CIC, FIHE Merger Will Lead to Increased Funding for Scholarships

The merger of CIC and the Foundation for Independent Higher Education (FIHE) was officially approved in October by appropriate government agencies in Maine and New York, the states in which the organizations were incorporated, respectively. The effective date of the merger was October 14, 2010.

In announcing the merger, CIC President Richard Ekman said, “The merged organization will enable us to advance the cause of independent higher education as never before possible. We also will be able to serve the heavily overlapping memberships of the two organizations with a new coherence and a far stronger national voice.”

Former FIHE President Myrvin Christopherson said, “This merger has an enormous capacity to create more and better services for private colleges and universities nationwide.”

Ekman added, “In my view, the planning for the merger has been careful and thorough, and both the FIHE and CIC Boards of Directors as well as the CIC and FIHE staffs are ready and enthusiastic about serving private higher education as a merged organization.”

Ned Moore, the new executive director of FIHE and CIC vice president, and Christopherson have worked with CIC to prepare for the implementation of the merger. Ekman said, “Their cooperative spirit and commitment to realizing the full potential of the benefits of the merger for both CIC and FIHE and for all our member colleges and state funds have been unwavering. We anticipate a very smooth transition; indeed, over the past few months we have already begun to integrate some of our operations.”

(continues on page 30)
To their credit, for-profit colleges have identified segments of the U.S. population for whom enrollment in traditional colleges and universities has often not been feasible, and they have moved quickly to fill a vacuum in access to higher education. Flexible schedules and technology-based learning have been attractive features, especially to older students who balance job and family responsibilities with college-going. The for-profits also have devised imaginative ways to deliver course content. Many leaders of nonprofit and state-supported colleges and universities are eager to learn the secret of success that the for-profits appear to have discovered.

But two fundamental truths are slowly emerging. The first is that there is nothing secret about the for-profits’ recipe. The profitability of these colleges is the simple result of minimizing expenses and maximizing revenues. A second—and more important—emerging truth is that, at colleges and universities that give top priority to what is best for students, there are many potential ways to reduce expenses and increase revenue that responsible educators will not—and should not—ever consider.

Profits at for-profit colleges are rarely plowed back into improvements to the institution. Venture capitalists have understood the potential for big profits very well and (until recently) an investment in one of these institutions promised an excellent rate of return. As other investment opportunities stagnated during the recession and high unemployment drove more people back to school, enrollment in all colleges soared, most dramatically at for-profits. For-profit colleges became one of the few attractive areas for investment.

Dick Merriman, president of nonprofit Southwestern College in Kansas, reminded us in a recent Chronicle essay (October 31, 2010) that students are not customers; they are beneficiaries of the philanthropy of previous generations who founded colleges and endowed their operations. At most nonprofit colleges, the philanthropic impulse to serve the common good is reflected today in the values of faculty members who work for modest wages, in the priorities of presidents and trustees who choose to devote institutional funds to scholarships, and in the largesse of donors who happily give money to the college, not draw money from it as a return on investment.

The public does not yet fully grasp the fundamental differences between for-profit and nonprofit higher education. To protect the student consumer as well as the reputation for integrity that U.S. higher education as a whole now enjoys, the key differences need to be displayed more prominently—much like a label on processed foods that lists the ingredients. Here is a starter list for what should be on the label.
**Attrition.** Most for-profit institutions have incredibly high drop-out rates. For the University of Phoenix, the six-year graduation rate is 9 percent. For all for-profits, it’s 22 percent. At state universities the numbers are more than twice as good: 55 percent of entering students graduate in six years. Most impressive is the performance of nonprofit colleges and universities: their average is 65 percent. The graduation rates at the for-profits are also dismal for low-income and first-generation students in comparison with the retention and graduation rates of similar students at state universities (better) and nonprofit independent colleges (best).

**Admissions.** We now know, thanks largely to the PBS Frontline special “College Inc.” and Senator Tom Harkin’s hearings, that even the biggest and most established of the for-profit universities engage in unscrupulous admissions practices. False promises about job prospects after graduation are routine. The availability of courses to meet a student’s objectives is often overstated. Quotas are set for enrollment staff at unrealistically high levels, with compensation linked to those goals. Staff members often misrepresent the institution in order to enroll a prospect, no matter what.

**Financial Aid.** For-profits routinely encourage students to assume loans that are too big. The average debt of bachelor’s degree recipients from for-profits was $33,050 last year. At nonprofit colleges, it was much lower, $22,250. For-profits also consume high percentages of federal and state financial aid. Although they enroll low-income students in large numbers, they are not alone in pursuing this laudable objective. At one third of CIC’s roughly 600 member nonprofit colleges and universities, for example, 30 percent or more of the students are the first in their families to go to college. At many for-profits, more than 80 percent of the operating budget comes from federal aid to students. In fact, the average net price at nonprofit, independent colleges is lower than the average net price at for-profits, and the large numbers of low-income and first-generation students at most nonprofit colleges enjoy a much higher graduation rate than those at for-profits.

**Administrators’ Salaries.** Among the 3,300 traditional colleges and universities only a handful of salaries are so high as to raise questions of appropriateness. Among for-profit universities, extremely high salaries are the norm. This would be merely a sign of questionable values were it not for the fact that 25 percent of the federal government’s massive $89 billion for student scholarships and loans is consumed by for-profit colleges despite their enrollment of only 10 percent of all students.

**Faculty.** At for-profits, 88 percent of faculty members are part-time and less available to students outside of class time. Many of these part-timers are also employed elsewhere and cannot take the time to work with students outside class meetings.

**Student Support Services.** To maximize the operating surplus, for-profits don’t invest much money in student support services such as advising and counseling. The absence of these services is one reason that for-profits have terrible attrition rates.

**Directors’ Fees.** In both state and private nonprofit colleges, distinguished alumni and others are honored when asked to serve as trustees, and they usually pay their own expenses to come to board meetings and make charitable gifts to the institution. In for-profit colleges, trustees are paid directors’ fees—and often in orders of magnitude that are comparable to major U.S. corporations—for example, $100,000 for attending three meetings per year. This is money that is not being spent on direct educational services, as it would be by traditional colleges.

Given these startling facts, it’s puzzling that the wider public does not yet recognize that the for-profits are engaging in irresponsible practices. CIC institutions have been forced to play defense in the “message war” for several reasons:

First, traditional institutions have not demonstrated a clear enough statistical connection between expenditures and results. We know, for example, that the effective student “engagement” practices identified and measured by NSSE do lead to better academic performance and better graduation rates. More use of existing data and a growing body of evidence would help to make this case.

“The public does not yet fully grasp the fundamental differences between for-profit and nonprofit higher education. To protect the student consumer as well as the reputation for integrity that U.S. higher education as a whole now enjoys, the key differences need to be displayed more prominently.”

(continued on page 31)
SPECIAL REPORT:
2010 Institute for Chief Academic Officers and Chief Financial Officers

The CAO-CFO Partnership: Blending Perspectives to Build Stronger Institutions

The overarching goal of CIC’s 2010 Institute for Chief Academic Officers and Chief Financial Officers was to strengthen the partnership between chief academic officers and chief financial officers and thereby help them better understand each other’s perspectives on campus priorities. Participation in the meeting set a new record, with 474 CAOs, CFOs, and other administrators, and a total participation of 534 people. Sponsorship levels were also at an all-time high. The 38th annual Institute was held November 6–9 in Williamsburg, Virginia.

Major speakers included Andrew Delbanco, Julian Clarence Levi Professor in the Humanities at Columbia University; Sarah E. Turner, University Professor of Economics and Education at the University of Virginia; Kent Chabotar, president and professor of political science at Guilford College (NC); Richard L. Morrill, president of the Teagle Foundation; and John D. Walda, president of the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Issues such as tuition discounting as an enrollment management strategy, using assessment results to improve student learning, fundraising and the CAO, post-tenure review, and prioritizing academic programs and services were among the topics explored during the four-day meeting. The texts of many Institute presentations have been posted on the CIC website at www.cic.edu/cao-cfoinstitute.

What is College For?

In his keynote address, Andrew Delbanco, Julian Clarence Levi Professor in the Humanities at Columbia University, described the challenges of campus leadership in a time of economic constraints and examined the dramatic changes taking place today that threaten the small college model.

Apocalyptic rhetoric claims that “students going to college today may be the last generation of students who actually go away to college. Colleges will be torn apart by new ways of sharing information enabled by the internet. The business model of private colleges cannot survive.” Yet, Delbanco said, “your institutions have a market niche—they offer something that for-profits, large privates, and large public institutions cannot match. Your institutions have never been more valuable than they are now, though they represent a declining share of the higher education landscape. My sense is that one challenge we face in the current environment is that there is little public understanding about what college is or aspires to be.”

Beginning with a historical perspective, Delbanco said that the curriculum of early American colleges strove for unity, coherence, and interdisciplinarity. “True colleges aspired to connect all branches of knowledge and did use the word ‘university’ but in a different way—as the ‘university’ of things; the wholeness of creation.” Not long after the Civil War, he said, “old-time colleges found themselves increasingly in the shadow of the new university” that featured academic freedom, research seminars, and new concepts of advancing knowledge. “The paradox is that colleges survived in the shadow of these powerful new institutions precisely because these new universities didn’t know what to do with undergraduates…. The idea of providing a coherent education for undergraduates at the university became a sideline idea or was relinquished altogether.”
Small private colleges continued to focus on teaching and conducting education by lecture and small class discussions. This basic premise of small colleges “passed the test of time gloriously” yet they are under stress today as never before, he said. Some critics claim that one of the main reasons small colleges are in trouble is “the failure to adapt to the new business models for education—they are stuck in a rut because they are committed to doing things as they’ve always been done.” Others believe “we are attempting to educate students who are fundamentally different from those of the past. Students today bring a new epistemology to college—they don’t arrive in awe of the institution and faculty nor are they happy to let faculty members decide what is worth knowing. Now they show up knowing that any knowledge claim is dubious.” In addition, some say, traditional ways of transmitting knowledge, such as the linear model or monologue, “may no longer work for this generation of students who are accustomed to dealing with multiple knowledge streams in short bursts.” And the notion of having great lectures on campus, according to people such as Bill Gates, “will be obsolete because those lecturers will come to campus via the internet.”

Beyond these challenges, private higher education is also dealing with the aftermath of the recession and “the economic and political forces arrayed against us,” Delbanco said. “The heart of the dialogue between the CAO and CFO is how to respond to these realities without sacrificing basic elements and principles.” In attempting to reduce costs, colleges are collaborating with neighboring institutions to avoid duplication, jettisoning amenities, controlling instruction by relying on adjunct faculty, and controlling the financial aid budget by using increased merit-based rather need-based aid. These efforts, Delbanco cautioned, could very well undermine an institution’s mission, but he conceded that resorting to these strategies was probably unavoidable.

“Liberal education is in jeopardy. If we are going to meet these challenges, it seems we need to make the case more forcefully to the public why a liberal education should matter to students, parents, and society at large. The case you hear made most often, the economic case, is that college is today the only way into the middle class. This argument makes no distinction between your institutions and for-profits—and is the argument pushing the assessment movement: that an individual’s credentials should line up with what he or she should be able to do.”

“There is a second argument—more important to make if we are going to swing public opinion: colleges are places where we have the chance to educate genuinely responsible future citizens…. It should be obvious that our best chance to maintain a functioning democracy is to have a citizenry that can tell the difference between demagoguery and responsible arguments.”

