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Preface

The 2008 Linfield College Institutional Self-Study marks the culmination of thirty months of intensive and comprehensive institutional analysis in support of the Linfield’s application for reaccreditation. The process followed over that time involved literally hundreds of individuals—trustees, faculty, administrators, staff, and students—who consulted with the lead authors of the various standards or contributed text of their own to the final product. In every sense, this report reflects a thorough-going examination of the college at this point in its history and is intended to provide a baseline for community-wide discussions of Linfield’s future.

The Process

The specific steps taken to create this report began in February 2006 when Acting Linfield President Dr. Marvin Henberg convened a leadership team headed by Dr. Barbara Seidman, Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty, and Dan Preston, Dean of Enrollment Services. Joining them were associate deans of faculty Dr. Jeffrey Summers and Dr. Elizabeth Atkinson, as well as Assistant Registrar for Institutional Research Jennifer Ballard. Four of these five individuals attended the NWCCU accreditation workshop held that winter in South King County, Washington (the fifth member had quite recently completed an NWCCU accreditor training workshop and so declined to attend the repeat session).

In late spring 2006, newly arrived President Dr. Thomas Hellie invited fifteen members of the Linfield community (including the five members of the original leadership team) to convene the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) which was charged with shepherding the self-study process to completion. As the following list indicates, membership included two college trustees, five full-time faculty members (representing both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses), four faculty/administrators, and four full time administrators.

Accreditation Steering Committee Members

Chair: Dr. Barbara Seidman, Interim Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty and Professor of English
Co-Chair: Dan Preston, Dean of Enrollment Services

Standard One — Mission
Dr. Chris Keaveney, Associate Professor of Japanese and Modern Languages co-chair
Reverend Bernard Turner, Linfield Trustee

Standard Two — Educational Program
Dr. William Millar, Professor of Religious Studies and department chair
Dr. Barbara Seidman, Interim VP for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty

Standard Three — Students
Dan Preston, Dean of Enrollment Services

Standard Four — Faculty
Dr. Brenda DeVore Marshall, Professor of Theatre/Communication Arts (Faculty Trustee 2005–07)
Dr. Pamela Wheeler, Associate Professor of Nursing

Standard Five — Library and Information Resources
Susan Whyte, College Librarian
Standard Six — Governance
Dr. Elizabeth Atkinson, Associate Professor of Chemistry and Associate Dean of Faculty
Dr. Amy Orr, Associate Professor of Sociology/FEC chair (2006–08)

Standard Seven — Finance
Greg Copeland, Controller

Standard Eight — Physical Resources
John Hall, Director of Facilities
Dr. Jeff Summers, Professor of Economics and Associate Dean of Faculty

Standard Nine — Institutional Integrity
Pamela Jacklin, Attorney, Stoel Rives Law Firm (Portland, Oregon) and Linfield Trustee

Staff: Jennifer Ballard, Assistant Registrar for Institutional Research (later: Director of Institutional Research)

The ASC met for its opening orientation session in June 2006 and reconvened for a half-day retreat in August 2006 to inaugurate their work in earnest. [Exhibit 1]

The official campus kick-off to the self-study process began on September 26, 2006, when Dr. Al Johnson of NWCCU visited the McMinnville Campus to present a power-point overview of what accreditation at its best should entail. At the well-attended meeting (which was simulcast to the Portland Campus), Dr. Johnson impressed on the community the importance of making the self-examination effort analytic and forward-looking in providing lessons for the college upon which to reflect and build. His presentation slides were reproduced and distributed to every academic department, along with a folder of other materials to guide department chairs in completion of their respective contributions to the self-study [Exhibit 2].

Throughout 2006–07 Accreditation Steering Committee members—each of whom took responsibility for authoring a specific standard—convened working groups relevant to their standards, met quarterly as a body, and created their first drafts. In doing so, each author or co-author began introducing the strategic issues for the college that had surfaced in the course of researching answers for the questions in a given standard. A publicly accessible accreditation website was launched and the minutes of almost every ASC meeting were posted so that interested Linfield citizens could follow the discussions as they unfolded [Exhibit 3]. Co-chair Dan Preston began issuing a community accreditation newsletter distributed by e-mail and archived on the accreditation website to keep reminding the various college constituencies that the accreditation process had begun. Each edition of the newsletter sought to educate readers in rationale for institutional accreditation, its scope and character, and the particulars of that issue’s featured standards. Publication of the newsletters occurred every couple of months between fall 2006 and fall 2008 [Exhibit 4] and included dissemination of the strategic issues identified by the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC). In October 2006 the faculty devoted part of its biennial off-campus retreat to discussion of the strategic issues identified to that point by the accreditation steering committee [Exhibit 5]. Those strategic issues were also distributed to other campus constituencies to initiate widespread conversation about their implications for future institutional planning, which was also occurring at that time (leading to the adoption of the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007-12).

All steering committee members were charged with creating a preliminary draft of their respective standards for collective review during fall 2007. Included in this assignment were all academic departments, whose individual reports would contribute to the completed Standard 2
draft. Foundational to each departmental report was completion of a departmental template keying all relevant standards into one document provided to chairs; they were asked to fill out this template to provide a baseline for the entire self-study enterprise and for their respective departmental discussions [Exhibit 6]. Those templates may be found within each academic department exhibit binder. Each standard chair also refined its list of relevant strategic issues, which were collected anew and shared with the President’s Cabinet, the all-college Planning Council, the Faculty Executive Council (FEC), academic department chairs, and the Administrators’ Assembly, and the Linfield Employees’ Association [Exhibit 7]. In this way the Accreditation Steering Committee sought to make the self-study effort an integral part of ongoing strategic planning processes occurring within the institution.

In monthly meetings during fall 2007 the ASC vetted members’ standards-in-progress. The group designated March 31, 2008, for production of its first publicly-disseminated draft of the self-study, a deadline that was met [Exhibit 8]. This first formal self-study draft was made available electronically on the college website and in hard copy in several well-publicized central locations on each campus throughout April 2008. Members of the President’s Cabinet and Board Chair Glenna Kruger received hard copies for review and commentary. Numerous public meetings (two in McMinnville, one in Portland) followed release of this document to invite feedback from all constituencies. More focused feedback sessions were held with the following groups: the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees; the President’s Cabinet; the faculty at large and the Faculty Executive Council; the Administrators’ Leadership Council; the Leadership Team of the Linfield Employees Association; and current and incoming members of the ASLC (Associated Students of Linfield College) Cabinet. The Accreditation Steering Committee also invited email responses and provided a web survey for individual feedback. Those responses received are included in Exhibit 9. Meanwhile public notice of the pending accreditation visit was printed in the Linfield Magazine, which reaches all alumni on the college mailing list, as well as employees and friends of the college [Exhibit 10]. Notice also appeared in two local newspapers—the McMinnville News Register and the Oregonian, a state-wide publication [Exhibit 11].

Upon receipt of feedback following release of the March 31st draft, the steering committee set to work to finalize the self-study over the ensuing months to prepare it for publication in early September 2008. Between April and August 2008 the ASC alternated between meetings and electronic draft-sharing as the revision process proceeded so that everyone was apprised of the state of the self-study as it moved toward completion. In the final stage, ASC chair Barbara Seidman oversaw the editing of the document for cohesiveness of voice and style. Each completed standard was then placed on the ASC password-protected file sharing site for all committee members to see. Concerns about content and advice about proofreading were forwarded to Jennifer Ballard and Barbara Seidman as arbiters of the finalized electronic copy. The two-volume self-study went to the printer on September 5, 2008, and was mailed for overnight delivery to the accreditation visiting team on Monday, September 8.

Upon its publication the 2008 Linfield College Institutional Self-Study was also released to the Linfield community both through the college website and the positioning of hard copies at various sites on both campuses. Information about the upcoming accreditation was published in a special message to the Linfield community through the campus newspaper The Linfield Review. ASC co-chairs Seidman and Preston were invited to attend a student Senate meeting to discuss the accreditation process and its meaning for students in late September. Discussions of the ensuing visit also took place at the Faculty Assembly, Administrators’ Assembly, and the early fall meeting of the Linfield Employees’ Association. The Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees discussed the report at its September meeting. The vice president of academic affairs prepared department chairs for their role in the pending visit, as did the ASC co-chairs.
Goals for the Process

As the above summary makes clear, Linfield undertook the self-study effort with several goals in mind:

- Widespread involvement of all college constituencies, including the Board of Trustees;

- Transparency of communication about the self-study process itself, and the progress of discussions around it;

- Applicability to the institutional planning processes under way at the college given the arrival of a new president, the development of a new strategic plan, and the revision of the Linfield general education program.

With the subsequent hiring of a new vice president for finance and administration/CFO in July 2007, and a new vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty in July 2008, the importance of a comprehensive documentation of the state of the college in the present moment becomes all the more obvious.

The ASC worked very hard toward each of these goals. Members are proud, for example, of the way the process both prompted and drew upon significant efforts to assess faculty perspectives going into accreditation (particularly the Faculty Survey conducted in 2006 and the May 2008 Faculty Workload Report, both sponsored by the Faculty Executive Council and overseen by ASC member/FEC chair Amy Orr).

Similarly, the all-college Planning Council, also chaired by ASC chair Barbara Seidman, was regularly apprised of the deliberations of the ASC (for instance, the emergent strategic issues compiled at several points in the self-study process were discussed within the Council, particularly as it developed its priorities recommendations for the yearly budget deliberations). Two Planning Council members chaired the production Standard One; co-chair of that standard, Reverend Bernard Turner, also chairs the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The fact that President Thomas Hellie is a regular attendee at Planning Council meetings speaks to his regular engagement with discussions linking the Planning Council deliberations and the processes of the self-study.

The important role of Board of Trustee members in this self-study process was also a highlight of its inclusiveness, not to mention its guarantee of board attentiveness to the accreditation itself. Trustee Pam Jacklin, an attorney, chaired Standard Nine. Both trustee members of the ASC read the full self-study more than once during its evolution, provided regular feedback to the various authors, and provided updates on the process to other board members. Board chair Glenna Kruger read the entire March 31, 2008, preliminary draft. It is also worth noting that from 2005–07 Dr. Brenda Marshall, an ASC member, served as Faculty Trustee, thus raising the presence of trustees on the board to three at least for part of the time during which the ASC has operated.

Linfield thus undertook this self-study committed to making it a useful internal document for many years into the future at a pivotal moment for the college. Its authors rest confidently in the belief that such will be the case.

Eligibility Requirements

Linfield’s eligibility to apply for reaccreditation is soundly based, for the college’s reaccreditation upon Commission review of the 1998 Self-Study [Exhibit 12] was reaffirmed at the time of the Five Year Interim Report [Exhibit 13]. All of the conditions met at those
times are met today. In demonstrating compliance with the nine standards of the NWCCU, the college hopes to establish simultaneously its eligibility for this review. For example, Linfield’s charter from the Territory of Oregon was later recognized by the State of Oregon and has been in continuous force since 1858. This foundation provides the grounds for Linfield’s formal governmental authority to award degrees, as called for in Eligibility Requirement 1. This fact is documented in Standard 1, which also establishes that Linfield has “a governing board of at least five members, a majority of whom have no contractual, employment, or personal financial interest in the institution” (Eligibility Requirement 2). Discussion within Standards Four and Nine indicates that “intellectual independence” (Eligibility Requirement 3) is guaranteed through adoption of policy statements on academic freedom and due process from the American Association of University Professors. Compliance with the remaining eligibility requirements can be similarly established by inference from the relevant sections of the following self-study.

A Guide to Reading the Self-Study

Linfield has produced a two-volume self-study organized in the following way. Discussion of each standard unfolds directly in relation to the order established by the components of the standard. The standard itself is quoted, in bold, at the outset of each response. Standards 1 through 9 are compiled within Volume I of the self-study, with one caveat—academic department reports have been published in a second separately bound volume. This was done to provide ease of access for those responsible for review of specific academic departments. Academic programs are organized alphabetically.

Attachments required by each standard (those not already embedded or summarized in the standard’s chapter) appear at the end of the relevant standard. This preface and each standard’s exhibits are numbered independently of one another and are collected in separately dedicated and identified exhibit bins. A list of the exhibits in the bin may be found at the end of the narrative responding to each standard. Only in the case of Standard 2 is there deviation from this practice.

Readers of Standard 2 will find a variety of collection strategies for exhibits. Exhibits associated with Standards 2.A through 2.G (including January Term and International Education) are collected in the two bins. Exhibits supporting Standard 2.G Continuing Education occupy their own container, marked as the Division of Continuing Education Exhibit Bin. Finally, the exhibits supporting each academic department (in conjunction with the departmental reports in Volume II) are contained within individual binders marked by the departmental name. Within these departmental binders readers will find the following: (1) department faculty CV’s; (2) departmental syllabi; (3) the departmental accreditation template; (4) exhibits as referenced in the accompanying narrative within Volume II.

Conclusion

Linfield has produced this self-study in the hope that its greatest salience will exist for members of the community itself, for whom it should provide considerable food for thought as the college considers next steps in its progressive commitment to steady institutional improvement. In the process it is the conviction of this document’s authors that Linfield ably comports itself according to the nine standards of the NWCCU reaccreditation process. The findings of the visiting accreditation team will be quite welcome as guideposts for further strengthening the promise and accomplishments of Linfield College.
Members of the Linfield Community Contributing to Each Standard

Many members of the Linfield community contributed to the development of this self-study. Each standard was assigned a committee chair or co-chairs, and the chair/co-chairs determined the best method to complete analysis of the standard. This list includes the committees that were formed, or the list of people who worked closely with the chair/co-chairs of each standard, to develop approaches to the report, methods of data collection, drafting of initial information, and completion the complete standard report. Some chairs of standards worked with multiple college staff in offices to the extent that it was difficult to designate a person supporting the accreditation process and in those instances the full office is listed below. It should also be noted that all members of the Accreditation Steering Committee read and commented upon the drafts produced for each standard, so that as a body they too have ownership of the final product.

The college owes a great deal of thanks to each contributor listed below who made the final accreditation report so comprehensive and thoughtful. Beyond those named are literally hundreds of others who contributed to the work of those responsible for each standard. As a result, the Linfield College 2008 Institutional Self-Study is truly a collaborative summation of what this institution strives to be and regularly delivers to its students.

Standard One — Institutional Mission and Goals, Planning and Effectiveness

- Dr. Chris Keaveney, Associate Professor of Japanese, Committee Co-Chair
- Mr. Bernie Turner, Trustee, Committee Co-Chair
- Ms. Anne Hardin Ballard, Director of Career and Community Services
- Dr. Debbie Canepa, Associate Professor of Nursing
- Ms. Mardi Mileham, Director of Public Relations
- Dr. Dawn Nowacki, Professor of Political Science
- Dr. Linda Olds, Professor of Psychology
- Professor Donna Routh, Associate Professor of Nursing
- Ms. Kasey Richter, Student
- Mr. Nick Pagenkopf, Student
- Ms. Carly Kummerlowe, Student
- Ms. Lisa Knodle-Bragiel, Director of Admission and the Office of Admission
- Mr. Bruce Wyatt, Vice President of College Relations and the Office of College Relations

Standard Two — Educational Program and Its Effectiveness

Faculty contributors

- Dr. Barbara Seidman, Professor of English; Interim Dean of Faculty 2005–08, Committee Co-Chair
- Dr. William Millar, Professor of Religious Studies and Department Chair, Committee Co-Chair
- Dr. Stephen Bricher, Professor of Mathematics and Department Chair
- Dr. Nancy Drickey, Associate Professor of Education and Department Chair
- Professor Martin Dwomoh-Tweneboah, Associate Professor of Computer Science and Department Chair
- Dr. J. Christopher Gaiser, Professor of Biology and Department Chair
- Dr. Eugene Gilden, Professor of Psychology and Department Chair
- Dr. Sharon Bailey Glasco, Assistant Professor of History and Department Chair
• Dr. Dawn Graff-Haight, Professor of Health, Human Performance and Athletics, and Department Chair
• Dr. Randy Grant, Professor of Economics and Department Chair
• Dr. Marv Henberg, Professor of Philosophy and Chair both of Philosophy and Environmental Studies
• Dr. Katherine Kernberger, Professor of English and Department Chair
• Dr. Christopher Keaveney, Associate Professor of Japanese and Co-Chair of the Modern Languages Department
• Dr. Jack Keyes, Professor of Biology, Portland Campus Science Department Chair
• Professor Kathy Kinderman, Assistant Professor of Nursing
• Dr. Howard Leichter, Professor of Political Science and Department Chair
• Dr. Thomas Love, Professor of Sociology/Anthropology and Department Chair
• Dr. Brenda Devore Marshall, Professor of Theatre/Communication Arts and Department Chair
• Dr. Joelle Murray, Associate Professor of Physics
• Dr. Michelle Nelson, Associate Professor of Business and Department Chair
• Dr. Jennifer Nordstrom, Associate Professor of Mathematics
• Professor Liz Obert, Associate Professor of Art and Visual Culture and director of the Electronic Arts program
• Dr. Violeta Ramsay, Associate Professor of Spanish and Co-Chair of the Modern Languages Department
• Dr. Michael Roberts, Professor of Biology and Department Chair spring 2008
• Dr. Bonnie Saucier, Dean of the School of Nursing, Portland Campus
• Dr. Faun Tiedge, Professor of Music and Department Chair
• Dr. Brad Thompson, Associate Professor of Mass Communication and Department Chair
• Dr. Brian Winkenweder, Assistant Professor of Art and Visual Culture
• Dr. Robert Wolcott, Department of Chemistry Chair

Administrative and student contributors:
• Dr. Kate Bemis, Dean of the Division of Continuing Education
• Dr. Eileen Bourassa, Linfield College Registrar
• Ms. Joanne Demay, Associate Director, the Division of Continuing Education
• Dr. Kate Elias, Director of Academic Advising, McMinnville Campus
• Ms. Annette Frank, Student
• Dr. Shaik Ismail, International Programs Director
• Mr. Todd McCollum, Director of Registration and Records, Portland Campus
• Ms. Susan Whyte, Director of the Linfield Library

Standard Three — Students
• Mr. Dan Preston, Dean of Enrollment, Committee Chair
• Dr. Sharon Bailey Glasco, Assistant Professor of History and Chair, Enrollment, Retention and Student Life Committee
• Professor Dave Hansen, Vice President of Student Services/Dean of Students
• Ms. Lisa Knodle-Bragiel, Director of Admission, McMinnville Campus
• Dr. Eileen Bourassa, Registrar, McMinnville Campus
• Mr. Scott Carnahan, Athletic Director
• Mr. Jeff Mackay, Associate Dean of Students, Director of Housing
• Ms. Lisa Burch, Director of Student Services, Portland Campus
• Ms. Crisanne Werner, Director of Financial Aid, McMinnville Campus
• Ms. Lindsay Skog, former Director of Academic Advising
• Dr. Kate Elias, Director of Academic Advising
• Dr. Dawn Graff-Haight, Professor of Health and Human Performance
• Dr. Brad Thompson, Associate Professor of Mass Communication and Committee Member, Admission and Financial Aid Committee
• Ms. Stacy Martin, Student
• Ms. Brianne Ries, Student

**Standard Four — Faculty**
• Dr. Brenda DeVore Marshall, Professor of Theatre and Communication Arts, Committee Co-Chair
• Dr. Pamela Wheeler, Associate Professor of Nursing, Committee Co-Chair
• Dr. Richard Bourassa, Professor of Music and former Committee Member, Promotion and Tenure Committee
• Professor Teri Joyer, Asst. Professor of Nursing and Committee Member, Faculty Development Committee
• Dr. Tanya Tompkins, Associate Professor of Psychology and former Committee Member, Faculty Development Committee

**Standard Five — Library and Information Resources**
• Ms. Susan Barnes Whyte, Library Director, Committee Chair
• Mr. Irv Wiswall, Chief Technology Officer
• Ms. Mary Margaret Benson, Associate Director Technical Services/Professor
• Ms. Barbara Valentine, Reference & Systems Librarian/Professor
• Ms. Carol McCulley, Reference & Distance Learning Librarian/Professor
• Ms. Patrice O'Donovan, Library Director/Assoc. Professor/Portland Campus Library
• Mr. Bahram Refaei, Director Access & Educational Media Services
• Dr. Jo Meyertons, Director of Instructional Support
• Ms. Paula Terry, Acquisitions, Cataloging and Administrative Coordinator
• Dr. Brad Thompson, Associate Professor of Mass Communications
• Dr. Jack Murphy, Assistant Professor of Biology
• Ms. Cassie Kanable, Student (2008)

**Standard Six — Governance and Administration**
• Dr. Elizabeth Atkinson, Associate Professor of Chemistry, Associate Dean of Faculty, Committee Co-Chair
• Dr. Amy Orr, Associate Professor of Sociology, Committee Co-Chair
• Ms. Pam Jacklin, Trustee
• Office of Academic Affairs
• Office of Accounting
• Office of College Relations
• Office of Enrollment Services
• Office of Finance/Administration
• Office of Human Resources
• Office of Institutional Research
• Office of the President
• Office of Student Services
• Mr. Dan Fergueson, Director of College Activities
• Administrator Leadership Council
• Faculty Executive Council
• LEA Executive Board

**Standard Seven — Finance**
• Mr. Greg Copeland, Senior Director of Accounting Services/Controller, Committee Chair
• Mr. Glenn Ford, Vice President for Finance and Administration
• Mr. Bruce Wyatt, Vice President College Relations
• Ms. Suzanne Frum, Assistant Controller
• Mr. Pedro Nunez, Student

**Standard Eight — Physical Resources**
• Dr. Jeff Summers, Associate Dean of Faculty, Committee Co-Chair
• Mr. John Hall, Senior Director of Facilities Services, Committee Co-Chair
• Mr. Mike Dressel, Director of Campus Safety
• Mr. Tim Stewart, Manager of Custodial Services
• Mr. Irv Wiswall, Chief Technology Officer
• Mr. Bahram Refaei, Director of Access and Educational Media Services

**Standard Nine — Institutional Integrity**
• Ms. Pam Jacklin, Trustee, Committee Chair
• Dr. David Groff, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs/Director of Portland Campus
• Dr. Marvin Henberg, Professor of Philosophy
• Dr. Jodi Kilcup, Assistant Vice President for College Relations
• Dr. Nancy Cornwell, Associate Professor of Mass Communication
**Preface Exhibits**

1. Meeting agendas of Accreditation Steering Committee
2. Materials supplied to academic department chairs about self-study
3. Selections from the Accreditation Self-Study website
4. Newsletters
5. Faculty retreat agenda.
6. Departmental template
7. Review of relevant strategic issues
8. Public draft of Self Study, March 2008
9. Written feedback from public review of self-study
10. Notification of alumni about accreditation review
11. Public notification of accreditation review
12. *1998 Institutional Self-Study*
13. *Five Year Interim Report*
Glossary

**Academic Department Staff:** An exempt employee whose responsibilities directly support instruction (also called Instructional Associate).

**Administrator:** An exempt non-teaching employee of Linfield College; includes officers of the college.

**AFA:** Admission and Financial Aid Committee. See Faculty Handbook for description of responsibilities.

**ASLC:** Associated Students of Linfield College, the student government organization on the McMinnville Campus.

**ASLC-PC:** Associated Students of Linfield College, Portland Campus, the student government organization on the Portland Campus

**AY:** Academic year, July 1 through June 30

**BAC:** Budget Advisory Council, the college-wide committee responsible for recommending the annual budgets for all programs to the President. The BAC includes the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Vice President for Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty, the Dean of Enrollment Management, three faculty members chosen by the faculty, individual members representing non-exempt employees, exempt employees and students, and staff support from the office of finance and administration and the office of academic affairs.

**BlackBoard:** Software tools that assist in the delivery of online courses.

**Cabinet:** See President’s Cabinet.

**Collaborative Research:** Undergraduate research partnership between faculty mentors and students on a project identified either by the student or in support of a faculty project. The college has built a $1.8 million endowment thus far in support of such effort, and a separate student professional travel fund also exists for presentation of work in scholarly venues.

**Colleague:** The college’s administrative computing system, supporting most of the functions of the college’s computing needs, including financial accounts, student records, admission, financial aid, degree audit, billing and student accounts, and accounts payable. Several departments utilize other administrative software – College Relations and Human Resources.

**Colloquium:** The academic advising program created to support entering first year students during their fall semester as they choose courses and acclimate to college life and academic expectations.

**CTO:** Chief Technology Officer.

**DCE:** Division of Continuing Education, the college’s program throughout Oregon and the United States, giving working adults the opportunity to complete a bachelor’s degree.

**EL:** a course designation indicating that the course is considered an experiential learning course.

**EMS:** Educational Media Services. Provides equipment delivery to classrooms, maintains equipment in classrooms, and recommends equipment purchases to all academic departments and space for students to
work on multimedia projects.

**ERSL**: The Enrollment, Retention and Student Life Committee of the faculty. See Faculty Handbook for description of responsibilities.

**FEC**: Faculty Executive Council. See Faculty Handbook for description of responsibilities.

**FDL**: Faculty Development Lab, a workshop space and a space with specially trained staff/student support where faculty can come to work on higher-end multimedia computers and equipment, with more advanced multimedia software. The lab is located in Nicholson Library.

**Enrollment FTE**: For a semester or term, all enrolled student credits divided by 15 (a typical full-time load in a semester). For the academic or calendar year, all enrolled student credits divided by 30 (a typical full-time load over a year).

**Financial FTE**: Tuition revenue divided by the full-time per student tuition charge.

**FY**: Fiscal year, July 1 of one year through June 30 of the following year. FY2008 would cover July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

**Hewlett Packard Property**: Property acquired from the Hewlett Packard Corporation in two different transactions. Both transactions were combined purchase/gift arrangements where Linfield College purchased a portion of property and Hewlett Packard donated a portion. The total acquisition made possible by the two transactions totaled 115 acres.

**HR Answers**: A consulting firm located in Portland, OR offering information and solutions to human resources issues. Linfield College utilizes HR Answers for compensation analyses.

**Instructional Associate**: An exempt employee whose responsibilities directly support instruction (also called academic department staff)

**ITAC**: Information Technology Advisory Committee, a group with faculty, exempt staff, non-exempt staff, and students that advises the Chief Technology Officer (CTO) on matters of technology policy and priorities.

**ITS**: Integrated Technology Services, the administrative department supporting the Linfield community by identifying and meeting current and future needs for hardware, software, and networks for voice and data. ITS plans, develops and implements technology infrastructure for teaching and to enhance institutional productivity.

**Jan Term or January Term**: A short, optional enrollment term between fall semester and spring semester. Students enrolled usually take only one course.

**Keck Campus**: Seventeen acre parcel purchased from Hewlett Packard Corporation, on which sit Jereld R. Nicholson Library, Kenneth W. Ford Hall, Miller Fine Arts Center, Vivian A. Bull Music Center, Facilities Services/Campus Safety building, Hewlett-Packard Park Apartments and Withnell Commons.

**LEA**: Linfield Employees Association, representing its members in employee-employer relations with Linfield College and its subsidiaries and providing the membership with an opportunity to meet on a regular basis and discuss college business as it relates to the association.
LC: The Linfield Curriculum, the name given by the faculty to the college’s general education program. It has existed since 1997 and has recently been revised (with implementation beginning in 2008-09).

LCRS: The Linfield Center for Regional Studies, a pilot program intended to expand college efforts in collaborative research, community service, and internships for those interested in work with a regional focus. Still in its early organizational phase, the LCRS hopes to generate funds for the above activities and raise institutional visibility for important college accomplishments.

LRI: Linfield Research Institute, a research program founded in 1956 to advance scientific knowledge. The Institute has supported student and faculty research since its inception and has been central to the college’s strong record in the sciences.

McMinnville Campus: the college’s campus in McMinnville, Oregon, offering bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees in a wide array of majors.

OCLC: Online Computer Library Center, a not for profit computer service and research organization whose systems help libraries locate, acquire, catalog, and lend library materials.

Orbis Cascade Alliance: A group of 36 academic libraries which provide a unified library catalog for all faculty, students and staff in all 36 institutions. Also provides other resources and services to its members.

O-Team: Student Orientation Team, a group of returning students at the Portland Campus who assist with New Student Orientation in ways such as giving campus tours, meeting new students, sharing experiences with new students, answering questions, and speaking in Orientation sessions.

PACCON: Pacific Consortium of West Coast Small Colleges. Members include primarily business officers from California Lutheran University, Chapman University, Claremont Graduate University, Claremont McKenna College, Claremont University Consortium, Harvey Mudd College, Lewis & Clark College, Linfield College, Loyola Marymount University, Mills College, Mount St. Mary’s College, Occidental College, Pepperdine University, Pitzer College, Pomona College, Reed College, St. Mary’s College of California, Scripps College, Seattle Pacific University, University of La Verne, University of Portland, University of Puget Sound, University of Redlands, Whitman College, Whittier College, and Willamette University.

Paracurricular: personal skill and creativity courses, usually 1 credit, identified by course numbers below 100.

Planning Council: A campus-wide committee formed in 1999 to ensure the integration of institutional goals and priorities, planning, budgeting, and administrative decision making. Membership includes four faculty members (one from the Portland Campus), four administrators (one of whom will be the vice president for academic affairs), two non-exempt staff members, one trustee, and two students. Members are appointed according to processes established by their respective constituencies.

Portland Campus: the college’s campus on the grounds of Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital and Medical Center in Portland, Oregon, offering bachelor’s degrees in Nursing and Health Sciences. Linfield College has had this affiliation since 1982.

President’s Cabinet: The members of the Linfield College administration who are the administrative officers of the college, plus the Senior Advisor and Special Assistant to the President. The listing of administrative officers is in the Linfield College Course Catalog.
**SPOC:** Strategic Planning Oversight Committee. The Portland Campus committee acting as an advisory body to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs/Director of the Portland Campus, with the special responsibility for upholding the vision for the Portland Campus and overseeing the planning process to ensure that all activities and initiatives reflect the strategic goals established in the plan and by the college.

**WebAdvisor:** the web interface to selected parts of Colleague, Linfield College’s administrative computer system. Faculty, students and staff are assigned appropriate access to WebAdvisor based on individual data and information needs.
Executive Summary

Linfield welcomes the accreditation team to campus some nine months after having celebrated its 150th anniversary, an event that has prompted much reflection upon the college’s history, accomplishments, and aspirations. This self-study invariably expresses the enthusiasm of a community that sees itself operating within a steadily rising tide of achievement and opportunity. It also speaks to the challenges faced by the college in seeking to meet its goals. The re-accreditation report to follow address what the college believes itself to do well, what it recognizes as areas needing further improvement, and what it should consider in planning the next steps toward realizing its institutional vision.

As an institution focused upon an undergraduate education that integrates traditional liberal arts disciplines with a number of pre-professional programs, Linfield includes two residential campuses (one in McMinnville, one in Portland) and a Division of Continuing Education, all of which base their efforts firmly on the college mission. Collectively, the three arms of the college serve 2522 students. Linfield faculty and staff commit themselves to an extraordinary degree to the establishment of an academically challenging program and a vibrant community ethos, both of which become clear quickly even to the casual observer or short-term visitor. Linfield’s concise mission statement—Connecting Learning, Life, and Community—surfaces throughout the daily life of the college.

Even before the 1998 acquisition of the Hewlett Packard property adjacent to the McMinnville Campus, Linfield had been intensively engaged in assessing its strategic institutional goals, opportunities, and challenges so as to provide a foundation for a new capital campaign. All of this effort was accelerated exponentially by the H-P acquisition and the possibilities it put in reach for the college. Hence the last decade has included:

• revision of the college mission statement;
• two rounds of master planning to absorb the new property into the historic footprint of the college and identify the major facilities projects facing the college over a twenty year horizon;
• individual design projects for new and renovated structures in six academic buildings (including those made possible by the H-P property);
• completion of the most successful capital campaign in college history;
• dramatic expansion of residence life options for students;
• adoption of a Strategic Agenda 2000–2005 and its heir the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12.

Amidst all this, the college also saw a major leadership transition as Dr. Vivian Bull retired, after a 13 year tenure as Linfield College President, in July 2005 and Dr. Thomas Hellie assumed the helm in April 2006. Glenna Kruger, Class of ’68, became the new Chair of the Board of Trustees in 2005. New vice presidents for academic affairs (July 2008) and for finance and administration (July 2007) have been hired, as has a new dean of the School of Nursing (July 2007). Many academic programs have gained new faculty and six new majors have been created. The Portland Campus moved from offering a four year undergraduate curriculum to an upper division curriculum in its two majors, Nursing and Health Sciences. The International Programs Office has significantly expanded study abroad sites for Linfield students, and the general education program has been thoroughly studied and thoughtfully revised for implementation in fall 2008. Linfield athletic programs have continued to shine both in women’s and men’s sports, with Linfield’s fabled football team last winning a national championship in 2004 and women’s softball taking the first ever national championship for a Linfield women’s team in 2007. It has been an eventful decade.
Such momentum in so short of time makes the accreditation process all the more timely in its demand for additional reflection and documentation about where the college stands at the start of 2008. The college in fact undertook its strategic planning effort with one eye on its upcoming accreditation, and the resultant Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 identifies both the unifying educational themes of the curriculum (Integrated Learning, Global and Multicultural Awareness, and Experiential Learning) alongside the pressing resource needs of the college to support the institutional mission. These latter needs will also emerge as central issues throughout the self study and include:

- Attention to improving the investment made in the “human capital” of the institution through improved compensation and professional development;
- Attention to the financial base of the college through growth of the endowment;
- Stewardship of the college’s physical assets to ensure their timely upkeep and modernization in keeping with the needs of 21st century higher education.

More specific institutional aspirations and resource needs surface throughout the pages that follow and include, first and foremost, a major renovation and expansion of science facilities at the college. Many other academic and administrative units are also constrained from realizing their full potential by inadequate spaces in which to work. Educational spaces have been undergoing adaptation to support technology-aided pedagogies but the need regularly outstrips funds available; this is also the case with equipment needs in various departments. And as the technological sophistication of faculty, staff, and students increases, so do expectations for institutional capacity to support the wonders that are possible through mediated venues. The college strives to keep up with demand but readily acknowledges the limits operating on its ability to do so.

While Linfield has a widespread departmental ethos of instructional evaluation and holds its faculty to very high standards of performance in the classroom, it has yet to devise an integrated institutional culture of evidence-based outcomes assessment. Similarly, a means by which to conduct regular department reviews as a means of also building shared understanding of the entire curriculum remains to be developed. Student life administrators are currently developing an outcomes-assessment approach to their efforts in support of the co-curriculum.

Linfield College finds itself flourishing within a state and a region in dynamic flux. Building on a history of excellent town/gown relations with the city of McMinnville, the college also stands poised to explore with new intensity the opportunities for research, experiential learning, and community service offered by the Yamhill and Willamette Valleys. The mission of the School of Nursing has never been more important to the health care needs of Oregon and the nation. And the Division of Continuing Education continues to provide access to a Linfield degree for those seeking a non-residential learning opportunity.
An Institutional Overview

The considerable institutional growth and change at Linfield College over the past decade has necessarily and inevitably affected all facets of the institution. In setting the stage for this self-study, it seems useful to situate the reader in relation to the most significant changes that have occurred in the leadership and physical character of Linfield since 1998.

Leadership Transition
In May 2004 President Vivian Bull announced her pending retirement in July 2005, after completing thirteen years in office. Board chairman Dr. Richard Ice convened the search for a new president at that time but the 2004-05 search effort did not yield an acceptable candidate. Dr. Marvin Henberg, Academic Vice-President and Dean of Faculty, was then invited by the new Board chair, Glenna Kruger, to serve as interim president during the second round of the presidential search. In fall 2006 Dr. Thomas L. Hellie was selected to become Linfield’s 19th president. He assumed his duties on April 2, 2006.

Four of the other vice-presidencies of the college have also changed since the last self-study. In 2000, John Reed, Vice President for Enrollment Management resigned and was replaced by Dan Preston, then serving as Linfield’s Director of Financial Aid. The position description was changed from Vice President to Dean to accommodate changing responsibilities. Bruce Wyatt became Vice President for College Relations in 2002. When Dr. Henberg moved into the interim presidency, Dr. Barbara Kitt Seidman, Professor of English, became dean of faculty and Academic Vice President until such time as President Hellie was ready to launch a national search for a new dean. In July 2008 Dr. Victoria McGillin succeeded Dr. Seidman in that post. In June 2006, previous Vice President for Finance and Administration Carl Vance left Linfield for another position and Dr. Hellie invited Paul Aslanian to serve for a year as interim CFO and bring to bear the considerable experience he had amassed in that position at both Macalester and Swarthmore Colleges. Glenn Ford became Linfield’s new Vice President for Finance and Administration in July 2007.

Given the amount of flux in the senior leadership of the college since 2005, the institution’s steady progress on a number of strategic fronts in recent years provides concrete evidence of the shared vision and commitment of the Linfield community to their core mission of educating undergraduates in a liberal arts context meant to prepare them for meaningful lives in the world. Since 2005 the college has:

- Completed a five-year strategic plan (2007-12) to succeed the 2000-05 Strategic Plan
- Revised the general education program (for full implementation in 2008-09)
- Planned and has begun fundraising for renovation of an iconic building, Northup Hall
- Planned and launched the silent phase of a new capital campaign
- Expanded international partnerships to permit semester abroad study opportunities in the People’s Republic of China, Ecuador, Australia, and New Zealand
- Moved the programs on the Portland Campus to an upper division transfer-only model in Nursing and Health Sciences (and devised a true 2-2 program linking curricula between the Portland and McMinnville Campuses for the first time)
- Launched a nascent Linfield Center for Regional Studies pending external fundraising to support expanded experiential learning, collaborative research, and community outreach
- Converted 90% of the courses offered through the Division of Continuing Education to an online format
- Undertaken significant Board of Trustees renewal activity.
McMinnville Campus

Academic Spaces
When Linfield last underwent re-accreditation in 1998, the promise of the next decade was clear but existed more in the realm of the pending than the actual. Nonetheless the visiting accreditation team, while citing the limitations of existing educational facilities in a number of areas, also recognized the college’s commitment to improve many of them dramatically in the near future. It is thus a pleasure to report that improvements to the McMinnville Campus academic spaces have been wide-ranging and powerful in their impact on Linfield’s educational program and the students it serves. Four academic programs (Music, Theatre/Communication Arts, Art and Visual Culture, and the library) now occupy new homes; combined with various additions of FTE in each area, these departments are firmly engaged in reimagining their futures in relation to the broader college mission.

The success of “The Defining Moment” capital campaign led by then-President Bull (which raised in excess of $70 million, the largest sum ever achieved by Linfield in such efforts) made possible the acquisition of property previously owned by the Hewlett Packard Corporation. Together these efforts not only doubled the physical acreage of the college but permitted significant academic infrastructure improvements. The opening of a long-awaited state-of-the-art library (Nicholson Library) has provided the anchor for a new arts quad on what is now called the Keck Campus. Its borders are defined by the two-building Miller Fine Arts Center (which includes a much improved public gallery space); Ford Hall (contiguous with Nicholson Library) where the versatile black box Marshall Theatre provides a technically sophisticated space some thirty years after a fire drove the department to “temporarily” relocate; and the Bull Music Center, built to house the Music Department within a structure far better suited to its needs than the building they had occupied over the decades since the aforementioned fire. The latter facility contains, among other improvements, a new recital hall, an improved and expanded practice space for the band, and the room to centralize its individual student practice cubicles within one area contiguous to faculty studios. In conjunction with these changes the Music Department has benefited enormously from a $1 million renovation of the large-audience performing space in Melrose Hall, now renamed the Richard and Lucille Ice Auditorium for its donor and former Board chair Richard Ice and his wife.

The completion of the Keck Campus Arts Quad in 2006 freed up academic spaces in the vacated areas for additional remodeling. Renshaw Hall was renovated in 2007 to house the Department of Mass Communication (together with the Department of Computer Science, already situated in Renshaw). Each program now enjoys significantly upgraded educational venues in which to deliver its curriculum, assisted by a new state of the art computer lab and another highly-equipped lab classroom. The college’s FM radio station KSLC also moved into Renshaw and now occupies a significantly upgraded facility, complete with a new signal tower.

The college’s signature (and oldest) building, Pioneer Hall, previously housed the college black box theatre, along with three academic departments. In summer 2008 Pioneer underwent long overdue but modest renovation on the two academic floors of the building. This effort has improved collaborative research activity lab spaces for the Psychology Department and is adapting the former theatre for use as a multipurpose room. The second floor now accommodates a departmental work study office and student gathering space for the History and Political Science programs; Political Science has also received a small computer lab.

Planning to improve the educational space dedicated to the sciences—a long-recognized need of the college—began in earnest in 2004. Since then, Linfield has outlined the architectural and pedagogical aspirations for the project, in consultation with Portland architectural firm SRG Partnership and with national expertise in science facilities planning available through Project Kaleidoscope. This work will provide the basis for a major capital
campaign projected for the next decade. A crucial first step toward that effort involves the renovation of Northup Hall (once the campus library) to transform it into a new multidisciplinary teaching and learning space for four departments: Business, Economics, English and Philosophy. The design for a renovated Northup is in place and the fundraising has begun in earnest as part of the college’s most immediate McMinnville-based bricks and mortar fundraising project, with the hope of opening the building to its new occupants within the next several years. This move by the Business Department permits the Mathematics Department to relocate temporarily to Taylor Hall as the next preliminary step in the science facilities project. In a distinct but related area, the Environmental Science program will acquire its first dedicated academic office and lab space in January 2009 in Renshaw Hall.

Current fundraising is also under way for a new health education and fitness facility that will improve the educational space available for the Athletic Training program and allow the college to better serve the conditioning needs of student athletes. In tandem with this project the college hopes to improve the existing fitness facility which now inadequately provides support to the entire campus for fitness activity. In spring 2008 the Exercise Science program acquired its own dedicated lab space in Cook Hall.

**Student Life Spaces**

In conjunction with development of the southern end of campus where the new Keck Arts Quad now stands, the college also built six new apartment buildings contiguous with the areas dedicated to the library, fine, and performing arts. These structures addressed a college goal of keeping more upper division students on campus while also providing a vibrant residential life corridor to link the historical North Campus with the transformational South Campus created on the Hewlett Packard property. The HP apartments have steadily achieved a 95% occupancy rate.

The relocation of music, art and theatre departments freed up space in older parts of the campus previously occupied by trailers that served those programs where the college has since opened two new residence halls for first and second year students.

The South Campus expansion has also permitted improvements in athletic facilities for the men’s and women’s soccer teams and the women’s lacrosse team. Moreover, through the contributions of donors committed to continuing the college’s historically successful sports program, significant improvements have been made to the football, baseball, and softball facilities as well as practice spaces for varsity sports.

**Student Body Size and Profile**

As the college has expanded its McMinnville physical plant, it has also undertaken a plan to grow its student body. To provide the fiscal resources necessary to support its improved campus, as well as to enhance the diversity of the student body, the Board of Trustees in 2001 approved a McMinnville Campus-specific cap of 1750 financial FTE to be accomplished slowly by 2009. As of fall 2007, however, the FFTE of the McMinnville Campus was 1620 FFTE, a figure that has obviated some of the accompanying space challenges posed by the target number. See the May 2008 College Master Plan for a study of the relation between student FFTE and facilities needs.

**Portland Campus**

The Portland Campus has undergone its own series of dramatic changes. With the move to an upper division transfer-only campus in 2005-06, the hiring of a new dean of Nursing in spring 2007, and the redesign of the Health Sciences program, a number of key goals are being brought to bear in the renovation project. Successful external fundraising has allowed the college to redesign several teaching spaces in Peterson Hall which were readied for fall 2008 classes.

With the move to upper-division transfer-only programs on the Portland Campus, the college has steadily pursued curricular integration around the two Portland-based majors in nursing and health sciences. Conversely, the need for lower division science and general education
classes has significantly diminished. Concurrent enrollment growth in entry level science classes in McMinnville, where approximately forty first year students enter Linfield annually with the intention of majoring in Nursing and moving to the Portland Campus in their junior year, has led to the reassignment of two tenured Portland-based faculty members to the McMinnville Campus. One of these faculty members now holds a dedicated faculty line in the Environmental Studies program.

