

LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY

REVIEW

FEBRUARY – MAY 2007

James L. Fisher, Ltd.

Gene A. Budig, former Chancellor, University of Kansas and
former Commissioner of the American Baseball League
George Kidd, Jr., President Emeritus and
Professor of Economics, Tiffin University
James V. Koch, Board of Visitors Professor of Economics and
President Emeritus, Old Dominion University
Scott D. Miller, President, Wesley College
Lynn E. Weaver, President Emeritus and
Professor of Electrical Engineering, Florida Institute of Technology
James L. Fisher, Chair, Review Team
James L. Fisher, Ltd.
May 2007

Table of Contents

Recommendations are numbered and in bold print throughout the text.

Introduction	Chapter I, p.1
Overview	Chapter II, p.4
Academic Programs	Chapter III, p.14
Research	Chapter IV, p.20
Faculty	Chapter V, p.22
Students	Chapter VI, p.27
Budget and Finance	Chapter VII, p.31
Administration and Operation	Chapter VIII, p.34
Technology	Chapter IX, p.36
Institutional Advancement.....	Chapter X, p.38
Governance.....	Chapter XI, p.46
Recommendations	Chapter XII, p.48
Members of the Review Team	Appendix A, p.52
Interviewees.....	Appendix B, p.57
Interview Form.....	Appendix C, p.64
Index of Materials Used in the Review	Appendix D, p.68

I. INTRODUCTION

In February 2007, the Board of Supervisors for the University of Louisiana System contracted with educational consultant Dr. James Fisher to provide an institutional review of Louisiana Tech University (Tech). Dr. Fisher agreed to:

- Identify and appoint a team of persons considered authorities in higher education and experienced in conducting institutional reviews and also to serve as lead reviewer;
- Conduct an objective assessment of the general condition of Louisiana Tech University and identify opportunities for operational improvements; and
- Formulate specific recommendations that address (1) academic programs, (2) technology, (3) faculty, (4) students, (5) administration, (6) budget and finance, (7) intercollegiate athletics and auxiliary services, (8) senior officers, (9) private support and outside grants, (10) public relations, (11) governance, both Board and campus, and (12) other issues and conditions presented during the course of the Review.

The report is as follows:

In February and March of 2007, a team of higher education professionals reviewed the general condition of Tech (Appendix A) by assessing materials and conducting on-site interviews, which were carried out on March 18-21, 2007.

The purpose of the Review was to assess the condition of the University from an objective and uninvested but informed perspective. It was felt that a completely objective assessment would candidly identify and address issues affecting Louisiana Tech University and help establish a tentative agenda for the immediate future.

The Review considered the following in terms of strengths, limitations, and/or aspirations:

- General
- Academic programs
- Faculty
- Students
- Administration
- Technology
- Budget and finance
- Fund-raising
- Public relations
- Senior officers
- Governance
- Other issues and conditions presented during the course of this Review.

Before beginning interviews, team members read and evaluated materials assembled by Tech staff and position papers prepared by the President and the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Finance and Administration, Research and Development, Student Affairs, University Advancement and the Graduate School. All counted, over 300 persons were interviewed including faculty, students, staff, alumni, elected/appointed officials, area residents, local business persons, members of the Board of Supervisors and Board of Regents, potential benefactors, professionals at the regional and national levels, persons selected because of special knowledge, and randomly selected persons (Appendix B). Interviewees were selected based on position, stratified random sample, and random sample. All interviews followed a general format that included 18 separate areas (Appendix C).

Interviewers were to ask about each of the areas and all interviewed were advised that their opinions might be used in the final report but *without* attribution.

Readers should bear in mind that although much of the Review can be documented, much of it is based on the opinions of those persons interviewed. Wherever the opinions of the Review team are expressed, it shall be obvious.

This Review is the exclusive work of James L. Fisher, Ltd., and should not be attributed to individual members of the Review team.

II. OVERVIEW

Louisiana Tech University, founded in 1894, is a high-performing institution that has accomplished much despite its historically modest funding base. Located in Ruston, Louisiana, the University enrolls more than 11,200 students (about 9,600 Full-Time Equivalency), a 16 percent increase since 1998. Its attractive campus is well maintained and contributes to the atmosphere of the University.

Eighty-two percent of the student body is enrolled full-time. Fifty-three percent of the Tech student body is female, slightly below the national average of 57 percent. Almost 18 percent of Tech's students are African-American. Tech's graduate enrollment has increased over the past eight years from 13 to 20 percent and correspondingly the undergraduate enrollment has changed from 87 to 80 percent, which is an appropriate direction of movement for a Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) Four-Year 2 institution.

Louisiana Tech's primary enrollment region is composed of the four northern parishes of Bossier, Caddo, Lincoln, and Ouachita, which contribute nearly 47 percent of its student population. Ten percent of Tech's enrollment is from out-of-state. International students comprise five percent of Tech's enrollment. The additional 38 percent of its enrollment represents students from throughout the entire State. Of the 26,000 students enrolled in public higher education in these four northern parishes, Tech enrolls the largest percentage of all State institutions with 20 percent of that market.

Nine percent of undergraduate students are members of fraternities and sororities. Students told us, "*Being Greek can be important, but it is not the only way to go.*" At least 160 student organizations exist, which afford students many opportunities for interaction and civic engagement.

Louisiana Tech's location in Ruston (population approximately 21,000) places it about 200 miles from the nearest doctoral research institution in Louisiana or in adjacent states. The four primary parishes served by the University had a total population of approximately 540,000 people in 2000, a 4.2 percent increase from 1990 compared to a six percent statewide population increase during the same time period, 1990 to 2000.

One cannot help but be impressed by how many members of the Louisiana Tech community refer to the "*Tech Family*." This terminology and a spirit of unity pervade faculty, staff, and administrators, as well as many students. A number of students talk about the closeness of the campus and the feeling that someone knows and cares about their progress at the University. "*This is an unusual place*," commented a student who transferred to Tech from a flagship university outside of Louisiana. "*The people here really seem to care, and they have gone out of their way to make my experience here a good one.*"

Louisiana Tech is a campus where the faculty, staff, and administrators use the pronoun "we" far more often than the pronouns "I" and "they." There is a general feeling that everyone is a part of the success. Everyone sacrifices, everyone shares resources, and everyone recognizes that limited resources mean that choices have to be made as to the allocation of those resources.

Tech is an institution that is continuously improving. Whether it is rankings by external groups such as *U.S. News and World Report* and *Small Times Magazine* – or by educational agencies such as the Board of Supervisors for the University for Louisiana System, the Southern Regional Education Board, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools – or by the general public and internal constituencies, the observations are the same: Louisiana Tech is an institution of excellence and is considered a model of leadership. Members of the Board of Regents, public officials, and business leaders enthusiastically echoed Tech's exceptional performance and leadership. Perhaps it was best stated by a faculty member who said, "*We are better than we were and are becoming better than we are.*"

Tech was the first university in the University of Louisiana System to phase in admission requirements, having done so in the Fall of 1992. In 2006, its classification changed from an SREB Four-Year 3 university to a Four-Year 2 university. Institutions receiving this classification must award at least 30 doctoral degrees that are distributed among at least five Classification of Institutional Programs (CIP) categories for three consecutive years. Louisiana has three universities with this classification: Louisiana Tech, the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, and the University of New Orleans.

The average American College Testing (ACT) score for the Fall 2006 entering freshman class was 22.7, well above the Louisiana average of 20.1 and the national average of 21.1. *“Tech is a very popular choice for strong students in the region and in Louisiana,”* observed a public school teacher. The University is selective, but not overwhelmingly so. *“This is an institution on the move,”* exclaimed the president of another institution. *“They know what they’re trying to accomplish, and they’ve been very well led.”* *“Their major danger,”* according to a national higher education official, *“is to avoid trying to do too much. As long as they focus their attention, they can continue to achieve good results.”*

Student retention from the freshman to sophomore years has averaged around 73 percent in recent years, placing Tech above the State’s four-year university average of 70 percent and above its former SREB Four-Year 3 peers (70%), yet below its new SREB Four-Year 2 peers (78%). With the help of highly anticipated new State revenue, President Dan Reneau expects that Tech will exceed its SREB Four-Year 2 peers within six years.

Generally, the more academically selective an institution, the better the graduation rate. Compared to other institutions, however, research by The Education Trust has revealed that leadership matters considerably when comparing like institutions to one another. In 2005, Tech was highlighted by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and The Education Trust in their publication *Student Success*

in State Colleges and Universities for successfully retaining and graduating students.

The report highlighted 12 institutions in the country for their best practices in creating an environment and culture that promoted student success. Tech's six-year graduation rate of 52 percent is the second highest in Louisiana behind LSU A&M at 64 percent, and far exceeds Louisiana's average of 41 percent. When comparing the SREB peers to Tech's graduation rate, Tech exceeds both the SREB Four-Year 2 rate (50 percent) and the SREB Four-Year 3 rate (43 percent) and falls only slightly behind the national public four-year graduation rate (53.1 percent). In fact, Tech is well positioned to achieve the University of Louisiana System's goal for its institutions which is to exceed the national graduation rate by the year 2012.

According to the Louisiana Board of Regents, the primary obstacles to access and success (graduation), particularly for low and moderate income students are inadequate academic preparation, insufficient guidance, and unmet financial need. Tech is addressing these obstacles by promoting higher academic achievement, providing guidance for every student, and increasing need-based aid.

Appropriations designated for need-based aid (referred to as Louisiana "GO Grant") are proposed in the Governor's FY 2007-2008 executive budget and, if approved by the Louisiana Legislature, will greatly benefit many students. Currently, 7,730 students receive loans with the average debt of graduates approximating \$16,000. Twenty-eight percent of enrolled undergraduate students receive Pell grants compared to the System average of 46 percent. This reflects the first generation college student background of many Tech students and helps explain how and why Tech has functioned as a vehicle of social and economic mobility for many of its students. The comment of a recent graduate is representative of Tech's impact, "*Without Tech, I don't know what I'd be doing. Now I'm earning a salary quite a bit higher than my parents and am going to get promoted this summer. Tech was a great place for me.*"

Louisiana Tech students have also benefited greatly from the State of Louisiana's Tuition Opportunity Program for Students (TOPS) which provides tuition assistance to

individuals who have taken prescribed college preparatory core courses in high school, achieved better than average academic grades, and have met a minimum ACT score. Fifty-three percent of Tech's freshman class earned the TOPS tuition award in 2006. This is a significant increase from 2003 when 41 percent of the freshman class earned TOPS. The University also provides several hundred tuition waivers to excellent, out-of-state students who score 23 or better on the ACT. Still, there is a need for additional financial assistance for students with financial need.

The five largest industry sectors in Tech's primary service area, which includes the parishes of Bossier, Caddo, Lincoln, and Ouachita, are health care and social assistance (45,500 employed), retail trade (31,000 employed), manufacturing (22,000 employed), educational services (20,500 employed), and accommodation and food services (20,000 employed). In January 2007, the unemployment rate for the four parishes was above the Louisiana unemployment rate of 3.7 percent (Bossier 4.4 percent, Caddo 5.9 percent, Lincoln 4.8 percent, and Ouachita 4.8 percent). The national rate was 4.6 percent. The economic progress of North Louisiana has not been as robust as other regions in part because of the closing of two major businesses in the area – State Farm Insurance Company and Guide Corporation, which is a supplier to General Motors. Nonetheless, Tech's contribution to the health of the region is not underestimated. Along with Grambling State University and the University of Louisiana at Monroe, Tech is *“the best thing we have going for economic development,”* cited a local elected official while another referred to it as a *“beacon.”* A higher education board member told us: *“There is a tremendous need in the region for what Tech does.”*

The University's sterling ability to apply knowledge to regional problems and needs is demonstrated by Professor Henry Cardenas' development of a method of making concrete impermeable to water and Professor Frank Ji's project in developing sensors to test moisture levels in natural gas. Along with a penchant for developing innovative multidisciplinary programs, Tech has evolved as one of the most important economic development influences in North Louisiana. In 2006, the institution's strong commitment to economic development resulted in four patents. So far in 2007, Tech has applied for

11 other patents. According to a regional elected official, “*This is just what the doctor ordered.*” *Washington Monthly Magazine* recognized these efforts by ranking Louisiana Tech second among all universities in Louisiana in terms of its contribution to the nation’s competitiveness.