“The third and last imperative for your kind of education is the hardest to articulate but is the most important and valuable: college opens up the senses and mind to experiences otherwise foreclosed to students. The whole world is opened up in a way that it wouldn’t be if an individual doesn’t go to college. The proudest achievement of American higher education is that it is not strictly for the elite—it is available for all…. Private colleges have much to be proud of in their work of democratizing education and making it available to people without significant resources.”
“Low-income, first-generation students underapply to private and selective colleges because there is a barrier in the system that limits their applications.”

—Sarah Turner

Effective Collaboration Between the CAO and the CFO

Whether a college is rich or poor, large or small, the budget process always ends up being an exercise of “trying to put ten pounds of sugar into a five pound bag,” said Kent Chabotar, president and professor of political science at Guilford College (NC), during his plenary session opening remarks. The challenges inherent in the budget process make “the relationship between the academic and financial sides of the house critical, and yet there seems to be a dynamic between the two sides that is not as productive as it could be,” he said.

The classic issues, he explained, are that CFOs “believe that ‘academics just don’t get it’ – the CAO doesn't understand that the university is on a tight budget and most of the endowment income is restricted. The CAO, on the other hand, believes ‘the CFO just sits there like God telling me how much money I can have and what purchasing procedures to follow.’”

“The reality is that we’re locked into certain positions because of tradition and stereotyping,” Chabotar said, emphasizing that a different perspective is needed. Both CAOs and CFOs must understand that “they share core responsibilities—and if they don’t do it well, the college won’t survive.” The executive team must “define priorities and engage in strategic thinking and financial planning—and if they do it right, the annual budget then follows. There is nothing more critical than linking strategic and financial planning with the budget process.”

Keeping some fundamental principles in mind will help ease that process, Chabotar said.

• The mission of the college is academic and educational, not budgets and bookkeeping.
Good data contribute to better decisionmaking. Don’t argue about the facts.

Finance and accounting are not exact sciences. There are rules but lots of judgment calls to make as well.

Control is important.

Politics are inevitable. People routinely ask for more than is needed with the expectation of getting cut; 3–5 percent of budgets are padded. Know the historical basis for costs.

In the process of identifying and prioritizing cuts and deferrals, Chabotar recommends naming the most important criteria that the budget should meet. He also suggested ways to improve the CAO/CFO relationship for the sake of a smoother budget process. Both officers should:

• Set clear expectations and identify what information each expects from the other.
• Learn the details about each other’s job.
• Get a second opinion.
• Participate in professional development programs to understand better the mindset of their counterpart—for example, CAOs could attend NACUBO meetings and CFOs could attend meetings such as CIC’s CAO Institute.
• Hold regular meetings together.
• Focus on narrative communication when discussing the academic or college budget—don’t start with tables or charts.
• Meet with auditors. Both officers should meet with auditors to better understand the overall budget, which in turn helps to understand the tough tradeoffs that need to be made.
• Include the faculty in the budget process. Tell faculty members what is going on and allow them to be involved in the process (but set expectations for them).
• Seek peer review. Get the opinions of outsiders who can determine and discuss how well you are doing.

Chabotar outlined a number of questions that both the CAO and CFO should ask and be able to answer, among them: What proportion of the total budget is invested in instruction and academic support versus administration? What endowed funds are available for the academic program and what is the available annual spending? What is the role of the academic dean and faculty in the annual budget process? How are academic buildings planned and what are the roles of the academic dean and building occupants? How does the academic dean influence the choice of major maintenance and capital projects?

Genuine collaboration, cooperation, and coordination are crucial components of a strong partnership between the CAO and CFO, Chabotar said, adding that each officer should bring to the table specific competencies and skills. The CFO, for example, should be able to blend financial and strategic considerations; be honest and straightforward and speak in clear, declarative sentences; make an effort to know the academic program and faculty; be an educator and accountant; be customer-service minded (know the student experience); and have good interpersonal skills. The CAO should be able to blend academic and strategic considerations; be honest, straightforward, and supportive in public; be an educator and manager with good budget accountability; understand financial terms and concepts; and have a desire to develop a good working relationship with the CFO.

The Roles of the CAO and CFO in Campus Governance

Conflict and tensions in academic governance are normal and universal and they are built into the world of decision-making that we inhabit, said Richard Morrill, president of the Teagle Foundation and chancellor of the University of Richmond (VA), in his remarks during the closing plenary session. Morrill outlined the challenges to decision-making on campus, and John Walda, president of the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO), explored the relationship of boards of trustees to the increasingly complex issues faced by senior campus administrators.

“Conflict in academic governance is structural,” Morrill explained. “Academics believe they are serving the intrinsic values of the college—that learning is good for its own sake and doesn’t have to be judged by credit hours or the cost of a course. Administrators, on the other hand, govern with a different set of
The CAO and CFO are lynchpins to guarantee integrated work and to articulate strategic priorities. Working together, they can offer an inspiring and realistic sense of what the institution can do to excel in the future.”

—Richard Morrill

values that lead to effective and responsible administration. These values necessitate financial systems, controls, policies, regulation, and legal compliance.”

But why are conflicts in academic governance a given? His answer: “Academic organizations try to do the impossible. They link two worlds of decision-making that resist being combined. On the academic side, authority is widely dispersed and decentralized; collaborative decision making is based on professional expertise; and decisions are made by departments, programs, and committees that are largely self-governing…. On the administrative side, lines of authority and responsibility are more clearly defined in a hierarchical fashion and goals, metrics, and the operational system are different from the academic side. Presidents and CFOs are attributed responsibility for what happens in the academic sphere because it embodies the mission of the organization, yet they have little direct responsibility to determine what is taught or made the subject of research.”

Another set of contending values—autonomy and control—confound the decision-making process and “create constant conflict because autonomy and control don’t live happily together.” Morrill explained that those who value autonomy claim that academic work won’t flourish unless the faculty has autonomy in how they carry out the work; without academic freedom, creativity and the creation of new knowledge would suffer. Those who value control are frustrated because faculty members don’t care about budgets or metrics because that takes them away from the work they love.”

So how do we find ways to mediate and reconcile these value conflicts? Morrill’s answer: Reinterpret the concepts of shared governance and collaborative leadership. He described the “leadership imperative,” which emphasizes not formal roles and responsibilities but rather skills, abilities, behavior, and knowledge. “The accent then shifts to shared leadership, an active process that involves the president, governing board, faculty, staff, students, and external constituents.”

The CAO and CFO “are lynchpins to guarantee integrated work and to articulate strategic priorities. Working together, they can offer an inspiring and realistic sense of what the institution can do to excel in the future…. They can and must make common cause to fulfill the task of integral strategic leadership and find new ways to govern our institutions,” Morrill concluded.

One key way to improve governance and decision-making on college campuses is for the CAO and CFO to develop a closer relationship with the board of trustees, said John Walda. “Governing boards have to address issues now that they never had to before because of the financial times. The days of trying to marginalize the board—by setting time constraints in committee and board meetings or thinking that you can tell them what you want them to know and get them out without too many questions—are over.” Today, boards are thinking about changes in fees, tuition, endowment spending, fundraising, and the long-term stability of the institution, Walda said. Boards are increasingly concerned with “how to control costs and be innovative to save resources and become more efficient in delivering education.”

One of the biggest changes is a new focus by boards on enrollment and ensuring that seats are filled and students are retained. Boards are increasingly looking at recruiting practices: Do we have the right number of people in the recruiting and retention programs? They are also becoming better versed in financial aid, tuition, and tuition discounting because these issues impact the financial stability of the campus. Efficiency and cost cutting are increasingly of interest as well. “What boards need to understand in detail is where the revenue comes from and where it goes, what generates revenue, and how to align spending with strategic goals.” Walda said boards are now adopting accountability measures to monitor productivity, improvements, and costs, and they are rethinking the business model in terms of class size, the academic calendar, and collaborating with other institutions.

Governing boards remain concerned about endowments and whether payout rates from the endowment need to be rethought or lowered. In addition, they are increasingly involved in the development process and many are effective in bringing donors to the table. Furthermore, Walda said, most boards are adding more and longer meetings to deal with financial issues and to talk at length about issues that affect the institution. They are having joint meetings with other campus representatives, meeting with faculty members to learn more about the academic side, creating ad hoc committees to oversee operational changes, and asking difficult questions. “We need to think of ways to provide accurate information and keep boards informed so they can be more strategic in their governing and decision-making.”

Walda concluded that these dramatic changes to college governing boards are not transitional. “We are in for a new business and governance model with boards that have changed in
terms of their education and level of understanding of the issues going forward because we have many challenging years ahead before we get back to a more peaceful financial existence.

Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services

Campus leaders increasingly need to set priorities and reallocate resources because of external pressures, unbalanced budgets, increased competition, more federal regulations, and changing public attitudes, among other factors, said Robert Dickeson, president emeritus of the University of Northern Colorado and former senior vice president of the Lumina Foundation. He and Johann Lindig, principal of Academic Strategy partners, led a workshop to help institutions shape academic priorities through an orderly process supported by a sound conceptual framework.

Colleges frequently allow academic programs to grow without regard to their relative worth and, “as we keep adding and adding and adding, without chopping along the way, resources are getting scarcer,” Dickeson said. Many other factors, including the growth in the minority student population that requires more services and attention, lead to resource challenges.

While campus leaders might hope for new resources from increased tuition and fees, gifts and grants, auxiliary income, or state or federal appropriations, he discounted those possibilities given economic realities. “The most likely source for needed resources is reallocation of existing resources.” And doing that, he said, requires prioritization. “Traditional approaches to saving money, such as across the board cuts, are not wise and tend to create mediocrity for all programs…. The inescapable truth is that not all programs are equal. Some are more efficient, effective, and central to the mission than others.”

When Dickeson asked participants why their campuses were starting the prioritization process, many indicated that budget cuts were the driving force, while others cited the desire to expand stronger programs or eliminate unsuccessful programs, a new president or trustees with a new focus on the bottom-line, or a wish to increase faculty salaries.

These and other challenges provide the impetus for starting a prioritization project, said Johann Lindig. Some campuses need to bring greater clarity of mission to decision-making, decide what range of programs is too many, or rectify years or even decades of inattention to program prioritization. Others desire program clarity or need to decide whether to strengthen some programs more than others. Financial difficulties such as a decrease in net revenue or increased expenditures on adjunct instruction, or an immediate request from the president for a new program, also create the need for prioritization. An institution getting ready to launch a campaign needs to ensure that the investments are well placed, so prioritizing programs prior to the launch is necessary.

Selecting the appropriate criteria by which to measure programs is key. In doing so, campus leaders should determine the essential data elements and sources. They should look at the history, development, and expectations of the program; external demand; internal demand; the quality of inputs and processes; the quality of outcomes; the program’s scope and productivity; revenue and other resources generated; and costs and other expenses. They should focus also on whether the program meets the expectations of today’s students, said Dickeson and Lindig.

In starting the prioritization process, adequate preparation is key. Steps include identifying the responsible leadership; developing a data collection rating system and ranking by categories; getting buy-in from the president, CFO, board, and stakeholders; setting up a rumor-control system; reviewing the operational mission statement, which provides a grid against which programs can be measured; and announcing in advance the specific criteria to be used.

The challenges campuses face in beginning the prioritization process are many, including the need to agree on metrics and standards, wrestle with the mission of the liberal arts, and obtain buy-in from campus constituents to the process. “The toughest decision is what to stop doing,” Dickeson said. He also cautioned that “prioritization and reallocation are not the places for politics as usual—you need to move to a culture of evidence where decisions are truly based on data.”

