

THE CHE - PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

CHURCH HISTORY
PROFESSOR FREDRICH
MARK S. VOSS

1984

Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library
11831 N. Seminary Drive. 65W
Mequon, Wisconsin

The Commission on Higher Education, or the CHE as we will from here on refer to it, is that working body of the Wisconsin Evangelical Synod which coordinates the operating and continuing development of our Synod's institutions of higher learning. Since the need for maintaining sound Christian doctrine and practices in these schools is vitally important for the future of the Synod, and because the operating of these schools makes up 39.1% of our Synod's budget, it is imperative that the CHE runs smoothly and efficiently.

This paper will serve to examine the inner workings of

THE CHE - PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE.

I. THE PAST

The manner in which the worker training division of the Synod was supervised and administered can be divided into three time periods. The first is the time period prior to 1959. The second is from 1959 to 1969. The third is from 1969 to the present.

The time prior to 1959 was characterized by full independence on the part of each institution. Without delving into minute details and into the conception of each school and the first time the heads of these schools met for planning and coordinating programs, let's just say that they did meet, but that they met in a state of confusion - at the least.

The meetings were not planned, no agenda was followed, nor was there any preparation on the part of the representatives for the meetings. Common problems were discussed, interesting stories were exchanged, but no real business was conducted nor were there any attempts made to plan for new programs or expand existing ones.

When new buildings were needed or the remodeling of established buildings became necessary no effort was made as a worker training unit to prepare for such needs with the result that there was no coordination on the part of these institutions. Each one shifted for itself. In like manner there was no coordination with the other units of the Synod to determine where the need was the greatest and which need should be taken care of first. In short, the institutions were not working together, but took care of their own needs with but a general and scanty knowledge of the plans and programs of another institution and the other areas of the Synod's work.

Furthermore, when new projects were initiated at an institution, careful studies were not made in regard to the needs, present or future, the serviceability, the location of a building with the future in mind, the kind of construction and materials to be used with the maintenance factors in mind. Nor was there any qualified person or synodical committee who could offer advice and counsel to prevent countless future problems and save hundreds and thousands of dollars along the way. When a need became imperative, the one who could talk the loudest and the longest, who had the ability to appeal to the synodical conventions often received the authorization needed to proceed.

Out of this unstructured system which often cost the Synod dearly, in both money lost and feelings hurt, the Advisory Committee on Education - ACE - came into being in 1959. This committee was "composed of the Presidents of the Synod's educational institutions and of the Chairmen of their respective Governing Boards." (1959 Proceedings, p. 284)

In 1961 the ACE reported that it invited one area Lutheran high school principal and one board chairman to attend the meetings in order to provide a liaison between the Synod's institutions and the Lutheran high schools. (1961 Proceedings. p. 82)

The responsibilities of the ACE were stated as follows: " The Committee shall counsel together concerning the welfare of the Synod's educational institutions with a view toward coordinating policies, and administration " (1959 Proceedins. p. 284) Co-ordination was the primary objective of this reorganization. This objective was effectively pursued. In order to cope with its assignment and work load, the ACE reorganized into three distinct committees (policy, cirriculum, budget). Additional meetings were called.

However, because of the amount of work confronting ACE, and because items on the agenda were put off due to lack of time to plan for and exeucute the programs, it became evident that a re-organization and a full time person with appropriate staff was necessary to analyze, coordinate, and execute the plans of the institutions. Hence the Synod resolved to change ACE " from an advisory committee to an operating agency with the title, 'Commission on Higher Education.' " The Synod also

RESOLVED, b) That it be given the responsibility for the following: 1) long range planning and policy; 2) seeing that the educational programs of the institutions, individually and collectively, make the maximum contribution to the Synod's objectives; 3) recommending and planning additional physical facilities; and 4) administering the Synod's worker training system as a whole, and be it further

RESOLVED, c) That it guide, supervise, and consult with the Boards of Control without depriving them of essential autonomy in administering the affairs of their respective institutions guaranteed by the constitution. (1969 Proceedings. pp 166f).

