B5  Standard 5—Library and Information Resources

Library

Linfield’s major accomplishment is the opening of the new Jereld R. Nicholson Library in August 2003. Planning for this library started in the fall of 1998. Construction began May 2002 and the doors opened August 4, 2003. The new library has 440 study spaces, as contrasted with the 45 student spaces in the old Northup Library. The study spaces range from individual comfortable seats to carrels to small- and large-group study rooms to listening and viewing rooms to a computer lab to a small media viewing room that will double as a classroom to a seminar/conference room. The new library represents the best that technology and thoughtful practice bring to academic library service: a wireless environment, a robust teaching lab, an expansive educational media services, space for collection growth, ample space for students and faculty, and a raised floor whose flexibility anticipates changes in future technologies.

In addition to the new building, Linfield has added a half-time technical services specialist to the Portland campus branch library (added in 2001) and a 10-month evening library supervisor to the McMinnville campus (added August 2003).

These handsome new facilities address one of the 1998 evaluation committee’s main concerns: “With these accolades in mind, it is difficult to understand the inadequacies of the (library) building and the concomitant deficiencies of the collection. The campus has too long been aware of the situation without seeking a solution. These deficiencies were pointed out in the last full scale accreditation visit as well as the five-year interim review (Evaluation Committee Report, p. 32).” From August of 2003, with the opening of the Nicholson Library, the library has removed a main impediment to collection building—namely, that in the old Northup Library, space constraints required us to “weed” a book for every new book acquired. Equally importantly, Linfield now has space that will serve it as the “intellectual commons” it has long lacked.

Teaching and reference remain the hallmarks of Linfield library service to the community in all three Linfield programs. We performed two Web usability studies in 1999 and 2000 that informed the design of our library Web page. We also have held conversations with almost every department to seek faculty input to collection and teaching. In our teaching we are more mindful of assessment techniques so as to improve the integration of our classes with the rest of the course. This has been especially useful with many of the inquiry seminars, where we work closely with some faculty and their concomitant assignments requiring library research. We are using simple assessment tools such as asking students to free write responses at the end of a session, working with faculty to develop library worksheets, and co-evaluating with faculty assignments such as annotated bibliographies.

In company with sister colleges in Oregon and now Washington, Linfield participates in the Orbis-Cascade alliance, a consortium of 27 academic libraries in the two states. Summit, the consortial catalog, has 22.5 million available for Linfield students and faculty.
Integrated Technology Services (ITS)

The 1998 Evaluation Committee Report states: "This year's evaluators suggest that the Director (sic) develop a formal mission statement and planning process that includes goal setting and the documentation of policies and procedures which includes ongoing faculty and student participation. The clientele needs greater ownership in the process as the service moves from its initial period of infrastructure building and crisis response to one of campus technology planning and instructional design (p.33)."

The college has taken this recommendation to heart. A mission statement has been approved as follows:

Integrated Technology Services (ITS) supports the Linfield community by identifying and meeting current and future needs for hardware, software, and networks for voice and data. With regular feedback from students, faculty, and staff, ITS plans, develops and implements technology infrastructure to meet the College's goals for teaching excellence and to enhance institutional productivity in an efficient, cost-effective manner.

The full mission statement incorporates ten goals and multiple objectives under each goal. The full statement can be viewed on the Linfield Web site at [www.linfield.edu/support/mission.php](http://www.linfield.edu/support/mission.php).

The outline for the 5-year accreditation report asks: "How have the library/learning resources and laboratories been maintained to keep pace with the growth of instruction or with significant program changes, such as computer science or health technologies?" Discussed below are the major ways Linfield has addressed these important issues.

Since 1998, Linfield added a part time Web designer who later moved to full time. Recently Linfield split the combined network/system administrator into two positions, a full time network administrator and a full time system administrator. In addition, Linfield added an entry-level desktop support assistant. Linfield participated in a Murdock foundation grant that supported a two-year position shared with two other institutions to integrate technology into the Modern Languages curriculum. Linfield hoped to continue this position full time for all aspects of the curriculum, but a tight budget for FY 2003-04 prevented achieving this goal. However, the dean of the faculty has expressed strong support for this position in the next budget year and has already identified part of the institutional funding necessary to achieve this goal.