In the end, he told participants, this process often generates a great deal of interest and excitement, as faculty members are asked to prove the value of their programs and offer ideas and suggestions for new or revamped programs.
Exploring Assessment and Learning Outcomes

“Assessment is about change, not about measurement,” argues Charles F. Blaich, director of inquiries for the Wabash National Study of Liberal Arts Education, who presented a concurrent session on the Wabash Study and was awarded CIC’s 2010 Academic Leadership Award for his contributions to independent higher education. Evidence-based research can help institutions identify target areas as well as recognize the good practices already occurring on their campuses, Blaich said, noting that it also strengthens institutional change—ensuring that the best practices in pedagogy and curriculum are repeated throughout the college.

Practices that have previously been shown to improve the level of student learning include: good teaching and high-quality interactions with faculty members, academic challenge and high expectations, and deep learning, Blaich said. Implementing these practices across the curriculum and into individual classrooms is the next step in the assessment process, and in order to institute that change, he stressed that “assessment must be linked to pedagogy.”

Another session led by Marc Chun, director of education at the Council for Aid to Education (CAE), also reflected on the connection between teaching and assessment. He explained how colleges can link what is taught in the classroom to the set of critical skills virtually every college and university name as an objective of its undergraduate education. The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) measures the presence of these skills through the use of performance tasks or active learning strategies. The Performance Task Academy, as developed by CAE with help from the CiC/CLA Consortium “equips faculty members to present students in their courses with a complex, real-world challenge they must complete using higher-order thinking. By tying assessment to practical situations, the performance task helps to improve student learning outcomes overall,” Chun said.

In order for any assessment tool to be effective, however, it must reflect the needs of faculty members and their work in the classroom. Chun pointed out that academic officers should bring faculty members into the assessment plan early and get their support. “This will legitimize the process and strengthen any changes being made to improve the learning outcomes for students.”

Fundraising and the CAO

How are a college’s fundraising priorities set? How can CAOs and chief advancement/development officers work better as a team? What expectations does each executive officer have of the other? These are just a few of the questions raised during the Institute’s session on “Fundraising and the CAO.”

Addressing these and related questions was a panel comprised of Doreen Riley, vice president for advancement at John Carroll University (OH), and William Craft, vice president for academic affairs, and Keith Christensen, vice president for development at Luther College (IA).

Panelists presented the case that CAOs and chief development officers are two of the most important players in assuring the success of an institution in strengthening its educational mission. But panelists also noted that the two executive officers “aren’t always in sync”—the academic officer tends to be focused on internal campus matters while the development officer is focused on external fundraising and external support.
“Advancement officers and deans have different ways of working, different professional duties, and different assumptions about how things operate. Only by understanding and appreciating these differences can these two senior officers maximize their work together on behalf of their institution.”

—William Craft

audiences. Much of the presentation, then, focused on ideas to create mutual understanding and a team approach.

One of the key factors in success, panelists noted, is that both the chief academic and chief development officers need to proactively and conscientiously strive to understand the parameters of their colleague’s profession and methods of operation. As Craft noted, “By education, training, and experience, advancement officers and deans have different ways of working, different professional duties, and different assumptions about how things operate. Only by understanding and appreciating these differences can these two senior officers maximize their work together on behalf of their institution.”

During the discussion following the presentations, participants were particularly interested in having the development specialists describe fundraising components—the differences among annual funds, major gifts, planned gifts, and capital campaigns—as well as discuss “the ask” itself. As one CAO noted, “Fundraising is a mystery to me—I know there’s more to it than ‘the ask,’ but I would like to learn more about what you call the ‘cultivation cycle’ and how I could be of help to the development office in the process.”

In closing, when the panelists noted that the program for CIIC’s Institute for Chief Academic Officers next fall would include both chief academic officers and chief advancement officers to address and expand on these very topics, there was a rousing round of applause.

Debating Post-tenure Review

Helen J. Streubert, vice president for academic affairs at Our Lady of the Lake University (TX) and Mark J. Braun, vice president and dean of the college at Augustana College (SD) described two very different models in a session on “Post-tenure Review and Alternative Review Models.” Characterizing himself as no fan of post-tenure review but a firm believer in formative evaluation and professional development, Braun worked with Augustana’s faculty personnel council to develop a model in which academic departments conduct annual evaluations of untenured faculty members while tenured faculty members conduct their own annual self-evaluations and file a report with the chief academic officer. The self-evaluation is mandatory and requires that tenured members of the faculty report on both their activities during the past academic year and their goals in teaching, scholarship, and service for the coming year. If issues persist, Augustana can dismiss tenured faculty members for cause or take disciplinary actions short of dismissal.

Helen Streubert, on the other hand, sees herself as both a proponent of post-tenure review and a firm believer in formative evaluation and professional development. With over 20 years of post-tenure review, evaluation of every course every semester, and annual goal setting, realignment, and assessment of accomplishments by every member of the faculty with the dean, Our Lady of the Lake was in “evaluation paralysis.” Streubert worked with the faculty to develop “triggered” reviews for tenured faculty members. Following two unsuccessful annual reviews, the vice president for academic affairs works with the faculty member, department chair, and dean to develop an improvement plan that includes goals, outcomes, and evidence that the dean will monitor. The promotion and tenure council reviews the plan after two years and recommends that the review is complete, that it should be extended, or that the faculty member be dismissed for cause.

Panelists Keith Christensen (left) and William Craft of Luther College (IA) and Doreen Riley of John Carroll University (OH) explored ideas about CAOs and CFOs working together to identify opportunities for donors during a session on “Fundraising and the CAO.”
2010 Institute for Chief Academic Officers Awards

The 2010 CAO/CFO Institute in Williamsburg, Virginia, featured an opening awards ceremony on Sunday, November 7, honoring individuals who have had a significant impact on independent higher education.

Charles Blaich (left), director of inquiries for the Center of Inquiry in the Liberal Arts at Wabash College (IN), received CIC’s 2010 Academic Leadership Award. William Pollard, vice president and dean of the college and professor of English at Transylvania University (KY), was the recipient of CIC’s 2010 Chief Academic Officer Award.

Linda Lankewicz of Sewanee: The University of the South (TN) (left) and Task Force Chair Rita Knuesel of College of Saint Benedict/St. John’s University (MN) were honored for completing their terms of service on the CAO Task Force. George Miller of Claflin University (SC) (not pictured) also completed his service. CIC Senior Advisor Bill Julian (center) was honored for his work in planning and execution of the CAO Institute and the Workshops for Division and Department Chairs.

Members of the CAO-CFO Task Force (l-r): John Day of John Carroll University (OH), Michael Selmon of Alma College (MI), Linda Lankewicz of Sewanee: The University of the South (TN), Ron Lostetter of Carroll University (WI), Judy Muyskens of Nebraska Wesleyan University, Sneh Veena of Heritage University (WA), Jeff Aper of Blackburn College (IL), Daniel Taddie of University of the Ozarks (AR), Don Aungst of Upper Iowa University, and Task Force Chair Rita Knuesel of College of Saint Benedict/Saint John’s University (MN).

Not pictured are Phyllis Whitney of Iowa Wesleyan College and George Miller of Claflin University (SC).
During a session on linking pedagogy to assessment, participants broke into groups to discuss the Collegiate Learning Assessment’s Performance Task tool that measures critical thinking skills linked to pedagogical practice.

Participation in the 2010 CAO-CFO Institute set a new record, with 474 CAOs, CFOs, and other administrators, and a total participation of 534 people.

Karen Davis of California Lutheran University discusses enrollment management strategies as it relates to the discount rate.

CAOs and CFOs, including Joseph Silver of Clark Atlanta University (GA), were highly engaged during question and answer periods in sessions and plenary addresses throughout the Institute.

Redesigning learning spaces in existing facilities was the focus of a session presented by (l-r) Lawrence Breiborde of Knox College (IL), Elizabeth Paul of Stetson University (FL), Christopher Ames of Washington College (MD), and Steven Foote of Perry Dean Rogers Partners Architects.

Ferol Menzel of Wartburg College (IA), Shirley Williams of Alvernia University (PA), and Mark Sargent of Gordon College (MA)—all from campuses participating in CIC’s Network for Vocation in Undergraduate Education—shared campus practices to embed vocational thinking in academic life.
CONFERENCES

2011 Presidents Institute to Feature Distinguished Speakers, Variety of Workshops

The CIC Presidents Institute, the largest annual meeting of college and university presidents in the country, will feature an exceptional array of speakers, sessions, and workshops to address key aspects of presidential leadership based on this year's theme, "A Dynamic Equilibrium: Essential Missions, Evolving Models." The conference will be held January 4–7, 2011, at the Renaissance Esmeralda in Palm Springs, California.

In addition to distinguished plenary speakers Walter E. Massey, president, School of the Art Institute of Chicago; Jon Meacham, executive editor and executive vice president, Random House; Sandy Baum, independent higher education consultant and professor emerita, Skidmore College; and Richard P. Chait, research professor, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, other highly anticipated presenters include Robert Zemsky, noted professor of higher education at the University of Pennsylvania and author of Making Reform Work, who will co-lead "Presidents and Curricular Change: Diversifying Programs, Reducing Costs, and Enhancing Revenue" with two seasoned CIC college presidents. Mary Patterson McPherson, executive officer of the American Philosophical Society, former vice president of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and president emerita of Bryn Mawr College, will speak when she receives CIC’s Allen P. Splete Outstanding Service Award. Philanthropists Red and Charline McCombs as well as the Walmart Foundation and Arthur J. Schmitt Foundation will be honored for their support of independent higher education.

A number of workshops during the conference will provide hands-on opportunities to explore particular aspects of presidential leadership:

- Collaborative Approaches to Student Aid Policy will feature a panel of six higher education veterans, including Michael S. McPherson, president of the Spencer Foundation and president emeritus of Macalester College, and Thane D. Scott, the attorney who successfully defended United States v. Brown University. They will lead participants in a discussion of alternative approaches to restrain merit aid and maximize institutional commitment to access and need-based financial aid.

- Using Technology to Reshape Educational Delivery, Improve Service, and Cut Costs will explore new service models and technology applications that best serve the needs of higher education institutions, led by presidents who have successfully employed technology at their colleges to increase student retention and success.

- A President’s Guide to Tuition Pricing will feature economist Lucie Lapovsky, former president of Mercy College (NY), and Sandy Baum, who will present the latest data on net tuition revenue, tuition discounting, and tuition pricing and discuss the theory behind the setting of tuition and the awarding of institutional grant aid.

In the afternoon following the conclusion of the Presidents Institute, two sessions will be offered:

- Comprehensive Campaigns: New Strategies for the New Economy in which a team of seasoned presidents with proven fundraising experience will provide fresh ideas and hands-on learning for each step of the campaign process: pre-campaign planning, the role of the board, major gifts, and the “silent” phase; the public announcement; and concluding events.

- CIC/Aspen/Wye Seminar on Educational Leadership in a Global Context will provide presidents and spouses an opportunity for intellectual renewal and a time to engage in substantive and scholarly discussion of ideas about educational leadership in a global context.

The 2011 Presidents Institute will include many of the same ingredients that have made past Institutes successful—concurrent sessions on timely topics, opportunities to share ideas with presidential colleagues, presentations by knowledgeable experts, and a superb setting. Presidents in their first or second year as president will participate in the New Presidents Program that begins the day before the Institute. As always, there will be a program for spouses, who are also welcome to attend all conference sessions.