The keystones to Tech's contributions to regional economic development are its science and engineering programs in addition to its business and health profession offerings. Engineering programs at Tech are highly regarded. *Small Times Magazine* recently rated Tech among the five top institutions nationally in the area of nanotechnology education, surpassing such institutions as the University of California-Berkley, Northwestern University-Chicago, Rutgers University, Rice, and the University of Pennsylvania. Collaterally, Tech has become an expert in transferring knowledge from laboratories to the field. The University generates a rate of return on its investment in research and development that triples the national average. Developments such as the Institute for Micromanufacturing provide ready evidence of this expertise.

Tech’s nationally competitive science and engineering programs are primarily conducted within four campus centers: the Center for Applied Physics Studies, the Center for Biomedical Engineering and Rehabilitation Science, the Trenchless Technology Center, and the Institute for Micromanufacturing. Because these programs attract primarily Caucasian male students, **(1) we recommend that Tech consider utilizing scholarships to attract more women and minorities in the disciplines of science, technology, and math.**

Nationally, many individuals know more about Tech’s prowess in intercollegiate athletics than its academic programs. The Lady Techster basketball team boasts the highest cumulative winning percentage among all Division I women’s teams (.854 entering this past season) and past Lady Techster teams have won three national championships. Famous graduates such as NFL Hall of Fame member Terry Bradshaw, NBA Hall of Fame member Karl Malone, and Baylor’s million dollar women’s basketball coach, Kim Mulkey, symbolize Tech’s traditionally competitive teams. The

University's teams (seven men's and ten women's) compete in the Western Athletic Conference (WAC). The WAC provides top-level competition in a wide variety of sports but also brings with it high levels of expense.

While the reputation of Tech's highly proficient intercollegiate athletic teams is well deserved, this should not deflect attention from its academic programs, where virtually every program, ranging from nursing and engineering to business and education, has obtained the highest available level of disciplinary accreditation. Tech's outstanding faculty deserves congratulations for this achievement in light of the institution's modest public funding.

Tech receives approximately 81 percent of the amount of funding per student as a SREB Four-Year 2 institution. Tech's State appropriation per FTE is approximately \$4,589, about \$1,800 per FTE below its SREB peers. Arguably, some proportion of this reflects below national average income levels in the State of Louisiana, which provides lower levels of funding per student than many other states. If funded at 100 percent of the average of its peers, Tech would increase its budget for FY 2007-2008 by approximately \$12 million. If Tech had received the average funding of its peers in the previous five years, Louisiana would have infused an additional \$48.8 million into Tech's operations which would have had a dynamic economic impact in the area. Governor Kathleen Blanco's proposed executive budget includes an additional \$200 million in higher education funding, of which at least \$50 million will be dedicated to salaries statewide. This is "*a drink of water for someone isolated in the middle of the desert*" (the view of a faculty member).

Much needed capital improvement funds (over \$100 million) are requested for FY 2007-2008 to address major repairs, renovations, and new construction. These funds are necessary if Tech is to continue on its path from good to great. The campus facilities seem "*tired*" and "*in need of a shot in the arm*" according to several interviewees. Evidence that Tech is moving to address facility needs includes the facts that the University recently dedicated its first new student housing in many years, has recently

constructed several fine new academic buildings (with others such as a biomedical engineering building under construction), and has connected itself to the Lambda Rail ultra high-speed computer network. Academic facilities are adequate, but residence halls – for the most part – are still outdated and in need of repair. Approximately 40 percent of Tech’s students live on campus. New apartment-style housing has made living on campus a more attractive alternative. Although Tech’s new housing has been met with great student satisfaction, the older residence halls are in need of renovation or demolition to make room for more modern housing. New “third party” residence halls due for completion have been well received and will be an important part of recruitment and retention of top-quality students. **(2) We recommend that Tech continue to expedite plans to provide state-of-the-art, safe, affordable, and comfortable living-learning environments for students.**

Additionally, some athletic facilities need renovation to meet the needs of contemporary student-athletes and to comply with federal standards (handicap accessibility and Title IX). As is the case at most colleges and universities, a more active generation of students is seeking additional recreational space as well. **(3) We recommend that the University make it a priority to provide additional recreational field space.** Overall, the Tech campus itself is attractive and well maintained. *“You can tell they care,”* commented a community member, who also observed that, *“It didn’t used to be this way.”*

Immediately after Hurricane Katrina, the University was challenged to respond in exceptional ways, as did other Louisiana universities, and served as a host to a variety of displaced students. Tech helped to ease the burden of New Orleans evacuees. One of the most visible examples of this effort was the fact that the Tulane University football team shared facilities with the Tech football team. Tech’s band even performed the Tulane fight song in honor of their guests on game nights.

During the past few years, Tech also has improved its development and fund-raising efforts. During 2006-2007, the University raised more than \$8 million. Its

endowment rose to over \$40 million, a 31 percent increase over the previous four years, but below the endowment funds of the institutions Tech seeks to emulate or compete against for its students. While we believe significant improvements can be made in this arena, we laud the increased attention Tech has given to fund-raising and related tasks. The total fund-raising goal for 2007-2008 is to surpass the \$8 million previously raised with major gifts, endowments, and the Annual Fund Drive.

The University has also developed an attractive plan for the future which it refers to as a “road map for its transition to greatness.” However, what the plan is lacking is specificity (i.e., time frames, costs, accountable officers, and ways in which these goals will be pursued).

Unquestionably, the architect of Louisiana Tech’s performance has been its President, Dr. Daniel D. Reneau, who recently celebrated his twentieth year as Tech’s President. Dr. Reneau is universally praised for his vision, his willingness to make choices, and his ability to listen and relate to people. *“Without Dan, Tech would be simply just another struggling Louisiana institution,”* opined an admiring college president in a neighboring state. A 2002 evaluation praised his vision, integrity, and courage and more recent evaluations have included similar encomiums. According to University of Louisiana System indicators of performance, which include first-time freshmen retention, TOPS retention, ACT increases, percent of SREB average full-time faculty salaries, financial audit results, graduation rates, and ACT Student Opinion Survey results, Dr. Reneau has achieved high marks. One of the keys to his success has been his ability to obtain widespread support for his initiatives and to assemble a talented, stable administrative team. Indeed, everything about President Reneau appears to be first-rate except his salary, which is clearly non-competitive in the context of SREB Four-Year 2 presidents, at 78.1 percent of his peers.

The consensus on campus is that he is a very effective President. In the view of a national higher education association leader, *“Dan Reneau has turned Tech into a gem within the Louisiana system.”* Another admirer observed that, *“Tech has done so much*

with so little; it is an amazing story that reflects great, great credit on President Reneau.” Also worthy of recognition is the mutual respect and positive working relationship between President Reneau and System President Sally Clausen and her staff.

Another significant achievement of Dr. Reneau has been the creation of a friendly, mutually supportive campus community. *“We often behave like a family, and it is fun to come to work here. We have our differences, but very little of the brutal antagonism you see on many other campuses,”* observed a veteran faculty member. The President receives major credit for this via his patient, accessible, and non-adversarial approach to issues. **(4) We believe that it is important that President Reneau remain in office for at least the next several years and recommend that the State and Board of Supervisors provide sufficient incentives to retain him.**

III. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Degree Programs

Louisiana Tech's academic programs are divided into five colleges: Business, Applied and Natural Sciences, Education, Engineering and Science, and Liberal Arts, which award degrees from associate (general studies and nursing) to doctoral. Tech offers 90 undergraduate degree programs, 43 graduate degree programs, and 25 non-degree programs. Degree programs in Architecture, Aviation, Health Information Management, Business, Education, and Performing and Fine Arts demonstrate the variety of academic offerings.

There is an emerging emphasis in programs in Biomedical Science and Nanotechnology that are both cutting edge and important to the economic development of the State. The University is to be complimented on establishing excellent instruction and research in their nanotechnology graduate program. Clearly, this is the wave of the future and over time will be a major industry. Tech has already received national, even international, recognition in this new field (e.g., Louisiana Tech was ranked third in the nation in nanotechnology education by *Small Times Magazine*, May/June 2006). While care must be taken not to neglect the traditional disciplines that are fundamental to engineering and science, there were no major areas of concern in the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) reports that have not been addressed and corrected.

Every undergraduate program eligible, except journalism, has obtained disciplinary accreditation. Program accreditation for journalism has not been sought by the University primarily because the program's emphasis is on print journalism only and as such the program is combined with the University's News Bureau. Accreditation would require separation of the program from the News Bureau, which the University feels would negatively impact the uniqueness of the program.

(5) In light of limited resources and growing emphasis in science and technology at Tech, it seems prudent to review all programs with an eye to possibly eliminate those that are marginal performers and those that do not fit the University's mission as a SREB Four-Year 2 institution.

The University's graduate enrollment has grown by 35 percent over the past six years and now constitutes about 20 percent of total enrollment. The University currently offers nine doctoral programs and has three doctoral program proposals under review for approval. The proposed programs are Molecular Science and Nanotechnology, Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and Bioinformatics. The submissions address innovative, multidisciplinary approaches to science and engineering and are well within Louisiana Tech's mission. The critical question is whether the University has sufficient resources to support all these programs at respectable levels.

Although there is great expectation that Tech will be fully funded in the proposed executive budget, the absence of these resources might result in the inability of the University to add new programs unless old programs are eliminated. Very specific offsetting sources of funding must be identified; to do otherwise is to invite mediocrity in other programs at the University.

Despite budgetary challenges, we commend President Reneau and Tech's leadership for making effective choices concerning academic resource allocation. It is obvious to the visiting team that Louisiana Tech is not attempting to do everything. It is gratifying to see an institution make choices, albeit very difficult ones, that one administrator has likened to "*an academic version of 'Sophie's Choice.'*" Some faculty may perceive themselves in less-favored programs, yet nearly all of them are supporters of the President.

A national movement is currently underway that focuses on accountability and learning outcomes. This Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) is being created by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and

the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and is aimed at enhancing university accountability in undergraduate education. The initiative involves the work of a number of task forces and focus groups. The task force charged with researching and identifying reliable sources of pre- and post-testing is the Core Educational Outcomes Task Force. **(6) We recommend that Tech participate fully in an accountability assessment, especially where undergraduate students are concerned, once the work of the Task Force is complete and reliable sources of pre- and post-testing are determined.** We suggest the University also select specific graduate programs in which similar exercises might be undertaken by means of the Graduate Record Examination or similar nationally standardized examinations. We do not believe that all important educational outcomes can be measured, but we do believe certain educational outcomes are amenable to measurement and Tech is positioned to lead Louisiana institutions in doing so. This effort will compliment the University of Louisiana System's participation in the National Association of System Heads (NASH) reporting initiative that is focused on student access and success.