By resolution a representative of the area Lutheran high schools was granted membership on the CHE. The CHE was granted authority to call an Executive Secretary and the Synod resolved to elect a chairman for the Commission. These resolutions provided for no substantial change from the ACE but rather took note of how the ACE had been functioning and growing and provided for this constitutionally.

Throughout the years the report of the Board of Education-Wisconsin Synod was included with the reports of the Synod's educational institutions. When ACE was organized, the Board of Education was represented on the committee in an advisory capacity. With the reorganization in 1969, the name of the Board of Education was changed to Board for Parish Education. It continued as a part of the Commission on Higher Education with representation on the commission. Although its responsibilities involved primarily the elementary schools conducted by the Synod's individual parishes, it has continued as a part of the Commission on Higher Education within the Synod's administrative structure.

II. The Present

In examining the present CHE one can note the Synod's concern that there be increased coordination of the efforts of our worker training divisions and institutions.

In order to examine whether this is effectively being done one needs to study the CHE's Statement of Purpose and also its List of Objectives. The best men to do this are those who are directly involved. Following the Statement of Purpose and List of Objectives is a summary of interviews with five present and past presidents of our Synod's institutions.

PURPOSE

The continuing purpose of the CHE is to coordinate the efforts of the Wisconsin Evangelical Lutheran Synod on behalf of the worker training division to provide a preaching and teaching ministry qualified to proclaim the Word of God faithfully and effectively, in accord with the Lutheran Confessions.

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the CHE are:

- 1) To provide the efficient and effective administration of the worker training division and of its respective units;
- 2) To coordinate recruitment and retention of students who will serve in the public ministry of the WELS;
- 3) To cooperate with the boards of control in the calling and maintaining of capable teaching staffs for the worker training schools;
- 4) To coordinate all the curricula of the schools primarily for the thorough and effective training of future pastors and teachers;
- 5) To coordinate and implement programs for the erection and/or acquisition and maintenance of adequate physical facilities and property of the schools;
- 6) To cooperate with the respective boards of control in providing competent, non-called auxiliary staffs for the efficient operation of the schools;
- 7) To correlate the fiscal needs of the division of its respective units with the overall program of the Synod;
- 8) To establish, coordinate, and clarify policies by which the units of the worker training division will be guided in their programs.

Each of the five was asked to comment on the coordination provided by the CHE in the eight objectives. They were each asked two questions: "Does the CHE coordinate?" and "Could the CHE do more and/or coordinate better?" This is a summary of their answers reported in a self-study done by the CHE, the Committee on Continuing Purpose.

I. Administration

All were agreed that in the area of administration the CHE does a very good job of coordinating. This coordination of administration is accomplished by a review of the self-studies of the various institutions, examination of biennial Program Statements from each institution, and a study of the goals of each institution and its means of attaining those goals within the framework of the institutions role within the system. Current budgetary needs, new programs, and capital needs of the whole system and its separate parts are examined, priorities established, and past performances in the meeting of goals evaluated. New administrators noted that the CHE was particularly useful to them in learning how to carry out these necessary aspects of administration in their particular institution and within the system. All pointed to the knowledge and broad range of experience of the Executive and his staff as essential to the success of the CHE in coordinating the work of the various administrative units within the system.

Could there be a better coordination in the area of administration? It was suggested that a "codification" of the resolutions of the CHE would be useful as the number of resolutions multiplies over the years, and as membership changes. It was also noted that the committee structure of the CHE can present a problem: since each member serves on one of the four standing committees, and since all of the committees

meet at the same time, it is very difficult for a member of one committee to appear before another in behalf of his school's particular need. How this problem could be resolved however is not apparent, given the limited amount of time and increasing work load of the committees and the commission itself.