For more information on all aspects of the Institute, visit www.cic.edu/PresidentsInstitute. Thanks to the generous support from sponsors, the registration fee has not increased and remains the same as in 2009 and 2010.
2011 NetVUE National Conference Will Build on Strong First Year

The first national conference of the Network for Vocation in Undergraduate Education (NetVUE) will be held March 10–12, 2011, at the Indianapolis Marriott Downtown in Indianapolis, Indiana. NetVUE fosters the exploration of vocation in college and university campus communities.

This new initiative, administered by the Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) with generous support from Lilly Endowment Inc., seeks to provide a nation-wide campus-supported network to expand and extend the conversation about vocational exploration. Launched in the fall of 2009, more than 150 colleges and universities already have joined NetVUE.

Exceptional plenary speakers, resource experts, and campus presentations will address the NetVUE Conference theme, “Deepening the Theological Exploration of Vocation.” Featured speakers include Christian Smith, professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame, who will describe the quest for faith among emerging adults based on his recent research. Award-winning writer Kathleen Norris will consider how an education rooted in the liberal arts shapes a life of sacred meaning and purpose. Eboo Patel, founder and executive director of the Interfaith Youth Core, will explore strategies for deepening vocation through interfaith cooperation.

The conference will provide an occasion for all NetVUE member campuses to engage in conversation about the intellectual and theological nature of vocation as well as best practices for vocation-based undergraduate education. Each NetVUE member college and university is invited to designate a campus conference team to be led by the president, chief academic officer, or another senior vice president. The cost of accommodations, meals, and materials for up to three team members will be covered by CIC. NetVUE member campuses will also develop sessions that showcase effective practices that deepen our understanding of students, describe sound program strategies, and consider graduates’ vocational responses to the world. The March 2011 NetVUE conference schedule and additional program information are available at www.cic.edu/NetVUE/2011conference. Conference registrations are being received on a space available basis until February 1.

The range of NetVUE member programs and services also continues to grow. During summer 2010, CIC created a NetVUE online resource library. The digital collection includes over 400 listings of vocation resources, including books, course syllabi, and films, all of which can be searched by a set of keywords such as “vocation,” “social justice,” and “ministry.” Each resource has a description of its focus and content. Searches can bring together many NetVUE resources related to a single topic.

During the fall of 2010 NetVUE sponsored two regional gatherings for representatives of member institutions. In early October, Earlham College (IN) hosted a gathering titled “Living the Question” that brought together faculty and staff members as well as students to explore use of the Quaker tradition of “clearness committees” as a means of vocational discernment. Teams from Bluffton University (OH), Goshen College (IN), and John Carroll University (OH) joined Earlham leaders to explore foundational concepts of calling while learning to use clearness committee practices. They also considered ways to implement clearness-related practices at their home institutions. In mid-November another cross-section of NetVUE members met at St. Norbert College (WI) to consider “Models of Excellence in Vocation Mentoring.” Participating institutions included Cardinal Stritch University (WI), College of Saint Benedict (MN), Dominican University (IL), Elmhurst College (IL), Graceland University (IA), Gustavus Adolphus College (MN), John Carroll University (OH), Luther College (IA), Marian University (IN), Marquette University (WI), Saint Mary’s College (IN), and Wartburg College (IA). NetVUE will sponsor additional regional gatherings in 2011–2012.

In addition, a new NetVUE Consultation Service was established this fall. NetVUE consultants are college and university leaders who have considerable experience in developing and sustaining campus programs for the exploration of vocation and can provide advice on specific aspects of undergraduate vocational exploration through an on-campus visit. Some have expertise in establishing student mentoring programs while others have woven vocational exploration into academic curricula. NetVUE consultants Carter Aikin of Hastings College (NE), Bob Haak of Augustana College (IL), David Cunningham of Hope College (MI), and Julie Massey of St. Norbert College (WI) bring many years of leadership in program development, teaching, and administration to their roles. A limited number of on-campus consultation grants is available to NetVUE members. Grants will cover the time and travel of the NetVUE consultant for a one- to two-day visit. Host campuses are expected to cover on-site accommodations and meals during the visit.

Additional information about NetVUE membership, programs, and services is available at www.cic.edu/NetVUE.
CIC Offers Fourth Seminar on Slave Narratives

The popular seminar on Slave Narratives will be offered for a fourth year in a row for full-time faculty members in history, English, and related fields. This seminar-based program is intended to help senior administrators of CIC member institutions who aspire to be college presidents and their spouses who have thought deeply about matters of personal vocation and institutional mission as they relate to the college or university presidency—both spiritual and secular perspectives.

Participants will examine the place of slavery and abolition in American history and culture and will discuss the genre of slave narratives through several exemplary texts including biographies, fiction, and autobiographies. Participants will read both antebellum and postbellum narratives—approximately 65 narratives were published in English. The pre-emancipation narratives were often serious works of literature as well as works that fit into certain conventions and formulas and tended to focus squarely on the oppression of slaves. The post-emancipation narratives were more likely to be success stories—triumphs over the past and visions of a more prosperous future.

The seminar will cover the most famous pre-war narrative, that of Frederick Douglass, and the most famous post-war narrative, that of Booker T. Washington, as well as narratives from Professor Blight’s recently published book, A Slave No More: Two Men Who Escaped to Freedom, Including their Narratives of Emancipation.

For more information and the nomination form, visit CIC’s website at www.cic.edu/projects_services/coops/gilder_lehrman.asp.

CIC Announces Vocation and Mission Program for Prospective Presidents

CIC will once again offer the presidential Vocation and Institutional Mission program in 2011–2012 for prospective college and university presidents. This seminar-based program is intended to help senior administrators of CIC member institutions who aspire to be college presidents and their spouses—clarify their own sense of personal vocation in relationship to the missions of the institutions that they might lead. Candidates for the program must be nominated by a current or retired college president. Nominations received before February 15, 2011, will be given priority consideration.

The program—offered for the fourth time in 2011–2012 and funded by a generous grant from Lilly Endowment Inc.—will include up to 20 participants and their spouses. It will begin with a four-day seminar in Napa, California, July 10–13, 2011, include a two-day winter seminar, and conclude in the spring of 2012.

Through a series of structured conversations and selected readings, participants will engage in an exploration of the ways in which a greater understanding of the alignment of personal vocation and institutional mission can be a resource for effective presidential leadership. This program provides an extraordinary opportunity for those who are inclined to think carefully in terms of “vocation”—being called to one’s work—and the “fit” between vocation and institutional mission.

Guiding the discussions will be facilitators—experienced college presidents and spouses (see box below)—who have thought deeply about matters of personal vocation and institutional mission as they relate to the college or university presidency—from both spiritual and secular perspectives.

Spouses are strongly encouraged to participate as full members of the program, which operates on the premise that each participant has his or her own vocation. Coming to discern one’s own calling can contribute significantly to a sense of fulfillment, whether in the role of presidential spouse or in any other occupation.

William V. Frame, CIC senior advisor and president emeritus of Augsburg College (MN), is leading this project. Participants or their institutions are responsible for paying a modest registration fee.

For more information, visit www.cic.edu/VocationMission.
2010 Foundation Conversation Featured New Small Group Discussions with Foundation Representatives

Presidents who participated in the 2010 annual Conversation between Foundation Officers and College and University Presidents were particularly pleased with their experience this year. Many cited keynote speaker Richard Morrill, president of the Teagle Foundation, and the new small-group discussions, as highlights of the meeting. Comments in response to the question on the evaluation form, “What was the best feature of the Conversation?” also included:

“The discussions by Phil Lewis of the Mellon Foundation and Mason Granger of the Hearst Foundations, the lunch conversation, and the interaction with other presidents. This is one of the best four hours of my year.”

“It was all helpful. The candid lunch conversations were very good…. The opportunity to mix with so many thoughtful fellow presidents was, of course, good.”

“Meeting the foundation representatives and having adequate break time to do this. Just right this year!”

The 22nd annual Foundation Conversation, which was held on Tuesday, October 12, at the TIAA-CREF headquarters in New York City, focused on the theme of “New Perspectives on Funding Independent Colleges and Universities.” Eighty CIC presidents participated in the meeting and eight FIHE executives attended this year for the first time.

The five major speakers explained why their foundations focus on certain initiatives and not on others; what they choose to fund and why; what changes they see coming to philanthropy; and the possible impact of those changes on the kinds of programs they will support in the future.

Keynote speaker Richard Morrill discussed “Fundraising from Two Perspectives—College President and Foundation President” or, as he said, “moving from one side of the philanthropic desk to the other.” Morrill characterized his career, in which he progressed from faculty member to college president to university president to foundation president, as motivated by the same vocation—“as an educator driven by the transformative process of education for human possibilities…and one who sees education as a moral imperative, a form of faith in human potential and dignity.”

Foundation and college presidents, he said, “have in common a need to think strategically, to find the thread of identity or narrative of a foundation or college that will lead to a sense of engagement with that foundation or college.”

Morrill then shared the narrative of the Teagle Foundation. Even as it shifted focus over the years from supporting scholarships to capacity building for individual small colleges to improvement of liberal education through assessment at individual institutions to consortial efforts to improve student learning through assessment, the foundation has always valued “the educational advantage” for which it was founded. Morrill plans to extend the recent Teagle emphasis on assessment initiatives to stress the content of learning and how to use assessment evidence to improve student learning, to move from the collection of data to action. “Now is the time,” he said, “to draw what we know about student learning into an integrated whole,” and he called on the college presidents in the audience to lead that process, to embed opportunities for student learning throughout their campuses.

Morrill closed by granting that the race for prestige and resources among both foundations and institutions of higher education “will always go on, but it is not the only game in town. Take the actions that will simultaneously improve student learning, your institution, and the quality of higher education.”

Session II featured “Two National Perspectives on Philanthropy and Independent Colleges” with Mason Granger, director of grants for the William Randolph Hearst Foundations, and Philip Lewis, vice president of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Granger explained that various foundations have differing approaches to grant funding. Some identify projects they are willing to fund and ask for proposals. Others, including the Hearst Foundations, want to discover the goals the presidents of colleges and universities have set and help them attain those goals. Granger announced that 58 of the colleges led by presidents in the room have Hearst Foundations-endowed scholarships and that Hearst is looking for new ways to continue to support colleges even with its lower endowment. For example, Hearst is allowing more flexibility for institutions during this period of particular need, and it is giving more direct aid to institutions for scholarships and for capital projects. The major issue with which Hearst is wrestling is how to move forward with diminished resources.
Philip Lewis reminded everyone of "the strong influence for the good that presidents of colleges and universities can exert" even in these difficult economic times. He asked the presidents to reflect on four propositions:

1. The recession has altered assumptions about college budget models and long-term capacity to deal with increasing costs, and the usual cost-cutting approaches are exhausted. Therefore, there will be pressure on presidents to restructure the composition of the faculty and revamp the delivery of instruction.

2. The state of the economy has led to an intensified demand for professional or vocational programs in higher education. The paradox is that "a liberal education may provide better preparation for dealing with the turbulent socio-economic environment than a college experience that provides a currently valuable skill or competency that will fade into obsolescence." In other words, societal need for a liberally educated citizenry has never been greater than now.

3. In colleges and universities, "the very financial moves that serve to generate financial aid quite commonly work against increasing diversity and generally reinforce the dominance of the affluent."

4. Liberal arts colleges are largely immune to the social issues surrounding all levels of public education. Given this relative insulation and given the small fraction of the educational sector that is independent higher education, what should our mission and social responsibility be? To whom are we responsible?

"A liberal education may provide better preparation for dealing with the turbulent socioeconomic environment than a college experience that provides a currently valuable skill or competency that will fade into obsolescence."