Finally, we would be negligent if we did not salute the multidisciplinary approach Tech has taken toward many of its academic programs. The undergraduate engineering program perhaps provides the most important example. In the 1990s, Tech integrated basic science departments, faculty, and curricula into its engineering programs and focused on multidisciplinary and team approaches to engineering instruction. One also sees this emphasis at the graduate level, where programs such as nanotechnology stretch across numerous department lines. President Reneau and Vice President for Academic Affairs Ken Rea, both of whom have strong multidisciplinary backgrounds, deserve praise for their encouragement of multidisciplinary programs, which serve to differentiate Tech from the crowd. **(7) We recommend Tech continue encouragement of multidisciplinary programs, especially at the graduate level.** Multidisciplinary approaches offer fresh vantage points, increased funding, and distinctiveness.

Library

There is a paucity of bound volumes and journals in the Louisiana Tech library – just over 1.2 million books, serial backfiles, and other paper materials – which constitutes a major academic challenge to the institution. The library's holdings are very small (“*discouragingly small*,” averred a faculty member in the fine arts) for a doctoral research institution. Other SREB Four-Year 2 institutions such as Georgia Institute of Technology (2.1 million), Mississippi State University (2.07 million), University of Louisville (1.9 million), and University of Memphis (1.8 million) far exceed Tech’s holdings.

Tech has begun to rely upon electronic access to many scholarly items in lieu of paper and bound copies. That is not necessarily inappropriate; electronic access to scholarly material, especially journals, is the wave of the future. Digitization of journals allows scholars around the world to utilize materials that otherwise would be inaccessible. However, caution is provided to those who believe that digitization is necessarily a cost-saving venture. While it may broaden access, it may also require considerable up-front investment as well as on-going management costs.

Nevertheless, the cooperative purchase of journals and other digitized library materials such as databases is one way to provide a wider array of access for students and faculty and hence makes eminently good sense for an institution such as Louisiana Tech. **(8) We recommend that Tech ramp up its support for, and participation in, cooperative electronic library consortia and purchasing arrangements.** Much of this is already occurring, but for a remotely situated institution such as Louisiana Tech, this action is absolutely essential to meet future student and faculty expectations of the future.

General Education

The Board of Regents for the State of Louisiana prescribes a 39 semester hour program of general education for each undergraduate plus an international education

course requirement that can be fulfilled within the 39 hours. Tech requires 45 hours in its own general education program which we believe exceeds most public universities and surpasses the 39-hour requirement in general education at Louisiana State University.

Tech's general education program involves the usual distribution requirements. Notable in comparison to other institutions is a six-hour English composition requirement, a nine-hour natural sciences requirement, and a computer literacy requirement. We applaud these requirements.

We believe, however, that every Tech undergraduate should be required to demonstrate proficiency in a foreign language. Language is the central repository of culture and one cannot understand another culture fully without having some command of its language. Further, even inside the United States, the Spanish language has become the second language of the country and in some places the first language. A majority of elementary school children in California now do not speak English as their first language. Tech graduates must be prepared to live and prosper in a rapidly changing world. Tech degree holders will cooperate and compete with individuals who speak other languages and come from other cultures. We agree that the international education course requirement constitutes a step in the direction of readying Tech graduates for such a world. **(9) We recommend that Tech require all undergraduates to demonstrate foreign language competence equivalent to second year university-level proficiency.** We add that such a requirement would provide a very good reason for Tech at the same time to make a dramatic increase in its study abroad programs, whether during a regular academic year, during the summer, or through short courses.

Within this century, the United States will become a "majority/minority" country in that Caucasians will constitute less than one-half of the nation's population. An understanding of racial, ethnic, and gender issues will assist Tech graduates in understanding and prospering in a global society, to say nothing of an appreciation of the surfeit of challenges that already exist in these arenas. It is apparent that Tech has incorporated discussion of these issues into existing courses in academic degree

programs. Tech is well on its way to ensure that its graduates appreciate the value of diversity in a well-educated society.

IV. RESEARCH

Tech's volume of funded extramural research now approximates \$17 million per year. With its SREB peers' research average at \$73 million, the University's resources are limited for a doctoral research institution. However, Tech has achieved a laudable amount of research productivity given the University's limited funding at the State level.

Tech's research leaders must be focused and realistic in terms of their objectives. With careful decisions and prudent management of resources, Tech will continue to be a national leader in specific research areas such as nanotechnology and in the process, stimulate economic development in North Louisiana. *"Focus, focus, focus" (almost like location, location, location in real estate) is the key for them,*" commented a research official at another, larger public university. We agree and urge Tech to continue its practices of focusing its limited resources, rewarding productivity, and paying close attention to opportunities. The University's emphasis upon nanotechnology and biotechnology is entirely consistent with this notion and should be pursued.

Consistent with this focus, we believe that the economic development of North Louisiana could be greatly enhanced by capitalizing on this tremendous asset through the development of a centrally located area for research. Therefore, **(10) we recommend that Tech, regional legislators, economic development personnel, and State officials work to achieve a Ruston area research park that would be intimately related to the intellectual productivity of Louisiana Tech.** However, we would only caution that administrators must be financially frugal and rigorous in their operation in order to ensure that the research park can succeed.

Demonstrably, some faculty can produce very good science that receives highly prestigious scholarly recognition but nonetheless cannot usefully be developed or commercialized. **(11) Tech's research park must emphasize the development portion of research and produce early on some successes in terms of commercialization.** The University already has exhibited great competence in this arena. It is averaging more

than 30 “inventions” per year and in FY 2006, its researchers submitted 17 patent applications, four of which have been issued. Tech also takes credit for eight start-up companies based upon faculty research. All of these developments lend credence to the vision of the research park.

Relevant to this, **(12) we believe that the University and perhaps the research park might capitalize upon cybernetic and related scientific developments at Barksdale Air Force Base.** It is still too early to ascertain precisely what this could mean to Tech, but the potential is huge.

Finally, we applaud the notion of the State locating computer backup functions and server facilities at Tech. Hurricane Katrina underlined how vulnerable South Louisiana is to weather-related calamities. North Louisiana is not exempt from such problems but clearly constitutes a less risky location than South Louisiana for large-scale data storage and back-up.

All things considered, a proposed research park is an excellent initiative and now seems closer to fruition. It will take courage and perhaps a bit of good fortune to attain the goals outlined for the park, but the payoff to North Louisiana could be immense.

V. FACULTY

Tech's faculty is predominantly full-time – 419 of 516 faculty positions are of this nature. An estimated 85 percent of all course sections throughout the academic year are taught by full-time faculty of whom 81.6 percent hold terminal degrees. True, graduate students do teach some undergraduate course sections; however, the University does far less of this than its peer institutions. The major reason for this may be that Tech does not support dozens of doctoral programs but limits itself to a few quality programs, which allows and encourages the faculty to be in the classrooms and also available to students outside of classes.

Tech's faculty are, “*dedicated, hard workers and productive,*” reported a senior faculty member. Said another, “*If you come to Tech, it is because you like the place, you appreciate the easy small town atmosphere, and buy into what we are doing, because usually you could get paid more elsewhere.*” A non-random sample of students told us that in general students are pleased with the quality of their faculty and especially with the faculty's willingness to provide them with help. “*I probably spend a couple of hours a week in my faculty members' offices,*” praised a senior business student, “*and they're usually always there and ready to help me.*”

As noted earlier, Tech has placed a greater emphasis on refereed scholarly productivity and external funding in concert with its drive to be considered a top research institution. This has created some predictable intergenerational divisions and debates over teaching versus research. Our conversations revealed that not all faculty members agree that they must publish or perish. They prefer instructors to work more with students in and out of class and in local schools and hospitals. They are encouraged to use their strengths and experiences to promote research in teaching and learning.

Hence, performance expectations for tenure and promotion of faculty members are different from college to college. This should not be surprising in that the missions and funding of the sciences and engineering at Tech are quite different from the

disciplines in the humanities and social sciences for example. Achieving balance between teaching, research, and service is a challenge in higher education. **(13) We recommend that President Reneau commission a study to examine the requirements for promotion and tenure as well as membership on the graduate faculty.**

Our inspection of class sizes and faculty loads revealed that the typical Tech faculty member teaches a respectable, even healthy number of students. *U.S. News* reports that Tech's student/faculty ratio is 23:1, well above the approximate 15:1 or 16:1 at most doctoral research institutions or the 18:1 ratio one often finds at non-flagship doctoral research institutions. Louisiana Tech's most recent average class size (2005-2006) decreased to an average of 21 students, which shows movement in the right direction.

This is reflected in faculty load statistics. Tech faculty generate an average of approximately 650 semester hours of credit per year. This is a very healthy number and is as much as 50 percent higher than the average at most doctoral research institutions. This also suggests that the typical Tech faculty member handles more than 200 students per year over the three academic quarters, a very respectable number.

These data underline the extent to which Louisiana Tech is underfunded relative to its mission and compared to a reasonable set of peer institutions. "*Louisiana is getting a great bargain here at Tech,*" exclaimed a faculty member, who clearly would prefer to reduce the nature of that bargain somewhat by substituting smaller classes and more research support for the current situation. It is not clear, however, that this is probable in the long-term, given the uncertain condition of State finances and pressure from competing uses for public funds. Nonetheless, it is a sentiment we believe to be well-founded and, as stated elsewhere in this report, the Governor's proposed budget may address some or all of this issue.

Faculty Salaries

Cardinal Newman, in *The Idea of the University*, observed that “*the faculty are the University.*” One need not be Cardinal Newman to understand that attracting and retaining highly-talented faculty is vitally important to any academic institution. Louisiana Tech University is no exception. Alas, it is precisely here that Tech suffers. As the table on the next page reveals, Tech’s average faculty salaries are so far below regional and national averages for similar institutions that one could label them “*non-competitive*” (phrasing that a president of an out-of-state institution used in talking to us).

Nevertheless, our analysis reveals that Tech tends to offer competitive, market-level salaries for its new hires. Further, it has enticed some excellent new faculty with ties to the region, or with preferences for small cities, to come to Tech. **(14) Given the relative geographic and even scholarly isolation of Tech, however, it must be careful that it does not fill its ranks too heavily with its own graduates.**

As noted, Tech does appear to “*meet the market*” (the phrasing of a dean) when it hires most new faculty. Hence, it is existing faculty who have tended to fall far behind the curve and thus experience salary compression. “*The longer you are at Tech, the worse it gets,*” offered a senior faculty member who is regarded as a productive colleague.

When comparing faculty salaries using Tech’s peers for the past two years they were funded at 94 percent and 97 percent of their SREB Four-Year 3 peers. Following the recent change in classification to a SREB Four-Year 2 university, their comparative faculty salaries dropped to 79 percent.

At every rank, Tech’s average salary trails its peers. In 2005-2006, Tech’s full professors trailed the national average for public, doctoral institutions by an astounding 48.8 percent. At the associate professor rank, the salary deficit is 21.0 percent; at the assistant professor rank, the salary deficit is 17.7 percent; at the instructor level, the

salary deficit is 28.8 percent. If one assembles a group of non-flagship institutions in Louisiana and surrounding states, then Tech’s mean salaries trail the average of these three peers (see AAUP chart below) by 28.6 percent at the assistant professor rank, 23.7 percent at the associate professor rank, and 43.3 percent at the full professor rank. Interestingly, Tech's average salary at the assistant professor level is slightly higher than that at the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, but that advantage disappears at the associate professor level (-7.7 percent) and the full professor level (-23.0 percent).