With expanding use of technology, Linfield experiences difficulty in timely replacement of equipment. To help address this issue, the college will institute, starting next academic year, an additional $25 per semester technology fee. This charge is in addition to a portion of tuition ($70 per-semester-per-student) that is already dedicated to technology.
Following the 1998 report from the Evaluation Committee of the Northwest Association of Colleges and Universities, the president appointed a Technology Integration Task Group to examine the delivery of information technology services across the campus. The goal was to understand whether we were organized to deliver these services most efficiently and effectively. Representatives from all campus constituencies participated in this effort. An external consultant was hired for an external review to assist the committee in its deliberations (see Exhibit 5A). Significant outcomes of this process include a reorganization of the unit to deliver services more efficiently, the mission statement discussed earlier, and the creation of a campus-wide Information Technology Advisory Committee. This committee draws representatives from all campus constituencies and is responsible for guiding policy formation, strategic planning, goal setting and goal monitoring.

The college also upgraded the administrative classification of the head of the new ITS division to be more in line with the ranking of chief technology officers at sister colleges. Concomitantly, the director of ITS now serves on the President’s Advisory Council.

Bolstering assessment-related activities jointly in the library and in ITS, both Linfield’s library director and the director of ITS were selected to participate in the summer 2002 Frye Leadership Institute. The institute is partially supported by a grant from the Robert W. Woodruff Foundation. Linfield applied for and received a Mellon grant to cover additional expenses for the institute. The Frye Leadership Institute is sponsored by the Council on Library and Information Resources, EDUCAUSE, and Emory University. Admission is highly competitive, and participants are required to develop new means and measures for conducting educational assessment at their home colleges. A draft report (Exhibit 5B) of proposed assessment measures for information literacy at Linfield was forwarded to the vice president for academic affairs in spring of 2003.
B.6 Standard Six—Governance and Administration

Following are the significant changes in Linfield’s governing board and in leadership and management since 1998.

Governing Board

Board leadership has remained stable under the same chairperson as in 1998. Reflecting a need for the board to be regularly apprised of the active planning, development, and new construction occasioned by the Hewlett-Packard property acquisition, the board changed its triennial two-day meeting format. Committee meetings were confined to Friday mornings and late Friday afternoon to allow for extended plenary sessions on wider issues facing the college. Through these plenary sessions, the board was kept apprised of development of The Linfield College Strategic Agenda, 2000-05; progress and challenges of The Defining Moment capital campaign; architectural and facility planning for the new art and theatre buildings, new library, and six new residence apartment complexes; replacement and upgrading of the campus energy system; transition from the former General Education Curriculum to the Linfield Curriculum; and deliberations over the revised mission statement. To take advantage of an anticipated pause over the next few years in planning and a hiatus in new construction, the trustees are considering shortening the Friday schedule during triennial meetings of the full board. The plenary sessions would be eliminated (except when especially called for), with most committee meetings scheduled for Friday afternoon rather than Friday morning. One hope is that this schedule might encourage trustees to spend Friday evening and night in McMinnville rather than to drive back to Portland, as sometimes happens with Friday morning committee meetings.

The sole change in board constitution was amendment of a bylaw requiring that a majority of members “…shall be members of Baptist churches.” Following the recommendation of a Church-College Relations Task Force, the board chose to cede 19 potential nominations to representatives of designated American Baptist constituencies. Under the new bylaws, if all board seats are filled, these representatives would constitute 37 percent of board membership. The task force believed that representatives of specified constituency groups such as the American Baptist Churches of the Northwest were likely to reflect and sustain the college’s historical valuing of freedom of conscience. By contrast, the prior and more vague stipulation that 51 percent of board members be members of “Baptist churches” did not always yield this result.

As a result of changes unanticipated at the time of the preceding bylaw amendment, the college finds itself re-thinking its de jure relationship to nominees from the American Baptist churches. One group named in the bylaws has recently divided into two, creating a quandary of succession. What is more, the American Baptist Churches USA has merged the former Division of Educational Ministries into the National Ministries, yet Linfield’s bylaws specify that the board is to entertain a nominee from the “Division of Educational Ministries.” A remedy to the uncertainty created by schism within, consolidation of, or renaming of external constituencies stipulated in the bylaws is under discussion in the
Committee on Trustees, which will make a recommendation to the full board. There are no plans to convene a task force, as in the prior bylaw amendment.

