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This report of the Institutional Reaearch Committee is the second to be presented to the faculty and administration, and such reports will most likely become an annual inquiry into the condition of Lindenwood College. The first report, presented in November, 1966 at Pere Marquette Park in Illinois, entailed an enormous amount of work on the part of many members of the faculty and administration, because such a survey of our institution had never before been undertaken. The main problems consisted of deciding on what data to collect, who would collect the data, and the interpretation of the data after it was collected.

The first report was the forerunner of many changes in policy. It involved admissions, academic standards, geographical recruitment, student retention, tuition, faculty salaries, and a new calendar. The adoption of a 4-1-4 calendar creates difficulties in comparing data before and after the change. An increase in the knowledge of factors affecting our institution, the ever increasing rapidity of change in our society, and the availability of data regarding the academic community make imperative more and more statistical studies. In addition to updating the material gathered for 1966 1967, we have additionally for 1967-1968, the "ACE Sumary of Data on Entering Freshmen,", and anticipate an "attitudinal study" of students on the campus, as well as "a survey of conditions in the dormitories."

With the addition of an IBM 1620 Data Processing System to the facilities of our mathematics department, we now have the tools to record the data necessary for further research. Unfortunately we do not have enough money
for the disc-packs so necessary on which to record the data, Plans for the future would seen to indicate the need for a Director of Research whenever finances will perait.

This report attempes to bring our dats up to date for the year 1967-1506 and focuses on (I) the Students, (II) the Acadenic Program, (III) the Faculty, and (IV) Finances.

## I. STUDENTS

## A. Size of Class and Rank of Entering Freshmen 1957-1967

|  | Size of | st | nd | First | rd | th |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Class | 1 Qtr. | 2 Otr . | Half | 3 Qtr. | 4 Qtr. | Not Ranked |
| 57-58 | 221 | 56\% | 26\% | 82\% | 14\% | 4\% |  |
| 58-59 | 221 | 50\% | 37\% | 87\% | 9\% | 4\% |  |
| 59-60 | 250 | 60\% | 2.9\% | 89\% | 9\% | 2\% |  |
| 60-61 | 260 | 58\% | 30\% | 88\% | 10\% | 2\% |  |
| 61-62 | 264 | 55\% | $31 \%$ | 86\% | 11\% | 3\% |  |
| 62-63 | 240 | 51\% | 36\% | 87\% | 10\% | 3\% |  |
| 63-64 | 234 | 50\% | 31\% | 81\% | 14\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| 64-65 | 324 | 39\% | 23\% | 67\% | 17\% | 14\% | 7\% |
| 65-66 | 338 | 40\% | 32\% | 72\% | 19\% | 5\% | 4\% |
| 66-67 | 276 | 37\% | 30\% | 67\% | 18\% | 7\% | 8\% |
| 67-68 | 164 | 61\% | 27\% | 88\% | 7\% | 3\% | 2\% |

1. The size of the freshman class has declined from 324 to 164 since 1964-1965 or approximately fifty per cent.
2. The percentage of students in the upper half of their high school graduating class in 1967 is approximately what it was from 1958 through 1963.

## B. Size of All College Classes 1957-1967 <br> (First Semester)

| First- <br> time <br> Yreshmen <br> 221 | All <br> Freshmen | Sopho- <br> more | Junior <br> $57-58$ | Un- <br> Senior | Seniorsasas <br> classified | cant of all <br> Freshmen |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $58-59$ | $2 ? 1$ | 277 | 106 | 70 | 57 | 11 |

1. Beginning in 1964 the increase in all Freshmen over First-time Freshmen widens significantly.
2. The 1959 freshman class (89) per cent in first half) had a 35 per cent retention.
3. The 1963 freshman class had 46 per cent retention.
4. Percentage of change shows a variation of 91 per cent in retention ( $24 \%$ to $46 \%$ ) of the different classes.
5. Comparison of All Freshmen and Seniors leaves out the unclassified.

## C. Students Enrolled and Graduates

 1919-1967| Students Enrolled <br> $1919-1964$ | Graduates <br> $1922-1968$ | Graduates as <br> a per cent of <br> Enrollment |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10,288 | 2,219 | 21.7 |

1. 1919 was the year Lindenwood became a four year college.
2. Per cent graduation indicates difficulty of moving from the position of being a Junior College.