American Association of University Professors

2005-2006 Mean Annual Faculty Salaries

	<u>Assistant</u> <u>Professor</u>	<u>Associate</u> <u>Professor</u>	<u>Professor</u>
La Tech	\$51.3	\$58.7	\$ 68.3
Nat’l. Public	\$60.4	\$71.0	\$101.6
Doctoral			
Texas Tech	\$56.9	\$67.4	\$ 92.4
UT Dallas	\$82.4	\$83.5	\$109.7
Ala-Huntsville	\$58.7	\$66.9	\$ 91.7
Average	\$66.0	\$72.6	\$ 97.9
ULL	\$49.3	\$63.2	\$ 83.8
LSU	\$60.3	\$66.4	\$ 93.2

(15) We recommend that the State bring Louisiana Tech faculty salaries to 100 percent of its SREB Four-Year 2 peer institutions.

Additionally, it can be quite challenging for Tech to attract and retain faculty, especially faculty in the technical, scientific, engineering, business and health disciplines. **(16) We strongly recommend that the State of Louisiana, via its Board of Regents and Board of Supervisors, address the challenges of retaining faculty especially in the technical, scientific, engineering, education, business, and health disciplines.** Tech cannot be expected to fulfill its mission if it is fundamentally non-competitive in faculty salaries. Second, we agree with an elected official that differences in the cost of living mitigate the observed salary problem. It is not as expensive to live in Ruston as in Dallas or Atlanta. Still, it is simply not true that it is 43.3 percent less expensive for a full professor to live in Ruston than in either Dallas or Atlanta or another university town hosting a public, doctoral research university. Louisiana should not hang its hat on the cost of living explanation.

A few words need to be said about staff salaries, which, by our inspection, appear to trail national averages by comparable amounts. Nevertheless, staff personnel markets may be more local and regional and this may reduce (though not eliminate) the competitive problem the University faces here. **(17) We recommend that staff salaries be reviewed and increased to be competitive with SREB Four-Year 2 institutions.**

With respect to administrative salaries, CUPA data for SREB Four-Year 2 institutions shows Tech pays its administrators substantially less than its peers. This fact is easily observable for the positions of President and Vice President for Academic Affairs, where doctoral research institutions pay such individuals \$100,000 to \$200,000 more annually than does Tech.

In summary, Tech is relatively below its peers as far as administrative salaries are concerned. **(18) We recommend that positive action is needed to address salary disparities among administrators to be competitive with SREB Four-Year 2 institutions.** The recent recommendations of Governor Blanco represent a first step in remediating this situation.

VI. STUDENTS

Undergraduate admissions standards have increased four times since the Fall of 1992 and Tech continues to attract and retain talented students. The average ACT score in 1991 was 20.9 and in 2006 it was 22.7 – the highest ever. Tech had a retention rate of freshman to sophomore year in 1994-95 of 79 percent and in 2005-06 the rate was 83 percent.

Many describe Tech students as “*polite, ambitious, a bit naïve, sometimes ill-prepared, but capable.*” Science and engineering faculty generally had the best things to say about their students. However, graduate students received more praise from Tech faculty than undergraduates which is consistent among college and university faculty nationally.

Many Tech students are the first in their families to attend college. Most have great financial need and many hold jobs while they attend the University. The ACT Student Opinion Survey results indicated that 57 percent of the student body worked and 20.1 percent worked 20 or more hours a week. They are an upwardly mobile group and tend to view Tech as “*an avenue to a good job after they graduate rather than as their opportunity for a life-changing intellectual experience*” (the view of a department chairperson).

By and large, Tech students are well satisfied with the University and their experiences at Tech. They praise faculty for the accessibility and say they enjoy Tech's relatively small class sizes – a faculty to student ratio of 21 to 1. American College Testing (ACT) program survey results indicated that student respondents rated Tech's small class sizes more favorably than student respondents at the State and national levels.

Predictably, students have some complaints. For example, parking and housing are concerns, which is most noticeably reported in the ACT Student Opinion Survey. Parking complaints are common among college students nationally. Parking is available,

albeit not outside one's door. The housing situation is another matter. Much of the institution's student housing stock is old, dating back to the late 1930s and 1940s and in need of rehabilitation and modernization (into suites, etc.). Tech is now in Phase II of its facility planning that addresses construction and replacement housing and renovation of existing housing. Tech deserves praise for creating Innovative Student Facilities, Inc., a 501(c)3 not-for-profit corporation, in order to address this situation. The new University Park is quite attractive and is a tremendous improvement over the dilapidated structures that formerly occupied that space.

Required undergraduate tuition and fees for a full-time student were a bit more than \$4,400 this year. This is about \$1,000 more than students pay at System institutions such as McNeese, Grambling, Nicholls, ULM, ULL and Southeastern. However, this is a very low amount when viewed not only through a national but also, more specifically, a regional prism. Students pay an average of \$5,154 at Tech's SREB Four-Year 2 peer institutions.

Several academic colleges at Tech require special fees. Business Administration majors pay an additional \$40 per quarter, as do Engineering and Science students. All students pay an additional \$5 per hour technology fee and a \$15 per hour energy surcharge fee. Still, Tech is a bargain for students.

Intercollegiate Athletics

Intercollegiate athletics have long occupied a significant position at Tech. Led by the Lady Techsters, Tech teams have won national championships and competed successfully with much larger and better financed institutions. Tech alumni are proud of many and varied things related to their alma mater, but their conversations frequently veer off into a discussion of how Tech's intercollegiate athletic teams are doing. Tech teams provide an important source of identification and pride for the University's many constituencies, so much so that some faculty argue, "*Our teams have overwhelmed our academic achievements.*"

Tech competes within the Western Athletic Conference (WAC), a Division I organization that stretches westward from Ruston to Honolulu. Members include institutions in locations such as Las Cruces, New Mexico and Moscow, Idaho. Needless to say, the cost of sending teams back and forth to such locations is considerable. For example, the football team alone may spend \$500,000 annually flying to its away games. To the objections of some faculty, student-athletes in sports such as baseball depart from campus for road trips that can last up to two weeks. Clearly, it is difficult for such individuals to pursue their academic work and, as one faculty member stated, *“They set themselves up for failure in any course where there is a lot going on in the classroom.”* Tech’s 2004 – 2005 freshman cohort graduation rate for student athletes was 42 percent as compared to all its students at 49 percent.

The WAC is a much higher rated conference in nearly all sports than the Sun Belt, to which Tech formerly belonged; and, as one of its members, Boise State, recently demonstrated in football, the quality of competition is often excellent, which generates television and bowl revenue as well as recognition.

When Tech joined the WAC, institutions such as Southern Methodist, Rice, and Tulsa also were members. Unfortunately, all three institutions have departed the WAC, and there is not another institution currently in the Conference that realistically can be considered within reasonable driving distance. This situation reduces the ability of Tech fans to follow the University’s teams when on the road.

Relatively few of the current WAC institutions constitute familiar names that evoke visions of hot rivalries. Consequently, attendance has suffered and averaged only 14,586 per home game in football in 2006 (115th among 119 Division I-A institutions and below at least a dozen I-AA institutions) and has fallen off in men’s basketball to only 2,788 in 2005-2006.

Should attendance figures continue at these levels, we are concerned about future athletic department revenues. When combined with the expenditures associated with participation in a high-profile conference such as the WAC (Tech's reported expenditures exceed \$12 million per year), we caution administrators to monitor this situation closely.

VII. BUDGET AND FINANCE

There are few better managed and administered institutions of higher education than Louisiana Tech. Currently funded at approximately 81 percent of the SREB average of other Four-Year 2 institutions for FY 2006-2007, Tech has evinced the greatest skill in generating *“the most from the least”* (the language of a State higher education official). *“They are the gem of Louisiana higher education in terms of their efficiency, the quality of their reports, their clean audits, their responsiveness, and their clarity of purpose,”* averred another higher education official. *“It all starts with President Reneau,”* commented a member of the Board of Supervisors. *“He has created a climate of efficiency with emphasis on cost effectiveness and accountability.”*

The senior administration articulates the institutional parameters, within State guidelines, and the budget is formulated from the lowest unit back up through the University’s administrative organization, approved by the President, and forwarded to the Board of Supervisors.

Tech’s general purpose funding from the State per Full-Time Equivalency (FTE) in FY 2006-2007 is \$4,589 compared to \$6,370 for SREB Four-Year 2 peers for FY 2005-2006. Additionally, Tech is funded \$986 per FTE below its peer average in net tuition and fees. Overall, in total dollars per FTE for FY 2006-2007, Tech is receiving \$8,942 per FTE while its SREB peer average is \$11,981 per FTE.

According to FY 2005-2006 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data, Tech spends \$2,700 less per FTE on instruction than its SREB Four-Year 2 peers and \$2,400 less per FTE on research. The same holds true for academic support, public service, student services, and institutional support. In FY 2006-2007 some improvement has been made; however, the proposed executive budget should alleviate most of the budget shortfall.

The University has been able to manage its finances effectively and efficiently at a time when growth in operating expenses has outpaced growth in State appropriations. The State's relatively underfunded budget has caused higher education institutions statewide, including Louisiana Tech, to rely on tuition and student fees to fund operations.

Currently, Tech's tuition at \$4,353 is the second highest tuition for four-year public universities in the State, behind LSU which charges \$4,419. However, Louisiana tuition is one of the lowest in the South. Tuition rates can only be increased with a two-thirds vote of the Legislature. The management boards and the Board of Regents continue to negotiate with the executive and legislative branches in an effort to strike the appropriate balance between State contribution and student contribution.

The imposition of student fees such as a technology fee, an excellence fee, and an operational fee have helped Tech buy equipment and make academic enhancements. However, this has created further financial burden on its students. As of Fall 2006, Tech's students paid \$1,612 annually in student self-assessed fees and University fees, which represents approximately 37 percent of the \$4,353 annual tuition. Although fees of this nature are not unique to Tech or the Louisiana universities, students essentially are being asked to fund the State's higher education obligation.

Dr. Reneau has surrounded himself with a quality team of vice presidents and administrators. We have seldom encountered a campus at which there are so few gripes and complaints about financial affairs. Even an erstwhile faculty member noted, *"Those people know what they're doing and they do their jobs well. Maybe I would change a few things, but not much."*

Auxiliary enterprises such as the bookstore, food services, and housing operate at a surplus and, with the exception of the dormitories, there seems to be general satisfaction with the operation of these services. However, the University is working hard to overcome the dissatisfaction among students and the perceived competitive disadvantage

in recruiting students due to the condition and the configuration of its dormitories. The recent addition of apartment-style student housing has been a success. In an effort to become more competitive with housing that is attractive to students, Tech gained approval by the Board of Supervisors for the University of Louisiana System to construct Phase II Housing that will add approximately 500 new beds, as well as renovate and construct additional recreational facilities.

We were quite impressed with the quality of Tech's audit reports. These reports reflect a well-managed, fiscally sound, financially prudent institution that follows the rules. Collateral to this, we also must note that Tech has been prudent in terms of the long-term debt it has assumed. There is room for the institution to incur additional debt, should it wish to do so.

There is a widely held view on the campus that it is "*their time*" to be recognized by the State with direly needed resources. Faculty members believe they have been good soldiers through difficult times and that they have produced remarkable results; so do the President and his Board Members.

VIII. ADMINISTRATION AND OPERATION

The administrative structure at Tech functions quite well. Whether the task in question is cleaning offices or paying bills, the administration typically functions smoothly, albeit sometimes with lengthy delays (a complaint of several faculty) and a sentiment that “*way too many signatures are required.*”

A student remarked, “*I have no feeling at all for the administrative organization.*” That may be the ultimate compliment—the organization is there, it performs its function, and it is unobtrusive.

Throughout the team’s visit it was clear that the University is well organized and working well. There is a shared sense of limited resources and a belief that everyone must do more with less for the good of the institution.

However, we note that the University’s technology administration is divided into three areas: academic, administration, and tech support. With limited financial resources coupled with the desire to offer the best services possible, **(19) we recommend the possibility of combining the three areas in technology administration under one umbrella.** This might allow Tech to move more quickly and more cost effectively toward its goals.

