenberg, the office has also developed expertise in meeting government reporting requirements, making appropriate travel arrangements, and providing emotional support for students and their families in times of crisis, such as September 11, 2001 and in the run up to the war in Iraq.

The Office of International Education has for many years matched these international students with host families who periodically check on their student’s progress in making friends, offer rides and other help with navigating daily life in the United States, invite the student on excursions or for dinner, and generally act as a supportive presence in a strange land. This program has been very successful, often resulting in life-long friendships and visits abroad to meet the student’s family.

Upward Bound

Wittenberg’s Upward Bound Program has acted as a direct liaison between the campus and the community for three decades. Upward Bound mentors high school students from low-income backgrounds or from families in which neither parent has attended college. Through academic advising and planning, tutoring, programming, and summer enrichment programs, as well as fee subsidies for taking college entrance exams such as ACT and SAT and for the college applications themselves, Upward Bound ascertains and meets the needs of these students and raises their chances considerably of completing college. Through their parent national organization, too, the local program responds to changing needs and environments, as with their recent mandate to increase the number of young men in their programs because of the growing lopsidedness between the genders in college.

In addition to mentoring and cultural enrichment activities throughout the school year, Upward Bound also hosts a summer bridge program on the Wittenberg campus in which students experience what it’s like to attend a college, from the time-management skills required to the level of academic effort necessary. Two special classes are offered for the students; usually, these include a first-year composition course and a course in African-American politics.
The School of Community Education

The School of Community Education, founded in 1951, seeks to ascertain needs in the community and to develop programs that serve those needs. To that end, it offers a number of non-credit-bearing enrichment programs as well as its popular degree programs in liberal studies with concentrations in organizational leadership and health-care leadership. While the degree programs respond directly to student interests among adult students seeking to advance in their careers, those programs retain the key features of the liberal-arts education offered to all Wittenberg students. A few modifications concordant with the special emphases of the SCE program have also developed in response to students’ situations, such as special language classes for SCE students that emphasize the language in a business context, or a basic composition class that meets once a week and follows up with intensive individual work. These have been viewed as popular solutions to problems that limited the success of adult students in completing degree requirements in a timely manner.

Likewise, the non-credit-bearing programs include a number of enrichment programs for both children and adults, and are aimed primarily at people not normally part of Wittenberg. The Center for Musical Development arranges lessons in a wide range of instruments for children and adults; the summer Kaleidoscope Camp offers a more intensive experience. The WISE summer academic camp puts middle-schoolers together with a small coterie of outstanding Wittenberg faculty members in mini-seminars on topics of interest; the Young Women’s Summer Institute encourages middle-school-aged girls interested in science and math with the cooperation of the Ohio Supercomputing Center. Additionally, Wittenberg coaches offer a number of athletic camps for boys and girls during the summer, as well, often in soccer and basketball. In 2001 and 2002, a grant from the National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) Fund and the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) for such camps benefited 200 young people each summer.

It is clear that the School of Community Education offers high-quality educational programs in keeping with Wittenberg’s mission to benefit diverse constituencies in the Springfield and Clark County community. Wittenberg’s SCE is also responsible in its interpretation of its goals and mission; other local community colleges, for instance, offer useful and popular certification courses in computing programs or specific job skills training. While there is clearly a need for such courses in the community, the SCE does not offer them because they are less congruent with our liberal-arts mission than some of the courses we do offer. In a relatively small pool with two excellent and well-funded community colleges (Clark State Community College in Springfield and Sinclair Community College in Dayton), it is best for each educational institution to seek its own educational niche.

The special needs of adult students – and the special contributions that adult students bring to the traditional college classroom – are well-served by the SCE, and SCE Dean Paul Parlato is a vigilant and dedicated monitor for non-traditional students’ best interests as policies and curricula change. With his retirement in spring 2007, Wittenberg will need to take care to hire another dean with the same appreciation of both adult students’ needs and their ability to succeed in a rigorous liberal-arts educational institution.
Summary

Wittenberg University is strongly aware of the needs and opportunities its Springfield home offers. In keeping with its mission-driven culture of compassionate service, several important offices on campus provide natural contact points with the Clark County community. Those offices engage routinely in environmental scanning as well as more formalized assessments, but one thing is clear: Wittenberg and Springfield provide each other many opportunities for growth and learning of all kinds.

Core Component 5B

*Wittenberg has the capacity and the commitment to engage with its identified constituencies and communities.*

In earlier chapters, we have detailed policies and lines of communication that routinely engage constituencies such as the Board of Directors (well-planned meetings, regular communication and interaction with the president and the secretary to the university, reports, etc.), the president and Senior Staff (weekly meetings, interaction with faculty governance, alumni events, regular internal reports, etc.), the faculty (faculty governance systems, development opportunities, direct contact with students), staff members (staff development opportunities, participation in governance, human resources outreach), and students (academic relationships, student development and student activities). Add to all of this the great opportunities afforded by the ubiquity of on-line communication: current students, staff, and faculty, as well as alumni, board members, parents, and friends of the university, can receive the latest news in *Around the Hollow*, the biweekly on-line newsletter; *Wittenberg On-Line*, a web version of our award-winning alumni magazine; and on-line versions of the *Torch*, the student-run weekly newspaper. Students, staff, alumni, board members, and faculty members have access to Wittenberg e-mail accounts, and group labels are routinely developed for departments, clubs, classes and other groups that need to communicate with each other regularly. Unfortunately, students claim they do not check or read their e-mail from academic and administrative figures, so what should be a boon to communication is not fully effective. Still, multiple lines of communication set the stage for extensive webs of engagement among Wittenberg constituencies.

Engaging our Alumni

One important constituency that deserves more attention is our alumni base. The Office of Alumni Engagement (until recently it was named the Office of Alumni Relations), situated in the Office of Advancement, stages dozens of alumni events in various cities around the world every year, solicits annual donations, and aids in the planning of such events as Homecoming. The Career Center maintains a “Tiger Network” of alumni willing to talk with current students or recent graduates about their career, and Homecoming (which is our reunion date) also features Alumni Careers Day panel discussions in many departments. The Alumni Association is represented by an elected Alumni Board; over a dozen Alumni Association Chapters maintain active social and volunteer programs in cities around the world. The Alumni Association accepts nominations for and awards a range of honors for young alumni, distinguished professors, or members of any constituency who have served Wittenberg in an extraordinary way. Since 1999, alumni are also eligible to be honored as Wittenberg Fellows; this program...
brings successful graduates in the prime of their careers to campus to speak to students in a variety of ways and to serve as role models for professional success. Some of our Wittenberg Fellows so far have included Fred Mitchell ’69, sports columnist for the Chicago Tribune; Professor of Economics Douglas Brown ’64 of Georgetown University; and Lois Raimondo ’81, Pulitzer-nominated photojournalist for the Washington Post.

While alumni of the university are influential contributors to Wittenberg’s mission, we could include them more intentionally in current initiatives and in learning about our own programs. The Hardwick-Day Alumni Survey of 2001, for instance, gave us heartening and even inspiring affirmation of our mission and its learning outcomes. The recent Lutheran Identity Study Commission used an e-mail survey of alumni to gather responses to preliminary drafts of their report. But more frequent alumni surveys on substantive matters could help us to shape our initiatives and strategies, as well as to confirm our successes. Likewise, many academic departments indicate that faculty members keep personal contact with a number of alumni majors, but that they would need more support (in the form of up-to-date e-mail and mailing lists from the Office of Alumni Engagement and/or the Computing Center) in order to do the kind of routine alumni assessment they would like to do. Several departments create a newsletter once or twice a year and circulate it to alumni, as well as to current students. The History Department reports, however, that they may not have funds to enable continuation of the project; the English Department produces its newsletter in hard copy for the campus audience and makes it available in a PDF version on-line for alumni, parents, prospective students, and friends.

Co-Curricular Activities: Students Learn to Serve and Serve to Learn

We have already outlined in Chapter Four how service learning and the required community service semester connect students to the Clark County community in reciprocal relationships that enlighten and inspire both parties. But in addition to those formalized examples of student outreach, many student clubs, organizations, fraternities, and sororities also seek out areas in which their youth, energy, ideas, and time can make a difference. Examples abound of students organizing, leading, and working creatively with others to engender good relationships between students and residents and to give a hand up to those less fortunate than themselves. Some examples of these student philanthropies include:

• Providing Kits for Kids (school supply kits for lower-income children) for Springfield City Schools,
• Leading Girl Scout activities,
• Mounting a clothing drive for Interfaith Hospitality Network, a group that aids homeless people,
• Organizing Student Senate’s blood drive,
• Fundraising for the Rocking Horse Center, a pediatric medical clinic with sliding fees and free care for the impoverished,
• Coordinating a toy drive for the Parents and Infants Center,
• Volunteering at St. John’s Nursing Home,
• Fundraising through the Relay for Life of the American Cancer Society, and many, many more. In fact, in 2005-2006, Wittenberg’s fraternities and sororities alone raised over $20,000, 72 units of blood, nearly 7,000 pounds of food, and 100 toys for their targeted charities.
In addition to social and leadership groups including service among their activities, some student groups exist for the purpose of service and social awareness. Groups such as the Conservation Club, STAND, and the Gay-Straight Alliance offer programming open to the public and have participated with local citizens in recycling efforts, protests, and educational panels on current issues. Some organizations also connect with community organizations with shared concerns and agendas, such as when Voices, the Wittenberg women’s group, joined community citizens in going to Washington for protest marches. The Student Democrats and College Republicans also sponsor talks about current events and issues that connect students’ views to concrete issues in state, local, and national government.

In terms of more traditional service groups, Wittenberg’s campus chapter of Habitat for Humanity is extremely popular and successful. Within the past decade the local chapter has been among the “10 most active” in the country at least once. Students follow Habitat for Humanity’s familiar pattern of volunteer labor and engagement of the homeowners through sweat equity, but Wittenberg’s chapter also raises money for projects in addition to volunteering their labor. Concessions at home athletics contests and an annual Valentine’s Day cookie sale provide a significant contribution to Habitat’s coffers. The campus chapter also works with the local Springfield chapter on projects, so that students engage with the community in the person of both the homeowner and the other volunteers, thus enriching their sense of their larger community. The campus chapter also participates in a spring break Collegiate Challenge trip and provides the trip as a way to fulfill the community service requirement in an intensive, hands-on environment.

Another inspirational student activity involves Empty Bowls, an ingenious and community-building activity that puts students’ creativity together with community needs in a program of powerful symbolism. With the help and advice of Associate Professor of Art Scott Dooley, student potters make hundreds of hand-thrown pots throughout the year. In spring of each year, the community is invited to the Empty Bowls dinner, at which they make a donation, choose a bowl, and share a simple meal of soup and cornbread. Diners take their empty bowls with them to remind them of the plight of the hungry. The money raised is donated to area food banks and soup kitchens; the April, 2006 event, for example, raised over $6,000 for Second Harvest Food Bank in Springfield.

The foregoing examples represent only a fraction of Wittenberg’s co-curricular activities that engage students, staff, and faculty with external groups in the community. Perhaps primed by the community service requirement, and certainly committed to positive change, Wittenberg students find ways to connect with both national support networks and local people and programs in need.

Educational Program Outreach: Gown Meets Town

Wittenberg’s academic programs find many ways to move beyond the classroom, whether through internships (Chapter Three), service learning (Chapter Four), fieldwork and activities, and special programs. In some cases, the merger of classroom and “real world” is meant to educate the student; in other cases, it is meant to offer educational opportunities to those beyond Wittenberg. In many cases, what really happens is a little learning on both sides.
Field Experiences

Fieldwork and trips are ubiquitous in many classes in the natural sciences: astronomy students stargaze in Weaver Observatory; geology students visit the cliffs in Cliff Park to see Springfield limestone; and botany students attempt to identify the many varieties of deciduous trees on campus from their leaves and bark. But some field work also allows for interactions with people in the community, as when an environmental studies class helps with bog clean-up or hears local government officials on water-quality issues in the community. Such work not only engages students with their physical and civic surroundings, but helps them understand their coursework in context as well.

Non-science classes, too, use field work to help students engage class concepts in personal ways that connect them to the community. Poetry students may attend – and participate – in a poetry slam together; students may understand the mathematics of proportion by visiting Frank Lloyd Wright’s Westcott House here in Springfield; education majors may observe and assist in area classrooms as part of their coursework; students of Victorian literature learn about everyday life and aesthetics of the period through architecture by touring campus and the venerable houses along Fountain Avenue; history students may help in the urban archaeology project surrounding the Gammon House, an Underground Railroad museum; psychology students may volunteer or complete internships at local mental health and rehabilitation facilities; American studies students may take oral histories from veterans; freshman composition students may research the history of Springfield itself for their final paper.

The Wittenberg Seminar program (WittSems) intentionally includes a small budget ($400 per section) for field experiences to help students see their learning as going beyond the classroom. Classes might use this to travel to an art museum, to attend a Beat poetry reading, to spend a day on an Amish farm, complete with a dinner shared with the family, to take a nature hike to collect specimens, or to do whatever imaginative activity a creative teacher-scholar can plan for her or his class.

Of course, some programs offer more dramatic field opportunities, such as studying marine science in the Bahamas, learning and practicing Spanish in Mexico, studying the Industrial Revolution in England, studying African history while engaging in a Habitat for Humanity building project in Lesotho, or learning how to run a small city in our summer program in urban management (past sites have included Meredith, New Hampshire and Grand Island, Nebraska). In fact, the urban management program, developed at Wittenberg, is now sponsored by the International City/County Management Association to increase awareness among college students of career opportunities in local government management. In each of these programs, the emphasis is on student learning, but there is also a component of mutual respect inherent in the activity; to study a place, a people, a way of life is to respect it. It is a valuable lesson for everyone involved.

Special Outreach Programs

While many departments welcome qualified high school students into their regular classes as part of Ohio’s Post-Secondary Educational Opportunity Program (PSEOP), some also offer non-credit educational programs to community members. A few exemplary programs have included Girl Scout Science Night, a Freeman-funded event series on Asian cultures open to the public, Arts Alive, and Grrlz to Womyn.
Girl Scout Science Night has become a mainstay program since its debut in 2001 at the request of an adult science student with two young daughters. Professors from science disciplines such as biology, chemistry, psychology, computer science, environmental science, geology, and physics design intriguing and fun demonstrations for over one hundred Girl Scouts from the Buckeye Trails Council. Wittenberg women science majors assist the professors in the demonstrations and in greeting, registering, and helping the girls and their parents. The evening is capped off (on clear nights) by a trip to the observatory.

The East Asian Studies program, with aid from the Freeman Foundation Grant, developed a series of educational events on Asian culture that were open to the public, such as a Japanese calligraphy workshop, a tea ceremony, and an Asian film festival in conjunction with the Little Art Theatre in Yellow Springs. The program also holds an annual East Asian Festival featuring crafts demonstrations and Asian food, all open to the public.

The Wittenberg Center for Applied Management (WittCAM) offers local small businesses, not-for-profit organizations, and government offices the services of junior and senior Wittenberg management majors for special projects. The students, who may receive credit either as an internship or as part of a course, act as consultants for the business clients and are supervised by Professor of Management Pam Schindler, director of WittCAM. Local clients apply for the service, such as a marketing plan, an advertising campaign, or a special project, and are expected to create a professional learning environment for the student and offer feedback on the consultant services tendered. The program has become a signature of the Management Department and a positive draw in the community.

Arts Alive is a collaborative undertaking by the Education Department in conjunction with the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, Clark County Schools, Springfield City Schools, and the Clark State Performing Arts Center. The program’s goal is to enhance education in the arts and learning through the arts by providing high-quality professional development opportunities to pre-service and in-service teaching practitioners.