Procedurally, the board has recently instituted a practice of second readings for substantive policy matters, thereby allowing more opportunity for deliberation by board members who happen not to be on the committee proposing a policy change. Prior to the second reading practice, a new policy could come up in a committee of the board on Friday, be passed by that committee, and sent for final vote of the full board on Saturday. Board members believe that this new practice will elicit more substantive scrutiny of policy.

In addition to its continuing to elect a student trustee and a faculty trustee, the board has experimented over the past two years with having an ex officio faculty member on each of its committees, save for the Executive Committee and the Committee on Trustees. The experiment has been received with enthusiasm by both the board and the Faculty Assembly, and so the ex officio membership will continue.

**Leadership and Management**

Senior posts designated by the trustees as administrative officers of the college remain the same as in 1998, with one addition and two changes in title. The offices of president, vice president for academic affairs, vice president for finance and administration, vice president for college relations, and dean of enrollment management remain the same. The former office of dean of students is now the vice president for student affairs and dean of students. Added to the officers since 1998 is the post of director of the Portland campus. These seven offices make up the president’s cabinet, advising her on day-to-day operations, serving as senior administrative heads and budget officers, and proposing a balanced budget in advance of subsequent deliberations by the President’s Budget Advisory Committee.

With respect to incumbency, five of the seven officers are in the same position as in 1998. Following resignation of the incumbent to pursue opportunities elsewhere, the dean of enrollment management is new to his responsibilities, though not new to the college. He was selected to the post after prior service as director of financial aid. Following retirement of the incumbent, a new vice president for college relations was hired after prior service in similar positions at Beloit College and Mt. Holyoke College.

In addition to serving as budget officers and advising the president on day-to-day operations, the cabinet in 1998 constituted the President’s Advisory Council, deliberating over college-wide initiatives and policies. That group has now expanded to include the chairperson of the Faculty Executive Council, the director of the Division of Continuing Education, and the director of Integrated Technology Services. The new group serves under the name “President’s Advisory Council” (the same as in 1998, but differently constituted, with the three new members). The council’s expansion has improved communication and provided a wider set of perspectives on issues facing the college.
Within the administrative staff below senior officers, administrators now elect an Administrator’s Leadership Council (ALC), another innovation since 1998. The ALC is responsible for setting the agenda for and conducting monthly administrator meetings. (In 1998, the officers set the agenda for and conducted administrator meetings.) The ALC coordinates the election of members to serve on three administrative committees. In addition, administrators propose nominees to the president to serve on other administrative and college-wide committees. These changes were undertaken so that middle-level administrators could 1) assume more responsibility for issues that cut across divisions, 2) enjoy more opportunity for growth and leadership, and 3) do their part in improving communication among the administrators as a group and between the officers and the rest of the administrative body. It is fair to say that progress has been made along these dimensions, though the ALC has recently met with college officers to discuss further ideas for improving communication.

It is equally fair to say that the ALC is searching for identity in a way that its companion body, the Faculty Executive Committee, does not. The ALC is seeking to evolve into a voice and link for the diverse corps of administrators with other college constituencies. The ALC functions much differently from the Faculty Executive Committee. The faculty, as stipulated by the college bylaws, is delegated authority in curriculum, in advising on conditions of scholarship and student life, and in recommending appointment of its own ranks. No analogous base of authority for administrators as a distinct body exists in college governance documents.

No significant changes have been made in respect to the college’s non-exempt employees. The Linfield Employees’ Association (LEA), which represents many non-exempt employees, nominates representatives to serve on the Planning Council, the college-wide Benefits Committee, and the President’s Budget Advisory Committee. The group was also represented on the ad hoc Mission Statement Revision Committee.
B7  Standard 7 — Finance

Financial Status

Because the 2002-2003 audited financial statement has not yet been completed, just this paragraph will use data from the year ending June 30, 2002. (The 2002-2003 audit is available as Exhibit 7A.)

Since the last accreditation self-study, fund balances have increased as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Fund</th>
<th>6/30/98</th>
<th>6/30/02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$ 53,519</td>
<td>$ 53,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Current Funds</td>
<td>2,703,267</td>
<td>4,564,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Funds</td>
<td>6,303,743</td>
<td>6,411,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment Funds</td>
<td>35,214,613</td>
<td>38,548,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Income Funds</td>
<td>13,994,623</td>
<td>14,323,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Funds</td>
<td>27,719,740</td>
<td>48,981,757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The General Fund balance remains unchanged from year to year because current practice is to transfer out any additional surplus at the end of each fiscal year. Other Current Funds and Loan Funds reflect very small increases. The 9.5 percent increase in the Endowment Fund balance reflects new gifts more than investment performance, which is discussed in the next paragraph. The small increase in Life Income Funds reflects the results of a roller coaster stock market. The most dramatic fund balance increase during these years occurred in Plant Funds. Those changes are explained in the section discussing Standard VIII: Physical Facilities.