It was evident that administrators had a clear understanding of the University’s mission, its goals, and its direction. There is great support for, and pride in, the upward trajectory of Tech.

For the most part, the people who work at the University seem to love being there. They are qualified, competent, well trained, and doing their jobs in a manner that serves the students. It is impressive the number of times people spoke of “*servicing the students.*”

There is a widespread belief that Tech employees are underpaid, that this is a shared sacrifice from top to bottom, that it is worth it, and that it will be rectified.

Yes, there is much about which to be impressed as to the administration of the institution. By way of illustration, unless one actually encounters a train, one would not know that a railroad runs through the middle of the campus. This reality is well disguised and the tracks actually serve as a mental partition between academic and other activities on the campus. It has been turned into a positive rather than constituting a negative. There is also the Centennial Mall project, which closed off a street and turned a “*so-so area*” (the language of a vice president) into an attractive, busy centerpiece for the campus.

IX. TECHNOLOGY

Befitting an institution with the word “Tech” in its name, Louisiana Tech’s deployment of instructional technology has been brilliant. Numerous PCs (and Apples) exist on campus. High-speed internet access is available and much (though not all) of the campus is wireless. Perhaps 100 legitimate multimedia classrooms exist, with more being added each year.

However, only 40 percent of the classrooms have been outfitted as “smart classrooms.” Some of those were equipped so long ago that they need to be updated. That expenditure will delay other classrooms from being upgraded. On the upside, Tech’s participation in the State’s Louisiana Optical Network Initiative (LONI) has allowed its researchers access to high-performance computing and acquisition of a supercomputing server for high-performance computing needs.

While the levying of a student technology fee has added \$11 million to the technology budget, Tech is still working diligently on integrating technology into campus life because of underfunding.

The constituents on many campuses complain about the adequacy of the service they receive from computer services. At Tech, in no small measure to the mutually supportive spirit of the campus, complaints are relatively few in number. Liberal Arts would like to have its own dedicated computer/tech person, as would other colleges such as Engineering and Sciences and Business Administration. Also, some faculty and staff are disappointed with response times when problems arise, and students reported having to walk across the campus to do print work because the lab lacked a printer. Even so, the overall evaluation of instructional technology and computing support services by faculty, staff, and students is warmly positive.

One significant complaint – slow network response speeds – should be eliminated when LONI formally comes on-line. While there have been continual implementation

delays and setbacks, LONI should be available for campus use in the near future, and this may quadruple the bandwidth available to Tech computer users. This will do wonders for network speeds.

Tech is a Blackboard campus in terms of instructional software and all faculty are required to place at least their course syllabi on Blackboard. It is not clear what proportion of faculty do more than this; the high estimate we received was 75 percent. What is clear is that some faculty do not understand how to utilize Blackboard and other instructional software effectively. Despite numerous workshops designed to upgrade the skills of faculty, some have lagged in this regard and others simply don't like the idea.

(20) We recommend that Tech continue workshops to upgrade the skills and knowledge of faculty and that both incentives and sanctions be implemented to encourage faculty to continue to learn more and expand their teaching horizons.

Finally, we must note that there is considerable variability in the availability and deployment of technology across the Tech campus. Much of this variability reflects the nature of disciplines and the availability of funding. **(21) We recommend that the Tech administration work to eliminate the most egregious technology differentials between colleges and departments.** This will increase pedagogical effectiveness and improve morale.

X. INSTITUTIONAL ADVANCEMENT

Alumni, Fund-Raising, Public Relations, & Government Relations

Today, the University is adjusting to a decline in enrollment after several years of stability. This can be attributed to a declining demographic population and scholarship funds that lag behind the competition. More positively, in Fiscal Year 2006, the Louisiana Tech University Foundation marked its best fund-raising year ever, with gifts from individuals and corporations totaling more than \$8 million. Investment income and related fees totaled approximately \$4.5 million. The Foundation neared \$60 million in total assets as the fiscal year ended.

During the 2005-06 academic year, the Foundation provided nearly \$5.5 million for institutional support directly to Tech and almost \$400,000 in student scholarships. Of particular note, the Foundation received nine donor gifts of over \$750,000 with varying matches from the State of Louisiana. These accomplishments are notable, and the University should be commended.

The last time that higher education in Louisiana was funded at 100 percent of the formula was in 1981. When Dr. Reneau was appointed President in 1987, State funding had diminished to 63 percent. Tech's current formula funding is 82 percent of the SREB average of its peer Four-Year 2 institutions as stated earlier. Unfortunately, higher education in Louisiana has not been competitive within the SREB or the nation.

In 1987, Tech's endowment was about \$1 million. Currently, Tech's endowment is almost \$45 million. This growth reflects multiple factors – changing mission and goals, superior personnel, presidential participation, improved software, address capture, and the like.

While the current legislative session may result in Tech being funded at 100 percent of the SREB average for similar institutions, traditional financial support through

self-generated funds is expected to remain relatively low. This means that the importance of outside funding and gifts will continue to be critical to the University's ongoing success.

Dr. Reneau's persistence, motivation, and political acumen have been truly remarkable and are a primary reason the University has prospered in support from State resources as well as private donors. Vice President for University Advancement Corrie Stegall is to be commended for her work ethic, personal motivation, and dedication. Their work has been critical to the growth and the success of the Foundation to date.

Today's higher education environment requires significant fiscal participation by private funding sources. This means that Tech will continually need to secure private resources that State funds and tuition simply cannot provide to accomplish its goals. Private dollars will be critical in Tech's quest to recruit highly-qualified students, especially in light of the need to reach out beyond its traditional demographic base. Further, private funds will be necessary for much-needed modern facilities for the future, dollars that are often secured through public/private partnerships.

Further, we suggest that President Reneau review staffing and responsibilities within the Office of Institutional Advancement to ensure that fund-raising is being conducted in a timely and effective fashion. **(22) We strongly recommend that Tech consider additional attention and resources to fund-raising.**

Should this initiative be conducted in a timely and successful manner, an appropriate goal would be for Tech to aim to have a \$100 million endowment by the end of 2010 (less than four years from today). If this campaign (and we believe a formal fund-raising campaign should be initiated) succeeds, it will change both the culture and the face of Louisiana Tech. *"Tech needs to utilize the reputation and contacts of Dan Reneau decisively before he retires; he is already a legend,"* opined an off-campus luminary.

Further, in light of the University's accomplishments and assets, we believe Tech is primed for its first comprehensive capital campaign. Therefore, **(23) we recommend the commission of an appropriate firm to conduct a feasibility study for a capital campaign.** The potential is huge, and the ultimate impact would be dramatic.

We strongly suspect that a new capital campaign will depend on the University's website to generate funds. According to the Pew Internet and American Life Project, 26 million people made a charitable gift on-line in 2006 – evidence that on-line fund-raising programs generate a significant number of gifts and have the potential to build relationships with alumni and donors. With printing/postage costs rising and new obstacles emerging to screen/block phone solicitations, on-line fund-raising may very well become the primary annual giving strategy. This new trend in e-philanthropy requires even the best run fund-raising operations to explore new approaches and techniques. We suggest that Tech explore the new trend in e-philanthropy.

Planned Giving

The University has placed a strong emphasis in recent years on developing a planned giving program. Staff has attended programs offered by one of the top planned giving firms in the nation. Likewise, the University utilizes a wide variety of printed planned giving materials prepared by that firm. The materials are informative, graphically appealing, and distributed on a regular basis to an appropriate audience. Higher education literature suggests that full development of a planned giving program is the most efficient method for developing college and university endowments.

The Foundation has been fortunate to receive some major planned gifts that have matured in the recent past. The McCann Society (the planned giving society of the Foundation) is named in honor of Melvin McCann, a retired postal worker and military retiree who left his life savings (valued at over \$1,000,000) to the Foundation for a scholarship endowment. The University has received several other significant planned gifts and maintains a list of active living individuals with estate provisions. The

Executive Director of Development manages this area, but as noted previously, it would be well worth the investment to appoint a full-time Director of Planned Giving.

Government Relations

Relationships with State educators are strong, according to all accounts. The President and his senior staff are described as “*effective, bright, innovative, collegial, and loyal.*” One observer stated, “*They definitely put the best foot forward for Louisiana Tech University.*”

The Vice President for Research and Development has primary responsibility for Federal relations. The Vice President works closely with the President, faculty, and administration in developing annual Federal priorities. These priorities are communicated to the Congressional delegation throughout the year. The University enjoys a good relationship with its delegation.

In keeping with similar institutions, **(24) we suggest that an annual report of research and development activities be generated. It would be appropriate to develop a printed report, CD, and on-line version of the report.**

Public Relations

The Division of University Advancement is housed in the Marbury Alumni Center, which is situated at one of the main entrances on the campus. This location is a major public relations asset for the Division and the institution as a whole because the Center serves as an information and welcome center for the University. The facility has undergone significant renovation and expansion in recent years to accommodate growth of the staff and related activities.

The public relations function at Louisiana Tech is organized under the Department of Marketing and the Division of University Advancement. While

organizationally apart, their approach is unified and generally results are commendable with well done publications, effective media reports, and sports publications that reflect a positive attitude about the University.

However, **(25) we suggest that a review and upgrade of the University’s website be considered.** The site as a whole is fairly navigable, but too many small photographs fail to create high impact. We suggest that more quality, memorable images be used – there are far too many photos of empty buildings that appear lifeless with no students. In particular, we suggest that the admissions section of the website develop a greater appeal to the current “Millennials” who learn best by interacting with others through student-written blogs and access to current students, other applicants, young alumni, and faculty in their fields of interest or expertise. Integration of the latest iPod and Internet technology should be considered. We suggest reviewing Carnegie Mellon’s website (www.cmu.edu/admission), as well as Mount Holyoke College (www.mtholyoke.edu/go/tour), and Ball State University (www.bsu.edu/reallife) for further ideas.

Community leaders state that good “Town and Gown” relations have been a priority of the President; they both like and respect him. Likewise, the advancement office utilizes faculty and staff from across the campus in lobbying and in “high visibility events” around the State. The office also works with other areas of the campus in special event planning to make sure that events carry “Tech’s signature.”

Despite countless positive news clippings, the University does not have a central news and information office. While this decentralized approach has worked, **(26) it may be necessary to consider formalizing the news and information function under the Department of Marketing as Tech competes in a new SREB Four-Year 2 arena.**

Alumni Relations

A University is ultimately judged by the quality of the “end product,” its graduates. Tech’s alumni consistently and openly express pride in their alma mater as well as the quality and value of their degree. Tech’s alumni participation rate is slightly above national averages for similar institutions and could increase significantly with a more intensive communication program. With 52,000 alumni of record situated around the world, a wonderful story can be told about the institution. **(27) The University should develop a multi-faceted strategy that includes face-to-face and electronic tactics to interact and communicate with more of its graduates.**

One focus of the University’s Alumni Association is its membership drive. With a primary goal of involvement, dues are nominal, and lifetime memberships are available. Revenue from dues is utilized for activities and events throughout a broad geographical area. The Director of Alumni Relations and his administrative assistant, who have primary responsibility for staffing events, are both respected on and off campus. A Coordinator of Advancement Programs provides assistance and the link between the cultivation/fund-raising component and the alumni-oriented activities.