Division of Continuing Education
Like the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, the Division of Continuing Education has seen several pivotal changes to its operation over the last decade. Shifting enrollment patterns have reduced the number of matriculants entering the Adult Degree Program (in great part because of growing competition in distance education). Yet the number of credits undertaken by those who enroll has risen. In response to the marked preference of distance learners to take online courses, the Division of Continuing Education has shifted approximately 90% of its curriculum to a web-based format. This move has also helped to stabilize enrollments. As a result, DCE has become a college leader in encouraging residential faculty to explore and adopt technologically mediated pedagogies. DCE has also aligned itself with the mission of the Portland Campus School of Nursing to assist with the nursing shortage by graduating more bachelor-level nurses. It does so by providing the online delivery medium and administrative infrastructure to support delivery of an RN (registered nurse)-to-BSN degree. This program has proven extremely attractive to professionals in the field seeking to upgrade their credentials; it is the true growth center in DCE at the moment. In sum, DCE has weathered difficult competition to provide a sound educational opportunity for degree-seeking individuals unable to participate in traditional ways. In doing so it continues to be a viable economic unit in its own right and a significant contributor to the financial stability of the college.

Endowment Growth
The value of the college endowment has grown from $37.7 million at the end of fiscal year 1997 to $81.7 million at the end of fiscal year 2007. Endowed scholarship funds have increased on both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses to help ensure that Linfield will remain affordable to students of modest means, in keeping with its history. Endowments for faculty development ($1.2 million) and student/faculty collaborative research ($1.8 million) have also been created in the last decade.

In Summary
Much of what follows in the pages of this self-study touches on or has been touched by these overarching changes in the college’s superstructure. Discussion of Linfield in relation to the nine standards of the NWCCU (Volume I), as well as the 28 detailed academic program reports constituting Volume II, will provide a comprehensive and nuanced portrait of the institutional infrastructure as it has evolved to meet the needs of a college moving confidently into the new century.
Since its last accreditation effort in 1998, Linfield College has refined its mission statement and has sought to improve understanding of its relevance to the daily as well as long term efforts of the three Linfield campuses. The mission statement both defines and expresses the institutional values informing the college’s goals, activities, and assessment. The more targeted mission statements of the Portland Campus, Division of Continuing Education, and individual academic or administrative departments each draw upon the overarching institutional mission of Linfield College to “advance a vision of learning, life, and community,” foster “intellectual challenge and creativity” that “values both theoretical and practical knowledge,” and “pique curiosity for a lifetime of inquiry.” In the process it promotes a “rich texture of diverse cultures and varied ways of understanding” within “a climate of mutual respect” that should “inspire the courage to live by moral and spiritual principle and to defend freedom of conscience” [Exhibit 1].

While debate occurs around the selection of specific initiatives and resource allocations, very little debate exists over the priorities articulated in the institutional mission itself. Linfield College vigilantly grounds significant decisions upon the mission, with its emphasis on values derived from its liberal arts heritage (intellectual inquiry, lifelong learning, the interplay of theory and praxis, breadth of cultural perspectives, freedom of conscience, and ethical courage). The mission informed the selection process of a new President in fall 2005 and drove campus-wide conversations that produced The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 [Exhibit 2], endorsed by the faculty in May 2007 and adopted by the Board of Trustees in September 2007. In 1999 an all-campus strategic Planning Council was created to ensure the integration of institutional goals and priorities, planning, budgeting, and administrative decision making. The mission statement opens the current Strategic Plan to foreground the root motive informing each of these processes. The Plan’s Six Foundational Education and Resource Principles underscore college-wide practices that concretely embody the mission and identify the infrastructure support necessary to its realization.

At the same time, Linfield’s comprehensive identity rests upon three distinct entities which share a commitment to the linkage between liberal arts and pre-professional education but serve varied student populations within decidedly different milieus. The core identity of Linfield College derives from its 1858 founding as a Baptist institution for young adults in rural Yamhill County. In 1975, the college launched its Division of Continuing Education with a target population of non-traditional-age students seeking bachelor degrees in a subset of majors rather than the full panoply of McMinnville Campus offerings. While previously situated in a number of sites around Oregon and Washington, the division now offers most of its curriculum through an online format, though its reliance on residential faculty oversight remains central to its philosophy and operation. In another major instance of institutional evolution, Linfield adopted the Portland-based Good Samaritan School of Nursing in 1982 in order to establish a four-year bachelor of nursing program in that urban setting; in 2007–08, the Portland Campus became an upper-division transfer-only program. The Linfield mission statement, with its showcasing of liberal arts values of mind and spirit, continues to provide the unifying thread weaving together these educational undertakings. In keeping with that fact, the college has, over the last several years, become increasingly intentional in its emphasis upon Linfield’s collectively shared purpose as one unified institution. This orientation poses ongoing challenges to established ways of thinking about and managing the relationship of each part of the college to the other parts but has also brought real benefits of enhanced organizational and curricular integration.
1. A – Mission and Goals

1.A.1 The institution’s mission and goals derive from, or are widely understood by, the campus community, are adopted by the governing board, and are periodically reexamined.

The 2000–2005 Linfield College Strategic Agenda, approved by the Board of Trustees in November 1999 [Exhibit 3], opened with a vision statement that crystallized two years of college-wide discussion about institutional direction in the 21st century. In April 2001 the board convened a Mission Revision Committee consisting of membership from all key constituencies to align the mission statement more closely with that vision. On May 4, 2002, the trustees adopted the resultant mission statement following its affirmation by all employee groups.

Linfield’s mission exists both as a concise statement highlighting institutional values and as an extended articulation of the core educational goals informed by those values. After six years of referencing these statements regularly in college communications, the members of the college community broadly understand and embrace them as public definitions of the institution. Yet a survey of representative groups within the college reveals that the concise statement—“Linfield: Connecting Learning, Life, and Community”—has achieved the more widespread familiarity, while the richer mission statement from which it derives has not achieved the same salience within the collective campus consciousness.

Faculty strongly and widely endorse the college mission. In conjunction both with ongoing strategic planning efforts and completion of this self-study, every academic department revisited its own departmental mission statement in 2006–07 to ensure ongoing congruence with the institutional mission. A survey conducted in fall 2006 (to which 69% of the regular faculty—98 individuals—responded) revealed that over 95% “believed in the mission of the College” and agreed that the mission statement accurately reflects the values of the institution [Exhibit 4]. While there is general agreement that the mission generally informs all important decision-making processes and actions at the college, the same survey suggests some concerns that decisions surrounding resource allocation do not sufficiently reflect mission-identified priorities. In an institutional environment characterized by creative, ambitious faculty struggling to meet the high ideals of the mission with limited resources, it is not surprising that tensions surrounding resource allocation emerge. Leadership councils for both the administrator cohort and non-exempt staff have affirmed for this self-study that the college mission helps them better understand their own roles in contributing to and supporting the comprehensive educational experience to which Linfield remains dedicated.

During its own strategic planning effort in 2004–05, Portland Campus faculty and administrators renewed their commitment to the college-wide mission. At the same time they developed a modified campus-specific version of that mission to underscore the relationship between institutional values and those distinguishing a community of health professionals [Exhibit 5]. It appears in the Portland Campus Strategic Plan, adopted in September 2005 [Exhibit 6].

The mission statement for the Division of Continuing Education (DCE) proceeds from the mission statement of the College and highlights the needs of the particular population of students it seeks to serve. The brief statement asserts that the division seeks to “provide access to a Linfield education for adults” [Exhibit 24]. The DCE Student Handbook supplies on its first page a richer explanation of the division’s educational objectives and the relationship of its mission to the specific qualities of a Linfield education articulated in the concise statement of “Connecting Learning, Life, and Community” [Exhibit 7].
The trustees of the college held a facilitated retreat in May 2007 where they reviewed results of a board survey examining the intersections between their efforts as board members and the strategic issues facing Linfield. Respondents indicated varying awareness of and engagement with those issues but expressed universally high commitment to determining levels of trustee involvement that will ensure continued institutional vitality [Exhibit 8]. Their retreat included sessions on a number of topics addressed by the survey:

- vision and values;
- trustee responsibilities (including financial ones);
- integration of liberal arts and professional studies;
- national positioning;
- preparation of students for global citizenship; and
- board membership and structure. These discussions led to a detailed action plan by which the board hopes to strengthen its performance as guardian of Linfield’s mission.

1.A.2 The mission, as adopted by the governing board, appears in appropriate institutional publications, including the catalog.

Linfield’s mission statement—either in its complete form or its concise version—appears in paper and electronic form in a variety of external and internal college documents.

The complete statement is published at the front of the annual course catalog as well as in the various handbooks delineating policies and procedures for faculty, administrators, the members of the Linfield Employees’ Association (LEA), and students. It also appears on the annual promotional calendar and the Linfield website homepage: www.linfield.edu. The concise statement appears on a variety of public and college-specific spaces ranging from the mast of every college webpage, folders issued by the Accounting Office and the First Year Inquiry Seminar program, promotional materials developed by the Offices of Admission and College Relations, and college booster items like tee shirts. Given the widespread visibility of the concise statement in the general college environment, almost everyone on-campus can recite it upon request. By contrast, the complete mission statement remains less widely known and is rarely cited. The recent adoption of the 2007–12 Strategic Plan and the extensive conversation around the Foundational Principles that derive from the mission offer hope that the full mission statement will achieve almost as much recognition as the crisper summary statement [Exhibit 2]. In addition, all academic departments conducting faculty searches now use a search plan template that opens with the full mission statement.

Because the concise statement was devised as a shorthand for the Linfield College institutional mission, its broader familiarity throughout the community testifies to a welcome success at least in communicating the fundamental values uniting the college’s different constituencies and activities.

1.A.3 Progress in accomplishing the institution’s mission and goals is documented and made public.

Linfield College communicates advancement of its mission and goals through various house publications, brochures, press releases, and electronic postings on the college website. Beginning in 2007 the Office of College Relations replaced the Linfield College Bulletin (a black and white quarterly tabloid newspaper) with the Linfield Magazine, a four-color booklet distributed three times a year to alumni, faculty, administrators, parents of current students, and friends of the college. Its pages celebrate recent achievements illustrative of the college mission.
The annual President’s Report, also widely distributed, reports on Linfield’s financial and academic health. College Relations personnel send out news releases on notable accomplishments of faculty, students, and staff. Targeted profiles of students and alumni, as well as other institutional data, are regularly provided to the Oregon Independent College Association and the Oregon Independent College Foundation for inclusion in their publications. Recently the national bulletin of the Council of Independent Colleges acknowledged Linfield’s successful January Term 2007 Cameroon-based course in international health.

Each fall the President’s Office distributes to the Board of Trustees a progress report on eight key indicators: (1) four and five year graduation rates; (2) enrollment figures; (3) annual net tuition revenue per student; (4) endowment per student; (5) a facilities condition index; (6) depreciation funding index; (7) total giving; and (8) a student satisfaction index. This concise snapshot of the college helps the trustees track Linfield’s performance on a number of fronts widely recognized as indices of institutional health [Exhibit 9]. The Compensation Committee of the Board of Trustees receives annual updates on the PACCON (Pacific Consortium of West Coast Small Colleges) comparative data surrounding faculty, administrator and staff remuneration. The entire board approves faculty sabbatical requests each year.

Internally the college follows an annual reporting process whereby each academic department and unit submits to the appropriate college officer an overview of the past year’s accomplishments and challenges. The cabinet distills information from these Annual Reports and, beginning in fall 2009 (the year following the dissemination of information from this self-study), will provide a summary of each area’s progress on the Foundational Principles to the Planning Council. In turn, the Planning Council will report what they have learned to the college community. Through the publicly available agendas of the Faculty Assembly, faculty development awards are published twice yearly, as are sabbatical approvals.

The Institutional Research Officer compiles and submits data for external audiences such as IPEDS and various national surveys. This data also appears in many Linfield publications, most notably Linfield College Institutional Data: A Fact Book [Exhibit 10]. Linfield’s recent IPEDS profile, in conjunction with its mid-range listing in the new Carnegie liberal arts colleges classification, led to a request in January 2008 from scholar Dr. Andrew Hacker to visit the college as part of his research into the relation of institutional wealth to educational quality; at his departure he praised Linfield for its noteworthy marshalling of modest resources in order to deliver an exemplary liberal arts experience to its students.

In fall 2007 Linfield published a history of the college entitled Inspired Pragmatism to celebrate its sesquicentennial. That volume documents Linfield’s successful enactment of its institutional mission for the preceding 150 years. It also depicts the physical transformation of the campus over that period. The book offers another means for informing the public about Linfield’s traditions and attainments.

1.A.4 Goals are determined consistent with the institution’s mission and resources—human, physical and financial.

All institutional goals, including those pertaining to facilities, human resources and finances, derive from and further the college mission. It is the role of the Planning Council, in close consultation with the trustees, the President’s cabinet, the Faculty Assembly, the Faculty Executive Council, and standing faculty committees, administrators, and staff to ensure that all planning efforts effectively integrate mission and goals.

The most recent example of such coordinated effort was the development of the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12, a process led by the Planning Council but involving all constituencies of the college. The Plan sets forth
three Foundational Education Principles and three Foundational Resource Principles that together embody the college’s current operational goals. The Foundational Education Principles emphasize Integrated Learning, Global and Multicultural Awareness, and Experiential Learning, all of which inform and derive from the mission. The three Foundational Resource Principles affirm the necessity of expanding the means through which the college will further its mission. The two year discussion that led to the formulation of the Strategic Plan consistently referenced the mission statement. Together the six Foundational Principles guide the budgeting process and establish fundraising priorities. They also inform the cooperative efforts of all divisions of the college to pursue the common goals articulated in the mission.

The Portland Campus Master Strategic Plan also grew out of the college mission as it intersects with the specific character of the nursing and health sciences programs. Following collective analysis led by an outside consultant, the Portland Campus voted to adopt the Master Strategic Plan before recommending it to the college Planning Council, which affirmed its soundness. The Board of Trustees ratified it in 2005. Its implementation has since been monitored by the Strategic Planning Oversight Committee (SPOC), a body including faculty, administrators, staff, and student representatives [Exhibit 6].

The Division of Continuing Education also determines its long and short range goals in concert with Linfield’s institutional mission (of which its own mission is a subset). On behalf of the Faculty Assembly, the Continuing Education Committee fosters and guides conversation around goals-integration between the residential campus and DCE. Similarly, the Linfield Strategic Plan 2007–12 fosters educational principles that clearly align with DCE’s academic programming. The dean of faculty/vice-president for academic affairs represents DCE (as part of the Academic Affairs Division) on the Planning Council.

1.A.5 The institution’s mission and goals give direction to all its educational activities, to its admission policies, selection of faculty, allocation of resources, and to planning.

The mission statement articulates the shared educational goals of the college and provides the rationale for their enactment, as evidenced in the six Foundational Principles outlined in the 2007–2012 Strategic Plan. Several initiatives over the last decade speak to the mission’s ongoing role in directing academic planning: for example, creation of a collaborative research endowment for faculty and students; fuller incorporation of experiential learning across the curriculum (see pages 10–11 of the 2007–08 Linfield College Catalog); reaffirmation in 2002 of January Term’s centrality to the mission of the college (particularly its off-campus component); and introduction of two new interdisciplinary majors (Environmental Studies and Electronic Arts). The three year revision process (2005–08) around the general education program called the Linfield Curriculum also rested upon the mission’s emphasis upon fostering students’ intellectual curiosity and lifelong learning across diverse frames of reference. Efforts begun in 2006–07 around a pilot Linfield Center for Regional Studies systematically link the three Foundational Education Principles to the three Foundational Resource Principles and promise to enhance public understanding of how the college accomplishes its mission through the successes of its students pursuing community/college partnerships beyond the campus.

The October 2006 faculty retreat addressed a number of mission-specific issues concerning the direction of the college, including the expectations of the new President, possible changes in the configuration of the academic dean’s position, and the accreditation self-study process [Exhibit 11]. The college mission also served as the focal point for the Board of Trustees’ annual retreat in May 2007 (see Section 1.A.1). The recent revision of the Faculty Handbook incorporated language noting the relationship between the current Strategic
Plan and priority-setting for annual budget negotiations (see Standard 7 –Finance).

The mission explicitly guides Linfield’s admission practices. Admission policy (found on pp. 18–21 of the 2007 college catalog as well as in Appendix O of the Faculty Handbook) states that students are considered for admission based on their potential “to succeed at Linfield both academically and socially, and on their ability to contribute creatively and positively to society.” Thus the college seeks students who aspire to lead lives shaped by intellectual inquiry and conscience-guided action while contributing to a community discourse informed by diverse perspectives. Admission publications cite Linfield’s American Baptist heritage. They also note the importance of international/multicultural study and experiential learning within the academic program.

Hiring policies for all Linfield employees proceed from the college mission and are articulated in the Common Chapter of each employee handbook. Because a 2006–07 survey of academic departments revealed that they did not typically cite the college mission as part of the search process for new faculty, the mission statement has opened each search plan since 2007–08. It should also be noted that, even without explicit reference to the mission statement, academic position announcements have long stressed the liberal arts emphasis of the college, its commitment to undergraduate education, and the high priority placed upon the close interaction of faculty and students in the learning process [Exhibit 12].

The Division of Continuing Education seeks to provide a Linfield education to adult students for whom a full-time residential experience is not possible. DCE’s targeted mission guides programming and strategic planning based on the guidance provided by the Linfield College mission. As the division formulates course offerings and schedules, reviews curriculum, allocates resources, selects faculty, and recruits students, the intersection of students’ lives, communities, and educational endeavors articulated in the mission remain paramount.

In accordance with both the college and Portland Campus mission to expand institutional diversity, the School of Nursing in 2003 applied for and in 2004–05 began receiving a three-year Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) grant to assist in recruiting and retaining up to 20–25% traditionally underrepresented minority students. The Portland Campus has since hired a director of multicultural programs and has successfully increased its minority student presence through outreach programs and dedicated scholarships. In 2007, the program’s effectiveness, particularly with Hispanic students, led to a three year renewal of the grant. In 2007–08 the School of Nursing also revised its faculty search plan template to attract a more diverse applicant pool for new hires [Exhibit 13].

In a related effort of the McMinnville Campus to recruit and diversify both the faculty and the curriculum, the Modern Languages Department in 2006 recast an existing position in French to focus on Francophone Studies, particularly Africa. Successful hiring in this area has led to plans for a Francophone Studies concentration and a possible institutional partnership with Senegalese educational centers willing to host Linfield students interested in African-based study abroad.

Historically, the mission statement has not been invoked or utilized in a systematic way among all faculty standing committees; the manner in which the mission is alluded to, if referenced at all, has seemed to depend on the charge of a given committee. For example, in evaluating a faculty member’s teaching, the Promotion and Tenure Committee studies the available evidence for proof of the candidate’s effectiveness in encouraging students to “engage in thoughtful dialogue in a climate of mutual respect.” The Faculty Staffing Committee reviews the mission as it prioritizes new position requests. In reviewing student applicants, the Admission and Financial Aid Committee looks for academic achievement, character traits, and personal experiences that suggest how an individual might contribute to the educational environment envisioned in the mission.
The all-college Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), on which three members of the Faculty Budget and Benefits Committee sit, recommends to the President how best to allocate limited financial resources among competing needs. The mission guides the Planning Council when it crafts its annual budget priorities memo to the BAC at the start of budget negotiations. Recent budgets in 2006–07, 07–08, and 08–09 each demonstrate the high priority given to improved faculty compensation as essential in recruiting and retaining top educators who will ensure effective delivery of the academic program—the centerpiece of the college mission [Exhibit 14].

Resource allocations in 2005–06 demonstrate how budget decisions support the college mission. In that period, 48.8% of the college’s operating budget was spent on instruction. When that figure is combined with those portions of the budget designated for academic and student support of the curriculum and co-curriculum, one sees that 69.4% of the budget directly supported the three Foundational Education Principles identified in the 2007–12 Strategic Plan, integrated learning, global and multicultural awareness, and experiential learning. The plan’s inclusion of three Foundational Resource Principles—developing Linfield’s human resource base, strengthening its financial base, stewarding its physical assets—foregrounds the importance of maintaining and expanding existing assets as well as cultivating new ones to advance Linfield’s mission even more fully.

One must also acknowledge that nearly 40% of respondents to the 2006 Faculty Survey indicated that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that Linfield’s resources are allocated in ways consistent with its mission. To redress the effects of limited budgets which must serve competing institutional needs, the faculty regularly emphasize the need for a larger college endowment to fund more competitive salaries, improved learning spaces, increased collaborative research opportunities, and expanded support for scholarly effort that keeps faculty current in their fields. Toward these ends the college has seen the market value of its endowment grow from $48.6 million in 2003–04 to $73.1 million in 2006–07. A relatively new endowment for student/faculty collaborative research totaling approximately $1.8 million has provided approximately $335,000 to support this mission-specific activity between 2003 and 2008 [Exhibit 10].

1.A.6 Public service is consistent with the educational mission and goals of the institution.

While the mission statement does not directly cite public service, the reference to “a vision of learning, life, and community” in its opening line receives further clarification in the concise mission statement: “Connecting Learning, Life and Community.” Linfield thus seeks to prepare adults who will contribute in meaningful ways to the world beyond the college. This commitment builds upon Linfield’s historical ties to the American Baptist Churches, USA. The 2007–12 Strategic Plan explains that the Foundational Education Principles, in addition to articulating the academic aims of the institution, also “clarify the goals of a Linfield education as the cultivation of good citizens” as students move toward “finding their calling—the vocation or passion that will shape and enrich their lives.” For these reasons, public service receives explicit mention in the experiential learning section of the 2007–08 college catalog (pages 10–11).

The college provides extensive opportunities for students to pursue public service both through academic departments and co-curricular organizations. In the Graduating Senior Survey conducted in spring 2007, 89% of McMinnville Campus respondents, 83% of Portland Campus respondents and 71% of DCE respondents indicated that they had contributed to some form of community service or volunteer work; 21% had participated frequently in such activity [Exhibit 15]. McMinnville Campus respondents to the 2007 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) indicated that 79% of them had participated in community service or
volunteer work, a statistic that compares very favorably to the 72% reported for the baccalaureate arts and sciences comparison group. [Exhibit 16]. DCE students may also pursue the Credit for Prior Learning option whereby significant community or public service (among other activities) may earn academic credit. See Standard 3 – Students for additional information.

To support and increase student public service, the McMinnville Campus fully absorbed the position of community service coordinator (previously funded in part by an AmeriCorps grant) into the 2007–08 operating budget. This administrator now provides a central point of contact for individual students and student leaders seeking to engage in or organize public service activities. Other administrators and faculty members aiming to enhance their programs with a community service component may also receive guidance and logistical support from the community service coordinator, whose efforts to date have already improved the planning, management, and evaluation of college-sponsored national service day events such as Make a Difference Day, Global Youth Service Day, and Alternative Spring Break. The coordinator also oversees Linfield’s participation in the AmeriCorps Students in Service education award program.

Identification of experiential learning as one of Linfield’s three Education Principles intentionally reinforces the importance of community service as a means of wedding theory and praxis. Within the co-curriculum and affiliated student life activities sponsored by the Greek system, as well as through participation in the annual Make-a-Difference Day and Spring Service Day, McMinnville Campus students undertake numerous service projects with organizations such as Goodwill Industries, McMinnville Parks and Recreation, Kids on the Block and SMART (Start Making a Reader Today). Linfield’s Greek organizations boast a long history of service to the region.

The Linfield Center for Regional Studies (LCRS), currently in its pilot phase, also foregrounds public service as a hallmark of the college mission. In addition to its goal of expanding internship opportunities for Linfield undergraduates, the LCRS will encourage collaborative research projects of special relevance to the broader communities of the city of McMinnville and Yamhill County. In this way student-centered academic inquiry (involving, for example, the local Hispanic community, the Yamhill County Historical Society, or the Tribes of the Grand Ronde) will generate research findings of possible usefulness to the very groups under study [Exhibit 17].

The incorporation of service learning components within the academic program has also increased through various off-campus January Term courses. For example, recent faculty-led classes have examined health care in Cameroon (2007) and housing in Guatemala (2008), with participants in both cases volunteering many hours to improve health or housing conditions for local community members. Faculty and administrators have also coordinated Alternative Spring Break opportunities including off-site Habitat for Humanity projects and Hurricane Katrina relief activities. Academic curricula in Psychology, Modern Languages, Education, Sociology/Anthropology, and Theater/Communication Arts include a community service option under the designation 040.

On the Portland Campus, students often pursue internships with a public service emphasis in homeless shelters, Doernbecher Children’s Safety Center, and the Oregon Department of Public Health. The Blue Dot Club supports volunteer projects serving the Red Cross, the Salvation Army food kitchen Harbor Lights, and fund raising on World AIDS Day. Proceeds from one such event were donated to medical teams in Cameroon in conjunction with the above-mentioned January Term course held there. In completing their required 900–1000 hours of clinicals, nursing students often participate in community service projects. A health science student recently conducted research on the incidence of West Nile virus infections in Oregon.
1.A.7 The institution reviews with the Commission contemplated changes that would alter its mission, autonomy, ownership or locus of control, or its intention to offer a degree at a higher level than is included in its present accreditation, or other changes in accordance with Policy A-2 Substantive Change.

There have been no substantive changes to Linfield College’s mission or implementation of its mission since the 1998 accreditation visit. Linfield carefully distinguishes between “Substantive Changes,” which would necessitate review from the Commission, and the kind of ongoing institutional change represented by curricular modification, creation or deletion of specific academic concentrations, and staffing changes, all of which contribute to the natural evolution of an educational institution.

Several decisions made in the last decade have resulted from and in turn influenced Linfield’s strategic planning. These include the 2001 adoption of an enrollment goal of 1750 FTE on the McMinnville Campus (see 1.B.1) and the spring 2007 decision to make the programs on the Portland Campus upper-division transfer-only (see 1.B.1). Both changes have had impacts on the college in terms of staffing, curricular integration across the two residential campuses, and student life. In the Portland Campus decision, the discussion did not widely engage the McMinnville faculty and staff ahead of time to prepare them for the impact of this change (except through distribution of minutes by the Planning Council as it considered the Portland Division recommendation). This oversight resulted from a faulty assumption that students interested in nursing would not begin their education on the McMinnville Campus in greater numbers than had historically been the case (the flawed presumption was that community college students would comprise the strong majority of Portland Campus transfer matriculants).

1.B – Planning and Effectiveness

1.B.1 The institution clearly defines its evaluation and planning processes. It develops and implements procedures to evaluate the extent to which it achieves institutional goals

The planning process at Linfield has been organized to foster wide and effective participation. Strategic planning is guided by the Planning Council, a body with college-wide representation (including a trustee) that recommends to the President, trustees, the Faculty Assembly, administrators, and staff on issues facing the college. The Council arose as a response to a directive from the September 1998 Accreditation Evaluation Team to then-President Vivian Bull that the college better link institutional planning and assessment (advice reiterated in the October 1999 focused interim follow-up visit). A recommendation in Strategy VII of Planning for the Future: The Linfield College Strategic Agenda 2000–05 brought the Planning Council into being in 1999 [Exhibit 3]. The Strategic Agenda itself grew out of a consultative process orchestrated by a committee of faculty, administrators, and trustees appointed by President Bull. That committee managed the work of 13 referral groups with a collective membership of more than 80 individuals drawn from among faculty, staff, and students. After numerous open campus meetings to consider iterative versions of the draft agenda, the planning committee presented a strategic agenda to each constituent body for ratification in fall 1999. The agenda was affirmed by a ballot vote of each group and approved by the trustees in November 1999.

The Planning Council thus began operation in spring semester 2000. Its formal charge requires that the Council request and receive information from academic and administrative annual reports; identify strategic priorities and goals in its yearly memo to the Budget Advisory Committee; develop an institutional strategic agenda and attendant strategic plan for
consideration by the college’s constituencies; monitor progress on the strategic goals set forth in both documents; and work with members of the Linfield community to encourage activity furthering the college mission (see Faculty Handbook, III.2.2.3).

The relative newness of the Planning Council has meant that its relationship to more established components of the institutional governance structure has at times been strained, indicating a need for further refinement and clarification, particularly regarding the Faculty Assembly. As a contribution to this effort, the Council affirmed at its meeting on May 1, 2008, that it recognizes and respects faculty sovereignty in curricular matters. It passed this resolution in response to a concern that the Council’s spring 2007 encouragement of the nascent Linfield Center for Regional Studies had been premature, as it occurred before the concept had been vetted by relevant faculty standing committees. Going forward, the Council also seeks to strengthen and increase its interactions with the Faculty Executive Council as future strategic initiatives appear.

Linfield’s institutional assessment processes draw on a variety of data sources including academic and administrative annual reports, the Linfield fact book, key indicators developed by the President’s Office, and other information as requested from the institutional research officer or the various administrative sectors of the college. Assessment data are provided to the Planning Council, the President’s Cabinet, and various standing committees of the faculty from a number of survey instruments such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), alumni surveys, and the 2006 Faculty Survey. Since spring 1995 the college has annually surveyed graduating seniors and distributed the results each fall to academic departments, heads of special academic programs, and selected administrators. In fall 1999 the college conducted a five-year-out survey of 1995 graduates, the results of which were sent to the President’s Advisory Council and the Planning Council. In 2007–08, a ten-year-out alumni survey was initiated for the first time; the results were received in spring 2008.

As part of this accreditation self-study, the Office of College Relations assisted academic departments in contacting graduates through an email survey sent in March 2008 to solicit feedback about the contributions of specific majors to their subsequent career paths and to encourage respondents to suggest curricular improvements to enhance that equation. The resultant information will be disseminated to the relevant personnel (faculty and administrators) as the 2008–09 academic year gets under way [Exhibit 29].

Halfway through the period covered by the Linfield Strategic Agenda 2000–05, the Planning Council evaluated institutional progress on its announced goals and informed the community of what had already been achieved, what was still under way, and what had lost relevance for the future of the college. The Council then began drafting what became the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12, which was formally adopted by the board in fall 2007. In spring 2008, the Council developed an assessment model by which to measure yearly progress on the six Foundational Principles identified in the Strategic Plan. Building on the previous annual reporting guidelines distributed to academic and administrative departments, the new reporting framework directly references the six Foundational Principles and will require all cabinet officers to synthesize information received and provide it to the Council. The Council in turn will present a strategic plan update each fall to the wider Linfield community. Building on the inventory embedded within this self-study, the new reporting procedure will begin in 2008–09 [Exhibit 18].

At the level of the President’s cabinet, each administrative officer presents a set of administrative goals at the fall Board of Trustees meeting, along with reports on the previous year’s goals. The President is responsible for articulating and reporting upon the institutional goals pursued each year [Exhibit 19].

The adoption of the current 1750 financial FTE goal on the McMinnville Campus exemplifies the college’s planning processes. Initiated by the
Planning Council through a memo to the Linfield community issued in March 2001, the proposal to reach the specified enrollment target by 2009–10 was discussed in various faculty committees and administrative departments. The Council argued that a larger student body would advance the college mission in three ways: (1) it would generate additional tuition dollars to attract and retain the finest faculty and staff; (2) it would foster improvement in academic programs by generating financial resources to lower the student/full-time faculty ratio; and (3) it would provide resources to improve facilities supporting academic and student life experiences at the college. In the same memo, the Council recommended revising the mission statement to acknowledge new enrollment goals on the McMinnville Campus (an effort undertaken and completed in 2001–02, culminating in the adoption of a revised mission statement; see 1.A.1). The Faculty Assembly subsequently endorsed the following amended Planning Council proposal of “increasing the FTE to 1750 and reducing the FTE student to full-time faculty ratio to 14:1.” The Board of Trustees approved the amended proposal in spring 2001 without a specific timeline for attainment. At this writing, the McMinnville Campus financial FTE stands at 1625 according to Institutional Data 2007 (Fact Book, p. xviii). This decision also gave increased urgency to planning for significant enhancement of Linfield’s science facilities (see 1.B.3).

Another substantial institutional change involved the decision to move to an upper division, transfer-only model on the Portland Campus. Planning toward this outcome involved several steps taken over a number of years, some of which were strongly contested by segments of the community. The Portland Campus began strategic planning in spring 2003 as a result of substantive changes in student enrollment patterns. An external consultant guided development of a draft strategic plan approved by the Portland Campus Strategic Planning Task Force in fall 2003 and the Planning Council in April 2004. Under that plan, the Portland Campus would stop admitting first year students in fall 2005, making both its nursing and health sciences programs transfer-dependent (a situation that had already become the de facto reality). The Portland Campus Master Strategic Plan was forwarded to the all-college Planning Council for review and the Council recommended it to President Bull, as reported in its publicly distributed minutes. President Bull subsequently approved the plan.

Understandably, such significant change aroused opposition in some quarters of the Portland Campus that did not ease with the majority’s approval of the strategic plan or its adoption by the President. Division of opinion was initially mitigated by allowing sophomore transfers as well as juniors and seniors in the first two years of the transition. In January 2006 then-Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs Barbara Seidman began discussions with Portland Campus faculty about the sustainability of that approach given pressing resource needs on both campuses and decreasing lower division enrollments in Portland. As the nursing faculty voted to restrict their program to upper division transfers only, Dean Seidman presented her case in writing for the same practice in health sciences [Exhibit 20]. During 2006–07, the Portland Campus Strategic Planning Oversight Committee (SPOC) discussed the change at length and voted to continue sophomore entry for health sciences majors, as did the Portland Division. The college Planning Council recommended to President Hellie that he act in accordance with what made the most sense institutionally after his analysis of the issues. In spring 2007 President Hellie determined that the Portland Campus would pursue an upper division transfer-only model exclusively beginning in fall 2008, putting his rationale in writing and distributing it to the entire college community [Exhibit 21]. While disagreement continued in some quarters, the rationale for the direction taken was fully shared with those involved at multiple points during the debate. Both the McMinnville and Portland Campus communities continue to seek improved curricular and student life intersections to meet student needs as a result of this transition that has more extensively linked the curricular and enrollment practices of the two residential campuses far more than has ever been the case.
1.B.2 The institution engages in systematic planning for, and evaluation of, its activities, including teaching, research, and public service consistent with institutional mission and goals.

The Planning Council meets at least bi-monthly to oversee institutional strategic planning and draws on the information sources cited in 1.B.1 to ensure that decisions remain aligned with and foster Linfield’s mission. Academic and administrative annual reports enumerate achievements by students and staff; they describe successes of the preceding year and explain changes adopted to redress perceived programmatic shortcomings and/or disappointments in student or staff performance.

Linfield’s director of institutional research became a full time position in the decade since the 1998 self-study and in 2007–08 began reporting directly to the Senior Advisor to the President. The institutional researcher prepares a range of quantitative and qualitative data for the institutional fact book, national higher education reporting bodies, the President’s Cabinet, and the Board of Trustees, which requests yearly updates on a number of key indicators of institutional performance [Exhibit 9]. As of 2008–09, this administrator also provides staff support for the Planning Council.

In 2006–07 the Faculty Curriculum Committee began developing a review protocol for academic departments to pick up where this self-study leaves off. To be conducted jointly by the dean of faculty/vice president for academic affairs and the Curriculum Committee, this process will establish a regular rotation by which departments will examine their curriculum in view of current disciplinary trends, as well as revisit their published goals in support of the college mission. With the arrival of a new vice president for academic affairs in July 2008, the Curriculum Committee will finalize its proposal for approval by the faculty and implement it in 2009–10. As with the departmental reports accompanying this self-study, regularized reviews will provide opportunities for a department to take stock of what it has accomplished and how it has adjusted to reflect changes in the field, the student body, or the college. It will also foster the next phase of departmental planning. Such information feeds directly into the larger strategic planning processes of the institution through the dean of faculty’s role in other such bodies and through the visibility of the Curriculum Committee in the review process.

Evaluation of each faculty member’s teaching, professional achievement, and service occurs in a carefully delineated fashion at several levels, starting with the academic departments themselves in concert with the academic vice President. The Faculty Handbook sets forth the criteria by which tenure-track faculty members are evaluated and identifies teaching as the centerpiece of one’s performance, although professional achievement and service also play significant roles in colleague assessment. This emphasis on teaching clearly reflects Linfield’s mission-based commitment to undergraduate education. The Tenure and Promotion Committee becomes explicitly involved in the 2nd, 4th, and 6th years of an untenured faculty member’s probationary period. Associate professors are reviewed on a three-year rotation in meetings with the academic dean and the appropriate department chair. Full professors undergo review with the dean of faculty on a five-year rotation.

Both the Portland and McMinnville Campuses take careful note of how Linfield’s mission-centered commitment to multiculturalism informs actual practice. In the 2007 Senior Survey, 70% of McMinnville respondents, 76% of Portland Campus respondents and 77% of DCE respondents indicated that their experience at the college had enhanced their abilities to “foster global and multicultural awareness” either moderately or greatly. Likewise, 68% of McMinnville respondents, 59% of Portland respondents and 62% of DCE respondents indicated that Linfield had enhanced their
abilities to “relate well to different ethnicities, races, nationalities, or religions” either moderately or greatly [Exhibit 15]. Several initiatives should improve these outcomes; specifically, (1) the general education revision process has made its two diversity requirements stand-alone entities within the Linfield Curriculum; (2) college study abroad opportunities have expanded over the last decade to include new international partnerships with institutions in Ecuador, Australia, New Zealand, and China; (3) diversity recruitment efforts have increased the percentage of underrepresented groups in the student bodies of the McMinnville and Portland Campuses.

1.B.3 The planning process is participatory involving constituencies appropriate to the institution such as board members, administrators, faculty, staff, students, and other parties.

As noted in 1.B.1, the Planning Council oversees institutional planning and serves in an advisory capacity to the President. Its membership includes a trustee, four faculty representatives, three administrators, two Linfield Employee Association (LEA) representatives, and two students appointed by the cabinet of the Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC). The Council is chaired by the vice president of academic affairs/ dean of faculty, with the director of institutional research now providing staff support (a role held previously by the associate dean of faculty). The Council reports regularly to the Faculty Assembly, the Administrative Assembly, the President’s Cabinet, and the Board of Trustees at their respective meetings. Its minutes are publicly disseminated to the entire Linfield community by email. One of the elected faculty members serves as direct liaison to the Faculty Executive Council. The Planning Council periodically invites to its regular meetings representatives from various standing committees or other campus constituencies who can help it better frame strategic issues facing the college. For example, in the course of the last two academic years the Council has met with the chairs of the Staffing and Faculty Development Committees, the chair of the Faculty Executive Council, the vice president of college relations, and the vice president of finance/administration; in each case the conversation served to share information and discuss common concerns related to strategic planning and resource allocation. Since April 2006 President Hellie has been a regular guest at Council meetings, as has Senior Advisor to the President Fred Ross since his ascension to that post in fall 2007.

The planning for renovation of Northup Hall (the first phase of an extensive plan to expand and upgrade Linfield science facilities) demonstrates the care taken to ensure participation of the key stakeholders in such major undertakings. A 2005 feasibility study completed by the architectural firm SRG Partnership was presented to the Planning Council for recommendation to the Board of Trustees (See Standard 8 for discussion of the Science Facilities Feasibility Study). Upon receiving approval to proceed, Interim President Marv Henberg and the vice presidents for academic affairs and college relations began conversations with the anchor academic department, Business, about how to design teaching spaces to best serve the curriculum. Upon his arrival at Linfield, President Hellie launched a Business Advisory Council intended to assist in resource development and strategic alliance-building with the wider business community. Meanwhile, the Office of Academic Affairs began consultation with other possible building residents, and plans were finalized to include the departments of English, Philosophy and Economics along with Business. In 2007–08 the basic design of the building was shared with the prospective tenants; design development was completed by fall 2008. Simultaneously the Office of College Relations launched the quiet phase of a capital campaign to raise funds for the renovation, having already researched the giving capacity of the college’s donor base and foundation prospects.
Efforts to involve science and mathematics faculty in planning their new facilities are proceeding on a parallel track, albeit more slowly. Accompanied by SRG partner Jon Weiner, a team of five faculty members from four programs attended a Science Facilities Planning Workshop held in March 2007 by the national science educators’ organization Project Kaleidescope. Since then, the Linfield faculty team has developed an integrative approach to their envisioned facilities meant to promote experiential education and extend their thriving collaborative research programs (also see 1.B.4).

A complete description of institutional facilities renovation and construction needs on the McMinnville Campus, including possible staging, may be found in the Facilities Master Plan Analysis drafted in August 2007 and subsequently reviewed by faculty, administrators, the President’s Cabinet, and the Facilities Committee of the Board of Trustees (see Standard 8). Production of this master plan also provides evidence of Linfield’s participatory culture, as it resulted from the work of a committee of faculty and administrators representing the Board of Trustees, the academic program, athletics, student life, facilities, and financial affairs convened by President Hellie in spring 2006. A full discussion of this initiative appears in Standard 8—Facilities.

1.B.4 The institution uses the results of its systematic evaluation activities and ongoing planning processes to influence resource allocation and to improve its instructional programs, institutional services, and activities.

The President’s Cabinet and the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) are charged each year with developing a college budget to recommend to the Board of Trustees. Budget deliberations center around allocating resources based on the Strategic Plan in accordance with the broad-based educational goals of the mission. The Strategic Plan’s three Foundational Education Principles are supported by three corresponding Foundational Resource Principles, and the Planning Council annually recommends budget priorities to the cabinet and the BAC after assessing the most pressing strategic issues facing the institution in the near future. This is done through a written memo shared with the entire Linfield community. At the end of the BAC’s deliberations, the members draft a return memo to the Planning Council (shared with all college constituencies) setting forth questions to be considered during the next year’s priority-setting process [Exhibit 22].

Institutional Data (the campus fact book) provides regularly updated information about the distribution of budget dollars across the administrative divisions of the college; from
this, historical trends can also be determined, as has been done by members of the Faculty Budget and Benefits Committee. This self-study establishes another vehicle to assist the various planning bodies of the college in assessing the impact of budgeting decisions.

A clear connection between the college mission, institutional planning, and resource development informs Linfield’s approach to capital campaigns. "The Defining Moment" campaign (January 1997–June 2004) raised nearly $74 million in charitable gift support. Almost $29 million of this amount supported campus expansion, including the opening of new library, art, theatre, and music facilities. The campaign also added $22 million immediately to the college's endowment (mostly for scholarships); another $9 million, received in the form of life income gifts, will eventually expand endowment funds. Most of the remainder of the campaign proceeds bolstered academic and co-curricular programs and general college operations.

In the midst of “The Defining Moment” campaign, the college engaged Paulien and Associates to conduct an analysis of teaching spaces on the McMinnville Campus. The ensuing 1998 report made clear the need to begin planning for improved science facilities since, even at an enrollment of 1548, the campus had reached capacity in meeting the laboratory needs of students studying in science fields. As explained in 1.B.3, the 2005 science facilities feasibility study led to trustee adoption of a plan that identified the renovation of Northup Hall as the first step in a multi-phased project. Building on these efforts (as well as on a study of fundraising capacity), the college embarked in 2007–08 on the quiet phase of a new capital campaign with three articulated goals: (1) facilities modernization and expansion (see discussion of Northup Hall, 1.B.3); (2) creation of endowed support for faculty salaries, including new faculty chairs; (3) expansion of endowed scholarship support for students. These foci grew out of the convergence of planning efforts that included the Paulien study, the adoption of the new 1750 financial FTE goal, trustee commitment to strengthened faculty compensation levels, and the need for greater scholarship and endowment funds.

On the Portland Campus, the long-recognized need for improved instructional space prompted successful grant proposals to the Miller and Collins Foundations which enabled the start of renovation to Peterson Hall in spring 2008 (scheduled for completion by fall 2008). This renovation will also permit enrollment growth in nursing to assist in meeting the current and future nursing crisis regionally and nationally. It has also been determined that previous calls for improved science laboratory facilities on the Portland Campus have been obviated by the adoption of the two year transfer model. More information on facilities enhancement on both campuses may be found in Standard 8.

The Trustee Compensation Committee analyzes the competitive status of employee compensation at all levels to ensure that Linfield continues to hire and retain highly qualified faculty, administrators, and staff. The committee annually reviews the impact of the previous year’s budget on each group’s compensation. The committee has also tackled the budget challenges posed by escalating employee health coverage by placing a cap on percentage increases tied to the cumulative percentage increase in salary dollars within each budget. This step reflects trustee attentiveness to preserving crucial funds to support the core institutional mission. In adopting a policy that allocates the same percentage of college dollars for both of the subscribed college health plans in assisting with the health insurance costs of dependents, the Compensation Committee sought feedback from the all-campus Benefits Committee beforehand and also chose to phase in the equalization process over three years. While these decisions have not been popular with all employees, the trustee chair put the rationale in a memo to the college community to assure transparency about the process.

