

Summary: February 26, 2008 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

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

NEXT MEETING/SPRING MEETING SCHEDULE

March 4 -- 5:30 till 7:30 p.m., Standard 4

OTHER IMPORTANT DATES

MARCH 31: Posting of first public draft for Linfield community

MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

Minutes of Feb. 19 meeting reviewed and approved.

STYLE UPDATE

It was reaffirmed that the self-study would be written in 3rd person.

Standard 6 draft review

Clarify strategic compensation issues:

Concerns about communication and transparency in the benchmarking of compensation complicate the discussion of compensation and should be recognized in the strategic issue.

As a group, administrators are within the benchmark range and two out of the three faculty ranks are within the benchmark range. There is evidence that some classifications of employees and some disciplines among the faculty are not well represented by the summary data. A weakness of the current model is that it assumes homogeneity within the groups.

Complicating transparency are issues of confidentiality. Linfield's administrative compensation data cannot be shared publicly because that process would reveal individual salaries (sample in any given position is very small), though comparative salary information by generic job title is available from CUPA (College & University Professional Association for Human Resources). Summary CUPA data are published periodically in the Chronicle of Higher Education. Note that these data are salary only and not overall compensation. For benchmarking, benefit information is derived from PACCON (Pacific Consortium of West Coast Small College Business Officers) reporting.

LEA compensation benchmarking is done through an annual assessment of the local market. This information is not distributed.

Summary: February 26, 2008 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

Faculty, on the other hand, have access to both Linfield information -- average by rank -
- and to comparison schools compensation data through information published by
AAUP (American Association of University Professors).

There is concern about salary in some faculty disciplines; the last analysis of faculty
compensation by discipline was done earlier this decade. Linfield has valued an
egalitarian pay structure among faculty. Is this typical? This value is more common at
liberal arts colleges than at those with professional schools or at research institutions.

6.A.2 Clarify faculty orientation information. Note unusual/distinctive roles of a
student and faculty member as voting members of the Board of Trustees.

6.B.5 Linfield doesn't offer vocational, technical, or diploma programs.

6.B.6 Further information needed on trustee performance evaluation. Plan is under
development.

6.B.8 Clarify process of hiring and approving auditor.

6.B.9 Clarify that the Board is aware of significance of accreditation and members of the
Board are involved in the building blocks of the self-study (steering committee, etc.)

6.C.1 Position description summaries (not the actual position description) are available
in a variety of locations.

6.C.2,3 Is Linfield following its own evaluation policy? Is the policy realistic or
achievable? The satisfactory evaluation of administrators would support that
administrators are acting in accordance with their duties. If evaluation is not
happening consistently, what other ways do we have to know?

Note that the staffing proportion description does not demonstrate the adequacy of
staffing, only that Linfield has similar proportions to other institutions. This portion
supports 6.B.7 more than this section (as noted in existing cross-reference in 6.B.7).
Move there. Use all Linfield information only.

6.C.4 Reduce detail about future campaign plans.

6.C.5,6 Alternative way of expressing: College has not failed to meet any of its
fundamental obligations due to overly speedy or overly slow decision making.

6.C.8,9 Faculty detail not needed as this standard addresses administration and staff.

Summary: February 26, 2008 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee

6.D Format faculty survey results to tables for clarity. Articulate the transformation of the Portland Campus in a relatively short time frame to provide a context for faculty concerns about governance.

Distinguish between workload issues as they do or do not intersect with the governance system. Concerns about how faculty participate in governance is a faculty issue, but perhaps not a governance issue.

6.1 Affirmative action section not yet updated.