Grrlz to Womyn grew from a one-day event in 2001 to an ongoing mentoring program by the time of its last incarnation in 2004. The program matched Wittenberg women’s studies students with high school sophomore girls whom their counselors thought might benefit from a mentoring program. As the program expanded, it grew to include student mentors from Clark State Community College and Antioch College as well as Wittenberg, and the schedule grew to include five events across the year. The program’s benefits included not only the interaction between Wittenberg students and area high schoolers, but also growing relationships among the mentors from the three colleges. Girls continued in the program even as new sophomore girls were added each year. The program was awarded both an AAUW Technology Grant, as well as a KnowledgeWorks Foundation Grant. Activities included informal socializing and communication as well as conversations on topics such as non-traditional career choices, forming friendships, budgeting, safer sex and healthy lifestyles, and making good choices.

Unfortunately, the Grrlz to Womyn program has not run in several years, not because of a lack of will among the women’s studies faculty coordinators or the potential student mentors, but because the high schools involved have found that, due to budget cutbacks and personnel cuts, they do not have time to identify appropriate candidates or accompany them to sessions. This is a great loss, not only to the young
girls who might benefit from such mentoring, but for Wittenberg students who learned so much about themselves and about people quite unlike themselves. Still, this program stands as an inspiring example of what such educational outreach programs can be.

Walking the Walk: Devotion of Resources to Engagement and Service

Wittenberg consistently and generously devotes resources to support effective programs of engagement and service. We have already seen how entire administrative units such as the Office of Community Service, the School of Community Education, Weaver Chapel, and the Office of Student Development devote significant portions of their time, budget, and creativity to just such programs; all of these offices are funded by Wittenberg. Upward Bound, while funded largely through government grants, is supported by Wittenberg in its indirect costs such as facility use, classroom space, and a tuition reduction for Upward Bound’s summer bridge program students.

Likewise, facilities are reserved or used free of charge for community programs such as those referenced in this chapter. Empty Bowls uses the university’s potting wheels and kilns; Girl Scout Science Night uses the equipment of the Barbara Deer Kuss Science Center; public lectures and performances use auditoriums, recital halls, and theatre space.

But perhaps the most valuable contribution of resources that Wittenberg makes to engagement with the community is the time and talent of its faculty and staff. In myriad ways, members of the Wittenberg community contribute their gifts and time to the larger Springfield and Clark County communities. While examples of individual contributions and activities are innumerable, a small list will suggest the range and weight of such community engagement:

• Wray Professor of Religion Warren Copeland has served on Springfield City Council or as Springfield’s mayor for over fifteen years. His campaign chairman is Professor of Economics Jeff Ankrom.
• President Mark Erickson is a member of the Dayton Development Coalition Board.
• Professor of Philosophy Don Reed currently serves on the Springfield City School Board; Professor of History Jim Huffman served before him. Members of Reed’s campaign team included as campaign manager Associate Professor of English Ty Buckman and as treasurer, Director of Business Services Donna Picklesimer.
• Director of Computing Services Joe Deck serves as chief advisor for technology for the Rocking Horse Center.
• Provost Emerita Sammye Greer and Associate Professor of English Cynthia Richards serve on the board of the local chapter of Planned Parenthood.
• Professor of Political Science Rob Baker serves as Vice President of the Board of Trustees of the Rocking Horse Center, a pediatric clinic for low-income children.
• Every year, a student and a faculty or staff member are recognized at the Honors Convocation for their contributions to and leadership in service.
• John Paulsen, Director of Plant, Safety and Environment is chair of the Center City board.
• Lin Erickson, Director of Government, Corporate, and Foundation Relations serves on the board of the Westcott House and Oesterlin Home.
• Professor of History Tom Taylor has provided public history research for the Gammon House Project on the Underground Railroad, and Assistant Professor Dar Brooks-Hedstrom has provided urban archaeological support.

• Professor of Sociology Alan McEvoy has worked extensively with local schools, aiding administrators in developing anti-bullying programs and speaking in professional development contexts. He has also conducted a formal review for an area alternative school, the Academy of Greene County, which was instrumental in the school’s approval for state funding.

• Associate Professor of Religion Barbara Kaiser tutors an adult learning to read each week at the Warder Literacy Center.

• Darrell Kitchen, Vice President for Business and Finance, serves on the boards of the NextEdge Applied Research & Technology park, Elderly United of Springfield, National Trails Parks & Recreation District (vice chair-person).

• Visiting Assistant Professor of English Kimberly Thompson and librarian Ken Irwin spearheaded a drive for donations to build holdings in local school libraries, netting over $3,500 for 16 area schools.

In addition to these outstanding contributions, many additional faculty and staff members volunteer in church programs, at their children’s schools, as judges or master of ceremonies at science fairs, speech contests, charity spelling bees, and the like. Wittenberg faculty and staff members march for peace and unity, give advice on everything from writing to water quality, lead discussion groups on books and films at the public library, ladle soup to the homeless, comment on current events for the Springfield newspaper and television outlets, and any number of other community contributions one could name.

Wittenberg University is proud to have its facilities, its financial resources, and most of all its people taking a prominent place among community leaders and contributors. For even more examples of service and engagement, see departmental responses on Criterion Five in the resource room (3.2B).

Service and Engagement in the Strategic Plan

As is already clear, Wittenberg’s mission and values statements strongly support the inherent worth of compassionate service to one’s community. Furthermore, Wittenberg’s institutional structures, processes, and lines of communication underscore the desire to create an environment in which great ideas for making a difference can find sustenance and support. Students, staff members, faculty members, and alumni, among other groups, have risen to the call and given of their time, their expertise, their creativity, and their energy – their Wittenberg “light” – to others.

The strategic plan, Distinctively Wittenberg, envisions even stronger connections between Wittenberg and the world. Goal A includes a call for increased international study, experiential learning, internship opportunities, field experiences, and service-learning opportunities, as well as enhancing the role of the School of Community Education. Goal F calls on us to “foster, support and celebrate our unique urban location and the benefits it provides to both students and the community.” This goal presents objectives that will position Wittenberg as a major force in the life of Springfield while creating an environment in which all members of the Wittenberg community will feel inspired to contribute to the larger Springfield community as well. And Goal G, while it
primarily sets expectations about the pedagogical potential of our facilities, also recognizes that Wittenberg, as a part of Springfield, is steward to its architectural heritage as well.

The strategic plan, like our motto, demands engagement and service from students, faculty members, administrators, and staff members alike: “Having light, we pass it on to others.”

Core Component 5C

Wittenberg demonstrates its responsiveness to those constituencies that depend on it for service.

As we have seen, Wittenberg’s situation in the small city of Springfield, Ohio makes it an influential player in the local economy and local systems, sometimes as a corporate member and sometimes through the actions of exceptional individual contributors. Even though southwestern Ohio is blessed with many institutions of higher learning, Wittenberg still feels and carries out a unique responsibility in Springfield to supply support, encouragement, and leadership in creating local initiatives that will make life better for all of Clark County.

Educational Initiatives

Clark County’s transition from a community based on prosperous agricultural and industrial endeavors to one poised on the edge of a high-technology information culture has not been easy, and the public school systems have suffered for decades from a shrinking tax base and a high proportion of impoverished or transient children with material, physical, and emotional needs as well as educational ones. Wittenberg, especially its Education Department, has worked tirelessly to try not only to stabilize, but to improve that situation through a number of crucial contacts, projects, and partnerships. Springfield’s two high schools are in the process of consolidation, and members of the Wittenberg community are involved at several levels in making that change a success. In addition to those individual contributions, a number of systematic and institutional programs work to enhance teaching and learning at all levels.

The connection between Wittenberg and local education that is most ingrained is our longstanding placement of student teachers into area elementary, middle, and high schools. Obviously, the students benefit from the chance to practice what they have learned, to be mentored by more experienced teachers, and to feel firsthand the thrills and frustrations of teaching real children. But the schools and their students benefit as well; youthful enthusiasm and energy can provide some much-needed encouragement, as well as some useful disruption of the status quo at times. Student teachers are likely to expose students to new information and ideas, different works of literature, different historical figures, and new techniques for learning as compared to their supervising teachers. Likewise, the student teachers learn tried-and-true strategies for gaining authority, inculcating respect and kindness, creating a thirst for learning in their students. These symbiotic relationships work their magic in scores of placements each academic year across the county.

Beyond the needs of our own education majors and minors, Wittenberg’s Education Department has created programs that serve Clark County’s teachers directly. The Springfield-Wittenberg Teacher Institute seeks to strengthen teaching, learning, and educational research at all educational levels and to provide
opportunities for professional development for providers of education, social, and health services for youth, as well as parents. Some of the institute’s programs include professional development courses run through the master’s program in education, a summer conference, a mentoring program, and small grants originated from a $15,000 grant from the Turner Foundation. Area teachers can apply for money to seed innovative teaching projects; an institutional committee judges the proposals and awards an average grant of $500. The Aspire Grant serves as recognition of excellent teaching; there is no application process. Rather, institute teaching associates (master teachers who provide professional development programming in courses and conferences) may nominate area teachers who are making a difference through their excellent results with student learning.

Another special program of the Springfield-Wittenberg Teacher Institute is the Entry-Year Program, developed in collaboration with Springfield City Schools. This program attempts to help new teachers and teachers new to the district make the transition into a professional life consciously focused on continual growth and improvement. In an atmosphere combining theory and practice, the program uses instruction, interaction, discussion, reflection, and expansive communication to develop intentional and confident professional teachers.

Wittenberg also supports a program targeting students in area schools. Youth as Resources (YAR), one of over twenty chapters in the country, provides small grants for community enrichment projects developed and completed by young people, with advice from adults. Students gain confidence, practice in work skills, and the knowledge that they can make a difference. Current grant areas include general grants for community clean-up and beautification, literacy, and other improvements that affect the lives of young people, the implementation of an International Baccalaureate Program in the soon-to-be merged city high schools, and other projects relating to the merger. This program connects young people, their dreams, and Wittenberg, which provides space and administrative support for YAR.

Predictably, the Education Department is also involved in two key initiatives aimed toward the enrichment of the teacher pool in Clark County and toward the professional development of those teachers. The Springfield Alliance for Minority Teacher Recruitment and Preparation, a body linking Wittenberg and local schools, received a grant totaling nearly $200,000 from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) for the recruitment and support of teachers from traditionally underserved populations in Springfield. The project aligns Wittenberg with Springfield City Schools and Upward Bound, while establishing partnerships with Clark State Community College and Central State University, a regional historically-black college, for minority teacher development. Springfield schools students are eligible for the program if they are from low-income families, are members of racial or ethnic minorities, or are first-generation college students. This grant runs from 2004 to 2008.

Dr. Bob Welker, Professor of Education, has joined with other leaders in Clark County, including Wittenberg’s president Dr. Mark Erickson, to form The Aspire Corporation, one of several P-16 councils around the country. The recipient of a competitive grant from KnowledgeWorks, The Aspire Corporation provides a “think tank” environment for individuals who might not normally come together and gives them an opportunity to apply their special knowledge to local real-world situations that effect learning and achievement in all levels of education and across the
socioeconomic spectrum. This project represents the complex challenges the people of Wittenberg are choosing to become engaged with in the local community.

And finally, the master’s program in education (discussed more fully in Chapter Four) was designed specifically to help practicing teachers improve their pedagogy through content delivery innovation, social and philosophical contexts of education, and development of action research protocols. In 2001, FIPSE also awarded a grant worth over $200,000 for projects and specific kinds of courses associated with the graduate program and the Springfield-Wittenberg Teacher Institute. The project courses focus on innovative pedagogies and action research with follow-up reported through interactive web pages.

Additionally a number of the outreach programs noted earlier also involve partnerships with the community to support educational initiatives. Some examples include the Ohio Post-Secondary Educational Opportunity (PSEOP) program in which the state pays tuition for qualified high school students to take college courses at Wittenberg to substitute for specific high school courses. PSEOP, run through our School of Community Education, brings bright and enthusiastic young people to campus and eases their later transition to full-time college work. The National Youth Sports Program (NYSP) summer sports camps were developed with the cooperation of the Springfield City School District, the Springfield Urban League, the National Trail Parks and Recreation District and other local action agencies.

**Seamless Articulation with other Institutions**

Wittenberg attracts a small but consistent group of transfer students each year, as well as a number of traditional and non-traditional students who have begun their education at Clark State Community College or Sinclair Community College. The Office of the Registrar publicizes clear transfer and articulation policies in *Academic Catalog, 1.2A*, and transfer students enjoy individual appointments to determine and understand their transfer status. Under current personnel, this system works well; Assistant Registrar Janine Dogan pays close attention to detail and consults department and program directors in ambiguous cases. The most complicated aspect of transferring from the community college is the dissonance between their quarter credit system and our semester credit system. While we have a lenient policy allowing a transfer course equivalent to at least three semester credits to fulfill a requirement of a four-credit course, many community college classes are only equivalent to two semester credits. This does lead to some repetition of courses with similar learning goals, but often, students have taken two courses with similar learning goals that may be combined for general education credit. Both the Office of the Registrar and the School of Community Education work with students flexibly to give them as much credit as is fair and feasible.

During the course of their Wittenberg education, students may take courses at other institutions (in study abroad situations, for instance, or during the summer) and transfer them back. Students seeking to transfer courses in this way, however, must have them pre-approved by the registrar, the relevant department chair, or the director of general education, whichever is appropriate. This practice avoids disappointment for students who hope to satisfy a requirement with a course that doesn’t carry enough credits or is at an inappropriate level. It also gives discretion to department chairs on the kind, level, and number of courses they will accept for a major or minor from another institution.
Criterion 5

Wittenberg also enjoys formal agreements with such institutions as the School of Occupational Therapy at Washington University in St. Louis, the Johns Hopkins School of Nursing, the Case Western Reserve University Francis Payne Bolton School of Nursing, the Case School of Engineering at Case Western Reserve University, the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences at Columbia University, the School of Engineering and Applied Sciences at Washington University, Duke University’s School for the Environment, Georgia Tech’s Department of Computer Science, and the Weatherhead School of Management at Case Western Reserve University. All of these programs follow the familiar “3-2” pattern, with the exception of the cooperative agreement with the Weatherhead School for a “fifth-year” master’s of science degree in management (MSM). Wittenberg students also enjoy opportunities to study for a semester or summer at continuing programs with the Duke Marine Science Laboratory, the Gerace Research Center in the Bahamas, the Lutheran Colleges Washington Semester Program, and the International City/County Management Association (ICMA). A number of other institutional memberships in consortia and partner programs with Wright-Patterson Air Force Base and the Ohio Supercomputing Center mentioned earlier in the self-study also provide broader contexts for our educational programs. These programs broaden students’ worlds and also demonstrate the regard that other institutions have for Wittenberg’s students.

Partnership in the Local Economy

As one would expect of a small college in a small city, Wittenberg has often joined forces with area leaders to improve the community’s attractiveness to businesses and industries seeking suitable plant sites. In recent years in particular, Wittenberg has been a major player in efforts that, while they might seem opposed in some ways, actually complement each other wonderfully: simultaneous initiatives to take Clark County’s economy to the twenty-first century information age, and to preserve, enhance, and revere Springfield’s historic downtown core and architectural heritage.