The committee utilizes compensation benchmarks for each of the three employee classifications and is currently reviewing the PACCON comparison that the college uses in analyzing the competitiveness of faculty compensation.
salaries. The benchmark compares Linfield average compensation for administrators and each of the three classifications of faculty against the average for other PACCON schools. The trustees have identified 85 – 100% as the range in which to make comparisons, although no particular percentage was identified as a goal. The benchmark report is best viewed over a period of time for trends, rather than at any data point for a single year. See Standards 4.A.4 and 6.C.9 for more detail.

One of the biggest challenges for the institution in assessing administrator compensation is that administrator job matches through CUPA data results in a limited number of schools, including a few changes in who reports each year. With the recent hiring of a new senior human resources director, the institution hopes to review administrator classifications in order to address some of the shortfalls of the administrator benchmark. Another caveat of the use of these benchmarks is that such comparisons need to be viewed in context of resources available (net tuition and net endowment per student) and student faculty ratio compared to the other PACCON schools. See Standard 6.C.9 for a further discussion of compensation issues for administrators.

The faculty reviews recommendations regarding instructional programs and institutional services through the Faculty Assembly, the Faculty Executive Council, and the standing committees of the faculty. Recent examples include the work of the ad hoc committee on general education revision (2005 to 2008) and the ad hoc committee on faculty workload (2006 to 2008). A faculty interest group created the proposal for what has become the pilot Linfield Center for Regional Studies. In 2005–06 the Planning Council invited academic departments to share with the Council their respective vision statements for the near future, from which the Foundational Principles embedded in the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 emerged. Faculty committee chairs have been invited to Council meetings to talk about intersecting institutional priorities to ensure an effective planning process that accurately represents a range of faculty interests. Beginning in fall 2009–10, the Council will compile and distribute an annual progress report on the strategic plan for the campus community. The vice president for academic affairs meets monthly with the chair and co-chair of the Faculty Executive Council to set the agenda for the Faculty Assembly.

1.B.5 The institution integrates its evaluation and planning processes to identify institutional priorities for improvement.

Priorities for institutional improvement proceed naturally from various activities authorized by the President, often in tandem with recommendations from the Board of Trustees: (1) consultancy reports commissioned for the college; (2) regular cabinet deliberations; (3) strategic planning efforts led by the Planning Council; and (4) recommendations from standing and ad hoc faculty committees; (5) participation in institutionally specific and nationally based surveys that highlight areas for improvement within the college. All of these feed into the yearly budget negotiations that determine resource allocations for the coming year.

A 2006 McMinnville Campus facilities consultancy conducted by the Sightlines firm provides one example of how institutional evaluation contributes to ongoing priority-setting. Sightlines specializes in the assessment of physical plant management on college campuses. Although Linfield scored high in campus appearance, the college fell well below median in providing resources for facilities upkeep [Exhibit 23]. Having missed several modernization cycles, facilities management has identified the most pressing needs as part of the 2008 Master Plan Analysis. This analysis was produced following a charge from President Hellie in February 2007 that an ad hoc committee be formed to identify the facilities and space impacts of 1750 financial FTE on the McMinnville Campus in relation to academics, student life, athletics and student wellness, and other support activities. The report also
addressed real estate and modernization/deferred maintenance (MR&R). A separate section outlined Portland Campus needs. The committee chairs presented their findings and recommendations to the President’s Cabinet, the Trustees’ Facilities Committee, the Planning Council, the Faculty Assembly, the Administrators’ Assembly, and the Linfield Employee Association membership, in spring semester 2008. The report provides the college with a comprehensive approach to facilities development and renovation for the next 25 years, albeit one that will remain dynamic in response to changing circumstances. In this way the Master Plan Analysis exemplifies Linfield’s efforts to link planning and accountability via regular assessment.

In another example, the production of this self-study involved several iterations of emergent strategic issues for consideration by the wider college community. In fall 2006 the first such list was distributed as a discussion item for the October faculty retreat. It subsequently went by email to all constituencies of the college through the accreditation newsletter circulated later in the fall. Updated lists were also provided to the community in 2007–08 [Exhibit 27]. As other sections of this self-study will indicate, the college has already begun to address some of these strategic issues (see, for example, Standard 8 – Facilities and Standard 6 – Governance). In spring 2007, the Planning Council invited all faculty standing committees to identify strategic issues in their respective arenas for discussion as part of the college strategic planning process. Data from the 2005 and 2007 rounds of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) have been distributed to the President’s Cabinet, the Planning Council, all academic department chairs, the director of the college writing program, the Enrollment, Retention and Student Life standing committee, and selected administrators. All of this data has informed and will continue to inform budget and decision-making processes at the college. For example, the 2007 Budget Priorities Memo to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) identified retention as a strategic issue deserving of budgetary support in the 2008–09 budget.

1.B.6 The institution provides the necessary resources for effective evaluation and planning processes.

The establishment of a full-time institutional researcher offers a very concrete instance of the college’s commitment to allocate sufficient funds for effective evaluation and planning. So too does the creation of a college-wide Planning Council and a Portland Campus-specific Strategic Planning task force (SPOC). A full-time facilities planner position was established in summer 2007 to coordinate infrastructure projects on both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses.

The Board of Trustees engages in college planning both through its regular meetings and its retreats, typically held every two or three years. To foster planning within the faculty, the Office of Academic Affairs works with the Faculty Executive Council to organize an off-campus faculty-wide retreat in alternate years. Other constituencies of the college convene regularly in retreats intended to discuss strategic planning within their own areas: this happens both with academic departments and administrative offices (for example, the Office of College Relations and the Division of Student Services). In January 2008 Student Services administrators also met with a consultant who discussed the development of explicit learning goals for the student life areas they oversee. Both the Office of Admission and the Office of Financial Aid hold annual planning retreats. The dean of enrollment services meets regularly with the directors of those offices as part of the Enrollment Management Leadership Team and thereby influences the issues addressed in each office’s retreats.

In terms of institutional advancement, the college enlisted the services of the nationally recognized consulting firm Bentz Whaley Flessner in February 2007 to study Linfield’s campaign readiness and donor capacity. The
firm evaluated the college’s internal systems and leadership, reporting its finding and recommendations to the President and to the newly-established Campaign Committee in summer 2007. Bentz Whaley Flessner continues to provide counsel to the Office of College Relations, especially in the areas of major gifts development and data systems.

Other examples of institutional activity that warrant mention include the fall 2005 consultancy conducted by the Office of International Programs Office (see 2.G: International Programs). As noted earlier in this standard, the architectural firm SRG Partnership has worked with Linfield since 2004 to plan expanded and improved science facilities. The Noel Levitz firm has provided numerous enrollment and financial aid services on the McMinnville Campus as part of a long-term professional arrangement. Each year its staff helps the college build an awarding plan for new first year and transfer students. At the end of the enrollment cycle Noel Levitz then assists the college in reviewing the results of the financial aid awarding plan and developing a plan for the following year in view of the new budget’s targeted discount rate.

To assist with preliminary feasibility analysis for the Linfield Center for Regional Studies, college personnel (including faculty) wrote a successful planning grant to a local funding organization and has since secured additional support from the nationally recognized Kemper Foundation.

1.B.7 The institution’s research is integrated with and supportive of institutional evaluation and planning.

In 1994–95 the college established the Office of Institutional Research (housed in the Office of Academic Affairs via the Registrar’s Office) to oversee data collection that can serve strategic planning. Following the 1998 self-study, Linfield began increasing the position’s FTE until it became full time in 2003. As evidence of its centrality to the next era of institutional planning, the position started reporting to the senior advisor to the president in 2007–08. Supervision of the college’s ongoing participation in the National Survey of Student Engagement will be provided by the director of institutional research starting in 2008–09.

The work of the institutional researcher extends broadly across the college. This administrator compiles the data produced by first year Colloquium evaluations (responses from both students and advising personnel); processes and delivers the results of all teaching evaluations; oversees the annual graduating Senior Survey; and assists in the design and delivery of alumni surveys (most recently targeting those one year and ten years out from graduation). In the latter effort the institutional researcher collaborated with staff from the Offices of College Relations, Career Services, Academic Affairs, and Enrollment Services to devise a questionnaire to provide useful assessment information for each of those areas. Every task listed above generates data that is shared with the relevant parties: instructors, academic department chairs, and the dean of faculty review teaching evaluations; the academic advising staff and advisors see Colloquium evaluations and revise the program yearly; all academic programs as well as the appropriate administrative offices receive results from the Senior and Alumni surveys.

Data are also distributed to faculty standing committee as requested or required for their work (for example, information on enrollment and retention goes to the Enrollment, Retention and Student Life Committee). The work of the institutional researcher is complemented by data collection performed throughout the college. For example, the Office of Finance and Administration compiles the IPEDS financial reporting data; the Office of Enrollment Services oversees the retention analysis data, and the Office of Academic Affairs currently handles the salary benchmarking.

The most significant single activity undertaken by the Office of Institutional Research involves
the compilation of the *Institutional Data 2007*, a widely distributed fact book (also available on the web) that provides the President’s Cabinet, the Planning Council, the Faculty Executive Council, academic department chairs, and other institutional standing committees and offices with reliable longitudinal data to understand the present condition of the institution. Data in the fact book is updated annually [Exhibit 10].

1.B.8 The institution systematically reviews its institutional research efforts, its evaluation processes, and its planning activities to document their effectiveness.

As noted earlier, the Planning Council emerged from the 1998 self-study’s identification of a need for better integrated planning and evaluation processes. Internal review of the effectiveness of Linfield’s planning efforts is continuous. In conducting its deliberations, the Planning Council strives to work with the faculty governance system and hopes to improve its consultation with the Faculty Executive Council (FEC) in the future, particularly where curricular impacts may result from Council recommendations. In terms of the current Strategic Plan, the Council made substantive changes to the draft version of the Foundational Principles in response to concerns voiced by the faculty through the FEC, adding the three Foundational Resource Principles whose presence in the document provides a concrete example of the seriousness of the consultative process. The Council circulates minutes of every meeting to the entire Linfield community by email [Exhibit 28]. Its faculty members regularly report to their respective divisions, and the chair regularly updates the Faculty Assembly about ongoing issues before the Council. Planning and evaluation processes aim for inclusiveness and transparency; as such, they are open to scrutiny and undergo revision in response to feedback.

In 2007–08, the senior advisor to the president (a newly created position) began participating in Planning Council meetings. This participation and the exchange of information inspired by the adoption of the current strategic plan suggested the need for more active and deliberate integration of data generated by the Office of Institutional Research into Planning Council deliberations. In February 2008, the institutional researcher attended a Council meeting to discuss the types of institutional information that would most benefit the Council; as a result, the Council (along with the wider college community) now receives copies of the key indicators which have been distributed to the Board of Trustees since 2005–06.

1.B.9 The institution uses information from its planning and evaluation processes to communicate evidence of institutional effectiveness to the public.

As noted in 1.A.3, the college uses the information gleaned from its planning and evaluation processes to communicate institutional effectiveness to the public through a number of media venues. Nevertheless, the President’s Cabinet and the Planning Council recognize the need to improve its data collection and distribution involving student internships, graduate school acceptances, and job placements. A more complete database of this information would allow the college to better document how the “Linfield Experience” informs the subsequent lives of its graduates. Toward this end, the annual reporting practices of academic and administrative departments will move to an online format (beginning in 2008–09) so that mining of reports for specific kinds of information can occur more easily and better serve those offices whose work involves communication of institutional effectiveness both internally and externally.
Conclusion

Linfield College finds itself highly fortunate in the depth of institutional commitment shown by all those who ensure its daily functioning and foster its long-range aspirations. Such dedication among trustees, faculty, administrators, staff, and students bespeaks a thorough-going belief in and understanding of the institutional mission as it informs each arm of the college. Quite simply, the engine that drives Linfield and keeps it steadily improving is the passion with which all participants approach the call to educate each new class of undergraduates to their highest potential. Student-centeredness that embraces the whole person both during and beyond matriculation characterizes Linfield’s public identity and internal operations. It also provides the common ground through which disagreements about institutional priority-setting and assessment are addressed.

In the last decade, Linfield has made great strides in developing an effective interplay of mission-articulation, planning, budgeting, and assessment. Yet the increasing complexity of a growing institution in the new century has generated more complex organizational processes that have at times proved challenging to reconcile with well-established practices, as debates around the relationship of the Planning Council to the faculty governance structure demonstrate. Similarly, Linfield’s need to respond to a dramatically changing higher education landscape while remaining true to its community-based ethos will require continual and broad-based conversation to ensure transparency and foster greater trust around decision-making. Limited resources have meant that institutional planning provokes anxiety over the elevation of certain priorities or initiatives that will deflect support for ongoing efforts in other areas, as strategic decision-making invariably implies. This deeply-rooted concern underlies the suspicion that frequently greets discussions of strategic planning.

Linfield has never lacked for visionary ideas and energetic personnel to launch them. Over the last decade, it has become better at realistic planning and regularized public assessment of its progress. That assessment loop operates very well in some areas of the college but unfolds by fits and starts in other areas, in part because of the labor-intensive nature of the work occupying each office and department from day to day. Cultivating a more integrated picture of the dynamically evolving whole will remain a high institutional priority in the years to come, particularly as it can inform individual perspectives as they contribute to the planning discussions.
Standard 1 Attachment 1 Official Statement of Institutional Mission

Linfield College advances a vision of learning, life, and community that
- promotes intellectual challenge and creativity,
- values both theoretical and practical knowledge,
- engages thoughtful dialogue in a climate of mutual respect,
- honors the rich texture of diverse cultures and varied ways of understanding,
- piques curiosity for a lifetime of inquiry,
- and inspires the courage to live by moral and spiritual principle and to defend freedom of conscience.

Concise Statement
Linfield: Connecting Learning, Life, and Community

As adopted by the Board of Trustees, May 4, 2002.
As printed in the 2007–08 Linfield College Course Catalog, page 3.
Standard 1 Exhibit List

1. Linfield College Mission Statement
2. The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12
3. The Linfield College Strategic Agenda 2000–05
4. Faculty Survey, 2006 Results
5. Portland Campus Mission Statement
6. Portland Campus Master Strategic Plan
7. DCE Student Handbook, 2007–08
8. Trustees’ Survey, 2007 Results
9. Linfield College: Key Indicators, 2007
10. Linfield College Institutional Data 2007: A Fact Book
11. Faculty Retreat Agenda 2006
12. Faculty Search Template and Job Announcement template
13. Nursing Search Plan and Announcement template
14. 2007–08 BAC Budget Memo
15. 2007 Graduating Senior Survey
16. NSSE Survey 2007
17. Mission Statement of Linfield Center for Regional Studies (LCRS)
18. Departmental Annual Report Template
19. Administrative Goals of Cabinet Officers
20. Dean’s 2006 Memo Concerning Move to Transfer-only Model
21. President’s Memo on Transfer-only Planning
22. Planning Council and Budget Advisory Committee Annual Memos, 2007–08
24. Division of Continuing Education Mission Statement
25. Academic Department Mission Statements
26. Administrative Department Mission Statements
28. Strategic Issues Communications throughout the self-study process
29. Linfield Magazine
30. Minutes from the Planning Council 1999–Present
31. President’s Report 2007–08
32. Alumni Surveys 2007–08 (departmental and college-wide)
The educational program of Linfield College results from the considerable expertise and academic ambition of a community of teacher/scholars and administrators who have carefully aligned their energies to the furtherance of student intellectual growth, human understanding, and life-long learning: in other words, to the furtherance of the college mission.

Faculty oversight of the academic program is comprehensive and thorough, as will emerge in what follows. This effort ensures that Linfield graduates will bring with them into the world an education that has both breadth (through general education and elective opportunities) and depth (through the major). The faculty themselves are all carefully vetted before hiring for the necessary academic credentials and are regularly evaluated by their students to ensure continuing efficacy in fostering the learning goals of the curriculum. Moreover, as the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 makes clear, the entire curriculum shares common commitments to three Foundational Education Principles (Integrated Learning, Global and Multicultural Awareness, and Experiential Learning) that operate within each program and department in ways appropriate to their respective academic missions.

Each academic arm of the college—the McMinnville Campus, the Portland Campus, and the Division of Continuing Education—provides faculty-approved majors appropriate to their respective missions and settings. The McMinnville Campus offers a traditional four-year residential program with 40 majors. The Portland Campus serves only upper division transfer students (a growing number coming from McMinnville) who major in nursing or health sciences. The Division of Continuing Education (DCE) provides distance learning and online-mediated curricula through the Adult Degree Program (ADP) and its seven majors. In the narrative that follows, the academic endeavors of each area will be contextualized in view of those differences but will regularly articulate the centralized institutional practices within the faculty governance structure and the administration that integrate the three areas into one college issuing the same Linfield diploma.

The goals of the academic program receive considerable buttressing from the academic advising programs operating in each arm of the college. These programs tie together the faculty and administrative efforts to guide students toward fruitful courses of study and support them in their progress toward graduation.

Linfield’s long-established commitment to providing global educational experiences to its students continues to deepen and expand under the aegis of the International Programs Office, which works closely with faculty to develop a rich array of off-campus study opportunities (ranging from four-week January Term courses to semester-abroad and year-long residencies). The enthusiastic participation of a strong percentage of faculty in this effort means that over half of Linfield’s graduates complete international study of some kind and that virtually all students may choose ways to integrate an international study option within their majors or minors. Moreover, the presence of a growing population of international students on the McMinnville Campus brings the world to the college as another means of globalizing student sensibilities.

January Term provides a further example of Linfield’s support for educationally innovative programming especially suited to compressed time frames. Here too repeated faculty study and affirmation of January Term testify to its centrality in delivering the college mission.

The aspirations of the Linfield community to keep elevating the scope and excellence of its academic program are bounded only by the inescapable constraints imposed by limited resources. Yet those resource constraints are real and surface in each departmental self-
study. Nonetheless, the college is proud of the educational opportunities available to Linfield students and greatly appreciative of the individuals whose unflagging commitment to the academic mission make those opportunities so rich, various, and intellectually compelling.

2.A – General Requirements

Continuing its exclusive focus on undergraduate education, Linfield College consists of the McMinnville Campus, offering 40 majors; the Portland Campus, offering two majors; and the Division of Continuing Education (DCE) whose Adult Degree Program features seven majors—three identical to majors on the McMinnville or Portland Campuses and four specific to the Adult Degree Program (one of which is delivered through the School of Nursing). Linfield students thus may choose from among 45 distinct academic majors. Standards for and courses required/offered in each major are determined by the relevant academic department, with the approval of the college-wide Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Assembly. Teaching faculty, both permanent and adjunct, must meet the academic credentialing standards established by each department, in consultation with the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty and approved by the Faculty Assembly.

NOTE: Most of the work to prepare this standard was completed in during AY 2007–08. Consequently the data and documents cited will provide a snapshot of Linfield’s academic programs in 2007–08; the 2007–08 Linfield College Catalog serves the principal resource for readers seeking to clarify statements or pursue curricular references made in the following narrative. This was made necessary in great part because the 2008–09 college catalog does not become operative until fall semester 2008. Nor is the new catalog available as a reference document until mid-August 2008. Where the 2008–09 catalog copy is relied upon, that distinction will be made clear.

2.A.1 The institution demonstrates its commitment to high standards of teaching and learning by providing sufficient human, physical, and financial resources to support its educational programs and to facilitate student achievement of program objectives whenever and however they are offered.

The professional academic standards operating among the faculty are evidenced by the number who possess the appropriate terminal degree. According to the Institutional Data 2007 (Fact Book, p. 46), of the 147 regular faculty employed by Linfield College at that time, 87% held the institutionally designated terminal degrees in 2007–08 (94% of faculty on the McMinnville Campus, 63% of faculty on the Portland Campus). The following tables, repeated in Standard 4.A.1, provide a fuller breakdown of faculty credentials, as does Required Table 2 (Institutional Faculty Profile) placed at the end of Standard 4.

| 2.A Table 1 Percentage of Regular Faculty with Terminal Degrees, Fall 2007 |
|-------------------|-------------------|
|                   | Doctorate | Terminal Degree |
| McMinnville       | 77%       | 94%             |
| Portland          | 59%       | 63%             |
| All Linfield      | 73%       | 87%             |
### 2.A Table 2 Regular Faculty: Degrees, Fall 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>A.M.L.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.N.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D.M.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.F.A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D.N.Sc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L.S.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr.P.H.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.D.A.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.B.A. with C.P.A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.N.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2005–06, the Faculty Assembly, at the recommendation of the School of Nursing, voted to require that the terminal degree for nursing become the Ph.D. from that point onward. At this writing, 14 of the 26 tenure–track nursing faculty hold the doctorate (54%), and 12 hold master’s of nursing degrees (46%). Currently three members of the School of Nursing are pursuing doctoral studies.

### Personel (McMinnville and Portland Campuses)

As the departmental reports collected in Volume II of this self–study testify, each of Linfield’s 22 residential academic departments (as well as the library, the English Language and Culture Program, the Health Sciences Program, and the Environmental Studies Program) would welcome additional staffing to deepen and strengthen the programs it offers. Nonetheless every one of them has constructed a comprehensive curriculum that introduces students to the disciplines represented by its faculty. Widespread commitment by departments to the general education program means that the Linfield Curriculum is effectively staffed to provide intellectual breadth of experience to all Linfield students as well. Departments also cooperate in areas where prerequisites cross disciplinary lines so that the needs of students are met (e.g. mathematics, biology, psychology, chemistry, etc.).

Data below regarding class sizes, as well as student/faculty ratios and student/administrator ratios, also suggest the sufficiency if not abundance of human resources to deliver the curriculum devised by individual academic units and the Faculty Assembly as a whole.

### 2.A Table 3 Class Size and Staffing Ratio Data McMinnville and Portland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Size</th>
<th>McM</th>
<th>Ptd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Class Size 06–07</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Class Size Range 06–07</td>
<td>17 to 21</td>
<td>7 to 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staffing Ratios</th>
<th>McM</th>
<th>Ptd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Regular Faculty FTE 97–98</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Regular Faculty FTE 06–07</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Regular Faculty FTE Avg. 02–03 to 06–07</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Administrator 97–98</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Administrator 06–07</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE/Administrator Avg. 02–03 to 06–07</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the McMinnville Campus FTE student/FTE faculty ratio remained approximately the same in 1997 and 2007 should be seen in the light of two other facts: the enrolled student FTE over this period had grown from 1553 (fall 1998) to 1713 (fall 2006) while full time faculty FTE had grown from 105.3 (1997–98) to 113.1 (2006–07). See Institutional Data 2007 (Fact Book, pp. 9, 42).


The reduction in the administrator/student ratio on both campuses since 1998 reflects staff increases/status changes in these areas:
• Student services (e.g. internship and community service coordinators; learning support)
• College relations/fundraising/public relations
• Technology support
• Instructional associate hires for science labs, theatre, educational design, and clinicals
• Repositioning of newly hired athletic coaches from faculty to administrative ranks (replacement hires are now classified as administrative employees)
• Reclassification of several non-exempt positions to administrative status.

Physical Plant
The 2008–09 McMinnville Campus physical plant includes a dramatic expansion of square footage added to the college since 1998, the vast majority of it devoted to educational spaces including Nicholson Library; Ford Hall, housing both the Marshall Theatre and the Department of Theatre and Communication Arts; the three structures comprising the Miller Fine Arts Center, including a new gallery space; and the Bull Music Center. At present, 145,000 square feet of good quality instructional space are available on the McMinnville Campus. The estimated 2007 replacement value totals $175,644,669. See Standard 8.A.1 for more specific detail.

The Portland Campus occupies space leased to the college by the Legacy Health Systems (on the site that once supported the Good Samaritan School of Nursing. The estimated 2007 replacement value of facilities in Portland is $20 million. In 2007–08 Linfield secured approximately $500,000 in grant funding to combine with college funds so as to undertake long-awaited renovation of Peterson Hall, the main educational building for the Portland Campus. Upon finalization of a new lease arrangement with Legacy Health Systems, the college began this renovation in spring 2008, with plans to have it completed in time for fall 2008 classes. The college has also secured external funds to create two simulation labs for the School of Nursing since 1998. See Standard 8 for extended discussion of the physical resources of both residential campuses.

Operating Budget and Endowment
Linfield’s administrative staff devise and deliver the college’s educational mission through assiduous budget management. The all-campus 2007–08 budget (including the Division of Continuing Education) totaled $50,519,806. The five year budget average (2003–08) totaled $45,671,096. In fiscal year 1998–99, the college’s actual budget totaled $32,595,611, meaning that the 2007–08 budget represented an increase of $17,924,195, or 55%, over the last decade (Institutional Data 2007, pp. 76–77).

Since 1998, net assets as reported in college financial statements have increased as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>$37,859,327</td>
<td>$81,126,998</td>
<td>114%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
<td>$20,923,441</td>
<td>$28,176,876</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
<td>$17,583,792</td>
<td>$35,159,565</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$76,366,560</td>
<td>$144,463,439</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Standard 7 for more detail on the college’s finances.

The Division of Continuing Education
The Division of Continuing Education (DCE) enrolls about 500 students in approximately 250 credit-bearing courses. To support these students DCE employs 17 individuals (13 FTE) situated in seven locations around Oregon. The Adult Degree Program (ADP), which serves the majority of those enrolled in DCE, provides academic advising, transcript evaluation, transfer assistance, library services, computer technical assistance, and access to financial aid information to all prospective and enrolled students. DCE operates as a self-supporting unit within the college whose revenues contribute to the all-campus budget. In 2006–07, it posted expenditures of $2,086,977, revenue of $3,069,280 and a surplus of $982,303 (Institutional Data 2007, pp. 76–77).
Within DCE, traditional student/faculty ratios do not operate as they do on the residential campuses because of the online nature of the delivery format. According to the *Institutional Data 2007 (Fact Book, p. 61)*, in 2006–07 the most frequent class size (approximately 22% of offerings) numbered between 7–11, with classes of 12–16 comprising 18% of offerings and classes of 17–21 students making up 17%. The largest classes, serving between 47–51 enrollees, comprised approximately 2% of the total offerings of DCE, and the smallest enrolled 1 person (5% of classes did so). Instructor compensation is based on enrollment. See 2.G – Continuing Education for fuller discussion of the Division of Continuing Education.

2.A.2 The goals of the institution’s educational programs, whenever and however offered, including instructional policies, methods, and delivery systems, are compatible with the institution’s mission. They are developed, approved, and periodically evaluated under established institutional policies and procedures through a clearly defined process.

The Linfield College Bylaws invest the faculty with responsibility for ensuring the integrity of the academic program in all its facets. As a body, the Linfield faculty firmly supports the institutional mission (see Standard 4; Introduction) and continue a strong tradition of providing student-based liberal arts and professional education to undergraduates preparing to become global citizens. The revised college mission statement resulted from extensive conversation among the faculty about the nature of the educational experience they seek to foster and reflect the aspirations of the faculty in their daily work with students in classrooms, labs, co-curricular activities, collaborative research, academic advising, and mentoring (see Standard 1.A.1 for discussion of the mission statement revision process).

The above-mentioned data concerning median class sizes and student/faculty ratios on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses speak to the importance given on both residential campuses to relatively small classes that allow faculty to deliver intellectually challenging content along with scaffolded support to assist students in reaching the high academic standards set for them. In this way the faculty’s educational practices and delivery systems foster each of the goals set forth in the mission.

The annual college catalog publishes the educational goals of each academic program within the appropriate departmental section, as well as extensive explanations of academic policies of the college (see the *2007 Linfield College Catalog*, pp. 7–18). Departmental and program websites also provide program-specific information related to goals and requirements. Syllabi are expected to identify the learning objectives of each course, including their role within the general education program where applicable.

The *Faculty Handbook* outlines the educational policies in operation for the faculty (IV.1–3). Through its standing committees, the faculty sets policy related to attendance, graduation requirements, and the structures of majors and minors. Yearly catalog revisions document curricular changes in accordance with the actions of the Faculty Assembly during the preceding year. The Office of Academic Affairs closely reviews each new edition of the catalog before it goes to press to ensure that institutional practice remains clear, as well as consistent with the will of the faculty, regarding educational policy.

Faculty oversight of the educational program begins with academic departments, which design, deliver, and monitor majors and minors. Changes in published educational policy are proposed to the appropriate standing committee, which reviews and forwards recommendations to the Faculty Assembly. The Enrollment, Retention and Student Life Committee (ERSL), for example, oversaw the development of new Greek Academic Standards in keeping with its charge to recommend policy concerning residential life, including Greek life, to the faculty [Exhibit 4].
The central governance body in regard to the college’s academic program is the Curriculum Committee (to which all other departmentally based entities submit requests to revise the status quo). The Curriculum Committee reviews and must recommend to the Faculty Assembly all proposals to revise major or minor requirements, create a new course or major, and delete existing courses or majors. Each month’s Faculty Assembly agenda contains a written Curriculum Committee report. The Assembly’s actions in relation to this report and any motions it contains are recorded in the Assembly minutes [Exhibit 5]. The Curriculum Committee and all other standing committees of the faculty include student members. See Attachment II–C for an inventory of degree programs added or deleted since 2003.

Where curriculum renewal efforts prove especially complex, the Faculty Assembly has created special task forces charged with the responsibility for conducting specified reviews. Such was the case with the recent revision of Linfield’s general education program called The Linfield Curriculum. In May 2005 the Faculty Assembly authorized the creation of an ad hoc General Education Review Committee (GERC) comprised of members elected from the four academic divisions as well as ex officio members (the dean of faculty and college librarian). The committee began its work in fall 2005, held numerous public meetings with interested faculty about the various subsets of the general education program, consulted at several key points with the entire campus community (including a fall 2006 faculty-wide retreat and at least two open campus meetings in spring 2007), and eventually presented a revision proposal that was adopted with an 88% vote of the faculty assembly in spring 2007. The adoption of specific learning goals for each area of the revised Linfield Curriculum occurred at the December 2007 Faculty Assembly. Assembly approval of new assessment practices to track progress on those goals occurred in spring 2008 (see 2.C.1–3 for a fuller discussion of general education).

All courses offered by the Division of Continuing Education (DCE) originate and fall under the supervision of the academic department with which they are associated. Any new course development or modification to existing courses must involve collaboration between DCE and the appropriate academic department, from where it goes to the Curriculum Committee and ultimately the Faculty Assembly. New adjunct hires in DCE and the textbook selections of non-residential faculty are reviewed by the DCE liaison in each department. Beginning in fall 2008, departmental liaisons are to be provided with syllabi for these courses as well, a change in practice that will likely take some time to achieve full compliance, given long-time adjuncts’ accustomed practices in DCE. Approximately 16 residential faculty have taught in the DCE program over the last three years, as do a number of emeriti faculty not included in that figure; in most cases these instructors deliver the same course content in both the residential and online teaching environments. See 2.G—Continuing Education for a additional information about efforts to strengthen communication around faculty oversight of the DCE curriculum.

Faculty in all three arms of the college increasingly employ web-based course delivery either as part of or as the only mode of instructional interaction with students. The web platform Blackboard provides the basis for their online activities. On the McMinnville and Portland Campuses an increasing number of hybrid classes are being offered (combining traditional classroom-based instruction with web-based components). In the Division of Continuing Education, the vast majority of classes have moved online, in keeping with student preference as evidenced by enrollment patterns.

To support faculty in the development of online pedagogical skills, the McMinnville Campus has hired an Ed.D. in curriculum and instruction (emphasis on educational technology) who is housed centrally in Nicholson Library. The faculty voiced a desire
for greater support in this area and the efforts by Dr. Jo Meyertos in this regard have been greatly appreciated. The expansion of "smart" and "semi-smart" classrooms has also proceed steadily over the past decade, as described in Standard 8.A.1–2. On the Portland Campus, a fall 2007 consultancy assessed the needs of the faculty regarding technology support and resultant improvements began in spring 2008. See 8.A.2.

DCE provides on-line pedagogical training for individual faculty through two consultants hired as course designers to help instructors select the tools and structure the course to ensure a quality educational experience.

2.A.3 Degree and certificate programs demonstrate a coherent design; are characterized by appropriate breadth, depth, sequencing of courses, synthesis of learning, and the assessment of learning outcomes; and require the use of library and other information sources.

The educational mission, coherence, breadth, depth, currency, and assessment of each major is discussed in the section of this standard dedicated to individual academic departments and programs (see Volume II of the accreditation report). Departments regularly review their curricula through a variety of efforts including yearly retreats, internal reviews, and outside consultancies. Departmental annual reports and assessment plans document these efforts [Exhibits 6, 7]. In spring 2006 the Curriculum Committee, in conjunction with the Office of Academic Affairs, began considering ways to formalize departmental reviews that would involve the committee as well as the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty. A regularized rotation of departments through the review process would ensure ongoing collegial conversation both within and beyond a department about its foundational assumptions and student learning outcomes. At the May 2008 Faculty Assembly the committee introduced a motion regarding the initiation of such a process; a second reading and fuller discussion of the proposal will occur in 2008–09.

Linfield's librarians are intimately connected with the divisional structure organizing academic departments into four distinct groupings (Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and the Portland Campus). All librarians are members of the faculty and thus vote within the Faculty Assembly on curricular matters. Most of the librarians participate directly in the educational mission of the faculty through their contributions to information literacy instruction; this starts with their heavy involvement in the first year Inquiry Seminar program and extends across the curriculum into most senior capstone experiences. Through these efforts the college librarians and other staff members in the Linfield library system work closely and regularly with departmental faculty to become familiar with the particular nuances of various departments’ educational agendas. Those who deliver specialized instruction also administer student evaluations to assess the outcomes of their efforts and strategize improvements.

Of DCE’s seven majors, three are identical to McMinnville Campus majors: Accounting, Management (“General Business” on the residential campus), and International Business. The course content, prerequisites, learning outcomes, and sequence within each major replicate those of the Business Department.

The RN to BSN major is delivered by DCE but is overseen directly by the School of Nursing, which in summer 2008 hired a new associate dean of nursing for distance education to manage the growing program and ensure its congruence with the goals of the residential BSN program.

DCE offers three majors not offered elsewhere in the college: Arts and Humanities (A&H),
Social and Behavior Sciences (SBS), and Business Information Systems (BIS). These interdisciplinary majors were vetted by the appropriate academic divisions at the time of their creation, then reviewed by the Curriculum Committee, and finally adopted by the Faculty Assembly. An assessment plan relying on student completion of electronic portfolios has been developed for the Arts and Humanities major and was approved by the Arts and Humanities Division in 2007–08. The Continuing Education Committee will review it in fall 2008 and will present its recommendation to the Faculty Assembly. The Social and Behavioral Sciences Division will undertake a review of the SBS major in 2008–09 [DCE Exhibit 35]. The BIS major has been revised by the Department of Computer Science both in 2002 and 2006.

DCE offers Linfield’s only certificates. The four certificate programs in Accounting, Human Resource Management, Marketing, and Computer information Systems (with three distinct tracks), were approved by the relevant academic departments, the Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Assembly. All courses in these certificate options are credit-bearing, are drawn from courses offered by academic departments, and undergo the same approval and review process described above.

2.A.4 The institution uses degree designators consistent with program content. In each field of study or technical program, degree objectives are clearly defined: the content to be covered, the intellectual skills, the creative capabilities, and the methods of inquiry to be acquired; and, if applicable, the specific career-preparation competencies to be mastered.

Linfield publishes each major’s learning goals in the annually updated catalog. These goals provide the basis upon which each department assesses student learning outcomes in its programs. Assessment plans are discussed in the individual departmental self-studies published in Volume II of this accreditation report. See also Exhibit 6 for the summary document entitled 2007–08 Linfield College Assessment Plan, as well as previous iterations of this volume. Each of the academic concentrations in DCE falls under the responsibility for oversight of the comparable residential departments or divisions. See 2.B.2: Division of Continuing Education Assessment for additional information.

2.A.5 The institution provides evidence that students enrolled in programs offered in concentrated or abbreviated timeframes demonstrate mastery of program goals and course objectives.

Linfield provides academic programs in several concentrated or abbreviated formats: the four-week January Term on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, a variety of short course offerings throughout the academic year in the Portland Campus School of Nursing; and varying-length terms administered by the Division of Continuing Education (these include a five-week winter term, a ten-week summer session, and a thirteen-week fall and spring semester). The syllabi for courses taught in non-standard terms on the residential campuses are carefully reviewed to ensure compliance with college policy regarding instructor availability and contact hours appropriate to the number of credits earned (see 2.A.6 below). The one exception to this emphasis on contact hours involves off-campus study-abroad courses where students often convene six or seven days a week for varying amounts of time. Many departments restrict the offering of prerequisite classes in the major to the standard semester to ensure sufficient breadth and duration for delivery and mastery of course content.

The courses offered by DCE in the five-week Winter Term and the ten-week Summer Term
have the same curricular requirements and learning outcomes of courses offered in DCE’s 13-week semesters. The amount of student involvement, such as required reading, research, papers, and online discussion is reviewed by the DCE dean using a syllabus evaluation tool [see DCE Exhibit 6]. As of spring 2008 DCE will also share these syllabi with the departmental faculty liaisons, in keeping with a broad-based effort to improve the timeliness of oversight activities among all parties. Courses offered through the web-based platform Blackboard (the vast majority of DCE classes) require regular, frequent interactions between the instructor and the students, as well as among the enrollees themselves. These requirements must appear in each course syllabus. The student evaluation form for online courses includes questions about the amount and quality of interaction experienced and the responsiveness of the faculty member [DCE Exhibit 4]. Student feedback does not indicate significant differences in their experience of traditional length vs. abbreviated length classes. DCE faculty who teach these courses in both traditional and abbreviated formats also report that they do not find any significant differences in learning outcomes. See sample syllabi and surveys among DCE Exhibit 17 and 36.

2.A.6 The institution is able to equate its learning experiences with semester or quarter credit hours using practices common to institutions of higher education, to justify the lengths of its programs in comparison to similar programs found in regionally accredited institutions of higher education, and to justify any program-specific tuition in terms of program costs, program length, and program objectives.

On the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, semesters unfold over 15 weeks. Classes range between 1–6 credits per course with commensurate contact hours (compliance is reviewed by the Curriculum Committee at the time of course creation). The number of credits earned by any given class follows the definition accorded a unit of credit in the college catalog: “Normally, Linfield grants one credit for fifteen 50-minute periods of instruction (including discussion, testing, etc.) or equivalent. Laboratories of two or three hours are considered the equivalent of one period of instruction” (2007 Linfield College Catalog, p.12).

The McMinnville Campus has retained the same residential calendar that operated in 1998—two semesters of fifteen weeks each plus a January Term of four weeks. By faculty action in 1998, January Term courses may not exceed four credits unless a fifth week is added to the syllabus to provide sufficient content and contact hours to justify five credits. No five credit classes are currently offered in January Term. Greater variability in course length exists on the Portland Campus, with some classes lasting the standard fifteen weeks while others may be 2–3 weeks long and still others six weeks in duration. In each case the amount of credit awarded is predicated on the formula quoted in the paragraph above.

All courses offered in DCE bear the amount of credit approved by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Assembly. The length of programs offered in DCE varies and includes two thirteen-week semesters, one five-week Winter Term, and a ten-week Summer Term. As noted above, DCE courses are designed to provide contact hours and content delivery commensurate with the traditional length semester version of the same courses.

Linfield College charges three distinct tuition rates: the rate for the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, the rate for the Division of Continuing Education, and the rate for obtaining licensure as a post-baccalaureate student. Each of these rates reflects the differing levels of services provided enrollees. The tuition differential between DCE and the rest of the college results from the limited availability to DCE students of scholarships, health care, residence life, and student activities such as clubs, organizations, and
athletics (this fact is communicated to enrollees upon their application to DCE). The lower fee charged for students who qualify for the post-baccalaureate rate reflects their having exhausted their financial aid as (typically) fifth-year students. In addition, a January Term per-credit fee of $160 (as of 2008–09) is charged to full time students who enroll in its optional courses.

2.A.7 Responsibility for design, approval, and implementation of the curriculum is vested in designated institutional bodies with clearly established channels of communication and control. The faculty has a major role and responsibility in the design, integrity, and implementation of the curriculum.

As stated in the Bylaws of Linfield College, “The Faculty Assembly shall prescribe, with the concurrence of the President, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, requirements for admission, conditions of graduation, the nature of degrees to be conferred, and rules and methods of educational work of the College . . . .” In practice, the Board of Trustees has made the Faculty Assembly sovereign in curricular matters. Departments submit all curricular changes (including creation, re-design, and deletion of majors/minors, additions and deletions of courses, general educational requirements, etc.) to the Curriculum Committee, which reports directly to the Faculty Assembly, where faculty curricular authority is vested. When curricular changes require authorization but the Assembly does not meet (summer, for example), the Faculty Executive Council (FEC) is empowered to act on its behalf.

These practices operate for all arms of the college, including the Division of Continuing Education, where the curriculum derives from approved offerings of the residential programs and receives oversight by academic departments and divisions. To this end, a faculty member in each department serves as liaison to the Division of Continuing Education [DCE Exhibit 9]. In 2007–08, the faculty Continuing Education Committee moved the liaison cohort to become an actual advisory body for the DCE dean and the committee itself through joint dinner meetings held once a semester. Processes to ensure more timely communications among the relevant groups continue to be developed.

2.A.8 Faculty, in partnership with library and information resources personnel, ensure that the use of library and information resources is integrated into the learning process.

Each year, academic departments are accorded a specific budget by the director of the library for purchases requested in support of their programs. The library acquisitions director regularly provides departments information on new works of interest in their areas and conducts periodic reviews of the relevant collections in order to identify and fill holes. The library director also consults regularly with department chairs about their preferred periodicals and about changes occurring in the availability of electronic databases. The faculty Academic Support Committee advises on library policy.

Five of the six librarians directly engage in informational literacy instruction as part of specific classes, most notably in the first year Inquiry Seminar but also through invited participation in a great many junior and senior capstone courses across the disciplines. The mission of Linfield’s library is unusual among college libraries in that it emphasizes collaboration with faculty to teach students effective information retrieval and evaluation strategies in all formats. As noted extensively in Standard 5.A.1, such participation by the librarians in faculty-led courses has steadily
grown over the past decade, particularly on the McMinnville Campus following the opening of Nicholson Library. Students evaluate the instruction provided by the college librarians through formal written assessments that are placed in their personnel files for regular review.

The Portland Campus branch library has one tenured librarian. A LibQual survey conducted in spring 2005 documented the exceptional service provided by the staff and identified the deficits of the library space, some of which have been resolved through modest renovations.

One McMinnville-based librarian has a .5 appointment to the Division of Continuing Education. This librarian collaborates with DCE faculty and creates course-specific content for them. She is also added as a member to online courses for easy availability to students. Each online course has direct links to Linfield’s library web pages [DCE Exhibit 12].

The Linfield library system affects student learning most directly through its information resources and services, including the trained staff that develop and deliver them. The library collections directly reflect the teaching mission of the college. Hence the library’s commitment is two-fold: (1) to build excellent collections of and access to a broad and deep landscape of resources; and (2) to teach students, in collaboration with faculty, how to use those resources effectively. The library supports Linfield’s plan [Exhibit 32] “to prepare students to be thoughtfully engaged in a world that demands ever more flexible, creative, and critical thinkers and communicators.” Accordingly, library personnel work closely with the college community on both campuses, as well as with the faculty and staff of DCE, to ensure that library services and collections make sense in themselves and satisfy reasonable expectations of the faculty and students. The college librarian meets regularly with the Academic Support Committee, administrators in the Office of Academic Affairs, and academic department chairs to facilitate assessment and secure guidance on library issues.

Until 2000, all librarians were hired as faculty members. Accordingly, five of the six Linfield College librarians hold tenure and have been promoted under the standard review processes of the faculty. The most recently hired librarian has the title Assistant Professor but is in a non-tenure track position.

2.A.9 The institution’s curriculum (programs and courses) is planned both for optimal learning and accessible scheduling.

Student learning is optimized by preparing new students for the rigors of college-level work, paying careful attention to and enforcing prerequisites, and challenging students throughout their course of study with work of increasing complexity. This occurs both in the development of the general education program and within the structuring of each major.