Due to Linfield’s asset allocation policy, endowment returns during this time period were more volatile than most: 22.9 percent in 1998-1999; -7.5 percent in 1999-2000; -6.5 percent in 2000-2001; -14.2 percent in 2001-2002; and -.1 percent in 2002-2003. The Investment Committee of the board reviewed this history carefully and made several asset allocation shifts effective June 30, 2003, that will reduce risk. Fortunately, endowment performance has turned around during 2003 with a six-month return of 10.6 percent. The college also received in May of 2003 a $6.4 million unrestricted bequest, the largest in the college’s history. Board policy is to apply such bequests to endowment unless the board specifically designates otherwise, so this significant boost should help the college weather the decline in operating revenues stemming from multiple quarters of poor investment return.

Because life income beneficiaries have different tax exposure and do not have the same investment horizon as the endowment, the Board of Trustees decided to split the life income and endowment investments. With a couple of small exceptions, all life income assets were shifted to US Trust on May 1, 2003. Linfield’s Board approved a new investment policy for these assets.
In 1998 Linfield had a low level of bonded indebtedness when compared to similar institutions. Working with Prager Sealy investment bankers Linfield obtained a Moody’s rating of Baa1, then issued $31,210,000 of new debt in three transactions occurring in 1998, 2000 and 2001. The proceeds allowed Linfield to replace its central heating facility, reduce its critical deferred maintenance, upgrade the interior of its dining facility, and construct new apartments for 276 students. These improvements were secured without increasing the net annual debt service costs within the operating budget. Most of these projects generated revenue or produced operating cost savings that could be used for debt service.

The college’s dependence on student-generated revenue is similar to 1997-98. The percentage of current fund revenue that is derived from net tuition dollars has not significantly changed in the past five years. The college remains reliant on tuition discounting to enroll students, as evidenced by the percentage of tuition revenue devoted to financial aid, which has risen from 31.26 percent to 33.75 percent at the McMinnville campus and from 30.28 percent to 34.36 percent at the Portland campus. The 2003-2004 tuition increase was limited to 3 percent so the discount rate would not increase further.

The college has balanced its operating budget in each of the past five fiscal years (making for a cumulative 28 years without deficit), though in FY2001-02 use was made of an enrollment reserve fund established for occasions when enrollment falls below budgeted levels. Rebuilding this reserve will be a focus for future operating surpluses.

Status of Fundraising

Since July 1, 1998, Linfield College has achieved extraordinary success in fundraising through its “Defining Moment” campaign. On that date, the incipient campaign gift total stood at $9.7 million after 18 months. As of June 30, 2003, the campaign gift total stands at $66.4 million. When outstanding pledges are added to this total, the campaign figure is $69.4 million, assuring achievement of the $70 million goal by the end date of the campaign, June 30, 2004. For the last five years, paid gifts have averaged $11.3 million, compared to $4.8 million annually in the prior five-year period. While the major focus of the campaign has been on campus facilities, nearly twice as much has been raised for endowed scholarships as targeted ($9.5 million vs. $5 million). Increasing both endowment gifts and annual unrestricted gifts will be emphasized in the post-campaign period. The one capital priority that may not be fully funded by the conclusion of the campaign (a new music facility) continues to be a focus of fundraising efforts.

Conclusion

The past five years have been both challenging and exciting for Linfield. The economic environment changed dramatically during this interval. By 2002 Oregon had fallen into recession with the highest unemployment rate in the country. Together with the stock market collapse after March 2000, the poor economy limited Linfield’s ability to increase net tuition revenue as rapidly as had been anticipated in 1998. Yet in the midst of this
negative environment, Linfield has been able to complete a capital campaign, increase the size of the permanent faculty by 8.4 FTE on the McMinnville campus and 2 FTE in Portland, and significantly expand and improve the physical plant.