—Philip Lewis

Lewis ended with a declaration that the Mellon Foundation is willing to support efforts of liberal arts colleges to add the humanities to business and other pre-professional programs. Because there is little chance that higher education will focus exclusively on either liberal education or vocational education, the best we can hope for is weaving art, philosophy, history, and culture into the vocation curricula.

The third session featured the leaders of two regional foundations, Sherry P. Magill, president of the Jessie Ball duPont Fund, and Steven G.W. Moore, executive director of M.J. Murdock Charitable trust, on "The Role of Regional Foundations." Magill indicated that the duPont Fund supports 330 organizations, including 85 institutions of higher education that reflect the interests of Mrs. duPont. More specifically, the fund supports student recruitment and retention efforts, especially to help first-generation and low-income students move successfully through the curriculum and graduate in four years. It also supports diversity in all of its forms on campus, including programs to recruit and retain faculty members of color, African American studies programs, and diversifying the curriculum to be more inclusive. Recently the fund has helped presidents develop an energy conservation agenda on campuses.

Moore categorized three different foundation approaches: proactive, reactive, and interactive. According to Moore, the Murdock Trust is an interactive foundation that works with colleges and universities to fashion mutually beneficial projects. In recent years, the Trust has supported undergraduate research in the sciences and science facilities. Often, Murdock-funded programs will be beta-tested on a regional level before being tried nationally or in other regions. Proposals are evaluated according to the quality of their assessment plans, leadership, financial management, planning, best practices, and engaged constituencies.

The final activity of the day, a new feature of the meeting, was very well received. Seven small group discussions were led by the five speakers, who were joined by Max Marmor, president of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, and Eugene M. Tobin, program officer of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Each of the roundtable discussions was rated extremely or very useful by 100 percent of the participating presidents. This is a feature CIC will be certain to retain in subsequent Foundation Conversations.

More information about the Foundation Conversation is available on CIC’s website at www.cic.edu/foundationconversation.
Some of the nation’s top higher education journalists will speak at the 25th annual College Media Conference, scheduled for June 29–July 2, 2011, in Washington, DC, at the Fairmont Hotel. The conference, “Celebrating 25 Years of Connecting Campus and Media,” is cohosted by CIC and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

Communications officers, public and media relations directors, news bureau managers, writers, university relations vice presidents, assistant deans for external relations, and other interested administrators from all colleges and universities are invited to attend. The conference is intended to help campus communications professionals develop techniques that work, prepare news materials that produce results, and make contacts with key higher education reporters as well as editors, freelance writers, producers, bookers, and campus news professionals.

The 25th anniversary of the conference will be celebrated in the nation’s capital with a special event at the National Press Club, a tour of the Newseum, and visits to The Chronicle of Higher Education, Inside Higher Ed, and other DC-based newsrooms. Given the popularity of the “Meet the (Higher Ed) Press” concurrent sessions last June, these sessions featuring in-depth discussions with several reporters and editors from the two major higher education publications, The Chronicle of Higher Education and Inside Higher Ed, will again be offered in 2011. Many stories from these publications make their way into national and regional press reports. The goal of these sessions is to allow ample time for campus professionals to get to know key journalists, delve deeply into the workings of the publications, learn what topics and features will be covered in the future, and get tips on pitching story ideas or opinion pieces.

In addition, the preconference workshop on Wednesday, June 29, will focus on “Mastering the Maze of Social Media.” More information about the 2011 conference and registration materials will be available on www.collegemediaconference.org in January.

 Speakers Announced for 25th Anniversary College Media Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Banchero</td>
<td>Education Reporter, Wall Street Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharon Begley</td>
<td>Science Reporter, Newsweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Brady</td>
<td>General Manager, TBD.com and TBD TV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Carton</td>
<td>Chief Creative Officer, idfive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Clarke</td>
<td>Education Editor, U.S. News &amp; World Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lee Colvin</td>
<td>Editor, The Hechinger Report, and Director, Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media, Columbia University Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Jones</td>
<td>Senior Editorial Producer, CNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Kelly</td>
<td>Team Leader (Science/Environment/Energy/Weather), USA Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kingsbury</td>
<td>Higher Ed Correspondent, The Daily Beast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Lederman</td>
<td>Editor, Inside Higher Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Levin</td>
<td>Senior Editor, Slate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Maciavenna</td>
<td>Producer, NBC’s Today Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Schiller</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, National Public Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Selingo</td>
<td>Editor, The Chronicle of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Witte</td>
<td>Annapolis (MD) Bureau Chief, Associated Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Zernike</td>
<td>National Reporter, New York Times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Salit</td>
<td>Producer, NPR’s Fresh Air with Terry Gross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Lee Colvin</td>
<td>Editor, The Hechinger Report, and Director, Hechinger Institute on Education and the Media, Columbia University Teachers College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Jones</td>
<td>Senior Editorial Producer, CNN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Kelly</td>
<td>Team Leader (Science/Environment/Energy/Weather), USA Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Kingsbury</td>
<td>Higher Ed Correspondent, The Daily Beast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Lederman</td>
<td>Editor, Inside Higher Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Levin</td>
<td>Senior Editor, Slate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoinette Maciavenna</td>
<td>Producer, NBC’s Today Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vivian Schiller</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer, National Public Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Selingo</td>
<td>Editor, The Chronicle of Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Witte</td>
<td>Annapolis (MD) Bureau Chief, Associated Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Zernike</td>
<td>National Reporter, New York Times</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Senior Leadership Academy Gets Off to a Strong Start

The newest of CIC’s roster of leadership development programs, the Senior Leadership Academy, had a high-spirited launch November 5–7 in Williamsburg, Virginia. The 41 participants and program director Ann Die Hasselmo, president of the American Academic Leadership Institute (AALI), had been communicating since their selection during the summer by telephone and email, but this was their first face-to-face meeting.

The first day of the Academy featured a panel discussion led by several provosts who are participating in another leadership development program, the CIC/AASCU/AALI “Provosts to Presidents” program, on how participants could make the most of their Senior Leadership Academy experience. The dominant message from Ed Ericson III, vice president of academic affairs at John Brown University (AR); Tina S. Holland, executive vice president and provost at Holy Cross College (IN); Leslie Lambert, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Ferrum College (VA), and Michael B. Sperling, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Mercy College (NY), was that “everything you learn and experience from this point on is preparing you for the next step. Take full advantage of this experience.”

The program is made possible through the generous support of AALI. CIC and AALI developed the Senior Leadership Academy in response to expressions by presidents and provosts that many talented people on their campuses, some of whom report to cabinet-level senior officers, would benefit from leadership development opportunities and be better prepared to assume senior leadership responsibilities. The purpose of the Academy is to prepare prospective leaders to assume positions as the chief officers in a division—including academic affairs, student affairs, finance, enrollment management, and advancement—in independent higher education. The Academy is intended to fill a much needed gap in the current “presidential pipeline” by strengthening the preparation of leaders who have promise of developing the talents and skills needed to assume a presidency. A major goal of the Academy is to help participants develop an understanding of the broader context within which their own institution operates and perspectives beyond their current department or division.

Following the first panel, Beverly Daniel Tatum, president of Spelman College (GA) and a member of the CIC Board of Directors, delivered a moving and well-received life lesson, “From Me to We.” Tatum, who had encouraged CIC to offer a program for potential leaders in all divisions, described her personal journey as she moved from the “me” as a faculty member promoted through the ranks to full professor and department chair to the “nearly we” as dean of the college and then interim president at Mount Holyoke College (MA) to the “we” as president of Spelman. Tatum told the mid-level administrators that being a senior leader “is not about what you want but what the institution needs…. We all have to work for the common good.” After answering participants’ many questions, she advised them that, “Getting from me to we will be worth all the effort.”

Another panel of cabinet-level leaders—Karen Gainey, executive vice president and vice president for academic affairs at Limestone College (SC); Tina Holland; Susan J. Kupisch, senior vice president for academic affairs at the University of Evansville (IN); and Nancy Tessier, vice president for enrollment management at the University of Richmond (VA)—discussed their experiences of working effectively with other senior staff members and presidents both “horizontally and vertically.” They said, “when the phone rings, answer. In other words, take advantage of every opportunity to develop and hone your leadership skills.” The panel recommended that Senior Leadership Academy participants balance performing very well in their current positions while simultaneously preparing for the next position by becoming a student of higher education.

Thomas Morris, president emeritus of Emory & Henry College (VA), former secretary of education for the Commonwealth of Virginia, and new president of the Virginia Foundation for Independent Colleges, explained the way he and other presidents build their cabinets. Participants closed the long first day with dinner and working groups to create experiential plans for themselves and the larger group.

On the second morning, two participants in last summer’s CIC/AALI seminar on Administrative Wisdom for Chief Academic Officers: Classic and Contemporary Readings on Leadership and Responsibility in Annapolis, Katie Conboy, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Stonehill College (MA), and John Donohue, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Albertus Magnus College (CT), led a seminar on “Antigone—What Did the Greeks Know about Leadership and its Issues and Dilemmas?”

Following lunch, Leslie Lambert and Michael B. Sperling were joined by the Bridgewater College (VA) team of Anne B. Keeler, vice president for finance and treasurer, and Carol A. Scheppard, vice president and dean for academic affairs, for a panel on “What I Wish I Had Known, Learned, and Done before I Became a Vice President.” Ed Ericson and Andrea Chapdelaine,
provost and vice president for academic affairs at Albright College (PA), shared their insights and experiences of shaping a year-long experiential plan. Another panel—Patricia Draves, vice president for academic affairs and dean of the university at the University of Mount Union (OH); Lizbeth Martin, vice president for academic affairs at Holy Names University (CA); Donald Taylor, provost and vice president for academic affairs at Benedictine University (IL); and John Yoder, vice president for academic affairs at Friends University (KS)—shared advice on using mentors effectively to prepare for senior leadership positions.

Participants then joined the participants of CIC’s Institute for Chief Academic Officers and Chief Financial Officers for the opening keynote address by Andrew Delbanco, “What Is College For?” (See story, page 4.), followed by a reception and buffet dinner where many SLA participants met up with their chief academic and financial officers.

The final day of the Academy included a presentation by Lee King, vice president for external relations at Hollins University (VA), on a subject that all higher education leaders must grasp in the current economic climate: “Understanding Advancement: What Really Happens in Institutional Advancement and Why Other Cabinet Officers Need to Care.” He was followed by the CAO and CFO team from Shenandoah University (VA), Bryon Grigsby, senior vice president and provost, and Richard Shickle, vice president for administration and finance, who described how they work together and with other cabinet officers. Discussing the “Ethical Dilemmas and Perplexing Conundrums” that Academy participants are likely to encounter as they increase their leadership roles were William C. Deeds, vice president for academic affairs and dean of the faculty at Wartburg College (IA); William Pollard, vice president and dean of the college at Transylvania University (KY); and Reynold Verret, provost at Wilkes University (PA). The final presentation by Paul H.L. Chou, new president of Academic Search, Inc., examined each step of the process in a national search for a senior administrator. Participants then shared suggestions for future activities, communication, and readings.

CIC Announces Second Art History Seminar

The second of CIC’s series of seminars on Teaching Pre-Modern European Art in Context will take place June 19–24, 2011, at the High Museum of Art in Atlanta, Georgia. The seminar will focus on “Living with Art in Renaissance and Baroque Europe.” Applications will be accepted this winter and 20 faculty members will be selected to participate.

Participants will have the opportunity to reconnect with museum objects in their original form and function. Since most of the objects in American museums that date from this period come from religious and domestic settings, the seminar will pay particular attention to how art functioned in churches and homes. Discussions will cover topics such as the spectacular form of multiple panel altarpieces, how painting was incorporated into furniture, and how people interacted with art throughout their daily lives. Attention will be paid to Renaissance and Baroque painting and sculpture in the High’s collections, particularly works from the Samuel H. Kress Collection.