## D. College Entrance Examination Board Scores 1963.-1967

| VERBAL: | $1963-1964$ | $1964-1965$ | $1965-1966$ | $1966-1967$ | $1967-1968$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | High 736 | 753 | 756 | 570 | 785 |  |
|  | Mean 476 | 467 | 481 | 463 | 521 |  |
|  | Low | 301 | 271 | 251 | 270 | 367 |
| MATH: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | High 753 | 784 | 756 | 704 | 749 |  |
|  | Mean 458 | 447 | 466 | 458 | 502 |  |
|  | Low 204 | 216 | 240 | 267 | 329 |  |

1. Increase in Mean Verbal Score of 58 points this year.
2. Increase in Mean Mathematics Score of 44 points this year.

## E. Size of Senior High School Classes of Entering Freshmen 1962-1967 Number of Students

Si:e of High School Class
1902-1966 1967
1 - 48
111
10

50 - 29 180 16

## 100 - 145 122

16
150 - $198 \quad 91 \quad 7$
$300-349105$
14
250 - 990 is
$300-342104$
气
$350-399 \quad 108 \quad 2 ?$
$400-449$ ह? 13
$450-409750$
$500-545 \quad 60 \quad 4$
550 - 558 50 10
$500-64550 \quad 5$
650 - 659 26 3
700 - 742 ?
750 - 799 20 1
800 ~ $04916 \quad 0$
$350-299 \quad 1$
900 - 29511
$1000-1029 \quad 1$
1100 - 1195 Total $\frac{6}{1371} \frac{1}{161 *}$

* Total does not coincide with Table B but this does not affect conclusions

1. 1962-1566 Mean $=315 \quad$ Median $=285$
?. $1967 \quad$ Mean $=3^{2} 4 \quad$ Median $=300$

| Average Grade | Lindenwood | 4 yr. Colleges National Norms |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in High School | Percentage | Male | Female | Total |
| A or At | 8.0 | 4.0 | 7.7 | 5.8 |
| A- | 6.0 | 7.6 | 13.4 | 10.4 |
| B+ | 28.2 | 16.0 | 24.0 | 19.8 |
| B | 27.0 | 22.4 | 27.3 | 24.8 |
| B- | 13.5 | 17.3 | 12.9 | 15.2 |
| C+ | 9.2 | 18.0 | 9.3 | 13.8 |
| C | 6.1 | 13.9 | 5.2 | 9.7 |
| D | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.1 | 0.5 |

1. Lindenwood falls below National Norms in A- students.
2. 68.7 per cent receive grade of "B." This could be inflected in such a large percentage of " $B$ " grades at Lindenwood.

| Class | Number | B.A. DEGREE |  | B.S. DEGREE |  | B.M. and <br> B.M.E. DEGREE |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number | Per Cent | Number | Per Cent | Number | Per Cent |
| 1949-1958* | 387 | 227 | 58 | 131 | 34 | 29 | 7 |
| 1959 | 65 | 34 | 52 | 27 | 42 | 4 | 6 |
| 1960 | 64 | 40 | 63 | 19 | 30 | 5 | 7 |
| 1961 | 58 | 36 | 62 | 22 | 38 | 0 |  |
| 1962 | 75 | 37 | 49 | 38 | 51 | 0 |  |
| 1963 | 105 | 54 | 51 | 44 | 42 | 7 | 7 |
| 1964 | 106 | 63 | 59 | 37 | 35 | 6 | 6 |
| 1965 | 91 | 45 | 49 | 42 | 46 | 4 | 4 |
| 1966 | 87 | 54 | 62 | 32 | 36 | 1 | 1 |
| 1967 | 125 | 76 | 60 | 47 | 37 | 2 | 1 |

