and seminar projects. At the same time, the program calls for monitoring of students’ advancement through the curriculum by retaining earlier essays for comparison with later ones. As with other traditional liberal arts disciplines, the history department remains convinced that qualitative assessment measures make the most sense as it strives to maintain and improve a healthy environment for student learning.

**Strengthening Faculty Engagement in the Division of Continuing Education**

With respect generally to the engagement of regular full-time faculty members in the curriculum of the Division of Continuing Education, the rising prosperity of the college as a whole has had inadvertent negative consequences. As this report’s introduction attests, the economic incentive for faculty members to earn additional income through regular engagement with DCE is less today than in 1988. Simultaneously, expectations for promotion and tenure in the college have risen with respect to the category of “Professional Achievement,” that is, research, scholarship, and creative activity. Today’s faculty members are expected to engage critically with peers from other institutions in a way that was not as explicitly recognized as before. It is no wonder, then, that full-time faculty members are more wary today than in 1988 about the implications of participating in the Division of Continuing Education.

The college’s strategy to address its challenges with respect to DCE has two main prongs. The first concerns faculty oversight and governance of the program. With the anticipated return to a standing Faculty Assembly Committee charged exclusively with policy review and guidance for the Division of Continuing Education, we should meet both the letter and spirit of Commission on Colleges’ standards for faculty oversight. The committee will have time, scope, and energy for regular review of policies such as those concerning faculty hiring, use of adjunct faculty, and assessment of distance learning and other non-traditional means of instruction.

The second prong of Linfield’s strategy for re-engaging full-time faculty with the Division of Continuing Education will be built around an allocation of $30,000 to the base budget in the division expressly for the purpose of creating incentives for faculty and academic department heads to engage with the program. The planning process has identified cultivating human resources as to realizing the college’s strategic aspirations. Whether by internal assessment of teaching and workloads or by comparison with our peer colleges, Linfield College benefits a great deal—some would say too much—from its employees’ time, energy, and dedication. Filling in important gaps in the present faculty is a priority that must be realized before greater expectations can be placed on present faculty. This perception of present resources being stretched to a
breaking point rendered unfeasible any attempt resolve the issue of faculty engagement in DCE by simply “adding on,” without financial incentives, the requisite duties to existing job descriptions.

Fortunately, sound management in DCE has paved the way for the college to incorporate into its budgeting exactly these needed incentives. These funds did not appear in the base budget for 1999-2000 because the budget process for that fiscal year had already been closed to requests for additions at the time (late December) when the college received final word of its accreditation status. We thought it best to take a studied approach to the recommendations of the Evaluation Team. This approach required tackling the governance issues first, working with both the Special Academic Programs Committee and the Faculty Executive Council on the challenges before us. After deliberating between February and May, the Special Academic Programs Committee issued a report to the Faculty Assembly (see appendix ___) outlining three possible ways of addressing the governance challenge. Only recently has the committee come to a consensus that a distinct Continuing Education Committee is warranted.

As with its inclusive and time-consuming strategic planning process, Linfield College is acting with respect to DCE accreditation issues according to the faith that shared governance produces the best and most lasting solutions in academic institutions. To have commanded faculty involvement by administrative fiat would not only have been counter to the Linfield ethos, it would ultimately have been self-defeating. The reviewer will thus find our approach to re-engaging full-time faculty in DCE to be in process—though its main outlines are clear.

Let us, then, turn to addressing each of the distinct areas cited under Recommendation 2 in the Evaluation Team report.

2.G.3. Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are not involved in the systematic recruiting, staffing, or oversight of Linfield’s continuing education and special learning activities.

A careful review of the language of the standard shows that the requirement is for faculty to be “involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution’s continuing education and special learning activities.” Linfield’s full-time faculty are, in many ways, so involved, as evidenced below. The suggestion that full-time faculty should be involved in the systematic recruiting and staffing of Linfield’s continuing education program is not drawn from this, or any, standard.