The Linfield Curriculum (the college general education program, adopted in 1997 and revised in 2007) builds upon a required first year Inquiry Seminar designed to help new college students learn to ask interesting, intellectually driven questions and to begin to formulate disciplined answers. For the most part it relies on departmentally based classes that encourage students to recognize that general education exists on a continuum with, rather than apart from, the curricular paths that define the college’s majors. In this way the Linfield Curriculum rests upon course offerings where departments systematically structure the level of difficulty through assigned course numbers and the use of prerequisites. The revised Linfield Curriculum, implemented in 2008–09, requires students to take one course in six so-called Modes of Inquiry and at least a second class at the upper division in one of those Modes; this is done to
ensure that at least one general education requirement prompts students to study beyond the introductory level. The faculty have also approved a set of learning outcomes meant to provide intentional points of commonality among the varied offerings that satisfy each requirement. To foster continued consistency in achieving these learning outcomes, a number of faculty working groups will rotate responsibility for reviewing, on a regular basis, the courses taught within each required area of the Linfield Curriculum (see 2.B.1/General Education Assessment, and 2.C.2/General Education).

In relation to academic majors, each department or affiliated faculty group (in the case of interdisciplinary majors) carefully identifies and arranges the appropriate sequencing of courses and makes sure students are apprised of this information through published materials and academic advising. Prerequisites are clearly identified, with waivers permitted only on an individual basis pending instructor approval. Due to staffing limitations, many courses are offered on an alternating schedule of which students are apprised either in the college catalog or through their advising sessions with departmental faculty. DCE schedules its courses in rolling two-year cycles to ensure students can plan their coursework optimally, complete prerequisites, and satisfy general education and major requirements.

In 2002–03 the McMinnville Campus initiated a new class scheduling system to address student concerns about too many courses competing for the same time slots. The new approach also sought to distribute classroom usage more evenly across the day and throughout the week to maximize the use of available space. This new schedule relegates classes that meet for longer than 50 minute sessions to specific days and times. Students do indeed now have more access to a wider array of classes. New problems have arisen, however, due to inconsistent time breaks between class periods, as well as because of the system’s break from standardized start and stop times for all classes in a given hour. These difficulties have prompted many faculty and students to call for a redesign of the class scheduling template, something the Curriculum Committee has deferred until the transition to the revised Linfield Curriculum had been completed. On the Portland Campus, the challenge of arranging clinicals continues to complicate the scheduling of campus-based classes, both for faculty and students.

2.A.10 Credit for prior experiential learning is awarded only in accordance with Policy 2.3 Credit for Prior Experiential Learning.

Credit for prior experiential learning is accorded only through the Division of Continuing Education, which operates a rigorous portfolio assessment process. Review of all student portfolios submitted for prior learning credit occurs within the relevant academic department. Linfield procedures conform to Policy 2.3, as discussed in 2.G—Continuing Education. See DCE Exhibit 25, 26, 27.

2.A.11 Policies, regulations, and procedures for additions and deletions of courses or programs are systematically and periodically reviewed, AND

2.A.12 In the event of program elimination or significant change in requirements, institutional policy requires appropriate arrangements to be made for enrolled students to complete their program in a timely manner and with a minimum of disruption.

As noted in 2.A.2 above, proposals to add or delete courses or programs undergo careful review by the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Assembly. Departments involved, as well as the college as a whole, take into account the need to accommodate students...
who might otherwise be disadvantaged by such changes. For example, with the adoption of the revised Linfield Curriculum, continuing students will be allowed to choose which set of general education requirements they will pursue for graduation credits (though they must adhere completely to the specifics of their chosen model and not move back and forth between them).

Similarly, when the requirements of a major are changed, students already in the pipeline are permitted to graduate under the requirements in force when they entered the college.

The biggest programmatic change at Linfield in the last decade has involved the decision to move the Portland Campus to a transfer-only model beginning in fall 2005. All students enrolled in the four-year matriculation model were provided with the courses they needed to graduate and have now done so. See Standard 1.B.1 and 4.A.2 for a fuller discussion of this decision. One result of this move has been the redesign of the Health Sciences major to operate within the constraints of the upper division transfer-only program now in place on the Portland Campus. Here too every effort has been made to see those students already in the program through to graduation.

2.B – Educational Program Planning and Assessment

2.B.1 The institution’s processes for assessing its educational programs are clearly defined, encompass all of its offerings, are conducted on a regular basis, and are integrated into the overall planning and evaluation plan. These processes are consistent with the institution’s assessment plan as required by Policy 2.2 Educational Assessment. While key constituents are involved in the process, the faculty have a central role in planning and evaluating the educational programs.

Over the last decade the college has consistently emphasized the importance of assessing student learning as part of faculty conversations around curricular review and revision. This has brought more tangible results at the institutional and departmental levels than in general education, although some progress has been made in that arena as well.

Institutional Assessment of the Linfield Academic Experience

A number of regular assessment efforts operate at the institutional level. By increasing the institutional researcher position to full time in 2003, turnover in the job has ended and data collection has stabilized and expanded. Institutional Data 2007 (Fact Book, p. 6) documents the college’s rolling five year graduation rate: between 1998 and 2003, the figure varied from a low of 55.9% (1999) to a high of 64.7% (2000). The most recent calculation (for 2003) is 62.6%. The annually administered Senior Survey tabulates pending graduates’ satisfaction levels with their educational experience at Linfield. Results are sent each fall to every academic program and the DCE dean for analysis of individual unit effectiveness in meeting educational objectives. Most of the academically-oriented questions in the survey ask students to evaluate their major departments and the general education program (see Department Reports volume).
The adoption of the *Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12* prompted revision of the senior survey for 2007 to secure student feedback on elements of their educational experience directly pertinent to the mission and the Foundational Education Principles. Questions were also included to ask about the totality of respondents’ academic experience. The tables below detail student perceptions of Linfield in relation to strongly held liberal arts values of the institution as embodied in the strategic plan. *Note: the 2006 survey did not include comparison questions in a number of areas, as indicated by “n/a.”*

2.B Table 1 Student Perceptions of Liberal Arts Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Survey Question</th>
<th>McMinnville</th>
<th></th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th></th>
<th>DCE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Percentage combines ‘moderately/greatly’ responses</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned to think critically/analyze effectively</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned how different fields interrelate</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared me for graduate/prof. study</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostered global/multicultural awareness</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared me for lifelong learning</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained in-depth knowledge of a field</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand moral/ethical issues</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used theoretical/practical knowledge</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have developed intellectual self-confidence</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Percentages combine ‘satisfied/very satisfied’ responses</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with faculty as whole</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching as a whole</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning across curriculum</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Percentages combine ‘agree/strongly agree’ responses</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The [major] program pursued was academically stimulating</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data results suggest that the faculty has reason to be encouraged about Linfield graduates’ perceived growth as critical thinkers committed to lifelong learning. The facts that 85% or more of respondents in all arms of the college in both survey years reported themselves well-prepared for advanced study beyond Linfield, and that, in 2007, the vast majority regarded themselves as having developed intellectual self-confidence, testify to students’ widespread embrace of the educational ideals of the institution. Moreover, perceived gains in cross-disciplinary understanding substantiate the emphasis placed upon integrative learning in the strategic plan as well as in the mission.

The data also indicate, however, that the college has had slightly less success in developing students’ global and multicultural awareness, an academic goal whose placement as Foundational Education Principle Two suggests that the institution has further work to do in this regard. One step in that direction is represented by the revised general education program, which now contains two stand-alone Diversity Requirements (see 2.C.3); this change may produce better student outcomes.
in the near future, as should continuing efforts to expand the percentage of students who study abroad either through semester or January Term programs (see 2.G – International Education). It is worth noting that among the individualized comments made by seniors on these surveys, enthusiasm for their study abroad experiences surfaces repeatedly and strongly. The challenge for the college looking ahead, then, is to make such opportunities feasible for more Linfield undergraduates.

Another institutional vehicle for assessing McMinnville-based students’ perception of their academic engagement has involved the administration of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2005 and 2007 (timing that admittedly yields data on different student cohorts). The NSSE data provides information comparing Linfield’s McMinnville Campus with like institutions [Exhibit 9]. The lists of “selected peers” are located at the front of each of the two NSSE reports in Exhibit 9. It is important to note that these lists are not identical; only four schools appear on both lists, all of them PACCON (Pacific Consortium of West Coast Small Colleges) peer institutions. The 2005 peer group included several other “western comprehensive” institutions among whom Linfield was then grouped by U.S. News and World Report (a category dropped in 2007). In 2007 the list only contained PACCON institutions that had participated in NSSE that year.

Exhibit 10 contains summaries of informative results accrued from each survey in relation to broad-based educational objectives of the college. In 2005, 56% of first and fourth year students responded to the invitation to participate in the survey; in 2007, 55% did so. The surveys document first year and senior student perceptions of the academic challenges they found at Linfield in each of the survey years, as well as the level of perceived effort they exerted to meet those challenges. Some observations regarding these data:

- Senior respondents report being more or equally challenged academically than first year students reported being;
- Senior mean responses were lower than first year responses in several areas including three related to the academic program: taking exams that challenge them to do their best work; preparing for academic activities like class; and experiencing an institutional environment that provides support to succeed.
- In both 2005 and 2007 seniors reported having fewer assigned textbooks, books, or book-length reading packets than first year students reported, and all four cohort groups showed a statistically lower score in this area than those at peer institutions.

In the NSSE Benchmarking Reports that accompany the survey results Linfield responses are compared to the peers’ and NSSE percentiles’ on the basis of benchmarks of effective practice – academic challenge, active/collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching educational experiences, and supportive campus environment. Collectively this benchmarking data suggests that Linfield’s average level of student engagement may fall at or roughly above the median for the NSSE universe but has a way to go to enter into the ranks of the top 10% of institutions where students report the highest levels of engagement in their educational experiences. These results have been shared with the President’s Cabinet; the college-wide Planning Council; the Enrollment, Retention, and Student Life Committee; the Accreditation Steering Committee; academic department chairs; the director of the college writing program; and the chair of the General Education Review Committee (GERC). Selected administrators in the Offices of Enrollment Management and Academic Advising, as well as with the college institutional researcher have also received copies.

To date there has been no faculty-wide conversation about these NSSE results,
although the *Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12* affirms faculty commitment to the fostering of liberal arts values such as critical thinking, oral and written communication skills, broad and integrated intellectual discovery, and the merger of theory and praxis, all of which students report having experienced in pursuit of their degrees, particularly at the senior level. The Senior Survey asks a number of related questions, as noted above and in Exhibit 8, and student responses indicate widespread satisfaction with their growth toward mastering these intellectual competencies.

Academic departments stand in the best position to discuss and adopt measures to address NSSE results that speak to the level of student engagement at the college. The scores reported by first year students hold special salience for those delivering general education classes heavily populated by new college students, particularly Inquiry Seminar instructors. The enhanced assessment practices for that course (see in 2.C.5—General Education) will provide a ready venue for analysis of the NSSE information on the reading, writing, speaking, independent learning, and intellectual self-examination fostered in the first year.

Similarly, members of the faculty review panels recently convened to develop assessment measurements for each area of the revised general education program (the Linfield Curriculum) will find both the first and senior year data instructive as they devise strategies for ensuring reflective integration of ongoing learning as part of the general education experience (which extends across all four years). The upper division “Integrative Seminar” approved as a pilot general education course promises rich opportunities for faculty to develop classes where students engage in intentional academic synthesis across disciplines—a learning experience that the NSSE data suggest would strengthen student perceptions of the degree of challenge they experience in their later college years.

Linfield will continue to administer NSSE every four years to provide a regular source of institutional and comparative data for evaluating the student experience of a Linfield education. In addition, the college will consider administering the Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE) to provide companion data on faculty perceptions of the educational experience they are providing.

The college conducts alumni surveys as another means of securing feedback on the efficacy of a Linfield education. These surveys have been conducted occasionally over the past decade. In 2006–07, the Office of Institutional Research, together with the Offices of Academic Affairs, Career Services, and Alumni Relations, developed a pair of surveys for annual distribution beginning in the fall 2007 to all Linfield alumni one year out and ten years out from graduation. Complete results may be found in Exhibit 31. Given the small respondent pool in each case (32% in McMinnville; 20% in Portland; 28% in DCE), generalizable conclusions are difficult to draw, particularly since selection bias among those who chose to reply may be at work. Employment and post-graduate educational data are tabulated on p. 4 of the survey results. More important for educational assessment are the data recorded on pp. 16–29 in response to questions that derive from the Senior Survey as it was revised in 2006–07.
In addition to college-wide alumni surveys, the Offices of Academic Affairs and College Relations launched an electronic survey tool for use by academic departments wishing to contact graduates for feedback on their major curricula from their current vantage points in the workforce or graduate school. Departmental findings based on this survey are included within the individual self-studies in Volume II.

**Departmentally-based Assessment**
Linfield has a well-established system of student evaluations for individual courses. Results are tabulated in the weeks following each semester and are placed in the professional files of both regular and adjunct faculty members, to which the appropriate department chairs have access. Regular faculty are formally reviewed by the dean of faculty and the department chair through the performance evaluation process explained in the Faculty Handbook (IV.4–6.5.3) and in Standard 4 of this self-study. In DCE, the departmental liaison shares this responsibility with the DCE dean; the liaison is also advised to share teaching evaluation results for departmental courses with the chair. This entire effort necessarily focuses on student perception of an instructor’s effectiveness rather than offering a measurement of the actual learning accomplished in the class. Many faculty regard the grades they assign as their primary means of documenting individual student progress toward the goals of specific classes.

In terms of a faculty-based comprehensive approach to assessing student learning, then-Vice President for Academic Affairs Marv Henberg explained in the 1998 accreditation self-study that the faculty had at that time reached a “consensus . . . that, given its variety of disciplines, Linfield would be best served by a decentralized approach” to the process so as to take into account the very different

---

**2.B Table 2 2007 Alumni Survey Responses to Selected Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alumni Survey Questions</th>
<th>McMinnville 1 Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
<th>Portland 1 Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
<th>DCE 1Yr</th>
<th>10 Yr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages combine “moderately/greatly” responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned to think critically/analyze effectively</td>
<td>92% 94%</td>
<td></td>
<td>82% 83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>97% 87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned how different fields interrelate</td>
<td>92% 86%</td>
<td></td>
<td>66% 64%</td>
<td></td>
<td>95% 81%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared me for graduate/prof. study</td>
<td>82% 81%</td>
<td></td>
<td>64% 76%</td>
<td></td>
<td>88% 65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fostered global/multicultural awareness</td>
<td>74% 69%</td>
<td></td>
<td>46% 58%</td>
<td></td>
<td>78% 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared me for lifelong learning</td>
<td>89% 90%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60% 68%</td>
<td></td>
<td>93% 87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained in-depth knowledge of a field</td>
<td>88% 83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>90% 94%</td>
<td></td>
<td>89% 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand moral/ethical issues</td>
<td>79% 73%</td>
<td></td>
<td>62% 65%</td>
<td></td>
<td>68% 71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used theoretical/practical knowledge</td>
<td>94% 94%</td>
<td></td>
<td>80% 83%</td>
<td></td>
<td>87% 89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have developed intellectual self-confidence</td>
<td>87% 91%</td>
<td></td>
<td>60% 70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>92% 78%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentages combine “satisfied/very satisfied” responses</strong></td>
<td>98% n/a</td>
<td>75% n/a</td>
<td>95% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>82% n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with faculty as whole</td>
<td>97% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>81% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>92% n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching as a whole</td>
<td>87% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>73% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>82% n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning across curriculum</td>
<td>88% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>80% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>89% n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in major</td>
<td>85% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>49% n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>84% n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses outside of major</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with Linfield education</td>
<td>n/a 96%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a 88%</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a 97%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
educational programs operating within “a college with a liberal arts orientation, a broad profile of professional programs, and an ambitious Division of Continuing Education” (1998 Linfield College Self-Study, Standard II, p. 42). That consensus has not changed over the intervening decade. In 1995 Dr. Henberg initiated the practice of requiring all departments to submit annual reports to the Office of Academic Affairs and requested that they include the following elements: (1) curricular highlights; (2) faculty activity and achievement; (3) student activity and achievement; (4) assessment. The latter category prompted each department to determine how best to evaluate its effectiveness in accomplishing the learning goals published in its section of the college catalog. He later requested that each department refine the assessment section of its annual report to include a common format built upon three components: (1) goals for the major/minor; (2) means of assessing achievement of these goals; (3) use of assessment in curricular planning. This effort produced regularly revised assessment plans published in 1999-00; 2001-02; 2003-05; 2005-06; and 2007-08 (accreditation edition), each time under the title Linfield College Assessment Plan [Exhibit 6].

The all-college Planning Council periodically reviewed departmental and administrative annual reports but wider community discussions infrequently occurred. With the adoption of the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12, the Council advised on the revision of the annual reporting form to bring it into closer alignment with the Foundational Principles. Beginning in 2009–10, the officers of the President’s Cabinet will provide the Council every September with a written summary of contributions from his/her area regarding the goals of the strategic plan. The Council will review these summaries and disseminate them each fall semester to the college community. Distribution of this information, along with results of the previous spring’s Senior Survey, will assist the Council in recommending priorities to the Budget Advisory Council regarding strategic priorities for that year’s budget deliberations, particularly regarding enhancement of student learning based on departmental feedback.

Since 1998, departmentally focused external consultancies have occurred sporadically at the request either of individual departments or the dean of faculty. Such consultancies were undertaken, for example, by the Business Department, Political Science Department, and the Exercise Science program within Health, Human Performance, and Athletic Training (see academic departments’ exhibit binders). The Modern Languages Department undertook a wholesale review through the guidance of an educational technology consultant, Dr. Paula Gunder. Professionally accredited departments (Education, Nursing, Music, and Athletic Training) undergo re-accreditation on cycles that overlap with the college-wide self-study (see academic departments’ exhibit binders). Departments regularly undertake their own reviews, often through scheduled retreats, and describe the outcomes in their annual reports (as well as through curricular revisions submitted to the Curriculum Committee). The hiring of new faculty frequently triggers such self-examination and redefinition, as has been the case recently with the Departments of Art and Visual Culture, Chemistry, Music, Philosophy, and Modern Languages. Several departments conduct such retreats annually (for example, Biology and Theatre/Communication Arts). An increase in departmental budgets to ensure yearly retreats across programs would contribute significantly to this form of ongoing assessment within the Office of Academic Affairs.

In 2006–07, the then-Dean of Faculty Barbara Seidman began conversations with the Curriculum Committee about launching a regular rotation of departmental reviews under their joint auspices to ensure that each department engages the broader faculty community in discussion of their departmental goals, measured outcomes, and planned curricular revisions based on best practices in the discipline. In May 2008 the Curriculum Committee introduced a motion (for first reading) proposing a departmental review
system; discussion of the committee’s recommendation will occur in 2008–09 in conjunction with the arrival of new Dean of Faculty Victoria McGillin.

**General Education Assessment**

As noted in 2.C.1–3, the faculty undertook an extensive review of the college’s general education program (the Linfield Curriculum or LC) from fall 2005 through spring 2007. Intermediate efforts had occurred in the late 1990’s, under the auspices of the Curriculum Committee, to assess faculty perceptions of the effectiveness of the original LC (adopted in 1997) and reported on their findings to the Faculty Assembly [Exhibit 11]; no systematic attempt to evaluate the learning outcomes of the program took place, however. In 2005 the Faculty Executive Council convened the ad hoc General Education Review Committee (GERC) to determine the faculty’s satisfaction with the program nearly a decade later and to recommend possible changes. During their two years of deliberation, GERC members also addressed the need to devise a true assessment of student learning achieved through the general education program. Accordingly, GERC’s proposal for a revised Linfield Curriculum, adopted by the Faculty Assembly in fall 2007, included specified learning goals for each requirement [Exhibit 12]. Faculty panels convened in 2007–08 began the initial process by soliciting and reviewing departmental proposals for courses seeking general education eligibility. In spring 2008 these panels forwarded their recommendations to the Curriculum Committee for further review and eventual recommendation to the Faculty Assembly. This process was completed by the end of spring semester 2008 for implementation in AY 2008–09.

During 2008–09, another round of faculty working groups (comprised of instructors from each area of the LC) will devise a formal assessment mechanism for evaluating student learning outcomes associated with each LC requirement. Once those assessment strategies have been devised and approved by the Faculty Assembly, the working groups will begin meeting on a rotating basis to review their respective learning goals and attendant student outcomes, making recommendations for revisions as needed. This process should ensure a continuity of purpose among faculty teaching in every area of the LC and will provide a baseline set of assumptions on which to build more comprehensive assessment practices examining cumulative learning outcomes in general education [Exhibit 13]. Faculty participants will be modestly remunerated for their efforts.

As with academic departments, the variety of the disciplines, instructors, and pedagogies contributing to the LC mitigates against one uniform approach to program assessment. Drawing upon the best assessment practices already at work within departments contributing to each LC category, every faculty panel will devise an evaluation tool suited to that category’s dominant methodologies and representative assignments. Furthermore, the assessment tool adopted will need to be adapted to the unique circumstances on the Portland Campus, where most transfer students from outside Linfield will have completed their general education requirements elsewhere. Similarly, in the Division of Continuing Education, the disparate educational backgrounds of the DCE matriculants will require an assessment vehicle appropriate to the program’s character.

The use of electronic portfolios has been discussed in all three arms of the college. Several departments have already adopted them for assessment of their respective majors. At this writing the McMinnville faculty hold differing opinions about e-portfolios, particularly given the work load challenges and concerns over adoption of a “one size fits all” approach to portfolio development and construction. The college has put in place the technological infrastructure to support widespread use of e-portfolios, but considerable faculty development needs to occur to make them feasible beyond the departments themselves. In 2008–09 faculty will thus be hard at work to identify an approach to general educational evaluation that will close the assessment loop linking
instructors, students, and the college budgeting process to strengthen student learning.

2.B.2 The institution identifies and publishes the expected learning outcomes for each of its degree and certificate programs. Through regular and systematic assessment, it demonstrates that students who complete their programs, no matter where or how they are offered, have achieved these outcomes.

The Linfield College Catalog publishes the learning goals of every major, minor, and certificate program offered by the institution and makes that information available to students and all other members of the community via the paper copy of the document, the electronic version carried on the college website, and the individual department web pages linked to the website. When departmental curriculum review leads to learning goal revisions, those are reported in the next edition of the catalog.

As noted in 2.B.1, Linfield’s assessment strategy rests heavily on departmentally-based (and faculty-orchestrated) oversight and analysis of the efficacy of its academic programs. Results are regularly forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through departmental annual reports; the dean of faculty makes them available to all interested parties. Beginning with this self-study, the results will also be forwarded annually to the Curriculum Committee and the Planning Council to foster broad-based conversation about where student learning outcomes might be assisted through better resource allocations or strategic planning.

Review of departmental annual reports and updated assessment plans yields many examples of how individual departments have fed back results from capstone experiences into curricular restructuring and pedagogical adaptations to improve student learning outcomes. Each departmental self-study in Volume II explains curricular changes made over the last decade and the rationales behind them. Departmental reports also describe assessment protocols used to determine how well students are achieving program goals. In every case departments recognize that the true value of their discoveries about student performance lies with the improvements made to program delivery.

Disciplinary differences obviously surface among the assessment techniques used. Some departmental curricula demonstrate more sequential structuring than others so that data about students’ incremental mastery of subject matter includes their success rate in upper division classes and their cumulative GPA’s at graduation. In other fields, less hierarchical construction of the major causes greater weight to be placed on the capstone experience as a window into student attainment of departmental learning goals. To assist students in preparing for these culminating events in the major, many departments have developed explicit entry points to the major to introduce basic methodological paradigms upon which subsequent study will build. Many departments are also developing formal templates that map the relationship of individual requirements or electives to the overarching goals of the major. Faculty are expected to include their course objectives on each syllabus to clarify how a given course fits within the major and/or general education program.

A wide variety of summative assessment practices occurs across programs. Comprehensive senior examinations/conversations are held in Biology and Economics. Senior thesis requirements operate in Philosophy and Theatre/Communication Arts, and Creative Writing. Senior theory classes or seminars are required in Business, English, Sociology/Anthropology, History, Economics, Gender Studies, Environmental Studies, and Political Science. Standardized professional competency examinations are mandated in Nursing (NCLEX), Education (PRAXIS), and Accounting (the CPA exam). Prescribed capstone field experiences include
student teaching and departmentally required internships. Completion of departmental portfolios occurs among majors in Art and Visual Communication and in Computer Science. Many departments emphasize the importance of student-faculty collaborative research that leads to student presentations in regional or national venues (Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Studies, Mathematics, Physics, Psychology, Sociology/Anthropology, Theatre/Communication Arts). As a result of lessons learned from these various capstone experiences, and in response both to the college-wide writing-across-the-curriculum emphasis and the desire to assure the writing competency of all graduates, each department has implemented a required writing-intensive course in the major.

The growing interest among departments (for example, Computer Science, Health and Human Performance, English, Modern Languages, Economics, and Sociology and Anthropology) in using electronic portfolios offers another example of faculty efforts to foster competencies, showcase their accomplishments at Linfield, and document their attainment of learning goals set out for them in their majors.

Some faculty have suggested that e-portfolios provide an effective means of archiving student work from key points in their matriculation (including capstone experiences) which then become available to wider internal and external review of learning outcomes achieved within both the curriculum and the co-curriculum. The college is positioned to move forward on this front with departments interested in adding this strategy to their assessment toolbox. Other departments are likely to pursue different approaches to making their student learning outcomes available for review.

**Assessment in The Division of Continuing Education**

DCE oversees educational assessment in several ways. Curricular oversight by the residential faculty on both the Portland and McMinnville Campuses provides educational cohesiveness for DCE’s dispersed programs, students, and faculty. The Continuing Education Committee (CEC) is responsible for regular review of DCE policies and practices. Faculty in the Arts and Humanities Division and the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division have oversight responsibility for the two interdisciplinary majors built on their respective curricula. Departmentally based DCE liaisons work with DCE staff to provide timely and consistent review of planned course offerings. In 2007–08, DCE, the CEC, and faculty liaisons sought to improve communication around their respective oversight roles. Both interdisciplinary majors will undergo formal review by their respective divisional sponsors in 2008–09. The Accounting, International Business, and Management majors in DCE exactly replicate those offered on the McMinnville Campus and are evaluated by the same processes.

The DCE dean has proposed a four-year assessment cycle for A&H, BIS, and SBS majors. To inaugurate this effort, Dr. William Millar is piloting an assessment process for the A&H major [see DCE Exhibit 35] which he will share with the Continuing Education Committee as a possible model for the SBS major (scheduled for divisional review in 2008–09). The DCE dean envisions the following stages in the process finally adopted: (1) a survey of current students and alumni using a tool developed by the DCE liaisons and the DCE dean; (2) a survey of DCE faculty using a tool developed in the same way; (3) review of results by the divisions in which each major resides, with conclusions and suggestions reviewed by the DCE dean, the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty, and the CEC; (4) resultant drafts brought by CEC members to the overseeing divisions and/or departments for review, with revised proposals submitted to the Curriculum Committee and eventually the Faculty Assembly; (5) implementation of changes the following academic year. This effort should be central to the work of DCE and the CEC in 2008–09, with recommendations coming to the Curriculum Committee and then to the Faculty Assembly [see DCE Exhibit 5].
DCE administrators are also considering adoption of electronic portfolios for all enrollees, for the same reasons noted above. E-portfolios offer DCE students a means by which to reflect regularly upon and synthesize their educational experiences despite the decentralized nature of their learning circumstances.

2.B.3 The institution provides evidence that its assessment activities lead to the improvement of teaching and learning.

The fuller story of Linfield assessment unfolds in the departmental self-studies that appear in Volume II of this re-accreditation report. Taken together with the institutional measures already established, as well as those being planned for the Linfield Curriculum, these departmental reports demonstrate the faculty’s commitment to steady, intentional efforts to determine how well learning goals are being met and thereby improve student learning to keep pace with the distinctive needs of 21st century undergraduates.

2.C – Undergraduate Program

2.C.1 The institution requires of all its degree and pre-baccalaureate programs a component of general education and/or related instruction that is published in its general catalog in clear and complete terms.

All three arms of the college—the McMinnville Campus, Portland Campus, and Division of Continuing Education—operate under the general education requirements collectively identified as the Linfield Curriculum (LC). The results of recent efforts to evaluate and revise the LC are binding on all students matriculating at the college and all faculty delivering required LC classes.

The Linfield Curriculum has existed in both its original and its revised form since 1997. After two years of deliberation, the Faculty Assembly approved a revised Linfield Curriculum for implementation in 2008–09 [Exhibit 14]. Built upon inquiry-based learning goals, each general education requirement derives from broadly-organized cross-disciplinary modes of analysis meant to introduce students to the major areas of intellectual investigation constituting liberal education. It is worth noting, however, that while the revised LC, like its precursor version, strongly reinforces the collective importance of the arts and humanities, the natural sciences, mathematics, and the social/behavioral sciences, it does so through a curricular organization that emphasizes Modes of Inquiry (previously called “Areas of Inquiry”) around shared questions rather than prescriptive disciplinary pathways.

Linfield Curriculum requirements are carefully articulated and published in several places: (a) the college catalog; (b) the first year Colloquium Handbook; (c) the college website; and (d) the degree audit form available on the advising website. Colloquium advisors on the McMinnville Campus and advisors in the Division of Continuing Education work with each new college student to explain those requirements and how to satisfy them. Admitted transfer students receive specific and timely information from registrar staff as to how previously completed coursework meets LC requirements.

2.C.2 The general education component of the institution’s degree programs is based on a rationale that is clearly articulated and is published in clear and complete terms in the catalog. It provides the criteria by which the relevance of each course to the general education component is evaluated.
Linfield’s general education program assumed the basic character it now holds in 1997. Beginning in fall 2005, two years of faculty conversation about the existing Linfield Curriculum culminated with a strong majority vote of the Faculty Assembly to adopt a revised LC for implementation in 2008–09. In the intervening period, the faculty as a whole has examined and adjusted the rationale for the original LC to reflect lessons learned over the previous decade. The Linfield Curriculum described in 2008 college publications is thus in every way a product of faculty curricular oversight of and commitment to general education as it embodies and fosters the Linfield mission.

The effort producing that outcome began in spring 2005 when the Faculty Assembly created the ad hoc General Education Review Committee (GERC) to assess and possibly revise the Linfield Curriculum. The Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) moved this action forward in response to a felt need among faculty to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the existing program, particularly in view of Linfield’s pending 2008 accreditation visit. In seeking to improve the LC, GERC was expected to develop concrete statements of the shared learning goals within each general education requirement. The committee also recognized the need to initiate more systematic faculty monitoring of student learning outcomes.

The General Education Review Committee began its work in fall 2005 with a 13 person membership including two faculty from each of the college’s four academic divisions, two student members (appointed by the Associated Students of Linfield College/ASLC), the director of the library (ex officio), the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty (ex officio), and a chair elected at large by the Faculty Assembly. Dr. J. Christopher Gaiser, associate professor of Biology, led the committee’s bimonthly meetings from fall 2005 through fall 2006. GERC used a variety of means to solicit information from faculty and students regarding the existing Linfield Curriculum. In fall 2005, academic departments responded to a questionnaire about the strengths and weaknesses of the LC from their respective vantage points. The committee’s divisional representatives canvassed their constituencies on the same topic at monthly division meetings. A progress report was presented to the Faculty Assembly on February 13, 2006. During the following spring, the committee sponsored a series of public forums to discuss possible changes to each LC requirement, as well as to explore the possibility of a proposed upper division Integrative Seminar. The committee’s student representatives also held a session for their peers to discuss their general education experience.

In May 2006, the Faculty Assembly received an interim report from the committee [Exhibit 15] offering three different models for a revised LC and presenting the following conclusions:

- Linfield faculty still favored the basic architecture of the LC as adopted in 1997. They regarded the Inquiry Seminar, all five existing Areas of Inquiry, and the two Diversity Requirements as having introduced students to the basic analytic approaches to knowledge characterizing a contemporary liberal arts education;
- The faculty appreciated the reliance on a variety of curricular paths to meet LC requirements and did not favor a “common core” approach;
- The Inquiry Seminar (IQS) was regarded favorably by the vast majority of faculty but was also seen as needing more faculty oversight to ensure consistent attention to written communication across all sections;
- The three emphases within the Inquiry Seminar—writing, research, and speaking—were affirmed as needing to continue by the faculty;
- The absence of a quantitative reasoning component (as distinct from the math
proficiency requirement) was seen as a decided deficit of the existing LC;

• A regularized faculty oversight process ensuring commonly held learning outcomes for each area of the Linfield Curriculum needed to be established;

• An explicit upper division requirement within the LC was desirable;

• The practice of tying together requirements in the Areas of Inquiry with the two Diversity Requirements inadvertently obscured the importance of diversity studies within the broader LC and indeed within the college mission;

• Academic departments sought relief from the enrollment pressures, particularly at the lower division, produced by the previous LC.

Continued deliberations during summer and early fall 2006 led the committee to select one of its models as best representing the faculty’s aspirations for general education. This model was presented and discussed at an October 2006 off-campus faculty retreat. Armed with further faculty feedback, the committee developed a proposed general education program consisting of ten courses (the same number associated with the earlier program) to include:

• A one-course requirement for each of the newly renamed “Modes of Inquiry” (vs. two courses in each of the previous five Areas of Inquiry)

• An additional sixth Mode of Inquiry entitled Quantitative Reasoning (moving students beyond the college mathematics proficiency requirement)

• Two stand-alone requirements addressing (1) global and (2) U.S. diversity

• A rule against double-counting diversity requirements or the Inquiry Seminar to satisfy Modes of Inquiry

• A new upper division course in any one Mode of Inquiry outside a student’s major

• A reduction of the number of LC courses one may complete within one’s major from three to two.

A final vote on the proposal took place in April 2007, where it was approved by 88% of those in attendance at the Faculty Assembly (64 yes, 9 no). Exhibit 15 contains all GERC interim reports and motions to the Faculty Assembly. The Board of Trustees was kept apprised of the entire revision process through reports made by the vice president for academic affairs to the academic affairs committee of the board.

The revised Linfield Curriculum consists of four major components: (1) the Inquiry Seminar; (2) Six Modes of Inquiry; (3) Global and Multicultural Inquiry; and (4) a Writing-Intensive Requirement in the Major. Each student must complete at least ten approved courses: the Inquiry Seminar; one course in each of the six Modes of Inquiry; an additional course numbered 300 or above from one of the Modes of Inquiry; and two courses, one each, in Global and Multicultural Inquiry. In addition, each student is required to take a course designated as major writing intensive (MWI). Courses contributing to the Linfield Curriculum (including Modes of Inquiry, Global and Multicultural Inquiry, and Writing-Intensive courses) are normally a minimum of 3 semester credits. Any single class transferred from outside institutions must be at least 3 semester-credits or 4 quarter-credits. To encourage intellectual breadth, no student may count more than two courses from a single department toward completion of the Linfield Curriculum.

In December 2007 the Faculty Assembly further refined the scope of the revised LC by adopting specified learning outcomes for each requirement [Exhibit 12]. In January Term and spring 2008, academic departments reviewed past contributions to the Linfield Curriculum and identified those for which they would seek inclusion in the revised LC based on the newly articulated goals. Approved LC courses carrying multiple designations must meet the
established learning goals for each relevant category and were evaluated as such by two faculty bodies (small working groups and then the full Curriculum Committee). Both the relevant faculty working group for each area and the Curriculum Committee evaluated submitted syllabi; the Curriculum Committee then presented its roster of eligible LC classes to the Faculty Assembly during spring 2008. The entire proposal earned unanimous approval for implementation in 2008–09.

**Assessment of the Linfield Curriculum**

Prior to GERC’s full scale review, institutional evaluation of the general education program occurred in the following ways:

- Departmentally based courses used individualized course evaluations addressing a particular class’s effectiveness within its larger disciplinary context;
- In the case of the Inquiry Seminar, each instructor administered a specially designed IQS teaching evaluation to the students enrolled, with results reviewed annually by the dean of faculty and director of the IQS program;
- The annual Senior Survey includes a special section asking students to respond to 29 questions about their Linfield Curriculum experiences;
- The Curriculum Committee in 1998–99 led conversations with the faculty teaching in each area of the LC to discuss their experiences with it since initial implementation. The committee then issued written summaries of its findings to the Faculty Assembly [Exhibit 11]. The committee subsequently undertook efforts to require the inclusion of general education-specific learning goals within each eligible class syllabus (though compliance had not been formally monitored except when new class proposals appeared before the Curriculum Committee).

At its creation, the faculty regarded the Linfield Curriculum as a new model for general education that: (1) enhanced the variety of courses eligible for LC credit; (2) ensured the rigors of such courses by drawing them directly from departmentally-situated classes taught by a higher percentage of regular faculty (as opposed to “core courses” staffed heavily with adjuncts); (3) entitled each requirement with language explaining its intellectual aspiration; and (4) increased student buy-in to general education as integral to their intellectual growth at Linfield. The college was rewarded for its creativity with this model by the awarding of a $100,000 grant from the Hewlett Foundation to support faculty development around the shared “habits of mind” associated with each “Area of Inquiry.” Analysis of Senior Survey results on the McMinnville Campus revealed that the Linfield Curriculum also produced real improvements in student satisfaction with the general education program on several fronts. See below for a comparison of Senior Survey responses between 1997 and 2006 on a number of key questions (Note: 1997 responses refer to the general education program that had preceded the LC. The Senior Survey was significantly changed in 2007 regarding LC questions so is not included).

### 2.C Table 1 Graduating Seniors (McMinnville) on the Linfield Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senior Survey Question</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#41—Academically demanding</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#44—Academically stimulating</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#43—Lasting value of general education</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#46—Seniors more supportive than earlier in their careers</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#50—Allowed me to engage in intellectual/topical discussion</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#51—Assisted me in choosing major</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All was not completely rosy in the survey results, however. While students generally affirmed the importance of each designated area of the LC by supporting its continuation as a graduation requirement, they did not voice a similar personal enthusiasm for each individual requirement, as the split data below on two distinct questions indicates (“Retain Requirement?” and “Requirement was Important to my own education”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89%; 73%</td>
<td>80%; 68%</td>
<td>78%; 69%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital Past</td>
<td>81%; 70%</td>
<td>90%; 73%</td>
<td>90%; 73%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images and Arts</td>
<td>85%; 71%</td>
<td>81%; 67%</td>
<td>85%; 74%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate Questions</td>
<td>78%; 62%</td>
<td>82%; 72%</td>
<td>84%; 72%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals, Systems, Societies</td>
<td>86%; 76%</td>
<td>90%; 77%</td>
<td>85%; 77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural World</td>
<td>81%; 62%</td>
<td>81%; 65%</td>
<td>79%; 70%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Diversity</td>
<td>87%; 71%</td>
<td>86%; 74%</td>
<td>88%; 77%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Pluralisms</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Exhibit 8 for complete 2006 and 2007 Senior Survey tabulations.

The mixed results above suggest that students in the first decade of the Linfield Curriculum’s existence acknowledged the legitimacy of the college’s goal of providing a “well-rounded” liberal arts education to all students via general education, since nowhere did even a sizable minority opinion emerge to drop any one requirement. On the other hand, even while validating the LC in principle, far fewer students testified to the personal importance of these separate requirements to their own educations. Moreover, in 2006 the student responses on this latter question dropped across the board when contrasted to earlier points in the decade.

This student feedback may have been a telling symptom of faculty fatigue with the original Linfield Curriculum and the need for just the kind of reengagement with its principles and learning goals that the General Education Review Committee and the Curriculum Committee fostered through their combined three-year effort. The revised Linfield Curriculum now in effect rests upon a reinvigorated and systematic approach to identifying and assessing the educational outcomes shared by all courses contributing to each LC requirement.

**Inquiry Seminar Assessment Practices**

The first phase of this effort involved, appropriately enough, the gateway course to the general education program, the Inquiry Seminar. Then-Dean of Faculty Barbara Seidman and Director of the Linfield Writing Program Dr. David Sumner organized the first of what is now an annual retreat for IQS and other writing-intensive instructors, held off-campus over two days, to deepen the conversation among writing instructors across the disciplines about their shared commitment to inquiry through the cultivation of
communication skills in writing and speaking. A direct result of that first retreat was the adoption in 2006–07 of an Inquiry Seminar Portfolio requirement for all students completing the course. Every IQS instructor, in turn, is asked to forward a representative portfolio to the Office of Academic Affairs for review by a sub-group of faculty in the last month of the academic year.

In spring 2007 Dr. Sumner led IQS instructors to refine formally articulated learning goals and assessment practices, and at that year’s IQS retreat, led by consultant Dr. John Gage from the University of Oregon, discussion of results from the first year’s portfolio review [Exhibit 16] held a central place on the agenda (this report was subsequently distributed in fall 2007 to all IQS instructors). Course goals were further clarified, both at the June 07 retreat and during AY 2007–08, to ensure maximum instructor participation and support [Exhibit 17]. This process will continue yearly, with further conversation to follow about what the portfolios suggest about ways of enhancing the Inquiry Seminar’s meaningfulness to the rest of the students’ careers at Linfield and beyond. For example, in 2008–09, Inquiry Seminar instructors will continue to meet once a semester under Dr. Sumner’s guidance, to review the results of the summer 2008 IQS portfolio assessment [Exhibit 18] and to discuss the composite student evaluation results across all sections of the course [Exhibit 19], in view of course goals and envisioned outcomes.

It should also be noted that the June 2008 off-campus retreat (led this time by Dr. James Crosswhite of the University of Oregon), was explicitly devoted to discussion and faculty development in support of the major-writing-intensive requirement of the Linfield Curriculum.

Assessing the Revised Linfield Curriculum
Systematic assessment mechanisms akin to those underway with the Inquiry Seminar will be developed in 2008–09 for every other required component of the Linfield Curriculum. This will be important to provide the faculty and the larger community with a clear picture of the actual learning outcomes of the Linfield Curriculum both in relation to each required component and in terms of the overall objectives for general education at Linfield.

The faculty began this effort in 2007–08 by adopting clear learning goals for each requirement and subsequently evaluating courses suggested for inclusion in each category against those learning goals. The faculty will continue conversation in 2008–09 around the next stage of this effort: development of appropriate assessment instruments for determining learning outcomes within individual Linfield Curriculum requirements and design of a methodology to assess the total outcomes of the general education experience. Until both processes are complete, the faculty will not have closed the assessment loop linking general education course design, delivery, and outcomes.

Some assessment efforts involving LC classes will continue as they always have, independent of the faculty panels described above. Individual instructors will administer teaching evaluations in their LC courses as an ongoing measure of the success of each offering. Department chairs and the dean of faculty will regularly review these evaluations for problems. Past deans of faculty Henberg and Seidman can both testify to the efficacy of teaching evaluation results in prompting instructors to rethink course content, delivery, and assignments to improve the general education experience they are providing to students. Similarly, student grades as a measure of performance also testify to how well a student has grasped the particulars of the “habit of mind” fostered by a given LC course. Finally, the Senior Survey will continue to provide yearly snapshots of student perception of their general education experiences.

Toward the larger end of reviewing student outcomes in view of cumulative LC learning goals, the faculty, in conjunction with the Office of Academic Affairs, will in 2008–09...
convene eight panels consisting of instructors from each LC area who will assume two ongoing responsibilities: 1) the assignment of LC designations to new courses, and 2) design of a protocol for ongoing assessment of learning outcomes related to each LC requirement. Once the protocols have been put in place, these same panels will meet on a rotating basis to discuss learning goals, outcomes, and pedagogy for that category, and to assess whether eligible courses are meeting the designated learning goals. This process will ensure a continuity of purpose among faculty teaching in each area of the Linfield Curriculum and will provide a baseline set of assumptions upon which to develop more comprehensive assessment of the entire general education effort [Exhibits 12, 13]. Faculty participants will be modestly remunerated for this oversight effort.

As noted earlier, the variety of disciplines, instructors, and pedagogies that contribute to the LC mitigates against one uniform approach to assessment in general education. The faculty have already determined that no one size will fit all in evaluating what students take away from their respective LC requirements. Rather, every faculty panel will devise an evaluation tool suited to that category’s dominant methodologies and representative assignments. The possibility of using electronic portfolios as a means of engaging students regularly and directly in mapping and reflecting upon their own intellectual growth through general education has met with divided responses, particularly given accompanying workload and faculty development challenges. Meanwhile, as departmental assessment plans demonstrate, the electronic portfolio concept is proving increasingly popular as an evaluative tool in the major, with possible salutary effects carrying over to the area of general education assessment as well.