These focused week-long seminars, made possible through the generous support of the Samuel H. Kress Foundation, are for full-time faculty members who regularly teach art history at smaller colleges and universities. The seminars are especially valuable for those at institutions without large campus museums or proximity to major art museums. Art historians, studio artists, or faculty members trained in other disciplines such as theatre arts, English, or communications are eligible to participate if they teach art history. There is no fee for those selected to participate.

Each of the seminars is being hosted by a museum with a significant Kress Collection of pre-1830 European art. The goal is to strengthen the teaching of art history—a discipline that is fundamental to a liberal arts curriculum—to undergraduates at smaller colleges and universities.

The first seminar, which took place at the Birmingham Museum of Art in Birmingham, Alabama, in July 2010, concentrated on the topic of artistic workshop practices of late medieval and Renaissance Italy. The third and final seminar in summer 2012 will take place at the Allen Memorial Art Museum at Oberlin College (OH) and will focus on religious art.
The highlight of the seventh annual CIC/New York Times Partnership’s Presidents Council meeting in New York City was the opportunity to meet with Times national editor Richard Berke and labor and workplace reporter Steven Greenhouse. The 25 presidents who participated in the October 11 event at the Times also discussed benefits of membership in the Partnership and plans for the 2011 Student News Editors Workshop.

Richard Berke described the Times’ commitment to education coverage, noting that 30 reporters cover education issues and six are full-time higher education reporters who are “open and eager for education story suggestions.” While noting that it can be difficult for colleges to attract the attention of a Times reporter, he offered practical advice to increase the probability of campus coverage. “Don’t hire professional PR people to pitch stories—it’s always better for reporters to hear directly from campus officials. Be picky about when you reach out to Times reporters who aren’t interested in day-to-day news but rather unusual or controversial stories worthy of national attention.” He also advised that “light features on campus culture, college life today for students and professors, and what is happening in classrooms” would be of interest, as would stories that “put a human face on public policy issues that help the reporter tell what the policy means and how it impacts students.” Berke said he would love to send a reporter to a campus to shadow the president and report on “what life is like for college presidents today and how their job has changed in the past ten years. Is it as much fun? How challenging is the job? How much of a president’s time is devoted to fundraising?” He wants the “inside scoop” on the life of a college president.

Reporter Steven Greenhouse is interested in labor and workplace issues related to higher education such as: What are the job prospects for graduates? What is their debt load upon graduation? What is the unemployment rate among college graduates? How are graduates competing for jobs against laid-off adult workers? Are companies hiring graduates as interns rather than paid employees to save money? How many four-year colleges are partnering with community colleges to attract those students? What is the impact of the for-profit sector of higher education on the nonprofit sector?

Participants also heard from Kathleen O’Connell, national education director for the Times, about the benefits of being a member of the Partnership:

- Partner campuses receive priority to host Times editors and reporters on campus.
- Faculty workshops on best practices for integrating Times content into coursework will be offered by Times officials.
- Editors and reporters will come to Partner campuses for Times Talks events, which are informal dialogues over dinner about global citizenship with students, faculty members, the president, and others.

Participants also discussed plans for the next Student News Editors Workshop, which will take place at the Times in April 2011. Student editors from campuses that are members of the CIC/NYT Partnership will be invited to the workshop (the event is no longer open to all CIC members). The only requirement for being a member is to purchase bulk copies of the newspaper at a discount for the campus community.

Thomas Trebon, president of Carroll College (MT), was elected 2011 chair of the Partnership succeeding Marjorie Hass, president of Austin College (TX).

Woodrow Wilson Visiting Fellow Applications Accepted

Applications are being accepted from campuses that wish to host a Woodrow Wilson Visiting Fellow in the 2011–2012 academic year. The priority application deadline is March 4, 2011, but applications will continue to be accepted after that date.

Woodrow Wilson Visiting Fellows are nonacademic professionals from a variety of fields and notably include a research scientist who went diving in the Gulf during the BP oil spill to determine for herself its environmental impact; an international jurist whose United Nations report on the recent Israeli-Palestinian conflict in Gaza sparked international controversy; the former Governor of New Jersey who later served as head of the Environmental Protection Agency; an ACLU lawyer whose book on Abu Ghraib discusses instances of torture during wartime; and a documentary film maker whose civil rights saga, Eyes on the Prize, was lauded across the world.

Instead of a one-day visit typical of the college lecture circuit, the Visiting Fellows come to campus for a week-long residential program of classes, seminars, workshops, lectures, and informal discussions. Fellows and campuses report that the week-long program fosters intellectual dialogue among campus communities and connects students to the broader society. The fee is lower than the price most of the Fellows charge for a single lecture.

To apply to host a Fellow, visit www.cic.edu/visitingfellows or email visitingfellows@ic.nche.edu. The website includes a complete and searchable roster of Fellows, fees for hosting a Fellow, and the online Campus Request Form.
Books of Note

Three recently published books will be of interest to presidents and other leaders of small and mid-sized private colleges and universities.

From Bottom to Top Tier in a Decade: The Wagner College Turnaround Years
Norman R. Smith
© 2010
This memoir by Wagner College President Emeritus Norman Smith recounts a remarkable turnaround story in American higher education. During his 14-year presidency (1988–2002), Smith led a campaign to bring Wagner College—a then-troubled, under-enrolled college—from impending closure to a reputation as one of the top small, residential private colleges in the East.

By the time Smith departed in 2002, the college was ranked highly, operated at capacity, and was cited as one of America’s most beautiful college campuses.

Smith recounts stories about the many trustees, benefactors, faculty members, and staff who were key to the turnaround, and photos throughout the book help tell the story. Smith’s memoir represents a case study for survival in these competitive times for private higher education.

Hardcover copies are available on iUniverse for $31.95 and electronic versions are available on the ReaderStore website, www.readerstore.com, for $8.99.

Seeing the Light: Religious Colleges in Twenty-First-Century America
Samuel Schuman
© 2010
Samuel Schuman examines the place of religious colleges and universities, particularly evangelical Protestant institutions, in contemporary American higher education. The book begins with a history of postsecondary U.S. education from the perspective of the religious traditions from which it arose. Schuman focuses on three Roman Catholic institutions—the College of New Rochelle (NY), Villanova University (PA), and Thomas Aquinas College (CA). He then profiles several evangelical colleges and universities, discovering the factors contributing to their success along the way. These institutions range from the nationally recognized to the little known, from the rich to the poor, and those with both highly selective and open admission requirements. Interviews with key administrators, faculty, and students reveal the challenges, the successes, and the goals of these institutions.

Schuman concludes that faith-based institutions—including CIC members Anderson University (SC), Calvin College (MI), North Park University (IL), George Fox University (OR), Westmont College (CA), Oral Roberts University (OK), and Northwestern College (MN)—and others like them offer important and timely lessons for the broader higher education community. They have rigorous academic standards, impressive student recruitment, ambitious philanthropic goals, and well-maintained campuses and facilities. Yet much of the U.S. higher education community ignores them or accords them little respect. Seeing the Light highlights what can be learned from the viability of these institutions.

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press, the book is available for $50 at www.jhupbooks.press.

Realizing Our Intentions: A Guide for Churches and Colleges with Distinctive Missions
Albert J. Meyer
© 2009
In this book, Meyer draws upon his many years in education and administration to provide readers with concrete recommendations about how to structure initiatives, develop faculty and staff, and coordinate efforts to fulfill institutional missions. Specifically, Meyer offers procedures for board initiatives in developing and implementing long-term goals that can guide short-term decisions; advice on appointing a top-level administrator for strategic faculty development; and guidelines for structuring a higher education board that effectively represents the church and institution in implementing a common mission.

Celebrating Achievements

For the first time, a scholar from Ursinus College (PA) was chosen as one of 32 American winners of Rhodes Scholarships for 2011. Aakash K. Shah of Cliffside Park, New Jersey, graduated from Ursinus in May with honors in sociology and biology and neuroscience. Shah is now in his first year at Harvard Medical School. The Rhodes Scholarships provide all expenses for two or three years of study at the University of Oxford in England. Shah plans a career combining clinical and academic medicine with global health policy.

CIC also congratulates the national and state winners of the 2010 Professors of the Year Awards who are from CIC member institutions. John Zubizarreta, professor of English and director of honors and faculty development at Columbia College (SC), was named Outstanding Baccalaureate College Professor of the Year for challenging his undergraduate students to become critical thinkers and engaged life-long learners. Ten CIC faculty members (of 46 awardees) were named state winners: Liz Gron (chemistry), Hendrix College (AR); Rochelle L. Johnson (English and environmental studies), The College of Idaho; Lendol Calder (history), Augustana College (IL); Carolyn E. Dallinger (criminal justice and social work), Simpson College (IA); Ken Keffer (French and German), Centre College (KY); Karen McFarlane Holman (chemistry), Willamette University (OR); Monica McCoy (psychology), Converse College (SC); Alan Swinkels (psychology), Saint Edward’s University (TX); Gary E. Scudder, (assistant dean, Core Division), Champlain College (VT); and Mike Veseth, (international political economy), University of Puget Sound (WA). CIC cosponsors the Professors of the Year program, which is administered by the Council for Advancement and Support of Education.

Constitution Day Special Events

In observance of Constitution Day on September 17, CIC institutions across the nation marked the holiday with special lectures, events, and webcasts. Hillsdale College (MI), for example, organized a two-day webcast that was broadcast live from Washington, DC, and featured panel discussions, debates, and special guest speakers including columnist and commentator George Will and historians Victor Davis Hanson and Richard Brookhiser. Misericordia University (PA) hosted a debate and dialogue on the topic: “Should a Mosque be Built Near Ground Zero?” featuring professors Brian Carso, historian and Constitutional scholar, and Joseph Curran, theologian and ethics scholar. Students at Maryville College (TN) participated in “Know Your Constitution,” an educational quiz game. All participants and spectators received a free copy of the Constitution, and top-scoring participants earned gift cards to the college bookstore. The University of New England (ME) recognized the day with a discussion on “The Constitution and the Place of Religion in Public Life” that explored how to interpret the Constitution, the politics behind it, and the place of religion in public life. Goucher College (MD) celebrated Constitution Day with a lecture by U.S. Senator Benjamin L. Cardin, “What Does an Activist Justice Look Like? Roberts v. Stevens.”
International Activities

In October, Tanesha D. H. Pittman, executive director and associate dean of adult programs at Benedictine University's (IL) Moser College of Adult and Professional Studies, joined a select group of women from across the United States as a member of the 2010 Leadership America Abroad Program to travel to the United Arab Emirates. Fifteen U.S. women visited Dubai, Abu Dhabi, and Sharjah to form connections with local and international business and government leaders.

Creating Partnerships

This fall, Averett University (VA) and Danville Community College entered into a partnership to guide area students to a four-year degree. The new Passport Transfer Program allows regional students who are not initially accepted into Averett to earn credits at DCC and ultimately qualify for admission. And Pikeville College (KY) and Morehead State University together launched a “teacher leader” master’s program this fall.

The Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum in Kansas and Westminster College’s (MO) National Churchill Museum announced a partnership to encourage new visitors to both facilities and allow for the sharing of resources. Artifact and speaker exchanges, joint programs, and events are some of the projects being planned. The Churchill Museum features the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, Aldermanbury, a 17th century Christopher Wren church that was devastated during the Blitz. In 1965 it was brought, stone by stone, to Westminster’s campus and rebuilt in order to commemorate Churchill’s 1946 “Iron Curtain” speech that was given at the College.