1. B.S., B.M. and B.M.E. Degrees will gradually be phased out.

## H. ACE Summary of Probable Major Field of Study for Entering Freshmen

| Lindenwood College For Women | Total 4 yr . Colleges National Norms (Percentages) Male Female Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agriculture (incl Forestry) | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0.9 |
| Biological Sciences | 3.1 | 5.2 | 3.8 | 4.5 |
| Business | 4.3 | 17.8 | 5.6 | 11.9 |
| Education | 15.4 | 5.9 | 20.7 | 13.1 |
| Engineering | 0.6 | 13.7 | 0.2 | 7.1 |
| English | 10.5 | 2.4 | 8.6 | 6.4 |
| Health Professions (Non-M.D.) | 6.8 | 1.0 | 6.1 | 3.5 |
| History, Political Science | 9.3 | 9.2 | 6.8 | 8.0 |
| Humanities (Other) | 11.1 | 3.6 | 8.7 | 6.0 |
| Fine Arts | 14.2 | 6.3 | 11.2 | 8.7 |
| Mathematics or Statistics | 4.9 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Physical Sciences | 0.0 | 5.5 | 1.4 | 3.5 |
| Pre-Professional | 3.7 | 10.3 | 1.9 | 6.2 |
| Psychol. Sociol, Anthropol | 13.0 | 6.4 | 12.8 | 9.5 |
| Other Fields (Technical) | 0.6 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 1.7 |
| Other Fields (Nontechnical) | 1.2 | 0.5 | 3.6 | 2.0 |
| Undecided | 1.2 | 1.9 | 1. 6 | 1.8 |

## I. ACE Summary of Probable Career Occupations for Entering Freshmen

| Lindenwood College | Total 4 yr Colleges National Norms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| For Women | (Percentages) | Male | Female | Total |
| Artist | 9.4 | 4.0 | 7.8 | 5.8 |
| Businessman | 4.4 | 17.3 | 2.1 | 9.9 |
| Clergyman | 0.0 | 2.8 | 0.4 | 1.6 |
| College Teacher | 1.3 | 1.9 | 1.1 | 1.5 |
| Doctor (M.D. or D.C.S.) | 0.6 | 6.9 | 1.4 | 4.3 |
| Educator (Secondary) | 15.0 | 14.9 | 23.7 | 19.2 |
| Elementary Teacher | 14.4 | 1.1 | 21.8 | 11.1 |
| Engineer | 0.6 | 12.7 | 0.2 | 6.6 |
| Farmer or Forestor | 0.0 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.8 |
| Health Professional (Non-M.D.) | 5.0 | 2.0 | 5.2 | 3.5 |
| Lawyer | 1.9 | 6.3 | 0.6 | 3.5 |
| Nurse | 2.5 | 0.0 | 2.6 | 1.3 |
| Research Scientist | 0.0 | 4.5 | 1.8 | 3.2 |
| Other Choice | 26.3 | 13.6 | 22.0 | 17.2 |
| Undecided | 18.8 | 10.6 | 10.2 | 10.4 |

## J. ACE Summary of Major Influences in Deciding to Attend Lindenwood

| Lindenwood College <br> For Women | Total 4 yr Colleges National Norms |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Percentages) | ) Male | Female | Total |
| Parent or other Relative | 55.8 | 42.7 | 47.1 | 44.8 |
| H.S. Teacher or Counselor | 21.5 | 23.9 | 22.3 | 23.1 |
| Friends attending this College | 8.0 | 15.0 | 16.9 | 15.9 |
| Grad or other Coll ege Reprsntv. | 27.0 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 16.1 |
| Counseling or Placement Service | 4.9 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 3.9 |
| Athletic program of the College | 4.9 | 10.6 | 2.7 | 6.8 |
| Other Extracurricular Activities | 4.3 | 5.2 | 5.0 | 5.1 |
| Social life of the College | 5.5 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.7 |
| Chance to live away from home | 24.5 | 15.8 | 22.0 | 18.8 |
| Low cost | 3.7 | 16.2 | 16.4 | 16.3 |
| Academic reputation of the Colleg | ge 63.2 | 50.4 | 56.4. | 53.3 |
| Most students are like me | 11.0 | 9.4 | 12.4 | 10.9 |
| Religious Affiliation | 6.7 | 14.0 | 19.5 | 16.7 |