Wittenberg has long been a member of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, and many university officers have participated in the civic organizations that make a small city such as Springfield work. But with the loss of some heavy manufacturing jobs, the Clark County community has moved to develop an economy focused on the future. The NextEdge Technology Park, located on the eastern edge of Springfield, will provide a hub for a number of virtual information-related businesses, specializing in data warehousing and analysis. Lexis Nexis, data centers, core services, and corporate and support software companies will all find a home there, providing a number of high-paying jobs with good benefits. Wittenberg’s partnership with the Ohio Supercomputing Center (see Chapter Four) has been instrumental in persuading two firms, Applications International Corporation (SAIC) and Advanced Virtual Engine Test Cell, Inc. (AVETeC), to locate at NextEdge. Once established, companies at NextEdge will serve as internship sites for Wittenberg students, and Wittenberg in turn may develop curricula attractive to NextEdge firms. These projects reveal Wittenberg’s place in a powerful web of large corporate, non-profit, and government institutions working together to improve the economic competitiveness and viability of our region. Copies of supporting documents such as meeting agendas and minutes, grant applications and award letters, and other notes are available in the resource room (4.5A).
As important as this technology initiative is, however, the college’s participation in the revitalization of downtown Springfield promises to yield results as exciting in very human ways. Current ideas for revitalization will take advantage of the planned downtown campus of the consolidated hospitals to provide a campus of beautiful new medical facilities south of Buck Creek, creating a figurative bridge to some of the town’s wonderful resources such as the Kuss Performing Arts Center, the dynamic Clark County Public Library, and the Heritage Center Museum. The architecturally splendid Springfield Regional Cancer Center has already been built near the target area; the hospital campus will replace several blocks of semi-derelict industrial warehouses with well-designed, state-of-the-art facilities. A proposed footbridge over Buck Creek will physically establish a neighborly link between campus and downtown, and a group of downtown businessmen and community leaders, including representatives of such stakeholders as Wittenberg, the hospital, and the Turner Foundation, hope for a small “college town” area of small businesses and restaurants to find a home downtown. Although these visionary plans will require long-term commitments from all parties, they underscore Wittenberg’s desire to be a valued and trusted partner in initiatives that benefit the larger community and the region.

Summary
Wittenberg’s deeply-planted roots in Springfield have enriched the college beyond measure. Many current partnerships, programs, and business agreements honor that relationship and seek to nourish Springfield and the region in turn, both at the individual level and the institutional level. With both partners valuing and supporting education, diversity, involvement, utility, beauty, and prosperity, the future is bright indeed.

Core Component 5D
*Internal and external constituencies value the services Wittenberg provides.*

Given the vast array of mission-driven services Wittenberg offers to its students, employees, and community, we certainly desire assurance that those efforts are appreciated, or desire constructive feedback on how to make the positive impact of services even greater. In some instances, we are able to assess formally how our services are valued, while other evaluations are more anecdotal, impromptu, and observational.

The Right Choice: Senior Satisfaction with Wittenberg

Given our intentional general education program and an array of student services from learning support to student activities to residence life and dining services, students receive many services from Wittenberg. So the data contained in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) can be advantageous in considering services and processes that are succeeding or that need attention. Wittenberg has administered the NSSE to groups of first-year and senior students in alternate years since 2002; some data from the 2004 administration of the survey offer good news, but also identify some areas for concern.

In their response to their own academic and intellectual experiences, seniors are comparable to seniors at other liberal-arts colleges, but report significantly better experiences than the national NSSE cohort in many areas. Our students
have worked on more group projects and study groups outside of class and have participated in community-based projects as part of a regular course at a higher rate than both other liberal-arts colleges and the national cohort. They report generally more outside consultation and serious intellectual discussions with faculty members and fellow students than students in the national group; they may write more short papers or journal entries but also write a comparable number of substantial papers. Predictably large numbers report having performed community service, learned a foreign language, and participated in a culminating senior experience. One disappointing finding is that our students (both seniors and first-year students) do not take advantage of the many arts experiences available at the same rate as students at other liberal-arts colleges, although their reported attendance is slightly higher than the national cohort.

Encouragingly, Wittenberg seniors evaluated the quality of their academic advising slightly better than that at other liberal-arts colleges, but quite significantly better than seniors in the national cohort. This may reflect the satisfaction they expressed in their relationship with faculty members. They also express deep appreciation for relationships with other students; one of concern is a significantly lower assessment of relationships with administrative personnel and offices than either liberal-arts colleges or the national cohort. This finding may need significant follow-up local assessment to target the policies, procedures, and rules that cause this dissatisfaction.

Overall, though, our seniors tell us something very encouraging: if they had it to do all over again, they would choose Wittenberg again. And they would do so at a slightly higher rate than students at other liberal-arts colleges, and at a significantly higher rate than students in the whole NSSE database. Those results mirror precisely their response to their evaluation of their entire educational experience at Wittenberg. While there are certainly significant areas for growth and improvement, it is heartening to know that our seniors do appreciate the many services they have received in their four years at Wittenberg.

Appreciation for Community Service

Assessing the value of community service could seem dangerously like fishing for compliments; that phenomenon probably explains the informal nature of most assessments. Many departments report that they receive thank-you notes, citations of appreciation, and other tokens of recognition from groups they have helped in some way. Others note that they assume their contributions to local events have been helpful when they are asked back repeatedly to perform the same function; the development of such traditions certainly bespeaks appreciation.

The Office of Community Service, of course, takes a more formal approach to assessment, since they serve not only the community and the students, but also the university’s general education requirement. The office seeks to ensure that students’ services are, in fact, making a difference. The policy change of 2001 that required students to complete the requirement within one semester and with a majority of hours in one service site was instituted largely to ensure that the student’s time would be meaningfully spent, rather than squandered on bits and pieces of activity with no sustained interaction. That change was initiated in part because of feedback received in several ways by the office. Students completing their service fill out evaluations, but so do site mentors. These site mentor evaluations are reviewed at the end of each
semester, and the director, along with the Community Service Committee, may implement changes based on these evaluations. Additionally, representatives from community service partner sites are asked to attend a meeting annually to provide general qualitative feedback. As with the written evaluations, this commentary can help guide necessary refinements of individual elements of the experience, such as the reflection or the orientation/service fair, or it may help tailor guidelines for certain kinds of service activities.

Contributions to Public and Cultural Life
As has been detailed throughout the self-study report, Wittenberg’s programs often take place on the campus and open Wittenberg's facilities to participants from the community. Some specific facilities have a high usage rate by people and groups not otherwise affiliated with Wittenberg: some community members can use Thomas Library and its collections; wedding receptions are held in both the Student Center Dining Room and Hollenbeck Hall’s Ness Auditorium and atrium. The Shouvlin Center for Lifelong Learning is used for small conferences by local and regional organizations such as local ELCA ministers and the Southwestern Ohio Council for Higher Education (SOCHE).

Athletic facilities and events bring many community members to campus, as well. Quite a few townspeople are loyal fans of the Wittenberg Tigers and attend games both home and away, especially in football and basketball. Additionally, local schools use the swimming and diving pool and the track both for practices and meets. The gym is also used at times for non-athletic events, such as large meetings of ELCA ministers, the annual Rotary Christmas Party for children with disabilities, or local high school proms. And individuals can use the state-of-the-art Rosencrans Fitness Center, as well as the pool, gyms, tennis courts, and racquetball courts, for a small fee.

The Wittenberg Series
The crown jewel in Wittenberg programming open to the public is the Wittenberg Series. Since 1982, the series has brought to campus an annual mix of provocative, famous, talented, and intelligent artists, educators, politicians, and writers. Each year’s series features an artist’s residency, a dance performance, a musical performance, a dramatic performance, a literary figure, and a group of intellectuals in diverse fields such as history, the sciences, public life, and education. The Series also includes annually the Festival Choral Eucharist for the Reformation, the Kenneth H. Sauer Luther Symposium, and Lessons and Carols for Advent and Christmas. Series events are always free and open to the public; the Springfield community attends in large numbers. Retiring Wittenberg Series Coordinator Gwendolyn Scheffel has created an amazing network of appreciative contacts among speakers and artists, their representation, faculty and student groups, and community organizations such as the Springfield Arts Council and the Kuss Performing Arts Center. Replacing her grace, sophistication, wit, and organizational skills will be a tall order, but is one that we must undertake seriously for the continued good of the series.

Some selected events from the past ten years of the Wittenberg Series include:

- Irish poet Eavan Boland (1996-97)
- The Joffrey Ballet (1998-99)
- Cavani String Quartet (1999-2000)
• Poet Nikki Giovanni (1999-2000)
• Vocal artists Chanticleer (2000-2001)
• Attorney-activist Morris Dees (2000-2001)
• Filmmaker Rory Kennedy (2000-2001)
• The Acting Company’s production of *The Comedy of Errors* (2001-02)
• Winberg Chai ’55 and daughter May-Lee Chai, authors of the National-Book-Award-nominated *Girl from Purple Mountain* (2001-02)
• Education activist Parker Palmer (2002-03)
• Civil Rights Movement icon Julian Bond (2002-03)
• The Twyla Tharp Dance Company (2003-04)
• National Book Award winner Tim O’Brien (2005-06)
• Paul Taylor Dance Company (2006-07)

Complete scrapbooks of the Wittenberg Series for the past ten years are available in the resource room (9.1B). Continuing strong community attendance at these and other cultural events on campus indicates a deep appreciation of the university as a resource.

**Summary Assessment of Criterion Five**

Wittenberg consciously situates itself in its community. The relationship between Wittenberg and Springfield is one of mutuality; Wittenberg’s students are able to treat their small city as a virtual learning laboratory, while they give back in creative service as well. Likewise, the community benefits from programming, educational outreach, classes, and facilities that Wittenberg makes available to the public even as Wittenberg’s employees use the services and share the future of Springfield and Clark County. Guided by President Erickson and key officers in community service, advancement, and the School of Community Education, as well as by the relationships of individuals to their community, Wittenberg fulfills Criterion Five in ways ultimately beneficial to both.
Conclusion: Passing the Light

When Ezra Keller founded Wittenberg University in the decades before the Civil War, he surely would not have imagined the day when his institution would be sustaining research partnerships with high technology organizations, or sending its students to study abroad in China, Senegal, or Lesotho or fielding nationally-ranked athletic teams. But he might have thought – in fact almost certainly he did think – that in the future, Wittenberg professors would be excellent teacher-scholars serving both their students and their academic disciplines. He certainly thought that Wittenberg students would be hard-working, curious, and idealistic. And he must have envisioned a light – of knowledge, of hope, of homecoming – streaming from the little hill in Clark County.

In the long process of strategic planning and self-study in which we have engaged, it has been humbling to learn all that our institution and our Wittenberg community members do so well. The five criteria and their core components have imposed an order, and trained a reflective eye, on the busy workings of each day. In this long and inclusive process, we have confirmed our beliefs that Wittenberg University does, indeed, fulfill the criteria for continuing accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association. Furthermore, our plans for the future – in new curricular initiatives, in new and renovated facilities, in a dynamic and more diverse student body – will continue to embody not only the best practices of a modern university as described in the criteria, but also that long-ago dream of the light on the hill. As we move into the twenty-first century, in a world in need of both clarity and generosity, it is more important than ever that, having light, we pass it on to others.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Directors Standing Committee Minutes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advancement Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Affairs &amp; Honors Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audit Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Affairs Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings &amp; Grounds Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finance – Investment Subcommittee (established May 2002)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Development Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board of Directors Meeting Minutes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>President’s Updates to Board of Directors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>President’s Senior Staff</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advisory Committees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Resources Advisory Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WACKO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Consultant Reports</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2.2 CHARTER AND BYLAWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charter</td>
<td>2.2A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.3 FACULTY COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Committees</th>
<th>2.3A</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Executive Board, General Information, Members and Self-Study</td>
<td>2.3A i.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.wittenberg.edu/feb/index.php?action=feb">https://www.wittenberg.edu/feb/index.php?action=feb</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Educational Policies, General Information and Proceedings</td>
<td>2.3A ii.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete List of Faculty Committees/Task Forces and Descriptions</td>
<td>2.3A iii.</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/bylaws_documents/bylaws_faculty.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/bylaws_documents/bylaws_faculty.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3. Self-Study Process

### 3.1 NCA ACCREDITATION, EXTERNAL DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HLC Handbook of Accreditation</td>
<td>3.1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeline and Self-Study Concept</td>
<td>3.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 NCA ACCREDITATION, INTERNAL DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning Commission: Task Group Reports</td>
<td>3.2A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Study Steering Committee: Self-Study Departmental Reports</td>
<td>3.2B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4. Financial and Physical Resources

### 4.1 FINANCIAL DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five Year Revenue Projection</td>
<td>4.1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Strength Ratios</td>
<td>4.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audited Financial Statements</td>
<td>4.1C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Policy Statements</td>
<td>4.1D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Policy, 2004</td>
<td>4.1D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Allocation, 2006</td>
<td>4.1D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation Fund</td>
<td>4.1E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Resolution, 2006</td>
<td>4.1E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Presentation</td>
<td>4.1E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Finance</td>
<td>4.1F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 FACILITIES DOCUMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Facilities Plan: 10 year</th>
<th>4.2A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Maintenance Inventory</td>
<td>4.2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Master Plan</td>
<td>4.2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Master Plan 1996</td>
<td>4.2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Master Plan 2001</td>
<td>4.2C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3 BUDGET CALENDAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>4.3A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>4.3B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.4 TECHNOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transforming Technological Information Services</th>
<th>4.4A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### 5. Human Resources

#### 5.1 FACULTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Roster</td>
<td>5.1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications of Faculty</td>
<td>5.1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Faculty Awards</td>
<td>5.1B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Packet for New Faculty</td>
<td>5.1C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals</td>
<td>5.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Sabbatical Policy&quot;</td>
<td>5.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. External Faculty Awards</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/benefits/sabbatical.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/benefits/sabbatical.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbaticals Granted in the Last Five Years</td>
<td>5.1D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Sabbaticals Granted in the Last Five Years</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/benefits/sabbatical.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/benefits/sabbatical.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising Handbook 2006</td>
<td>5.1E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Development Board</td>
<td>5.1F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Faculty Development Programs (10 years)&quot;</td>
<td>5.1F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Faculty Development Programs (10 years)</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_development/">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_development/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Research Fund Board</td>
<td>5.1G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERI Survey 2004-2005</td>
<td>5.1H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provost’s Report to Faculty</td>
<td>5.1H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Provost’s Report to Faculty</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/support_services/research_fund_print.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/support_services/research_fund_print.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Results</td>
<td>5.1H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Survey Results</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/support_services/research_fund_print.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/support_services/research_fund_print.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Faculty Research</td>
<td>5.1I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2 STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff Performance Review Process</td>
<td>5.2A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 5.2 Professional Development Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.2B</th>
<th>See Staff Manual, pgs 35, 36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5.2C Training and Enrichment Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3A</th>
<th>Tuition Remission Policy and Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3B</th>
<th>Employee Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3C</th>
<th>Wittenberg Courses Taken by Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.3D</th>
<th>Child Care Task Force Report 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 5.3 BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.4A</th>
<th>Human Resources Annual Report 1996-2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6. Curriculum and Educational Programs

#### 6.1 CLASS SCHEDULES AND CATALOGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.1A</th>
<th>Course Offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Summer 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2 CURRICULUM REVISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.2A</th>
<th>General Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.2B</td>
<td>Department Learning Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Departmental Self-Study Reports (3.2B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.3 ACCREDITATION REPORTS AND EXTERNAL REVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music, NASM</td>
<td>6.3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry, ACS</td>
<td>6.3B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, NCATE</td>
<td>6.3C</td>
<td>See addendum to Consultant Reports &amp; Self Studies Vol I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Curriculum Reviews</td>
<td>6.3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Reports &amp; Self Studies Vol I</td>
<td>6.3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant Reports &amp; Self Studies Vol II</td>
<td>6.3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 ADDITIONAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School of Community Education</td>
<td>6.4A</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/school_of_community_education/">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/school_of_community_education/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD Program</td>
<td>6.4A</td>
<td>i.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Scholars Program</td>
<td>6.4A</td>
<td>ii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Musical Development</td>
<td>6.4A</td>
<td>iii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Programs</td>
<td>6.4A</td>
<td>iv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE Adjunct Manual</td>
<td>6.4A</td>
<td>v.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Licensing</td>
<td>6.4A</td>
<td>vi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Education Program</td>
<td>6.4B</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/academics/educ/masters.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/academics/educ/masters.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Sites 2005-2006</td>
<td>6.4C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5 CAMPUS ACADEMIC CONFERENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan and the World Conference, 2006</td>
<td>6.5A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Academic Assessment

