B.3  Standard Three—Students

Changes in Admissions

The admission process for Linfield College is similar and consistent with the practices in place in 1998. The Office of Admission receives freshman or transfer applications, prepares and completes files, and reads and reviews files. The admission policies used to determine whether the Office of Admission staff has authority from the faculty to grant admission to a student have been modified since 1998. Exhibit 3A examines, point-by-point, the changes in the 1997-98 policy and the 2002-03 policy.

The changes in the policy since 1998 to determine which students will require the review of the Admission and Financial Aid Committee of the faculty are the result of several factors. One was the desire of the committee to simplify the determining factors for required committee review. The 1998 policy resulted in some students not appearing before the committee when, in fact, the committee should have reviewed them (e.g., 3.51 GPA, 300 SATV, 300 SATM was technically eligible for admission without committee review). In other cases, too, the policy was a bit lax (i.e. a student with a 2.75 GPA and 1020 SAT did no require committee review). The policy in effect in 2002-03 has raised the bar for committee review of students. Another factor driving revision of the 1998 policy was a desire to eliminate the “ineligible” category. Mandatory use of this category did not permit the faculty to make exceptions for students when their high school GPA was below 2.00. There is an occasional, though rare, reason to do so.

A change for transfers is to now require the high school transcript if the student has fewer than two years of full-time college attendance, rather than the single year required in the 1998 policy. This change allows the college to review the student’s performance over a longer period than one year.

A final difference is that the college no longer restricts the committee to admitting only eight percent of the prior year’s class under the “Special Considerations” category of the policy. This change permits the committee to make whatever decisions are necessary, in the year of their work, to meet the college’s multiple goals of quality, diversity, special program needs, and the numerical goals of the college for budgetary purposes.

These changes have been accompanied by a relative consistency over the past five years in the qualifications of entering classes. The academic quality of entering classes on the McMinnville campus has been maintained even while the class in 2002 is 30 students larger than the class in 1997. At the Portland campus the enrollment has remained stable while the academic quality of the freshman class, as measured by average high school GPA and SAT, has increased.

Early Decision was the first early application program utilized by many colleges and universities, including Linfield. Early Decision is a binding option (i.e. a student may only have one pending Early Decision application open at one time; and, if admitted, the student must immediately withdraw all other applications and is expected to enroll in the Early Decision college). Linfield joined other colleges in a concern over the pressures
placed upon prospective students to have a one-choice option for college early in their senior year. Accordingly, Linfield moved to Early Action for the class entering in the fall 2001. This challenge allowed the college to continue with an early application option, but also gives students an application plan that is non-binding. That is, students may apply to more than one Early Action school at a time and, if admitted by an Early Action college, are not required to withdraw all other applications. Early Action also does not require an early commitment by the student—the priority date for informing Linfield is the same for Early Action as it is for Regular Decision—May 1. The Early Action application option benefits both the student and the college in that both parties have early opportunities for communication without the pressures of Early Decision.

Changes in Enrollment

The college’s overall enrollment between fall 1997 and fall 2002 has increased in headcount from 2,731 to 3,401. The FTE, though, has remained nearly unchanged: 2,133 in 1997 as compared to 2,070 in 2002. This stasis is due, first, to a larger number of Adult Degree Program students taking fewer total credits (i.e., 4,434 credits in fall 1997 versus 3,195 credits in fall of 2002). Second, there has been a decrease in the average number of credits taken by students on the McMinnville campus.

A comparison for the McMinnville campus of enrollment of new students in 1997 versus 2002 is detailed in Exhibit 3B. The number of first-year inquiries between the two years is comparable, but the number of applicants dropped. However, a six percent increase in yield from “admitted” to “enrolled” resulted in 30 additional new first-year students in 2002 over the number of first-year students in 1997. For the Portland campus (Exhibit 3C) overall applications have increased for a similar number of spaces, allowing the college to be more selective and improve quality at the Portland campus.

Changes in Student Services

Below is a brief review of changes related to student services since 1998. While, in general, the mission and structure of the Student Services Division remain largely unchanged, there have been modest staff additions and considerable program enhancements.