## K. ACE Summary of Students Estimate Chances are Very Good that They Will:

| Lindenwood College | Total4 y Colleges National Norms <br> For Women |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (Percentages) | Male | Female | Total |  |
| Get Married while in College | 7.4 | 6.1 | 7.6 | 6.8 |
| Marry within a year after College | 30.7 | 20.2 | 27.7 | 23.8 |
| Obtain Average Grd of A- or Higher | 3.7 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Change Major Field | 21.5 | 17.5 | 19.2 | 18.4 |
| Change Career Choice | 22.1 | 18.9 | 19.8 | 19.3 |
| Fail one or more Courses | 2.5 | 3.7 | 2.4 | 3.1 |
| Graduate with Honors | 3.7 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 3.6 |
| Be elected to a Student Office | 3.7 | 3.1 | 2.4 | 2.7 |
| Join Social Frat or Sorority | 43.6 | 32.7 | 36.3 | 34.5 |
| Author a Published Article | 11.7 | 6.6 | 7.0 | 6.8 |
| Be elected to an Honor Society | 5.5 | 3.1 | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Participate in Demonstrations | 4.9 | 5.7 | 4.8 | 5.3 |
| Drop Out Temporarily | 3.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 |
| Drop Out Permanently | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 0.6 |
| Transfer to another College | 34.4 | 12.4 | 13.1 | 12.7 |

## L. Church Preference of Students of Lindenwood College 1065-1560

| Denomination N | 1205-1565 |  | 1:06-1067 |  | 1967-1963 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Per Cent | Number | Per Cent | Number | Per Cent: |
| Presbyterian | 7.36 | 30.33 | 223 | 29.82 | 172 | 26.33 |
| Methodist | 100 | 12.85 | 1?? | 1.6 .11 | 97 | 15.13 |
| Episcopal | 108 | 13.88 | 106 | 14.00 | 74 | 11.54 |
| Cathol.ic | $7 ?$ | 2.25 | 3 ? | 10.83 | 63 | 9.83 |
| Lutheran | 51 | 5.55 | 41 | 5.41 | 44 | 6.26 |
| Baptist | 50 | 5.42 | 41 | 5.41 | 44 | 6.86 |
| Disciples of Christ | st ${ }^{\circ}$ | 3.34 | $3 ?$ | 4.?? | 31 | 4.04 |
| Jewish | 21 | 2. 59 | 2.3 | 3.03 | 1.5 | ?. 34 |
| Miscellaneous | 60 | 10.26 | 14 | 1.84 | 77 | 12.01 |
| No church listed | 34 | 4.37 | $6 ?$ | 0.18 | 24 | 3.74 |
| Total | 778 | 02.86 | 757 | 99.94 | 641 | 29.90 |

1. Interest has been high in this category but it seems to indicate only that people with many different beliefs attend Lindenwood.

## M. Church Preference of Day Students Fall Term 1967-1968

| Denomination | Number of <br> Day Students | Per cent of <br> Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Catholic | 28 | 22.8 |
| Presbyterian | 18 | 14.6 |
| Baptist | 16 | 13.0 |
| Latheran | 16 | 13.0 |
| Methodist | 13 | 10.6 |
| United Church of Christ | 10 | 8.1 |
| Disciples of Christ | 7 | 5.7 |
| Episcopal | 4 | 3.3 |
| Christian Science | 1 | .8 |
| Church of God | 1 | .8 |
| Ethical Society | 5 | .8 |
| No Church Listed | 123 | 6.5 |
| Total |  | 100.0 |

## N. Number of Freshmen by Selected States

1967-1968

| Rank | State | Number of Freshmen |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. | Missouri | 40 |
| 2. | Illinois | 19 |
| 3. | Arkansas | 16 |
| 4. | Oklahoma | 16 |
| 5. | Texas | 15 |
| 6. | Nebraska | 8 |
| 7. | New Jersey | 7 |
| 8. | Colorado | 6 |
| 9. | Indiana | 6 |
| 10. | Ohio | 5 |
| 11. | New York | 2 |