7.1 ASSESSMENT PLANNING DOCUMENTS

| Assessment Policy | 7.1A | http://www4.wittenberg.edu/facstaff/faculty_manual/05-06/assessment/ |

7.2 DEPARTMENT AND PROGRAM ASSESSMENT RESULTS

| Department Reports (A – L) | 7.2A |
| Department Reports (M – T) | 7.2B |
| Program Reports | 7.2C |
| General Education Assessment 2006 | 7.2D |
| Collegiate Learning Assessment Project 2005-08 | 7.2E |
| Community Service Survey | 7.2F | See Professor Wilson’s study |

7.3 ALUMNI SURVEY RESULTS

| Baccalaureate Origins of PhDs from liberal arts colleges | 7.3A |
| Hardwick Day Alumni Survey 2001 | 7.3B |

7.4 ENROLLMENT DATA

| Integrated PostSecondary Education Data System 1997-2005 | 7.4A |

7.5 TEACHING EVALUATION

| IDEA | 7.5A |
| Departmental Summaries | 7.5B |
# 8. Student Development

## 8.1 Student Organizations

| Clubs and Organizations | 8.1A | http://www4.wittenberg.edu/students/stuorg_links.html |

## 8.2 Financial Aid

| General Program Information | 8.2A | http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/financial_aid/index.html |
| Financial Aid Audit | 8.2B |
| NCAA Athletic Aid Audit | 8.2C |

## 8.3 Student Surveys

| CIRP | 8.3A |
| NSSE | 8.3B |
| Institutional Report 2004 | 8.3B i |
| Institutional Report 2005 | 8.3B ii |
| NSSE Analyses 2006 | 8.3B iii |
| Residence Hall Survey 2005 | 8.3C |
| Student Satisfaction Survey | 8.3D |
| 2001 | 8.3D i |
| 2006 | 8.3D ii |

## 8.4 Student Support Services

<p>| List of Services | 8.4A | See under heading labeled “Student Support Services” <a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/students/stulife_links.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/students/stulife_links.html</a> |
| Policies &amp; Procedures for Learning Disabled Students | 8.4B |
| Student Achievement Results of RITA Program | 8.4C |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing Center Mission Statement</th>
<th>8.4D</th>
<th><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/writing_center/">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/writing_center/</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usage Reports for Library and OhioLINK</td>
<td>8.4E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LibQual+ Survey of Library Service</td>
<td>8.4F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math Workshop</td>
<td>8.4G</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/math_workshop/">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/math_workshop/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Learning Center</td>
<td>8.4H</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/academics/lang/labs/">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/academics/lang/labs/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8.5 OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internship Database</th>
<th>8.5A</th>
<th><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/careers/Internship/internshipsummer2004.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/careers/Internship/internshipsummer2004.html</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Service Partners</td>
<td>8.5B</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/witt_services/community_services/sitelist.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/witt_services/community_services/sitelist.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg Study Abroad Program</td>
<td>8.5C</td>
<td><a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/inted/studyabroad/index.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/inted/studyabroad/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 9. Institutional Culture/Community Relations

#### 9.1 EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student/Alumni/Parent/Family Events</th>
<th>9.1A</th>
<th>See Alumni Webpage <a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/alumni/">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/administration/alumni/</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wittenberg Series</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td>See individual reports for more details <a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/news/series/05-06/">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/news/series/05-06/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowed Lectures</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Sponsored Events</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convocations</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapel</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lectures</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sesquicentennial Symposia</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Events</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artists in Residence Series</td>
<td>9.1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poster Artists for the Wittenberg Series</strong></td>
<td>9.1B ix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Department Concert and Recital Series</strong></td>
<td>9.1C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theatre and Dance Department Productions and Dance Concerts</strong></td>
<td>9.1D <a href="http://www4.wittenberg.edu/academics/thdn/productions/calendar.html">http://www4.wittenberg.edu/academics/thdn/productions/calendar.html</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Research Projects, Presentations, Publications</strong></td>
<td>9.1E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freeman Grant Projects</strong></td>
<td>9.1F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**9.2 PUBLICATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Wittenberg Review of Literature and Art</strong></td>
<td>9.2D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spectrum</strong></td>
<td>9.2E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The East Asian Studies Journal</strong></td>
<td>9.2F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The History Journal</strong></td>
<td>9.2G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political Science Journal</strong></td>
<td>9.2H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pholeos</strong></td>
<td>9.2I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus Directories</strong></td>
<td>9.2J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Research Symposia</strong></td>
<td>9.2L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 ATHLETICS AND RECREATION</td>
<td>9.3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics and Recreation</td>
<td>9.3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department – Policies and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures Manual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCAA Gender Equity Reports</td>
<td>9.3C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural Program</td>
<td>9.3E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athlete Advisory</td>
<td>9.3G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>9.3H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composite Schedules</td>
<td>9.3J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Distinctively Wittenberg: A Vision for Excellence

The Strategic Plan for Wittenberg University

February 6, 2006

Introduction

In spring of 2003, then President Baird Tipson initiated the process to develop a replacement for the 1997 Strategic Plan. The newly convened Strategic Planning Commission was charged to “define the ideal future for Wittenberg University and identify the strategies and objectives required to achieve that future,” aiming for a Wittenberg that is “highly attractive to our preferred students, highly effective in accomplishing its mission, financially strong and sustainable, important and attractive to donors,” and possessing “an outstanding and unique reputation.”

A total of eleven working groups were created to address specific topics of importance to the future of Wittenberg. The Commission received and discussed reports from these eleven groups in the opening months of 2004; the faculty spent its one-day February retreat discussing the ongoing work of these committees. By early spring, the plan began to take shape, with the major initiatives re-organized around six themes: academic programs, facilities, the Wittenberg community, stable enrollment, student success, and operations. Additional task groups were appointed and convened to begin developing action plans around these themes.

In fall of 2004, under the leadership of interim president Bill Steinbrink, a committee was charged to streamline the university’s mission statement and to affirm the core values of the university.

With the arrival of a new president, the importance of the strategic plan was confirmed. In fall of 2005, President Mark Erickson convened and charged the Strategic Plan Advisory Committee to refine the strategic plan, taking into consideration the need to identify no more than 15 priorities and to address the realities of today.

The goals and objectives contained in this document represent the work of more than one hundred individuals who contributed to the plan over the past three years. (The appendix lists all of the individuals who participated in formal committees and task groups. Many more participated in less formal ways.)

The plan will guide the work of Wittenberg and will continue to evolve to meet our changing needs and to address the changes in the world around us.
Wittenberg University Mission

Wittenberg University provides a liberal arts education dedicated to intellectual inquiry and wholeness of person within a diverse residential community. Reflecting its Lutheran heritage, Wittenberg challenges students to become responsible global citizens, to discover their callings, and to lead personal, professional, and civic lives of creativity, service, compassion, and integrity.

The University’s Values

Liberal Arts

Since its founding in 1845, Wittenberg’s curriculum has centered on the liberal arts as an education that develops the individual’s capacity to think, read, and communicate with precision, understanding, and imagination. We are dedicated to education in the core disciplines of the arts and sciences and in pre-professional education grounded in the liberal arts.

Intellectual Inquiry

Wittenberg embraces the life of the mind. We promote high standards of artistic, scholarly, and scientific inquiry among our students and faculty. Teaching and research at Wittenberg emphasize the discovery of new knowledge as well as the learning of received wisdom. Intellectual inquiry is enhanced by the thoughtful participation of diverse peoples with diverse perspectives. We are committed to bringing to the lives of our students an enduring passion for learning, which requires risk-taking, persistence, reflection, and high ethical standards.

Wholeness of Person

Members of the Wittenberg community support each other in the personal search for balance that characterizes wholeness of person. To promote leadership, confidence, and community engagement, we help every student develop in harmony intellectual capabilities, aesthetic sense, physical well-being, spiritual identity, and social relationships.

Community of Learners

A purposeful and intentionally diverse community, centered on a residential campus, sustains education in the liberal arts and the exploration of complex and competing ideas within an ethos of accountability and support. From this community, we serve and engage our urban home of Springfield and the broader communities around the globe. By affirming the dignity of every person and fostering a spirit of respect, we create and expand opportunities to pursue knowledge in and out of the classroom.

Lutheran Heritage

Wittenberg expresses its Lutheran heritage through its continuing relationship with the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, its welcome to people of all beliefs and backgrounds, its commitment to academic freedom and excellence, its exploration of
the relationship between faith and learning, its promotion of campus worship life, its encouragement of reflection upon religious views and values, and its commitment to service to the community and the world.

Global Citizenship
A Wittenberg education prepares students for the challenge and responsibility of global citizenship. Through our curriculum, study-abroad opportunities, and the enriching presence of international students, we engage the complexity of the human experience, learning about and from cultures around the world. We are committed to providing opportunities for students to interact with others of widely different backgrounds, seeking common solutions to problems facing our world.

Calling
Wittenberg values the unique contributions each individual can make in responding to the needs of neighbors both near and far. We encourage all students to discern their vocations and to understand the meaningful connection between self-fulfillment and service to the world.

Creativity
Creativity is central to the study of the arts and sciences and to problem solving in all areas of inquiry. Creativity requires the free and open exchange of ideas, the ability to value and imagine different perspectives, and the intellectual tools necessary to make personal contributions in any area of study. We are committed to providing opportunities for students to explore new areas of knowledge and to form the intellectual associations supportive of the creative life.

Service
Service provides an intentional opportunity to give back to the world and to promote social justice. Service requires us to learn about community needs, about who we are, and about what we can contribute. We are dedicated as faculty, staff, and students to advancing the common good as local citizens and as members of the global community.

Compassion
Compassion requires a broad knowledge of ourselves and of others, and of all our joys and ills. It combines an awareness of suffering with a desire to respond. At Wittenberg, we educate the mind to understand and we educate the heart to care.

Integrity
Integrity means honesty and fidelity to the highest ethical standards, which are fundamental to teaching, learning, and personal growth. We encourage our students to pursue knowledge and truth with moral courage and reflection, and so to live their lives.
Distinctively Wittenberg: 
A Vision for Excellence

This strategic plan charts an exciting and inspiring path for Wittenberg University that will both build on our historic strengths and propel us in bold new directions. It provides a road map for excellence that will focus our energy and our investments. The plan aims to establish Wittenberg firmly among the nation’s top 75 national liberal arts colleges, completing the effort begun a quarter century ago to re-position Wittenberg from among the worthy colleges of the Ohio Athletic Conference to its rightful place among the finest national liberal arts colleges in the country.

The plan affirms the university’s essential characteristics: its fundamental academic commitments to liberal learning, to selected pre-professional majors, and to both traditional and nontraditional students; its primary relationships with the Springfield and Miami Valley communities and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; its rich athletic tradition; and its historic values of a small college, personal attention to individual student needs, and opportunities to develop the whole person. Simultaneously, the plan challenges and stretches us: to reevaluate how we teach, advise, and mentor our students in the 21st century – both inside and outside the traditional classroom; to extend our national and global reach; and to focus on student success, innovation, and untapped possibilities.

The plan also challenges us to be more intentional in defining the learning outcomes of a Wittenberg education by developing a comprehensive four-year educational model. This developmental model includes a comprehensive advising program initiated in the first year and expanded through all four years, a vibrant first-year experience, service-learning opportunities throughout the curriculum, an expanded international focus including study abroad opportunities for all students, increased emphasis on experiential learning, and capstone senior projects.

Such an ambitious plan will require great investments of intellect and talent to strengthen and advance our academic programs, and to attract and retain outstanding and talented students, staff and faculty. It will call for equally great financial investments in our programs, facilities, and people.

In the end, this plan will transform this university, inspire the Wittenberg community, and establish Wittenberg University as a national leader in liberal arts education. It is a plan that will answer the question, “Why Wittenberg?” clearly and compellingly for the next generation of college students. It is a plan that will make us Distinctively Wittenberg.
**Goal A:** Provide distinctive, innovative, and relevant academic programs that challenge and inspire our students.

At its heart, Wittenberg is an academic institution with a primary purpose of engaging students in a lifelong passion for learning. Our academic programs are the core of a Wittenberg education. They must provide our students with the depth and breadth of a traditional liberal arts education. Students will be prepared for the next step in their lives and for a lifetime of work and service. Our education must remain relevant, addressing the complexities of an increasingly diverse and interconnected world. Our programs should also serve to distinguish Wittenberg from our peer liberal arts colleges.

**Objective 1:** Renew the liberal arts core (as expressed in the general education requirements) to ensure it is current to the world in which we live, reflects the priorities of the strategic plan, and reinforces the connection between all majors and “the core.”

- Redefine the liberal arts core to reflect our educational priorities.
- Encourage integrated learning experiences with inter-disciplinary work teams.
- Review current departmental structure and processes to encourage integrated and cross-disciplinary thinking and to facilitate the development of interdisciplinary majors.
- Provide curricular flexibility to encourage multi- and interdisciplinary exploration.

**Objective 2:** Infuse the curriculum with an international perspective.

- Provide a study-abroad opportunity for every Wittenberg student.
- Increase international internships.
- Include a global perspective in courses, majors, and minors.
- Explore the development of a global citizenship program that would provide courses, experiences, and reflection for interested students.
- Explore the development of an interdisciplinary International Relations program.

**Objective 3:** Supplement the liberal arts core with experiential learning opportunities for all students.

- Provide an experiential learning opportunity for every Wittenberg student.
- Expand, coordinate, and market offerings of internship experiences.
- Expand field experiences.
- Expand service-learning opportunities inside and outside the classroom.
**Objective 4:** Strengthen and promote distinctive program opportunities that attract and retain outstanding students.

- Provide funds to seed exploration of new and extant distinctive programs that attract students who might not otherwise choose Wittenberg.
- Increase interdisciplinary opportunities with East Asian Studies and Russian Area Studies programs.
- Strengthen the Honors program and market as a recruitment tool.
- Strengthen the Arts programs and enhance their visibility on and off campus.
- Strengthen and integrate the Management program with the liberal arts and other disciplines.
- Enhance and promote pre-law, pre-health, and pre-ministry graduate school preparation.
- Support the enrichment of the computational disciplines through collaborations with organizations such as Wright Patterson Air Force Base and Ohio Supercomputer Center.
- Strengthen, differentiate, and promote our School of Community Education.

**Goal B:** Attract talented and motivated students to join a vibrant academic community.

Our students are the primary focus of this community. A truly liberal education requires engagement with a wide range of viewpoints and experiences, and it requires individuals who are committed to learning. Through our admissions process we strive to enroll outstanding students who reflect the wide diversity of the world around us and who have a passion for learning. We actively seek students with unique and varied talents and with records of significant expression of these talents and gifts. This diversity strengthens our learning community and prepares our students for success later in life. We intentionally provide opportunities to students whose academic preparation may not be strong, but whose motivation and promise to learn is high.

**Objective:** Attract outstanding students with a passion for learning, who reflect the diversity of the world, and embrace the values of Wittenberg. Achieve optimal composition and diversity of entering class.