2.C.3 The general education program offerings include the humanities and fine arts, the natural sciences, mathematics, and the social sciences. The program may also include courses that focus on the interrelationships between these major fields of study.

The Linfield Curriculum is specifically designed to provide a breadth of study across all disciplines. The LC requires course work in six Modes of Inquiry, each of which highlights a different set of academic disciplines: The Vital Past; Ultimate Questions; Individuals, Systems, and Societies; The Natural World; Creative Studies (previously “Images and Arts”); and Quantitative Reasoning. Moreover, these Modes of Inquiry also function as distinct methods of inquiry or intellectual habits of mind. Students are not simply introduced to disparate academic fields, but are instead expected to learn how to think from diverse intellectual perspectives. The emphasis on inquiry is foregrounded by the Inquiry Seminar.

Another mechanism for ensuring that Linfield students gain a broad general education involves two distinct Global and Multicultural Inquiry requirements. Because these courses may no longer be double counted with the Modes of Inquiry or Inquiry Seminars, students fulfilling their diversity requirements will invariably enroll in more than one course in several Modes of Inquiry. Lastly, students must complete an upper division course in one of the Modes outside the student's major field of study. This requirement ensures that students will attain some depth, as well as breadth, within their general education curriculum.

A hallmark of the Linfield Curriculum is its dedication to cross-disciplinary definitions of the learning goals associated with each requirement. This is made manifest in the very structure of the LC: the Modes of Inquiry, though based in traditional academic disciplines, are not tied to those disciplines. For example, the humanities and fine arts are represented by courses satisfying the Ultimate Questions as well as the Creative Studies Modes of Inquiry. Courses across the natural sciences (including an introductory psychology course with a biological
emphasis) are encompassed within The Natural World Mode of Inquiry. The Individuals, Systems, and Societies Mode of Inquiry incorporates courses from the departments of Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology/Anthropology (as well as several classes in Modern Languages and Communication Arts). Lastly, many courses in economics, sociology, psychology, business, and the natural and physical sciences teach students to interpret and evaluate quantitative data as a tool for investigating the world and thus contribute to the Quantitative Reasoning Mode of Inquiry. Courses in Global and Multicultural Inquiry provide an impetus for integration across disciplines since the study of diversity as their informing principle regularly involves analysis that links different fields. See individual departmental sections within the 2008 Linfield College Catalog for examples of courses eligible to satisfy various LC requirements.

The General Education Review Committee at one point in its deliberations argued for the creation of an upper division class dedicated to revisiting with juniors and seniors the same goals of the first year Inquiry Seminar. This became the seed for what the faculty approved in spring 2007 as a pilot program only: the Integrative Seminar (described below). Currently strained faculty loads would not permit departments to support wholesale adoption of such a requirement at this time.

See Exhibit 14 for the rationale accompanying approval of the Integrative Seminar Pilot.

2.C.4 The institution’s policies for the transfer and acceptance of credit are clearly articulated. In accepting transfer credits to fulfill degree requirements, the institution insures that the credits accepted are comparable to its own courses. Where patterns of transfer from other institutions are established, efforts to formulate articulation agreements are demonstrated.

Linfield transfer policy, applicable to all three arms of the college and published on p. 13 of the 2007 Linfield College Catalog, has remained constant in the last decade and states:

Generally, full credit is acknowledged for work completed at a regionally accredited four-year college or university, provided the courses are comparable to courses listed in the Linfield College catalog and no grade in those courses is C- or below. Up to 72 credits can be granted for work taken at a regionally accredited two-year college. Generally, these must be numbered 100 or above. Transfer credit will be listed on the academic record. Transfer credit is not computed in a student’s GPA until the last semester, when scholastic honors at graduation are determined.

In practice, valid certification from the registrar of an accredited two or four year institution regarding successful completion of a course at grade C- or above earns credit toward a Linfield degree for any student admitted to the college. The registrar, in consultation with department chairpersons and the dean of faculty, is charged with determining credit in non-standard, questionable, or marginal cases. In no cases are unfamiliar courses approved for transfer without supporting evidence contained in a catalog description from the previous institution or a valid syllabus.

To enhance its attractiveness to community college students in the Willamette Valley, Linfield has developed a template of transferable general education offerings that are shared with academic advisors at regional two-year institutions. In 2007 the Portland Campus entered into articulation agreements with various Oregon community colleges extending from the coastal areas, to Portland Community College, to schools east of the Cascades. To improve communication about the opportunities available at the McMinnville Campus for community college students, the Offices of Admission and Academic Affairs began two initiatives in spring 2008:

- acceleration of the credit evaluation undertaken by an accepted student’s prospective major department and
• development of new articulation agreements for specific majors to help potential transfers plan more confidently for their move to Linfield.

2.C.5 The institution designs and maintains effective academic advising programs to meet student needs for information and advice, and adequately informs and prepares faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function.

Linfield operates a systematic program of academic advising in which faculty and professional advisors assist students in making sound educational, career, and life plans. Academic advisors mentor students, support them as individuals, and use their specialized knowledge for student benefit. The process is mission-driven, helping to promote intellectual growth, critical thinking, thoughtful dialogue, and lifelong learning.

The three arms of the college—the McMinnville Campus, Portland Campus, and Division of Continuing Education—employ different advising models designed to match the needs of their respective student populations and academic foci. In each case academic advisors are provided with updated information and ongoing training to ensure that they remain current with college-wide academic requirements, advising theories, and best practices in the field.

McMinnville Campus
The McMinnville Campus employs a shared advising model involving both faculty and professional advisors. The Office of Academic Advising is led by two full-time professional advisor/administrators responsible for coordinating faculty advising efforts, fostering effective academic advising practices, and advising special populations of students.

Over the last decade, the responsibilities of the Office of Academic Advising have increased. Since March 2001, staffing has expanded to include two professionals with expertise in young adult intellectual and psychological development. The assistant director position has been upgraded to associate level and has expanded to a full 1.0 FTE during the academic year. The director of Academic Advising also holds a full 1.0 FTE administrative position (in contrast to 1998, when the director was also a part-time instructor). This increased FTE allows Academic Advising to function more proactively on behalf of at-risk students and those interested in pursuing graduate or professional careers. Linfield’s greater investment in this area also contributes to campus-wide efforts at enhancing retention by better addressing the changing needs of students and faculty.

The Office of Academic Advising supports the faculty advising role by providing resources and information to faculty and students. Office personnel link students with faculty advisors and with campus academic resources. They also keep faculty updated on changing academic issues and maintain advising resource materials for faculty use. The office coordinates the process by which students declare majors and change advisors. Staff often field general questions about career planning, degree progress, and graduation requirements. They work with provisionally admitted and probationary students, monitor the Academic Alert system (an early warning effort by which faculty caution students about poor performance in a specific course), and advise students interested in health professions or legal careers.

A primary function of the Office of Academic Advising is the coordination of the first year Colloquium program, including academic advising and registration. Staff recruit and train peer and faculty advisors, plan many entering-student Orientation activities, schedule placement exams, annually revise the Colloquium schedule and curriculum, and integrate first-semester advising with subsequent majors’ advising.

The Office of Academic Advising also works with academically struggling students, particularly those placed on probation.
Provisionally admitted students are those who may need additional support to be academically successful at Linfield. Historically, these students were assigned a variety of responsibilities that ranged from meeting with the associate director of Academic Advising, to enrollment in a learning skills course, to limited credit enrollment in the first semester. Beginning in fall 2008, all provisionally admitted students must meet with the associate director of Academic Advising in addition to other provisions of their acceptance. This will allow the associate director to adjust admit provisions to meet the unique needs of each student, provide a consistent experience for all students, and allow the Office of Academic Advising to track their progress.

In fall 2006, the director of Academic Advising began assisting McMinnville Campus students who intend to transfer to the Portland Campus nursing program. She also provides information and counsel to those planning post-baccalaureate careers in medicine or other health professions. In fall 2007, the director also assumed advising for all pre-law students. Moving these duties from various academic departments to a full-time professional academic advising unit occurred after consultation with the faculty involved, who all approved the changes. In all cases students continue to work closely with faculty advisors as well.

**Faculty-Based Academic Advising (McMinnville Campus)**

All incoming first year students are assigned a faculty advisor who works with them through the Colloquium program (described below) to determine an educational path. Upon declaring a major (a step mandated by the end of the sophomore year), students select an advisor from their major department with whom they are expected to meet at least once a semester prior to registration. Students with more than one major are encouraged to choose an advisor in each department. Those with declared minors should consult that department regularly as well.

Full-time faculty in each department do the bulk of academic advising by working with declared majors and minors as well as undecided students. The Office of Academic Advising hosts periodic advisor training workshops to enhance faculty effectiveness in this role. Such activities have included new faculty advisor training, study abroad advising, and guidance on working with undecided students. In March 2008 the Office of Academic Advising, in conjunction with the Office of Academic Affairs and the Office of Enrollment Management, brought a nationally recognized facilitator to campus to discuss the kinds of advising relationships that contribute to student educational persistence in the 21st century.

Each faculty advisor receives an annually revised *Academic Advising Handbook* each summer which articulates specific advisor responsibilities. Students may receive a copy of these responsibilities upon request. Each academic and student services department annually updates its entry in this *Handbook*. Qualitative feedback from faculty advisors in 2004 suggested that the *Handbook* would prove more useful if the information were specifically designed to assist advisors working with undeclared students contemplating majors outside the advisor’s home department. Accordingly, the 2005–06 *Academic Advising Handbook* was developed with a common suggested template for each department entry that foregrounds advising information specific to the needs of first and second year students [Exhibit 20].

On the McMinnville Campus, approximately 110 faculty serve as academic advisors, each working with an average of 18 students (although individual advising loads range widely from 0 to 90). This number includes students who are majoring in more than one academic discipline and have multiple advisors. Clearly a striking disparity exists in the actual number of advisees each faculty advisor serves, especially in the most heavily enrolled academic disciplines (e.g. Business, Education, HHP), where faculty work with significantly more majors. The 2008 Report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Workload Committee has included this issue in its deliberations and the issue will thus be part of a wider faculty conversation in 2008–09.
Degree-seeking international students on the McMinnville Campus work closely with faculty advisors in their declared major departments. Staff in both the Office of Admission and the Office of International Programs also advise these students. International students who attend Linfield on a short-term basis work primarily with advisors in the International Programs Office to help them establish language proficiency through English Language and Culture requirements. Depending on prior academic experience, international students may also be assigned to Colloquium in their first semester. If requested, the Office of Academic Advising can assign a faculty advisor to any international student. Improved communication among the various personnel who advise international students has been identified as a future goal, particularly by faculty who shepherd degree students through a major.

**Academic Advising Assessment (McMinnville Campus)**

Regularly conducted assessments demonstrate that McMinnville Campus students have usually rated their advising experiences highly. For example, the National Survey of Student Engagement was administered at Linfield College via web survey in 2005 and 2007, providing two sets of observations from first year and senior students. Results cited below illustrate the efficacy of different aspects of Linfield’s advising program in comparison to selected peer institutions. NOTE: Although the two surveys asked the same questions, they cannot be compared to each other because they draw from different samples. Also, some results are statistically significant and others are not, as indicated by asterisks below [Exhibit 9].

2.C Table 3 2005 NSSE means comparison for "Overall, how would you evaluate the quality of academic advising you have received at your institution?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Response (Scale 1–4)</th>
<th>Linfield</th>
<th>Select Peers</th>
<th>Bac A&amp;S</th>
<th>NSSE 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First years</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>***3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>**2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (2-tailed).

As another source of evaluative feedback, graduating McMinnville students are asked yearly to rate the academic advising (as well as the career advice) they received at Linfield. The table below indicates that from 2000 to 2006 approximately 65% of graduating students rated the advising they received as “excellent” or “good.”

2.C Table 5 McMinnville graduating senior responses to “How do you evaluate the curricular and career advising offered by your major department?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent/ Good</th>
<th>Fair/ Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>292 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2007, the senior survey tool was revamped and students were asked to evaluate the accuracy and quality of the academic advising they received during their time at the college. 92% of graduating McMinnville students stated that they received accurate academic advising during their time at Linfield and 86% indicated they were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the academic advising offered them at Linfield (see tables below).
2.C Table 6 2007 McMinnville graduating seniors responses to "How satisfied are you with [this] academic [opportunity] at Linfield?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Advising</th>
<th>Very Satisfied/Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Did Not Use</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.C Table 7 2007 McMinnville graduating senior responses to "To what extent do you agree with [the following statement] about your major [program]?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree/Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received accurate academic advising.</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the advising relationship, students and faculty are encouraged to discuss career, academic, and life goals, in addition to course selection and registration. Data from the 2005 and 2007 National Survey of Student Engagement indicate that first year and senior students discussed career plans with a faculty member or advisor at approximately the same frequency as Linfield’s comparison groups (selected peers, baccalaureate-general in 2005 and baccalaureate arts & sciences in 2007, and the respective year’s NSSE participants). This is illustrated in detail below.

2.C Table 8 2005 NSSE means comparison for "talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Response (Scale 1-4) Linfield</th>
<th>Select Peers</th>
<th>Bac Gen</th>
<th>NSSE 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First years</td>
<td>2.31 **</td>
<td>**2.14</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>**2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>2.95 ***</td>
<td>***2.64</td>
<td>**2.58</td>
<td>***2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (2-tailed)

2.C Table 9 2007 NSSE means comparison for "talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Response (Scale 1-4) Linfield</th>
<th>Select Peers</th>
<th>Bac A&amp;S</th>
<th>NSSE 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First years</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>*2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>*2.64</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>***2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p<0.01, ***p<0.001 (2-tailed)

The 2007 NSSE data indicates that first year and senior Linfield students discussed career plans with a faculty member or advisor more frequently than at the comparison schools.

First Year Colloquium
First year students begin on the McMinnville Campus without a declared major and are matched with a faculty advisor through Colloquium, a program designed to help them make a successful transition from high school to college. Colloquium was established in 1987 in a college-wide effort to increase retention. The most significant outcome assessment measurement, therefore, remains the retention rate. In 1986, just prior to Colloquium’s establishment, the first year to sophomore retention rate was 70.3%. Since the inception of Colloquium, first year to sophomore retention rates have risen and remained significantly above that starting point. As the table below indicates, first year retention has ranged from a low of 78.4% to a high of 85.7, producing an average retention rate of 81.7% over the last decade. The college regards this as evidence of the long-term effectiveness of the Colloquium program.–
2.C Table 10 McMinnville Campus first year to sophomore retention rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second Fall Enrolled</th>
<th>Retention Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007–2008</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–2007</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–2006</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–2005</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–2004</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–2003</td>
<td>80.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–2002</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000–2001</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999–2000</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998–1999</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Linfield College Institutional Data 2007

From the outset, systematic, annual assessment of Colloquium has involved a student survey conducted at the conclusion of the program in early November. Students are asked to rate all aspects of the program and record individual comments as well. Accordingly, the program is revised yearly to reflect assessment findings, in consultation with a committee of experienced faculty and peer advisors.

For example, the fall 2000 student evaluation of Colloquium reported over a 12 point drop in student satisfaction with many elements of the program. As a result, the Colloquium schedule was abbreviated to include only that material which faculty and peer advisors felt most appropriate and effective. Discussion of study skills and time management moved from the first to the second week of the term, and the Consent Awareness Training Team was asked to provide sexual assault training during Orientation rather than during the academic year. The 2005 survey of Colloquium faculty and peer advisors revealed that they desired a more academic approach to the socialization of first year students. A summer common reading program was thus developed and implemented in fall 2006. Students were asked to read the book prior to August 1, 2006 and participate in online discussions through Blackboard with other members of their Colloquium group during August. Student evaluations of Colloquium 2007 reveal increased overall satisfaction with the transitional program and a desire to see greater incorporation of the summer common reading program into the Colloquium curriculum. To that end, the opening convocation address for fall 2008 will feature one of the co-authors (David Relin) of the summer 2008 common reading selection, Three Cups of Tea—a practice the college hopes to continue [Exhibit 21].

In addition, the Academic Advising staff have completely redesigned the Colloquium website to better meet the needs of entering students. It may be found at www.linfield.edu/advising/colloquium.

2.C Table 11 Student Evaluations for “Overall satisfaction with Colloquium program”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Averages (4.0) Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Directions (McMinnville Campus)

Working with the Offices of Academic Affairs and Enrollment Management, the staff of the Academic Advising Office will continue to strengthen the program’s visible presence on-campus as a resource for faculty, staff, and students and as an integral part of the advising process. With this goal in mind, in fall 2007 first year students were provided with a document detailing their responsibilities as advisees in the advising process, as well as what they can expect from advisors. This advising contract, published on the Academic Advising webpage, is available to the campus community.

The Office of Academic Advising has recently revised both the general education website (in accordance with the faculty revision of that program) and the Colloquium website to increase their effectiveness for students and faculty advisors. Academic Advising will continue to offer faculty training through online resources, electronic newsletters, and professional development opportunities. As Colloquium evolves, the staff will continue to evaluate the program, revise it to meet student needs, increase academic rigor, and incorporate changes into the curriculum. The
office also remains at the forefront of campus-wide discussions about student registration processes, retention efforts, and programming for students facing academic and personal challenges.

**Portland Campus**

In 2005 the Portland Campus transitioned from a four-year campus to a transfer-only campus. This changed the number and profile of students matriculating on that campus, as well as the curricular offerings available. Because students enroll on the Portland Campus with a clearly declared academic path, advisors can focus their attention on specific course and career planning instead of working with students who are still exploring majors.

The Portland Campus uses an advising model tailored to nursing and health sciences majors. Faculty advisors assist students in appropriate course selection and career planning. The Portland Office of Registration and Records coordinates the academic advising process by assigning students to faculty advisors, facilitating orientation and initial advising programs, answering faculty questions, and ensuring progress toward graduation. The director maintains an “open door” policy for students and acts as a de facto academic advisor as well.

All Portland Campus students are required to attend orientation before they begin classes. In 2006 the new director of registration and records developed a new orientation program whereby he now distributes advising guides to each student to inform them of their responsibility for developing a course schedule appropriate to their course of study. Using the guidelines established for each major, he also begins the process of assisting new students in planning for all graduation requirements. These advising guides walk students through course selection, registration, and consultation with faculty advisors. In the nursing program, where three separate entry points to the major exist (in fall, spring, and summer), a separate advising guide exists, along with a curriculum plan for each cohort [Exhibit 22]. Prior to summer 2006, orientation activity involved bringing students together in small groups led by a faculty advisor to review curriculum and registration questions. The new general advising program allows for distribution of consistent information and frees up the faculty advisor to develop relationships with students rather than providing basic degree information.

At orientation, students also begin working with faculty members to become familiar with the campus and to register for classes. Students are assigned a permanent faculty advisor at the beginning of their first term and must meet with that advisor at least once a semester prior to registration. Nursing students are assigned a faculty advisor based on advisee load. Health Sciences students are assigned an advisor based on academic interest and faculty specialty. Because of the structured nature of the academic programs on the Portland Campus, faculty advisors provide detailed academic advice about graduation requirements as well as on career development and professional planning.

Twenty faculty advisors serve majors in the nursing program, each of whom works with an average of 17–18 students. In health sciences, five faculty advisors served in 2007–08, each working with an average of 3 to 4 students. With the revision of that program planned to take effect in 2008–09, three faculty advisors will remain available on the Portland Campus and at least one will serve that function on the McMinnville Campus.

Between 1996 and 2006, graduating seniors on the Portland Campus were asked to evaluate the curricular and career advising provided by their faculty advisors. Over this period, approximately 55% of graduating students rated the advising they received as “excellent” or “good” (2.C Table 10). The lower satisfaction rates beginning in 2001 could reflect the growing reliance on transfer students whose undergraduate advising did not occur at Linfield and whose expectations of advising differed from those of four-year matriculants.
2.C Table 12 Portland graduating seniors responses to “How do you evaluate the curricular and career advising offered by your major department?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent/Good</th>
<th>Fair/Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Insufficient number of responses to report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The picture has improved substantially since the hiring of the new director of registration and records in January 2005. Since the beginning of his tenure on the Portland Campus he has made significant changes to the academic advising process. For example, he has assumed responsibility for completing final degree evaluations for all students prior to graduation, a process faculty advisors used to complete. This change reduced faculty advisor workload, improved consistency in the evaluation process, and allowed students to receive crucial information earlier, allowing them to resolve potential problems.

The director of registration and records has also increased the tools and resources available for faculty advisors to work effectively with students. Faculty now receive blank requirement forms (or check-lists), as well as a grid of degree requirements and prerequisites, to work with their advisees [Exhibit 22].

Versions of these forms will soon be available online for students or faculty to complete and store electronically.

As part of his duties, the director of registration and records provides regular training opportunities for faculty advisors. He invites them to the orientation session in which he outlines graduation requirements, registration issues, and the important of the advisor-advisee relationship. In addition, he meets with the faculty on an as-needed basis (usually twice a year) to discuss advising issues. These conversations take place in departmental meetings, open campus forums, or faculty meetings.

With the revision of the all-campus senior survey tool in 2007, students were asked to assess the faculty advising they received while at Linfield. In that year, 76% of graduating Portland Campus students stated that they received accurate academic advising during their time at Linfield and 86% indicate that they were “very satisfied” or “satisfied” with the academic advising offered them at Linfield. The increase from 55% to 76% could reflect the specificity of the assessment question and the isolation of academic advisor from career resources. One is also encouraged to regard this improved student response as a consequence of enhanced advisor support efforts on the Portland Campus since January 2005. See tables below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.C Table 13 2007 Portland graduating senior responses to &quot;How satisfied are you with [this] academic [opportunity] at Linfield?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Response Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.C Table 14 2007 Portland graduating senior responses to &quot;To what extent do you agree with [the following statement] about your major [program]?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Survey Response Rate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received accurate academic advising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future Directions (Portland Campus)**

The director of registration and records will continue to develop more online materials and tools for faculty advisors and students, including an online degree audit, an FAQ website for faculty advisors, and online pdf’s of registration
forms. He also hopes to expand the nursing transfer equivalency guides to provide more details on documented transfer courses. Eventually, this document will be online and searchable, including information about recommended courses, prerequisites from large regional schools, and the Linfield general education curriculum.

**Division of Continuing Education**
The Division of Continuing Education (DCE) utilizes a professional advising model in which non-faculty advisors counsel students who complete classes at remote locations or online. Students are advised in person, on the phone, and/or electronically. DCE’s professional advising staff is physically located at various sites throughout Oregon. Advisors are assigned students based on regional locale, recruitment relationship, and/or advising load.

All DCE academic advisors also act as recruiters for the college and function as admission representatives with prospective students. They meet regularly with prospective students who may become their official advisees if they apply, are accepted, and matriculate. With the exception of financial aid issues, which are handled by the college Financial Aid Office, DCE advisors provide comprehensive service to students throughout their time at Linfield.

The number of DCE academic advisors has decreased over the last decade due to decreasing enrollments in the Adult Degree Program (ADP). At one time enrolling nearly 1000 students, ADP currently serves fewer than 500 (a number that has remained fairly consistent for the last five years). Current advisor postings consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FTE/Hours of Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland area</td>
<td>2 FTE (two individuals each holding a full 1.0 FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>.5 FTE (two individuals, each with a .25 FTE advising load)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>.8 FTE (one individual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany/Eugene</td>
<td>1 FTE (one individual holding a full 1.0 FTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coos Bay</td>
<td>1 hourly/nonexempt advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>1 hourly/nonexempt advisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since 1998, an administrative assistant in Eugene has been cut and the Eugene advisor’s geographic responsibilities have expanded to include Albany. A 1.0 FTE Corvallis-based advisor has been eliminated, as advisors previously hired at .5 FTE in Bend, Coos Bay, and Astoria now earn an hourly wage. Because advisors also act as recruiters, an overload can result at certain times of the year. This may have been a factor in static enrollments, in tandem with significantly greater competition from other online and distance education programs regionally and nationally.

To assist advisors and enhance recruitment, the dean of the Division of Continuing Education in fall 2007 created a new position of enrollment specialist in fall 2007. This employee works from home, communicates with prospective students immediately upon initial contact with the program, and assigns new matriculants to divisional advisors. Consideration has been given to centralizing all DCE advising in one location, but thus far consensus has favored continuing regionally based advising, given Linfield’s historic success with geographically-decentralized face-to-face relationships.

Hiring credentials for DCE academic advisors include previous experience in academic advising, with a master’s degree preferred. [DCE Exhibit 37] At the time of hire, they receive two days of training on the McMinnville Campus regarding college and degree requirements, transfer equivalencies, FERPA regulations, advising theory, and productive approaches to individualized advising sessions [DCE Exhibit 38]. Ongoing training is provided through staff discussions, quarterly advisor meetings, and other professional development opportunities. DCE students must meet with an academic advisor upon their acceptance to the Adult Degree Program and are encouraged to consult their advisor every spring semester through graduation. While students are not required to meet each semester with their advisor, in order to receive financial aid they must work with that advisor to develop and submit an academic plan that outlines degree progress each year.
DCE requires that all newly entering students also complete the Entry Colloquium (IDS 008), a one-credit pass/no-pass course, in their first term at Linfield [DCE Exhibit 38]. Due to the increasing number of students completing the Adult Degree Program online, the Entry Colloquium was redesigned by Ann Sukalac (Salem DCE advisor) to be an online course in 2003–04. Like its predecessor version taught face-to-face, this course helps students transition to the program and introduces them to the library, online, and social skills necessary to succeed [DCE Exhibit 39].

Graduating seniors in DCE are annually surveyed regarding their academic advising experience. Over the past six years they have consistently rated their curricular and career advising to be “excellent” or “good.” Statistical variations may in part reflect the small number of student responses, particularly before the survey went online in spring 2007.

### 2.C Table 15 DCE graduating senior responses to “How do you evaluate the curricular and career advising offered by your major department?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Excellent/Good</th>
<th>Fair/Poor</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.C Table 16 2007 DCE graduating seniors responses to "How satisfied are you with [this] academic opportunity at Linfield?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Advising</th>
<th>Very Satisfied/</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied/</th>
<th>Did Not Use</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Use</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.C Table 17 2007 DCE graduating seniors responses to "To what extent do you agree with [the following statement] about your major [program]?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree/</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree/</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I received accurate</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic advising.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I received accurate</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career advising.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2007, the senior survey tool was redesigned and went online. Questions were revised as well. Students are now asked to evaluate the accuracy and quality of the academic advising they received during their time at the college. The online format appears to have been especially helpful in raising the DCE response rate, which shot up to 70%. Responses for 2007 reveal that 91% of graduating DCE students stated that they received accurate academic advising at Linfield. The career advising results likely reflect the fact that career advising is not a formal part of DCE services (although in 2008 DCE is improving its website materials to include some career resource materials). See 2.G – Continuing Education for more detail.

### 2.C.6 Whenever developmental or remedial work is required for admission to the institution or any of its programs, clear policies govern the procedures that are followed, including such matters as ability to benefit, permissible student load, and granting of credit. When such courses are granted credit, students are informed of the institution’s policy of whether or not the credits apply toward a degree.
Linfield does not offer remedial classes with one exception: a study skills class expected of McMinnville Campus matriculants who, in the judgment of the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee, need additional academic help to adjust to college academic life. Taught during their first semester by professional staff in the Office of Learning Support Services, this class must be completed to meet the conditions articulated in the students’ letters of acceptance. Students with learning disabilities or other indicators of special needs are directed to and assisted by Learning Support Services staff.

Applicants to the Portland Campus School of Nursing must submit an Essential Functions form to complete their application. This document outlines activities prospective students must be able to perform and/or develop to succeed in the BSN program. To assist the growing number of nursing students who come in with limited English language skills, the faculty have worked with a consultant to develop ways of fostering student success as their English improves (for example, the use of less linguistically intricate phrasing on exams). Students with documented learning disabilities receive services provided by the Portland Campus Learning Support Services director.

On both residential campuses, student academic assistance is provided to regularly admitted students in the form of tutoring available both to groups and individuals, depending on the course. These arrangements are handled jointly by the Learning Support administrator and the appropriate departmental chairpersons, or by departments on their own (where a given class is known to generate student support needs, for example in mathematics or chemistry).

The DCE budget includes funding to support students with disclosed physical or learning disabilities in need of accommodation.

2.C.7 The institution’s faculty is adequate for the educational levels offered, including full-time faculty representing each field in which it offers major work.

Information provided in 2.A.1 documents the quality of the regular faculty employed by Linfield College to deliver its programs on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses. On the two residential campuses, a total of 94% hold the institutionally designated terminal degrees (Institutional Data 2007, p. 46). More specifically, of the 153 tenure track faculty at the college, 111 (73%) hold doctorates and 42 (28%) hold master’s degrees. See Standards 4.A.1 and 4.A.8 (and accompanying exhibits) for a fuller picture of Linfield’s faculty profile. Individual faculty CV’s may be found in each departmental exhibits binder.

As the reports by academic departments will demonstrate, all majors on the residential campuses draw upon at least two full-time faculty members’ expertise, typically within specific academic departments. In the case of interdisciplinary majors like Electronic Arts, Environmental Studies, Environmental and Public Health, and Health Sciences: Administration, agreements exist among departments about the contributions expected from their respective faculty contributors to each program. Together with targeted adjunct hires, the faculty who oversee each major provide sufficient courses for their students to complete their degrees in a timely fashion. To maximize faculty resources, many upper division courses are offered only in alternate years. Departmental advising practices alert students to these rotation patterns.

On the McMinnville Campus in 2007–08, 95% of the enrolled credits were taught by individual instructors; 5% were team taught. Of all enrolled credits, 74% were delivered by residential faculty (some receiving salary supplement for teaching overloads); 21% were delivered solely by adjuncts; and 4% were taught solely by administrators with faculty rank or by instructional associates (identified
as administrators in the college employee system). On the Portland Campus in 2007–08, 46% of the enrolled credits were taught by individual instructors, while 54% were team taught. Residential faculty delivered 90% of enrolled credits in Portland; 6% were delivered solely by adjunct faculty; and 4% were delivered solely by administrators with faculty rank or by instructional associates. In all cases, department chairpersons and faculty review credentials of adjunct applicants and recommend hires to the vice president for academic affairs. Before hiring is approved, candidates must be interviewed by one of the Academic Affairs deans and department chairs.

In the Division of Continuing Education, all 2007–08 courses were taught by individual instructors. Residential faculty delivered 19% of enrolled credits (receiving a supplemental salary at the adjunct rate); 79% were delivered by outside adjunct faculty; and 2% were delivered by administrators. While the established hiring procedure involves consultation with departmental faculty liaisons, recent practice requires attention to the timeliness of information exchange about potential hires. In 2008–09 the DCE dean will also initiate a direct interview process (either by phone or in person) between liaisons and prospective adjunct hires.

2.C.8 In an effort to further establish an institution’s success with respect to student achievement, the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities shall require those institutions that offer pre-baccalaureate vocational programs to track State licensing examination pass rates, as applicable, and job placement rate

Linfield College does not offer pre-baccalaureate vocational programs.
2.G – January Term

2.G.1 (and Policy 2.4.A) The institution provides evidence that all off-campus, continuing education (credit and non-credit), and other special programs are compatible with the institution’s mission and goals, and are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures.

Mission
January Term, one of the distinguishing academic and experiential learning components of the Linfield calendar, consists of an on-campus component and an off-campus component (the latter involving many overseas study opportunities). The faculty regard January Term as a central vehicle for delivering the college mission. A survey conducted in October 2004 by the January Term Ad Hoc Committee led to the conclusion “The faculty feels that a short term is important to the mission of the college” (based on an average point value of 4.43 on a five point scale involving 94 respondents). Faculty respondents felt, based on an average point value of 4.68, that “[Off-campus] courses are especially important to this mission” [Exhibit 23, p. 5]. It does this as a bonafide part of the formal curriculum (thereby “promoting intellectual challenge and creativity” and “piquing curiosity for a lifetime of inquiry.”) Similarly, January Term supports all three Foundational Education Principles outlined in the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12, but particularly Two (Developing Global and Multicultural Awareness) and Three (Experiential Learning). Its strong study-abroad emphasis contributes significantly to “honoring the rich texture of diverse cultures and varied ways of understanding” that remains central to the mission. The many opportunities January Term provides for focused research, internships, field work, and service learning also highlight experiential learning as a significant means of integrating “theoretical and practical knowledge.” For these reasons, all academic departments of the college have, since 1998, twice affirmed through formal Faculty Assembly action their ongoing support for the program and have committed to providing a range of classes to enrich general education, major, or elective offerings for those students who choose to participate.

2.G.2 The institution is solely responsible for the academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers. The institution conforms to Policy A-6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited. AND 2.G.6: There is an equitable fee structure and refund policy.
(also Policy 2. 4. B, C, E, G)

Linfield College undertakes full responsibility for the development and delivery of each January Term. In addition to the regular curricular offerings selected by departments as appropriate to a four-week format, the faculty also oversee the creation and approval of each new course designed explicitly for the short term. Academic departments manage staffing either through their own members’ teaching assignments or overloads, or through the hiring of properly vetted adjuncts. The International Programs Office (IPO), in consultation with the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty and the International Programs Committee (IPC), actively encourages and financially supports faculty innovation in developing new off-site courses (see 2.G. International Programs below). Since 1998, IPO also sets fees and provides budget oversight of the program, together with managing the off-site travel and onsite arrangements. It later surveys returnees about their experiences [Exhibit 24].
Linfield’s general operating budget covers the costs of January Term. Regular faculty who assume January Term assignments as overloads are paid at the adjunct rate, something that was recommended for revisiting by the 2005 January Term Ad Hoc Committee [Exhibit 23, p. 15]. Linfield covers the airfare of any student’s first off-site study experience done under college auspices, which is the case with most (though not all) January Term participants. Faculty airfare and lodging costs are funded by the college. Each student enrollee incurs out-of-pocket costs associated with food, lodging, ground transportation, and course activities; each course thus has an individually set fee which is publicized well before the application process begins.

In order to better support the ambitious nature of the program, which functions as a compressed third semester in terms of the various curriculum ends it serves, the college initiated a fee per credit in 2002–03 for those also enrolled in both contiguous semesters. January Term fees are published in the fees section of the college catalog (2007 Linfield College Catalog, p. 24). In 2008–09 the fee per credit will be $160 (2008 Linfield College Catalog, p. 24). Because it is a non-standard term with less than half-time enrollment, the college cannot award state or federal financial aid support, nor does it provide college financial aid dollars, for attendance during January Term (additional information about January Term tuition and fees may be found on p. 24 of the 2007 Linfield College Catalog).

2.G.3 Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution’s continuing education and special learning activities.

AND

2.G.4 The responsibility for the administration of continuing education and special learning activities is clearly defined and an integral organizational component of the institution’s organization.

AND

2.G.8 Continuing education and/or special learning activities, programs, or courses offered for academic credit are approved in advance by the appropriate institutional body and monitored through established procedures.

AND

2.G.12 Travel/study courses meet the same academic standards, award similar credit, and are subject to the same institutional control as other courses and programs offered by the sponsoring or participating institution. Credit is not awarded for travel alone. The operation of these programs is consistent with Policy 2.4 Study Abroad Programs, and Policy A-6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited. (also Policy 2.4.D, F, H, I, J, K, L, M and N Implementing a “seamless” study abroad experience with objectives and learning outcomes

The January Term curriculum consists of a wide array of traditional and one-of-a-kind offerings that serve a variety of educational needs. Every course offered in January Term has been vetted by the Curriculum Committee and approved by the Faculty Assembly. In the case of unique off-site courses, the International Programs Committee also reviews and advises on faculty proposals before sending its recommendations forward to the dean of faculty and the Curriculum Committee. Also see 2.A.2, 2.A.5, and 2.A.6. The International Programs report included in 2.G also provides extensive discussion of the processes around course creation, review, and approval for off-campus January Term classes.

Faculty and students both rely on January Term to meet the demand for general education or required courses that would be hard to satisfy
within the regular semester load of either group. January Term also provides an opportunity for faculty to design courses uniquely suited to January Term’s format. The latter category includes on-campus opportunities for specialized classes not seen in the regular semester—for example, special topics emphases like ECO 299 The Economics of Star Trek; ENG 318 Script Writing; REL 320 Pilgrimages—Sacred Journeys; and single-author emphases (C.S. Lewis, Dante, Laurence Sterne, Herman Melville, etc.). Similarly, the Modern Languages Department teaches several accelerated introductory languages courses well served by the extended daily class sessions possible in January Term; notably, an introductory Latin class regularly achieves full enrollment during the short term (and fosters sufficient interest for the department to staff a second semester of Latin in spring semester). Equally creative off-campus offerings send students and their instructors to all parts of the globe. Such classes may be accorded general education designations that permit students to meet graduation requirements as well as potentially earn credits in their majors as determined by departments, the Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Assembly.

Experiential learning opportunities operate across the various January Term milieus. Many students undertake internships or pursue collaborative research activity. The Office of Career Services specifically designs a career exploration course for January Term which involves considerable job shadowing. Many departments offer classes with lab or field work components that would be unwieldy in the regular semester (examples include REL 320 Pilgrimages—Sacred Journeys; MLM 198 ASL Deaf Culture and History; CHE 335 Quantitative Analysis). Off-campus courses are by design an attempt to engage students directly in the regions of the globe where they are studying; moreover, Director of International Programs Dr. Shaik Ismail has made it a high priority to encourage the inclusion of service learning components in off-campus programs, with considerable success: for example, courses have involved students in Habitat for Humanity projects undertaken in Guatemala, health care outreach in Cameroon, and post-Katrina relief work in New Orleans. In each case the service facets directly supported the academic subject matter of the course by providing experiences—and data—for analysis through the lens provided by the class.

As evidence of the keen investment of the faculty in the vitality and academic integrity of January Term, in May 2003 the Faculty Assembly created the January Term Ad Hoc Committee (JTAC) to “report to the Faculty Assembly about current strengths and weaknesses, and recommend possible curricular directions and consequent resource allocations, as they relate to the faculty’s will.” In September 2005 the committee issued its report [Exhibit 23]. After surveying both faculty and students, as well as having consulted key administrators, the group recommended that the existing mix of curricular purposes served by January Term be continued (i.e. inclusion of general education, major-specific, off-campus, and experiential learning offerings). The report advised against the possibility of moving January Term to May, and encouraged the college to seek new resources to assist students with the costs of off-site course enrollment. It also urged the Office of Academic Affairs to move full-time faculty overload remuneration from the adjunct scale to one based on their full-time salaries.

The diversity of college offerings has indeed continued since 2005. The recommendation regarding targeted college fundraising for January Term has been deferred in the face of the needs identified for the current Linfield capital campaign. Adoption of a non-adjunct-based pay scale for full-time faculty who teach overloads in January Term has been determined to be unfeasible at this time within existing college resources. However, as of 2008–09, overload pay for participating faculty will begin at 23 credits rather than 25 (the operative figure determining overload teaching pay for those not teaching in January Term).

January Term’s off-campus program has long proven a major force in internationalizing the college, including among the faculty and the curriculum they deliver. For instance, in 2006–07, 22 faculty led January Term classes overseas
or to other regions of the United States. Student participation rates in those courses are documented in 2.G Table 1 below.

JT 2.G Table 1 January Term Off-Campus Participation, 1999 to 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: International Programs Office.

Institutional data indicates that, since 2004, enrollments have vacillated between 18% and 16% of fall semester FTE.

JT 2.G Table 1 JanTerm Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Head-count</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>% of Fall Heads</th>
<th>% of Fall FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1446</td>
<td>5031</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>5201</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>5631</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1611</td>
<td>5598</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>5927</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Credits completed have dropped from approximately 5900 (2004) to 5000 (2008). This has very likely resulted from the imposition of a January Term fee per credit in 2002–03, as noted above, as well as from the rising costs of overseas study generally in recent years. The absence of financial aid support for short terms (also noted above), may also be a factor. The January Term Ad Hoc Committee reviewed this latter situation but declined to recommend a change in college financial aid awarding practices. The variety of on-campus course offerings has also decreased over the last decade, though each department has committed to contributing at least two classes per January Term (one at the upper division and one at the lower division). The January Term Ad Hoc Committee recommended (pp. 12–15) against mandating student participation in January Term (though faculty respondents were more in favor of requiring at least one year’s attendance than were student respondents).

In recent years many faculty who lead off-campus courses have offered one-credit pre-departure seminars (IDS 090) during the preceding fall semester to help prepare students for the cultural changes they will observe and deepen their understanding of the history or political character of the region they will be entering. This has proven especially important for students heading into a non-western environment or a developing country. Each spring semester, the International Programs Office organizes a number of brown-bag noontime events where participants of individual off-campus classes discuss their experiences with interested members of the Linfield community. Some classes also provide programs as part of the weekly SOAN (Sociology/Anthropology) Table schedule.

An annual essay and photo contest offers January Term students another way to share their experiences. Contest winners are invited to a program discussing the cultural context of their photographs; winning essays are printed in the student newspaper. Within their classes back on-campus, students who have been involved in off-campus courses are regularly asked to contribute to relevant discussions based on their direct experience with the culture in question.

2.G.7: The granting of credit for continuing education courses and special learning activities is based upon institutional policy, consistent throughout the institution, and applied wherever located and however delivered. The standard of one quarter hour for 30 hours or one semester hour of credit for 45 hours of student involvement is maintained for instructional programs and courses.
No course taught in January Term may exceed four credits (in keeping with the four week duration of the short session); many courses earn fewer credits in accordance with their contact hours and scope. Students are limited to enrolling in five credits during January Term, which allows them to select one academic offering and one paracurricular course if they so choose. Enrollment in January Term is not mandatory for any student, nor are individual faculty members mandated to participate.

**2.G.5, 2G.9–11  Not applicable to January Term**

**Future Directions**

January Term’s vitality rests squarely on the initiative and creativity of the faculty who offer compelling course options for on-campus enrollees, as well as uniquely designed classes for those seeking to study off-campus. The lower participation rate among students since 2003, while not a cause for alarm, does highlight the desirability of expanding the campus-based curriculum to encourage more students to stay at Linfield between fall and spring semesters; the college recognizes that such a goal may also enhance fall-to-spring retention of first year students. This will remain a major focus in curriculum planning in the immediate future.

The January Term off-campus program will continue to demonstrate its considerable strengths as a thematic, interdisciplinary, and cross-curricular approach to internationalization, with every student, regardless of major, eligible to participate. Past data indicates that generating more off-campus offerings than the 13 or so provided in the last several years may not be wise, since student demand may not be great enough to fill more classes. The International Programs director has instead successfully encouraged more faculty to develop new courses to expand the repertoire of courses rotating into January Term from year to year. He has brought a number of new departments and faculty members into the fold, thereby increasing the opportunities for students from a wide variety of majors to find a class which contributes to their graduation requirements while also expanding their global experiences.

During 2005–06, IPO brought Dr. Brian Whalen, Associate Dean and Executive Director of Global Education at Dickinson College (Carlisle, PA), to consult about Linfield’s international studies program; among his many accolades regarding “best practices” in operation at the college, he singled out January Term as one of the most successful short term programs he has seen, particularly due to its strong faculty engagement [Exhibit 25]. He urged IPO Director Ismail to work to get the message out nationally about what Linfield accomplishes in January Term, something Dr. Ismail will achieve by sending a faculty panel to discuss their respective innovations at the national conference of the Forum on Global Education being held in Portland in spring 2009.
2.G – International Education

2.G.1 (and Policy 2.4.A) The institution provides evidence that all off-campus, continuing education (credit and non-credit), and other special programs are compatible with the institution’s mission and goals, and are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures.

Linfield’s mission “advances a vision of learning, life, and community that honors the rich texture of diverse cultures and varied ways of understanding.” The institution encourages students to develop a global perspective in a variety of ways, including study of foreign languages, meaningful encounters with other cultures beyond the classroom and, in their post-graduate lives, the ability to navigate in a world that is evermore technologically and culturally interconnected. Effective international education should integrate experiences abroad with a stimulating international environment on the home campus over four years.