- There are areas in which Linfield can improve, and these are discussed below. New activities undertaken in response to NWASC’s recommendation are
underlined. All other activities described pre-date the accreditation visit and recommendation.

- All prospective faculty members must be approved by the department chairs to teach specific courses; the approval is not a blanket one and for each course, separate approvals are sought. Faculty who teach courses cross-listed in two departments must be approved by both chairs. Each department sets its own educational and teaching standards for adjuncts in DCE. A department may require the same educational credentials for part- and full-time faculty, such as the Psychology Department’s requirement that all faculty hold a doctorate in clinical psychology.

- The chair reviews the c.v. and transcripts of each prospect for graduate preparation in the course material, prior teaching experience in the same or similar courses at four-year institutions, and current, relevant work experience. If there is any question about the appropriateness of the preparation or the extent of teaching or work experience, the chair asks for further information from the prospect. There may also be a phone or in-person interview by the chair. (See Appendix ___ for sample)

- The chairs of all the departments involved in the majors (Economics and Business, Religion, Philosophy, Computing Science, English, Sociology and Anthropology, Psychology, History) and many of the full-time faculty in these and other departments teach in the DCE program on a regular basis. In this way they are able to assess first-hand the quality of student preparation in the discipline and the level of skill students bring from prerequisite courses taught by DCE adjuncts. Dr. Sandra Kiehl, chair of Economics and Business, often teaches the capstone course for the major in DCE and is well aware of the skill level of the DCE adjuncts who also teach the course. Dr. William Millar, chair of Religious Studies, is the coordinator for all Arts & Humanities senior projects and often asks his full-time colleagues to act as first or second reader. It would be very unusual for an Arts & Humanities senior project to be read by two adjuncts. The successive chairs and most of the full-time faculty in Sociology and Anthropology work closely with the DCE adjuncts who oversee the Social & Behavioral Sciences senior project and hold them in very high professional regard. Many of the full-time faculty who have taught in DCE, such as Michael Jones in Accounting and Jeff Peterson in Sociology and Anthropology, have acted as unofficial mentors to new or struggling adjuncts. While this is not a formal mentoring assignment, they are very generous with their time. Martin Dwomoh-Twenaboah, chair of Computing Science, regularly confers with the adjuncts teaching computer science courses in the Business Information System major to ensure that the curriculum remains integrated among various Computer Science courses.
• Full-time faculty and chairs meet with DCE adjunct faculty at the daylong Fall Faculty Workshop, an event specifically designed to discuss issues of interest to both groups. After a plenary session in the morning, each discipline meets separately with its chair to pursue whatever topics need discussion.

• The text selections made by adjunct faculty for DCE courses must be approved by the chairs of the departments. The chairs sometimes make suggestions and comments about the choice of required and optional reading. In certain accounting and computing science courses the full-time faculty who teach the course on campus select the required text. Please see attached sample.

• The chairs of the Economics and Business, Computing Science, Religion, and Sociology and Anthropology departments are all especially involved all curricular issues in DCE. These individuals closely work with DCE staff and the Director to ensure that the content of the courses is consistent throughout the College. Any curricular changes made by on-campus departments are also made in DCE.

• Linfield received a Hewlett Foundation grant to fund a restructuring of the general education requirements. The final stage of this grant is earmarked for a series of training workshops for DCE faculty. These are scheduled for the summer of 2000 and will provide stipends for DCE adjunct faculty and full-time faculty to meet and discuss the new core curriculum. This will provide the opportunity for the two groups to interact and provide guidance and mentoring for the faculty.

• There is a study underway to review the effectiveness of traditional and non-traditional formats in meeting the stated outcomes of courses. Full-time faculty from a variety of fields are scheduled to participate in this study – Peter Richardson, Margaret Krause, Connie Waltz, Vince Jacobs, Eugene Bell, Randy Grant – along with DCE adjunct faculty. Linfield is eager to assess the comparability of different delivery formats. Anecdotal information suggests that there are no significant differences in meeting outcomes regardless of the format but this data will help us establish whether or not it is accurate.