II. Students

Coordination in recruitment is quite limited because of the very different immediate goals of the various levels and geographical areas within the system. The prep schools recruit for the future pastors and teachers within a given region, while the colleges recruit for a given vocation within less clearly defined geographical areas. Accordingly, the coordinating efforts of the CHE are limited to setting up meetings for the recruitment officers of the various schools, and studying enrollment trends as retention rates of the separate schools.

Could the CHE do more to coordinate in this area? It was suggested that the CHE might direct the recruitment efforts of the two colleges more towards recruitment for both colleges than for one particular school. While this worthy goal should certainly be held before the separate schools, it is only natural that the very familiarity of the officer within his own school will make his efforts more one school orientated.

III. Faculties. V. Facilities. VII. Budgets.

Does the CHE coordinate the needs of the separate schools for faculty and facilities? It was agreed that in these two areas the CHE does its most effective coordination. Before the creation of the CHE, each school had to plead its staff and capital needs to the

conventions of the Synod; the most effective suppliant won the most for his school in faculty and facilities. Now the needs of each school are reviewed, priorities set for the meeting of those needs within the system, and then these agreed upon priorities are presented. Thus an important balance between the schools is achieved which was lacking previously. The CHE also coordinates the teaching loads on the various levels within the system; such coordination facilitates the establishing of priorities for the creation of additional professorships. With both staff and capital needs coordinated in the CHE it is only natural that the budgets are also studied and accounting procedures coordinated in and through the CHE. While such a complex task is difficult its achievement is a considerable improvement on the old method of individual appeals from the various schools to the Synod in convention.

None of those interviewed suggested any concrete ways in which coordination in these areas could be increased or improved.

IV. Curriculum.

The CHE seeks to coordinate curricula on and between the various levels of the system through its Curriculum Review Committee. The CHE also sponsors plenary faculty conferences every four years to further facilitate curriculum coordination, with departments encouraged to meet on the interim. The requirements of the terminal schools dictate to a considerable degree the curricula of the feeder schools.

Could there be more coordination in the area of curricula? There was less agreement on the answer to this question with regard to curricula than with regard to the other seven areas of concern to the CHE.

This lack of uniformity on the part of those involved appears to stem from the normal tension between a desire for diversity within the system on the one hand and the need for coordination on the other; each school has a board of its own and a character of its own, both of which will be reflected to some extent in the development of curricula. Within the framework all those interviewed were agreed that there need not be 100% uniformity of curricula, and that there could not be total coordination without destroying the separate boards and the individuality of the respective schools. Thus a greater degree of coordination is possible, but not necessarily desirable; the exact degree of coordination best suited for the system as a whole and in its parts appears to be an open question.

VI. Auxiliary Staffs.

The coordinating role of the CHE in this area is consultative in its nature and those interviewed seemed satisfied with that. Local labor and market conditions, the relative sizes of the various schools and the degree of responsibility for the staff members with the same titles in different schools make this area less subject to coordination than many of the others.

VIII. Policies.

The CHE fosters the coordination of policies by requiring each school to formulate a precise Statement of Purpose, Objectives and Policies. These are reviewed on a biennial basis, together with any revised or newly inaugurated policies, to insure that the system is unified in its basic purpose. It also coordinates school calendars, choir tours, faculty anniversary observances, and retirement procedures.

None of those interviewed suggested any additional or improved ways of coordination in this area.

All of those interviewed agreed that the coordination provided by the CHE has been helpful to them in their particular schools, and none of them viewed the CHE as a hindrance to their work. All agreed as well that they did not desire a "super-board" to replace the CHE and its individual school boards. They further agreed that the terminal schools need the prep system if they are to continue to provide the church with a preaching and teaching ministry "qualified to proclaim the Word of God faithfully, effectively, and universally in accord with the Lutheran Confessions" (CHE Statement of Purpose). They agreed that the area Lutheran high schools are not and should not be expected to become the primary feeder school to the worker training colleges; and they noted that the philosophical, doctrinal and spiritual character of our student bodies would change significantly if a large percentage of our students in the colleges came from a public school background. Accordingly, all supported our synodical commitment to a single purpose school system from the prep level through the terminal schools.