This mission is further reinforced by the Foundational Education Principles that define a Linfield liberal arts education within The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12. Foundational Education Principle Two calls for “a systematically developed approach to global and multicultural awareness that prepares students to embrace and understand the challenges posed for educated people in the 21st century by the web of cultural differences characterizing the planet, the nation, and the region. Such awareness helps students answer the question ‘How will my time at Linfield enable me to make a difference in the world?’”

Linfield faculty and staff take great care to provide international study experiences that foster total cultural immersion, extensive field work, and greater engagement with the community to underscore the linkages between theory and praxis. Thus Linfield’s international programs and courses also further Foundational Education Principles One (Integrated Learning) and Three (Experiential Learning).

The International Programs Office (IPO) works closely with Linfield faculty to offer programs that provide a wide range of cultural experiences for students. Over 50% of the student body studies abroad at least once before graduation and close to 18% of full-time faculty are involved in some form of international pursuit each year. The Institute of International Education in New York ranked Linfield 11th out of all U.S. baccalaureate institutions for undergraduate participation in study abroad in 2005–06. In 2006–07, 252 students participated in various study abroad and cross-cultural experiences in 28 countries and in sites around the U.S. In addition to those participating in Linfield’s January Term and semester abroad opportunities, 27 students participated in either a semester or year abroad program through other institutions. In the same year, 22 faculty led January Term off-campus programs and one faculty member directed a semester-long experience in Mexico. See 2.G Table 1 for the participation trend from 1998 to 2008 for semester/year long programs and for January Term off-campus courses.
Table 1: Study Abroad Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Number of students who did a semester/year abroad</th>
<th>Number of students who did a January Term abroad</th>
<th>Total who studied abroad in that academic year</th>
<th>% of McM graduates that year who had studied abroad at some point in their career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07–08</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06–07</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04–05</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03–04</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02–03</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01–02</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00–01</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99–00</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98–99</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Linfield College also hosted 69 international students and visiting scholars representing 21 countries during 2007–08. International students contribute to a vibrant multi-cultural environment on-campus through their participation in such organizations as the International Students Association and the Asian Club. They regularly develop close ties with Linfield study abroad returnees since they share common experiences. The college’s commitment to enhancing the experience of international students is evidenced by the extensive services, opportunities, and programs provided by the International Programs Office, explained below. Over a ten year period the numbers have ranged from a low of 50 (fall 2001) to a high of 70 (fall 2006). Estimated figures suggest that fall 2008 will see the highest number of international students enrolled as degree-seeking students in the last 15 years. They have come from South and Central America, Eastern and Western Europe, various sectors of Asia (the Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, China, etc.) and the Pacific Islands. See Exhibit 26 for more detailed demographic information.

2.G.2 The institution is solely responsible for the academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers. The institution conforms to Policy A–6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited. AND 2.G.6: There is an equitable fee structure and refund policy. (also Policy 2. 4. B, C, E, G).

Linfield now offers semester or year-long programs in 16 locations around the world, compared to only five in 1998. The nature and purposes of the programs, as well as requirements for participation, are published in the college catalog, in promotional material, on the International Programs Office website, and within the Academic Advising Handbook [Exhibit 27].

Since 1998, the following study abroad opportunities have been added:

- National University of Ireland in Galway (begun as a partnership with Willamette University, Linfield’s participation now involves direct enrollment with NUI).
- Rikkyo University, Tokyo, Japan (direct enrollment and exchange; created to serve Japanese studies majors completing required year-long language study).
- Hong Kong Baptist University (direct enrollment and exchange).
- Universidad San Francisco de Quito, in Quito and the Galapagos, Ecuador (both
via direct enrollment; created to serve science and environmental studies majors as well as Spanish majors seeking year-long study).

- Peking University, Beijing, China (special program to bolster Asian studies at Linfield through affiliation with the Beijing Program of Asian Studies, administered at the School of International Studies of Peking University).
- Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea (direct enrollment and exchange).
- Oslo University College, Norway (direct enrollment and exchange).
- Instituto Cultural Oaxaca, Mexico (special program through affiliation with this center; led by Linfield faculty members who rotate into the position of resident director and instructor for some on-site courses).
- University of Canterbury in Christchurch, New Zealand (direct enrollment).
- University of Otago in Dunedin, New Zealand (direct enrollment).
- University of Waikato in Hamilton, New Zealand (direct enrollment)
- Deakin University in Australia, with campuses in Melbourne, Warrnambool and Geelong (all direct enrollment).
- James Cook University in Australia with campuses in Townsville and Cairns (both direct enrollment).

Several changes have also taken place within existing programs:

- The Paris Program was eliminated in 2003 since students considered it too much an “island” program not meeting their needs. After careful on-site examination of six programs in France, agreements with three new sites were developed: (1) Centre International D’Etudes Francaises in Angers (for those with one year or more of college-level French); (2) the American University Center of Provence in Aix (for those with two years or more of French); and (3) the Institute of American University in Avignon (for those with three or more years of French). Each provides a stronger connection between Linfield students and the local community and offers more opportunities for language development.
- A team of seven Linfield Latin Americanists conducted a year-long review of the Costa Rica Program in 2004–05 and concluded that it should be moved from San Jose to the quieter community of San Ramon, about an hour’s drive away. The first semester abroad in San Ramon occurred in fall 2005. Three Linfield faculty also conducted an on-site review and recommended additional adjustments to enhance the immersion experience of students. Their final report is found in Exhibit 28. The Costa Rican resident director has already implemented many of the recommendations.
- Linfield’s program in Oaxaca, Mexico, replaced a long-time partnership with the Universidad Autonoma del Esta de Morales in Cuernavaca. This shift was necessary because budget cutbacks and faculty firings at the Universidad de Morales had decimated their international programs operation.
- Linfield’s exchange agreement with the Nottingham-Trent University had to be abruptly terminated in 2001 when that institution closed its international office. A new relationship was then developed with the University of Nottingham.

Every major in the Department of Modern Languages requires that students in the discipline spend a year abroad to complete their degrees. Linfield allows language majors to remain enrolled at the college while studying through previously approved overseas institutions. This provision means that the college pays the total costs of study, up to 80% of Linfield tuition (inclusive of all financial aid awards), and reimburses up to $1200 in airfare to participating students. Funds will only be transferred upon the completion of a signed
consortium agreement and verification of enrollment from the host institution.

In addition, majors in International Business and Intercultural Communication both require students to complete a semester’s study abroad for degree completion.

A Linfield student who wishes to study abroad through another institution must first obtain approvals for the program and/or the intended course of study from: (1) the Office of International Programs; (2) the Office of the Registrar; (3) the Office of Financial Aid (if s/he is seeking to apply certain forms of financial aid toward the costs of the program); (4) the academic advisor; and (5) the various academic units authorizing credits for courses proposed for overseas completion. To apply certain forms of financial aid toward the costs of the program, a student must work with a study abroad institution that has a consortium agreement with Linfield. Language majors and others who plan to attend another institution’s program by taking a leave of absence from Linfield may only apply federal and state aid toward their costs if a consortium agreement can be consummated. Such agreements are possible only with institutions recognized by the U.S. Department of Education.

Both the International Off-Campus Study Student Agreement, which is part of the initial application packet [Exhibit 27] and the college catalog clearly state the payment and refund policies for semester/year programs and January Term courses. Because travel arrangements and other program commitments, such as housing and field trips, must be made early, specific withdrawal deadlines without penalty are published in these documents.

2.G.3 Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution’s continuing education and special learning activities.

AND

2.G.7 The granting of credit for continuing education courses and special learning activities is based upon institutional policy, consistent throughout the institution, and applied wherever located and however delivered. The standard of one quarter hour for 30 hours or one semester hour of credit for 45 hours of student involvement is maintained for instructional programs and courses.

AND

2.G.8 Continuing education and/or special learning activities, programs, or courses offered for academic credit are approved in advance by the appropriate institutional body and monitored through established procedures.

AND

2.G.12 Travel/study courses meet the same academic standards, award similar credit, and are subject to the same institutional control as other courses and programs offered by the sponsoring or participating institution. Credit is not awarded for travel alone. The operation of these programs is consistent with Policy 2.4 Study Abroad Programs, and Policy A-6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited. (also Policy 2.4.D,F)

The International Programs Committee (IPC) provides curricular and faculty development counsel to the International Programs Office. The IPC consists of faculty from each academic division, a student representative, and the director of International Programs as an ex-officio member. The IPC is charged to work with the academic vice president/dean of faculty and the director of International Programs in coordinating and implementing international and January Term off-campus programs. In addition to making overall policy recommendations, the committee reviews all courses proposed for January Term and makes
recommendations to the dean of faculty and the Curriculum Committee.

The IPC also reviews faculty proposals for overseas research and study submitted to two endowed opportunities for faculty development: the Asia Fund and the Housley Fund, both of which serve to further the internationalization of the curriculum and faculty professional experiences overseas.

The Curriculum Committee and the college registrar ensure that all courses taught as part of the semester/year abroad and off-campus January Term programs meet the same academic standards, award similar credit, and are subject to the same institutional control and oversight as on-campus courses and programs. The Curriculum Committee regularly reviews specially designed courses taught overseas for Linfield students and recommends the appropriate credit to the Faculty Assembly. The registrar applies college policy, in accordance with prevailing institutional standards and practices, for converting credits from overseas sites.

Faculty Oversight
Linfield faculty are intimately involved in selecting participants for all college-administered study abroad programs. Each year, teams of faculty interview every applicant and make recommendations to the director of International Programs. Faculty also help staff the study abroad fair, participate in pre-departure orientation, supervise the collection and posting of journal entries from students abroad, and provide oversight of the overseas curriculum.

The semester abroad program in Oaxaca has a Linfield resident director who teaches some of the courses offered. Faculty involved in Latin American Studies initiated a one-credit campus based course (IDS 090 Global Issues Forum) to prepare students for study in that region.

Faculty in the Modern Languages Department assess the language competencies of applicants for regions where a language other than English is spoken; this process helps ensure appropriate student placement on site. Students are also tested upon arrival at the overseas study site before being placed into a specific language level. College promotional materials as well as the Academic Advising Handbook clearly specify language proficiency requirements as well as other prerequisites and application rules for each program. See the Department of Modern Languages self-study for further discussion of this partnership.

The Office of the Registrar reviews and approves all courses taken abroad, either through Linfield’s administered/sponsored programs or via programs offered through other institutions. The registrar records grades and credits in accordance with college policy and prevailing institutional standards.

All January Term off-campus courses are developed and led by Linfield faculty (some in team-taught arrangements). Each year, several faculty conduct reconnaissance trips to assist in the design of new January Term offerings. Faculty who staff the International Programs Committee work closely with IPO to review annual proposals for January Term courses and make recommendations to the dean of faculty and the Curriculum Committee. In 2006 the IPC reviewed the policy on load allocation for team-taught January Term courses and arrived at an agreement with the dean of faculty which was announced at the Faculty Assembly.

January Term off-campus courses represent a cross-curricular approach to internationalization at Linfield in that they cover a broad spectrum of themes and topics and typically employ multi-disciplinary analysis. All courses are open to the entire student body. Most have few or no prerequisites, allowing for wide participation across both campuses.

Although many faculty would prefer that students undertake semester and year-long study abroad rather than short duration courses of the kind offered in January Term, the majority of participating Linfield students use January Term as a way to quench their thirst for international study. January Term courses
prove especially popular among students whose majors are tightly sequenced. Some faculty design January Term courses to achieve some degree of cultural immersion, such as home-stays and interaction with local students and communities.

Students applying to either semester/year long programs or to January Term off-campus courses follow the same process: each involves completion of the initial application (available on-line), at least a year ahead of the relevant time period. Two weeks prior to the application deadline in the fall, the International Programs Office conducts a two-day “study abroad fair” where participating departments as well student returnees advise prospective applicants. Faculty leading January Term off-campus courses hold a similar “fair” in February, a year ahead of the January Term in question. Applicants who meet the minimum college requirements and the specific program requirements are then vetted through the Office of Student Services before they are invited to meet with interview teams including faculty and student returnees. These teams then make recommendations to the International Programs Office. Acceptance or non-acceptance letters are sent shortly thereafter with a packet of material and documentation to begin the planning process [Exhibit 27].

Policy 2.4.H, I, J, K, L, M, N
Implementing a “seamless” study abroad experience with objectives and learning outcomes

At many institutions, only the participants of study abroad benefit from their experiences, with the rest of the campus left uninformed about and unaffected by the discoveries they have made. The individual’s semester or year of experience abroad thus becomes a self-contained activity, with very little extension beyond the time actually spent overseas. Linfield instead fosters a seamless study abroad experience for all participants meant to facilitate integrated learning. Students must take a companion course, “Intercultural Communication: Pre-Departure and Re-Entry,” upon acceptance to any semester or year-long program. Participants receive pre-departure assignments and attend orientation sessions which require that they formally identify their objectives for going abroad. The assignments also include: (1) readings on the city/country of their destination, and (2) required interviews with returnees and international students. After their overseas experience they must complete an evaluation whereby they revisit their objectives in view of their actual learning outcomes.

At the midpoint of their semester abroad, participants must also write essays on site to answer questions provided by the International Programs Office staff (in consultation with faculty). Selected essays are posted on the college’s website for review by those on the home campus. Some faculty, particularly those from the Modern Languages Department and the Intercultural Communication major, use these essays for discussion purposes in their own courses. Journal entries touch on issues of language acquisition, cultural adaptation, and cross-cultural interaction. They also allow the Linfield campus to share some of the overseas experiences with participants.

When Linfield enters into an overseas partnership, it ensures that the host institution will provide adequate and reasonable academic advising, social and psychological counseling, and medical needs. When necessary, Linfield pays an additional fee to the foreign institution (over and above standard tuition fees) for these services. Linfield staff and faculty work on course selection with study abroad participants before they depart so that credits earned will fit their degree objective. The IPO staff remains in constant communication with students abroad via email and telephone, so as to be available should they have questions or concerns about academic or other matters. Faculty advisors on the home campus are consulted when appropriate. IPO staff and select faculty visit Linfield affiliated sites on a regular cycle, and overseas partners visit Linfield frequently, particularly during the pre-
departure orientation period. IPO staff also touch base with these overseas liaisons at national conferences. The one-and-a-half day pre-departure orientation covers general cross cultural adjustment as well as country-specific and institution-specific information.

Upon return, all participants attend re-entry workshops to discuss reverse culture shock and assess the value of their experiences. Re-entry workshops focus on immediate outcomes from the study abroad experience but also ask students to assess its potential impact on their lives beyond Linfield. IPO staff invite administrators from The Office of Career Services to address career planning, resume building, and professional pathways development that highlight multicultural experiences. Guest speakers who have built successful careers involving international study are often invited into dialogue with students. This course exemplifies the integrative learning model connecting the various pieces of the study abroad experience.

Currently this “seamless” integration can only be provided to participants in Linfield-sponsored/administered programs since those who go on programs through other institutions take a leave of absence from Linfield and do not participate in the courses described above.

The annual essay and photo contest for participants of semester abroad and January Term courses offers another avenue by which to share their experiences with the Linfield community. Contest winners are invited to a program discussing the cultural context of their photographs; winning essays are printed in the student newspaper. Returning students often present noon-hour brown-bag discussions of their time abroad, assist with study abroad fairs, and contribute to orientation programs for new groups intending to study abroad. Intercultural Communication majors are required to offer a public program about their semester of off-campus study.

**2.G.4 The responsibility for the administration of continuing education and special learning activities is clearly defined and an integral organizational component of the institution’s organization.**

Following the 2002 retirement of the former director of international programs, the college conducted a national search and hired Dr. Shaik Ismail in July 2003 [Exhibit 29]. In accordance with the **Faculty Handbook**, the appointment also carries faculty rank (in Dr. Ismail’s case, as Associate Professor of Political Science). The director reports to the vice president for Academic Affairs, where International Programs budgets and new initiatives are reviewed for approval. Regular consultation occurs between IPO and Academic Affairs; IPO also works directly with the Office of the President as needed.

Since his arrival, two defining values directly aligned with Foundational Education Principle Three—Experiential Learning—have guided IPO in its ongoing review of existing programs:

- **Infusing a service learning component into study abroad:** Partnering with faculty, IPO has sought to infuse service learning into as many programs as possible to allow students systematic opportunities to interact with local communities and make significant contributions to those among whom they study while abroad. Examples include working with local Habitat for Humanity projects, orphanages, farmers, schools, hospitals, and clinics.

- **Fostering a field school approach to learning:** IPO works with faculty to develop curricula to move students beyond classroom based routines and out into the field” by engaging them in hands-on, interdisciplinary, community-focused activities. Program excursions and field trips supplement classroom material and allow students to engage in participant (resident)-observation activities through
day-to-day human transactions and interactions.

**International Students’ Services**

As noted earlier, international students contribute significantly to the Linfield community and further its evolution as a truly international college. The college added a staff position in the Office of Admission in summer 2000 to enhance international recruiting by developing better connections with on-site high schools around the world. Twice in the last five years Linfield has hosted touring groups of high school counselors on the McMinnville Campus.

In addition to visa and immigration concerns (discussed below), IPO also helps international students prepare for a successful experience at Linfield and afterward, communicating with them regularly prior to their arrival and attending thereafter to their social, emotional, health and physical concerns, along with career and life planning. For instance, they assist applicants for the Optional Practical Training, an opportunity to work in the United States for one calendar year after graduation. The Office also plans cultural excursions to sites in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest to help international students acclimate themselves to U.S. cultural norms and lifestyles. Every international student may be assigned a “friendship family” while studying at Linfield. This provides an opportunity to spend time with an American family during holidays and other celebrations.

Since Linfield did not have a significant population of Middle Eastern students, the college did not see a measurable decline in international student enrollment following the attacks on the United States on 9/11/01. However, as at most colleges and universities, student-applicants now face a more arduous visa application process. In response to changed immigration regulations, and to adequately prepare for the new web-based Student and Exchange Visitor Information System (SEVIS), IPO took several important steps:

- To be proactive, IPO staff actively participated in training workshops provided by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs: Association of International Educators and the new Department of Homeland Security. IPO then brought together a SEVIS Task Force to prepare for the regulatory changes. To comply with the State Department’s new rule for the J-1 Exchange Visitor Program, Linfield had to apply separately for enrollment in SEVIS by December 16, 2002 and was granted this permission within one month. SEVIS was fully implemented by the February 2003 deadline.
- After a year-long preparation for Immigration and Naturalization Service certification, and upon the successful completion of the on-site inspection by an outside contractor, Linfield College received the official approval for recertification of its F-1 program.

**English Language and Culture Program**

Since 1998, Linfield’s English as a Second Language Program has been renamed English Language and Culture Program (ELCP) to better reflect the mission of the program and the needs of different student cohorts. Currently, ELCP provides courses for four-year degree seeking students in the ELCP Bridge Program and for an increasingly diverse body of students who come to Linfield for short term Special Programs of one semester or more. While the one-semester Kanto Gakuin University program has existed at Linfield for thirty years, ELCP now welcomes shorter-term students with a wide range of English proficiency levels from Yonsei University, Hong Kong Baptist University, Rikkyo University, Maebashi Kyoai Gakuen College, and Kyoto Bunkyo University. Plans are underway to host additional short-term Special Program students from Shujitsu University, Kokugakuin University and Meisei University, all in Japan, in the near future.
In 1998, ELCP served 13 students compared to 47 in 2006 and 36 in 2007. Given the difference between the academic preparation needs of four-year degree-seeking students, and the communicative competence needs of short term students, ELCP is currently revising its mission statement, individual course objectives, course learning goals, and assessment methodology. See the English Language and Culture self-study in the academic programs’ section of Standard 2 for specific detail.

Policy 2.4.N Institutional efforts for follow-up studies on the individual and institutional benefits derived from such programs.

During 2005–06, Dr. Brian Whalen, Associate Dean and Executive Director of Global Education at Dickinson College (Carlisle, PA), undertook a comprehensive review of all Linfield’s international initiatives. During two days on-campus, Dr. Whalen met with fourteen separate college constituencies, including senior administrators, faculty, students, staff and alumni. The salient points in the report, along with recommendations and actions taken to date, are summarized below. The full report is provided in Exhibit 25.

Notable Strengths of Linfield’s International Programming:

- **Campus Ethos**: A general feeling exists at Linfield that international education stands as one of the defining characteristics and values of the college.

- **Faculty Involvement**: Over 50% of the current Linfield faculty have been involved or engaged in the international enterprise in one way or another. In addition to curriculum oversight and program development, faculty participate in the selection of candidates for January Term and semester abroad programs (over 300 faculty-based interviews are conducted each year in this process).

- **International Programs Office**: The fact that Linfield had consolidated everything international in a “one-stop” operation is an attractive feature for a small campus. This approach, an emerging model in many campuses, serves the college well.

- **English Language and Culture Program and Friendship Family Program**: Intensive English language instruction for international students is not a separate entity at Linfield, as is the case on many campuses. This program is integrated into the overall curriculum and the 20 credits potentially earned by international students apply to their Linfield degree objective. The infusion of culture and intercultural communication into these courses is a unique feature of the program.

- **January Term Program**: In the context of the national debate about the value of short term abroad programs (since over half of U.S. students who study abroad each year choose programs of eight weeks or less), Dr. Whalen praised Linfield’s offerings for their distinctive thematic and cross-curricular approach to internationalizing the campus. New courses are offered each year, not simply repeat offerings (11 out of 16 courses in 2007 and 6 out of 12 courses in 2008 are new).

- **High Rate of Student Participation**: As noted above, Linfield is ranked 11th among U.S. colleges and universities by the Institute of International Education for the number of students sent abroad in 2005–06, the last year this data was collected.

- **Broad Geographic Breadth of Program Offerings**: Linfield sends students to over thirty locations around the world (16 semester abroad sites and 14–16 January Term courses). Combined, they include all continents but Antarctica.

- **Best Practices**: Programs in Oaxaca, Mexico and Ran Ramon, Costa Rica earned praise for “the field school experiential study approach,” for an emphasis on heavy cultural and language immersion, and for having a strong service learning component.
• **Direct Admission Value:** Linfield’s international initiatives clearly provide direct admission value to the college. This fact was reinforced by conversations with students and alumni as well as staff in the Office of Admission.

**Consultant Recommendations:**

- **Further Review of Current Practices in January Term:** The college should address: (a) a perceived unevenness of quality across program offerings; (b) the balance between “free time” and course-related activities; (c) load issues related to team teaching; (d) preparation of students.

  **Action:** To address this point, the International Programs Committee has established and distributed criteria to ensure quality control in reviewing January Term proposals. It also worked on load issues with the dean of faculty to devise a compromise approach to counting instructor load in team-taught courses.

- **Possible Enhancements in the Oaxaca Program:** The college might add an exchange component to enable Mexican students to study at Linfield at low cost.

  **Action:** The Office of International Programs is seeking to identify appropriate partner institutions.

- **Enhanced Publicity Promoting Linfield on the National Stage:** Linfield’s international initiatives remain a well-kept secret. The college should publicize its successes more widely; foster more instances of scholarly work on international education; share best practices with the international education community; consider founding a chapter of the Phi Beta Delta honor society; and encourage more staff conference participation.

  **Action:** The IPO director has successfully fostered faculty and staff program participation in the spring 2009 national conference of the Forum on Education Abroad being held in Portland. He is looking into compiling a trend analysis of Linfield study abroad returnees who have successfully obtained Fulbright grants as seniors. Recently IPO also became a member of AsiaNetwork [Exhibit 30].

- **Future Strategic Plan:** The International Programs Office should develop a methodology for outcomes assessment for students and faculty; undertake more frequent evaluation/site visits; foster more faculty international involvement beyond study abroad and January Term opportunities; orchestrate wider program options for students, particularly for underrepresented majors, particularly in the natural sciences, math, and computer science.

  **Action:** In January 2008, IPO staff worked on areas where appropriate and effective assessment of learning outcomes can be accomplished. The *Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12* acknowledges that greater internationalization of the faculty would serve Foundational Education Principle Two. New partnerships with research institutions in New Zealand and Australia enable more students in the sciences to participate in semester abroad offerings at these sites.

**Future Directions**

The International Programs Office, in collaboration with the International Programs Committee, the faculty, and the community at large, will continue to be guided by the tenets of the new strategic plan in seeking to:
• Foster opportunities for all students to gain some form of global and multicultural experience during their time at Linfield, regardless of major or discipline.
• Engage in practices and promote opportunities that would enhance diversity.
• Expand programming to bring global and multicultural experiences to the college.

2.G.5, 2.G.9–11 Not applicable to International Programs

2.G – Division of Continuing Education

Mission
The Division of Continuing Education (DCE) consists of two distinct parts, the Adult Degree Program (ADP) and Summer Term. All credit-bearing courses offered during the summer on the McMinnville Campus are administered through DCE, including field-based courses.

ADP offers seven majors designed for working adults: Accounting, Arts and Humanities, Business Information Systems, International Business, Management, Nursing (for RN’s returning for the BSN), and Social and Behavioral Sciences. It also provides four certificate options: Accounting (post-baccalaureate), Computer Information Systems, Human Resource Management, and Marketing. DCE administers the ADP Nursing major for RN’s seeking to earn a BSN, but because the School of Nursing exercises academic oversight from the Portland Campus, it will be addressed in the “Academic Programs” section of the self-study. The creation of specific majors over the history of DCE generally reflects the fact that most of its adult students seek new or enhanced skills that will translate into greater career success or new career opportunities.

ADP was established in 1975 for working registered nurses who sought a bachelor’s degree but could not attend a traditional residential campus due to work and family obligations. Those constraints still characterize today’s population of ADP students, though they come with much more varied academic goals. In 2007–08, their average age was 38. Data show that most work at least part-time and often full-time while also raising families. In 2006 and 2007, just over 70% were female, another consistent pattern over time. Very few enroll full-time; the vast majority complete one or two courses each semester (87% in 2007) and frequently stop out for a semester or two on the way to graduation. In fall and spring semesters, about 500 students typically enroll, fewer in the five-week Winter Term and eleven-week Summer Session (Institutional Data 2007, p. 24). Ten years ago DCE enrolled approximately 1000 students, but due to increased competition from other distance learning programs, headcount has decreased by half. On the other hand, today’s enrollees typically complete more credits, so the total drop in credits since 1998 has only been 32% (Institutional Data 2007, pp. 14–15). Over the last five years the total credits delivered have slowly fallen from 10,372 in 2002–03 to 9206 in 2006–07.

Initially DCE offered classes face-to-face at various sites in Oregon and Washington, using classrooms rented from community college partners. DCE instructional formats have since changed in response to demonstrated student preference within the target population. Most face-to-face instruction has been replaced, first by live, synchronous satellite broadcast, then by asynchronous email, and most recently by web-based delivery. DCE still offers some face-to-face courses in Bend, Salem, Portland, and McMinnville, but most courses are now delivered online. Summer Term courses use three delivery methods: classroom-based (for
select Portland and McMinnville Campus offerings); online; and field-based. Advising practices within DCE have also changed with reduced enrollments and different ways of linking the college with distance learners. Linfield recruitment and advising staff work in Bend, Salem, Portland, McMinnville, Albany/Eugene, and Coos Bay.

A consultancy conducted in 2004 by Dr. Robert Wiltenburg, Dean of University College, Washington University (St. Louis), commended DCE for drawing upon “so many skilled and dedicated people” within the college’s administration, staff, faculty (residential and adjunct) who have moved the program into “a new and hopeful (and profitable) era. . . .” [DCE Exhibit 30]. The Continuing Education Committee has been and will continue working within the faculty governance structure to strengthen and improve the role of residential faculty in monitoring the quality of the academic program in the face of the many delivery system changes that have occurred over the past decade.

Curricular Engagement with Linfield’s Foundational Education Principles:

Integrated learning: By its nature, all of Linfield’s bachelor degree programs require the synthesis of learning across a variety of disciplines, as well as within the chosen major. To accomplish this goal requires intentionality by the faculty involved in presenting the curriculum, and as such the dispersed nature of the DCE faculty poses a special challenge in terms of Foundational Principle One. For that reason, DCE’s professional advisors play a key role in fostering integrated learning. Advisors help students identify academic areas of interest and guide appropriate course selection. Regular consultation assists students to develop a coherent educational plan consistent with the goals of the major. Each of DCE’s three interdisciplinary majors requires a capstone methods class designed to promote an integrative experience.


DCE students typify contemporary Oregon and Washington adult populations and bring a range of cultural, ethnic, chronological, and economic perspectives to their shared educational experiences. Institutional Data 2007 (p. 24) identifies rather broad ethnic categories within the student population, with the percentage of white non-Hispanics usually falling in the low 70% range and those in other ethnic groups collectively averaging in the mid-20% range. DCE faculty and advisors informally report considerable geographical diversity as well, with students hailing from Sweden, Vietnam, China, Russia, Cambodia, Laos, Great Britain, Israel, the Philippines, Denmark, Chile, Venezuela, Romania, and Mexico.

Economic diversity further distinguishes the DCE student population, which ranges from wealthy enrollees to those who have recently been homeless. Many belong to the working class and/or are first-generation college students. Some have been displaced from the forest products industry or regional fisheries. Others are military veterans or members of military reserves, some of whom have been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan while enrolled. Students also vary in age from their early 20’s to their mid 60’s, some occasionally older. Such varied characteristics enhance the range of perspectives these students bring to their classes, where – course requirements include regular student interactivity, whether in face to face settings or online. DCE faculty regularly cite this diversity of viewpoints as one of the greatest satisfactions of teaching in the program.

Experiential Learning: DCE courses encourage experiential learning in three ways. First, the curriculum includes field-based courses every
Summer Term (some of which are internationally focused and are offered every other year, others of which are domestic, taught yearly). One very successful example of the latter has been ENV 302 Shoreline Ecology. Second, many online and classroom-based courses include a field or experiential component: for example, REL 380 Buddhism, teaches students to meditate; BIO 105 Human Biology and Evolution, requires direct primate observation; HST 299 Native American History, brings students to visit Native American sites; and AVC 21 Contemporary Multicultural Art, involves gallery visits and reports. Students in the SBS methods class (SOA 490 Research/Thesis) develop a survey instrument which guides interviewing related to a course project. Third, some courses ask students to experiment with implementing changes in their workplace or family life based on course content and then report results. For more detail, see syllabi [DCE Exhibit 17].

2.G.1 The institution provides evidence that all off-campus, continuing education (credit and noncredit), and other special programs are compatible with the institution’s mission and goals, and are designed, approved, administered, and periodically evaluated under established institutional procedures. AND POLICY 2.6.a, 2.6.b, 2.6.t, 2.6.u, 2.6.v regarding Distance Delivery of Courses, Certificate and Degree Programs.

DCE’s explicit mission exemplifies and enacts Linfield’s concise mission statement, “Connecting Learning, Life, and Community.” That is, DCE provides a Linfield education to adults for whom a full-time, residential, college experience is not appropriate or possible. The DCE mission statement has been reviewed and reaffirmed by the Continuing Education Committee (on behalf of the faculty), as well as by the division’s staff, in 2000, 2004, and 2008 [DCE Exhibit 1].

Linfield began offering distance education in 1975 and established sites at various locations around the state after then-President Charles Walker gained Board of Trustees’ approval to establish the Division of Continuing Education. Later, DCE used the state of Oregon’s ED-NET system of satellite dishes to broadcast live courses from Salem to sites around the state. When personal computers became more common, DCE moved to electronically-mediated courses. These changes in delivery initially grew incrementally as the DCE dean worked directly with specific instructors to adapt individual courses to an online format. As student preferences for online delivery became clear in DCE enrollment patterns, aided by the availability of stable web-based course management systems, the move to a more extensive online format was approved by the senior administration. As online delivery of curricula has expanded, residential faculty are playing a role in assessing its effectiveness in accomplishing the goals of a Linfield education, both through individual instructor’s efforts and through the workings of the Continuing Education Committee (CEC). Some faculty members have had considerable success with the format and are passionate supporters; others have had negative experiences and choose not to participate again. Many residential faculty lack experience with online teaching, although hybridized classes (combining traditional face to face delivery with course management systems like Blackboard) are becoming increasingly common on both residential campuses. Some CEC members and departmental faculty liaisons have called for more extensive faculty development opportunities in electronically-mediated course delivery not only to enrich their own pedagogical options but to better position them to provide academic oversight for the DCE program. One example of the fruits of such faculty development can be seen in the DCE Exhibit 2, which documents the results of a residential faculty member’s 2007–08 comparative assessment of the learning outcomes of REL 140 (The Holy Qur’an) which he teaches both in McMinnville and in DCE.
Linfield includes DCE in its long-range planning, budgeting, and policy development processes so as to ensure that DCE receives the resources necessary to sustain its effectiveness in a changing market. The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 foregrounds educational and resource principles clearly applicable to DCE. In keeping with Policy 2.6.u, the college’s long-established commitment to the program ensures continuation “sufficient to enable enrolled students to complete the degree or certificate” they are seeking.

As a case in point, in 2004, the college contracted with Dr. Robert Wiltenburg, Dean of University College at Washington University, to review DCE operations and recommend changes to enhance the division’s continued ability to deliver a quality program. Dr. Wiltenburg recommended that the college reduce its share of the revenues generated by DCE to provide more reinvestment in the program [DCE Exhibit 30]. Subsequently the college budgeting process reduced its takeout from DCE revenues in both 2005–06 and 2006–07. With those additional funds, DCE has established an enrollment reserve and has also invested in the infrastructure to more successfully manage its online platform capability. Other areas of reinvestment include enhanced recruitment and marketing, as well as stronger liaison infrastructure support.

The mission of Linfield College identifies lifelong learning as one of its principal values. DCE assists adults in seeking a baccalaureate degree while simultaneously balancing job, family, and community obligations. DCE has fostered decades-long relationships with six feeder Oregon community colleges and continues to establish such ties with other institutions. DCE courses are also available to all college alumni for a modest fee. Many DCE adjunct faculty are professionals engaged in business or practice around the state; some work in corporate settings or regional governments. Others serve as faculty at various two- and four-year institutions in Oregon. Between fall 2005 and summer 2007, 16 residential faculty have also taught in the division, as did a number of emeriti faculty. Drawn from a wide range of backgrounds, DCE faculty both foster and model the ideal of lifelong learning.

Admission policies for DCE students reflect its mission to serve a different population of students from those attending the residential campuses—students requiring different measures for predicting academic success. Divisional administrators assess student capacity for success in distance education in three ways: (1) students must have a cumulative GPA of 2.0 in their transfer credits; no course with a grade of C- or below will transfer; (2) if a prospective student has completed no college credit, DCE staff carefully review the applicant’s work history for evidence of the maturity and self-discipline necessary to succeed at college work; admitted students are then asked to take a single course in their first semester of enrollment to help gauge their ability to succeed in an online environment; (3) if the applicant’s transcript demonstrates the requisite 2.0 GPA but raises other concerns about past academic performance, that student must petition the college Admissions and Financial Aid Committee for admittance and is sometimes referred to a community college before being accepted to Linfield. In the case of residential students who enroll in DCE classes, explanations regarding the special character of online instruction currently are left to their academic advisors, who are not always well-versed in the pedagogy. Improvement in this area is called for and should be one of the agenda items for the Continuing Education Committee in 2008–09.

The current DCE curriculum includes seven majors and four certificates. DCE curricular initiatives undergo review by the two standing committees of the residential faculty (the Continuing Education Committee and the Curriculum Committee) before reaching the Faculty Assembly, which must approve all such proposals.

The Continuing Education Committee (CEC), charged with advising on DCE policy and practice, meets monthly, its members reporting to and on behalf of their respective divisions. In 2007–08 the committee assisted in DCE’s...
preparation for re-accreditation by reviewing adjunct policies and the DCE mission statement. The committee has also worked to strengthen the protocols guiding communication between DCE administration and departmental faculty liaisons. CEC members participate in DCE-sponsored dinners held for departmental liaisons each semester since fall 2007 as a forum for both groups to consult with the DCE dean, the dean of faculty, and each other. The CEC has also advised in the drafting of this report [DCE Exhibits 3].

The learning goals of disciplinary-specific DCE majors and minors exactly mirror those articulated by the residential academic departments where they originated (Accounting, International Business, Management, and Environmental Studies). They are also described in 2007 Linfield College Catalog (pp. 149–150).

**Interdisciplinary Divisional Majors**

DCE offered a major in Liberal Studies until 1992, when two new majors—the Arts and Humanities major (A&H) and the Social and Behavioral Sciences major (SBS)—took its place. These interdisciplinary majors provide students who pursue them with a more defined academic focus than that provided by the Liberal Studies major that preceded them. The related academic division (Arts and Humanities in one case, Social and Behavioral Sciences in the other) consulted on each major’s curricular design and assumed responsibility for the major’s academic integrity. The Faculty Assembly approved their creation.

**Arts and Humanities (A&H) Major**

The 40 credit interdisciplinary A&H major, directed by Dr. William Millar (chair of the Religious Studies Department) allows students to explore the fields of art and visual culture, English, philosophy, modern languages, music, religious studies, and theatre/communication arts. Between 3–12 majors graduate annually. The senior capstone project provides a culminating year-long experience consisting of a one-semester research methods course (during which a thesis topic is developed) and a second semester in which the research project is completed under the guidance of the program director and a second faculty reader. The student presents the project orally to these and other interested persons. See 2007 Linfield College Catalog, p. 148, for goals of the major.

**Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) Major**

This 40-credit interdisciplinary major allows students to explore the fields of economics, history, political science, psychology, and sociology/anthropology. Many graduates plan careers or advanced studies in human services, social work, or other service professions. The year-long senior research project provides the capstone experience. In the one-semester research methods class (offered either as SOA 308, HST 485, or PSY 490), the student identifies a thesis topic; that thesis is written the following semester under the guidance of the instructor of the previous course. See the 2007 Linfield College Catalog, p. 150, for goals of the major.

**Business Information Systems (BIS) Major**

Core course requirements for this interdisciplinary major derive from the Departments of Business and Computer Science and allow students to choose either a Management emphasis or an Information Systems emphasis. Each concentration includes a capstone course where students undertake a final integrative experience. The Management emphasis requires BUS 495, the same capstone required in the DCE Management major and the McMinnville Campus Business major. The Information Systems emphasis requires CSC 400 Applied Software Development Project. See the 2007 Linfield College Catalog, pp. 148–149 for goals of the major.

**Certificates**

DCE offers certificates in Accounting (post-baccalaureate), Computer Information Systems, Human Resource Management, and Marketing. All four curricula derive from existing majors in Business and Computer Science and rest upon credit-bearing classes that enhance enrollees’ employment options while providing a stepping stone to the baccalaureate. Students seeking certificates need not complete general education requirements. Many who finish a certificate do go on to earn a bachelor’s degree at the college.
Assessment (in conjunction with Policy 2.6.c, 2.6.d, 2.6.e)

All individual DCE courses are evaluated by students every term. Courses delivered face-to-face use the evaluation form used on the residential campuses; these results are tabulated in relation to all other Linfield courses taught that semester. With online courses, a pilot online survey form has been created by combining questions about teaching from the standard college form with questions asking about the technology interface and the direct student/faculty contact provided. Review of the pilot form and its efficacy will be undertaken by the CEC and the Faculty Development Committee in 2008–09; the Faculty Development Committee will tender its recommendations regarding this form to the Faculty Assembly [DCE Exhibit 4]. Results of individual online course evaluations compiled to date have not been compared with each other, residential campus offerings, or face-to-face DCE classes because of technology difficulties, but in fall 2008 DCE will develop the software interface to allow online course evaluation results to be tabulated in relation to one another. The DCE dean is also investigating the possibility of a new software package to permit the scoring of written and online course evaluations together, thereby providing one measure of comparability between residential and DCE course outcomes.

The DCE dean reviews all teaching evaluations and sends them to the appropriate departmental liaison; they are also shared with the instructors. The continued employment of any instructor (adjunct or residential) requires consistently good teaching evaluations. Where improvement is indicated, the DCE dean discusses options with the instructor and preferably with the departmental liaison as well. Institutional efforts to improve coordinated communication around this process between DCE and individual liaisons began in 2007–08 and are ongoing in 2008–09.

DCE also receives the annual results of the annual Linfield Senior Survey wherein students comment on their experiences at the college. Prior to 2007, response rates had remained low but the survey is now sent online, which has already boosted participation significantly.

These data have already begun yielding more information to help improve DCE programs and procedures.

Curricular oversight by the residential faculty is designed to provide educational cohesiveness for DCE’s dispersed programs, students, and faculty. The Continuing Education Committee (CEC) advises on DCE policies and practices and will be playing an increasing role in reviewing assessment practices and reporting to the Faculty Assembly on this matter. Departmentally based DCE liaisons work with the CEC and with DCE staff to achieve a mutually acceptable and timely review of planned course offerings and syllabi; all three groups have spent 2007–08 working to improve communication around their respective roles in this process.

Assessment of DCE majors in Accounting, International Business, and Management replicates that applied to the same majors on the McMinnville Campus. With regard to the A&H and SBS majors, residential faculty in the Arts and Humanities Division and the Social and Behavioral Sciences Division are charged with responsibility for the interdisciplinary majors built on their respective curricula. Assessment procedures for both will be reviewed in 2008–09, in keeping with the DCE dean’s proposal of a four-year assessment cycle for them. Dr. William Millar is currently piloting an assessment protocol for the A&H major whose results he will share in fall 2008 with the CEC [DCE Exhibit 35].

The DCE dean envisions the following stages in the finalized process: (1) a survey of current students and alumni using a tool developed by departmental liaisons and the dean; (2) a survey of DCE faculty using a tool developed in the same way; (3) review of results by the divisions in which each major resides, with conclusions and suggestions reviewed by the DCE dean, the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty, and the CEC; (4) resultant drafts sent to the overseeing divisions and/or departments for review, with revised proposals submitted to the Faculty Curriculum Committee and eventually
the Faculty Assembly; (5) implementation of changes the following academic year. Such an assessment regimen would be conducted on each major every four years. This effort should be central to the work of DCE and the CEC in 2008–09, with recommendations coming to the Curriculum Committee and then to the Faculty Assembly [DCE Exhibit 5].

The DCE dean has developed a goals assessment rubric which requires each instructor to identify the learning outcomes sought in every course taught, how the course will pursue those goals in relation to specifics in the syllabus, how outcomes are to be evaluated, how successfully goals were attained (after course completion), and what modifications to the syllabus or course delivery will be undertaken based on that information [DCE Exhibit 6]. The DCE dean will present this rubric in fall 2008 to the CEC for review as a baseline against which to assess consistency across individual sections of a given course and upon which to analyze the effectiveness of different instructional methods.

The CEC will present recommendations to the Curriculum Committee and, from there, to the Faculty Assembly.

Beginning with new courses coming forward in fall 2008, each online course will be designed using an augmented form developed by a faculty member on the CEC who is completing doctoral studies in the area of online pedagogy. This rubric assesses new course proposals according to seven essential elements, some of which extend beyond the criteria included in the Goals Assessment Rubric. The DCE dean and the faculty author of the document will present it to the CEC in fall 2008 for review. It sets up guidelines for each course syllabus in terms of: (1) clear and organized graphic appearance, as well as ease of navigation; (2) syllabus inclusion of college and course standards, as well as information for handling technology issues; (3) explicit and transparent grading criteria, including any grading rubrics or templates used; (4) clear, easily accessible learning activities explicitly linked to course outcomes; (5) inclusion of multi-media as appropriate to course content; (6) functional links to appropriate resources within and outside the college so as to enhance the learning activity; (7) opportunities for social engagement by students and faculty [DCE Exhibit 7]. Here too the CEC will forward recommendations at the appropriate DCE liaisons’ dinner and from there will take its recommendations to the Curriculum Committee for review and presentation to the Faculty Assembly.

2.G.2 The institution is solely responsible for the academic and fiscal elements of all instructional programs it offers. The institution conforms to Policy A-6 Contractual Relationships with Organizations Not Regionally Accredited. AND Policy 2.6.g.

DCE’s budget exists as a subset of the integrated college budget [DCE Exhibits 31]. The DCE dean relies on faculty liaisons across residential departments, as well as the Continuing Education Committee, the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Assembly, to provide the academic oversight required by the Bylaws of Linfield College. DCE has no contractual arrangements with non-accredited organizations.

