Summary: January 24, 2007 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee


ALERTS:
Reports due to Planning Council, 1/31/07 (3-5 pages from each standard chair) on emerging issues for strategic planning.

OTHER EVENTS THAT INTERSECT COMMITTEE WORK:
Late March, Planning Council submits draft strategic agenda to faculty.
Late March, General Education Review Committee proposal

NEXT MEETINGS:
March 8, 2007, 5:30 PM (Thursday)
April 12, 2007, 5:30 PM (Thursday)
May 3, 2007, 5:30 PM (Thursday)

GENERAL TOPICS:
Minutes of last meeting to be distributed prior to next meeting.

January newsletters is pending and will be posted on the web as soon as final editing is complete. Newsletter will be monthly from now on. This issue covers standard I and emerging issues for strategic planning.

Handout: the most current version of ‘Emergent Strategic Issues Raised by Accreditation (10/2006).

ROUND TABLE (status of standard work, emergent issues):

Standard 1 Mission
Current status: have more on mission, less on planning.
Visited Portland Campus, received ‘grand tour’. Eye opening. Perhaps the Planning Council should plan a field trip to Portland.
Questions: how well represented are different constituencies in the planning process? What are the perceptions and what is ‘reality’? Is there a problem? Distinguish between the need to repair/alter a process and the need to work on correcting/altering/updating perceptions. How deeply do we look? Accreditors (and we the committee) value candor.

Standard 6 Governance & Administration
Current: have collected considerable documentation. Noticing that different departments may have different handbooks/faculty handbooks (ex: Nursing faculty handbook). Is it a refinement addressing the particular needs of a particular constituency or are there real differences? Are there any conflicts? What is the role of DCE faculty in governance?

Almost done with administrative structure (organizational charts) – some information still needed, especially with regard to the relationship between the board of trustees and the college. Nothing (yet) more current than the 1998 accreditation report. Seidman will bring request for current information to president.
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ONGOING THREAD: How are we handling the ‘tripartite’ structure of Linfield? Does every standard have 3 sections or are they woven throughout? Library, for example, will have 3 sections as services & needs are distinct. Where there is overlap, who covers what? For example, advising in DCE – covered in the Students standard or in the DCE portion of Standard 2?

Consensus by Steering Committee is that we can’t have each little component writing about itself -- has to be one institution writing about each of the components, must work across the institution.

‘Tripartite’ structure emerging as primary issue in DCE portion of standard 2 – perhaps the issue that drives others? – why is teaching for DCE considered ‘service’ (as opposed to ‘teaching’) for tenure track faculty? Implication that teaching is somehow different? Also in standard 9 – if degree is articulated as being the same, are the policies & procedures consistent?

Standard 2 Educational Program
Departments are in progress (theoretically) completing templates for departmental programs.

Consultation has begun with administrators on the administrative issues surrounding the delivery of the curriculum. For example: What does a credit mean? How is the transfer process happening? How do we make a more seamless, transparent transfer process in recognition of current student practices (especially for Portland & DCE, but also McMinnville), current public policy issues of degree completion, and, of course, supporting Linfield enrollment goals? How do we reconcile the historical model of ‘my course’ with the real flow of students (even residential students) across different institutions or within our institution?

Transfer emerges as a significant internal issue, especially with respect to McMinnville freshman preparing to transfer to Portland. The process has not been clean. ‘Transfer’ of credit or issuing of credit also an issue with Study Abroad – sometimes with other institutions, more often with our own programs.

The international programs sub-committee reports that it is ‘almost done’.

How do we get the assessment piece in place with respect to the new GE curriculum coming in the fall of 2008? The general education review has been faculty driven. There was no assessment of student learning in the process. We may be ‘dinged’ for this, but assessment has been built into the future model.

For Portland, in terms of assessment, the nursing faculty are ahead of the curve, though there’s still an issue of the interface between the programs.

Standard 3 Students
Still plan to do SSI (Noel Levitz). Preston will get cost information. We’re doing NSEE for McMinnville, but it isn’t a good fit for Portland or DCE. Perhaps the Noel Levitz survey can be done for all students at the college.

How do we handle the overlap with standard 2 – administering of curriculum (advising, registration, transfer)? How do we integrate all 3 programs into the report? How long should it be?