The University alumni membership program receives mixed reviews. While it does increase alumni participation, the costs of the membership “drive” (i.e. printing, postage, etc.) are increasing every year with a minimal return. The University would be better served investing those funds in alumni activities and programs aimed at increasing involvement and annual fund contributions. **(28) We recommend discontinuing the alumni membership program and redeploying funds to increasing alumni activities and related alumni solicitation.**

A growing number of colleges and universities nationwide are forming “undergraduate alumni associations” with the purpose of educating and involving students in the institution prior to graduation, thus making them more active and involved young alumni. Tech has developed its own somewhat similar version, the Student

Advancement Team (SAT). From all accounts, the SAT program gets rave reviews. “*We strongly believe that students are alumni-in-residence at the University’s campus!*” a long-time staffer commented. “*We work constantly to engender loyalty and the understanding of the need for continued support of the University by alumni among students from their freshman orientation through the reception given for graduating students.*” In addition, each new graduate is provided a complimentary one-year membership in the Alumni Association. While alumni memberships at institutions of Tech’s size have received mixed reviews nationally, it appears that this approach has resulted in stronger participation and more current information and contact information about alumni.

Alumni are solicited regularly through the University’s Annual Fund Drive in which they can support any academic/program area. The University effectively combines mail and calling programs. Mail solicitations are sent annually to those alumni rated below a specified major gift level. The major objective is to engage donors in a systematic ongoing “habit of financial support” and to increase their level of support each year. The Coordinator of the Annual Fund oversees the mail and telephone programs.

In 2006, the Annual Fund program participation was 24 percent of the alumni population. **(29) We recommend that the Annual Fund program be expanded to increase alumni participation from 24 percent (in 2006) to at least 40 percent of the alumni population.**

A more intensive, concentrated six-month per year calling program, with callers working Monday-Thursday from 6 – 9 p.m. has proven most effective at other schools. The University should also better utilize e-mail as a source of pledge reminders, “thank you’s,” and continued cultivation. With the cost of postage and printing increasing, the web and phonathon programs should become a more prominent part of the Annual Fund cultivation/solicitation process.

Unrestricted gifts through the Annual Fund, along with management and solicitation fees, provide the greatest source of funds for advancement and the Foundation. Slightly more than \$1 million was raised in the most recently completed fiscal year by annual fund solicitations. This figure includes more than \$800,000 for contributions designated for specific operating purposes and just under \$200,000 of purely unrestricted gifts.

The alumni office—with the support of the entire University Advancement Division—coordinates the largest alumni event, Homecoming. It also administers recognition programs, including the “Alumnus of the Year,” the “Distinguished Alumni” of the University’s colleges, the 50th anniversary class, and other prominent guests and awardees. Homecoming is traditionally well attended, and approximately ten events are spread over two days. While it is apparent that alumni have strong positive feelings toward their alma mater, the University should devote the human resources to develop a greater volume of structured events. **(30) We recommend development of alumni chapters in areas where a “critical mass” of alumni reside. Additionally, the University should establish a class agents program.**

The Hall of Distinguished Alumni (located in Marbury Alumni Center) is coordinated by the alumni office, too. The display is an impressive highlight for visitors to the University.

The future of Louisiana Tech University is bright. The University has a “product” that is marketable to various constituencies. Many exciting growth opportunities are on the horizon that could position the University in an increasingly prominent leadership role in the region. Procurement of funds from private, State, and Federal sources will no doubt move the University to the “next level.”

XI. GOVERNANCE

Internal Governance

A University Senate composed of faculty and staff exists, along with a Student Government Association. Neither has proven to be adversarial in recent years; both appear to be reasonably effective ways for individuals to make their thoughts known to the administration. In contrast to many other campuses, membership on the University Senate is not looked down upon and some strong and respected faculty members have served terms in that body. *“The Senate is rather tame, but certainly not completely domesticated. That’s because President Reneau and other administrators listen.”*

Board of Supervisors

The Board of Supervisors that manages Louisiana Tech also is responsible for seven other institutions within the University of Louisiana System. The Board and its staff generally receive high marks, especially the President of the System, Dr. Sally Clausen, who also receives admiration from across the country. One current Board member averred that *“The current membership of the Board is the best we’ve had in a long time.”* Through the years, we have come to respect this Board as among the very best in the nation; nonetheless, **(31) as new members of the Board of Supervisors come on board, we note the importance of thoughtful orientation.** We write this in spite of being assured that each of these new members is exceptional.

Faculty and staff at Tech typically do not know the Board of Supervisors or its members well. As a consequence, they sometimes attribute to the Board or its staff attitudes and actions that are inaccurate. They also tend to blame the Board for Tech’s funding situation and criticize it for *“funding institutional problems, not demonstrated success.”* Even so, the overall relationship between the Board, its staff, and the Tech campus is remarkably positive. System personnel tend to shower compliments on Tech

(“*a great example,*” “*the leader,*” etc.) and knowledgeable people on the Tech campus consistently report that the System has been supportive of the institution.

The Board has significant managerial authority, probably more than that found in many states. However, that managerial oversight is required by Louisiana law. As implemented by the Board and System staff, it does not appear to unduly interfere with the smooth operation of the University.

In Summary

Visiting Louisiana Tech was a unique and refreshing experience. It is a place where faculty, students, and administrators genuinely care about each other and the well-being of their University. They respect their President and see him as central to the immediate future of Tech. The University is to be commended for its excellent service to the community and the State of Louisiana.

XII. RECOMMENDATIONS

- (1) We recommend that Tech consider utilizing scholarships to attract more women and minorities in the disciplines of science, technology, and math.**
- (2) We recommend that Tech continue to expedite plans to provide state-of-the-art, safe, affordable, and comfortable living-learning environments for students.**
- (3) We recommend that the University make it a priority to provide additional recreational field space.**
- (4) We believe that it is important that President Reneau remain in office for at least the next several years and recommend that the State and Board of Supervisors provide sufficient incentives to retain him.**
- (5) In light of limited resources and growing emphasis in science and technology at Tech, it seems prudent to review all programs with an eye to possibly eliminate those that are marginal performers and those that do not fit Tech's mission as a SREB Four-Year 2 institution.**
- (6) We recommend that Tech participate fully in an accountability assessment, especially where undergraduate students are concerned, once the work of the Task Force is complete and reliable sources of pre- and post-testing are determined.**
- (7) We recommend Tech continue encouragement of multidisciplinary programs, especially at the graduate level.**
- (8) We recommend that Tech ramp up its support for, and participation in, cooperative electronic library consortia and purchasing arrangements.**

- (9) We recommend that Tech require all undergraduates to demonstrate foreign language competence equivalent to second year university-level proficiency.**
- (10) We recommend that Tech, regional legislators and economic development personnel, and State officials work to achieve a Ruston area research park that would be intimately related to the intellectual productivity of Louisiana Tech.**
- (11) Tech's research park must emphasize the development portion of research and produce early on some successes in terms of commercialization.**
- (12) We believe that the University and perhaps the research park might capitalize upon cybernetic and related scientific developments at Barksdale Air Force Base.**
- (13) We recommend that President Reneau commission a study to examine the requirements for promotion and tenure as well as membership on the graduate faculty.**
- (14) Given the relative geographic and even scholarly isolation of Tech, it must be careful that it does not fill its ranks too heavily with its own graduates.**
- (15) We recommend that the State of Louisiana bring Louisiana Tech faculty salaries to 100 percent of its SREB Four-Year 2 peer institutions.**
- (16) We strongly recommend that the State, via its Board of Regents and Board of Supervisors, address the challenges of retaining faculty especially in the technical, scientific, engineering, education, business, and health disciplines.**

- (17) We recommend that staff salaries be reviewed and increased to be competitive with SREB Four-Year 2 institutions.**
- (18) We recommend that positive action is needed to address salary disparities among administrators to be competitive with SREB Four-Year 2 institutions.**
- (19) We recommend the possibility of combining the three areas in technology administration under one umbrella.**
- (20) We recommend that Tech continue workshops to upgrade the skills and knowledge of faculty and that both incentives and sanctions be implemented to encourage faculty to continue to learn more and expand their teaching horizons.**
- (21) We recommend that the Tech administration work to eliminate the most egregious technology differentials between colleges and departments.**
- (22) We strongly recommend that Tech consider additional attention and resources to fund-raising.**
- (23) We recommend the commission of an appropriate firm to conduct a feasibility study for a capital campaign.**
- (24) We suggest that an annual report of research and development activities be generated. It would be appropriate to develop a printed report, CD, and on-line version of the report.**
- (25) We suggest that a review and upgrade of the University's website be considered.**

- (26) It may be necessary to consider formalizing the news and information function under the Department of Marketing as Tech competes in a new SREB Four-Year 2 arena.**
- (27) The University should develop a multi-faceted strategy that includes face-to-face and electronic tactics to interact and communicate with more of its graduates.**
- (28) We recommend discontinuing the alumni membership program and redeploying funds to increasing alumni activities and related alumni solicitation.**
- (29) We recommend that the Annual Fund program be expanded to increase alumni participation from 24 percent (in 2006) to at least 40 percent of the alumni population.**
- (30) We recommend development of alumni chapters in areas where a “critical mass” of alumni reside. Additionally, the University should establish a class agents program.**
- (31) As new members of the Board of Supervisors come on board, we note the importance of thoughtful orientation.**

APPENDIX A

James L. Fisher

Review Team Chair

James L. Fisher has been a consultant to more than 300 colleges and universities and is the most published writer on leadership and organization in higher education today. He has written scores of professional articles and has also been published in such popular media as *The New York Times*, *The Washington Times*, and *The Baltimore Sun*. The author or editor of ten books, his book, *The Board and the President*, "clearly established him as the nation's leading authority on the college presidency," wrote Michael Worth of George Washington University reviewing in *Currents*. His *The Power of the Presidency* was reviewed in *Change* magazine as "... the most important book ever written on the college presidency" and was nominated for the non-fiction Pulitzer Prize. His book, *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference*, has been reviewed as "...a major, impressive, immensely instructive book, ...a virtual Dr. Spock for aspiring or new college presidents, and ...a must read for all trustees." *The Entrepreneurial College President* (2004) is "...to be commended..." "...a Bible for those who are presidents..." "...or engaged in research..." *The Journal of Higher Education* and Interactive Reviews. His recent book, *Positive Power*, is quickly gaining popularity throughout the United States and internationally:

- The modern Machiavelli...from Aegon to Zenix...persuasive and to the point, *Baltimore Sun*
- There is definitely something happening with this book. We are out of stock already, *National Book Network*

He is presently writing two books, *The Entrepreneurial Personality in Corporate America* and *The Effective Board Chair*, which should be published in 2007.

A registered psychologist with a Ph.D. from Northwestern University, he is President Emeritus of the Council for Advancement & Support of Education (CASE) and President Emeritus of Towson University. He has taught at Northwestern, Illinois State, Johns Hopkins, Harvard, and the University of Georgia. He coined the term institutional review and has conducted hundreds of institutional and governance reviews for public and private institutions and systems. He also conducts board orientations and retreats and consults on presidential searches, evaluations and contracts.

Dr. Fisher has been a trustee at ten private colleges and universities and two preparatory schools. A former Marine, he presently serves as a board member of Millikin University, Florida Institute of Technology, Marine Corps University and the Marine Military Academy. He has received awards for teaching, writing, citizenship and leadership and has been awarded eleven honorary degrees. At Illinois State, The Outstanding Thesis Award was named by the faculty, The James L. Fisher Thesis Award. The faculty at Towson University recommended that the new psychology building be named after Dr. Fisher, and the CASE Distinguished Service to Education Award bears his name.