The only areas mentioned in which the CHE might provide additional coordination were in the areas of curriculum, recruitment, and relations with the area Lutheran high schools. There was some suggestions that the base membership of the CHE could be expanded to include representatives from outside of the school system. But there was no agreement as to how this would increase the effectiveness of the CHE in its assigned task or whether it would be desirable to do so.

That, in a nutshell, is how the CHE is presently operating. From the answers of these present and past presidents it becomes very obvious that the CHE is doing a tremendous job in meeting its Statement of Purpose and in carrying out its List of Objectives.

III. THE FUTURE

Since the worker training schools are so important to the future of our Synod it compels us to make a strong commitment to their future. And we are doing that. The Reaching Out program will designate about 50% of the funds collected to be disbursed to our Synod schools. This program has transferred approximately \$5 million dollars into the Educational Institution Building Fund. The first \$1, 547,000 was used for partial debt retirement of the fund, with the next \$3, 672,342 to be used for the various building programs, the major share for programs at Michigan Lutheran Seminary. The next \$2.5 million over and beyond that figure will flow into the Educational Fevelopment Fund. Beyond that the worker training share of Reaching Out will be split between the EDF and the debt retirement of the EIBF.

These building programs at the various institutions are well under way and will serve to help in the education of the students attending as wll as in recruitment efforts. And we do need recruitment!

A very important role of the CHE is to study future needs for our Synod. Enrollments are carefully studied and projections are made. For example, to produce 50 pastoral canidates, we need supporting enrollments at the Seminary of 165, at NWC of 251, and at the prep schools of 900. The following statistics will serve to show our needs and at the same time reflect on the fine work of the CHE looking to our Synod's future.

In his visit to the Seniors the Executive Secretary of the CHE stated that this is an exciting time for the Synod and to be working for the Synod. It is growing and expanding as never before. The CHE is there to make sure it has the workers to continue to grow and expand. The future looks promising indeed!

Enrollment Requirements to Meet Future Needs - Pastors

WISCONSIN LUTHERAN SEMINARY

| | <u>Semester I Enrollment (on campus)</u> | <u>Number Assigned in Spring</u> | <u>Percent of WLS Enrollment</u> |
|---------|--|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1970-71 | 162 | 45 | 27.8 |
| 1971-72 | 150 | 43 | 28.7 |
| 1972-73 | 172 | 55 | 32.0 |
| 1973-74 | 169 | 44 | 26.0 |
| 1974-75 | 174 | 48 | 27.6 |
| 1975-76 | 188 | 60 | 31.9 |
| 1976-77 | 174 | 58 | 33.3 |
| 1977-78 | 184 | 64 | 34.8 |
| 1978-79 | 185 | 51 | 27.6 |
| 1979-80 | 168 | 50 | 29.8 |
| 1980-81 | 175 | 54 | 30.9 |
| 1981-82 | 182 | 60 | 33.0 |
| 1982-83 | 165 | 57 | 30.3 |
| | <u>2248</u> | <u>689</u> | |
| Average | 173 | 53 | 30.6 |

If the patterns above hold true in the future, calls for replacements and growth will need supporting enrollments at the Seminary as follows.

| <u>Desired Number of Candidates</u> | = 30.6% of | <u>Necessary Seminary Enrollment (on campus)</u> |
|---|------------|--|
| 30 | | 98 |
| 35 | | 114 |
| 40 | | 131 |
| 45 | | 147 |
| 50 | | 163 |
| 55 | | 180 |
| 60 | | 196 |
| 65 | | 212 |
| 70 | | 229 |

NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE

| | <u>Semester I Enrollment</u> | <u>Supplies WLS Juniors</u> | <u>Percent of NWC Enrollment</u> |
|---------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1970-71 | 279 | 55 | |
| 1971-72 | 286 | 46 | 16.5 |
| 1972-73 | 279 | 66 | 23.1 |
| 1973-74 | 289 | 51 | 18.3 |
| 1974-75 | 271 | 62 | 21.5 |
| 1975-76 | 267 | 45 | 16.6 |
| 1976-77 | 239 | 51 | 19.1 |
| 1977-78 | 235 | 50 | 20.9 |
| 1978-79 | 237 | 63 | 26.8 |
| 1979-80 | 241 | 42 | 17.7 |
| 1980-81 | 255 | 49 | 20.3 |
| 1981-82 | 275 | 51 | 20.0 |
| 1982-83 | 269 | 51 | 18.5 |
| | <u>3422</u> | <u>682</u> | |
| Average | 263 | 52 | 19.9 |

| | <u>Semester I WLS Enrollment (on campus)</u> | <u>WLS Juniors from NWC</u> | <u>Percent of WLS Enrollment (on campus)</u> |
|---------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 1970-71 | 162 | 55 | 34.0 |
| 1971-72 | 150 | 46 | 30.7 |
| 1972-73 | 172 | 66 | 38.4 |
| 1973-74 | 169 | 51 | 30.2 |
| 1974-75 | 174 | 62 | 35.6 |
| 1975-76 | 188 | 45 | 23.9 |
| 1976-77 | 174 | 51 | 29.3 |
| 1977-78 | 184 | 50 | 27.2 |
| 1978-79 | 185 | 63 | 34.1 |
| 1979-80 | 168 | 42 | 25.0 |
| 1980-81 | 175 | 49 | 28.0 |
| 1981-82 | 182 | 51 | 28.0 |
| 1982-83 | 165 | 51 | 30.9 |
| | <u>2248</u> | <u>682</u> | |
| Average | 173 | 52 | 30.3 |

If the juniors at WLS from Northwestern are on an average 30.3% of the on-campus seminary enrollment, and if the patterns indicated on the previous charts hold true for the future, calls for replacements and growth will need supporting enrollments at Northwestern as follows.

| <u>Desired Number of Candidates</u> | <u>Necessary Seminary Enrollment</u> | <u>Necessary Seminary Juniors from NWC</u> | = 19.9% of | <u>Necessary Northwestern Enrollment</u> |
|---|--|--|------------|--|
| 30 | 98 | 30 | | 151 |
| 35 | 114 | 35 | | 176 |
| 40 | 131 | 40 | | 201 |
| 45 | 147 | 45 | | 226 |
| 50 | 163 | 49 | | 246 |
| 55 | 180 | 55 | | 276 |
| 60 | 196 | 59 | | 296 |
| 65 | 212 | 64 | | 322 |
| 70 | 229 | 69 | | 347 |

PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

| | <u>Semester I NWC Enrollment</u> | <u>Prep Grads - NWC Freshmen</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1970-71 | 279 | 63 | 22.6 |
| 1971-72 | 286 | 47 | 16.4 |
| 1972-73 | 279 | 48 | 17.2 |
| 1973-74 | 289 | 45 | 15.6 |
| 1974-75 | 271 | 56 | 20.7 |
| 1975-76 | 267 | 46 | 17.2 |
| 1976-77 | 239 | 37 | 15.5 |
| 1977-78 | 235 | 30 | 12.8 |
| 1978-79 | 237 | 46 | 19.4 |
| 1979-80 | 241 | 36 | 14.9 |
| 1980-81 | 255 | 55 | 21.6 |
| 1981-82 | 275 | 57 | 20.7 |
| 1982-83 | 269 | 38 | 14.1 |
| | <u>3422</u> | <u>604</u> | |
| Average | 263 | 46 | 17.7 |

If the freshmen at NWC who are graduates of the preparatory schools are on an average 17.7% of the NWC enrollment, and if the patterns indicated on the previous charts hold true for the future, calls for replacements and growth will need supporting enrollments at the preparatory schools as follows.