Residence Life

Following a period of student expansion in the early 1990’s, the college experienced a lag in adding permanent housing to cope with its increased population. A housing shortage was remedied with the remodeling of Memorial Hall as a residence hall rather than a fraternity, and with construction of the most recent and largest residence hall on campus, Mahaffey Hall.

Because some of our "suburb" (apartment style housing) had reached an age requiring considerable repair, and because it was desirable to attract upper-division students back into campus living, several older housing units were retired, and six new apartment-
style units were built. These new units are located in the area where the former campus boundary abuts the new Keck campus. This complex was christened Hewlett-Packard (H-P) Park. With space for 220 students, H-P Park houses mainly seniors in apartment-style quarters that are now the most popular choice on campus.

As our residential population has grown, we have slowly added to the student residence assistant (RA) staff (two additional since 1998) in order to maintain a reasonable staff-to-student-resident ratio. In the suburbs, rather than RA’s, we have instituted eight "community assistants,” new since 1998.

We have expanded the use of peer judicial boards to deal with infractions of community standards and expectations.

While our commitment to the liberal arts in general has made us reluctant to endorse "special interest" housing based on a selected academic theme (e.g., a “French hall” or “computer science hall”), we have begun and expanded opportunities for students who opt for "wellness halls".

Campus Ministry

While the college has long employed a chaplain, we have experimented with multiple means of staffing that position. In the late 1990’s the position was half time and did not exert the positive influence the college desired. When funds for a chaplain’s endowment reached a sufficient level, we re-instituted the full-time position of chaplain. We simultaneously reverted to an earlier model of according faculty status to the position. In the 2001-02 academic year, we hired a new chaplain capable of overseeing the college’s ministry while teaching within the Department of Religious Studies.

Learning Support

In the FY 2001-02 budget year, which placed special emphasis on retention, the Budget Advisory Committee expanded resources in Learning Support Services to employ a second learning-support specialist. This addition proved not only a wise strategy for retention, but was also a means of addressing expanded student demand for assistance as well as requirements for complying with the federal Americans with Disabilities Act.

Wellness and Health Issues

In the late 1980’s and early 1990’s our programs dealing with alcohol education and intervention were supervised by a professor of psychology who had a 1/6 position in the Student Services Division. When that individual retired, the college was able to expand that commitment to 1/4 time, and eventually to 1/2 time. We initially incorporated alcohol education as a co-lateral responsibility of one of three area directors within the residence-life staff. We learned, however, that this arrangement created awkward dual roles. Next year, we will instead hire a half-time wellness coordinator to be supervised by the health educator from the Student Health Center.
This change should allow that team, over the longer term, to broaden programming beyond alcohol concerns to other health-related issues.

Responsibility for responses to alcohol violations has moved from the dean of students to the alcohol education officer (while we had one) and, more recently, to another member of the student services staff who agreed to accept that responsibility and for whom the dual role was a good match.

With specific regard to alcohol, the college has been an active member of several national, statewide, and community consortia. In company with the local community, we received a grant focused on reducing underage and other high-risk drinking. The athletics department and Student Services Division also received and utilized a grant from the National Collegiate Athletics Association to deal with alcohol concerns.

Over time we have expanded the hours during which the Student Health Center is open and available to students.
Volunteer and Service Opportunities

Over the last three-year period we have assigned coordination of volunteer and service activities to an Americorps member assigned to the college and funded by the federal government. Two different alumnae of Linfield have served in that capacity. Because we have exhausted external funding for the position, volunteer coordination has now been assigned as a co-lateral responsibility for one of the area directors, with time freed up by transferring the health coordinator position to the Student Health Center (thanks to funding from the president's office.)

Greek Life

The benefits associated with having a Greek life program have increased, and the negatives substantially decreased, as a consequence of a 1998 decision to employ a half-time Greek advisor. The Inter-fraternity and Pan-Hellenic Councils have benefited greatly from the additional supervision and support.

