Summary: March 8, 2007 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee


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

DEADLINES TO NOTE:
June 30, 2007 – materials for 1st draft due to chairs.
August 1, 2007 – 1st draft due.

REVIEW OF JANUARY MINUTES
No comments at this time. Minutes will be posted to the accreditation website. Get any corrections to Jennifer.

STRATEGIC REPORTS OVERVIEW
(Written reports available for Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8.

Standard 1. How well is each of the campuses served by the mission – what is the relationship between the missions? DCE and Portland each have own mission statement. What is the community’s familiarity with the long statement mission? How well does planning proceed organically from the mission? How well do departmental mission statements coordinate with institutional mission?

Standard 2, 2G. See report. Issues relate to faculty load, cost of recruitment, challenges of programs that operate across 2 campuses (nursing, HSC), seamless transfer, improving general education. For 2G, issues include sustaining the relationships among the campuses, level of full-time faculty involvement, & support for electronic delivery of the curriculum.

Standard 3. See report. Emerging issues: how enrollment growth affects student services, the co-curricular learning experience, physical facilities, & the use of financial aid.

Standard 4. See report. The results of the faculty survey point to some issues (positives & negatives). Further question: what is/should be the role of adjuncts in governance? At this point, the role varies from adjuncts just delivering the curriculum regular faculty design to including adjuncts in the decisions -- should we be clear and consistent across the institution?

Standard 5. See report. How do we best use our limited resources to balance the needs & expectations of the ‘digital natives’ (incoming students) with the styles of ‘digital immigrants’ (faculty & staff, for now)? We need a more integrated culture of assessment to best know what resources to develop and use.

Standard 6. See report. Faculty survey provides great insights to faculty perspectives on governance.


Standard 8. See report. New master plan is just now getting underway.
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OVERVIEW OF FACT BOOK
Snapshot of available data is in the FAQ section at the front of the Fact Book. Generally, the Fact Book contains a consistent overview of the primary activities at Linfield over time (often, over the last 10 years). Athletics & IT are not represented at this time. Uses internal Linfield conventions. Question: is it consistent over time? Yes, generally. Both visual and table presentation is used to reach different audiences.

The Fact Book doesn’t have evidence for every standard, but has data that touches on many of the standards – organizational charts, faculty degrees, ethnicity of student body, tuition, etc.

Idea: Flesh out the FAQ section (making it more visual) as an introduction to the visiting accreditors?

HIGHLIGHTS OF NWCCU ANNUAL CONFERENCE
Susan Whyte, Kate Bemis, and Jennifer Ballard attended. Jennifer and Susan shared some highlights. Nothing in the conference indicated anything that will affect Linfield’s re-accreditation process between now and 2008. Standards are being revised (be more integrative and holistic), but Linfield will be reviewed by the 2003 standards.

At the federal level, many issues under consideration that may affect the accrediting process in the future, either through law (Higher Ed. Act reauthorization) or regulation. Speakers at the conference highlighted the ongoing issues of accountability, federal skepticism as to whether current higher education will meet the country’s needs in the future. Emphasis on learning outcomes continues – the need to prove to students/parents/consumers/government that what we’re doing works, is cost effective.

CHAIRS’ MEETING WITH MICHAEL CONNOLLY, U. OF PORTLAND
Barbara Seidman and Dan Preston met with the head of U. of Portland’s accrediting process. Some lessons from U. of P.’s self-study:

• technically, number the self-study using the standard numbers (they were ‘dinged’);
• spend time on analysis, not description (U of P. spent too much time on description),
• make sure we integrate all our points.
• make all comments on the self-study (and drafts?) open and visible, both for the community and for the accreditors (transparency of process, no surprises).

STYLE GUIDE/TECHNICAL ISSUES
Style sheet is in progress. A subcommittee is working out some of the technical infrastructure. Kay White will design some basic templates (with input) to be used by those writing pieces of the report to help things be more standardized. There will likely be some training available at the April meeting.

HELPFUL HANDOUTS
Page Allocation Analysis of 1998 Self-Study (narrative only); Mapping NSSE to NWCCU Standards (primarily standards 1 & 3); the NSSE 2005 Means Comparison Report.

NEW ISSUES
Need information on ‘non-faculty staff’ in governance. What are options?
Further student survey – still likely to do the Noel Levitz SSI. Does it have a staff component? Does have a survey or surveys that are more adult learner oriented (Ptd, DCE).