| <u>Desired Number of Candidates</u> | <u>Necessary NWC Freshman Enrollment (prep school graduates)*</u> | = 5.0% of | <u>Necessary Prep School Enrollment</u> |
|---|---|-----------|---|
| 30 | 27 | | 540 |
| 35 | 31 | | 620 |
| 40 | 36 | | 720 |
| 45 | 40 | | 800 |
| 50 | 44 | | 880 |
| 55 | 49 | | 980 |
| 60 | 52 | | 1040 |
| 65 | 57 | | 1140 |
| 70 | 61 | | 1220 |

*17.7% of total NWC enrollment

Enrollment Requirements to Meet Future Needs - Teachers

DR. MARTIN LUTHER COLLEGE

| | Semester I Enrollment | | | Assigned* Semester I | | | Assigned* Semester II | | | Total Assigned* | | | Percent of DMLC Enrollment |
|---------|-----------------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| | M | F | T | M | F | T | M | F | T | M | F | T | |
| 1970-71 | 226 | 582 | 808 | - | - | - | 51 | 80 | 131 | 51 | 80 | 131 | 16.2 |
| 1971-72 | 202 | 533 | 735 | - | - | - | 32 | 78 | 110 | 32 | 78 | 110 | 15.0 |
| 1972-73 | 170 | 490 | 660 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 34 | 83 | 117 | 37 | 87 | 124 | 18.8 |
| 1973-74 | 165 | 483 | 648 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 27 | 62 | 89 | 30 | 66 | 96 | 14.8 |
| 1974-75 | 184 | 463 | 647 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 34 | 72 | 106 | 35 | 77 | 112 | 17.5 |
| 1975-76 | 189 | 516 | 705 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 34 | 71 | 105 | 37 | 75 | 112 | 15.9 |
| 1976-77 | 214 | 508 | 722 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 31 | 74 | 105 | 35 | 77 | 112 | 15.5 |
| 1977-78 | 213 | 555 | 768 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 31 | 59 | 90 | 35 | 63 | 98 | 12.8 |
| 1978-79 | 230 | 575 | 805 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 33 | 79 | 112 | 34 | 80 | 114 | 14.2 |
| 1979-80 | 245 | 590 | 835 | 4 | 9 | 13 | 48 | 80 | 128 | 52 | 89 | 141 | 16.9 |
| 1980-81 | 225 | 574 | 799 | 5 | 10 | 15 | 34 | 78 | 112 | 39 | 88 | 127 | 15.9 |
| 1981-82 | 221 | 549 | 770 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 45 | 75 | 120 | 47 | 77 | 124 | 16.1 |
| 1982-83 | 202 | 522 | 724 | - | 3 | 3 | 51 | 82 | 133 | 51 | 85 | 136 | 18.8 |
| | <u>2686</u> | <u>6940</u> | <u>9626</u> | <u>30</u> | <u>49</u> | <u>79</u> | <u>485</u> | <u>973</u> | <u>1458</u> | <u>515</u> | <u>1022</u> | <u>1537</u> | |
| Average | 207 | 534 | 741 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 37 | 75 | 112 | 40 | 79 | 118 | 16.0 |

If the patterns above hold true in the future, calls for replacements and growth will need supporting enrollments at DMLC as follows.

| <u>Desired Number of Candidates</u> | = 16.0% of | <u>Necessary DMLC Enrollment</u> |
|-------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| 100 | | 625 |
| 105 | | 656 |
| 110 | | 688 |
| 115 | | 719 |
| 120 | | 750 |
| 125 | | 781 |
| 130 | | 813 |
| 135 | | 844 |
| 140 | | 875 |

*By assignment committee. Direct calls by districts not included.