At the recommendation of the Enrollment, Retention, and Student Life Committee (ERSL), which includes faculty, staff, and students, a new Greek standards system has been initiated. It establishes goals for Greek organizations based on finances, academics, and community service, and it makes their new-member recruitment contingent on meeting a minimum performance level. The program is being tested in 2003-2004, with plans fully to implement it in the following year.

Career Services

In the last decade the college added an assistant in the career services area. Originally funded by a trustee, the position has recently been brought into the operating budget. The principal focus of the position is to develop programs (such as internships and external study opportunities) that promote experiential education.

Student Leadership Development

Student services personnel now offer academic (often paracurricular) course work that extends leadership training into the classroom. Special courses now exist for potential members of the student-life residence staff, Greek leaders, and students in general.

Trustee Governance and Student Affairs Oversight

The Student Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees has had a Student trustee member for over two decades. The dean of students has always been a liaison to the committee. In the past two years, a faculty member representing the ERLS Committee has been added as a liaison. The student, the dean, and the faculty member work with the committee chair to establish an agenda for each of three committee meetings a year.
Changes in Academic Credit and Records

During the 2000-2001 academic year, Linfield inaugurated Web Advisor, which provides online information for faculty and students. During the 2000 fall semester, faculty received access to Web Advisor. Accordingly, advisors may now view both class rosters and their advisee’s academic information online. They also have the capacity to submit grades online. The number of faculty submitting grades online has increased steadily since this option was provided.

In February 2001, students could log onto Web Advisor with the capability to view their grades, registration status, course schedule, and other information. In April 2001, students who were scheduled to graduate during the coming academic year were given the opportunity to register for fall classes online. Entering first-year students used Web Advisor to register starting in fall 2001. Their registration took place along with the existing arena-style session and served two purposes—introducing the new students to Web Advisor and entering the registration into the college’s database. Since that time, all students have been able to register online once their advisors give approval for electronic registration. A student’s place in the registration queue is still based on the number of completed credits. After the initial registration period, all changes in registration are still processed on paper.

Intensive work on setting up a degree-audit capability started during the 1998-99 academic year. Although students had submitted their graduation materials using the paper graduation check sheet, the degree-audit function of COLLEAGUE (the college’s administrative computing system) was used to check requirements for the spring 2000 graduates. Starting in fall 2000, candidates for graduation received a paper copy of their degree audit along with a graduation status review. For the past two years, the registrar has prepared degree audits and status reviews during the summer for the candidates for graduation in the following spring. Since students receive their reviews when they return to campus for fall semester, there is ample time to adjust their course schedules for fall as well as for the upcoming January Term and spring semester. It is the college’s objective to make the degree-audit function fully available to students during the fall of 2003.

Changes in Intercollegiate Athletics

Since its last report the college has made significant strides in the number of participants in women’s sports. In 1997-98 (the report year for the 1998 accreditation review), 140 women participated in nine varsity and five junior varsity teams. In 1998-99 the college added women’s lacrosse as a varsity sport, raising the number of teams to ten varsity and five junior-varsity (JV) teams. In 2002-03, 217 women participated in intercollegiate athletes at Linfield—a 64 percent increase in participation over 1997-98.

The same period saw a small increase in participation in men’s sports. The college sponsored nine varsity and two JV teams in 1997-98 and continue that number today. In
1997-98, 283 men participated in intercollegiate athletics compared to 303 during 2002-2003—a seven percent increase.

During the past five years, the college has made several improvements to its athletics facilities, including lighting the softball and baseball fields, completing a competition soccer facility, and providing seven additional acres of practice fields for soccer, football, and intramural sports. We are actively raising funds to construct a new track and artificial grass football field as part of a recently adopted athletics master plan that has been incorporated into the overall master plan for the college.