Brenau University (GA) and the High Museum of Art in Atlanta have announced a three-year collaboration—the first of its kind for both institutions—that will allow for the sharing of resources to further the integration of the arts into Brenau’s educational curriculum. Brenau students and faculty will receive free or discounted access to the High’s exhibitions and collections, and students will have the opportunity to participate in internships, attend lectures, and experience behind-the-scenes programs at the High. Faculty members will receive annual updates on the High’s long-term plans for exhibitions and programs. These communications will allow university and museum colleagues to share ideas and explore ways to integrate resources from relevant exhibitions into the curriculum.

A $15.4-million grant from the National Institute of Health’s (NIH) National Center for Research Resources will fund New Hampshire’s IDEa Network of Biomedical Research Excellence, which is led by Dartmouth Medical School and the University of New Hampshire. The network will support biomedical research by faculty members and students from Saint Anselm College, Colby-Sawyer College, Franklin Pierce University, and New England College, among others. In addition, NIH’s National Institute of General Medical Sciences has awarded $1.7 million to a partnership of colleges and universities in Georgia to encourage and prepare people from diverse backgrounds to pursue neuroscience-related careers. Agnes Scott College and Spelman College will join Georgia State University and Emory University in an effort to encourage students with disabilities, educationally disadvantaged students, and racial and ethnic minority students to pursue a career in the neurosciences.

Georgian Court University (NJ) and the University of the Sciences in Philadelphia have signed formal agreements that will enable qualified GCU students to pursue their educational goals with a smooth transition to USciences’ doctor of pharmacy and doctor of physical therapy programs. The agreements will be in effect for GCU students wishing to enter USciences for the 2011–2012 academic year.

The departments of social work at Misericordia University (PA) and Temple University Harrisburg are collaborating to offer a Temple University master of social work degree program on the Misericordia campus beginning in January. The 60-credit program is open to working professionals who hold a bachelor’s degree in another discipline and wish to pursue a social work degree. The Misericordia program is unique because it offers students the opportunity to integrate necessary coursework to receive both a master’s degree and certification from Misericordia’s geriatric care management program. And Caldwell College (NJ) and Mountainside Hospital in Montclair have teamed up to offer a bachelor of science in nursing that integrates clinical practice and academic coursework. The program offers three tracks, one for traditional students who will receive a liberal arts education at Caldwell and comprehensive clinical professional nursing education at Mountainside; another is geared toward those who already have college degrees but want to change their professions;
and the third is for registered nurses who wish to pursue a bachelor’s degree.

In order to better prepare for tragedies, 12 institutions in Illinois have formed a partnership to provide assistance to one another during a campus crisis. This summer, a consortium of presidents signed a mutual aid agreement—believed to be the first of its kind nationally—that is designed to help a member institution maintain operations and continuity in the aftermath of a crisis. As part of the agreement, an institution in crisis may request facilities, equipment, or personnel including police, human resources, and crisis communications. The consortium includes Lewis University, Saint Xavier University, and University of St. Francis.

Area residents and members of the Westminster College (MO) community were able to access more than 25 free health care assessments and services by attending the Second Annual Westminster College/Callaway County United Way Community Health Fair that was held in October. The campus event offered services such as cholesterol tests, spinal alignment, blood/glucose levels, and blood pressure checks. Participating organizations included the American Red Cross, YMCA, Coalition Against Rape and Domestic Violence, and Homemaker Health Care and Bureau of Communicable Diseases.

Announcing New Majors and Facilities

Malone University (OH) this fall launched a master of arts degree in organizational leadership. The curriculum includes courses on engaging contemporary issues in leadership, ethics, strategic planning, and corporate governance and emphasizes the preparation of students to lead in diverse organizational settings including nonprofit and church environments.

Georgian Court University (NJ) is launching a master’s degree in homeland security program in January 2011. The 36-credit curriculum covers a range of current issues—the intelligence process, computer applications, hostage negotiation, emergency preparedness and response, and the informal and formal money transfer systems that often fund terrorism—that homeland security professionals face daily. In addition, students will examine the psychological and sociological aspects of disaster and terror, legal issues in homeland security management, and leadership and policy analysis. Park University (MO) also began offering this fall a new terrorism and homeland security certificate program that trains students to identify and respond to situations related to terrorism, security, and national emergencies.

Campbellsville University (KY) announced that it will transform its business administration, criminal justice, Christian studies, and general studies associate degree programs from on-campus classes to 100 percent online associate degrees in spring 2011. The programs are intended to allow students to transition immediately into the professional workforce or apply their college credits toward a higher-level degree. Northwestern College (IA) announced a new major in sports management that began in the fall. The interdisciplinary program offers courses in kinesiology, business and economics, communications, computer science, and mathematics. Next fall, Northwestern will offer a new major in Spanish translation and interpretation designed for bilingual high school graduates who want to work in the burgeoning fields of translation and interpretation.

This fall, Westminster College (UT) announced the grand opening of its state-of-the-art Meldrum Science Center. The $30-million facility is the capstone project in Westminster’s ten-year campus master plan. The center boasts 14 high-performance integrated lab/classrooms and five dedicated research labs, as well as optimum space for students and faculty members from different disciplines to discuss new concepts and conduct research collaboratively. Transylvania University (KY) also dedicated the renovated laboratories of Brown Science Center, a $9.2 million project that features new scientific equipment and moveable furnishings that make lab spaces more flexible.

Major Gifts

The James S. McDonnell Family Foundation (MA) this fall announced a $10 million gift to Davis & Elkins College (WV), the largest in the college’s 106-year history, to be used for debt retirement and adding to the endowment. James S. McDonnell III served in the United States Air Force and was a corporate executive of McDonnell Douglas Corporation for many years. He has served on the Davies & Elkins board since 1991.

Furman University (SC) has received a $3.4 million gift from an anonymous donor to support the school’s nationally recognized Bridges to a Brighter Future program, a college access and academic enrichment initiative for Greenville County high school students whose potential outdistances their circumstances. The gift will allow the program to expand its support beyond high school and provide its graduates with an array of services after they enroll in college including an intensive, one-week summer program preceding college enrollment and year-round advising and support for the students during the first year of college.

Elmhurst College (IL) announced that it has received a pledge of $2 million from Dennis J. Patterson, a leader and innovator in health care administration and a member of the Elmhurst College Board of Trustees. The gift is one of the largest ever received by the college and will support the transformation of the Arthur J. Schable Science Center into a state-of-the-art facility for research, teaching, and learning.

Changing Names

Midland Lutheran College (NE) has officially changed its name to Midland University and Mount Mercy College (IA) is now Mount Mercy University.
Building Blocks 2020

CIC joined the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) in launching a new website (www.buildingblocks2020.org) designed to highlight efforts by nonprofit private colleges and universities to increase the number of at-risk students who enroll and to help these students complete their degrees in timely fashion.

The website is the central component of “Building Blocks to 2020,” a national initiative organized by NAICU and CIC to help the nation meet President Obama’s call to make the United States the world’s top country in college completion rates by 2020.

The website provides opportunities for campus professionals who work on the front lines of student access, retention, and completion to learn from the experiences of others and adapt practices and policies to their individual institutional missions and student populations. The website will also serve as an information resource for consumers and policymakers who are interested in what colleges are doing to reach out to students from diverse backgrounds and enhance their chances of earning a degree. The number and diversity of institutions and programs available on the website will grow as NAICU and CIC continue to gather and post material from colleges and universities.

CIC Offers Scholarships for Librarians for Frye Leadership Institute

CIC, in partnership with the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR), will offer up to seven scholarships for librarians to participate in the Frye Leadership Institute. For ten years, the Frye Leadership Institute, cosponsored by CLIR, EDUCAUSE, and Emory University, has been preparing and developing the next generation of leaders of higher education.

IN MEMORIAM—JOHN STRASSBURGER

Members of the CIC community mourn the death of John Strassburger, president of Ursinus College (PA) and former chair of the CIC Board of Directors, who passed away in September after a courageous battle with cancer. Strassburger served with distinction as Ursinus’ president for 15 years until his retirement for health reasons in June. He was an active member of the CIC Board of Directors from 2005 until 2010 and served as chair from 2008 until 2010. CIC President Richard Ekman said, “CIC benefited from John’s clear leadership and his gift for circumspection, as well as from his steadfast commitment to the liberal arts and liberal arts colleges. With enormous generosity of spirit, he helped generations of students and faculty members to fulfill their educational aspirations and, as he emerged as an influential spokesman for private higher education on the national scene, he helped many colleges and all of us at CIC to fulfill our idealistic goals. We will all miss him.”

Strassburger earned a doctorate in early American history from Princeton University. He served as academic vice president of Knox College (IL) before assuming the Ursinus presidency. During his career, he was a board member of the American Conference of Academic Deans, American Academic Leadership Institute, American Council on Education, and Lenfest Foundation.
libraries and information services. The 2011 Institute, to be held June 5–10 at Emory University, addresses challenges in higher education, helping librarians and information technologists to initiate conversations and take action on issues of importance to their individual institutions.

CIC in the News

Two essays on leadership by CIC President Richard Ekman were published: *The Chronicle of Higher Education* featured “The Imminent Crisis in College Leadership” in the September 24, 2010, print and online editions and *University Business* published “The Joys of the College Presidency” in its September edition.


*The Chronicle* also quoted Ekman in “Negative Credit Ratings Reflect Financial Strain on Small Colleges” (July 21). Four *Chronicle* “On Hiring” blog posts by David Evans, vice president for academic affairs and dean of the faculty at Buena Vista University (IA), mention CIC and topics that have been raised on the CIC listserv for deans (August 6, September 1 and 8, November 5). *Inside Higher Ed* published a brief item on the merger of CIC and FIHE (November 1) and an article on “Liberal Arts I: They Keep Chugging Along” quotes Ekman (October 1).

*Newsweek* magazine in October published an essay by CIC, “Private Colleges are Affordable,” in a Special Advertising Feature of the publication titled “Excellence in Independent Higher Education.” The essay, which ran in nine of *Newsweek’s* regional editions, cited data that make the case that “the high quality of education at a nonprofit independent college is more affordable than most people think.” CIC member colleges and universities in New York, Illinois, Wisconsin, New Jersey, Missouri, California, Colorado, Iowa, and Texas advertised alongside the essay. Two additional CIC essays that are slated to run in *Newsweek’s* Special Advertising Feature in the next few months will make the case that private colleges and universities provide access and success for diverse students, and they offer a superior education that helps students learn to write and speak effectively, think creatively and critically, and develop analytic reasoning and problem-solving skills. CIC members will be offered the opportunity to advertise in conjunction with those messages in the coming months.

Staff News and Notes

CIC is delighted to welcome the members of the FIHE staff. As reported in the Winter/Spring edition of *The Independent*, Ned Moore began serving as executive director of FIHE and CIC vice president in February. Once the merger was finalized in October, Jacalyn Cox and Christopher Dodds were officially appointed to the CIC staff team. Cox will serve as director of state fund programs and will continue to direct aspects of the development and management of programs and services for State Fund Members that are intended to strengthen their fundraising capabilities and organizational effectiveness. She will also lend her expertise in accounting and financial management and in conference planning to CIC’s work in those areas. Cox is a graduate of the George Washington University. Christopher Dodds will serve as manager of state fund programs. His primary responsibilities will be to continue to manage State Fund Member programs and services and also will help with CIC’s digital communications, website development, and IT management. Christopher joined FIHE in 2009 as office administrator and has been involved in FIHE’s event planning, communications, research, IT, and member services.