• Dean Henberg has committed $30,000 for incorporation into the base budget to be used as incentives for full-time faculty members to become more engaged with DCE. Some of this will fund stipends or release time for designated individuals in each department to act as DCE liaison. Their responsibilities will probably include interacting with the DCE Subcommittee.
as needed, overseeing faculty and reading list approval, and ensuring the availability of a full-time faculty member during breaks and summers. These funds may also be used to underwrite training workshops with joint adjunct-full-time participation, cover travel expenses for full-time faculty to visit off-campus sites and meet with adjunct faculty, and encourage full-time-adjunct team-teaching at off-campus sites.

- Every DCE instructor is evaluated by students in every course, every semester. These evaluations are reviewed by the Director, with copies sent to the instructor and the chair of the appropriate department. The chairs are asked to review the evaluations and return a form to the DCE office, indicating that they have reviewed the evaluations and making any comments. Any concern about the performance of an instructor is communicated to the Director who takes the necessary action, including not using the faculty member again. Subsequent employment of any adjunct faculty member is contingent on the on-going approval of the department chair. (Please see attached forms) This approval has been implicit in the past. It will be explicit in the future. These evaluations will be part of the documents reviewed when DCE faculty are formally evaluated.

2.G.4. The responsibility for the faculty-based administration of continuing education and special learning activities is clearly not defined as revealed by the institution’s own Self Study (p. 132).

From 1997-1999, the Special Academic Programs Committee (SAP) oversaw January Term, International Programs, and the Division of Continuing Education. This was not a felicitous combination, as the institution has come to realize. DCE has little in common with the other two programs and needs a group devoted to its particular issues. The Faculty Executive Committee and the SAP Committee have recommended that the latter be divided into two committees, one of which is devoted entirely to DCE and whose sole responsibility will be to bring regular faculty oversight to DCE planning and assessment. This will focus faculty attention on DCE and clarify faculty oversight of the program. This committee can interact effectively with an advisory body of adjuncts and with other full-time faculty. It can also recommend courses of action to standing faculty committees, such as the Curriculum Committee as acting as to facilitate changes it sees as in the college’s interest.

Under the committee’s proposal, which will be discussed in division in September and introduced on the floor of the Faculty Assembly for a first reading in October, the new committee would be constituted as follows and according to the rationale provided:
Motion: Create a net addition of one faculty committee by dividing the responsibility of the present Special Academic Programs Committee into two committees called the International Programs Committee and the Continuing Education Committee.

Rationale: While keeping in mind the firm faculty sentiment expressed in the past about not creating any more faculty committees, the Special Academic Programs Committee nevertheless recommends the creation of an International Programs Committee and a Continuing Education Committee that would together replace the Special Academic Programs Committee.

Two main arguments underpin this recommendation:

1. Since the committee restructuring two years ago, the present committee has attempted to deal with both International Programs and Continuing Education, but this has proved to be unwieldy in the extreme. The two areas simply do not have enough in common to foster coordinated and efficient efforts on the part of the committee. We have had to divide into subcommittees of three or so persons to do any real work, and this subverts the principle of divisional representation.

2. It is clear after the accreditation report that the faculty must become much more involved in the oversight of the Continuing Education program in order to bring practice in line with the college’s stated policy. According to the accreditation report, such involvement among other things includes overseeing advising, curriculum review, review of adjunct faculty, and hiring policies. A subcommittee of SAP last year recommended to the Director of Continuing Education and the Dean that DCE not be made a more autonomous entity, but continue to be an integral part of the college’s structure. This being the case, the DCE component of the SAP committee’s work will demand much more time than it has in the past, especially with regard to addressing accreditation issues and their substantive consequences.

International Programs Committee

Area of Focus: International Programs and January Term.