Linfield has won the Northwest Conference All Sports Award in two of the past three academic years, attesting to the college’s across-the-board success in both men’s and women’s athletics.
B.4 Standard Four—Faculty

Changes in Policies Affecting the Faculty

The 2001-02 Faculty Handbook was the first to incorporate a common chapter of “Personnel Policies and Procedures Governing all Linfield Employees.” This chapter resulted from a 1998 directive from the Board of Trustees’ Executive Committee to its legal counsel “…to prepare and present such personnel policies and procedures as legal counsel advises are necessary to comply with current federal and state laws, regulations and case law.” The trustees were concerned because four college repositories of personnel policy (The Faculty Handbook, The Student Handbook and Academic Planner, The Administrators’ Handbook, and The Linfield Employees’ Association Agreement) were maintained by four separate offices. This circumstance created an unacceptable risk that crucial policies might be either inconsistently stated or out of compliance with changing legal mandates.

Legal advisors to the college counseled that there should be one handbook covering all Linfield employees. An initial effort by the administration to follow this advice was soon abandoned in favor of putting into a single chapter all personnel issues with legal requirements binding on all categories of employees. The text of the common chapter was drafted by legal counsel, reviewed and revised by a committee of faculty, administrators, and LEA representatives, and presented (all but the anti-harassment policy, which required further deliberation) to the Faculty Assembly on October 11, 1999. On May 8, 2000, the anti-harassment policy was presented to the Faculty Assembly. The common chapter was ultimately adopted by the Board of Trustees on November 6, 1999 (all but the anti-harassment policy) and May 13, 2000 (the anti-harassment policy).

The biggest substantive change was in anti-harassment policy, including sexual harassment. The college found it necessary to streamline its hearing process and assign primary responsibility for expeditious investigation of allegations to the director of human resources in cooperation with the vice president from the accused person’s division of the college.

Following a faculty-wide retreat focused on faculty governance in fall of 2000, the Faculty Executive Committee became aware that the college by-laws did not de jure reserve to the faculty its long-established role in recommending on tenure and promotion to the dean and president. It was also deemed that the role of the faculty in advising about the student environment for learning and about its own professional activity needed to be strengthened.

The Faculty Assembly thus recommended that the Board of Trustees amend Article XII of the By Laws of Linfield College as follows (Additions in bold face; deletions with strikethrough):

Section 4. The Faculty Assembly shall prescribe, with the concurrence of the President, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, requirements for admission,
courses of study, conditions of graduation, the nature of degrees to be conferred, and rules and methods of conduct of educational work of the College, and maintenance of a suitable environment for learning and professional activity; shall recommend to the Board candidates for academic degrees; review and discuss names of finalists for honorary degrees; and shall recommend to the President candidates for fellowships, scholarships, and prizes. The faculty shall advise the President and the Board on standards of faculty competence and ethical conduct, and shall recommend to the President and the Board candidates for faculty appointment, tenure, promotion, and the granting of faculty status.

These amendments were adopted by the trustees in November, 2001, effective with for 2002-03 academic year.

Two primary concerns were addressed in 2002-03 as a result of the faculty retreat in fall of 2002: 1) the need for an assessment of the roles of the divisions in faculty governance and in filling the committee structure and 2) the role of the faculty in setting the curriculum and having resources allocated as a consequence of this (as opposed to budget driving curriculum). In response to the former, two concrete actions were taken. Language that specifically outlines the role of the division and of the division chair in faculty governance were adopted into the Faculty Handbook as follows:

Divisions:

1. provide the primary forums for discussion involving faculty matters, ensuring open debate and discussion in a collegial environment.
2. facilitate interdepartmental communication and conduct such business as necessary for effective functioning of the departments within the division.
3. meet regularly during the academic year at meetings called by the division chairperson.
4. discuss issues brought to them by their representatives on committees and assure that representatives make regular reports to the division.
5. discuss issues referred to them by FEC.
6. propose motions to the Faculty Assembly, which may then refer them to the appropriate body, for example, FEC, Office of Academic Affairs, the President.

Division Chairs:

1. represent their divisions on the Faculty Executive Council.
2. develop agenda and lead division meetings regularly during the academic year.
3. conduct timely discussion of major policy issues and other matters important to the life of the Linfield community.
4. ensure the timely nomination of representatives to committees.
5. solicit reports from committee representatives to the division for discussion.
6. bring issues referred by the FEC to the division floor.
7. take motions from divisions to the Faculty Assembly.
8. provide a year-end report of division matters and actions to the Faculty Assembly.
There were several concrete actions taken on the issues of curricular concern that came out of the faculty retreat. In response to concerns about past and potential changes to January Term, in the form of new tuition fees imposed in the FY 2002-03 budget, and the consideration of moving to a May Term, the faculty have established an ad hoc committee for January Term curriculum evaluation (see charge and rationale below).