| | <u>Semester I Prep Enrollment</u> | <u>Prep Grads - NWC & DMLC Freshmen</u> | <u>Percent of Enrollment</u> |
|---------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 1970-71 | 905 | 133 | |
| 1971-72 | 914 | 117 | 12.9 |
| 1972-73 | 912 | 120 | 13.1 |
| 1973-74 | 899 | 113 | 12.4 |
| 1974-75 | 925 | 121 | 13.5 |
| 1975-76 | 915 | 127 | 13.7 |
| 1976-77 | 968 | 118 | 12.9 |
| 1977-78 | 1,034 | 108 | 11.2 |
| 1978-79 | 1,005 | 112 | 10.8 |
| 1979-80 | 992 | 112 | 11.1 |
| 1980-81 | 904 | 124 | 12.5 |
| 1981-82 | 861 | 128 | 14.2 |
| 1982-83 | 803 | 111 | 12.9 |
| | <u>12,037</u> | <u>1544</u> | |
| Average | 926 | 119 | 12.8 |

| <u>Desired Number of Candidates: Pastor and Teacher</u> | <u>Necessary NWC & DMLC Freshman Enrollments (prep school graduates)</u> | = 12.8% of | <u>Necessary Prep School Enrollment</u> |
|---|--|------------|---|
| 30 + 100 = 130 | 27 + 61 = 88 | | 211 + 477 = 688 |
| 35 + 105 = 140 | 31 + 64 = 95 | | 242 + 500 = 742 |
| 40 + 110 = 150 | 36 + 67 = 103 | | 281 + 523 = 804 |
| 45 + 115 = 160 | 40 + 70 = 110 | | 313 + 547 = 860 |
| 50 + 120 = 170 | 44 + 74 = 118 | | 344 + 578 = 922 |
| 55 + 125 = 180 | 49 + 77 = 126 | | 383 + 602 = 985 |
| 60 + 130 = 190 | 52 + 80 = 132 | | 406 + 625 = 1031 |
| 65 + 135 = 200 | 57 + 83 = 140 | | 445 + 648 = 1093 |
| 70 + 140 = 210 | 61 + 86 = 147 | | 477 + 672 = 1149 |

PREPARATORY SCHOOLS

| | <u>Semester I DMLC Enrollment</u> | <u>Prep Grads - DMLC Freshmen</u> | <u>Percent</u> |
|---------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1970-71 | 808 | 70 | 8.7 |
| 1971-72 | 735 | 70 | 9.5 |
| 1972-73 | 660 | 72 | 10.9 |
| 1973-74 | 648 | 68 | 10.5 |
| 1974-75 | 647 | 65 | 10.0 |
| 1975-76 | 705 | 81 | 11.5 |
| 1976-77 | 722 | 81 | 11.2 |
| 1977-78 | 768 | 78 | 10.2 |
| 1978-79 | 805 | 66 | 8.2 |
| 1979-80 | 835 | 76 | 9.1 |
| 1980-81 | 799 | 69 | 8.6 |
| 1981-82 | 770 | 71 | 9.2 |
| 1982-83 | <u>724</u> | <u>73</u> | 10.1 |
| | <u>9626</u> | <u>940</u> | |
| Average | 740 | 72 | 9.8 |

If the freshmen at DMLC who are graduates of the preparatory schools are on an average 9.8% of the DMLC enrollment, and if the patterns indicated on the previous charts hold true for the future, calls for replacements and growth will need supporting enrollments at the preparatory schools as follows.

| <u>Desired Number of Candidates*</u> | <u>Necessary DMLC Freshman Enrollment (prep school graduates)**</u> | = 7.8% of | <u>Necessary Prep School Enrollment</u> |
|--|---|-----------|---|
| 100 | 61 | | 782 |
| 105 | 64 | | 821 |
| 110 | 67 | | 859 |
| 115 | 70 | | 897 |
| 120 | 74 | | 949 |
| 125 | 77 | | 987 |
| 130 | 80 | | 1026 |
| 135 | 83 | | 1064 |
| 140 | 86 | | 1103 |

* 33.5% men, 66.5% women

** 9.8% of total DMLC enrollment

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Self-study done by the CHE.

Synod Proceedings 1959 - 1969