Purpose: To work with the Dean of Faculty, Associate Dean of Faculty, and Director of International Programs in the coordination and implementation of the college’s International and January Term Programs. The Committee:
1. Recommends policy relating to the programs in each of the special academic programs.

2. Advises the Director to include:
   a. student application and selection procedures
   b. long-range planning;
   c. other related issues.

3. Reviews and forwards recommendations on course and program proposals to the Curriculum Committee.

4. Provides ongoing review of current programs, with special attention to their relations to the College curriculum.

Membership: One member from each division elected by the Faculty Assembly to two-year alternating terms. One student member selected by the ASLC. The Director of International Programs and the Associate Dean of Faculty serve as advisory members.

Continuing Education Committee

Area of Focus: The Adult Degree Program, Summer Term, and Distance Learning.

Purpose: To work with the Director of Continuing Education in the coordination and implementation of the programs within the division. The Committee:

1. Recommends policy relating to the Division of Continuing Education.

2. Advises the Director to include:
   a. student application and selection procedures
   b. assuring consistency between DCE advising and the academic advising of other units in the college
   c. long-range planning
3. Reviews DCE Programs and forwards items for action to the Curriculum Committee. Provides oversight for DCE interdisciplinary majors.

4. Works with the Director and the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty on policies for the selection, supervision, and evaluation of all off-campus faculty.

5. Provides ongoing review of current programs, with special attention to their relations to the College curriculum.

Membership: One member from each division elected by the Faculty Assembly to two-year alternating terms. One student member selected from among the Division of Continuing Education. The Director of DCE serves as an advisory member.

4.A.2. Full-time residential faculty do not systematically participate in academic planning, curriculum review, advising and any meaningful governance at all in regard to the DCE.

The college believes that the kind and quality of oversight provided by the new Continuing Education Committee, as a standing committee of the Faculty Assembly, combined with the existing systematic oversight of the entire college’s curriculum through the departmental structure and the Curriculum Committee will sufficiently answer these concerns. We believe that the standards from Standard Four (Faculty) of the Accreditation Handbook must, for DCE, be interpreted in light of the standards for Off-Campus and other Special Programs Providing Academic Credit—2G.1 through 2.G.12. Following is a review of the ways in which full-time faculty are involved in planning, curriculum review, and oversight of advising in DCE. The governance deficiencies are addressed in the change in constitution of Faculty Assembly Committees.

Any curricular change made by any department must be reflected by the same curricular change in DCE. This include course numbering, content, title, cross-listing, and prerequisite changes, as well as changes to the general education requirements and requirements for each major.

Should DCE wish any curricular change, for example, offering a 3-credit version of a 5-credit course, the college-wide procedures for curricular changes must be followed. The appropriate department must approve any modification requested by DCE, the Curriculum Committee must approve the change, and it must be brought before the Faculty Assembly for approval in order to be
implemented. DCE cannot change its own curriculum or modify the on-campus curriculum unilaterally. (Please see Exhibit___ for Faculty Assembly Minutes)

Faculty do not advise students in the DCE program by design. The reasons for this practice are compatible with the standards of the Commission on Colleges, which do not require faculty advising in every program or unit of the institution, as evidenced by the existence at some accredited institutions of programs in which para-professional advisors, acting under the guidance and supervision of faculty members, handle the advising of students in specific programs. It seems clear from these examples that the relevant “participation” in advising called for in 4.A.2 may be best realized at the level of establishing the curriculum and overseeing the efforts of those professional staff who do the bulk of the advising.