January Term Evaluation Committee (Two-year ad hoc committee)

charge of the Committee: The committee will serve the faculty by evaluating the January Term curriculum. The committee will report to the Faculty Assembly about current strengths and weaknesses, and recommend possible curricular directions and consequent resource allocations, as they relate to the faculty's will. This report will be presented at the end of the two-year period following the establishment of the committee, in accordance with the Faculty Handbook. The report will be provided to the campus-wide Planning Council and to the Faculty Executive Committee for action.

Rationale: Although there has been extensive discussion over January Term actions, there has not been a comprehensive consultation of the faculty regarding the curricular assessment of an interim semester. Furthermore, the addition of large numbers of new faculty over the recent years makes such a consultation both pressing, and an important opportunity. Such deliberations would provide for broader agreement among the faculty regarding both the curricular directions and the resource allocation implications of the faculty's will.

The Faculty Executive Council (FEC) also sponsored a discussion regarding the oversight of the Inquiry Seminars, involving the Chair of FEC, Chair of Curriculum Committee and two other faculty members. This committee has requested from the dean of faculty that minimal resources be used for faculty orientations (especially important, given the number of new faculty mentioned above), resources and training for teaching the writing-intensive courses.

The FEC has also asked that the campus-wide Planning Council be used as a clearinghouse for programmatic change in the future. As the colleges moves out of its recent building phase toward a renewed emphasis on programmatic development, the Planning Council is best suited for assessing and delegating actions to be taken. This is crucial in closing the link between planning and assessment.

Faculty Compensation Policy and Goals

At the time of its last full-scale review, Linfield had a compensation goal of reaching the median in average compensation among seventeen peer-institutions. Linfield met this goal in each of the two years prior to the full scale visit, but there was good reason to believe that the other 17 colleges underreported their actual level of tuition remission as a portion of faculty compensation, casting doubt on the value of the comparison. What
is more, Linfield staff time spent gathering the 17-college comparison data was considerable.

In 2000, the trustees adopted a goal of reaching the 80\textsuperscript{th} percentile of AAUP Category IIB institutions for all three faculty ranks in compensation, exclusive of tuition remission and tuition exchange, by the end of the 2002-03 academic year. Relative to the previous goal from the 17-college comparison group, this goal was ambitious. Administratively, however, the data is readily available. Even so, the college confronted a moving target in trying to hit a mark that could be determined only the Category IIB data was published each spring. As a consequence, the handbook was modified in 2002 to base faculty compensation targets on the previous spring’s published data. The goal was also modified so that its achievement was tied to the mid-point of each rank rather than the average of each rank. This change made the goal independent of the shifts in Linfield faculty from one rank to the other. (E.g., under the previous 80\textsuperscript{th} percentile goal, a faculty member’s promotion from associate to full professor had the consequence of lowering Linfield’s average for both the associate and the full professor rank.) The change in methodology has been reviewed by the trustees and referred to the compensation sub-committee of the Executive Committee.

During this three-year period, the faculty salary scale was twice changed by vote of the Faculty Assembly and accepted by the administration. Because full professors were falling relatively farther behind their compensation goal than were associates and assistants, a salary schedule uncapping full professors was adopted in October 2000. This schedule also provided for overlapping steps among the three ranks, allowing capped associate professors room for step increases. After three years, full professors were closer to their goal than were associates and assistants, so in May of 2002, the 2000 schedule was replaced by a new one allowing for more flexibility in targeting whatever rank is farthest behind its goal.

For FY2003-04 year, total faculty compensation is estimated to have be $1.2 million short of the goal. This is approximately twice the margin as existed for FY2002-03 (see Exhibit 4B). This growing shortfall, reinforced by compensation concerns for other employee groups, is the main reason the Planning Council has adopted employee compensation goals as the top priority for the upcoming fiscal years.