The institution’s distance education policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, faculty compensation, copyright issues, and the utilization of revenue derived from the creation and production of software, telecourses or other media products. Each faculty member who creates an online course is paid a development fee and a per-student fee if another faculty member later teaches the course. This arrangement covers the next three offerings of the class under DCE, after which time all rights devolve to the program. [DCE Exhibit 8].
2.G.3 Full-time faculty representing the appropriate disciplines and fields of work are involved in the planning and evaluation of the institution’s continuing education and special learning activities. AND Policy 2.6.f, 2.6.j, 2.6.x.

The departmental liaison system arose in response to recommendations made in the 1998 accreditation process to ensure more direct academic oversight of DCE curricula by the residential faculty [DCE Exhibit 9]. DCE staff consult with a liaison when questions arise about departmental prerequisites, course offerings, course sequencing, and other curricular matters. Liaisons are accorded a stipend for their work in reviewing applicant instructor CV’s, book lists, and course evaluations. Recently liaisons have asked to review syllabi along with book lists, and efforts have begun to improve the timeliness of such information exchange.

Recent efforts by the DCE dean and the CEC have helped to clarify the responsibilities of liaisons. In 2008–09, the dean will also contract with a residential faculty member to serve as liaison mentor to provide another means of improving communication between DCE and departmental contacts. Liaisons have requested greater timeliness of information regarding upcoming DCE offerings, and the DCE dean is developing a formalized timeline for the delivery and return of information on a given course or instructor between DCE and the liaison. Similarly, in spring 2008, liaisons began receiving information prior to the publishing of the forthcoming year’s DCE course schedule and faculty, as well as any modifications that occur through the year. DCE instructors will also be asked to meet deadlines for syllabi and book list submission to the DCE dean so that this information can be reviewed by liaisons before the course is advertised [DCE Exhibit 10]. In turn, liaisons have recommitted themselves to prompt responses following receipt of these materials to assist with pressing DCE deadlines involving student registration. These examples have directly resulted from the dinner meetings inaugurated in fall 2007 and held every semester.

The learning goals of DCE curricula exactly match those of the academic departments whose majors or minor are offered. The liberal arts focus embodied in Linfield’s general education degree requirements remain operative wherever they may have been completed; the DCE program also offers many Linfield Curriculum classes drawn from the approved curricula of seventeen academic departments. Students who choose professionally oriented majors may initially question the importance of the liberal arts core but senior surveys indicate many come to appreciate the educational breadth provided by this coursework [DCE Exhibit 11]. The recent college-wide review of all general education classes for adherence to newly articulated shared learning goals (see 2.C. 1–3) ensures fresh familiarity of all liaisons with the specific goals of Linfield Curriculum courses and should further contribute to the consistency between DCE and residential faculty offerings in this area.

As the DCE Student Handbook indicates (p. 32), those enrolled in DCE may access all campus library resources available on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, as well as Linfield interlibrary loan services and the combined regional opportunities provided by the Orbis-Cascade Alliance (see Standard 5). One of the regular college librarians (a tenured member of the faculty) holds a .61 FTE appointment in DCE (half of a 12 month faculty contract) and receives ten hours of DCE-supported work study per week to satisfy library requests from its students. This arrangement ensures that the same informational literacy goals operate for DCE and residential students. The distance learning librarian monitors and reports annual DCE faculty and student use of library resources [DCE Exhibit 12]. Also see Standard 5.

While not a requirement, many residential faculty teach in DCE (16 in the last five years); all international field-based courses are led by full-time faculty. Some teach several courses a year; an increasing number teach online courses [DCE Exhibit 13]. A number of residential
faculty who teach the same course both in a face-to-face format on the McMinnville Campus and in an online format for DCE have analyzed the comparability of their courses as learning environments for students; their summaries appear in the DCE Exhibit 33. Also see DCE Exhibit 2 for Professor William Millar’s study of the two formats in his delivery of REL 140.

In recent years the foundational relationship between DCE curricula and those of the residential campuses has become even clearer than it had been given the greater numbers of residential students who enroll in DCE classes either in Summer Session or during the regular semester [Exhibit 34]. This fact reinforces the role of departmental liaisons in ensuring consistent instructor quality and course outcomes. To retain the residential character of campus-based majors, the college has adopted a policy permitting McMinnville and Portland Campus students to enroll in only one DCE class per regular semester (2007 Linfield College Course Catalog, p. 22). Some academic departments may require majors to complete key program components with on-campus faculty to ensure the direct mentoring that is a hallmark of their programs.

2.G.4 The responsibility for the administration of continuing education and special learning activities is clearly defined and an integral organizational component of the institution’s organization. AND Policy 2.6.h, 2.6.o, 2.6.q.

In 2005 the chief administrator for the Division of Continuing Education was given the title of dean while continuing to report to the vice president for Academic Affairs/dean of faculty [DCE Exhibit 14]. Regular consultation also occurs with the vice president for Finance and Administration. An associate registrar for DCE located on the McMinnville Campus oversees all admissions activity and monitors student academic progress. Adjunct faculty receive a copy of the policies and procedures of Linfield College and the Division of Continuing Education in the DCE Adjunct Handbook [DCE Exhibit 32].

DCE employs a cohort of geographically dispersed academic advisors. [DCE Exhibit 37] The number has decreased since 1998 due to lower enrollments borne of growing competition from other online and regional degree completion programs. Advisors currently serve at the following sites:

- Portland Metro: 2 FTE (two individuals each holding a full 1.0 FTE)
- McMinnville: .5 FTE (two individuals, each with a .25 FTE advising load)
- Salem: .8 FTE (one individual)
- Albany/Eugene: 1 FTE (one individual)
- Coos Bay: One hourly advisor
- Bend: One hourly advisor

This represents a loss of 2 FTE from 1998 levels (1 FTE was lost in Corvallis and .5 FTE was cut in Astoria; Coos Bay and Bend staff went from .5 FTE to an hourly wage).

All applicants to the Adult Degree Program receive an official transfer evaluation with their letter of admission to the college. Students and advisors have 24 hour access to degree audits on WebAdvisor to monitor progress toward degree completion. DCE advisors also use a streamlined graduation check sheet developed for each major by the associate registrar. This administrator reviews all senior degree audits prior to graduation and communicates with them several times during that time [DCE Exhibit 15].

Financial aid is awarded by the McMinnville Campus Office of Financial Aid. Every effort is made to ensure institutional integrity through complete accuracy in DCE publications and advertisements, all of which are updated annually (more frequently when necessary). DCE staff are currently working with the college institutional researcher to develop protocols for conducting a cohort style retention analysis each fall and spring; data collected will not only illuminate potential retention issues but will also allow comparison between DCE and other distance education programs.
To manage the technology infrastructure needed to deliver its online curriculum, DCE also employs a technology and systems administrator who oversees a DCE-owned server and manages Blackboard for the entire college.

In summer 2008 the college hired a new associate dean of nursing for distance education, stationed on the Portland Campus, who reports to the dean of the School of Nursing and provides academic oversight for the RN to BSN program operated through DCE’s Adult Degree Program. This hire also promises to enhance communication Portland Campus faculty and DCE.

Staff at DCE’s central office in McMinnville assist faculty in ordering desk copies of texts, securing copyright permission for course materials, and working with students to meet other needs. Instructional materials, including textbooks, are ordered online through the McMinnville Campus bookstore and delivered by mail to the Portland Campus DCE office [DCE Exhibit 16].

Student feedback about the administration of the program occurs most regularly through the online Senior Survey requested of all pending graduates (for recent DCE results, see 2.C.5. Academic Advising). Students may pursue academic grievances through DCE administrators and staff, as noted in the DCE Student Handbook (p.29). Complaints about administrative issues themselves come first to the divisional dean, or, where circumstances dictate, to the vice president for Academic Affairs.

2.G.5 Programs and courses offered through electronically-mediated or other distance delivery systems provide ready access to appropriate learning resources and provide sufficient time and opportunities (electronic or others) for students to interact with faculty. AND Policy 2.6.i, 2.6.l, 2.6.m, 2.6.n, 2.6.r, 2.6.s, 2.6.x.

Each syllabus articulates the requirements for regular, frequent interactions between instructor and students, as well as among enrollees themselves. All syllabi undergo review by the DCE dean to ensure sufficient amount and quality of student-instructor interaction [DCE Exhibit 17]. Teaching evaluations for online courses specifically ask students to assess this aspect of instructor performance [DCE Exhibit 4]. Some departmental liaisons have requested training in online course design to better equip them to review electronically mediated classes taught by DCE instructors [DCE Exhibits 6].

All online courses offered through Blackboard include links to technological assistance and library support. Several means to assist faculty in using this technology are available: (1) two consultants hired by DCE work individually with faculty to design courses using the most appropriate Blackboard tools. The DCE dean facilitates contacts between faculty and these consultants; (2) a full time Blackboard systems administrator supports faculty as they learn to harness the technology to their educational goals; (3) a yearly workshop trains faculty in new technology and teaching techniques [DCE Exhibits 18]; (4) residential faculty experienced with online instruction have mentored newcomers in the design of their courses. The systems administrator and dean regularly attend training sessions sponsored by Blackboard and other software vendors to share new information with DCE instructors. DCE holds a license for Webex, which allows the systems administrator to control computers remotely and conduct diagnostics and repairs problems as they arise at other sites.

DCE manages its own server for Blackboard usage, and only its systems administrator accesses, updates, and repairs it. In 2008, DCE contracted with Blackboard for a two-day on-site visit by a Blackboard specialist who performed a Technology Health Check on DCE’s server and Blackboard installation to ensure optimal use of the platform.
Each advisor's office is equipped with a computer, DSL Internet connection, printer, telephone, copier, and fax machine. DCE budgets each year for equipment and software replacement and upgrades [DCE Exhibit 19].

DCE prepares students for the demands of the online learning environment in several ways. The technical requirements for online courses are published in the DCE Student Handbook (p. 19) and as part of every course schedule. Prospective students who have not successfully completed an online course elsewhere or who have not taken an introductory course in microcomputer applications must verify their computer proficiency and skills before being admitted [DCE Exhibit 20]. DCE’s Blackboard site includes a demonstration course in using the technology. The DCE systems administrator conducts a Blackboard training session on both the Portland and McMinnville Campuses at the start of every semester; he is also available for individual training [DCE Exhibit 21]. The DCE website also provides students with a thumbnail explanation of what to expect of (and how to be responsible for) online learning. More work needs to be done to ensure that residential students who enroll in online courses understand that successful online learning strategies differ from traditional classroom practices, particularly since faculty advisors may not have had any experience with such modes of delivery and the pedagogies employed. Beginning in fall 2008, the online course evaluation form will include questions that explicitly ask students if they availed themselves of the training for online courses provided by DCE, and if so, how effectively it prepared them for online learning.

As a means of ensuring the integrity of the student work submitted to them, the college subscribes to Turnitin.com, an online tool for detecting plagiarism, used by residential and DCE faculty alike. The online version of the DCE Entry Colloquium for new students discusses academic dishonesty at length and also trains students to avoid plagiarism. Such instruction also occurs in classes taken for degree completion in the major, particularly research-based capstone courses.

When courses require specific laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the learning goals of the class, DCE staff ensure the availability of those resources, either by locating the courses on the McMinnville or Portland Campuses (where access to all college facilities is provided) or by contracting with community college partners for classroom and equipment usage. [DCE Exhibit 22].

2.G.6 There is an equitable fee structure and refund policy. AND Policy 2.6.o.

DCE’s refund policy complies with federal mandates and matches those of other adult degree programs. The tuition and fee structure for DCE is lower than that of the two residential campuses because Adult Degree Program students receive fewer college services. They may apply for only four of Linfield’s many scholarships. They do not have access to campus-based athletic facilities, health centers, counseling services, sports activities, student life outings, or clubs. To enroll in a McMinnville or Portland Campus course they must pay the same tuition rate per hour as full-time students. They are not eligible for the free airfare of field-based courses in January Term; if they take a Summer Term field-based course they pay all expenses, including airfare. Currently DCE students do not use the Career Services Office on-campus but DCE staff are creating a Career Services page on the DCE homepage to make available a wide variety of resources in this area.

2.G.7 The granting of credit for continuing education courses and special learning activities is based upon institutional policy, consistent throughout the institution, and applied wherever located and however delivered. The standard of one quarter hour of credit for 30 hours or one semester hour of credit for 45 hours of student involvement is maintained for instructional programs and courses.
To ensure compliance with the institutional definition of an academic credit, the DCE dean reviews the syllabus for each adjunct-taught course, including assigned reading, research expectations, number of assigned papers/projects, and expected levels of online discussion. To assist adjuncts in developing their syllabi, DCE provides them with examples of syllabi used for the same courses on the residential campuses. In 2007–08, one result of deliberations among the DCE dean, the CEC, and departmental liaisons was the agreement that a consistent timeline for the approval process for syllabi and book lists was desirable. This approach would provide another means of ensuring consistent practice across the college regarding the relation between credits earned and workload. The DCE online course evaluation also contains questions asking for student perceptions of the class workload.

2.G.8 Continuing education and/or special learning activities, programs, or courses offered for academic credit are approved in advance by the appropriate institutional body and monitored through established procedures.

All individual classes, as well as majors, minors, and certificates, offered through DCE have been vetted and approved through the regular processes of the college as monitored by the faculty through the Curriculum Committee and the Faculty Assembly. Where DCE relies on established departmental curricula, no additional approval is required, whereas courses specifically created to meet the needs of DCE students must be proposed to and reviewed by the Curriculum Committee before being recommended to the Faculty Assembly for inclusion in the college curriculum [DCE Exhibit 23 and 24]. The CEC provides another avenue for faculty review of curricular development in DCE. The departmental liaison system, whose strengthening has been a major focus of CEC efforts in 2007–08, provides still another means by which institutional monitoring of DCE curricula occurs.

2.G.9 Credit for prior experiential learning is offered only at the undergraduate level and in accordance with Policy 2.3 Credit for Prior Experiential Learning.

Linfield offers undergraduates the opportunity to earn credit toward their baccalaureate degree through prior experiential learning. The DCE Student Handbook and the pamphlet “You Deserve the Credit” describe the portfolio process as the preferred means toward that end in that program. Only 30 credits may be earned through portfolio submission, and only subjects that are part of Linfield’s regular curriculum are accepted. Students must take IDS 250 to assist them in preparing their portfolios. Full-time faculty in the appropriate disciplines review submitted DCE portfolios to decide if and how many credits may be awarded. A nonrefundable fee is charged for portfolio review prior to evaluation [DCE Exhibits 25, 26, 27, 28].

2.G.10 An institution offering an external degree, degree-completion program, or special degree has clearly articulated policies and procedures concerning admission to the program, transfer of prior-earned credit, credit by examination (e.g., College Level Examination Program (CLEP) of the College Entrance Examination Board and the institution’s own examinations), credit for prior experiential learning, credit by evaluation, and residency requirements.

DCE’s transfer credit policies are comparable to long-established policies operating on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses. They are published in the Linfield College Catalog and...
Field-based courses offered by DCE are created and approved by the same institutional bodies as any other DCE, McMinnville, or Portland Campus course and require the same level of academic rigor. These courses typically require substantial reading, field observation and field journals, written papers of various types, and possibly exams [DCE Exhibit 29].

Future Plans
One of Linfield’s strategic goals involves greater integration of the McMinnville Campus, the Portland Campus, and DCE. As the previous discussion makes clear, their curricula are already intimately intertwined and, indeed, mirror each other in terms of learning goals and other standards of academic quality. Several institutional challenges present themselves, however, in terms of achieving a clearer partnership between the residential and DCE programs. As exists in many higher educational institutions, some residential faculty regard the differences in delivery method, staffing, and campus life between their worlds and that of DCE as thwarting true comparability in outcomes. The increasing use of hybridized courses by residential faculty may foster greater comfort with the delivery modes dominant in DCE and thus may promote growing confidence in DCE’s contributions to the educational mission of Linfield College. By forging a stronger departmental liaison system linking DCE and residential academic programs, the leadership of the CEC also seeks to enhance that sense of shared mission. But progress on these fronts will take time and sustained effort, both of which are in short supply for residential faculty whose work load is already high (see Standard 4).

As assessment processes (see 2.G.1 and those listed below) are more widely discussed with and approved by the appropriate faculty bodies, greater residential faculty understanding of the student learning and advancement accomplished in DCE should also result. Development of the following tools is thus a high priority for DCE in the near future:

- An evaluation tool allowing full time faculty who teach the same course in DCE and on the McMinnville Campus to compare the experiences by way of assessing student learning outcomes; Dr. William Millar, director of the Arts & Humanities interdisciplinary major, has been a leader in this effort. The results of the evaluation process will also contribute to bolstering understanding of and confidence in the effectiveness of online instruction.
- An assessment survey for McMinnville Campus students who take DCE courses and can provide valuable perceptions regarding comparability of workload, rigor,
teaching quality with residentially delivered classroom experiences.

- Further clarification of the role of DCE liaison and regular consultation with an advisory board consisting of those faculty members. This effort should also result in more direct and regular contact between liaisons and the adjunct faculty delivering their departmental curricula to keep departments better informed about the quality of their performance and that of the students they teach.

The consultancy report submitted in 2004 by Dr. Robert Wiltenburg also offered important considerations for DCE’s future planning in two areas [DCE Exhibits 30]. He suggested that Linfield would be well-served to initiate a college-wide discussion of DCE’s vision and mission so as to foster a renewed sense of its contributions to the long term institutional mission and strategic aims. Accordingly, this conversation began in 2007–08 and will continue into 2008–09. While most of the discussion to date has been about administrative rather than larger issues, the plan is to expand the conversation.

Dr. Wiltenburg also suggested that Linfield examine how DCE can remain competitive with the growing number of competitors in the area of online, adult, and degree completion. In the four years since his visit, the competition has become even more intense with more players entering all fields. He outlined several approaches, some of which have been undertaken:

- **Online marketing, especially of online programs.** DCE has since hired a search engine optimization (SEO) consultant who advised changing key words and key word placement so that DCE now appears regularly on the first page of organic search results. SEO consultation will continue in the future.

- **Community college articulation agreements.** DCE has articulation agreements with several community colleges and a dual enrollment agreement with Portland Community College, the largest public post-secondary institution in Oregon. The RN to BSN program has separate articulations with five community colleges. DCE is working to increase these.

- **Technology costs and pedagogical efficacy.** The more powerful and sophisticated the technology, the more expensive it is to maintain hardware, software, and student and faculty technical assistance. DCE employs two part-time consultants who work with faculty to design and later troubleshoot courses. The DCE dean hopes to enhance effectiveness of this process by adding a newly retired faculty member to assist with course development and oversight, as well as with faculty/departmental liaison mentoring. Additional Blackboard assistance for faculty would also improve the quality of the courses.

- **A more nimble structure.** The process by which a new major or concentration is reviewed and approved at Linfield is typically a year, while the market in which DCE competes moves quickly. DCE would benefit from an efficient process for approving experimental programs while maintaining sufficient faculty oversight. Seeking this balance has been a topic of discussion on-campus for several years and will continue into 2008–09.
Conclusion

Linfield College has reason to be proud of the excellence of the academic program it provides its graduates. Certainly the results of Senior and Alumni Surveys indicate high levels of satisfaction with what was accomplished while at the institution and great appreciation for what faculty have contributed to their lives. Yet this self-study has identified a number of strategic challenges for the college in regard to the future of the educational program—challenges that will require campus-wide and department-specific analysis. Those strategic issues include the following:

- Development of integrated problem-solving strategies within the faculty governance structure and the administration for addressing long-term approaches to resource needs of departments, particularly staffing and equipment;
- Development of a comprehensive institutional culture of evidence-based educational assessment of student learning to accompany assessment efforts at the departmental level;
- Development of a regular departmental review process built upon a partnership between faculty governance structures and the Office of Academic Affairs;
- Continued curricular integration of the Portland and McMinnville Campuses in service to majors on both campuses;
- Continued strengthening of the communication and oversight loop between the Division of Continuing Education and the faculty to meet the needs of both;
- Expansion of faculty development support in relation to technology-based pedagogy.

Some of these issues raise resources questions and drive home the need for the college to continue efforts to expand its resource base, particularly through endowment growth, so as to support educational excellence in an increasingly competitive—and expensive—higher education landscape. For this very reason the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 includes three Foundational Resource Principles as central to the well-being of the institution.

Other challenges cited above must be addressed without intensifying an already heavy faculty workload, as noted in Standard 4. Perhaps the central problem for the college to solve in this regard, then, involves finding ways to make progress on such issues as institutional assessment, regular departmental review, curricular integration and oversight across all of its branches, and faculty pedagogical advancement by rethinking other facets of the faculty workload equation.
## Standard 2 Attachment 1 Inventory of Assessment Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Standard 2 Exhibit Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Linfield College Institutional Data 2007 (A Fact Book)</em></td>
<td>Exhibit 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Survey of Student Engagement Reports: 2005, 2007</td>
<td>Exhibit 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Year and Ten Year Combined Alumni Survey, 2008</td>
<td>Exhibit 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Surveys since 2005</td>
<td>Exhibit 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs Annual Reports</td>
<td>Exhibit 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERC Report to the Faculty Assembly after Reviewing The Linfield Curriculum</td>
<td>Exhibit 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Seminar Portfolio Review Summaries</td>
<td>Exhibit 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Seminar Student Course Evaluation Scores 07-08</td>
<td>Exhibit 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January Term Off Campus Evaluation Materials (Faculty; Student)</td>
<td>Exhibit 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester-Abroad Evaluation Materials (Student)</td>
<td>Exhibit 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Distribution Report</td>
<td>Exhibit 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Course Evaluation Forms (including online)</td>
<td>Exhibit 33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 2 Attachment 2 Inventory of Degree Programs Added or Deleted Since 2003

Added:                      Year Added:
Environmental Studies Major 2003-04
Japanese Major              2004-05
Communication Arts Major    2005-06
Intercultural Communication Major 2005-06
Electronic Arts Major       2006-07
German Studies Major        2007-08

Deleted: NONE
### Standard 2 Attachment 3 Number of Degrees Granted in Each Program Since 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
<th></th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>McMinnville Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>McMinnville Campus (continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Degree Graduates</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Studies (w. Biblical)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduates' majors (includes some double majors):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Physics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art, Studio</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Studies - German</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Science</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Science</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Major#</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Communication</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Concentration</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing Concentration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music (all concentrations)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PORTLAND CAMPUS**

|                      |       |       |       |                     |       |       |       |
| All Degree Graduates | 155   | 174   | 174   |                     |       |       |       |
| **Graduates' majors:** |       |       |       |                     |       |       |       |
| Health Sciences      | 4     | 8     | 11    |                     |       |       |       |
| Nursing              | 146   | 164   | 157   |                     |       |       |       |
| Nursing (RN to BSN)  | 5     | 2     | 6     |                     |       |       |       |

**DIV. OF CONTINUING EDUCATION**

|                      |       |       |       |                     |       |       |       |
| All Degree Graduates | 126   | 128   | 119   |                     |       |       |       |
| **Certificate-only completors** |       |       |       |                     |       |       |       |
| Accounting           | 28    | 31    | 32    |                     |       |       |       |
| Arts & Humanities    | 6     | 6     | 6     |                     |       |       |       |
| Bus Information Syst | 14    | 11    | 5     |                     |       |       |       |
| International Business | 3  | 2     | -     |                     |       |       |       |
| Management           | 34    | 31    | 33    |                     |       |       |       |
| Nursing (RN to BSN)  | 18    | 21    | 23    |                     |       |       |       |
| Social & Behav. Sciences | 23 | 26    | 21    |                     |       |       |       |

**Graduates' majors (includes some double majors)**

|                      |       |       |       |                     |       |       |       |
| Accounting           | 28    | 31    | 32    |                     |       |       |       |
| Arts & Humanities    | 6     | 6     | 6     |                     |       |       |       |
| Bus Information Syst | 14    | 11    | 5     |                     |       |       |       |
| International Business | 3  | 2     | -     |                     |       |       |       |
| Management           | 34    | 31    | 33    |                     |       |       |       |
| Nursing (RN to BSN)  | 18    | 21    | 23    |                     |       |       |       |
| Social & Behav. Sciences | 23 | 26    | 21    |                     |       |       |       |
The purpose of the general education requirement called the Linfield Curriculum is to foster the development of wholly-educated persons by providing a coherent experience spanning the arts and humanities, natural sciences, and social/behavioral sciences. The Linfield Curriculum seeks to enable students to communicate effectively; appreciate literary, artistic, and historical works; be conversant with various philosophical and religious conceptions of humanity; understand the role of diversity both globally and nationally; analyze how human beings behave individually and socially; understand, formulate, and critique quantitative arguments; and comprehend the methods and accomplishments of modern science.

Grounded in the multidisciplinary spirit of the liberal arts, the Linfield Curriculum stresses wide exposure to the ways that educated individuals, be they scientists, artists, entrepreneurs, teachers, or ethicists, engage ideas, articulate choices, and assert opinions. It encourages students to cultivate intellectual and personal flexibility, pursue independent action, and engage in responsible decision-making. The Linfield Curriculum emphasizes communication and facilitates self-discovery in personal, cultural, and academic contexts. It affirms the need to understand people and societies both nationally and internationally. In short, the Linfield Curriculum encourages inquiry, analysis, and imagination, habits of mind that provide the foundation for reasoned action, wonder, and continued learning in all aspects of life.

The Linfield Curriculum consists of four major components: (1) the Inquiry Seminar; (2) Six Modes of Inquiry; (3) Global and Multicultural Inquiry; and (4) a Writing-Intensive Requirement. Courses contributing to the Linfield Curriculum (including Modes of Inquiry, Global and Multicultural Inquiry, and Writing-Intensive courses) are normally a minimum of 3 semester-credits. Any single class transferred from outside institutions must be at least 3 semester-credits or 4 quarter-credits. To encourage intellectual breadth, no student may count more than two courses from a single department toward completion of the Linfield Curriculum.

I. The Inquiry Seminar (INQS 125)

At the center of the Linfield Curriculum is the Inquiry Seminar, taken by each first- or second-year student. A collaborative investigation of a compelling subject, the Inquiry Seminar builds upon and deepens the relationship between thinking and communication, both oral and written. It models the goals of the entire Linfield Curriculum by developing the critical thinking skills common to every discipline and vital to becoming an educated person. Inquiry Seminars are taught by faculty from many fields and offer a wide range of topics varying from semester to semester. Because they provide an introduction to thinking and communicating within the academic environment, Inquiry Seminars do not satisfy requirements for majors and minors. Each student may take only one Inquiry Seminar except in cases of failure.

Learning Objectives:
The overarching goal of the Inquiry Seminar is to introduce our students to the practices of inquiry, which form the foundation for the intellectual communities of the academy and the larger society. We believe this introduction is best accomplished by creating opportunities to conduct real inquiry within the classroom. We also recognize that the Inquiry Seminar is a beginning and that students will continue to
develop and refine the skills and habits of inquiry across courses and disciplines during their four years of study.

- Our students will frame key questions important to their own inquiry and to the understanding of a particular area of knowledge about which there is room for interpretation, ambiguity, and/or debate.
- Our students will discuss, draft, compose, and reconsider answers to such questions in ways appropriate to the field and compelling to an intended audience.
- Our students will engage and incorporate the voices of others to support their own learning and argumentation. In doing so, they will conduct research using library resources cited according to the ethical expectations of their academic community.
- Our students will self-consciously and self-critically reflect on their own ways of thinking.
- Our students will undertake all of these tasks, both as speakers and writers, using standard American English.

II. The Six Modes of Inquiry

The Modes of Inquiry offer six conceptual frames of reference central to the pursuit and construction of modern knowledge: Creative Studies; Individuals, Systems, and Societies; Natural World; Quantitative Reasoning; Ultimate Questions; and Vital Past. While resembling the traditional distributional arrangements of general education, these categories also transcend them by asking students and faculty to focus on the distinctive cross-disciplinary questions underlying each Mode of Inquiry. The Linfield Curriculum encourages intellectual breadth by introducing students to a wide variety of academic experiences.

Each student must complete at least seven approved courses, one in each of the Six Modes of Inquiry and one Upper-Division course. This Upper-Division course must be at the 300 level or above. It may be taken from any of the Modes of Inquiry, but it must be a course from outside the student’s major department. In the case of a student with multiple majors, the Upper Division course must be from outside one of the major departments. In other words, it may not be a course which satisfies the requirements of both majors. In the case of interdisciplinary majors, the Upper Division course must be from outside the student’s field of study.

A. Creative Studies (CS)

Courses with this designation are dedicated to the study of theory and practice in music, theatre, literature, and the visual and plastic arts. They foreground creative theory, or creative practice, or integrate the two. These courses study the making of art and how meaning—sometimes tense or contradictory—rises out of the interaction between artists, artworks, and audiences. Thus, they ask students to inquire into the ambiguities, contradictions, and tensions fundamental to art-making and its aesthetic effects. Art is a primary way that human beings reflect upon their experiences and perceptions. Therefore, these courses encourage students to value lifelong engagement with the arts. Creative Studies courses are designated CS in this catalog and each semester’s registration materials.

Learning Objectives:
Creative Studies (CS) students will:

- explore the media, genre, craft and presentation of art;
- investigate the complexity of defining and interpreting art;
- examine the contexts and influences of art;
- practice the improvisational and technical processes of art.
All syllabi for courses with the CS designation will include objective 1. In addition, they will include at least one of the remaining three.

**B. Individuals, Systems, and Societies (IS)**
Courses in this mode examine how members of societies organize themselves to satisfy individual and collective goals. They foster an understanding of the complexity and interconnectedness of individuals, systems, and societies across local, national, and/or global contexts. They also encourage students to think critically about themselves and their relationships to other individuals, institutions, and/or social systems. Individuals, Systems, and Societies courses are designated IS in this catalog and each semester’s registration materials.

**Learning Objectives:**
Courses with an **Individuals, Systems, and Societies (IS)** designation are intended to provide students with opportunities to:

- Understand individual, systemic, and/or social processes;
- Analyze individuals, systems, and/or societies through multiple frames of reference;
- Think critically about the ways that society affects individual behavior and/or individual behavior affects society;
- Articulate how key theoretical principles can be used to explain individual and social processes, inform public policy and/or develop practical approaches to human problems across local, regional, and/or global contexts.

To receive the IS designation courses must include one or more of the above objectives in the syllabus. Those courses meeting fewer than two objectives should address the learning goal in greater depth.

**C. Natural World (NW)**
Courses in this mode explore science as a way of knowing about the natural world, highlighting the process of scientific inquiry and the interplay between theoretical and experimental analysis. They focus on fundamental principles that illuminate the study of our surroundings, including matter, energy, and living things. Emphasis is placed on students making connections between science and their daily lives. Natural World courses are designated NW in this catalog and each semester’s registration materials.

**Learning Objectives:**
Courses with a **Natural World (NW)** designation are intended to provide students with opportunities to learn:

- To use the scientific method to pursue answers to questions;
- To think critically about current scientific developments;
- To understand the historical development of scientific ideas;
- To appreciate how knowledge gained by scientists affects us.

Courses with the NW designation will include all of the above objectives in the course syllabus.

**D. Quantitative Reasoning (QR)**
Courses in this category explore contextual problems involving quantitative relationships by means of numerical, symbolic, and visual representations. These courses foster critical analysis of the uses and constraints of quantitative information and its representations. Finally, they focus on discussing models;
Learning Objectives:
The Quantitative Reasoning requirement is designed to develop the student’s ability to do the following:

- pose questions involving quantitative relationships in real-world contexts by means of numerical, symbolic, and/or visual representations;
- analyze problems by discussing models; making appropriate assumptions; and deducing consequences or making predictions;
- understand the uses and constraints of various representations of quantitative information;
- communicate and critique quantitative arguments.

Courses with the QR designation will include all of the above objectives in the course syllabus. It should also be noted that the QR requirement is not tied to the college’s Math Proficiency graduation requirement. Depending on the material, some QR courses may require Math Proficiency as a prerequisite, while others may not.

E. Ultimate Questions (UQ)
Courses with this designation are designed to encourage students to articulate and evaluate unexamined assumptions and paradigmatic ways of acquiring knowledge through a critical analysis of fundamental beliefs, cultural practices, and competing truth claims with the aim to develop greater self-knowledge and wisdom; the ability for meaningful dialogue, social responsibility and understanding; and an appreciation for questions that lead to deeper insights into our actions and the reasons for them. While this mode of inquiry strongly emphasizes an assessment of cognitive systems and symbols, such courses also explore metaphors and language that penetrate to pre-cognitive or post-cognitive levels of people’s action (ethics) and ways of belonging (sociology) often associated with the sacred. Ultimate Questions courses are designated UQ in this catalog and each semester’s registration materials.

Learning Objectives:
Recognizing that other modes of inquiry engage many of these issues, in an Ultimate Questions course, these topics and method lie at the center of the inquiry rather than arising as implications drawn from work in other modes of inquiry. In Ultimate Questions classes, students will learn and demonstrate growth from among the following:

- To articulate and evaluate unexamined assumptions and paradigmatic ways of acquiring knowledge;
- To analyze critically fundamental beliefs, cultural practices, and competing truth claims;
- To develop greater self-knowledge and wisdom, the ability for meaningful dialogue, social responsibility and understanding;
- To appreciate questions that lead to deeper insights into our actions and the reasons for them;
- To explore pre-cognitive and post-cognitive levels of people’s action (ethics) and ways of belonging (sociology) often associated with the sacred.

All syllabi for courses with the UQ designation will include the first objective above. In addition, they will include at least one of the remaining four.

F. Vital Past (VP)
Courses in this mode of inquiry explore the human past and offer an opportunity to reflect on the continuities, change, and diversity in human experience across time. They investigate social, cultural,
political, and other dimensions of human historical experience. They introduce students to various methods that scholars in different disciplines have developed to study the human past. These courses also encourage students to think critically about the interconnections between past and present. Vital Past courses are designated VP in this catalog and each semester’s registration materials.

**Learning Objectives:**
Students who complete a course that satisfies the Vital Past (VP) requirement of the Linfield Curriculum should:

- learn how to analyze and contextualize primary sources;
- learn how to analyze and critique secondary, scholarly arguments about the past;
- learn how to make an analytical or interpretive argument about the past;
- recognize that differences separate people past and present, though all people share a common humanity;
- understand the nature and limits of knowledge about the human past.

Note that courses with the VP designation will fulfill many, but not necessarily all, of the learning objectives

## III. Writing-Intensive Requirements and Opportunities

Each student is required to complete both writing-intensive courses specified below. Beyond these, the college extends students opportunities to perfect their writing skills in many courses offered across the curriculum, designated WI in departmental listings.

**The Inquiry Seminar (INQS 125)**
See above.

**Writing-Intensive Course(s) in the Major (MWI)**
All students must complete the approved upper-division Writing-Intensive class, or sequence of classes, designated for their respective majors by their home departments. This requirement serves to enhance students’ mastery of the formats, conventions, and habits of mind appropriate to the major's disciplinary investigations.

## IV. Global and Multicultural Inquiry

An escalating interconnectedness marks the society into which Linfield students will graduate. Within our own national borders, heightened sensitivity to the diversity of perspectives, experiences, and aspirations that shape American culture grounds the successful operations of democracy and facilitates the exercise of effective citizenship. The emergence of women into every phase of public life has also accelerated the pace of cultural change. These developments challenge all learners to seek new sources of knowledge and question established views on what constitutes knowledge.

Global and Multicultural Inquiry within the Linfield Curriculum is meant to ensure that all students examine the cultural and individual differences produced by such factors as gender, race, ethnicity, national origin, religion, and sexual orientation. The college thus affirms the benefits of mutual tolerance and civil discussion fostered by a deepened understanding of and respect for human complexity.

Students must take two courses which address facets of cultural diversity such as gender, race, national or geopolitical allegiance, religion, sexual orientation, and cultural mores. One of the two required courses
must address Global Pluralisms (GP), and one must explore U.S. Pluralisms (US). This requirement applies to all students regardless of citizenship. It is not met by classes in modern language instruction, though upper division culture classes offered by the Modern Languages Department may satisfy Global Pluralisms. Courses in Global and Multicultural Inquiry may, but are not mandated to, belong to any of the Modes of Inquiry. Students may propose experiential learning projects to satisfy half of this requirement; such projects must receive prior approval from the Curriculum Committee.

A. Global Pluralisms (GP)
Courses with this designation focus students’ attention beyond their own national boundaries. The use of analytical frameworks challenges students to address and understand the social, political, ethical, cultural, and/or policy discourses of other countries from a global perspective. These courses also include a consideration of multicultural perspectives within other countries. Curricular offerings focusing on the history or culture of a given nation, group, or region may meet this requirement by including a comparative component for the course. This focus may include comparisons between or among countries, as well as comparisons of different time periods. Through the process of examining Global Pluralisms, students prepare for their participation and citizenship in an increasingly diverse world. Global Pluralisms courses are designated GP in this catalog and in each semester’s registration materials.

Learning Objectives:
Students taking courses with the Global Pluralisms designation will have opportunities to:

- Develop a better understanding of the issues of identity, politics, culture, history, health care, and/or economics in a context of a culture other than that of the United States;
- Interrogate issues of colonialism, dominance, hegemony, and control by examining the social, economic, business, and/or political relationships that formerly colonized countries share with their imperial sites;
- Reflect upon the relationship that two or more countries share with each other through a comparative analysis of literature, the arts, politics, and/or social movements;
- Examine the impact of globalization and interdependence of cultures and economies on the lives of individuals.

Courses with the GP designation will include at least one of the above objectives in the course syllabus.

B. U.S. Pluralisms (US)
Courses with this designation explore the diverse experiences among those living in the United States. Students pursue inquiry into the varied dimensions of human diversity such as age, disability, ethnicity, gender, language, politics, race, religion, sexual orientation, and/or social class. These courses examine how the dominant traditions of American culture have marginalized the voices of those who have typically fallen outside those traditions, using analytical frameworks, or discussion that addresses the social, political, ethical, cultural, philosophical, and/or policy discourses among those groups. Through the process of examining U.S. Pluralisms, students prepare for their participation and citizenship in an increasingly diverse society. U.S. Pluralism courses are designated US in this catalog and each semester’s registration materials.

Learning Objectives:
Students taking courses with the U.S. Pluralisms designation will have opportunities to:

- Develop a better understanding of a cross-section of issues related to age, disability, ethnicity, gender, language, politics, race, religion, sexual orientation, and/or social class;
• Interrogate the historical, socio-cultural, and/or aesthetic grounding of marginality and its relationship to power and modes of domination through the critical examination of these discourses;
• Explore the social, cultural, and/or economic inequalities addressed in a broader socio-historic context, including issues of social justice, privilege, health care, and/or power;
• Consider the repercussions of historic and contemporary ideas of “The United States” and one’s right to citizenship.

Courses with the US designation will include at least one of the above objectives in the course syllabus.
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<td>Semester Abroad Evaluation Materials (student)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard 2 Exhibit List, Part 2: Division of Continuing Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Division of Continuing Education Mission Statement (in DCE Handbook)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Comparative Study of REL 140 (McMinnville Campus and DCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Continuing Education Committee Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Online Course Evaluation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DCE Proposal for Assessment Protocols re. Interdisciplinary Majors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Online Course Pre-Delivery Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Online Course Development Rubric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DCE Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Departmental Liaison Job Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DCE Forms Assisting Liaison Review Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>DCE Senior Survey Results 2003-2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>DCE Librarian Job Description and Course Support Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>DCE Adjunct CV’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>DCE Dean Job Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>DCE Graduation Checksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>DCE Online Bookstore Order Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>DCE Course Syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Yearly Workshop Materials: Online Technology/Pedagogy Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>DCE Computer and Equipment Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>DCE Student Computer Skills Verification Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Blackboard Systems Administrator Training Materials for Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Partnering Institution Facilities Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Curriculum Committee Course Change/Creation Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Sample Faculty Assembly Minutes Citing Approval of DCE Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>“You Deserve the Credit” Pamphlet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Portfolio Handbook for Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>IDS 250 Syllabi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sample “Prior Learning” Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>ENV 303 Syllabi, Papers, Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dr. Wiltenburg’s 2004 Consultancy Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>DCE Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>DCE Adjunct Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Residential Faculty “Comparability” Statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Residential Campus Student Enrollment in DCE 2006–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Draft Arts and Humanities Assessment Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Student/Faculty Surveys of Short Course Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Vitae and training materials for DCE Advisors in the Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>IDS 008 (Entry Colloquium) Syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Domestic off-campus advising sites; enrollment data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard Three – Students

Since its last accreditation Linfield College has changed and grown significantly, both in enrollment and in services to students beyond the classroom. These changes have taken different forms in the three distinct cohorts matriculating at the college.

While a consistent type of student has continued to enroll in its residential program, the McMinnville Campus has experienced many other changes: enrollment growth, a larger population of students remaining in campus housing, the acquisition of the Hewlett Packard property, an explosion of technology uses, and changes in the national profile of contemporary undergraduates. Collectively these shifts have challenged student programs and services. Similarly, the Portland Campus shifted from a traditional four-year program to a two-year transfer-only program, a shift partially driven by state and national calls for increasing the number of nursing graduates. The Division of Continuing Education has also changed, moving from an almost entirely classroom-based educational delivery system to an online format, doing so by adopting new technologies and commensurate pedagogies. Student support services on all campuses have been challenged to adapt to these and other changes.

Other sections of this self-study document the impact of these changes upon Linfield’s academic programs. Administrative areas responsible for delivering necessary student services have faced higher numbers of student enrollment inquiries, growing student interest in community service activities, and expanding support needs for students managing documented learning differences and fragile physical and/or mental health. College staff have reason to be proud of the improvements made to date in the student services areas but continue to struggle with the limits imposed by time, space, and budget upon their aspirations in the face of growing student expectations.

3.A – Purpose and Organization

3.A.1 The organization of student services is effective in providing adequate services with the mission and goals of the institution.

Student services exist to further the college mission by developing the whole person to the degree appropriate for three distinct Linfield populations: traditional-aged residential campus students at the McMinnville Campus; a mix of traditional, transfer, and second degree students at the Portland Campus; and the non-traditional, non-residential online learners in the Division of Continuing Education. The academic objective at the center of the college mission remains the constant uniting of these varied efforts.

To foster the educational goals of students through on-campus living opportunities, the college provides residential life programs on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses. Academic support provides tutoring and learning support services. Students may also secure career planning advice and/or participate in community service activities. Admission and financial aid services assist qualified students to enroll at Linfield and locate available financial resources to support their academic objectives. Campus life activities, intercollegiate athletics, programs in the arts (music, theatre, visual arts), and recreational programs complement and often build upon the college’s educational offerings.

One measure of the primacy of the educational mission within the Office of Student Services involves the close partnership operating between faculty and student services personnel. Faculty members frequently serve on student services search committees. Credit-
bearing courses offered by student services staff undergo the same Curriculum Committee review as academic courses. Faculty members join student services staff on the Student Success Team, where together they strategize appropriate support practices for students at risk.

Responses to the 2005 and 2007 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) provide glimpses into the level of participation achieved by McMinnville Campus students in college life beyond the classroom [Exhibit 1]. Linfield seniors were more likely than students at other NSSE institutions in those years to have tutored or taught other students, to have talked about career plans with a faculty member, to have exercised or participated in physical fitness activities, to have studied abroad, and to have joined co-curricular activities.

Linfield seniors were less likely than NSSE selected peer respondents to have attended an art exhibit, gallery, play, dance or other theatre performance. Fewer Linfield seniors reported having had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity. Seniors also tended to report that they spent less time preparing for class than their peers at comparator institution. Though some of this information was not significantly different across both surveys, these issues concern faculty and staff.

3.A.2 Student services and programs are staffed by qualified individuals whose academic preparation and/or experience are appropriate to their assignments. Assignments are clearly defined and published. The performance of personnel is regularly evaluated.

Student services personnel are adequately qualified in their respective professional fields for the tasks they perform [Required Table 2 – Student Affairs Staff Profile]. They assume leadership roles on-campus, in the local community, and among their regional and national peers in the student services arena [Exhibit 2].

The college advertises regionally, and sometimes nationally, to fill administrative openings in the Office of Student Services. Staff members receive appropriate training and professional support by the college and are given opportunities to develop in their chosen position. A professional development fund for administrators exists and is managed by the Office of the President. Occasional opportunities also arise for student services personnel to advance to other Linfield positions.

Job descriptions are up to date [Exhibit 3]. During annual performance reviews of staff members, individual job descriptions should be reviewed as part of the evaluation process.