1. The number of students from other states are not large enough to warrant inclusion in this table.

## 0. Number of Students by Selected States

| Rank $1966-1967$ | State | Nunber of Students | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rank } \\ & \text { 1967-1968 } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Missouri | 215 | 1 |
| 2. | Illinois | 81 | 2 |
| 3. | Texas | 37 | 3 |
| 4. | New Jersey | 26 | 6 |
| 5. | New York | 22 | 7 |
| 6. | Arkansas | 27 | 5 |
| 7. | Oklahoma | 28 | 4 |
| 8. | Indiana | 18 | 8 |
| 9. | Iowa | 15 | 10 |
| 10. | Kansas | 11 | 14 |
| 11. | Ohio | 15 | 11 |
| 12. | Kentucky | 11 | 15 |
| 13. | Pennsylvania | 16 | 9 |
| 14. | Massachusetts | 9 | 16 |
| 15. | Virginia | 13 | 13 |
| 16. | Nebraska | 14 | 12 |
| 17. | Wisconsin | 9 | 17 |
| 18. | Michigan | 6 | 18 |
| 19. | Tennessee | 4 | 19 |

1. The number of students from other states is not large enough to warrant inclusion.
P. ALPHA LAMBDA DELTA STUDENTS WHO DROPPED OUT AND THOSE WHO STAYED TO GRADUATE 1949 - 1967

Q. Summary
2. The freshman class will probably decline in number again next year.
3. Illinois will furnish us with fewer students because
(a) an increased number of junior colleges
(b) a state scholarship program which grants aid to resident students.
4. Junior colleges in various states will probably cause a decline in our enrollment.
5. The quality of our freshman class is now about what it was for five years beginning in 1958.
6. The average increase in the C.E.E.B. scores over the last year was approximately 51 points.
7. Table I B indicates a wide variation in retention and from the statistics it is difficult to determine the cause.
8. Table I C points up our continued operation as a Junior College.
9. The size of high school classes from which we draw our students varied only slightly from the established pattern in 1967.
C. Church preference simply indicates the wide variation in the student preferences.
10. The pattern of admission by states showed little variation in 1967.
11. The increase in entrance requirements has not only reduced the size of next year's freshman class, but has also reduced the number of applications
12. While enrollment is up 3 or 4 per cent in the public colleges and universities, enrollment is down in private colleges and off 13 per cent in women's private colleges.
13. A large percentage of our freshmen indicate a desire for an advanced degree.
14. Freshmen tended to regard the academic reputation of the college rather highly, but the social life is not so highly esteemed.
15. The number of freshmen who indicated they wlll drop out or transfer is approximately 40 per cent as shown by the iCE report. However, a survey by the Dean of Jomen indicated that as of February 6, 1968 about 16 per cent are not returning and 19 per cent are undecided.
16. The assumption that a good academic program at Lindenwood will retain students needs further study.
17. The data presented show a very complex situation and solutions to problems will not be easy.
II. ACADEMIC PROGRAM

| Class Size | Numbe | of Classes | Per cent of Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-4 |  | 24 | 12.7 |
| 5-9 |  | 39 | 20.6 |
| 10-14 |  | 44 | 23.3 |
| 15-19 |  | 27 | 14.3 |
| 20-24 |  | 20 | 10.6 |
| 25-99 |  | 12 | 6.3 |
| 30-34 |  | 8 | 4.2 |
| 35-39 |  | 5 | 2.6 |
| 40-44 |  | 5 | 2.6 |
| 45-49 |  | 3 | 1.6 |
| 50 or over |  | 2 | 1.0 |
|  | Total | 189 | 99.8 |

1. Class sizes are not comparable to 1966-1967 because of a change to the 4-1-4 schedule.
2. Range 1 to 73
3. Not included in the above data are 26 students enrolled in Independent Study and students enrolled in Applied Music.
4. The mean size of classes is 16 .
5. The median size of classes is 13.6 .
6. Whether we have large classes depends upon the definition. If 40 is deemed to be large then we have 10 classes 40 or over which amounts to 5.2 per cent of the total.
7. The faculty-student ratio is approximately 1 to 10.4 (59 full-time faculty and 8 part-time faculty with 655 equated full-time students).
8. A reduction in the number of classes to 4 per term and the elimination of several 1 and 2 hour courses has reduced the number of courses still further.
9. Because a course is now approximately 3.5 hours instead of 3.0 hours this amounts to a percentage reduction of $162 / 3$ per cent.
10. The faculty-student ratio indicates that for the sake of accuracy further reduction is probably necessary.
11. The amount of work involved in the Freshman Common Course is very heavy and to equate this course with others makes the statistics rather misleading.