DCE has chosen to use professional advisors because DCE students’ academic careers are often very complex. Typically, students have attended several institutions over several years. They may be taking courses concurrently at other colleges while attending Linfield. These are special challenges with which advisors must deal constantly. They must be able to assess the applicability of prior and current course work to the Linfield Curriculum, guide their students through the selection of the necessary Linfield course work, and make sure that various maximum and minimum credit hour limits are met. Having faculty members advise these students is not the best solution. On-site, professional advisors, employed and trained by DCE, easily accessible in person, and familiar with the complexities of transfer credit, are of tremendous benefit to our students. DCE students rate the presence of our advisors as a strength of our program. In the coming year, DCE will provide stipends for full-time faculty (perhaps the department DCE liaisons described earlier) to meet with the on-site advisors to discuss curricular changes, new curricular possibilities, and approaches to the core curriculum. This change will help the college meet the letter and the spirit of the requirement that faculty “participate” in academic advising in DCE.

4.A.5. The full-time residential faculty do not provide for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in the DCE.

The departmental liaisons, working in concert with the DCE Committee, adjunct faculty from the same discipline, and the Director, sitting as the DCE Faculty Evaluation Panel, seem to be the most appropriate people to evaluate faculty performance. DCE has drawn up a list of all faculty currently teaching in descending order of years of service and a schedule for review (). The Evaluation Panel can meet regularly, reviewing each faculty member’s revised c.v., course evaluations, and syllabi and forwarding its results to department chairs. The chairs will be able to compare the evaluations of on-campus adjuncts,
full-time faculty, and DCE adjuncts. The DCE Subcommittee can suggest the procedures for and composition of the Evaluation Panel.

--4.A. 10. The institution has failed to demonstrate that it periodically assesses institution policies concerning the use of adjunct faculty within the DCE.

Linfield needs to turn its attention to policies governing the use of adjunct faculty throughout the institution, including DCE. The college has tacitly agreed to the on-going use of adjuncts as a way of delivering academic programs in DCE and as an economic necessity for the institution as a whole. We have not systematically addressed the appropriateness or applicability of current policies or the need for new policies.

The first step must be to initiate discussions among those involved. There are two arenas in which these discussions can take place. The first is the DCE Committee and its advisory group. The second is the suggested Task Force charged with reviewing the status of non-full-time faculty and coordinators. These two groups, meeting together, can suggest policy for the revised Faculty Handbook. It is important that both the DCE Committee and adjunct faculty have a voice in this discussion.

Closing the Loop Between Assessment and Planning.

As has been noted previously, the Evaluation Team found Linfield College in mid-stream with respect to development of its strategic plan. That plan is now in nearly final form and will, presuming support from the community at large, be ratified by the Board of Trustees at its November 6, 1999 meeting. The plan consists of seven strategies, as follows:

I. Developing Human Resources
II. Enhancing Experiential Learning Opportunities
III. Centering the Academic Experience in the Liberal Arts and Sciences
IV. Enhancing Our Appreciation of Diverse Perspectives
V. Building Upon Our Heritage
VI. Identifying Our Resource Base
VII. Linking Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Within An Enhanced Governance Structure

Each strategy consists of institutional goals and specific recommended means of achieving those goals. For the purpose of this interim visit, Strategy VII is obviously important. We incorporate the entire text of Strategy VII, for it addresses in a comprehensive and systematic way the concern of the September
1999 Evaluation Team that the college had not yet shown how it would link assessment and planning.

STRATEGY VII. Linking Assessment, Planning and Budgeting Within an Enhanced Governance Structure

Accreditation standards as well as prudent management practices require that the College establish methods of linking assessment, planning, and budgeting. Additionally, Linfield has a need to develop mechanisms that will carry this agenda forward and assure that the College can adjust and adapt to present and future internal strengths and weaknesses as well as external opportunities and threats. This can only be accomplished by developing effective methods of assessment, planning, and budgeting within an enhanced governance structure. Four goals and their associated recommendations address this strategy.

**Goal 1:** Assure that all college departments utilize assessment information to formulate plans that in turn inform annual budget requests.

