Summary: October 23, 2007 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

PRESENT: Liz Atkinson, Jennifer Ballard (staff), John Hall, Pam Jacklin, Chris Keaveney, Brenda Marshall, Bill Millar, Amy Orr, Dan Preston, Barbara Seidman, Bernie Turner, Pam Wheeler, Mary Margaret Benson (for Susan Whyte).

HANDOUTS IN THE MEETING: Strategic Issues for standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9. (Drafts of Standard 4, 6 were updated on Catfiles prior to meeting).

NEXT MEETING
Tuesday, November 20, 5:45 PM
Review drafts to date of standards 3, 7, and 8

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING
Revised version of the September 25, 2007 minutes approved.

INTRODUCTION
Please make feedback on standards as specific as possible. At the last meeting, the committee covered many big-picture issues, but may not have given adequate specifics to the authors.

Standard 1 and 9 chairs indicated that they had received feedback via other methods (outside the steering committee meeting) that was helpful.

KEY WORDS
Brainstorming for some key words that should appear throughout the self-study: foundational principles, mission, integrity, student-centered, integration, transparency. Others to consider: shared governance, resource allocation, institutional advancement.

It may not be realistic for all key words to appear in all standards, but these are ideas that should be revisited regularly.

Referencing institutional practice around DCE is a theme that should be integrated throughout the self-study.

WORDS OF ENCOURAGEMENT
As those who have been on accreditation teams elsewhere have reported to us, the job of the self-study and its authors is to tell the story of this college to a group of well-meaning outsiders. If we are confident that we meet individual standards, we need to explain that and prove it. Unless we seriously think we’re not meeting the standard, we should focus on marshalling evidence that shows how we do so in terms of our mission. We also want to show how we’re moving to improve areas where we’re farther from the standard than we’d like to be.
STRATEGIC ISSUES
The strategic issues emerging from accreditation have been circulated to the Planning Council, the Faculty Executive Council, the Cabinet, and academic department chairs.

As we continue to develop the self-study in the coming months, the steering committee will also refine the strategic issues document so that it will accompany the final accreditation report. Each chair should continue to plan for a strategic issues section to frame each standard.

Please note: in summarizing committee discussion of draft standard reports, these minutes will try to cover the essence of the feedback given, but will not speak to every word choice, typo, or correction mentioned.

STANDARD 4 REVIEW
It was commented that the draft as it currently stands is an honest treatment of the issues raised in the faculty survey of fall 06 but does not fully demonstrate the strengths of the faculty and the ways in which its qualifications and efforts meet the standard. It is important to note that Linfield is the kind of institution where this kind of open, discussion about what needs to happen to improve the situation for faculty takes place.

More documentation is needed to explain a shift of evaluative emphasis to greater research and scholarly activity among faculty than has historically been the case. Where does Linfield fall in the continuum that exists in higher education between research and teaching?

What is Linfield? The point was made that it is an institution with a strong faculty orientation that remains student-centered.

Clarify when and how (if) there have been exceptions to usual expectations with regard to the terminal degree.

Clarify curriculum committee’s role in relation to other committees with curricular responsibilities.

Be clear in use of term ‘administration.’ Where applicable, be specific: cite the President’s Cabinet, for example, where that is the intent of a given point.

If an issue is dealt with elsewhere in the self-study, cite that area specifically (3.3 or 8.2, for example).
Announced 90 minute meeting length was set aside to allow us to discuss Standard 6 in some detail. Meeting didn’t adjourn till 9:30 as a result.

STANDARD 6 REVIEW
Standard 6 was reviewed section by section to ensure accuracy and review strengths, weaknesses, and compliance.

Daily Dope no longer exists.

Further information on 6.B.6 needs to be provided (How is the review of the president by the board handled? What is the procedure?).

Appropriate references to other Standards were noted throughout.

Need to verify if narrative in section 6.C.4 is referring to entire college or just the McMinnville Campus.

6.D needs to include DCE and refer back to Std 2.

Further clarification of Policy 6.1 Affirmative Action must be undertaken.

When did the audit committee of the board become a separate committee? [answer provided in the November meeting: 2007]

6.C.4. The strategic plan was endorsed by the Administrative Assembly and by LEA.

6.C.9 Note that administrators and nonexempt staff do not receive the same level of access to salary comparison data as faculty.

There was continuing discussion about the Faculty Survey and how best to use and cite it and other surveys. Our mantra as a steering committee is to remember to draw on multiple sources of data wherever possible.