## B. Size of the Classes of Instruction - Interim Term (January 1968)

Class Size Number of Classes Per cent of Total

| $1-4$ | 8 | 17.8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $5-9$ | 9 | 20.0 |
| $10-14$ | 9 | 20.0 |
| $15-19$ | 8 | 17.8 |
| $20-24$ | 5 | 11.1 |
| $75-99$ | 1 | $2 . ?$ |
| $30-34$ | 1 | $2 . ?$ |
| $35-39$ | 0 | 0.0 |
| $40-44$ | 1 | $? ?$ |
| $45-49$ | 1 | $2 ?$ |
| 50 and over | Total $\frac{?}{45}$ | 4.4 |
|  |  | 99.9 |

1. Does not include 43 students doing independent study and students enrolled in Applied Music and students who dropped out during the Interim Terin.
?. The mean size of classes is 15.6
2. The nedian sie of classes is 13.0
3. Range ? to 60
4. 6 Per cent of classes over 40 students
5. If half of the classes (?2) are added to the total for the first term (189), this would make a total of ?.11 to compare with the first semester total of 283 in 1966-1.967
6. Reducing 283 classes last year by $162 / 3$ per cent or 47 classes would leave 236 classes with which to compare 211 classes this year (approximately a 10 per cent reduction)

C Summary

1. Some progress has been made in reducing the number of courses taught, but further action seems necessary.
?. A reduction in the size of some large classes has been accomplished and the load in instruction is more equitably distributed, but further action would be desirable.
2. The number of small classes is still too large.
3. A study of grade distribution is a future project, as well as an analysis of the Interim term, and choices as to divisions and areas of concentration.
A. Degrees of Full-Time Faculty 1967-1968

| Professors |  | Per Cent |
| ---: | :--- | :---: |
| Ph.D. | 14 | 82.4 |
| M. A. | $3(3)$ | 17.6 |
| B. A. | 0 | 0.0 |

## Associate Professors

Ph.D.
5
31.2
M. A.
11(10)
68.8
B. A.
0
0.0

## Assistant Professors

Ph.D.
M. A.
B. A.

Instructors
Ph.D.
M. A.
B. A.

Degree
Ph.D.
M. A.
B. A.
12.5
75.0
12.5

2(1)

0
0.0
70.0
30.0

Per Cent of Total
35.6
55.9
8.5
( ) Indicates additional work

|  | Professors |  | Associate Professors |  | Assistant Professors |  | Instructors |  | Visiting |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Full-Time | Part-Time | Full-Time | Part-Time | Full-Time | Part-Time | Full-Time | Part-Time | Lect. |
| 1956-1957 | 18 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 |
| 1959-1960 | 20 | 1 | 16 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 0 |
| 1963-1964 | 20 | 1 | 17 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 0 |
| 1966-1967 | 18 | 3 | 16 | 0 | 17 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 1 |
| 1967-1968 | 17 | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 0 |

## C. Full-Time Faculty Turnover by Highest Degree and Rank



| Age | Professors | Associate Professors | Assiscanc Professors | Instructor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 66-70 | 2 |  |  |  |
| 61-65 | 4 | 1 |  |  |
| 56-60 | 3 | 3 |  |  |
| 51-55 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |
| 46-50 | 3 | 3 | 2 |  |
| 41-45 | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| 36-40 | 1 | 3 | 3 |  |
| 31-35 |  | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 26-30 |  |  | 5 | 7 |
| 21-25 |  |  | 1 | 1 |

[^0]
## E. Average Faculty Compensation of Selected Colleges 1966-1967

| Mt. Holyoke | $\$ 12,819$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Sarah Lawrence | 12,379 |
| Goucher | 11,506 |
| Scripps | 11,701 |
| Bennington | 10,785 |
| Mills | 11,845 |
| Chatham | 11,215 |
| Wilson | 10,815 |
| MacMurray | 11,090 |
| Pitzer | 10,737 |
| Wells | 10,524 |
| Westminister | $10,08 ?$ |
| Lindenwood | 9,908 |
| Hood | 9,495 |
| Brury | 9,073 |

1. A.A.U.P. statistics for all colleges will not be available until March 1968.
2. Lindenwood average compensation increased \$1149.