While president at Towson, *The Baltimore Sun* wrote that he was a "master educational politician....under his leadership, enrollment doubled, quality went up and costs went down." In Washington, *Newsweek* magazine reported that, while President at CASE, his national campaign, The Action Committee for Higher Education (ACHE) resulted in "more than \$1 billion in student financial aid." CASE also created and orchestrated the "America's Energy is Mindpower"

campaign, "Higher Education Week" and "The Professor of the Year" awards. For several years, he did a popular daily radio commentary on WBAL in Baltimore and has been an occasional OP/ED feature writer for *The Baltimore Sun*. Through the years, Dr. Fisher has been encouraged by leaders in both parties to run for Governor or Senate.

Gene A. Budig

Dr. Budig served as President of the American League for six years (1994-2000) and oversaw the operations of 14 clubs and the construction of \$2.2 billion worth of new ballparks. He was a Senior Adviser to Major League Baseball for three years (2000-2003). MLB is a \$4.4 billion a year enterprise. He served as a Scholar in Residence at the College Board from 2002 to 2005, and was a member of the faculty at Princeton University during the 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 school years. He is now College Board Professor and Senior Presidential Adviser.

He authored a book on the economics of baseball, *The Inside Pitch, And More*, for the West Virginia University Press in 2004. He wrote another book on leading the modern college and university, *A Game of Uncommon Skill*, for the American Council on Education Series on Higher Education in 2002. He chairs *College Ed*, a national program funded by the Gates Foundation, which is designed to increase college attendance by 15 to 18 percent. He is a member of the National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges, and a member of the National Center for Innovative Thought.

Dr. Budig has headed three major state universities, each with enrollments of more than 22,000 students. The institutions were Illinois State University, West Virginia University, and the University of Kansas. He was a Professor of Higher Education Finance at ISU, WVU, KU, and the University of Nebraska. Over a period of 23 years he was responsible for the educational programs of 520,000 students.

Dr. Budig oversaw the administration of \$8.1 billion in educational funds, both public and private.

He is a retired Major General, Air National Guard/United States Air Force. His last assignment was Assistant to the Chief, National Guard Bureau, and the Army and Air National Guard had components at the time in all 50 states and 573,000 members and an annual operational budget of nearly \$9 billion.

He was appointed Chief of Staff for the Governor of Nebraska, serving three years early in his career (1964-67).

Dr. Budig had responsibility for 7,500 faculty and staff at ISU, 10,500 faculty and staff at WVU, and 12,500 faculty and staff at KU. He led these universities in long-range planning initiatives designed to enhance the learning experience of students. He was one of five executives named to establish a long-term business plan for Major League Baseball, a plan that produced record attendance of more than 72 million fans.

He served on the Executive Committee of the Kansas University Endowment Association during his 13 years as Chancellor (1981 to 1994) and the Association built an endowment of more than \$1 billion. He played a central role in raising funds and determining allocations to a wide array of educational programs.

He was recognized as one who could raise large amounts of private money for the public good at state universities. He headed successful fund drives at WVU and KU. He played a leadership role in Major League Baseball Charities, especially as it related to the creation of education and recreation programs in the major cities.

Dr. Budig has written essays for the Kansas City Star, New York Times, Omaha World-Herald, and USA TODAY. The Associated Press has carried reports of his studies on gubernatorial views in the 1960s and 1970s, and he has authored more than 70 articles for academic journals.

George Kidd, Jr.

George Kidd is one of the nation's most accomplished college presidents and financial officers. A college president for 26 years and a business and finance officer for 18 years, he has also been a director of 7 for-profit companies and financial institutions.

Dr. Kidd was President of Tiffin University (1981-2002), Vice President for Business Services at Mercyhurst College (1976-1981) and Interim President at Myers University (2005-2006). Prior to his presidencies, he served in a number of financial positions at the University of Pennsylvania (1964-1976).

He has an MA in Economic History from the University of Pennsylvania, an MBA from Drexel University and four honorary doctorates. He is presently President Emeritus and professor of Economics at Tiffin University.

James V. Koch

James V. Koch is Board of Visitors Professor of Economics and President Emeritus at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA. Dr. Koch served as President of Old Dominion from 1990-2001. Prior to that, he was President of the University of Montana, 1986-1990. An Exxon Foundation study of American college presidents selected him as one of the 100 most effective college presidents in the United States. During his tenure at Old Dominion, the University recorded its first Rhodes Scholar, developed the largest televised, interactive distance learning system in the United States, and initiated more than \$300 million in new construction.

Dr. Koch is an economist who has published nine books and 90 refereed journal articles in the field. His *Industrial Organization and Prices* was the leading text in this specialty for several years. The focus of his current research is the economics of e-commerce. He has taught at institutions ranging from Illinois State University to Brown University, the University of Hawaii, and the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. His *Presidential Leadership: Making a Difference*, co-authored with James L. Fisher, is regarded as the definitive work concerning college presidents and their boards. He has been individually or collectively involved in the assessment of more than 30 presidents and institutions of higher education.

Dr. Koch earned a B.A. degree from Illinois State University and his Ph.D. degree in Economics from Northwestern University. He has received three honorary doctoral degrees from universities in Japan and Korea and has received a host of honors from organizations such as the Urban League, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and several regional economic development agencies.

Scott D. Miller

Scott D. Miller is in his 10th year as president of Wesley College in Dover, Delaware. During this time, the College has thrived; he was one of 17 presidents nationwide featured in a Kaufman Foundation-funded book entitled *The Entrepreneurial College President* (American Council on Education/Praeger Series on Higher Education, 2004). The Wesley story was one of four “amazing transformational stories” featured in the book *The Small College Guide to Financial Health* (NACUBO, 2002). The College has received two gold medals from the Council for the Advancement and Support of Education in Washington, D.C. for overall fundraising improvement and performance.

Specifically, during the past decade, Wesley has founded a charter school with 629 students in grades 1-12; established an urban center serving over 500; acquired two historic landmarks—the Schwartz Center for the Performing Arts and Barratt’s Chapel and Museum; established the Wesley Community Service Center with six campus-based affiliates creating service learning opportunities for undergraduate/graduate students; dramatically increased enrollment (headcount from 1,052 to 2,400; full-time from 617 to 1,860); expanded non-traditional programs to include two branch campuses and multiple corporate based programs; increased annual operating revenues five-fold; procured \$63 million for operations, new construction, and endowment; and developed an \$84 million strategic plan.

He is a regular columnist for *The Delaware State News* and *College Planning and Management*; he has co-published the books *President to President: Views on Technology in Higher Education* (SCT/Sungard Publications, 2005), *From the Presidents’ Desks: Strategies for Success* (InterAmerican Press, 2006) and *Presidential Perspectives: Creating Competitive Advantages* (Aramark Publications, 2007); and has served on national boards and as a consultant to college and university presidents and boards.

Before coming to Wesley, he served for 13 years at Lincoln Memorial University (President, 1991-97; Executive Vice President, 1988-91; and Vice President for Development, 1984-1988) and the University of Rio Grande (1981-84). He is a former newspaper reporter in Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

He holds degrees from West Virginia Wesleyan College (B.A.), The University of Dayton (M.S.), Vanderbilt University (Ed.S.), and The Union Institute & University (Ph.D., Higher Education Administration) and has completed post-graduate studies at Ohio University and Harvard University.

Scott is married to the former Annie Cook, a native of Rio Grande, Ohio, and they have two daughters—Katie, 22, a senior at Goucher (MD) College, and Ashlee, 19, a sophomore at the University of Delaware.

Lynn E. Weaver

Dr. Lynn Weaver has served on the faculty of Purdue University, University of Arizona, University of Oklahoma, Georgia Institute of Technology, and Auburn University. He has held every academic rank and currently is President Emeritus and Professor of Electrical Engineering of Florida Institute of Technology.

He has received major funding from industry and government; is the author of two textbooks; the editor or co-editor of five technical books and over fifty publications in professional journals; and is Executive Editor of the technical journal, *Annals of Nuclear Energy*. He received the University of Missouri Honor Award for Distinguished Service in Engineering and is a Fellow of the American Nuclear Society.

Dr. Weaver has been a consultant to academic and industrial organizations, legal firms, and a consultant with the Organization of American States in education and research development in Latin America. In this course, he has been instrumental in raising outside support for buildings, equipment, endowed chairs and faculty development.

He has served on the Board of Directors of Oak Ridge Associated Universities, the National Center for Asphalt Technology, the Board of Directors of DBA Systems, Inc., the Board of the Florida Distance Learning Network and as Chairman of the President's Council of Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida (ICUF).

APPENDIX B

Interviewees:

John Adams, Dept Chair, School of Forestry
Janie Ainsworth, Admin Asst
Jan Albritton, Director, Admissions
Margaret Alexander, Asst, Academic Administration
Bruce Alford, Faculty
Glen Alford, Supervisor of Special Projects, Student Affairs
Sharon Alford, Admin Assistant, President's Office
David Anderson, Faculty
Bruce Ayres, Director, Facilities/Physical Plant
George Baldwin, Donor
Sheila Barham, Admin Asst
Chris Barr, Alumnus
Todd Barre, Associate Vice President, Planning & Budget, Board of Supervisors
Dawn Basinger, Director, Louisiana Tech Teachers' Institute
Erin Bass, Student
Scott Beder, Senior Sports Writer, *The News Star*
Glenn Beer, Director, Science & Technology Education Center
Edward Bell, Director, Professional Development & Research Institute on Blindness
Rebecca Bennett, Assoc Dean, Graduate Studies & Research, College of Business
Loren Blanchard, Vice President, Academic Affairs, Board of Supervisors
Ayres Bradford, Alumnus
Scott Brame, Board of Regents
Don Braswell, Director, Environmental Safety
Robert Bremer, Faculty
John Brewer, Director, Barksdale Program
Devin Broome, Director of IT, Board of Supervisors
Kyle Broussard, Student
Nick Bruno, Vice President, Operations & Facilities, Board of Supervisors
Walter Buboltz, Faculty
Andy Buffington, Student
Marie Bukowski, Faculty
Elsie Burkhalter, Vice Chair, Board of Supervisors
David Burleigh, Student
Allison Bushnell, Alumna
Tammy Butler, Director, External Relations, College of Business
Jack Byrd, President, Louisiana Tech University Foundation
Diana Cabrera, Student
Gene Callens, Professor Emeritus
Lisa Cammack, Student
David Cargill, Director, Center for Instructional Tech
Jenna Carpenter, Faculty
Walter Carpenter, Faculty
Peggy Carter, Faculty

Shawn Clark, Admin Coordinator
Sally Clausen, President, University of Louisiana Board of Supervisors
Lisa Cole, Comptroller
Jan Colvin, Dept Chair, Center for Children & Families
Jon Copeland, Student
Mel Corley, Dept Chair, Mechanical Engineering & Construction Engineering
Technology
Andre Coudrain, Board of Supervisors
Dickie Crawford, Dean, Student Life
Jennifer Crume, Faculty
Constantine Curris, President, AASCU
Candy Daniels, Admin Asst
Clarice Dans, Dept Chair, Speech
David Darland, Alumnus
Nancy Darland, Faculty
JoAnn Dausat, Dean, College of Education
James Davison, Community Leader
David Deal, Director, Information Systems & Finance
Benny Denny, Donor
Carol Denny, Donor
Mike DiCarlo, Associate Director, Library
Jonathan Donehoo, Dept Chair, Dept of Art
Lanie Dornier, Dept Chair, Dept of Health & Exercise Science
Lucy Douglas, Faculty
Mert Douglas, Director, Multicultural Affairs
Bobby Dowling, Director, Recreational Activities
Hollis Downs, Louisiana House of Representatives
Jerry Drewett, Budget Officer
Lydia Earhart, Student Editor, *The Tech Talk*
Joan Edinger, Assoc Director, Admissions
Kyle Edmiston, Alumnus
Susan Elkins, Associate Registrar
Jacob Ellard, Student
Kay Ellender, Faculty
Pam Emory, Faculty
Dan Erickson, Director, International Studies
Katie Evans, Faculty
Robert Fakelmann, Faculty
Scarlett Fiegel, Student
Rayla Kay Fish, Student
Christa Fisher, Student
Pamela Ford, Dean, Enrollment Management
Allison Fuller, Student
Peter Gallagher, Faculty
Mildred Gallot, Board of Supervisors
Rick Gallot, Louisiana House of Representatives