- Achieve target enrollment of 1950 FTE students by 2013.
- Enhance the academic profile of the incoming class.
- Increase number and presence of international students, students from throughout the United States, students from diverse ethnic, economic and religious backgrounds, and Lutheran students.
- Increase our endowed scholarships.
- Create a campus climate where all community members understand and fulfill their individual and collective roles in recruiting students.
• Develop the model program for Division III athletics with a focus on great academics and great athletics. Market and strengthen our nationally prominent Division III athletics program to attract outstanding student-athletes. Identify and support learning outcomes achieved through participation in athletics.
• Launch a comprehensive marketing initiative to promote the answer to the question “Why Wittenberg?”

**Goal C: Transform the undergraduate educational experience by adopting a comprehensive and integrated approach to student learning.**

Wittenberg provides students a personalized teaching and learning environment that is supportive and challenging, confirming and transforming. Entering students encounter engaged learning communities where they interact with students and faculty who share their developing interests and passions. They have opportunities to explore those interests when they arrive and develop them over their years here with internships, out-of-class learning opportunities, and global experiences that broaden and deepen their knowledge, sharpen their skills, and enliven their spiritual and ethical commitments. Faculty and staff are teachers, guides, and collaborators.

**Objective 1: Define and implement a four-year developmental model for student learning that integrates learning inside and outside the classroom.**

• Incorporate advising, service learning, international experiences, experiential learning, spiritual exploration, leadership development, understanding of diversity, and moral growth as elements of the model.
• Develop a vibrant, engaging, student-centered, success-oriented, comprehensive first-year experience program to include transition to college life, vocational exploration, early faculty/student collaboration, and residential learning communities.
• Develop comprehensive second-, third-, and fourth-year experiences that build on the stated learning themes and incorporate opportunities for teamwork and creativity.
• Engage all students in a synthesizing capstone experience with a faculty mentor.

**Objective 2: Establish a focused, comprehensive program to increase student success.**

• Develop a state of the art advising program.
• Create a Student Success Center that integrates all of the student support services to provide holistic support for the student learning environment.
• Create a campus climate where all community members understand and fulfill their individual and collective roles in enhancing student success and retaining students.
Goal D: Build, support, and celebrate a more diverse campus community.

Diversity is essential to ensure that Wittenberg University is educationally and intellectually vibrant. We affirm the dignity of every person, and we listen to, learn from, and appreciate the experiences of all individuals. Diversity is multifaceted. It relates to women and men; people of different races, ethnicity, and religions; people with disabilities; people from different intellectual perspectives and socioeconomic backgrounds; people of different sexual orientations; and people from the United States and from other countries. We are committed to creating and sustaining an interactive and supportive community in which all individuals feel part of a greater whole.

Objective: Develop and implement a comprehensive plan to increase diversity in all facets of the university: its students, faculty, staff, and programs; to prepare our students for a diverse world.

- Develop a clear statement outlining our institutional values and commitment to diversity.
- Transform the campus and campus climate through programs that develop a greater awareness of intercultural issues and perspectives.
- Attract and retain a diverse mix of students, faculty, and staff.
- Enhance campus diversity through our campus design, symbols, and ceremonies.
- Develop multi-faith worship spaces on campus.

Goal E: Recognize, reward, and invest in outstanding faculty and staff.

Faculty and staff provide the foundation of an energetic and self-renewing teaching and learning environment. The success of the university depends upon their care and commitment and upon the care and commitment that is extended to them. Changing student and curricular needs require opportunities for collaborations, partnerships, and close relationships that can extend across institutional boundaries. New strategic initiatives require that we support professional development activities that advance the goals in the strategic plans. Our continued development as an educational community requires us to attract and retain the highest caliber faculty and staff by offering them competitive packages of salaries, benefits, and community support.

Objective 1: Increase support for professional development and enrichment activities.

- Establish innovative faculty and staff development programs that sustain the comprehensive learning environment defined in the strategic plan.
- Establish formal faculty and staff mentoring programs to welcome and integrate new faculty and staff into the Wittenberg community and to sustain them throughout their careers.
• Increase support for discipline-related professional development (such as support for scholarship activities).
• Define opportunities for staff to advance within Wittenberg.

**Objective 2: Develop and sustain competitive faculty and staff compensation.**

• Ensure faculty total compensation supports our ability to recruit and retain the finest faculty. Benchmark against the median of our North Coast Athletic Conference peer group.
• Ensure staff total compensation supports our ability to recruit and retain the finest staff. Develop appropriate benchmarks.
• Launch a strategic evaluation of benefits and redesign the benefits package. Determine what benefits are needed and appropriate today.
• Review promotion, tenure, reward, and recognition criteria in light of the comprehensive needs expressed in the strategic plan.
• Establish a strategic funding mechanism to support development and enhancement of programs identified in the strategic plan.
• Recognize and reward outstanding achievement.
• Develop and fund endowed chairs.

**Goal F: Extend and cultivate the Wittenberg community.**

Community is central to the advantages of a residential college, to liberal education, to the Lutheran tradition, and to our institutional values. We recognize that creating community requires intentionality and purpose. Community enables us to foster learning in multiple ways, inside and outside the classroom. It enables us to engage faculty, staff, alumni, and our surrounding cities and villages in the learning process with our students. Community helps students discover how to use their gifts in service to others. We teach and model for students the practice of engagement with the world. We contribute to our local communities, and we benefit from our participation in the life of the communities.

**Objective 1: Foster, support and celebrate our unique urban location and the benefits it provides to both students and the community.**

• Work with the City of Springfield and Clark County to create a college town area adjacent to our campus.
• Sustain and develop additional partnerships, internships, and service-learning opportunities in Springfield and surrounding communities.
• Promote access and engagement of the Springfield/Miami Valley community on the Wittenberg campus.
• Promote engagement of Wittenberg faculty, staff, and students with Springfield and the surrounding communities. Recognize and celebrate this service and accomplishments.
• Increase our visibility and engagement with Dayton, Columbus, and the broader Miami Valley.
**Objective 2: Create and celebrate a fully engaged Wittenberg community of learners.**

- Foster opportunities for all members of the Wittenberg community to come together to address important issues, to participate in the cultural life of the community, and to celebrate successes.
- Foster opportunities for students in all four years to come together.
- Increase opportunities for collaboration campus wide.
- Encourage all students to become engaged in at least one community-building activity during their first year such as a club, organization, academic project, or team.
- Build strong residential communities that actively engage faculty and staff as “fellows”.
- Ensure that athletics, Greek life, clubs, and organizations are fully integrated into the life of the campus.

**Goal G: Build a foundation for success with outstanding facilities.**

Our facilities are essential elements in the Wittenberg experience. They create the physical environment for learning, and they create the spaces in which members of the community come together. As we continue renewing our facilities, we will ensure that all of our buildings, technology, and open spaces create an environment that invites and sustains a diverse range of learning activities and enhances the interactions that foster community.

**Objective 1: Renew and sustain the historic heart of the campus.**

- Renovate historic buildings to meet current and emerging programmatic needs of the departments housed in the buildings and to support the campus master plan. (Historic heart includes Blair, Carnegie, Koch, Myers, Recitation, Weaver Chapel, Weaver Observatory, and Zimmerman.)

**Objective 2: Create state-of-the-art academic and student life facilities to meet educational priorities.**

- Construct a Performing Arts Center and exhibition space to serve as laboratories for the arts programs and as gathering space for the Wittenberg and local communities.
- Upgrade existing housing (on campus and off) over time to offer a variety of high-quality housing options for our students consistent with the four-year developmental model and fully integrated with campus life, to incorporate learning spaces, and to meet the needs of today’s students.
• Complete campus master plan to inform various construction options/opportunities:
  - Conduct a feasibility study for a facility to meet the needs of an enhanced Management program.
  - Assess the future of Krieg in light of the campus master plan and plans for the Performing Arts Center.
  - Explore the physical space needs for an Information Commons.
  - Explore space options to house the Center for Student Success.
  - Explore the development of an on-campus childcare facility.
  - Conduct a feasibility study to construct a field house to meet student needs.
  - Explore the acquisition of various properties adjacent to campus.
  - Explore energy efficiency/sustainability in all new campus construction.
• Increase the presence of public art throughout the campus.

**Objective 3: Develop a strategic technology plan and implement fully.**

• Develop a comprehensive technology strategy.
• Explore the development of an Information Commons (including space for Center for Teaching Excellence).
• Ensure campus-wide access to appropriate AV teaching technology.
• Upgrade all campus wiring.
• Provide wireless access indoors and outdoors throughout the campus.
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Appendix B: The Curriculum of Wittenberg University

References: Selected passages in the Faculty Manual from the motion on the General Education Program for the 1995 curriculum, as approved by the faculty March 29, 1994 and subsequently revised in 1996, 2000, 2002 (writing goal and community service), and 2003.

All candidates for the bachelor’s degree must complete 130 semester hours to earn their degree. No more than two of these hours may be earned in physical activity courses.

General Education Program


Purpose of General Education at Wittenberg

General education provides the foundation of liberal learning upon which Wittenberg fulfills its primary purpose, as emphasized in its mission statement, imparting knowledge, inspiring enquiry, and encouraging independent thought. General education informs the more specialized study of the major and the minor and provides the basis for both lifelong learning and participation in Wittenberg’s learning community. In addition, students will have the opportunity to develop, assess, and clarify spiritual beliefs and ethical values, gain an appreciation of human diversity, and define the role of the educated citizen in the world community and in each person’s particular society.

By achieving the specific goals of general education, students will acquire a basis for understanding varied domains of knowledge and experience and for appreciating the power and limitations of the ways of knowing that characterize each domain. Students will develop the analytic and expressive skills necessary to engage creatively in the exchange of ideas and assimilation of information and will gain an awareness of the interconnectedness of academic disciplines and the relation between various areas of inquiry and specialized courses of study.

The university offers a variety of courses especially designed to ensure that students have sufficient opportunity to develop these skills and achieve these understandings. A minimum number of these courses, distributed with reference to learning goals, are required for degree completion. [A student without credits by transfer or examination, and starting language at the introductory level completes 64 semester hours in General Education.] To complement and support the academic program, the University provides a wide range of co-curricular activities and events that address particular components of Wittenberg’s mission. These include lectures, performances, religious events, counseling, athletics, and recreational activities.
General Education & the Major

The major at Wittenberg needs to be understood as a vital portion of general education for three reasons: a major offers the best opportunity for study in depth; some general education learning goals are best met in the coursework found in the major; and the major department/program is often in the best position to evaluate the student’s achievement of these learning goals. Recognition of this important principle is the reason behind these following requirements: (1) at least two of the student’s writing-intensive courses must be taken in the major; (2) departments and interdepartmental programs must include in their major programs plans for enabling students to achieve the Speaking goal, the Research goal, and the Computing goal in a manner appropriate to the field; and (3) departments and interdepartmental programs will include in their major programs a means of enabling students to meet the Diversity of Human Experience goal.

Electives

Electives at Wittenberg serve three essential purposes: (1) they enable the student to build more depth or breadth into a program of study; (2) they make possible the pursuit of a second major or a minor (or minors); and (3) they enable the student to explore areas of individual interest. Ordinarily, 30-40 semester hours of a student’s degree will be available for electives.

[Note: A total of electives greater than 34 is not possible unless the student places into the second semester of language (general education reduced by 5 semester hours) or places out of English 101.]

Goals of the 1995 General Education Program

“We have attempted to offer a plan of general education that suits Wittenberg but will challenge us, one that respects our need for flexibility while reaffirming our belief in the purpose of general education. It aims to assure that each Wittenberg graduate has learned the essential skills of an educated person; understands the dominant methods of investigation of our age; has studied the physical world of nature, the social worlds of human beings, and the mental worlds of the human spirit; and has learned that such learning is both a solitary and a communal quest, which yields both personal rewards and social responsibilities.” IRC Final Report 1994

Programmatic Assumptions:

1. Except as otherwise noted (e.g., Non-Western Cultures, writing-intensive and mathematics intensive courses), a course should meet only one general education requirement.

2. Courses that meet the Non-Western Cultures requirement may instead meet one other requirement. Each student shall indicate which requirement the course meets at registration.

3. The key test for a course proposed to meet a requirement is that it meets the relevant learning goal(s) and definition(s).

4. To address adequately the scope of general education learning goals, most general education courses should bear at least four semester hours of credit. Exceptions to this rule may be permitted in credit-bearing performance or production courses approved to satisfy the Fine, Performing, and Literary Arts and physical activity requirements.
5. Most students will take eight courses of 4-5 semester hours each for requirements R-8 through R-12 (Natural World; Social Institutions, Processes & Behavior; the Fine, Performing and Literary Arts; Religious & Philosophical Inquiry; and Western Historical Perspectives). In doing so, the student must choose courses from eight different departments and programs. In cases where the student takes coursework in more than two departments to fulfill an 8 semester hour requirement (as is possible in the arts category), the student must still take courses from six other departments for the remaining six courses (or 24 semester hours).

I. Foundations Goals

Writing

GOAL: A student should achieve a level of competency in writing that provides the necessary foundation for subsequent college work and further learning and should also strengthen writing with continued practice.

REQUIREMENTS: R-1. ENGL 101 during the first two semesters and earning a grade of C- or S, unless exempted by demonstrating writing competency through national tests, as certified by the Department of English. ENGL 101 should include some library work and utilize computers for word processing. R-2. Demonstrate continuing proficiency in writing. R-3. All students are required to demonstrate successfully their writing proficiency in seven courses designated as writing-intensive, at least two of which must be taken as part of the student's major.

Mathematics

GOAL: A student should achieve a level of competence in mathematics that provides the necessary foundation for subsequent college learning and should also strengthen problem-solving and reasoning skills through continued use.

REQUIREMENTS: R-4. At least four semester hours during the first three semesters in mathematics, statistics, or computer science that meet the foundational mathematics goal. Competency is demonstrated by earning a grade of C- or S in an approved course (designated as a Q course) or by exemption as certified by the Department of Mathematics & Computer Science. R-5. One additional course, from anywhere in the curriculum, that relies on mathematical reasoning and problem solving as a regular and integral part of the learning experience (designated by an M for mathematical reasoning-intensive). This course may count toward another requirement.

DEFINITIONS: Competency – Mathematics competency corresponds to C- level or better mastery of foundational skills. Courses designed to help students attain competence would provide frequent exposure to problems that may be solved by a variety of mathematical techniques developed in the course. Students may also demonstrate competency by examination.

Mathematical reasoning – Problem-solving and analytical thinking characterized by the use of mathematical abstraction, skills, and concepts. Mathematical skills include, but are not limited to, statistical, geometric, and probability analyses, computation, algebraic manipulation, differentiation, and integration.

Mathematics-intensive – A mathematics-intensive course strengthens learning through regular and integral use of numbers and mathematical reasoning. Some
potential examples include: all math courses; some courses in art, business, education, philosophy (symbolic logic), stage lighting or scene design; many natural science, computer science, and social science courses.

**Foreign Language**

GOAL: A student should achieve the degree of competence in a foreign language necessary to encounter another culture on its own terms and to enhance understanding of the structure of language itself.

REQUIREMENT: R-6. Complete a language 112 course, or its equivalent, during the first four semesters and earning a grade of C- or S, unless exempted through a competency test. (Please note: Students who take language courses at other institutions should take the competency examination at Wittenberg as soon as possible after completing the course at the other institution. Students who desire to fulfill the competency requirement in a language not taught at Wittenberg must consult with the chair of the Department of Foreign Languages & Literatures and arrange to demonstrate competency by achieving a predetermined score on a standardized examination or another acceptable means of evaluation.)

**Speaking**

GOAL: A student should be able to speak effectively within and before groups.

REQUIREMENT: No specific course is required. The development of speaking skills should be included in Common Learning and other courses, while accomplishment of the goal in full is a responsibility of each major program and, as such, must be certified by the major department/program for graduation.

