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NEXT MEETING
Tuesday, January 29, 9:00 AM to noon
Continued full-scale review of self-study

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING
Approved as amended.

NEWSLETTER
Next newsletter to cover standard 5.

Discussion of executive summary
General response to the summary and its inclusion in the self-study is positive. It is useful to provide an overview/big picture context to the rest of the self study. It can balance Linfield’s challenges with a sense of the progress that has been made in the last 10 years.

Bookend this section with a piece at the end that give a general sense of the challenges for the next 10 years (preparation for the overview of the next self-study).

What else should be included? Linfield has emerged as a leading producer of Fulbrights. Are there other student learning outcomes we can highlight?

Include notice of the change in the Linfield – McMinnville Campus Carnegie classification to liberal arts. (Note, though, that DCE is ‘baccalaureate – diverse’ and Portland is ‘special focus – health care’.)

Include outreach to the community college’s to smooth the transfer process, particularly Portland and DCE.

Include Portland HRSA (Health Resources and Services Administration) grant.

Is there a way of showing increase in faculty? Has there been an increase in faculty? There is a sense that the Fact Book numbers may not reflect all the ‘boots on the ground’ involved in teaching. (Fact Book does reflect the reclassification of some formerly faculty positions, like coaches, to administrative positions and includes ‘off-budget’ visiting faculty). Compare list of 1998 faculty to list now? Student credits per work load unit has been stable (see Fact Book). Review student-faculty ratio.
Review of strategic issues
Which of the issues listed so far really rise to level of ‘strategic issue’ as opposed to being a concern, something to do, or something that simply needs to be fixed now? Distinguish between strategic issues and concerns or questions.

Standard 1
1st proposed strategic issue: Replace with a statement that there is a need to clarify the planning and assessment process (ongoing issue from 10 years ago)

2nd proposed strategic issue: Perhaps the role of the office of institutional research does reflect a strategic issue, but how information/research is systematically used (or not) and how it flows (or doesn’t) through the organization might. How do we use available and wished for information in a meaningful way? How does Linfield work toward a culture of evidence across the organization? (links to assessment)

3rd proposed strategic issue: Replace with a statement that there is a need to realize and act as if we are one institution and not 3.

Bundle proposed 4 (budget & mission) and 5 (integrity of planning) into 1.

Summary of standard 1 strategic issues:
Developing the governance & strategic planning interface
Implementing our mission as one institution
Fostering a culture of evidence

Standard 2, 3
Defer strategic issues discussion to next meeting.

Standard 4
1st proposed strategic issue: workload. Finding a method to determine equitable work loads may not be strategic but achieving an environment where faculty can thrive for a career (balance pedagogical and professional renewal as well as personal).

2nd proposed strategic issue: compensation. Re-phrase -> develop and maintain a competitive compensation package.

3rd proposed strategic issue: promotion & tenure. Clearer communication is desirable, but there will always be some degree of ambiguity in the process and outcomes. The challenge is to maintain the integrity and fairness of the promotion & tenure process over time and across departments with different professional expectations.
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4th proposed strategic issue: adjuncts. Omit from strategic issues. Linfield has met expectations of the standard. It doesn’t rise to the level of a strategic issue, but are still areas of concern to be addressed:

--integration of adjuncts into campus life (and what does that mean across Linfield departments & locations -- if the adjunct is teaching online or at a clinical site and never comes to a campus?);
--honoring adjuncts different needs (adjuncts seeking a permanent position somewhere, freeway flyers teaching at multiple institutions, and the portfolio career adjuncts);
--non-monetary awards & recognition (currently there are no teaching awards for adjuncts, no recognition of longevity or commitment to Linfield, etc.).

5th proposed strategic issue: negotiating inherent tensions within the institution. Not a strategic issue. Perhaps part of a developing self-study theme that also applies to others at Linfield – finding Voice (being heard, participating and being recognized)

6th proposed strategic issue: faculty must acknowledge the things the institution does well. Definitely an issue, but not a strategic one.

Standard 6

1st proposed strategic issue: acting in accordance with policy. A tactical issue. Policies meet standards, but are they actually being followed? A to do item: what has actually been done? Particularly with respect to administrator evaluations (an area explicitly acknowledged as a problem in the 1998 study). Need data to distinguish the need to fix perception or the need to fix a problem.

2nd proposed strategic issue: compensation. Develop and maintain a competitive compensation package for faculty, administration, and staff. Note that this is the same issue as identified in standard 4 for faculty.

3rd proposed strategic issue: faculty supported in their role in governance. Is this only a faculty issue? What is the administrator role here? Is this similar to the same issue we see emerging in standard 1 (The 3 ‘part’ Linfield needs to function as one Linfield)?

We are people working together for the College – faculty, administrator, staff, and Trustee. There is a shared desire for Voice, transparency, communication, respect ACROSS the institution. We need to develop a shared understanding of our roles working toward the success of the institution. There are groups other than the faculty who also do not feel respected.
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4th proposed strategic issue: congruency between locations/campuses. A tactical issue – similar to proposed issue 1 – if our policies meet the expectations in the standard we need to reinvigorate the following of existing policies.