Linfield is well positioned for the new decade. For this coming fall semester enrollment applications and acceptances are at all-time highs. The biggest challenge stems from the failure of employee compensation during the past five years to keep pace with benchmarks. The Board of Trustees has established a new standing Compensation Committee to address these deficiencies. In addition, the Planning Council has designated progress in compensation as its top priority following successful integration of operating costs for the new library and theatre within the FY2003-04 budget.
B.8  Standard 8—Physical Resources

Linfield’s McMinnville campus has been significantly improved during the five years since its last accreditation. The key to this transformation was the acquisition of Hewlett-Packard’s 115 acres of adjacent property. This allowed the Linfield campus to increase its size by 150 percent. The expansion of property then served as the focus for an expanded comprehensive fund raising campaign with a major emphasis on capital improvements. To accommodate the new property the Trustees approved a new Master Plan in May 2000 (see Exhibit 8A).

During the past five years there have been a number of significant capital improvements on campus. Net plant assets increased from $31.6 million in 1998 to $72.2 million in 2002. When the audit for 2003 is complete the value for net plant assets will be in excess of $80 million. There has been a net increase of 188,000 square feet to the physical plant. Through a combination of bonds and gifts Linfield has added a new boiler plant and steam distribution system, reduced deferred maintenance by 50 percent, renovated eleven residence halls, built six new student apartment buildings, remodeled its central dining facility, added a convenience store, constructed a new post office, moved the Physical Plant and Campus Safety Offices into new quarters, and converted the H-P manufacturing facilities into a fine arts center, theatre and library.

During this same period we have removed nine mobile homes and demolished four older houses that had been used for student housing. We also have vacated two more manufactured homes that had been used for faculty offices. The three remaining trailers on campus used for faculty offices and studios will be removed when the one remaining project in the capital campaign (a new music building) is funded. Other improvements include a new soccer game field and several new practice fields that are used by multiple sports. Last summer the college invested $250,000 in security improvements, installing blue light emergency phones throughout campus as well as adding electronic locks in all residence halls.

In addition to the dramatic changes for campus facilities, Linfield’s trustee Real Estate Committee has been diligently pursuing a number of development possibilities for 74 acres of the H-P property that the master plan indicates will not be needed for academic or co-curricular use. The Board of Trustees wants to lease this property to earn rental income. A development agreement for 28 acres has been reached with Regency Centers and construction of phase one of the project is underway. When fully completed, that development will provide Linfield $600,000 of rental income annually.
B.9 Standard Nine — Institutional Integrity

In 1998 the college took advantage of the addition of this new accrediting standard to develop a common conflict of interest policy binding on all Linfield constituencies. That policy is now contained in the common chapter to all employee handbooks, with forms for disclosing of potential conflicts available on the college’s Web site. Each year the trustees are asked to complete a conflict of interest statement. Faculty members are advised of the policy during orientation. Exempt and on-exempt personnel have the policy in the handbook and work with their supervisor to determine the appropriateness of filing a statement. The officer receiving the statement gives written response to the person filing.

In 1998, review of publications for accuracy in statements about the college was assigned to a special assistant to the president. That position no longer exists, so this responsibility has been assigned to the director of publications, working closely with the registrar (who directs institutional research) and the director of admissions.

Safeguards continue in place for expenditures (e.g., no person may authorize payment to him- or herself), investments (a sub-committee of the Finance Committee manages the portfolio, recommends a pay-out ratio, handles asset allocation, etc.), and audits (also a sub-committee of the Finance Committee that reviews all aspects of the annual audit and recommends the independent audit firm for the following year.) The Finance Committee receives quarterly reports on revenues and expenses, as well as a pro forma report each quarter. These are then referred to the board. Annual budgets are prepared by the Budget Advisory Committee with wide community representation, presented to the president and forwarded to the Finance Committee and the full board for approval.

Linfield’s policies and procedures meet the requirements of Standard Nine, but these requirements are no guarantee. An institution, like an individual, ought to be wary of vouching for its own integrity. Lapses may, unfortunately, arise suddenly and in unexpected quarters. Ultimately, policies can reinforce standards, but they cannot guarantee that individuals will always act with integrity. For this reason, the college believes that careful initial hiring is as important to maintaining institutional integrity as is having the right set of policies and procedures in place. Along with care in hiring, the proper training of supervisors and consistency in the evaluation of employees is paramount. College officers have targeted these areas for special emphasis in the 2003-04 academic year.
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