**Research**

GOAL: A student should be able to use the library to acquire information and to explore ideas and should understand the role of technology in the collection, analysis, and dissemination of information.

REQUIREMENT: No specific course requirement. Some limited exposure to the appropriate information technology and to the library should be provided in ENGL 101 [and Common Learning]. Accomplishment of the goal in full is the responsibility of each major program, and, as such, must be certified by the major department/program for graduation.

**Computing**

GOAL: A student should be able to use a computer to help perform a variety of learning activities and should understand the power and limits of computing.

REQUIREMENT: No specific course requirement. Students will meet this computing goal through specified elements of some general education courses and through their major program, and, as such, must be certified by the major department/program for graduation.
II. Arts & Sciences Goals

The Diversity of Human Experience

GOAL: A student should gain an appreciation and understanding of the role of human diversity in contemporary culture.

REQUIREMENT: Courses counting toward the Arts & Sciences requirements (R7-R13) should address this goal, in ways, and to the degree, appropriate to the content and pedagogy of each individual course. This goal also should be addressed in the major, in a manner appropriate to the field.

DEFINITION: The readiness with which this goal can be addressed, as well the ways this goal can be addressed, will vary markedly from discipline to discipline and from course to course. Consequently, the key criterion for determining that a course meets this goal should be the instructor’s stated intention to address the goal in ways the instructor deems appropriate to the course.

Integrated Learning

GOAL: A student should gain an understanding of connections between differing modes of inquiry, experience learning as a shared enterprise, and see the relationships between the world of learning and their lives.

REQUIREMENT: R-7. A Wittenberg Seminar during the first semester for all entering students.

DEFINITIONS: The Wittenberg Seminars (4 semester hours) or Witt Sems are small, independent, topical seminars designed by individual instructors or teams of instructors based on their intellectual pursuits and training. Each Witt Sem will meet the following three objectives, although the means of achieving these objectives will necessarily vary by section and topics: 1) students understand the importance and practices of academic critical thinking; 2) students become intellectually and personally engaged in the seminar topic and in academic inquiry more generally; and 3) students be equipped to make a successful transition to the academic and co-curricular demands of their new campus community. Topics for Witt Sems will vary from instructor to instructor, but all Witt Sems will: 1) integrate instruction on targeted high school to college transition issues with course content; 2) be either writing or math-intensive; and 3) meet for the first time during New Student Days.

The Natural World

GOAL: A student should gain an understanding of the natural world through scientific inquiry and see the relations among science, technology, and contemporary culture.

REQUIREMENT: R-8. At least eight semester hours in courses that meet the Natural World goal, one of which must include laboratory experience.

Social Institutions, Processes & Behavior

GOAL: A student should achieve, through empirical and analytical methods, an understanding of human behavior, relationships, or institutions.

REQUIREMENT: R-9. At least eight semester hours in courses that meet the Social Institutions, Processes and Behavior goal.
**Fine, Performing & Literary Arts**

GOAL: A student should gain an understanding of aesthetic experience and of how the arts enrich and express the human spirit.

REQUIREMENT: **R-10.** At least eight semester hours in the creation, study, or performance of dance, literature, music, theatre, and/or the visual arts. Students should have the option of counting credit-bearing performance or production experiences that meet the goal. E.g., such a course must include self-awareness and study of the relationship between the performer/artist and the audience, etc. Up to four semester credits of performance or production experiences may count toward the requirements of the B.A. degree.

**Religious & Philosophical Inquiry**

GOAL: A student should gain an understanding of how central questions of reality, knowledge, and value are pursued in religious and/or philosophical traditions.

REQUIREMENT: **R-11.** Four semester hours in religion or philosophy that satisfies the goal.

**Western Historical Perspectives**

GOAL: A student should gain an understanding of the histories of the peoples and cultures of Europe and/or of the post-Columbian Americas.

REQUIREMENTS: **R-12.** At least four semester hours that meet the western historical perspectives goal.

DEFINITION: The course should provide an introduction to major ideas and developments and to the great variety of groups and cultures (e.g. women, different religious traditions, minorities, etc.) that shaped and were shaped by what is commonly understood as the Western tradition.

**Non-Western Cultures**

GOAL: A student should gain an understanding of the diversity of non-Western cultures through a study of the history, institutions, or traditions of one or more of these cultures.

REQUIREMENT: **R-13.** At least four semester hours devoted to the study of a culture or cultures outside the Western tradition, in accordance with our goal.

DEFINITIONS: This requirement includes courses, taught in any discipline, which focus on the history, institutions, ideas, culture, or traditions of a non-Western culture. Courses may concentrate on any time period, past or present, and on any non-Western geographical region. Courses on cultures other than those of Europe and the modern Americas would be included in this area, while a course such as modern African-American history would be more appropriate in the Western Historical Perspectives category.
III. Co-Curricular Activity Goals

Physical Activity
GOAL: A student should gain an appreciation of the relation between physical activity and personal well being by participating in appropriate physical activities consistent with the student's physical ability.

REQUIREMENT: R-14. Students will meet this goal by earning two semester hours in activities courses, including dance courses, or in intercollegiate athletics. Physically challenged students will be able to select activities that meet their special needs.

DEFINITIONS: Activities refer only to those that include instruction on the relation between physical activity and personal well being. One semester hour should correspond to thirty contact hours.

Community Service
GOAL: A student should gain an understanding of the role, responsibility, and challenge of service in community life through participation, experience, and reflection.

REQUIREMENT: R-15. Successful completion of the course Community Service 100 (0 credit): Thirty hours of community service, which includes three hours of reflection on the experience, as arranged through the Community Workshop and completed during any semester of the student's first three years.

The Major

Purposes
The major at Wittenberg serves three essential purposes: (1) It allows the student to explore intensively an academic area of great personal interest, one often closely linked to the student's career interests. (2) It plays a key role in the general education of the student, by providing experience in studying one focused area in great breadth and depth. Through the major several of Wittenberg's general education goals are pursued. (3) It provides the opportunity for the student to prepare for graduate and professional study.

Essential Components
All of Wittenberg's major programs of study should meet the following tests:

1. **Breadth:** The program adequately introduces each student to the range of essential topics and practices within the field.
2. **Depth:** The program involves each student in advanced study in at least some aspects of the field. (This is usually achieved by several upper-level courses that build on lower-level courses.)
3. **Method, Practices, and Skills:** The program teaches each student essential methodologies, practices, and foundational knowledge used in the field, and each student gains experience in their application.
4. ** Appropriateness:** The program does the above in ways consistent with the university’s mission.
5. **External Standards:** The program meets the standards of the field.
6. **A major typically consists of 32-42 semester hours of credit** in the department or program. Courses required or suggested for the departmental major but taught by other departments are not counted in the 32-42 semester-hour total. A proposed major that consists of less or greater than the 32-42 semester-hour range requires special justification.

7. Each department and program area shall develop a written mission statement and learning goals to guide the development of its programs of study. In addition, each department and program will specify its procedures for assessing student achievement and program effectiveness.

[Summary: General Education requires 64 semester hours, an academic Major is allowed 32-42 semester hours (some of which may have been general education credits), and 30-40 semester hours should be available for electives. General Education and a minimal major leaves at least 34 hours for electives; the maximum major imagined by the “1995 curriculum” leaves 24 semester hours for electives. Courses required for a major in other departments (cognate courses) were not counted in the total allowed in a major.]

## The Minor

### Purposes

Minor programs of study serve purposes different from majors. Although optional at Wittenberg, a minor can provide a student with an excellent opportunity to study systematically in a field of personal and career interest. Such study is sometimes necessary for career purposes. Many students consider a minor a good way to provide more focus in their selection of elective courses.

### Essential Components

A minor program of study should have integrity and purpose; it should consist of more than simply a stated number of courses in the field. Some minors maintain integrity by asking the student to devise a plan of study that must be approved by an adviser; some minors do so by prescribing several or all of the courses for the minor; others achieve integrity by requiring some kernel of the major within the minor program. A minor should be consistent with the university’s mission and the standards of the field. **A minor shall typically consist of 20-22 semester hours of credit.** A minor consisting of fewer or greater semester hours will require special justification.
Appendix C
Faculty Qualifications

Art

Mr. Edward Charney, Associate Professor, Chair
• M.F.A in Painting, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, 1972 (Minor in Sculpture)
• B.A. *(Cum Laude)* in Metallics, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 1979 (Minor in Art History and Painting)
• B.A in Education, Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, 1987

Mr. Jack D. Mann, Professor
• B.F.A in Painting and Design, University of Cincinnati, 1967 (Minor in Art History)
• M.F.A in Sculpture, Southern Illinois University, 1969 (Minor in Art History)

Mr. Scott Dooley, Associate Professor
• M.F.A in Ceramics, Kansas State University, 2000
• B.A in History, Philosophy, German *(Summa Cum Laude)* Bethel College, 1993 (Bible and Religion (minor))

Mr. Kevin Salzman, Assistant Professor
• M.F.A in Printmaking, University of Colorado, 1997
• Graduate Teacher Program Certificate, University of Colorado, 1997
• B.A in Fine Arts Photography *(With Honors)*, California State University, 1984

Dr. Amy M. Morris, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D in Art History, Indiana University (Minor in Medieval and Late Modern Art), 2006
• M.F.A in Art History, Kent State University, 1995
• B.S in Journalism and Mass Communication, Kent State University, 1991

Biology

Dr. Timothy Lewis, Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin, 1990 (Minors: Geography, Forestry)
• M.S in Wildlife Ecology, University of Wisconsin, 1988
• B.A. in Biology, Augustana College *(Magna Cum Laude)*, 1984 (Minor: Environmental Studies)

Dr. Ronald A. deLanglade, Professor
• Ph.D in Major Plant Morphology, Purdue University, 1964 (Minor in General Botany and Agronomy)
• M.S in Major Plant Morphology, Purdue University, 1961 (Minor in General Botany and Agronomy)
• B.A in Botany, Wabash College, 1958 (Minors in Zoology and Math)

Dr. David L. Mason, Professor, The George L. Greenawalt Chair in Biology
• Ph.D in Botany-Zoology, University of Wisconsin, 1970
• M.S in Botany-Zoology, University of Wisconsin, 1966
• B.S in Biology, Edinboro State College, 1963

Dr. Horton H. Hobbs, Professor
• Ph.D in Zoology (Limnology), Indiana University, 1973 (Botany Minor)
• M.S in Zoology, Mississippi State University, 1969 (Botany Minor)
• B.A in Biology, University of Richmond, 1967

Dr. Margaret Goodman, Associate Professor
• Ph.D in Cell Biology, Stanford University, 1990
• B.S in Biology and Mathematics, Erskine College, 1985

Dr. Cathy L. Pederson, Associate Professor
• Ph.D in Physiology and Neurobiology, Rutgers University, 1996
• B.A. in Biology, Wittenberg University, 1991 (Minor in Psychology)
Dr. Jay A. Yoder, Associate Professor  
- Postdoctoral Research, Harvard University, 1991 (Public Health Entomology)  
- Ph.D. in Entomology and Biochemistry, The Ohio State University, 1991  
- B.A. in Biology, French, Chemistry, University of Evansville, 1986

Dr. Kathleen A. Reinsel, Associate Professor  
- Ph.D. Duke University, 1995 (Department of Zoology and Marine Laboratory)  
- B.A. in Biology (Magna Cum Laude), Hood College, 1986

Dr. James M. Welch, Associate Professor  
- Ph.D. Duke University, 1998 (Department of Zoology)  
- M.S., University of Delaware, Graduate College of Marine Studies, 1994 (Marine Biology/Biochemistry Program)  
- B.S. in Biology, College of William and Mary, 1990 (Minor in Chemistry)

Dr. Kevin M. Gribbins, Assistant Professor  
- Ph.D. in Biological Sciences, University of Cincinnati, 2003  
- M.S. in Biology, University of Cincinnati, 2000  
- B.S. in Biology (Cum Laude), Butler University, 1995 (Emphasis: Anatomy and Physiology, Vertebrate Zoology)

Dr. Matthew H. Collier, Assistant Professor  
- Ph.D. in Biological Sciences, University of Cincinnati, 2003  
- M.S. in Botany, Miami University, 1997  
- B.A. in Biology (Cum Laude), Wittenberg University, 1994

Chemistry  
Dr. Kristin Cline, Associate Professor, Chair  
- Ph.D. in Chemistry, The Ohio State University, 1993  
- B.S. in Mathematics, Texas Lutheran College, 1988  
- B.A. in Secondary Education, Texas Lutheran College, 1988 (Teaching fields: math and chemistry)

Dr. David C. Finster, Professor  
- Ph.D. in Chemistry, The University of Virginia, 1980  
- B.S. in Chemistry and Physics, Bowling Green State University, 1975

Dr. Amil Anderson, Associate Professor  
- Ph.D. in Biochemistry, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1988  
- M.S. in Microbiology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1984  
- B.A. in Molecular Biology, St. Olaf College, 1976

Dr. Peter E. Hanson, Associate Professor  
- Ph.D. Organic Chemistry, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1991  
- B.S. Chemistry, University of Wisconsin, 1991

Dr. Justin Houseknecht, Assistant Professor  
- Ph. D. in Chemistry, The Ohio State University, 2003  
- B. S. in Biochemistry with Highest Honors, Grove City College, 1998

Dr. Raymond Dudek, Assistant Professor  
- Ph.D. in Chemistry Brown University, 2001  
- B.A. in Chemistry and Physics, Connecticut College, 1994

Communication  
Dr. Matthew J. Smith, Associate Professor, Chair  
- Ph.D. in Interpersonal Communication, Ohio University, 1998  
- M.A. in English, Ohio University, 1995  
- B.A. in English, West Liberty State College, 1993

Dr. Catherine E. Waggoner, Associate Professor  
- Ph.D. in Communication, The Ohio State University, 1994  
- M.A. in English, Bowling Green State University, 1987 (Major focus: Literary Studies)  
- B.A. in English, University of Southern Mississippi, 1985 (Major focus: Literary Studies; Minor: Secondary Education)
Dr. Stefne L. Broz, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. The Ohio State University, 2003 (Communication)
- M.A. Wake Forest University, 2002 (Communication)
- M.A. The Ohio State University, 2002 (Communication)
- B.A. Concordia College, Moorhead, Minnesota, 1997 (Communication and Spanish)

Ms. Amanda Karel, Vstg. Instructor
- M.A. in Communication, Eastern Michigan University, 2002
- B.A. in Communication and History, Eastern Michigan University, 2000

Education

Dr. Kathryn Calabrese, Associate Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. in Educational Leadership-Curriculum and Supervision, Miami University, 1994
- M.S. in Education, Reading Specialist, University of Dayton, 1985
- B.A. in Education, Wright State University, 1969

Dr. Robert Welker, Professor
- Ph.D. in Philosophical and Social Foundations, The Ohio State University, 1988
- M.A. in Historical Foundations of Education and English Education, The Ohio State University, 1979
- B.A./B.S., The Ohio State University, 1973

Dr. David Wishart, Professor
- Ph.D. in Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1985
- M.S. in Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1981
- B.A. in Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1978 (Ecology, Ethnology, Evolution minor)

Dr. Jeff A. Ankrom, Professor
- Ph.D. in Public Sector Economics, University of Notre Dame, 1982
- M.A. in Public Sector Economics, University of Notre Dame, 1980
- B.A. in Economics and Political Science, Otterbein College, 1978

Dr. Marcia J. Frost, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Economics, University of Pennsylvania, 1995
- M.A. in South Asia Regional Studies University of Pennsylvania, 1974
- B.A. in History of USA, Russia and India, Carleton College, 1970