**Recommendation 1:** All academic and administrative departments must prepare annual assessment reports and annual plans. The plans must articulate goals and their associated budget implications for the subsequent year and are to be informed by assessment results summarized in the assessment reports. The plans will be reviewed for their consistency of support for the College’s mission statement and the strategies, goals and recommendations established in this and subsequent strategic agendas by the appropriate member of the President’s Advisory Council and subsequently by the Planning Council identified under Goal 3, Recommendation 1 below. This submission and review process will occur each spring beginning in Spring 2000.

**Recommendation 2:** Departmental budget requests based on their plans and the annual budget instructions are to be forwarded to the appropriate member of the President’s Advisory Council and subsequently to the Budget Advisory Committee beginning with the 2001-02 budget cycle in Fall 2000. When formulating its budget recommendations, the Budget Advisory Committee will consider the priorities established by the Planning Council as discussed in Goal 3, Recommendation 2 below.

**Goal 2:** Assure that the College has the capacity to analyze and update as well as catalog and archive external and internal assessment information, and distribute this information as needed.
Recommendation 1: Department assessment reports and plans will be retained in the offices of the appropriate member of the President’s Advisory Council. In addition, a copy of each report and plan will be placed in the library archives.

Recommendation 2: The Office of Institutional Research will receive copies of departmental assessment reports and plans and will be responsible for analyzing and distributing information contained in them as requested by the President’s Advisory Council and the Planning Council identified in Goal 3, Recommendation 1 below.

Goal 3: Build an efficient, representative system which utilizes internal and external assessment information and analyses to prioritize, monitor fulfillment of, and develop strategies, goals and recommendations created as part of a continual process of strategic planning linked to the budget process at the College.

Recommendation 1: Create a Planning Council charged with managing the College’s planning process. Membership on the Planning Council will consist of three faculty, three administrators (one of whom will be the Vice President of Academic Affairs), one non-exempt staff member, one trustee, and one student. The Council will be chaired by the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Faculty, administrators, non-exempt staff, ASLC, and trustees will each establish their own processes for determining their membership on the Council.

Recommendation 2: The Planning Council identified in Recommendation 1 above is charged with:

a. reviewing departmental plans as indicated under Goal 1, Recommendation 1 above.

b. prioritizing the strategies, goals, and recommendations of this and subsequent strategic agendas and reporting these priorities to the Budget Advisory Council.

c. reviewing and proposing modifications to the strategies, goals, and recommendations of the strategic agenda over time.

d. monitoring the College’s progress in reaching the goals of this and subsequent strategic agendas.

e. consulting with Office of Institutional Research, committees, departments, divisions, the President’s Advisory Council, and external consultants as needed, in fulfilling the tasks identified in a)-d) above.
Recommendation 3: Create a long-range fiscal plan and update it annually. This fiscal plan will reflect the strategies, goals, and recommendations of this and subsequent strategic agendas and be used by the Planning Council when identifying priorities and by the Budget Advisory Committee when developing budget recommendations.

Goal 4: Ensure clear, open and responsive communication among all College constituencies. Develop a workable definition and understanding of the concept of representative and collaborative governance at the College.

Recommendation 1: Within the context of Linfield’s bylaws and the responsibilities designated therein by the Board of Trustees, effective decision-making at Linfield should be based upon consultation among the College’s constituent groups. Matters of college-wide concern should be discussed with and within committees, assemblies, and councils whose charge encompasses the issue in question. These groups should consult with and make their deliberations known to members of the community.

Recommendation 2: The Faculty Executive Council should continue its discussion about broadening membership of faculty committees for Academic Support, Admissions and Financial Aid, Enrollment, Retention and Student Life, Benefits and Budget, and Staffing, to include administrators, non-exempt staff, and students. These committees are to take an institution-wide perspective in dealing with matters before them, reflecting the College’s mission statement and the strategies and goals of this and subsequent strategic agendas when formulating their recommendations and making decisions.

Recommendation 3: Meeting minutes will be regularly kept by all faculty and administrative committees, the Faculty Assembly, the Planning Council, and the President’s Advisory Council. They will be regularly distributed via email to the members of the College community.