Summary: January 29, 2008 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

PRESENT: Liz Atkinson, Jennifer Ballard (staff), Greg Copeland, John Hall, Pam Jacklin, Chris Keaveney, Brenda Marshall, Dan Preston, Barbara Seidman, Jeff Summers, Pam Wheeler, Susan Whyte.

NEXT MEETING/SPRING MEETING SCHEDULE
- FEBRUARY 8--9:00 a.m. till 2:00 (light snacks, lunch)
  Standard 2, 5, and 8 (including review of the master plan)
- FEBRUARY 12--5:30 till 7:30 p.m. (dinner meetings resume)
  Standard 7 (and carry-over from 2/8/08 meeting)
- FEBRUARY 19--5:30 till 7:30 p.m.
  Standard 3 (and carry-over from previous meeting)
- FEBRUARY 26--5:30 till 7:30 p.m.
  Standard 6 (and carry-over from previous meeting)
- MARCH 4--5:30 till 8:30 p.m.
  Standards 1 and 4
- MARCH 11--5:30 till 8:00
  Standard 9
- MARCH 18-5:30 till 9:00
  Standard 2
- MARCH 25--Optional SPRING BREAK SESSION (community draft preparation)

OTHER IMPORTANT DATES
MARCH 31--Posting of first public draft for Linfield community
EARLY APRIL: Open meetings in McMinnville & Portland, contacts or meetings with key committees (Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees, FEC, Planning Council, department chairs, ASLC cabinet, LEA executive board, administrative leadership team, others?
APRIL 18--End of comment period for the first draft
MAY – Finalize & address 4/18 comments
EARLY JUNE: the penultimate copy will be turned over to Barbara Seidman and Dan Preston for final editing (moving toward a July publication submission).
EARLY JULY: to printer
April until the accreditors arrive in October: work on Exhibits.

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING
January 8 minutes approved as amended.

UPDATES:
Master plan needs to be reviewed by Accreditation Steering Committee. It has been to the Cabinet, to the Planning Council, will be presented to the Board of Trustees in February, and to the community in March.
STYLE UPDATE: **In the draft, the entire standard needs to be quoted.** When community members are reviewing, it needs to be easy for them to see what the standard is addressing.

COMMUNITY DRAFT PROCEDURES DISCUSSED

Make the draft self-study available on March 31:

- post a pdf in a password (Catnet/Linfield community only) protected area on the website
- post a pdf on the Board of Trustee website
- 2 hard copies on reserve at Nicholson/McM
- 2 hard copies on reserve in Portland
- 1 hard copy in Academic Affairs (McM)

Who should particularly be encouraged to read the self-study?

- Cabinet
- Faculty Executive Council
- Planning Council
- Academic Support Committee
- Administrator and LEA executive committees
- Enrollment, Retention & Student Life Committee
- Assc. Students of Linfield College
- Department Chairs

How will comments be collected and tracked?

- SurveyMonkey to collect comments. At the end, we can export to an archive as needed. Collect role (faculty, administration, student, trustee, lea), make name optional.
- Request comments focus on the content (errors of omission, inaccuracies, etc.) as copy editing will not have been done at this point. S
- Send out a weekly reminder of the need for comment.
- April 18 close date.
- Institutional Research and/or Academic Affairs will set this up.

Note on exhibits: include Steering Committee process, all agendas, all minutes.

**Standard 7 Strategic Issues:**

Roll issue #3 (net tuition revenue) into #1 (long range strategic planning & budgeting) to leave 2 strategic issues.

Re:issue #2 the relationship between the McM/DCE budget and the Portland budget. Why do the budgets need to be integrated? Is there really an issue here? The increased
intersection in the curriculum, enrollment, and staffing is leading to the need for a more integrated budget.

Is what is being described something that will be well handled by summer (in which case, it may not be strategic issue)? No, though reporting may be complete, implementation will be in progress.

**Standard 8 Strategic Issues:**
Revision to #2. Backlog is estimated at $35 million. Major repairs & renewal (MR&R is accruing at an estimated rate of $1 to $1.2 million per year. Currently, the budget is $600,000 for MR&R with a goal of increasing budgeted funds by $100,000 per year until it reaches $1 million. The issue is to fund MR&R sufficiently in order to stop the increase in the backlog. Then, the college can address the backlog though the master planning process.

Revision to #3 (modern classrooms in Ptd) to read: The need to construct modern classrooms on the Portland Campus and draft a master plan to guide future facility upgrades.

**Standard 9 Strategic Issues:**
Is issue #1 (integrity of communications about the college in the face of market pressures that all higher education faces) reflecting an existing problem at Linfield? Does Linfield accurately represent the value of its education both externally and internally? The issue belongs in the standard, but not as a uniquely Linfield strategic issue -- rather as an issue all higher education is facing. Consider re-phrasing and dealing with the issue elsewhere.

Does issue #2 (creation of a multicultural environment) stand alone? That is, in the strategic plan several foundational principles are listed with this principle among them. Should this issue be dealt with alone? Move elsewhere in the self-study.

#3 (creation of a culture where there is greater confidence in the promotion, tenure, personnel decision-making processes). This area needs to be explored. Is there evidence of a problem? Not a strategic issue; move to within the standard.

At conclusion of this conversation, standard 9 has no strategic issues identified.

**Standard 2 Strategic Issues:**
Issue #1 (managing growing professional expectations of faculty) overlaps issues in standard 4. Move to St. 4.
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Issue #2  Pressure on salaries and resources is handled in Standard 4, so leave strategic issue in #4, but the text in 2 and 4 needs to be coordinated. There is evidence that salaries are an issue: all pre-professional searches in 07-08 have failed.

Rephrase #3 (balancing department needs with resources). The challenge is meshing resources with a balance between curricular ambitions and curricular needs, to manage creative tensions that will continue to exist. For example, departments may offer too many 300 and 400 level courses when 100 level courses are needed.

Move issue #4 (linking faculty development funds to rewarding productive faculty) to standard 4.

Overview of remaining proposed strategic issues. They focus on these areas: How do we make sure we attend to student learning, effective academic programs in light of limited resources? (Even assuming improvement, limited resources are likely for the foreseeable future.)

The linkage between assessment and academic planning is highly variable by department. How do we make is happen consistently across all departments? How do we sustain a culture of evidence-based assessment? More planning needed.

Further discussion of standard 2 strategic issues deferred to future meeting.

Location of strategic issues in draft
The question emerged about where the strategic issues will be placed in the self-study. The strategic issues should be basically reflected in the content of the standard. But what about strategic issues that don’t ‘fit’ in a particular standard? Even if the issues emerged in the self-study, they might not emerge from specific standards.

It was concluded that the strategic issues should all be placed at the beginning of the document. Strategic issues need not be repeated within each standard.

The closing piece to the self-study will be the challenges for the future.