## F. Compensation of Faculty by Rank 1967-1968

| Academic Rank | Maximum <br> Compensation | Average <br> Compensation | Minimum <br> Compensation |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Professor | $\$ 16,096$ | $\$ 14,281$ | (C) | $\$ 11,896$ (C) |  |
| Associate Professor | 13,471 | 11,406 | (C) | 9,061 | (C) |
| Assistant Professor | 10,346 | 9,259 | (B) | 7,906 (B) |  |
| Instructor | 9,346 | 7,893 | (B) | 7,276 (AA) |  |


| Range | Professors | Associate Professors | Assistant Professors | Instructors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15,000-16,000 | 4 |  |  |  |
| 14,500-14,999 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 14,000-14,499 |  |  |  |  |
| 13,500-13,999 |  |  |  |  |
| 13,000-13,499 | 5 |  |  |  |
| 12,500-12,999 | 3 | 2 |  |  |
| 12,000-12,499 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 11,500-11,999 | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| 11,000-11,499 | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| 10,500-10,999 |  | 2 |  |  |
| 10,000-10,499 |  | 5 | 1 |  |
| 9,500-9,999 |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| 9,000-9,499 |  |  | 4 | 1 |
| $8,500-8,999$ |  |  | 7 |  |
| $8,000-8,499$ |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 7,500-7,999 |  |  |  | 5 |
| 7,000-7,499 |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| $6,500-6,999$ |  |  |  | 2 |

## H. Summary

1. The number of Ph . Ds is only 35.6 per cent. Percentage may be depleted more next year.
2. The number of part-time faculty has declined since last year.
3. The largest turnover occurred in the Assistant Professor category in 1966-1967.
4. The distribution of the faculty by age seems normal.
5. The average compensation of the faculty made a good gain in 1967-1968.
IV. FINANCES
A. Tuition and Fees of Selected Colleges

| College | 1959-1960 | 1966-1967 | 1967-1968 | Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bennington | \$ 2650 | \$ 3850 | \$ 3850 | \$ 0 |
| Mt. Holyoke | 2250 | 3050 | 3050 | 0 |
| Mills | 1900 | 2985 | 2985 | 0 |
| Wells | 2150 | 2900 | 3135 | 135 |
| Beaver | 1850 | 2832 | 2872 | 50 |
| Goucher | 2075 | 2750 | 3013 | 263 |
| Scripps | 1800 | 2700 | 2900 | 200 |
| Chatham | 1950 | 2690 | 2950 | 260 |
| Pitzer | Not founded | 2650 | 3025 | 375 |
| Wilson | 2000 | 2600 | 2900 | 300 |
| MacMurray | 1520 | 2595 | 2595 | 0 |
| Hood | N.A. | 2500 | 2748 | 248 |
| Lindenwood | 1580 | 2485 | 2535 | 50 |
| 1. Tuitions and fees increase to $\$ 2950$ for freshmen in the fall of 1968 , an increase of $\$ 415$ for Lindenwood. |  |  |  |  |

## B. Student Aid* 1963 - 1968

| Year | Student Aid |
| :---: | :---: |
| $1963-1964$ | $\$ 129,702$ |
| $1964-1965$ | 161,080 |
| $1965-1966$ | 194,541 |
| $1966-1967$ | 212,022 |
| $1967-1968$ | 191,485 |

* Includes scholarships, grants, student employment, and student loans


## C. Total Student Aid 1966 - 1968

| Type of aid | $1966-1967$ | Year |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| National Defense Student Loans | $\$ 23,050$ | $\$ 24,235$ |
| Educational Opportunity Grants | 12,135 | 19,300 |
| Guaranteed bank loans | N, A. | 20,125 |
| Aid Awards | 212,022 | 191,485 |

