

Summary: September 25, 2007 (rev) meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

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

HANDOUTS IN THE MEETING: Strategic Issues for standards 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9. (Drafts of Standard 5 & 9 were sent by e-mail and/or updated on Catfiles prior to meeting).

NEXT MEETING

Tuesday, October 23, 5:45 PM

Review drafts to date of standards 4 and 6; follow up of 2

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

August 2007 meeting minutes were approved by e-mail.

NEWSLETTER

The newsletter with an overview of Standard 3 was e-mailed and posted to the accreditation website September 25.

INTRODUCTION

Be alert to key words. Key words important in any one standard should be referenced in all other standards to demonstrate Linfield's understanding of the interrelationships among the standards and to facilitate key word searches by accreditors using our electronic files (CD). For example, 'integrity' should not only be found in standard 9 but in all standards.

At this stage, we may all be too aware of all the things we would like to do better. Try not to get bogged down in that topic. There are many things we do well. Goal: write effectively about what we do well and balance with what needs improvement.

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT OF STANDARD I KEY ISSUES

As we frame these standards in terms of their relevant strategic issues, we should distinguish between localized (department, campus?), immediate, and long term (over next 10 years) strategic issues at the institutional level.

Given Standard I's chairs' strategic suggestion that the college better clarify roles regarding strategic planning efforts, it was acknowledged that there are normal creative tensions that surface among faculty, administration, and trustees (the three governing arms of the institution). Are there mechanisms for managing this tension toward constructive results by creating better communication avenues and strengthened

Summary: September 25, 2007 (rev) meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

relationships among Faculty Executive Council, the Faculty Assembly, and the Planning Council?

Assessing the community's satisfaction with delivery on the institutional mission? We returned to the ASC conversation about weighing perception vs fact in this (and other) assessment areas. Some perception exists that budget practices and decisions don't match the mission or its avowed priorities. How do we better inform perception by marshalling and sharing relevant data? It was suggested that a review of budget allocations over the last decade would assist in determining whether budget decisions actually foster the mission. (Is this task feasible – at what level would this be feasible?)

Good practice on all fronts: multiple data sources (in the example above – look at budget, but also check other sources. Do multiple sources point to similar conclusions? How does information (data) flow through the organization – are information practices (institutional research across the organization) sufficient for fulfilling the mission into the future?

What structures/processes do we have in place to help us implement the mission? For example: Budget Advisory Committee interacting with Planning Council. If processes are there – do we follow them? (Theory vs practice).

Another way to think about it: Is there anything that we do that isn't related to the mission? Evidence of expenditures that do not serve the mission?

It was suggested that we think about depicting the processes involved in budget deliberations visually – we will soon be receiving an example of an institutional effectiveness table from another self-study (see Catfiles: Examples from Other Institutions.

Planning cycle timeline	Activity	Who participates
-------------------------	----------	------------------

EXHIBITS FOR STANDARD I:

All mission statements in use by institution, all levels, all departments.

Possible: graphic representation of intersection of foundational principles with department mission (Theatre & Communication is working on this.)

DISCUSSION OF DRAFT OF STANDARD 9 KEY ISSUES

Marketing vs ethical representation. What is acceptable marketing language? What do we need to prove in our public claims about ourselves as a college (uniqueness, exceptionality, etc.)? Does this rise to the level of an institutional strategic issue?

Summary: September 25, 2007 (rev) meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

Standard 9 work group has developed some questions that can only be answered by student body, but material is not covered in survey information collected institutionally to date. Is another survey warranted? Is it feasible (time, necessity, survey fatigue)? Would this be a job for a class project (SOAN methods class)? How broadly should that survey extend, if undertaken?

CONVERSATION ABOUT SURVEYS

Some caution should be exercised with internal surveys – when we're not able to benchmark against other institutions, what will be the standard to determine if we have identified a finding needing to be addressed?

Still a possibility to administer the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (would also apply to Portland and DCE locations). However, might not get at standard 9 issues. Dan Preston will attend a webinar on this SSI and will report back to Standard 9 chair as to its possible fit with that group's information goals.

Committee members asked for help knowing how to cite surveys (speak about those who responded to the survey vs extending survey conclusions to the whole population).

Who will decide what surveys to administer? It was recognized that the ASC as a whole should consult about how to proceed with individual standard quests for internally generated information (so as to consolidate where possible, tap into comparative surveys that might address the same questions, etc.).

Surveys available on Catfiles: X Survey Results...

Completed

Graduating Senior Survey 2005 (some historical information had been requested by some standards)

Graduating Senior Survey 2006

NSSE 2005

NSSE 2007

Coming soon

Graduating Senior Survey 2007

One Year Alumni Survey (of 05-06 alumni)

Ten Year Alumni Survey (of 96-97 alumni)