Economics

Dr. Frederick Tiffany, Associate Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. in Economics, University of Pennsylvania, 1988
- M.A. in Economics, University of Pennsylvania, 1987
- B.A. in Economics, Kenyon College, 1977

Dr. Lawrence Gwinn, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Economics, University of Kansas, 1983
- M.A. in Economics, University of Kansas, 1973
- B.A. in Economics and Political Science, University of Kansas, 1972

Dr. David Wishart, Professor
- Ph.D. in Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1985
- M.S. in Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1981
- B.A. in Economics, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1978 (Ecology, Ethnology, Evolution minor)

Dr. Jeff A. Ankrom, Professor
- Ph.D. in Public Sector Economics, University of Notre Dame, 1982
- M.A. in Public Sector Economics, University of Notre Dame, 1980
- B.A. in Economics and Political Science, Otterbein College, 1978

Dr. Lawrence Gwinn, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Economics, University of Kansas, 1983
- M.A. in Economics, University of Kansas, 1973
- B.A. in Economics and Political Science, University of Kansas, 1972

Dr. Robert Welker, Professor
- Ph.D. in Philosophical and Social Foundations, The Ohio State University, 1988
- M.A. in Historical Foundations of Education and English Education, The Ohio State University, 1979
- B.A./B.S., The Ohio State University, 1973

Dr. William Kraus, Professor
- Ph.D. in Mathematics Education, University of Wisconsin, 1980 (Minor: Computer Science)
- M.S. in Mathematics/Education, University of Wisconsin, 1972
- B.S. in Mathematics and Secondary Education, University of Wisconsin, 1967 (Minor: English)

Dr. Carmen E. Trisler, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. Environmental Education, The Ohio State University, 1994
- M.S. Environmental Education, The Ohio State University, 1971
- B.S. Elementary Education and Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Wittenberg University, 1964

Dr. Stefan J. Broidy, Assistant Professor, Director of Graduate Studies in Education
- Ph.D. in Philosophy of Education, The Ohio State University, 1977
- M.A. in Philosophy of Education, The Ohio State University, 1973
- B.A. B.S. in English and English Education, The Ohio State University, 1969
Dr. Lora Lawson, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Early Childhood Education Literacy and Language Arts, Child Development, Teacher Education, The Ohio State University, 1998
- M.A. in Special Education and Gifted Education, The Ohio State University, 1993
- B.A. in Elementary Education, Special Education Kindergarten, Wittenberg University, 1972

Dr. Lowell W. Monke, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, Iowa State University, 1999
- M.A. in Computer Applications Education, University of Northern Iowa, 1989
- B.S. in Mathematics, McPherson College, 1971

Dr. Sara A. Brannan, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Special Education, West Virginia University, 2005
- M. Ed. In Multi-handicapped & developmentally handicapped, Ohio University, 1991
- B.A. in Education, Elementary and Special, West Liberty State College, 1987

Dr. Deborah E. Doty, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Elementary Education, Ball State University, 1999
- M.A. in Elementary Education, Ball State University, 1989
- B.S. in Elementary Education, Endorsement in Computer Education, Indiana University-Purdue University, 1984

Ms. Debra G. Mallonee, Instructor
- M.Ed. in School Administration and Curriculum/Supervision, Wright State University, 1981
- B.A. in Music Education, Anderson University, 1974

Dr. Marjorie A. Wuthrick, Visiting Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Philosophy, Curriculum, and Instruction, Kent State University, 1994
- M.A. in Education, Reading Specialization, Kent State University, 1981
- B.A. in Education, Mount Union College, 1972

Dr. Robin Inboden, Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. in 19th Century Literature, Cornell University, 1985
- M.A. in 19th Century Literature, Cornell University, 1982
- B.A. in English, Kenyon College, 1979

Dr. Mimi Dixon, Professor
- Ph.D. in English Literature, University of Chicago, 1979
- M.A. in English Literature, University of Chicago, 1966
- B.A. in Literature, Sarah Lawrence College, 1964

Dr. Mary Ellen Jones, Professor
- Ph.D. in Media Studies, Union Graduate School, 1978
- M.A. in American Literature, Duke University, 1959
- A.B. in English, Duke University, 1959

Dr. Kent H. Dixon, Professor
- Ph.D. in Creative Writing, University of Iowa, 1979
- M.A. in Writing Seminars, Johns Hopkins University, 1965
- A.B. in Comparative Literature, French, University of North Carolina, 1964

Dr. Robert L. Davis, Professor
- Ph.D. in English, University of California, Berkeley, 1992
- M.A. in Education, Stanford University, 1981
- B.A. in English, Stanford University, 1978

Dr. Cynthia Richards, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in English and American Literature (Eighteenth-Century British Literature and Feminist Theory), New York University, 1996
- M.A. in English and American Literature, New York University, 1987
- B.A. in English, Brown University, 1984

Dr. D. Scot Hinson, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in English (20th Century Literature), The Ohio State University, 1993
- M.A. in English (Rhetoric and Composition), The University of North Carolina at Charlotte, 1984
- B.A. in English, The Ohio State University, 1981
Dr. Ty Buckman, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in English, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, 1997
• M.A. in English University of Virginia, Charlottesville, 1992
• B.A. in English (Summa Cum Laude), Nyack College, 1990

Dr. Carmiele Wilkerson, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in English, Miami University, 1999
• Master of Technical and Scientific Communication, Miami University of Ohio, 1992
• B.A. in English, Oakwood College, 1990

Dr. Lori Askeland, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in English, The University of Kansas, 1998
• M.A. in English (Honors), The University of Kansas, 1992
• B.A. in English and Spanish (Magna Cum Laude), Luther College, 1988

Dr. Michael McClelland, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in English/Contemporary American Literature, Florida State University, 2002
• M.A. in English/Creative Writing, Florida State University, 1996
• B.A. in English, Florida State University, 1983 (minor in Political Science)

Dr. Rick A. Incorvati, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in English Literature (from 1789 to 1900), University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2001 (Minor in Critical Theory).
• M.A. in English, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1992
• B.S.B.A. in Marketing, John Carroll University, 1987

Ms. D’Arcy Fallon, Assistant Professor
• M.F.A. in Creative Nonfiction, Antioch University, 1999
• B.A. in Journalism, San Francisco State University, 1982

Dr. J. Fitzpatrick Smith, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in English, Washington University, 2002
• M.A. in English, Washington University, 1997
• B.A. in English (Magna Cum Laude and Departmental Honors), Wittenberg University, 1995

Dr. David J. Savola, Vstg. Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in English, Michigan State University, 2001
• M.A. in English, Northern Michigan University, 1988
• B.S. in English and Drama, Northern Michigan University, 1984

Dr. Kimberly Thompson, Vstg. Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in English, The Ohio State University, 2005
• M.A. in English, The Ohio State University, 1995
• B.A. in English, University of Cincinnati, 1993

Geography

Dr. Ralph D. Lenz, Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Geography, Rutgers University, 1977
• M.A. in Geography, Eastern Michigan University, 1969
• B.A. in Geography, Concordia College, 1966

Dr. Olga Medvedkov, Professor
• Ph.D. in Geography, Soviet Academy of Sciences, Institute of Geography, 1975 (Spatial Analysis in Urban Studies)
• M.A. in Social and Economic Geography, Moscow State University, 1972

Dr. Artimus Keiffer, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in Human Geography, Kent State University, 1994
• M.A. in Cultural Geography, Ohio University, 1987
• B.S. in Journalism-Public Relations, Ohio University, 1985

Geology

Dr. John Ritter, Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Geosciences, Pennsylvania State University, 1990
• M.S. in Geology, University of New Mexico, 1987
• B.S. in Geosciences (Honors Degree), Pennsylvania State University, 1983

Dr. Kenneth W. Bladh, Professor (and Provost)
• Ph.D. in Geology, University of Arizona, 1978
• M.S. in Geology, University of Arizona, 1973
• B.A. in Geology, Wittenberg University, 1969
Dr. Katherine Bladh, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Geosciences & Chemistry, University of Arizona, 1976
- M.S. in Geosciences, University of Arizona, 1972
- B.S. in Geology, Oregon State University, 1969

Dr. Michael J. Zaleha, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Sedimentology, Binghamton University, 1994
- M.S. in Geology, Ohio University, 1988
- B.S. in Geology & Biology, Muskingum College, 1984

Health, Fitness, & Sport

Dr. Steven C. Dawson, Associate Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. The Ohio State University, 1994 (Physical Education, concentration in Sport Sociology)
- M.A. Kent State University, 1981 (Physical Education, concentration in Sport Sociology)
- B.E. (Honors) Loughborough University, 1979, (Physical Education and Sociology)

Dr. Linda L. Arena, Professor
- Ph.D. The Ohio State University, 1979 (Teacher Education)
- Minor: Applied Behavioral Analysis
- M.S. New York University College at Brockport, 1973 (Psychology of Sport)
- B.S. New York University College at Brockport, 1969 (Health and Physical Education)

Mrs. Patricia Ann Clouse, Associate Professor
- M.S. in Physical Education (Health & Physical Education), Indiana University, 1968
- B.S. in Heath & Physical Education, Wittenberg University, 1964

Dr. Thomas P. Martin, Professor
- Ph.D. in Physical Education, specialized in Exercise Physiology, Kinesiology, Statistics, Research Design, Tests and Measurements, University of Maryland, 1972
- M.A. in Physical Education, University of Maryland, 1968
- B.S. in Physical Education with a minor in mathematics, University of Illinois, 1966

Ms. Pamela Evans-Smith, Instructor
- M.S. in Physical Education, Ithaca College, 1986
- B.A. in Biology, Wittenberg University, minor in Physical Education, 1982

History

Dr. Amy Livingstone, Associate Professor, Chair
- Ph. D. in Medieval History, Michigan State University, 1992
- M. A. in History, Michigan State University, 1985
- B.A. in History (Cum Laude) Michigan State University, 1983

Dr. Tammy Proctor, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in History, Rutgers University, 1995
- M.A. in History, Rutgers University, 1993
- B.A. in History (Cum Laude), University of Missouri, 1990
- B.J. in Journalism, University of Missouri, 1990

Dr. Thomas T. Taylor, Professor
- Ph.D. in American Intellectual and Cultural History, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1988
- M.A. in U.S. History, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1978
- B.A. in History, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1976

Dr. James L. Huffman, Professor, The H. Orth Hirt Endowed Chair in History
- Ph.D. in History of Modern Japan, University of Michigan, 1972
- Language Study, Interuniversity Center, Tokyo, Japan, 1969
- M.A. in Asian Studies, University of Michigan, 1967
- M.S.J. in Journalism-International Relations, University of Minnesota, 1964
- A.B., Indiana Wesleyan University, 1963

Dr. Scott P. Rosenberg, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in History, Indiana University, 1998
- M.A.I.A. in African Studies, Ohio University, 1992
- B.A. in History and Sociology, Kenyon College, 1989

Dr. Molly M. Wood, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. University of South Carolina, 1998 (Concentrations: Modern U.S., Women’s History, U.S. Foreign Relations, Latin America)
- M.A. in History, University of Richmond, 1992
- B.A. in History, University of Virginia, 1988 (Minor in International Relations)
Dr. Darlene Brooks Hedstrom, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Ancient History, Religion, and Archaeology of the Mediterranean, Miami University, 2001
- M.A. in Theological Studies, Wheaton College Graduate School, 1994

Dr. Samuel Thomas, Vstg. Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in History, Washington University, 2003
- A.M in History, Washington University, 1999
- M.A. in History, University of Rochester, 1996
- B.A. in History, Pomona College, 1991

Dr. Amy Christiansen, Associate Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. in Japanese Literature, University of California, 1990
- M.A. in Japanese Literature, University of California, 1987
- B.A. in East Asian Studies, St. Olaf College, 1985

Dr. Stanley L. Mickel, III, Professor
- Ph.D. in Chinese Language and Literature, Indiana University, 1976
- M.A. in Chinese History, College of Chinese Culture (Republic of China), 1968
- A.B. in Structural Linguistics, University of California, 1965
- A.A. in Lower Division Studies, Monterey Peninsula College, 1963

Dr. David J. Barry, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in German, Queens University at Kingston, ON, 1983
- M.A. in German, Queens University at Kingston, ON, 1978
- B.A. in Modern Languages – German (Honours), Pembroke College, Oxford University, 1977

Dr. Timothy A. Bennett, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in German, Johns Hopkins University, 1985
- M.A. in German, Johns Hopkins University, 1980
- B.A. in German and History, Wittenberg University, 1978

Dr. Lillian C. Franklin, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Spanish, Spanish-American Literature, The Ohio State University, 1982
- A.M. in Spanish, University of Illinois, 1974
- B.A. in Spanish, College of Wooster, 1972

Dr. Leanne Wierenga, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in French Literature, University of Illinois, 1975
- Certificat de lettres classiques, Université de Rouen, 1969
- M.A. in French Literature, University of Illinois, 1969
- B.A., Calvin College, 1967

Dr. Lila M. Zaharkov, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Slavic (Russian) Minor in Polish, University of Pittsburgh, 1977
- M.A. in Slavic Minor in French, Pennsylvania State University, 1972
- B.A. in Russian, Boston University, 1970

Dr. Timothy Wilkerson, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in French, University of Minnesota, 1992
- M.A. in French, University of Iowa, 1987
- B.A. in French, Indiana University, 1985

Dr. Christine McIntyre, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Spanish Literature, University of Maryland, 1992
- M.A. in Spanish, Pennsylvania State University, 1980
- B.A., Pennsylvania State University, 1974

Dr. Ruth J. Hoff, Associate Professor
- Ph.D. in Spanish and Spanish American Literature, Duke University, 2000
- M.A. in Spanish and Spanish American Literature, Duke University, 1991
- B.A. in Spanish and Education, St. Olaf College, 1985

Dr. Shelley Wing Chan, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Comparative Literature and Humanities (Chinese), University of Colorado, 2003
- M.A. in East Asian Languages and Literature (Chinese), University of Wisconsin, 1992
- B.A. in Chinese Language and Literature (Distinction), Hong Kong Baptist University, 1987

Languages

Dr. Amy Christiansen, Associate Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. in Japanese Literature, University of California, 1990
- M.A. in Japanese Literature, University of California, 1987
- B.A. in East Asian Studies, St. Olaf College, 1985
Dr. Terumi Imai, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in Linguistics, Michigan State University, 2004
• Linguistic Society of America Institute, Michigan State University, 2003
• Linguistic Society of American Institute, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1999
• M.A. in Linguistics, Michigan State University, 1997
• B.A. in English, Rikkyo University (Tokyo, Japan), 1991

Dr. Manuel Apodaca-Valdez, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in Comparative Literature, Purdue University, 2006
• M.A. in Spanish Linguistics, Purdue University, 2001
• B.A. in Spanish Language and Literature, University of Guanajuato, Mexico, 1995
• B.A. in Education, University of Autonomous of Guerrero, 1985

Management

Dr. Wendy Gradwohl, Associate Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, The University of Akron, 1997
• M.A. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, The University of Akron, 1993
• B.S. in Psychology, Bowling Green State University, 1991

Mr. Wayne Maurer, Associate Professor
• Master of Business and Administration with Concentration in Accountancy, Wright State University, 1974
• B.A. in Accounting, Wright State University, 1973
• A.S. in Accounting, Sinclair Community College, 1968

Ms. Pamela Schindler, Professor
• M.B.A., University of Dayton, 1974
• B.B.A., University of Cincinnati, 1970; (Marketing major, Management minor)

Dr. Lowell Stockstill, Professor
• J.D. in Business Law and Tax, University of Toledo, 1982
• M.B.A. in Finance and Economics, Valdosta State University, 1974
• B.S. in Finance and Economics, Miami University, 1969