Emerging issues: what is the meaning of ‘residential life’ to various constituencies – presence or absence (McM., Ptd., DCE)? And what are the impacts of space constraints McM. and Ptd. are experiencing? What are the learning outcomes of the residential life program? How do we assess them? We say that
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students ‘learn a lot’, but how do we prove it? (ex: student government, athletics, res. life). There is a link to experiential learning that is in the mission.

Academic departments may need to pay attention to these issues too – intersection of academics with community life – especially where community events/activities are outgrowth of academic department – ex: theatre, forensics, music, nursing (clinical, labs).

Standard 4 Faculty
Pending final/near final faculty report. Still looking for current Promotion & Tenure member to join committee. Have 3 or 4 divisions represented, mix of length time at Linfield, tenure/not tenured, have a Portland representative. No adjunct or instructional associate.
Emerging issues:
Perception is that Portland faculty have different issues than the McMinnville faculty. As faculty survey was administered, issues pertinent to Portland may not have been addressed. Is this a ‘real’ issue or a ‘perception’ issue? Some preliminary investigation points toward many issues in common.

How do we incorporate the adjuncts, instructional associates? Not pursuing focus groups – logistically complicated. A survey? Some adjuncts completed fall faculty survey, but some apparently thought they weren’t ‘invited’ to participate. What are issues across McMinnville, Portland, DCE? Adjunct issues may be different. Orr may be able to take on a separate survey after other is complete.

AAUP has recently revised guidelines about adjuncts. What are implications? Is this an accreditation issue?

Instructional associates/clinical faculty are administrators not faculty -- #s are few, but increasing. No role in faculty governance.

What about faculty expectations of students? Faculty are looking for ‘better students’, but what does ‘better’ mean? Is there an intersection between who our students are likely to be (who we’re currently planning to recruit), what our enrollment goals are, and who the faculty expect the students to be? (For example: if better student means better SAT scores and SAT scores correlate with wealth, what does that mean for what we hope will be an increasingly diverse student body?)

Overlap with standard 9, DCE issues. Teaching in DCE as ‘service’ vs. ‘teaching’. Meaning of faculty evaluation across campuses.

Concerns that emerged from faculty survey
Salary – level, inquery across ranks
Workload – class size, staffing
Others – balancing teaching & research, (others?)

Standard 5 Library
Met with various constituencies – DCE, Ptd, McM, technology committees.
Emerging issues: pipes, content, bundles.
Pipes – impossible to have ‘enough’ bandwidth. How can that be funded?
Content – students want digital everything, faculty mixed.
Bundling/unbundling – journal articles, not journals.
One machine future (ipod, iphone, whatever it might be) – how do we NOT follow tech trend of the moment, but still take advantage of technology and meet students’ (& faculty) expectations for its use?
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How do we help internal constituencies who ARE using technology connect? Use it better?

Standard 7 Finance
Most information needed is updated annually/monthly in the financial statement, the federal report, the monthly trustee budget report. Committee has begun to complete the various tables and will update as appropriate. Processes are mostly internal to department; not much needed from other.

‘Tripartite’ issues still exist here, though – relationship between 2 campus budgets (McM, Ptd) and the relationship between McMinnville and DCE.

Standard 8 Physical Resources
See handout. We don’t have the physical capacity to handle 1750 F-FTE well in McMinnville. The existing master plan is done – need a current one. How do we fund the needs to preserve, maintain, and modernize where needed (consultant’s report).

Some Portland issues not (yet) addressed. In light of new agreement with Legacy, what needs to be done? No question of space expansion – that’s fixed – but issues of modernization.

Standard 9 Integrity
Are able to assess consistency, effectiveness of documents, but how do we assess the integrity/effectiveness of the implementation? Not even touched in 1998.

Continuing issues around integrity of degree across Linfield. Can degree be of equal quality if supporting structures & policies are not consistent?

Codes of ethics. No overarching Linfield policy that addresses the institutional expectation of how various professional constituencies’ codes of ethics are adhered to. Some exception to this with respect to AAUP/academic freedom.

Diversity. With the mission we have, how do we plan to achieve the diversity?

Faculty. Would like to be able to assess adjuncts, run some basic comparisons within the faculty. Can we do some basic stats to see if discrimination is or is not an issue (as a small, but noticeable, percentage stated on the faculty survey)?

What are policies about students and academic freedom?

Style Sheet
What more do we need to specify?
Pay attention to current tech. expectations: need coordination across standards – what stays on paper, what goes onto a CD, and what goes on the web? Apparently we can’t just put it all on a .pdf!