In nominal dollars, between fall 1998 and fall 2002, the faculty compensation pool on the McMinnville campus grew by $1,029,525. Adjusted for inflation and expressed in 1998 dollars, this increase amounted in real terms to $368,406. (See Exhibit 4C and, for the Portland campus, 4D.) The preponderance of this increase came in additional numbers of new faculty, for the per capita compensation for McMinnville faculty members actually fell between 1998 and 2002, the result of senior retirees being replaced by faculty members holding lower rank.

There is substantial concern among the faculty regarding the fact that compensation goals have not been met, and that this lack of progress has also been coupled with reductions in healthcare coverage. The faculty needs to see evidence of the attainment of compensation goals, beyond merely having them as goals. In the case of health care,
it is hoped that a new health insurance consortium among Oregon private colleges will lead to increased stability of health care costs and coverage.

In response to a faculty age-structure that projected a significant block of retirements between the years 2005-10, the chairperson of the Budget and Benefits Committee and dean presented to the Faculty Assembly a plan to encourage some in this cohort to retire earlier than projected. Effective June 30, 2000 the college implemented an “Early Retirement Option for Tenured Faculty Members.” that provides 1) a lump-sum cash payment and 2) continuation of medical benefits until age 65 for employees retiring between the ages of 59 & 1/2 and 65. So far eight faculty members have availed themselves of this option, so the intended consequence of spreading retirements more evenly across the years seems to be effective.

Changes in Characteristics of the Faculty

A significant challenge in promoting Linfield’s educational program derives from the age-structure of the existing full-time faculty. As a cumulative effect of retirements, new positions added, and a modest turnover in positions already allocated, Linfield’s McMinnville campus has hired 25 per cent of its faculty over the past three years. Bringing this new cohort into common conversation with seasoned faculty members while harnessing their fresh perspectives on learning and scholarship is a significant venture. On the Portland campus, the challenge will be to replace a cohort of nursing faculty members nearing retirement in a market where qualified replacement faculty members are scarce.

Emphasis has been placed on expanding the faculty in the interval following the last full-scale accreditation review. Below is a list of faculty positions added to the budget since the base budget year (FY1997-98) in the college’s most recent report:

McMinnville Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Year Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>99-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>01-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Chaplain) .4</td>
<td></td>
<td>01-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology/ Environ. Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>02-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>02-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>02-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>02-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>02-03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These positions represent a net addition of 8.4 FTE (eight percent growth) to the faculty ranks during a time when McMinnville campus student FTE diminished from 1657 to 1630 (a 1.6 percent decline).

**Portland Campus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Year Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursing (Visiting)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>99-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science (Bio &amp; Health Sci.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>01-02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The visiting nursing position was converted to a tenure-track position for 2003-04. With these net additions of 2 FTE, the Portland campus faculty grew by seven percent while student FTE remained relatively constant (329 in 1997-98 versus 332 in 2002-03).

**Changes in Faculty Development Programs**

Given the growth in new positions and the leading edge of what appears to be an increasing number of retirements, faculty development funds need serious attention from the college. After a period of relatively flat growth, the budgets for faculty professional travel were increased by $15,000 in FY 2001-02. This increase was accompanied by a rise in the supplemental contribution from the president’s discretionary fund. Comparing the funds allocated for professional travel in the base year for the last full-scale report ($50,000) to the amount allocated in FY 2002-03 ($62,969), these funds have increased by 26 percent (as against a tuition-and-fee increase of 20 percent over the same period.) Using the Bureau of Labor's Consumer Price Index calculator, $50,000 of purchases in the base year would require $56,290 in 2003. Accordingly, in real terms, funds for faculty professional travel have increased by $6,679 (12 percent).

On a per-capita basis, the increase in funding for faculty professional travel has been from $475 per faculty member in 1997-98 to $558 per faculty member in 2002-03. A cost-of living adjustment reveals that a $475 purchase in the base year requires $535 in 2003. In real terms, then, the increase in funds for faculty professional travel has been only $13 per faculty member (2.5 percent).