Mathematics & Computer Science

Dr. David M. Vrooman, Professor
• Ph.D. in Management, Northwestern University, 1975
• M.S. in Management, Northwestern University, 1974
• B.A. in Economics, Northwestern University, 1969

Dr. Carol Young, Professor
• Ph.D. in Applied Psychology, University of Georgia, 1983
• M.S., University of Georgia, 1979
• B.A., Sonoma State University, 1974

Mr. Ronald P. Lucchesi, Assistant Professor
• M.A. in Statistics, Boston University, 1977
• B.S. in Mathematics, Lowell Technological Institute, 1975

Dr. Brian Shelburne, Associate Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Mathematics, Duke University, 1978
• M.A. in Mathematics, Duke University, 1974
• B.S. (Cum laude) in Mathematics, Davidson College, 1972

Mrs. Nancy K. Saks, Associate Professor
• M.S. in Computer and Information Science, The Ohio State University, 1975
• B.A. in Mathematics, Wittenberg University, 1973 (Minor: Secondary Education, General Science)

Dr. James L. Noyes, Professor
• Ph.D. in Computer Science, University of Wisconsin, 1977
• M.S. in Applied Mathematics, University of Cincinnati, 1966
• B.S. in Mathematics and Physics, Morehead State University, 1963

Dr. Alan C. Stickney, Professor
• Ph.D. in Mathematics, University of Michigan, 1975
• M.S. in Mathematics, University of Michigan, 1970
• B.S. in Mathematics, Michigan State University, 1969
Dr. Douglas Andrews, Professor
• Ph.D. in Statistics, Iowa State University, 1989
• M.S. in Statistics, Iowa State University, 1986
• B.A. in Russian and Math, St. Olaf College, 1984

Dr. William J. Higgins, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, 1982
• M.S. in Mathematics, University of Notre Dame, 1979
• B.A. in Mathematics and Physics, Kenyon College, 1976

Dr. Adam E. Parker, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin, 2005.
• B.S. in Mathematics, University of Michigan, 1999 (High Honors)
• B.A. in Psychology, University of Michigan, 1999

Mr. John Davenport, Vstg. Instructor
• M.A. in Math (Honors), University of Colorado, 2000
• B.S. in Math and Physics, University of Colorado, 1994

Music

Dr. Kenneth L. Scheffel, Associate Professor, Chair
• A.Mus.D (Doctor of Musical Arts) in Voice Performance, University of Michigan, 1970
• Master of Music in Voice Performance, University of Nebraska, 1964
• Bachelor in Music Education-Voice Performance, University of Nebraska, 1962

Mrs. Trudy G. Faber, Professor
• M.A. in Music, Smith College, 1966
• 1 year of study at the Amsterdam Conservatory, the Netherlands, 1960-61
• 1 year of study in the M. Mus. Program at the University of Toronto, 1962-63
• B.A. in Music, Calvin College, 1960

Dr. Donald A. Busarow, Professor
• Ph.D. in Organ, Theory and Literature, Michigan State University, 1973
• M.Mus. in Organ and Theory, Cleveland Institute of Music, 1964
• B.S.Edu in Education and Music, Concordia Teachers College, 1956

Dr. Daniel Kazez, Professor
• D.M.A. University of Michigan, 1987
• M.M. Peabody Conservatory of Music (Johns Hopkins University), 1982
• B.M. Oberlin Conservatory of Music, 1980 (Minor in music theory)

Dr. Joyce L. Wendel, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in Musical Arts-Voice Performance, The Cleveland Institute of Music/Case Western Reserve University, 1987
• Master of Music in Voice Performance, Kent State University, 1982
• B.A. in Music- Voice and Flute Performance, Ashland College, 1973

Dr. Stephen C. Sick, Adj. Professor
• Ph.D. in Musicology, University of Cincinnati, 1991
• Master of Music in Piano, University of Maryland, 1972
• B.A. in Music-Piano, University of Maryland, 1969

Mrs. Gwendolyn Scheffel, Adj. Assistant Professor
• Master of Music in Vocal Performance, University of Michigan, 1969
• Bachelor of Music in Vocal Music Performance, University of Nebraska, 1965

Dr. Christopher Durrenberger, Associate Professor
• D.M.A. University of Southern California (USC) School of Music, 1996 (Piano performance major, music history, 20th Century music theory and instrumental conducting minor fields of study)
• M.M. University of Southern California School of Music, 1991 (Piano performance major)
• B.M. Oberlin Conservatory of Music, 1988 (Piano performance major, music theory minor)
Dr. Brandon Jones,
Vstg. Assistant Professor
• D.M.A. in Conducting, Wind Emphasis, University of Cincinnati, 2006
• M.M. in Conducting, Wind Emphasis, University of Cincinnati, 2003
• B.M. in Music Education, Miami University, 1998

Dr. Donald Reed, Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Philosophy, Vanderbilt University, 1986
• M.A. in Philosophy, Hendrix University, 1981

Dr. Nancy A. McHugh,
Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in Philosophy, Temple University, 1999
• Certificate in Women’s Studies, Temple University, 1999
• M.A. in Philosophy, Cleveland State University, 1992
• B.S. Lake Erie College, 1990

Dr. Miguel Martinez-Saenz,
Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in Philosophy, University of South Florida, 2001
• M.A. in Philosophy, University of South Florida, 1998
• B.A. in Religion, Florida State University, 1992

Dr. Elizabeth A. George,
Associate Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Physics, University of Wisconsin, 1993
• M.S. in (Radiology [Medical Physics]) University of Colorado, 1986
• B.S. in Physics (Magna Cum Laude), University of Arizona, 1983

Dr. William Dollhopf,
Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in Physics, The College of William and Mary, 1975
• M.S. in Physics, Western Reserve University, 1967
• B.S. in Physics, Thiel College, 1964 (Math minor)

Dr. Daniel A. Fleisch,
Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in Space Physics and Astronomy, Rice University, 1980
• M.S. in Space Physics and Astronomy, Rice University, 1976
• B.S in Physics (Cum Laude), Georgetown University, 1974

Dr. Paul A. Voytas, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in Physics, University of Wisconsin, 1993
• B.S. in Physics, University of Michigan, 1986

Political Science

Dr. George E. Hudson, Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Political Science, Indiana University, 1975
• M.A. in Political Science, University of Colorado, 1967
• B.A. in Russian, University of Colorado, 1965

Dr. J. Robert Baker, Professor
• Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Missouri, 1987
• M.A. University of Missouri, 1984 (Political Science)
• B.A. (Magna Cum Laude), Central Methodist College, 1982 (Political Science)

Dr. Bin Yu, Professor, The Melvin H. Laatsch Faculty Scholar in Political Science
• Ph.D. in Political Science, Stanford University, 1991
• M.A. in Political Science, Stanford University, 1987
• M.A. in Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, 1982
• B.A. in English, Beijing Institute of Foreign Studies, 1977

Dr. Staci L. Rhine, Professor
• Ph.D. in Political Science and American Politics, The Ohio State University, 1993
• M.A. in Political Science and American Politics, The Ohio State University, 1991
• B.A. in Political Science and Russian, The University of Iowa, 1987

Dr. James Allan, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. in Political Science, University of Connecticut, 2003
• M.A. in Political Science, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, 1997
• B.A. (Honours) in Politics (Second class, Upper Division), University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, Scotland, 1994
Dr. Heather Wright, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Political Philosophy, Fordham University, 2006 (Concentrations: History of Political Thought, Feminist Theory, Ancient Greek Political Thought, Politics and Literature)
- M.A. in Political Science, Fordham University, 1994
- B.A. in Government and Economics, Smith College, 1992

Dr. Edward B. Hasecke, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Political Science, The Ohio State University, 2002
- M.A. in Political Science, The Ohio State University, 2000
- B.A. in Political Science (Summa Cum Laude, University Honors, Departmental Honors), Wittenberg University, 1997

Psychology

Dr. Mary Jo Zembar, Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology, University of Houston, 1990
- M.A. in Developmental Psychology, University of Houston, 1986
- B.A. in Psychology, University of Akron, 1983

Dr. Jeffrey Brookings, Professor
- Ph.D. University of Arkansas, 1979 (Experimental Psychology)
- M.A. University of Arkansas, 1977 (Experimental Psychology)
- B.A. Louisiana Tech University, 1974 (Psychology (Major), English (Minor))

Dr. Josephine F. Wilson, Professor, The Paul Luther Keil Chair in Psychology
- D.D.S in Dentistry, SUNY at Buffalo, 1984
- Ph.D. in Psychology, Columbia University, 1982
- M. Phil in Psychology, Columbia University, 1982
- M.A. in Psychology, Columbia University, 1975
- B.A. in Psychology, SUNY Ferdonia, 1974

Dr. Clifford E. Brown, Professor
- Ph.D. University of Delaware, 1978 (Social Psychology)
- M.A. University of Delaware, 1976 (Social Psychology)
- B.A. Bard College, 1972 (Psychology)

Dr. Stephanie A. Little, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Psychology (Clinical), Vanderbilt University, 2000 (Minor: Quantitative Psychology)
- M.S. in Psychology (Clinical), Vanderbilt University, 1994
- B.A. in Psychology (Summa Cum Laude), Smith College, 1989

Dr. Michael D. Anes, Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Cognitive Psychology: Brain, Behavior, and Cognition Program, Boston University, 2000
- M.A. in Cognitive Psychology, Michigan State University, 1996
- B.A. in Communications, DePaul University, 1991

Dr. Diane Bonfiglio, Visiting Assistant Professor
- Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, Health Track, The Ohio State University, 2005
- M.A. in Psychology, The Ohio State University, 2003

Religion

Dr. Paul T. Nelson, Professor, Chair
- Ph.D. in Religious Studies, Yale University, 1984
- M. Phil in Religious Studies, Yale University, 1981
- M.A. in Religious Studies, Yale University, 1979
- M. Div., Yale University The Divinity School, 1977
- A.B. in Religion, Princeton University, 1974

Dr. Warren R. Copeland, Professor, The Kenneth E. Wray Chair in the Humanities
- Ph.D. in Ethics & Society – History of Christianity, University of Chicago, 1977
- M.A. in Ethics & Society – History of Christianity, University of Chicago, 1971
- M.Div. in Sociology of Religion, Christian Theological Seminary, 1968 (Theology minor)
- B.A. in Chemistry, MacMurry College, 1965 (Minor in Philosophy)
Dr. Barbara B. Kaiser, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in Religion and Literature, University of Chicago, 1983
• M.A. in Biblical Studies, Old Testament, University of Chicago Divinity School, 1977
• B.A. in English and Religion, St. Olaf College, 1973

Dr. Rochelle L. Millen, Professor
• Ph.D. in Religious Studies, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, 1984
• M.A. in Philosophy, McMaster University, 1975
• B.A. in English literature (Magna Cum Laude), Stern College for Women, 1965

Dr. Jennifer Oldstone-Moore, Associate Professor
• Ph.D. in History of Religions, University of Chicago Divinity School, 2000
• M.A. in the Study of Religion, University of Chicago Divinity School, 1987
• Indiana University, Intensive Mandarin, 1987
  – Inter-University Program (Stanford Center), Taipei, 1989
  – (Intensive Language Training)
• B.A. in Religion, Art History; Concentration in Asian Studies, Swarthmore College, 1983

Dr. Keith D. Doubt, Professor
• Ph.D. York University, 1986 (Sociology)
• M.A. York University, 1979 (Sociology)
• B.A. Dickinson College, 1976 (Self-Developed Major, Hermeneutics)

Dr. Alan McEvoy, Professor
• Ph.D. in Sociology, Western Michigan University, 1975
• M.A. in Sociology, Western Michigan University, 1972
• B.A. in Sociology, Grand Valley State College, 1970

Dr. David A. Nibert, Professor
• Ph.D. in Sociology, The Ohio State University, 1984
• M.A. in Sociology, The Ohio State University, 1977
• B.A. in Social Science, The Ohio State University, 1975

Dr. Stephen Smith, Professor
• Ph.D. in Anthropology, Columbia University, 1988
• M.A. in Anthropology, New York University, 1976
• B.A. in Sociology and French, Tufts University, 1970
• Diplôme (French), La Sorbonne, Paris, France, 1969

Dr. Beckett Broh, Assistant Professor
• Ph.D. (Sociology), The Ohio State University, 2003
• M.A. (Sociology), The Ohio State University, 1999
• B.A. (Psychology and Exercise Physiology) Concentration: Women’s Studies, Albion College, 1994

Sociology

Dr. Corwin Georges, Professor, Chair
• Ph.D. in Theatre, The Ohio State University, 1972
• M.A. in Theatre, The Ohio State University, 1970
• B.A. in Speech, Drama, History, Government, Morehead State University, 1967

Dr. Steven C. Reynolds, Professor
• Ph.D. in Theatre-Acting and Directing, The University of Michigan, 1981
• M.A. in Theatre-Acting and Directing, The University of Michigan, 1975
• B.A. in British Literature, Tufts University, 1971

Mrs. Shih-Ming Li Chang, Associate Professor
• M.F.A. in Dance, Smith College, 1986
• B.A. in Dance, University of Chinese Culture, 1983

Mr. James H. Humphries, Associate Professor
• M.F.A. in Theater-Production Design, University of Idaho, 1986
• M.A. in Theater-Technical Theatre, University of Idaho, 1980
• B.A. in Art, Southern Arkansas University, 1977

Theatre & Dance
Ms. Ligia Pinheiro, Associate Professor
• M.F.A. in Directing from a Labanotation Score, The Ohio State University, 2001.
• Teacher Certification Course in Labanotation, The Ohio State University, granted by the Dance Notation Bureau, 2000
• M.A. in Dance History, The Ohio State University, 1998
• B.F.A. in Dance (Summa Cum Laude), University of Cincinnati College-Conservatory of Music, 1995.

School of Community Education

Dr. Paul C. Parlato, Dean
• Ph.D. in English, University of Notre Dame, 1970
• M.A. in English, Canisius College, 1967
• B.A. in Philosophy, St. Joseph’s Seminary, 1964

Dr. Barb Mackey, Director (Community Programs)
• Ed.D. in Higher and Adult Education, Columbia University, 1979
• M.A. in Cello Performance, Hope College, 1971
• B.Mus. in Voice/Theory, Mannes College of Music, 1967

Dr. Elma Lee Moore, Director (Adult Leadership Programs)
• Ph.D. in Accounting, The Union Institute, 1993
• M.S. in Accounting, Ball State University, 1981
• M.A. in Speech, Eastern Michigan University, 1969
• B.A. in Speech, History-Government, and Education, Otterbein College, 1967

Thomas Library

Mr. Douglas K. Lehman, Associate Professor, Director
• M.A. in History, University of Vermont, 2004
• M.L.S. Indiana University, 1978
• B.A. in History, Miami University, 1975

Ms. Regina P. Entorf, Associate Professor
• M.A. (Communication), The Ohio State University, 1991
• M.L.S. Kent State University, 1977
• B.A. (German) (Cum Laude) University of California, 1972

Ms. Suzanne Smailes, Associate Professor and Head of Technical Services
• M.L.S., Kent State University, 1996
• M.Div., Pacific School of Religion, 1990
• M.A.T.S., United Theological Seminary, 1988
• B.S.S.W., The Ohio State University, 1983

Ms. Alisa Mizikar, Assistant Professor and Reference Librarian
• Master of Science in Information, University of Michigan, 1997
• B.S. in Biology, Juniata College, 1995

Mr. Kenneth R. Irwin, Assistant Professor and Reference/Electronic Resources Librarian
• Master of Information and Library Studies, University of Michigan, 1997
• B.A. in English (Medieval Studies) (Cum Laude), Kalamazoo College, 1996 (Theatre minor)