D. Summary of Occupations of Parents 1966-1967
Professional \& Semi-Professional. ..... 227
52 Physician and Surgeon )
37 Engineer ..... )
35 Lawyer ) Five highest
26 Teacher ..... )
26 Government ..... )
Business \& Industry ..... 311
84 Executive - owner ..... )
49 Manager ..... )
44 Sales ..... )
22 Contractor and ) Five highest construction
20 Inves tment ..... )
Business Fields - not defined ..... 43
White \& Blue Collar ..... 39
Farmer \& Rancher ..... 29
Retired ..... 6
Deceased or No Occupation Indicated ..... 38
Mothers Working ..... 165
44 Teacher
Two highest
35 Secretary )
Medicine ..... 17
Engineering ..... 9
Goverament ..... 6
Teaching ..... 11
Law ..... 6
Executive-Owners \& Self-employed ..... 20
Managers ..... 22
Sales ..... 14
Contractors. ..... 3
Investment \& Bankers ..... 5
Miscellaneous:
CPA. ..... 2
Printer ..... 1
Research. ..... 1
Insurance ..... 1
Foreman ..... 1
Farmer. ..... 6
Office. ..... 2
Foundry Sup. ..... 1
Pipe Fitter ..... 1
Yardmaster ..... 1
Real Estate. ..... 1
Architect. ..... 1
Geologist. ..... 2
Minister ..... 1
Laborer ..... 2
Electrician. ..... 1.
Fisherman ..... 1
Air Traffic. ..... 1

## F. Estimated Parental Income



## Income

| Educational and General | Per Cent of Total |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Tuition and fees | $\$ 1,058,000.00$ | $44.8 \%$ |
| Endowment income | $343,100.00$ | $14.5 \%$ |
| Gifts and grants | $165,677.00$ | $7.0 \%$ |
| Auxiliary enterprises | $\frac{792,625.00}{}$ | Total Income$\$ \$ 2,359,402.00$ |

## Expenses

Instructional, library, staff benefits, etc. $\$ 886,766.00$ ..... $37.7 \%$
General administration, student services $224,321.00$ ..... $9.5 \%$
General institutional $242,609.00$ ..... $10.3 \%$
Contingency fund $30,000.00$ ..... $1.3 \%$
Operation and maintenance of physical plant $319,170.00$ ..... $13.6 \%$
Auxiliary enterprises $474,720.00$ ..... $20.1 \%$
Student aid $176,435.00$ ..... $7.5 \%$
H. Operating Budget - June 16, 1967 - June 15, 1968

## Income

Educational and General Per Cent of Total
Tuition and fees \$ 862,500.00 ..... 40.5
Endowment income 390,675.00 ..... 18.0\%
Gifts and grants 232,410.00 ..... $11.0 \%$
Auxiliary enterprises $628,250.00$$29.5 \%$Total Income $\$ 2,134,835.00$$100.0 \%$
Expenses
Instructional, library, staff benefits, $\$ 862,527.00$ ..... $38.0 \%$
General administration, student services 280,531.00 ..... 12.5\%
General institutional 256,057.00 ..... 11.4\%
Operation and maintenance of physical plant $282,956.00$ ..... $12.5 \%$
Auxiliary enterprises $414,790.00$ ..... 18.3\%
Student aid 165,000.00 ..... 7.3\%
Total Expense $\$ 2,261,861.00$ ..... $100.0 \%$

## I. Summary

1. Tuition increases are necessary to operate a private college in a period of growing inflation. Inflation rapidly reduced the purchasing power of private endowment.
2. With parents in an income range such as those we service, demand tends to be inelastic up to a certain point and this is indicated in Table IV A.
3. Student Aid has declined with fewer students. There is a tendency to finance education more by loans than by grants in recent years.
4. Incomes of students' parents are to a great extent in the upper brackets and indicates ability to pay. hosh propr it hrh ende.
5. A comparison of budgets between last year and this year is possible. Percentages as well as absolute amounts are important.

[^0]:    Number of full-time faculty - 59