Donna Garner, Faculty
Otis Gilley, Dept Chair, Economics & Finance
Robert Grafton, Internal Auditor
Kimberlyn Gray, Faculty
Richard Greechie, Faculty
Andrea Green, Admin Coordinator
Elizabeth Green, Secretary, Louisiana Tech Foundation
Gary Green, Faculty
Marvin Green, Donor
Rusty Green, Donor
Linda Griffin, Dean, Student Development
George Grozdits, Faculty
Dave Guerin, Director, Marketing & Public Relations
Les Guice, Vice President, Research & Development
Kenny Guillot, President, Louisiana Tech Alumni Assn
Paul Hale, Dept Chair, Biomedical Engineering
Robert Hale, Board of Supervisors
David Hall, Faculty
Reggie Hanchey, Program Coordinator, President's Office
Ruth Ellen Hanna, Dept Chair, Mathematics & Statistics
Julia Hardie, Faculty
Edith Hawkins, Faculty
Jack Hawkins, Chancellor, Troy University
Hisham Hegab, Dept Chair, Electrical Engineering
Chris Henderson, Director, Technical Services
Patti Hendricks, Admin Coordinator
Larry Henrickson, Faculty
Wiley Hilburn, Dept Chair, Journalism
Justin Hinckley, Donor
Michael Hochstetler, Student
Laura Hogan, Student Leader
Rick Hohlt, Publisher, *Ruston Daily Leader*
Dan Hollingsworth, Mayor, City of Ruston
Penny Humphries, Annual Fund Officer
Mary Kay Hungate, Assoc Athletic Director & Senior Women's Administrator
Richard Hutchinson, Faculty
Tony Inman, Faculty
Ladd Jackson, Faculty
Ed Jacobs, Dean, College of Liberal Arts
Justin Jacobs, Student
Jeff Jenkins, Board of Supervisors
Beverly Johnson, Associate Director, Financial Aid
James Johnson, Student
Peter Jones, Faculty
Steven Jones, Faculty
Horace Judson, President, Grambling State University

Don Kaczvinsky, Dept Chair, School of Literature & Language
Newton “Track” Kavanaugh, Faculty
Angela Kennedy, Dept Chair, Health Information Management
Gary Kennedy, Dept Chair, Agricultural Sciences
Jim King, Vice President, Student Affairs
Lori King, Faculty
Kay Kirkpatrick, Vice President, General Counsel & Administration, Board of
Supervisors
James Kordemeier, Student
Robert Kostelka, Senator, Louisiana State
Mark Kroll, Dept Chair, Dept of Management & Information Systems
Connie LaBorde, Assoc Dean, Undergraduate Studies, College of Education
Emily Landry, Student
Robert Latham, Student
Douglas Lee, Asst Vice President, Facilities/Capital Improvements; Board of Supervisors
Pauline Leonard, Faculty
Althea Levingston, Student
Bob Levy, District Attorney, Lincoln & Union Parishes, Third Judicial Court; Board of
Regents
Karen Lewis, Faculty
James Liberatos, Dean, College of Applied & Natural Sciences
Edwin Litolff, Vice President, Institutional Research & Enrollment, Board of Supervisors
Jimmy Long, Chair, Board of Supervisors
John Long, Alumnus
Juan Lopez, Faculty
Jimmy Love, Donor
Aaron Lusby, Faculty
Bruce Magee, Faculty
Stanley McCaa, Faculty
Gavin McCarty, Student
Terry McConathy, Executive Vice President, Dean of Graduate School
Nancy McDonald, Admin Asst
Lucius McGehee, Donor
Mildred McGehee, Donor
Ben McMillan, Student
David Merchant, Faculty
Raymond Merritt, Captain, University Police
Pamela Moore, Dept Chair, Nursing
Courtney Mott, Student
Mark Murphey, Faculty
Cheryl Myers, Director, Career Center
Lomax Napper, Alumnus
Stan Napper, Dean, College of Engineering & Science
Raja Nassar, Faculty
Jeff Nelson, Student
Linda Newbold, Admin Asst

Davy Norris, Director, Enterprise Center
Jim Oakes, Athletic Director
Gary Odom, Dept Chair, Dept of Professional Aviation
Myrtis Orr, Donor
Virgil Orr, Donor
Kimberly Ortiz, Student
Carol Owens, Faculty
Matthew Pacobit, Student
Wayne Parker, Board of Supervisors
Christian Pasluosta, Student
Jim Pearce, City Councilman
Christopher Pharis, Student
Janet Phillips, Faculty
Tommy Phillips, Dept Chair, Accounting
Karen Pierce, Student
Jason Pigg, Dept Chair, Social Sciences
Marie Pipes, Executive Administrative Coordinator, College of Engineering & Science
Douglas Pittman, Student
Marcia Poole, Faculty
Janet Pope, Assoc Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Applied & Natural Sciences
Clay Posey, Student
Jon Pratt, Director, Center for Entrepreneurship & Information Technology
Gordon Pugh, Board of Supervisors
Karl Puljak, Dept Chair, Architecture
B. Ramachandran, Faculty; Assoc Dean, College of Engineering & Science
Linda Ramsey, Faculty
W. Clinton "Bubba" Rasberry, Board of Regents
Susan Rasbury, Executive Asst & Compliance & Title IX Coordinator
Bobby Rawle, Benefactor, Alumnus
Ken Rea, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Shirley Reagan, Dean, College of Administration & Business
Gerald Reeves, Director, Campus Bookstore
Daniel D. Reneau, President
Ryan Richard, Director, Alumni Relations
Jo Richardson, Faculty
Jennifer Riley, Director, Major Gifts
Ken Robbins, Dept Chair, School of Performing Arts
Doug Rogers, Alumnus
Gaye Ross, Faculty
Ruby Ryles, Faculty
Aziz Saber, Vice President, University Senate
Lee Sawyer, Dept Chair, Chemistry & Physics
Don Schillinger, Faculty
Bernd Schroeder, Faculty
Rastko Selmic, Faculty
D'eane Sheehan, Faculty

Tilman Sheets, Dept Chair, Psychology & Behavioral Sciences
Mike Shipp, Director, Center for Biomedical Engineering & Rehabilitation Science
Mark Shoemaker, Manager, Novell Networks, Computing Center
Winfred Sibille, Board of Supervisors
Rick Simmons, Faculty Senate
Kevin Singh, Faculty
Les Singletary, Faculty
Caleb Smith, President, Student Government Assn
Eunice Smith, Board of Supervisors
William Smith, Student
Sam Speed, Director, Residential Life
Tom Springer, Faculty
Corre Stegall, Vice President, University Advancement
Ray Sterling, Director, Trenchless Technology Center
Jennie Stockle, Student
Laurie Stoff, Faculty
Pat Strong, Chair, Board of Regents
Barbara Swart, Admin Coordinator
Carolyn Talton, Professor Emeriti
John Taylor, Superintendent, Grounds
Artis Terrell, Jr., Board of Regents
Lori Theis, Director, Institutional Research
Sally Thigpen, Faculty
Donna Thomas, Faculty
Joe Thomas, Vice President for Finance & Administration
Robert Toburen, Faculty
Kody Varahramyan, Director, Institute for Micromanufacturing
Bob Vento, Registrar
Roger Vick, Director, Financial Aid
Sam Wallace, Director, Facility & Support Services
Heidi Waltman, Student
Jimmy Washington, Admissions Counselor & Minority Recruiter
Roy Waters, Director, Computing Center
Stephen Webre, Dept Chair, History
Walter Wicker, Dean, Library Services
Carynn Wiggins, Dept Chair, A.E. Phillips Lab School
Julie Wilkerson, Alumna
Alan Willbanks, Exxon Mobil,
Matthew Williams, Faculty
Tamika Williams, Faculty
Bill Willoughby, Assoc Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Graduate Studies & Research,
College of Liberal Arts
Brittany Wilson, Student
Mike Woods, Parliamentarian, Board of Supervisors
Kathy Wyatt, Director, Small Business Development Center
Amy Yates, Faculty

Kai Zhang, Student

Li-he Zou, Faculty

Thirty-four Anonymous Faculty, Students, Staff and Townspeople

APPENDIX C
LOUISIANA TECH UNIVERSITY
REVIEW INTERVIEW FORM

Name

Title

Date

We have been asked to review the condition of Louisiana Tech University. Please respond in terms of your impression of the following. Your answers will be kept in confidence.

1. GENERAL CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY (STRENGTHS, LIMITATIONS)

2. ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

3. TECHNOLOGY

4. FACULTY (QUALITY, MORALE, WORKLOAD, COMPENSATION, ET AL)

5. STUDENTS (FACULTY ADVISING, STUDENT SERVICES, CREDENTIALS, MORALE, AWARENESS, RACIAL, ET AL)

6. ADMISSIONS, RETENTION, FINANCIAL AID, ET AL

7. INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

8. ADMINISTRATION

9. SENIOR OFFICERS

10. BUDGET AND FINANCE (FACILITIES, ET AL)

11. FUND-RAISING AND DEVELOPMENT

12. PUBLIC RELATIONS

13. ALUMNI AFFAIRS

14. CAMPUS GOVERNANCE

15. BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SYSTEM OFFICERS

16. PRESIDENTIAL EFFECTIVENESS

17. COMPARATIVE CONDITION OF THE UNIVERSITY, DOCUMENTATION IF ANY

18. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS

JLF 2007

APPENDIX D

Materials Used in the Review:

“Fisher Template”

Formal Evaluation of Daniel D. Reneau, 2002, by Dr. Robert Woodbury, Harpswell, Maine

Confidential Self Reviews by the President and Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, Finance & Administration, Research & Development, Student Affairs, University Advancement and the Graduate School

2006-2007 Catalog

Basic Facts, 2001-2005

COC/SACS 2005 Reaffirmation of Accreditation: Compliance Certificate

Tech 2020 Strategic Plan

Louisiana Tech University Policies and Procedures

Board of Supervisors Policies and Procedures

Board of Regents Policies and Procedures

University Accreditation

Annual Reports

Class Size

Retention Data

Student Opinion Survey

Financial Aid/Scholarship Information

Press Releases/Newspaper Articles

A Report by the Education Trust, May 2004

American Association of State Colleges & University, A Report of Graduations Rates Outcomes Study, September 2005 (includes Tech)

Consultant Report, Noel Levitz

Consultant Report: B.S. in Nanosystems Engineering

Consultant Report: M.S. in Molecular Sciences and Nanotechnology

Consultant Report: Doctorate of Audiology

Minutes, Administrative and Planning Council

Minutes, Board of Regents

Minutes, Board of Supervisors

Audit Reports: Louisiana Tech University Athletics, Louisiana Tech University Foundation

Confirmation of NCAA Certification

College of Administration & Business, Brochures/Promotional Pieces

College of Applied & Natural Sciences, Brochures/Promotional Pieces

College of Education, Brochures/Promotional Pieces

College of Engineering & Science, Brochures/Promotional Pieces

College of Liberal Arts, Brochures/Promotional Pieces

Materials on Delivery of Academic Services

Division of Student Affairs, Brochures & Publications

Division of Research and Development, Brochures & Publications

Division of University Advancement, Brochures and Publications

Athletics Media Guides