

## **Summary: March 4, 2008 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee**

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

### NEXT MEETING

March 11 -- 5:30 till 8:30 p.m., Standard 1

### OTHER IMPORTANT DATES

MARCH 31: Posting of first public draft for Linfield community

### MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

Minutes of Feb. 26 meeting reviewed, amended, approved.

### STYLE UPDATE

*(Change from April 2007 style guide.)* When writing of percents in text, use the % symbol following a number rather than the word 'percent'. Use actual numbers with all percents (don't spell out 1-9). Avoid beginning a sentence with a number.

Pending question: Should policies (for example, 4.1 Faculty Evaluation) have their own separate section or be addressed as a theme within each standard/element?

### **Standard 6 follow up**

Evaluation question is under review by cabinet. Current thinking is to stick with the annual review policy.

President's Advisory Council will probably no longer exist. communication among the constituencies who made up the PAC is needed, but the PAC may not be the best way to accomplish it. The president is considering new options. For example, the president intends to hold a joint Cabinet and Faculty Executive Council (FEC) meeting once per semester.

### **Standard 4 draft review**

It was noted that the strategic issues really apply to all employees groups (something to consider when handling these strategic issues at the self-study introduction), though that fact should not dilute the issues as they apply to faculty.

Overview: Clarify number of new positions (reconcile sources). Intersperse tables with text, avoid one table after another. Avoid conclusion that Linfield complies; leave judgment to accreditors. Except for required detailed tables, summarize information from exhibit sources.

4.A.1 Explain why (under what conditions) we hire faculty who don't have terminal degrees (ABD, etc.)

## **Summary: March 4, 2008 meeting of the Accreditation Steering Committee**

4.A.2 Clarify FEC/Planning Council relationship. The Planning Council has a faculty liaison to the Faculty Executive Council.

Include more cross references to standard 6. Include in exhibits the faculty retreat agendas. Clarify information about colloquium.

Include some results from the Board of Trustees survey to get at the disconnect between faculty thinking the board doesn't value faculty, while the board would probably say that it does.

Committee has not come to a consensus on whether the faculty survey is representative or not, but either way the survey is only one tool and must be balanced by other evidence. Perhaps more to the point is how we address what Linfield has done based on this information.

Include references to President Hellie's reports to the community.

4.A.3 Clarify workload requirements (what was in print vs. what was understood at various points in time).

Document increased requirements for professional activity circa 98-99 (since last self-study). Also, show how faculty receive increased support for professional activity and that increased resources are allocated to professional activity.

Move workload committee charge to exhibit.

The college reconfiguring of library and IT resources has opened up many options that support scholarly and professional activity (address in 4.B?).

4.A.4 Not yet revised. Defer to later.

4.A.5 Reformulate. Linfield has a process; the process is explained and followed. There are anxieties around the evaluation process, but those anxieties reflect, at least in part, the significance of the process.

4.B.3 Less emphasis on research policies; more emphasis on faculty pursuing research of their choosing.

4.B.6 List other grants. Mention grant writing support in College Relations.

4.B.7 Mention support of Board of Trustees.