The per-capita figure is the more pertinent measure, for experience shows that recently hired faculty members make disproportionately greater demands on faculty development funds than did the faculty members they replaced. Such demand is expectable, given that departing senior faculty members were hired into a college that, in tenure and promotion decisions, placed less emphasis than is placed today on scholarship and creative activity. Given the addition of new faculty, it is clear that Linfield has barely run in place with respect to professional travel funding at a time when it should have been increasing funds in this area solely to adjust to the changing faculty demographics.
The picture with respect to funds available for professional development apart from professional travel is mixed. Sabbaticals, affecting both campuses equally, have been provided to meet all recommendations of the Faculty Development Committee. The various endowments for faculty-led student collaborative research (also affecting both campuses) allowed the college to allocate $27,322 in 1999, the first year of the endowments’ maturity. In 2003, $64,853 was allocated for collaborative research—a level the college will be able to maintain over the next four years, despite a 20 percent drop in the value of the endowments. By contrast, funds to support individual faculty projects have remained unchanged—$12,000 in McMinnville; $5,000 in Portland—between 1997-98 and 2002-03. Recognizing the need for additional support in this area, the president has agreed to bolster these funds by $18,000 in FY2003-04.

In a highly tuition-dependent institution such as Linfield, significant forward movement in faculty development funding is unlikely to be generated by exclusive reliance on the operating budget. For this reason, The Defining Moment capital campaign established a goal for a $1 million endowment to generate new funds exclusively for faculty development. During the first four years of the campaign, little progress has been made in achieving this goal. However, in September the administration will request that the trustees approve allocating $750,000 from a recent unrestricted gift of $6.4 million to the campaign goal for faculty development. Having $750,000 in place improves prospects of raising the remaining $250,000 from other sources.

In the 2001-02 academic year the college restored the position of Faculty Development Coordinator, giving a senior faculty member one-third release time to attend to the faculty development program. This person meets with the Faculty Development Committee and has assisted the committee and dean in establishing a mentoring program for new faculty members. Evaluations turned in by the first cohort of faculty to go through the program indicated that new faculty wanted the program expanded. The inaugural program focused on orientation to the college and a review of important policy and governance issues. New faculty reported that they wanted more opportunity to discuss their teaching, both with their mentors and among themselves. The 2003-04 program has been revised accordingly.

Performance Evaluation of Faculty Members

Untenured faculty members are reviewed annually. In the first, third, and fifth years the review involves a meeting only with the department chair and dean of faculty. In the second and fourth years, the review involves colleague appraisals from all members of the department and a meeting of the department chair, dean of faculty, and a representative of the Faculty Development Committee. In the sixth year (normally the tenure year), a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee replaces the Faculty Development Committee member at the review.

The Promotion and Tenure Committee holds annual informational meetings on both the McMinnville and Portland campuses, reviewing handbook policy and answering questions from those in attendance. The committee reviews files of all candidates for tenure and/or promotion following close of the files in mid-December. The committee
transmits its recommendations to the dean and president in a meeting in early January. If the dean and president concur, the recommendations go to the Academic Affairs Committee and full Board of Trustees at the February meeting. If the dean and president do not concur, the handbook calls for a second meeting with the Promotion and Tenure Committee to discuss differences and attempt a resolution of them. The final recommendation rests with the president.

Tenured associate professors are reviewed every three years at a meeting including the department chair, dean, and Faculty Development Committee representative. Prior to the 2003-04 academic year, tenured full professors were subject *de jure* to a review every third year. However, when the accreditation standard of the Northwest Association of Colleges and Universities was changed back to every five years (in December of 2002), the dean reverted in practice to this five-year standard. With the 2003-04 Faculty Handbook, the *de jure* standard has been brought into conformity with practice: tenured full professors are reviewed by the dean every fifth year. Linfield is confident enough in its tenure standards and in the expectations for faculty that a return to five-year reviews for tenured faculty is fully in conformity with the high standards of the community.