CIC also welcomes a number of other new staff members. Lindsay Albert was named manager of research projects in October. Most recently, Albert served as project researcher with the AFL-CIO in Washington, DC. She has considerable
experience in higher education, having worked as research associate with JBL Associates, a higher education research firm, as senior associate with the American Federation of Teachers, and as research associate with American Institutes for Research. Albert is a graduate of Gettysburg College (PA), with a BA in political science, and she earned an MA in education policy and leadership from the University of Maryland, College Park.

Lara Alden Turci joined the staff in November as assistant to the president and the senior vice president. She is a graduate of Rhodes College (TN), from which she earned a BA in English with a minor in business. She previously served as a staff assistant in the U.S. Congress and has worked at the Diversity Memphis nonprofit organization and the Heritage Foundation.

Sherita C. Jackson joined CIC in November as conference and program coordinator. She is a graduate of Delaware State University from which she earned a BA in communications and has completed some graduate work in communications management at Towson University. She previously served as membership coordinator for the Community Technology Centers’ Network and as operations and membership manager for the Neighborhood Funders Group (NFG), both in Washington, DC. In her last position, Jackson managed all aspects of conference registrations for NFG’s annual meeting and provided programmatic support for NFG’s work groups.

Richard Ekman chaired a session at a September 30–October 1 Teagle Foundation conference on “Re-imagining Liberal Education.” CIC member presidents who participated include: Jeff Abernathy, Alma College (MI); Edwin Welch, University of Charleston (WV); Sharon Herzberger, Whittier College (CA); and Rock Jones, Ohio Wesleyan University.

Ekman also spoke about trends in private higher education at meetings of the board of trustees and faculty members of Edgewood College (WI) on September 9 and the boards of directors of the Ohio Foundation of Independent Colleges on October 5–6 and Arkansas’ Independent Colleges and Universities on October 17–18.

Ginny Coombs, CIC vice president for annual programs, is the 2010–2011 chair of the Council on Undergraduate Research Finance Committee.

Ned Moore, CIC vice president and FIHE executive director, was a speaker at the academic conference “Creating a Culture of Research on Campus,” held October 15–16 on the campus of the College of William & Mary (VA). He and co-presenter Carl Strikwerda, dean of the faculty of arts and science at William & Mary, provided an overview of best practices for faculty members working with advancement staff to generate public awareness and gift support for faculty-student research projects on campus. Moore also hosted a group of Chinese higher education leaders at CIC’s offices on November 11 and gave a presentation on philanthropy in America and American higher education.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND STAFF OF
CIC WELCOME THE FOLLOWING NEW MEMBERS
SINCE SUMMER 2010

New Institutional Members
Denison University, OH
Finlandia University, MI
Paul Quinn College, TX
Southern Virginia University

New Affiliate Members
American Philological Association (PA)
Hollings Center for International Dialogue (DC)
The merger culminates close cooperation between the two organizations over several decades. Discussions about a possible merger began nearly three years ago. In early 2008, representatives of the FIHE Board of Directors proposed to CIC that discussions begin that might lead to the merger of FIHE into CIC. This overture was very favorably received by the CIC Board of Directors, and after a June 2008 meeting, the Board voted unanimously to support the merger. In April 2009, the FIHE Board voted in favor of a resolution to merge FIHE into CIC. The full memberships of both organizations overwhelmingly approved the merger by October 2009.

Advantages of the Merger

In addition to the overarching benefits of advancing the cause of independent higher education and creating more and better services for private colleges and universities, specific advantages for the merger include:

- **Increased funding for independent colleges and universities.** With grants from FIHE’s endowment, currently valued at $36 million, providing support to the state funds for scholarships and consortial programs and providing matching grants to leverage additional fundraising by the state funds, the amount of money ultimately distributed to colleges and universities from the State Fund Members will likely increase.

- **Better organizational alignment.** College presidents will experience better alignment between the purposes of the two organizations, building on CIC’s good track record of focusing its programs and services on issues that are viewed as high priority by colleges.

- **Enhanced relationships.** The merged organization will increase and enhance the relationships among college presidents who are the principal participants in both CIC and the state funds programs. FIHE’s network of state partners will help promote CIC programs and services for colleges and universities.

- **Enhanced fundraising.** National fundraising by FIHE and CIC will complement each other.

- **Economies of scale.** Cost savings through elimination of duplicated services will be realized.

George Martin, president of St. Edward’s University (TX) and chair of the CIC Board of Directors, noted that one of the reasons for the overwhelming support of the merger among Board members was that “a merger would enhance collaboration and more closely align the priorities of the state funds and the individual college presidents.”

James Austgen, retired Motorola executive and former chair of the FIHE Board of Directors, said, “We welcome the opportunity to work more closely with CIC. This merger process has been a collegial exercise clearly benefiting the membership of both organizations.”

**FIHE Endowment**

In addition to supporting the 32 state associations that raise money for independent colleges and universities in their states, FIHE has raised money for national projects that are subsequently administered through the state funds. It has also functioned as a foundation and in this capacity, FIHE distributes proceeds from an endowment, now worth about $36 million, originally made possible by a $4 million gift of stock given to FIHE in the 1970s by the United Parcel Service Foundation.

The investment committee of the CIC Board will oversee management of the FIHE endowment and procedures for distributing its proceeds. CIC will continue to administer the FIHE endowment earnings according to the original letter of conveyance, and it is anticipated that through direct grants and through challenge grants to the state funds, financial support generated for independent colleges and universities will increase over time.
Second, while there are, admittedly, a small number of examples of egregious expenditures and practices at traditional colleges, in the media these inappropriate uses of funds do not appear as rare exceptions but as the norm. We need to identify outliers and norms for each sector of education, especially on such hot-button issues as administrators’ salaries.

Third, the amount of money spent by the for-profits on marketing and lobbying state and federal officials is enormous. The University of Phoenix alone spent $170 million on marketing last year. Nonprofit higher education has always been reluctant to use scarce funds in this way, trusting that prospective students, their families, and legislators will understand the importance to the functioning of American democracy of colleges that foster general education.

Fourth, the for-profits’ assault on the basic premises of higher education has found a receptive audience. The television ads by Kaplan University, in particular, suggest that higher education need not be concerned with the accumulated knowledge of the past, that proven formats of class participation, hands-on science laboratories, and term papers are worthless, that students should expect their colleges to allow them to study only what they want and when they want to, and that residential colleges are frivolous and for only the wealthy. Nonprofit colleges have a special obligation to expose these sensationalist messages as cynical attempts to increase profits by misrepresenting the truth.

Fifth, the for-profits have turned an important debate about educational effectiveness into a partisan mandate on the free market. In the stereotypes, Republicans favor for-profits because they exemplify American entrepreneurship, while Democrats are wedded to elitist, hidebound institutions. This polarized caricature prevents serious discussion of real issues and ignores the history of nonprofit, independent higher education—which is the story of idealistic and committed individuals who created colleges on the American frontier (and later) so that Americans could learn what they needed in order to create a prosperous and just society. The nonprofit sector continues to champion the innovative and market-oriented approach of the early days of higher education and we acknowledge our gratitude to the far-sightedness of those wealthy and dedicated individuals who used their capital to create institutions to serve the common good—without any desire or expectation of profits for themselves.

Contrast for-profit institutions with the distinctive features of nonprofit liberal arts colleges—low student/faculty ratios; courses taught by full-time faculty members who take advising and mentoring seriously; largely residential campuses with facilities that encourage civic responsibility, engaging academic and co-curricular programs, and a commitment to teaching civic values, ethics, and leadership development. These features have been shown repeatedly to produce graduates with the skills and aptitudes that employers most want—including the ability to solve problems, write clearly, think analytically, and synthesize information from disparate sources.

Good management should always seek a balanced budget. The uses of surpluses to maintain facilities, pay faculty well, and keep the net price to students as low as possible are the hallmarks of almost all nonprofit colleges and of very few for-profit colleges.

We could easily emulate the formula of the for-profits’ success. To follow it, however, would surely draw the country into a race to the bottom in the rankings of the world’s producers of college graduates with a high-quality education. Meanwhile, students would learn the hard way that they were lured by misleading advertisements and unscrupulous recruiters to give their savings to a company for which profit is everything rather than investing in education from an institution with a strong track record of helping students achieve personal and professional success.

There are several ways to reach CIC. Let us hear from you.
Phone: (202) 466-7230
Fax: (202) 466-7238
Email: cic@cic.nche.edu
Website
CIC’s website—www.cic.edu—is a rich resource of information. Visit the site for news about CIC conferences and programs, to download CIC publications, and for links to CIC member colleges and universities.
Listservs
Through listservs, CIC links a national network of people who lead and staff private colleges and universities. The service is free, and the listservs are reserved exclusively for CIC member institutions.
To join the discussion groups, send your request for a specific list via email to cic@cic.nche.edu. Make sure to include your name, title, and institution. If your request is approved, your name will be added to the appropriate listserv. You will receive an email confirmation.
PRESIDENTS (cicpres-list@cic.edu): Open only to current presidents of CIC member institutions.
CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS (cicdean-list@cic.edu): Open to chief academic officers, provosts and those with similar rank at CIC member institutions.
STUDENT AFFAIRS (cicstuaff-list@cic.edu): Open to student affairs officers and staff at CIC member institutions.
PUBLIC RELATIONS (cipr-list@cic.edu): Open to public relations officers and staff at CIC member institutions.
ADVANCEMENT (cicadvancement-list@cic.edu): Open to development officers and staff at CIC member institutions.
FINANCE (cicfinance-list@cic.edu): Open to business and financial officers at CIC member institutions.
SPOUSES (cicspouse-list@cic.edu): Open to spouses of sitting presidents of CIC member institutions.
TECHNOLOGY (cicnet-list@cic.edu): Open to those at CIC campuses interested in discussing issues of information technology.
DEPARTMENT CHAIRS (cicchair-list@cic.edu): Open to department and division chairs from CIC member institutions.
DATA (cicdata-list@cic.edu): Open to those at CIC member institutions interested in discussing issues of data and institutional research.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 3–4</td>
<td>New Presidents Program</td>
<td>Palm Springs, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 4–7</td>
<td>Presidents Institute</td>
<td>Palm Springs, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7</td>
<td>CIC/Aspen/Wye Seminar on Leadership</td>
<td>Palm Springs, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10–12</td>
<td>Information Fluency Workshop (Literature)</td>
<td>New Orleans, LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3–5</td>
<td>Information Fluency Workshop (History)</td>
<td>San Antonio, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 10–12</td>
<td>Network for Vocation in Undergraduate Education Conference</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 29</td>
<td>Symposium on the Future of the Humanities</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 30–April 1</td>
<td>Academia @ Apple Meeting</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 31–April 2</td>
<td>Conference on Teaching World Languages</td>
<td>Little Rock, AR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 7–9</td>
<td>Division and Department Chair Workshop</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 17–19</td>
<td>Division and Department Chair Workshop</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24–26</td>
<td>Division and Department Chair Workshop</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8–10</td>
<td>Division and Department Chair Workshop</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12–15</td>
<td>CIC/Gilder Lehrman American History Seminar</td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19–24</td>
<td>Teaching Pre-modern European Art in Context Seminar</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 30–July 1</td>
<td>College Media Conference</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 10–13</td>
<td>Presidential Vocation and Institutional Mission Seminar</td>
<td>Napa, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17–19</td>
<td>Walmart College Success Awards Conference</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>