3.A.3 Appropriate policies and procedures for student development programs and services are established. The objectives of each operating component are compatible and support the goals of student services.

Several policy guides assist in communicating appropriate community standards to students. These include the McMinnville Campus Student Handbook and Academic Planner [Exhibit 4], the McMinnville Campus Residence Life Guide [Exhibit 5], the Intercollegiate Athletic Policy and Procedure Manual [Exhibit 6], selected portions of the Linfield College Course Catalog [Exhibit 7], the Portland Campus Student Handbook [Exhibit 8], and the DCE Student Handbook [Exhibit 9].
Student development activities occurring under the auspices of the Office of Residence Life, the Chaplain’s Office, the Associated Students of Linfield College, the Office of Multicultural Programs, and the Office of Career and Community Services all operate within and further the goals of the Office of Student Services [Exhibit 10].

3.A.4 Human, physical, and financial resources for student services and programs are allocated on the basis of identified needs and are adequate to support the services and programs offered.

In preparing Linfield’s annual budget, the college officers carefully evaluate the services available to and needed by students outside the classroom. Recent budget deliberations have produced increased staffing in a number of areas. The position of assistant director of Learning Support Services was created in 2002, doubling the professional staff devoted to those duties. Enhanced FTE in the McMinnville Campus Office of Academic Advising allowed the college to make the director full-time in 2006. The Office of Admission expanded its staff in 2004 and the Office of Financial Aid did so in 2006; in both cases the additional personnel support expanded college enrollment efforts. With help from a federal HRSA grant, the Portland Campus added staff in 2005 to assist with recruitment and retention of Hispanic nursing students.

Targeted budget allocations have also made strategic facilities improvements possible in student services. The McMinnville Campus has added six new apartment-style residence buildings and two new residence halls to address growing student enrollment. Linfield has thus added 329 beds for on-campus living since 2000, moving from a total of 1059 then to 1388 in summer 2008 [Exhibit 11]. Placing the apartments on the new Keck Campus had the additional benefit of juniors and seniors returning to or remaining in the residential student community instead of heading to off-campus rentals.

Student housing on the Portland Campus remains limited to Loveridge Hall, a residence managed by Legacy Health Care Systems in consultation with Portland’s director of student services and staffed by student resident assistants. Recent growth in student migration from the McMinnville to the Portland Campus has prompted two questions currently under consideration by the college: (1) how should the Portland Campus address the expectations of traditional-age undergraduates accustomed to the more extensive residence life programming of the McMinnville Campus? and (2) how will the college respond if demand for campus housing exceeds the capacity in Loveridge?

On the McMinnville Campus, several offices dedicated to providing needed student services wrestle with space constraints, as evidenced by the college’s master planning documents [Exhibit 12]. While enrollment has expanded, the spaces allocated to the Offices of Admission, Financial Aid, Student Services, Learning Support Services, Counseling, and Career and Community Services have not expanded accordingly, even when new staff members have been added. On the Portland Campus, space constraints appear primarily in the area of academic programming (i.e. teaching and lab space), although a central gathering place for social interaction also remains a pressing need.

One area of concern within the McMinnville Campus Office of Student Services has been the increasing case load of the Office of Learning Support Services (LSS) as a result of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). To manage these demands within a limited budget, the office in recent years has reduced general tutoring support for students not covered under the ADA [Exhibit 13]. The college is currently seeking to hire a new director to replace the long-time previous director; once that has occurred, LSS staff will...
review the learning support needs of the wider student body and may seek ways to revive its tutoring programs (which at present have generally devolved to the relevant academic departments). This re-visioning effort will occur in tandem with the administrative reorganization that moved LSS from the Office of Student Services to the Office of Academic Affairs in late spring 2008. Under the leadership of the new dean of faculty, the relationship between LSS and the Office of Academic Advising will be strengthened to provide a more integrated approach to the academic support provided to Linfield students.

3. B – General Responsibilities

3.B.1 The institution systematically identifies the characteristics of its student population and students’ learning and special needs. The institution makes provision for meeting those identified needs, emphasizing students’ achievement of their educational goals.

Several principles guide Linfield’s admission programs in the search for potential enrollees. The college adheres closely to the following published statement: “Linfield College does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, age, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, or physical handicap or other disabling condition in its educational programs, admission, activities, or employment policies.” In addition, the published admission policy makes clear that the college seeks students “who show the greatest likelihood of benefiting from and contributing to the Linfield community,” including those with learning or other disabilities, whether documented before or after matriculation begins. College personnel take great care to understand the populations they serve so as to facilitate student success.

Both admission and learning support staff review the files of students who disclose a learning disability or other special needs during the application and admission process. Student financial aid allowances include costs for documented expenses related to disabilities. All learning-disabled applicants and matriculating students are informed of college support services. The learning support staff distributes information to assist students in understanding access to services, in knowing that individualized attention is available, as well as other pertinent information about planning for the transition to Linfield [Exhibit 14]. Information about the availability of such services is also communicated to the wider student body to reach those who choose not to disclose learning disabilities, or who disclose their needs after beginning classes. All course syllabi must include a statement about student access to accommodations for learning differences.

Since the 1998 accreditation review, the McMinnville and Portland Campuses have both added additional full-time learning support staff committed to fostering the success of students with disabilities. The McMinnville Campus employs both a full-time director of Learning Support Services and a .83 FTE assistant director. The Portland Campus has its own director of Learning Support Services. Both campuses contract interpreters for the hearing impaired as needed. Priority class scheduling and early registration are available for students with documented learning or special needs. Reasonable accommodation for students with documented disabilities may include substitutions for college or departmental graduation requirements so long as such accommodation does not fundamentally alter the nature of the academic program. In May 2008, the Office of Learning Support Services began reporting to the Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty, to better align academic programs with academically-oriented support programs.
Staffing increases have also occurred in the McMinnville Campus Office of Academic Advising. In 2001, a second academic advising position was created (currently at the associate director level); in 2004 the FTE associated with it grew to 1.0. In 2006, the director of academic advising went from .5 FTE to a 1.0 FTE (the previous holder of this position had been a classroom instructor as well as advising director; that split in duties no longer exists). Academic advising staff works closely with provisionally admitted students, including those with learning disabilities.

In the Division of Continuing Education, the associate director, in concert with the advisors on site, assists students with documented learning differences to ensure that the needed accommodations occur.

Linfield evaluates and tracks the performance of students with disabilities in several ways. Students receiving services complete surveys asking about their satisfaction with those services. The individual directors of Learning Support Services and academic advising compile annual reports (including faculty feedback) that provide a basis for assessing the progress of students in those programs, as well as the efficacy of the programs themselves. The Enrollment, Retention, and Student Life Committee (ERSL) within the faculty governance structure periodically reviews these data [Exhibit 15].

3.B.2 The institution provides opportunities for students to participate in institutional governance. Faculty are involved in the development of policies for student programs and services.

Students play an integral part in institutional governance, as evidenced by the many opportunities available to them to participate within decision-making or recommending bodies. The president of the Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC) serves on the college’s Budget Advisory Committee. The vice president of (ASLC) serves a year long term as a member of the Board of Trustees, with full voting rights. ASLC appoints two students to the all-college Planning Council. Students also serve as voting members on most faculty committees as well as general college committees. Academic departments include students on each search for new faculty hires. Recently, student representatives sat on search committees for a new college president (2004–06) and a new vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty (fall 2007).

Many student programs and services (though not all) come under the purview of one or more standing committees of the faculty. For example, faculty oversaw the development of new Greek Standards through the Enrollment, Retention, and Student Life (ERSL) Committee and reviewed practices associated with provisionally admitted students via the Admission and Financial Aid Committee. Faculty routinely serve on student services search committees.

3.B.3 Policies on students’ rights and responsibilities, including those related to academic honesty and procedural rights, are clearly stated, well publicized, readily available, and implemented in a fair and consistent manner.

Information about students’ rights and responsibilities appears in several published sources: (1) the McMinnville Campus Student Handbook and Academic Planner [Exhibit 4]; (2) the Linfield College Course Catalog [Exhibit 7]; (3) the Portland Campus Student Handbook [Exhibit 8]; and (4) the DCE Student Handbook [Exhibit 9]. Each campus distributes its student handbook through its new student orientation program. In addition, public announcements are made about the availability of handbooks, which are dispersed through the campus mail service. Similar
information on student-related policies and practices is posted on the college website.

College personnel frequently address the importance of academic honesty with students, both directly and indirectly. A statement about penalties for academic dishonesty appears in each student handbook. All first year students must complete an Inquiry Seminar (INQS) where questions of academic integrity form a required part of the curriculum. The course also includes a unit on information literacy taught by one of the college librarians. Faculty policy requires that each syllabus contain information about the consequences of violating academic integrity in that class; upper division course instructors often devote considerable attention to this topic in preparation for major assignments. Thus, even though transfer students to the Portland Campus do not take the Inquiry Seminar itself because they have completed the equivalent course as a prerequisite for admission, they receive classroom instruction about academic honesty in the classes they complete for their majors. The college has made the web tool www.turnitin.com available to faculty to assist in detecting academic dishonesty. The website has proven its efficacy with the faculty and has become a widely used tool in the last three years [Exhibit 16].

Both the student code of conduct and explanations of college judicial process appear in each student handbook. A principle of fundamental fairness guides the process for adjudicating possible violations of the code, including academic honesty. Records of the infractions and all information associated with judicial cases remain in locked cabinets on each campus.

3.B.4 The institution makes adequate provision for the safety and security of its students and their property. Information concerning student safety is published and widely distributed.

Linfield Campus Safety Officers patrol the McMinnville Campus twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. Since 2003, the McMinnville Campus has added two full-time officers to the security force to bring the current full-time staff up to 10 employees. In 2008–09, an additional full-time, nine month, safety officer will be hired. The McMinnville Campus also added emergency phones to the exterior entrances of all residence halls and placed 12 blue light emergency phones around campus [Exhibit 17]. The Portland Campus is patrolled twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, by Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital security staff. Escorts are available to students and staff on both campuses when requested [Exhibit 18].

The McMinnville Campus began adding card swipe access to all residence halls and some academic buildings in 2002. All new or remodeled buildings use card access. As resources allow, the college hopes to equip all academic buildings with card access, possibly by 2011, though no implementation plan currently exists. Since 1996 the Portland Campus has restricted access to the residence hall portion of Loveridge Hall by providing limited key access to the elevator. The Portland Campus security number is posted at the front door of the building, next to a public emergency phone.

Safety information appears on the Campus Safety website. Safety information for students in McMinnville Campus housing is published in the “Guide to Living at Linfield College” [Exhibit 19]. Fliers are posted in residence halls detailing procedures in case of fire, earthquake, sexual assault, theft, and alcohol poisoning [Exhibit 20]. Residence halls on both campuses conduct annual fire drills.

In keeping with federal law, Linfield publishes an annual safety report and publicly documents its crime statistics [Exhibit 21]. The college also issues timely safety warnings to the entire campus as required. In October 2007, the
college began offering an emergency update notice via cell phone and email, at no charge to students or staff requesting the service.

3.B.5 The institution publishes and makes available to both prospective and enrolled students a catalog or bulletin that describes: its mission, admission requirements and procedures, students’ rights and responsibilities, academic regulations, degree-completion requirements, credit courses and descriptions, tuition, fees and other charges, refund policy, and other items relative to attending the institution or withdrawing from it. In addition, a student handbook or its equivalent is published and distributed. A student handbook normally will include information on student conduct, a grievance policy, academic honesty, student government, student organizations and services, and athletics. The student handbook may be combined with the institution’s catalog.

The Linfield College Course Catalog is revised and published annually both in print and online versions (the latter available on the college website). It includes information on all items listed in this standard including college mission; admission requirements and procedures for McMinnville, Portland and DCE; academic regulations; degree-completion requirements; credit-bearing courses and descriptions; tuition, fees and other charges; and refund policies. Policies governing the following areas are also explained: withdrawal and leave of absence, financial aid, and study abroad. Additional policy clarifications are listed in the catalog index. The McMinnville, Portland, and DCE Student Handbooks describe community standards, expected student conduct, college grievance procedures, and academic honesty. The handbooks for the two residential campuses also include information about the relevant student government structure, available student organizations, and intramural athletics. Detailed descriptions of Linfield’s intercollegiate athletics program appear on the college website and are also available from the athletic director.

3.B.6 The institution periodically and systematically evaluates the appropriateness, adequacy, and utilization of student services and programs and uses the results of the evaluation as a basis for change.

Department heads in the Office of Student Services annually submit a report evaluating their respective services and programs [Exhibit 22]. Examples of actions taken in the last two-years as a result of these reports include: (1) addition of a fourth residence life area director position; (2) creation of a full-time administrative coordinator for community service programming; (3) selection of two Master of Social Work interns in counseling (from Western Oregon University); and (4) the contracting of monthly services by a local rabbi to minister to the spiritual needs of Jewish students.

The following administrative units charged with student support activities conduct annual reviews and surveys of users: the Counseling Center [Exhibit 23]; Learning Support Services; Career Services; and Residence Life. In spring 2003 and spring 2006, the McMinnville Campus undertook the National College Health Assessment to collect information about Linfield students, including items relevant to substance abuse and mental health [Exhibit 24].

3.C – Academic Credits and Records
3.C.1 Evaluation of student learning or achievement, and the award of credit, are based upon clearly stated and distinguishable criteria. Academic records are accurate, secure, and comprehensive. Credit is defined and awarded consonant with the Glossary definition.

Academic coursework falls into four categories:

- the Linfield Curriculum (general education);
- major and minor concentrations selected according to each student’s specific scholarly interest(s);
- electives chosen across the broad spectrum of disciplines; and
- experiential learning opportunities encompassing internships, peer instruction, and specific paracurricular classes.

Credit offerings on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses follow an academic calendar consisting of two 15-week semesters (fall and spring) and a four-week January Term. The DCE academic calendar includes 14-week fall and spring semesters and a five-week winter term. McMinnville Campus students enrolling for summer courses do so alongside their DCE counterparts in DCE-run programs; these courses vary in duration.

Between 2005 and 2008, the faculty also undertook a thorough redefinition of the learning goals ascribed to each area of the newly revised general education program (called the Linfield Curriculum). Evaluation based on these student outcomes statements will begin in earnest at the end of the first year of the revised curriculum’s implementation in 2008–09. All learning goals are published in the college catalog.

The Office of the Registrar supports the educational goals of the college by providing accurate, protected, and complete historical academic records formalized as student transcripts. Each arm of the college conducts its own registration and grade processing, with the Office of the Registrar (housed in McMinnville) coordinating all three efforts to ensure consistent reporting. The Office of the Registrar also monitors the academic data entered into Datatel’s Colleague software.

Since fall 2000, the college has used WebAdvisor, an online link to academic records stored in Colleague. McMinnville Campus and Portland Campus students use WebAdvisor for the following academic records functions: searching and registering for classes; viewing class schedules; checking grades and GPA; viewing transcripts; changing FERPA disclosure information; and authorizing information release. McMinnville Campus students can also review their academic progress through a degree audit function. Students in the Adult Degree Programs receive a printed schedule and use WebAdvisor to a lesser degree.

Faculty consult WebAdvisor to view class rosters and schedules, view advisee information (including transcripts, schedules, and program evaluations), enter grades, and issue academic alerts. The adoption of WebAdvisor has provided student and faculty access to secure, password-protected
information in a convenient and timely manner.

Students wanting a paper copy of grades mailed to parent(s), self, or others on a routine basis must make a specific request in writing to the Office of the Registrar. Students may order either official or unofficial transcripts at any time provided the student is in good financial standing with the college. Students may review their academic files, both physical and computerized, by making an appointment with the registrar.

3.C.2 Criteria used for evaluating student performance and achievement including those for theses, dissertations, and portfolios, are appropriate to the degree level, clearly stated and implemented.

All academic requirements for graduation, as well as the credit-bearing courses eligible to meet those requirements, undergo review and approval by the Faculty Assembly. Reviews undertaken at the departmental and Curriculum Committee levels serve as checks upon the appropriateness of each requirement to an undergraduate degree. Each academic department delineates the components of its major(s) and minor(s) in the college catalog, which is revised annually to reflect curricular changes effective for the coming academic year. The catalog explains the grading systems and expected standards of achievement, as do all student handbooks. The Faculty Handbook directs that each course syllabus contain the expected learning outcomes. The Office of Academic Affairs, with the help of the registrar and/or the Office of Academic Advising, ensures that publication of changes of grading systems or standards of achievement is in the appropriate documents.

The catalog and student handbooks also inform students of the following policies regulating Linfield academic transcripts: 1) the grade point average (GPA) recorded on the transcript includes only grades earned at Linfield; (2) once registered in a student’s academic record, a grade may be changed only upon evidence of clerical error or by faculty recalculation; and (3) a student may retake a course to replace a previously earned grade. Students may petition the faculty Academic Support Committee to request exceptions to academic policies [Exhibit 25].

The college catalog serves as the primary source for definitions of academic honesty, academic probation, and academic suspension. These policies apprise students of the standards for satisfactory academic performance and the bases for disciplinary action. They also explain the processes for corrective action including petitioning and academic grievance. The Linfield College Catalog exists in annually updated print and on-line versions.

Finally, Linfield policy as stated in the catalog makes clear that each student bears the ultimate responsibility for knowing and completing the college’s degree requirements. While the inside front cover of the catalog explains that the college reserves “the right to withdraw courses at any time, change fees, change the calendar and rules regarding admission and graduation requirements, and change any other regulations affecting the student body,” every effort is made both at the college and the departmental level to avoid disadvantaging continuing students in their progress toward degree completion.

3.C.3 Clear and well-publicized distinctions are made between degree and non-degree credit. Institutional publications and oral representations explicitly indicate if credit will not be recognized toward a degree, or if special conditions exist before such credit will be recognized. Any use of such terms as extension credit, X credit, continuing education credit, is accompanied by clear statements regarding the acceptability of such credit.
toward degrees offered by that institution. Student transcripts clearly note when any credit
awarded is non-degree credit. Whenever institutions grant non-degree credit other than the
Continuing Education unit (CEU), some summary evaluation of student performance
beyond mere attendance is available.

Linfield College offers only institutional
degree credit. The college does not accept or
award non-degree credit, and has no
designation available to post this type of credit
on the academic transcript.

3.C.4 Transfer credit is accepted from accredited institutions or from other institutions
under procedures which provide adequate safeguards to ensure high academic quality and
relevance to the students’ programs. Implementation of transfer credit policies is consistent
with 2.C.4 as well as Policy 2.5 Transfer and Award of Academic Credit. The final
judgment for determining acceptable credit for transfer is the responsibility of the
receiving institution.

Transfer students accepted to Linfield College
receive an evaluation which identifies
completed credits that fulfill degree
requirements in general education (known as
the Linfield Curriculum), prescribed major
courses, and electives. The appropriate
registration office consults with department
chairs as needed to confirm credits applicable
to the major or minor.

Linfield generally allows equivalent credit for
work previously completed at a regionally
accredited four-year college or university in
the United States or abroad. Accepted courses
must be comparable to departmental offerings
listed in the college catalog and completed
with a grade of C or better. Students may
transfer a maximum of 72 semester credits
from a two-year college, with all eligible
courses numbered at the 100-level or above.

Matriculating Linfield students taking courses
at other institutions may earn academic credit
for work completed through a regionally
accredited institution. Students must obtain
prior authorization from the registrar for
courses intended to fill general education or
elective requirements. Such approval is
required from the relevant department chair for
courses contributing to a given major or minor.

Linfield College also recognizes academic
credit earned through the following non-course
sources: (1) the International Baccalaureate
(IB) Diploma and subject examinations scored
with grades of 5 and above; (2) Advance
Placement (AP) scores of 4 or 5 on
examinations in academic areas normally
taught at Linfield; and (3) the College Level
Examination Program (CLEP) evaluated on a
course-by-course basis. The college catalog
states that neither AP nor CLEP credits will
satisfy Linfield Curriculum requirements. It
also makes clear that a maximum of 30 credits
will transfer through a combination of IB, AP,
and CLEP credits, and that credit is given only
once for each content area.

3.C.5 The institution makes provision for the security of student records of admission and
progress. Student records, including transcripts, are private, accurate, complete, and
permanent. They are protected by fireproof and otherwise safe storage and are backed by
duplicate files. Data and records maintained in computing systems have adequate security
and provision for recovery in the event of disaster. The information-release policy respects
the right of individual privacy and ensures the confidentiality of records and files.
The Office of the Registrar, in tandem with the registration staffs of the Division of Continuing Education and the Portland Campus, maintains the academic transcripts of students progressing toward degree completion. The priorities include: (1) creating accurate academic transcripts; (2) providing secure storage of data; (3) protecting students’ rights and the confidentiality of academic records by strict compliance to federal regulations; and (4) ensuring accurate and secure distribution of transcript information within the college and to other academic institutions.

To guarantee permanent backup of all academic records, the college purchased an electronic storage and retrieval system in 2005. The Registrar’s Office is currently scanning McMinnville Campus documents into this system, and the Division of Continuing Education will begin the process when scanning hardware arrives.

3.D – Student Services

3.D.1 The institution adopts student admission policies consistent with its mission. It specifies qualifications for admission to the institution and its programs, and it adheres to those policies in its admission practices.

In keeping with the college mission and as outlined in the admission policies outlined in the catalog, “Linfield College grants admission to students who are likely to grow and succeed in a personal and challenging liberal arts environment. . . .” The college assesses an applicant on academic potential as well as on evidence of ability to benefit from and contribute to the Linfield community. Admission policies are defined in Appendix O of the Faculty Handbook [Exhibit 26].

Linfield’s stated policies guide the faculty Admission and Financial Aid Committee (AFA) and college admission staffs to make informed decisions within a selective evaluation process. Staff in the Office of Admission review applications and occasionally request additional feedback from the director of Learning Support Services. Administrative staff may admit applicants who meet certain admission guidelines, while the Admission and Financial Aid Committee reviews applicants whose academic credentials fall outside those guidelines. The committee includes a faculty representative from each academic division; the Faculty Assembly elects the AFA faculty chair at-large. Policies for the admission of first time students differ from those applied to transfer students.

Specific admission requirements operate within several programs and majors (for example, education and nursing). The college catalog publishes these and other unique conditions related to select majors as part of the relevant departmental descriptions of the volume. Those departments themselves, not the Admission and Financial Aid Committee, monitor the enforcement of such requirements in tandem with the registrar.

Since 1998, the Admission and Financial Aid Committee differentiated its meeting times so that review of admission policy occurs separately from applicant reviews. This change permits student representatives, who are not eligible for confidential file readings, to participate in discussions of how to effectively use admission policy in building a diverse community.

3.D.2 The institution, in keeping with its mission and admission policy, gives attention to the needs and characteristics of its student body with conscious attention to such factors as ethnic, socioeconomic, and religious diversity while demonstrating regard for students’ rights and responsibilities.
The trustees, faculty and staff of Linfield College recognize the importance of enrolling a diverse student body as a necessary means of fulfilling its mission to create an academic community that “engages thoughtful dialogue in a climate of mutual respect” and “honors the rich texture of diverse cultures and varied ways of understanding.” The Offices of Admission and Financial Aid both follow plans to enhance recruitment and enrollment of American ethnic and international students, as well as students who would bring expanded socioeconomic, religious, and cultural diversity to the two residential campuses. The college also aims to support students from diverse backgrounds to foster their success at Linfield. The enrollment goals and objectives of each arm of the college differ somewhat in terms of student academic profile, talents and abilities, geographic origin, and cultural background.

Over the last decade on the McMinnville Campus, the academic profile of incoming first year students— as measured by average GPA, SAT, and class rank—has remained relatively consistent with some highs and lows among individual measures (see Linfield College Institutional Data 2007). Student participation in leadership and co-curricular activities has increased and athletic programs have expanded in competitiveness. Importantly, a variety of cultures, philosophies, and points of view have resulted from increasing enrollments of American ethnic students and international students, as well as through more students whose home residence lies outside Oregon [Exhibit 27]. The Office of Admission develops an Ethnic Student Recruitment Plan [Exhibit 28] as part of its annual marketing effort. The Office of Financial Aid supports students of varied socioeconomic background through its policies and practices. The Office of Enrollment Management tracks enrollment and retention data on all student groups and reports results to the college community.

In conjunction with efforts to attract and retain a diverse student population, the McMinnville Campus has established several support networks. A full-time director heads the Office of Multicultural Programs and coordinates a Multicultural Student Reception as part of each fall’s New Student Orientation. The International Programs Office employs full-time staff members who organize orientation activities for foreign students and sponsor cultural field trips locally and regionally; they also provide academic and personal advising. Several student clubs work to celebrate and educate the campus community about specific cultures represented by enrollees; examples include the Asian Culture Club, Hawaiian Club, and Multicultural Student Club. The college invites speakers to discuss issues related to a multicultural environment, brings international performers to campus, and mounts an annual Diversity Week involving extensive programming, some of it orchestrated by students themselves.

The McMinnville Campus celebrates religious diversity through activities organized by a full-time chaplain who oversees the Emmaus House worship center as a sacred space for those from various religious traditions. The Chaplain’s Office sponsors regular worship services and provides retreat opportunities and counseling services. Several student spiritual clubs operate at Linfield. The college has recently arranged for a rabbi to hold monthly services on-campus [Exhibit 29].

On the Portland Campus, the change to a transfer-only population, together with the impacts of recruiting for only two degree programs, has altered the measurement practices related to Portland’s enrollment goals. Linfield’s nursing program is one of only three in Oregon producing BSN graduates; faced with a well-established statewide nursing shortage, the college has for the last several years sought to expand the numbers of Portland Campus nursing majors. Special efforts to attract Hispanic students have been aided by the successes associated with Linfield’s receipt of a federal HRSA (Health Resources and Services Administration) grant and its recent renewal. (Note: currently Hispanics constitute only 1% of Oregon’s registered nursing professionals
despite a 10% presence in the state population).

To further the goals of the grant, the Portland Campus launched the *Ayudando Podemos* program with HRSA funds to recruit and enhance retention of Hispanic students. The program provides targeted services and resources, including academic support and financial aid guidance. It also enriches the cultural competency of the entire campus community by providing information used in curriculum development and the creation of new college partnerships with high schools, community based organizations, health career programs, and health care agencies and organizations.

Both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses organize an annual new student orientation program. In each case, all new students participate, including students of color and those from other diverse backgrounds. See Standard 2.C and Standard 3.D.9 for more information about academic advising.

The nature of the DCE program, with adult learners taking predominantly online courses, produces a different dynamic around the enrollment of students from diverse backgrounds. The percentage of female students is higher than the McMinnville Campus, while the racial and ethnic mix is similar to that of the McMinnville and Portland Campuses. The age of DCE students is generally older than students in the two other programs [Exhibit 27]. DCE requires all new students to complete a required one-hour course, “Entry Colloquium,” within the first year of enrollment in the program. The course is offered each semester.

### 3.D.3 Appropriate policies and procedures guide the placement of students in courses and programs based upon their academic and technical skills. Such placement ensures a reasonable probability of success at a level commensurate with the institution’s expectations. Special provisions are made for “ability to benefit” students (see Glossary).

Linfield faculty and staff work diligently to insure appropriate student placement in courses based upon their known academic and technical skills. Admission, placement exam, and advising processes operating in each arm of the college demonstrate this commitment.

Prior to admission, applicant files receive careful review by admission staff and possibly by the Admission and Financial Aid Committee to determine each candidate’s ability to succeed with Linfield’s curriculum. Provisional admission is offered to McMinnville Campus applicants judged by the committee to be capable of managing academic demands so long as additional college support and/or restrictions are required. The conditions accompanying such admission are adjusted to reflect the unique needs of each student and may include required enrollment in a learning skills course, a limitation upon credits taken in the first semester, or meetings with specific campus resource personnel [Exhibit 30]. All provisionally admitted students must meet with the associate director of academic advising at least once in their first semester to confirm the terms associated with each individual’s admission.

During orientation weekend on the McMinnville Campus, first year students take placement exams in chemistry, foreign languages, music theory, and English Language and Culture (for any student for whom English is a non-native language). Exam results guide appropriate student placement in courses within these disciplines. A self-advising form assists students with placement in mathematics courses as they determine whether to take the mathematics proficiency examination (mathematics proficiency is required for graduation; the test may be taken only once during a student’s Linfield career, and if a student fails on the first try, s/he must take a math class). Faculty advisors within the Colloquium program, along with
representatives from academic departments, help students make appropriate course selections based on their individual skills [Exhibit 31].

Because the Portland Campus now accepts only upper division transfer students, matriculants must have completed prerequisite coursework prior to admission. Successful performance on prerequisites helps to ensure that students enroll in Linfield courses commensurate with their skill levels. Portland Campus staff administer a reading comprehension exam during orientation to help identify students who may face academic challenges and assist advisors in recommending appropriate support resources [Exhibit 32].

Matriculants in the Division of Continuing Education generally bring prior academic course work with them to Linfield and are older than are traditional-age college students. As a result, placement exams generally prove unnecessary; rather, DCE’s professional advisors assist these adult learners with appropriate course selection. When required, DCE staff administer a mathematics proficiency examination and use the self-advising form to guide students in selecting appropriate mathematics courses. As the number of residential students enrolling in DCE offerings increases, residential faculty advisors may need more information about the nature of successful online learning practices to prepare their students to perform effectively in that venue.

Linfield admits only those individuals who have completed high school or its equivalent, or have completed sufficient college coursework so as to demonstrate the capacity to benefit from the degrees offered by the college. No special provisions are required under the Ability to Benefit provisions of federal regulation.

3.D.4 The institution specifies and publishes requirements for continuation in, or termination from, its educational programs, and it maintains an appeals process. The policy for readmission of students who have been suspended or terminated is clearly defined.

The Linfield College Course Catalog delineates policies regarding academic probation, academic suspension, and readmission. The Office of the Registrar also provides information about the suspension appeal process [Exhibit 33]. Selected academic departments monitor requirements for continuing enrollment in the major. The faculty Admission and Financial Aid Committee decides all suspension appeals with counsel from the registrar and director of admission.

The college monitors and evaluates student academic progress in a variety of ways. Semester grade reports, available both to the appropriate faculty advisors and to the students themselves, serve as one prominent method. The director of academic advising and the director of Learning Support Services collect academic data regarding provisional and other at-risk students. The college operates an academic alert system utilized by individual instructors and managed by the Office of Academic Advising with oversight from the Office of Academic Affairs; students and their faculty advisors receive issued alerts simultaneously through a protected webpage interface that contacts each immediately upon receipt of the message. The definition of satisfactory academic progress information appears in the college catalog under both the Academic Policies and Procedures section and the Financial Aid section.

3.D.5 Institutional and program graduation requirements are stated clearly in appropriate publications and are consistently applied in both the certificate and degree verification
process. Appropriate reference to the Student Right-to-Know Act is included in required publications.

Institutional requirements for graduation are clearly stated in the section of the college catalog entitled, “Degrees and Requirements: All Campuses.” Requirements for every major and minor offered on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses appear on the catalog pages devoted to each department or interdepartmental program. Requirements for majors offered through the Division of Continuing Education may be found in applicable online and paper publications. The program evaluation function (degree audit) of Colleague provides consistency in monitoring graduation and major requirements. Students and academic advisors have 24 hour access to this feature through a secure web-based interface.

3.D.6 The institution provides an effective program of financial aid consistent with its mission and goals, the needs of its students, and institutional resources. There is provision for institutional accountability for all financial aid awards.

Within the limits of institutional, state, and federal resources, Linfield College structures financial aid awards in ways that support the mission, expectations, and aspirations of the institution.

Admittedly, Linfield does not pursue stated goals for an entering class based on average high school GPA, class rank, average SAT/ACT scores, percentage of international students, percentage of underrepresented students, and the like. Instead, the enrollment division of the McMinnville Campus and the Financial Aid Office of the Portland Campus distribute aid dollars to attract and retain high quality students while devoting significant funds to assist students with financial need and/or special characteristics that will enrich the entering class.

Merit scholarship programs attract students with outstanding high school academic records. General grant aid is distributed to students based on their financial need. A small portion of aid each year is offered to traditionally underrepresented students based on their contributions to the campus community. McMinnville Campus students with demonstrated talent in music, theatre, or forensics are eligible for aid based on their intent to contribute to the artistic life of the college. Transfers with outstanding academic performance at prior schools may be eligible to receive scholarships. These varying types of aid help shape each entering class.

Two of Linfield’s financial aid programs exemplify the college’s commitment to recruit outstanding first year scholars. The Academic Competitive Scholarship Program, in existence since 1985, invites qualified students to campus where participating academic departments administer tests or auditions to determine worthy recipients of three designated scholarships per department. The Linfield Merit Award provides another means of recruiting outstanding scholars; eligible students must be Finalists in the National Merit Scholarship Corporation Program who list Linfield as their first choice college (ten such students enrolled in fall 2007).

The McMinnville Campus contracts yearly with the Noel-Levitz Center for Enrollment Management to help establish annual financial aid award plans congruent with new student enrollment goals. Analytical data provided by Noel-Levitz supports the college’s commitment to provide access for students while meeting enrollment and budgetary targets that assure fiscal stability. [Exhibit 34]
3.D.7 Information regarding the categories of financial assistance (scholarships and grants) is published and made available to both prospective and enrolled students.

*The Linfield College Catalog*, together with the financial aid website, provides easy access to information about the categories of financial assistance (scholarships and grants) available to prospective and enrolled students. Unlike many colleges, financial aid information links appear on Linfield’s home page rather than inside admission or prospective student pages. To improve access to financial aid information, the McMinnville Campus added a toll-free number in 2006. The college also provides access to a website identifying scholarships not controlled by Linfield. Students can search the site for various categories of aid and follow a link to other scholarship sites. Financial Aid personnel have monitored the number of visitors to this site since fall 2007 to measure accessibility and interest [Exhibit 35].

Financial aid practices, including the awarding of grants and scholarships, are guided by policies and procedures [Exhibit 36].

The McMinnville and Portland Campuses send out initial awards enclosed in an award folder/booklet to prospective students [Exhibit 37]. Current McMinnville Campus students may view their financial aid awards on WebAdvisor at any time. In the Division of Continuing Education, a single brochure serves both prospective and enrolled students [Exhibit 38].

Linfield regularly participates in data sharing efforts that provide easily accessed information about the college, including the voluntary Common Data Set [Exhibit 39] and the federally mandated IPEDS data collection process. [Exhibit 40].

3.D.8 The institution regularly monitors its student loan programs and the institutional loan default rate. Informational sessions which give attention to loan repayment obligations are conducted for financial aid recipients.

Linfield annually contracts with a major international accounting firm, KPMG, to evaluate the college’s compliance with federal regulations. Management letters issued by KPMG have offered high commendations on the financial aid operations of Linfield’s two aid offices. In the past 10 years, KPMG has issued seven findings that have resulted in corrective action on the part of the college. None of the findings has been “material” in nature, meaning that none has resulted in fines to the college or repayments of federal student aid.

Financial aid practices, including the awarding of grants and scholarships, are guided by policies and procedures [Exhibit 36].

The McMinnville and Portland Campuses send out initial awards enclosed in an award folder/booklet to prospective students [Exhibit 37]. Current McMinnville Campus students may view their financial aid awards on WebAdvisor at any time. In the Division of Continuing Education, a single brochure serves both prospective and enrolled students [Exhibit 38].

Linfield regularly participates in data sharing efforts that provide easily accessed information about the college, including the voluntary Common Data Set [Exhibit 39] and the federally mandated IPEDS data collection process. [Exhibit 40].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to increased public awareness about student loan borrowing, and to improve assistance to students navigating the complex world of loan options, the McMinnville Campus has revised job descriptions in the Office of Financial Aid and in 2001 designated a staff position as loan coordinator [Exhibit 41].

Federal loan programs require annual monitoring of default rates. Linfield adheres to all federal reporting requirements, including the FISAP [Exhibit 42], which monitors the Perkins loan default rate. The Department of Education provides a yearly cohort default rate for the Stafford loan program. Linfield’s default rate combines all three programs, by federal mandate.
3.D Table 2 Cohort Default Rate, Federal Stafford Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>02–03</th>
<th>03–04</th>
<th>04–05</th>
<th>05–06</th>
<th>06–07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linfield Default Rate</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Default Rate</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every federal student loan borrower receives notification of rights and responsibilities related to federal loans at least twice while enrolled at Linfield. Prior to the disbursement of the first federal student loan, all students regardless of program must attend an entrance interview coordinated by the Office of Financial Aid, or must complete this federal requirement online. If a student does not do so, loan proceeds are returned to the bank and the loan is cancelled. Graduating or departing students with federal loans must also attend exit interviews where borrower rights and responsibilities are again reviewed. If the exit interview is not completed prior to departure from campus, the financial aid office that processed the loan aid mails a packet with the exit interview information and document having met the obligation to communicate with the student.

3.D.9 The institution provides for the orientation of new students, including special populations, at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

On the McMinnville Campus, new student orientation programs occur twice each year. The larger population of new student enrollees arrives in the fall, when an extensive orientation offers special events or programs designed to address the specific needs of first year students, transfers, students of color, degree-seeking international students, and international students on-campus for intensive English language study. The New Student Colloquium holds a central position within the orientation program, as it assists new students in adjusting to college life [Exhibit 43]. Given the arrival of a smaller group of new students in February, spring semester new student orientation shifts to a less intensive Colloquium-style program called Spring Connections [Exhibit 44].

The Portland Campus provides a one day New Student Orientation three times a year to support the three distinct cohort groups who enroll in summer, fall and spring semesters respectively. Incoming students are invited to this event in their admission acceptance packets as well as through a letter sent by student services a month before each orientation session. New Student Orientation requires a team effort mounted collectively by the Office of Student Services, Enrollment Services, Learning Support Services, Multicultural Programs, Computing and Educational Media Services, the Business Office, Financial Aid, Legacy Fitness Center, the Nursing Lab, and the Registrar. Faculty advisors guide students through academic planning and course registration. The Portland Campus also hires between six and ten current students as O-Team members to assist newcomers during the day [Exhibit 45].

Starting in academic year 2006–07, the Office of Multicultural Programs provided a supplemental student and family orientation for incoming students participating in the Ayudando Podemos program. Current students, staff, and faculty members contribute to its implementation [Exhibit 46].

The Division of Continuing Education requires all new students to complete a one hour course, “Entry Colloquium,” within the first year of enrollment. It is offered each semester.

3.D.10 A systematic program of academic and other educational program advisement is provided. Advisors help students make appropriate decisions concerning academic choices
and career paths. Specific advisor responsibilities are defined, published, and made available to students (Standards Two and Four, Standard Indicators 2.C.5 and 4.A.2).

Linfield College operates a systematic program of academic advising in which a combination of professional and faculty advisors assist students to set sound educational, career, and life goals. Because successful academic advising rests upon a principle of shared responsibility, advisor and advisee responsibilities are defined, published, and circulated to students in various ways.

In the McMinnville Campus advising model, students who have declared majors select or are assigned faculty advisors in the appropriate departments. Students must meet with their advisors at least once a semester prior to registration. Incoming first year students enter the college without majors and are each assigned a general faculty advisor who assists in the transition from high school to college while teaching the required academic orientation course called Colloquium. Through discussion, published handouts, and online resources, this class introduces students to the responsibilities on both sides of the advisor-advisee relationship [Exhibit 47].

The Portland Campus also uses an advising model whereby students are assigned a faculty advisor upon transfer into one of the two academic programs offered—nursing or health sciences. Advisors assist students with appropriate course selection and career planning. Students must meet with their advisors at least once a semester prior to registration. The advisor–advisee relationship is outlined for students at orientation and appears in advising guides as well as the Nursing Student Handbook [Exhibit 48].

The Division of Continuing Education employs a professional advising model through which students receive academic guidance either in person, on the phone, or through email. DCE’s advising staff are located at various sites throughout Oregon and receive their assignments according to proximity to accepted students or their existing advising load. Students must meet with an advisor when they begin matriculation in DCE and should consult that advisor every spring semester throughout their enrollment. The advisor–advisee relationship is outlined in advising guides as well as the DCE Student Handbook [Exhibit 8], both of which are distributed to students upon their admission; the latter may also be found online.

For additional information see standard 2.C.5 for more about academic advising at Linfield.

3.D.11 Career counseling and placement services are consistent with student needs and institutional mission.

Linfield's career counseling and placement services are consistent with student needs and institutional mission. On the McMinnville Campus, the Office of Career and Community Service offers courses, workshops, a library, online resources for students interested in careers, short-term jobs, and internship opportunities. On the Portland Campus, the Office of Student Services provides resume/cover letter assistance. It also hosts both fall and spring Nursing Career Fairs that are consistently well attended by students.

Linfield Career Services staff continues to supply leadership to the Oregon Liberal Arts Placement Consortium (OLAPC). Linfield has a consistently high number of students participating in the consortium; in many years they form the largest contingent of attendees.

3.D.12 Professional health care, including psychological health and relevant health education, is readily available to residential students and to other students, as appropriate.
Linfield makes professional physical and psychological health care, as well as relevant health education, readily available to residential students and other matriculants as appropriate.

The McMinnville Campus houses a Student Health Center, whose staff expanded in 2007–08. The Counseling Center offers psychological support for students and, together with the Student Health Center, shares access to a psychiatrist. The Office of Student Services employs a health promotion and student wellness coordinator who works with a student team to provide education and health programming. These coalitions seek to reduce high risk and underage alcohol usage; they also train undergraduates through peer health courses to deliver additional health programming for the campus. A recent NCAA grant secured by the chairperson of the Health, Human Performance and Athletic Training Department directly supported outreach to student athletes around the issue of alcohol use.

The Portland Campus, located in the midst of a large metropolitan hospital complex, stresses quality health care in and out of the classroom. Students may use the Ambulatory Clinic at Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital for their general health needs. Psychological counseling is outsourced to the Portland location of Pacific University’s Psychological Service Center.

3.D.13 Student housing, if provided, is designed and operated to enhance the learning environment. It meets recognized standards of health and safety; it is competently staffed.

The Linfield College housing program seeks to foster positive living/learning communities on-campus. All college housing has established quiet hours to allow students to study and sleep. The college also provides internet access in all student rooms on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses. The McMinnville Campus continually upgrades and repairs college housing units each summer according to a schedule developed to keep residence halls updated and code-compliant [Exhibit 49]. The Legacy Good Samaritan Health System retains responsibility for upkeep and repair to Loveridge Hall, the Portland Campus student residence facility. All residence halls on both campuses have sprinkler systems.

A five year review of semester grades from fall 2001 to spring 2007 indicated that students at the McMinnville Campus who lived in college housing (including both residence halls and suburb apartments) achieved higher average GPAs that those students who lived off-campus [Exhibit 50].

A one credit class and two week orientation program train McMinnville Campus resident advisors and area directors to respond to safety issues and help create positively oriented communities to foster student success. The McMinnville Campus employs 55 resident advisors (RA’s). In the residence halls serving primarily first year and sophomore students, the RA to student ratio is 1 to 21; in the college apartments serving juniors and seniors, it is 1 to 39. On the Portland Campus, the RA to student ratio is 1 to 12.

3.D.14 Appropriate food services are provided for both resident and nonresident students. These services are supervised by professionally trained food service staff and meet recognized nutritional and mandated health and safety standards.

Food service is available to both residential and non-residential students in a variety of settings on the McMinnville Campus. Dillin Hall, the main dining facility, opens for breakfast, lunch, and dinner. O’Riley’s, the Cattyshack, and the Observatory provide more
limited dining options. The college contracts with Sodexho to provide food service in each of the above locations. Sodexho administers an annual satisfaction survey to help with menu development and determine hours of operation [Exhibit 51]. A food service committee also consults with Sodexho on food service matters.

All students living in McMinnville Campus residence halls must contract for one of four meal plans. Two additional meal plan options are available for students in college apartments and commuter students, who may also purchase a cash card for use at campus dining facilities.

Sodexho trains its employees on health and safety standards and annually scores well on health inspections [Exhibit 52].

Food service plans are not a part of the residence hall program at the Portland Campus. Students may utilize the cafeteria services at Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital for meal purchases. The Portland Campus facilitates the creation of the appropriate debit accounts for the students to access the cafeteria services.

3.D.15 Co-curricular activities and programs are offered that foster the intellectual and personal development of students consistent with the institution’s mission. The institution adheres to the spirit and intent of equal opportunity for participation. It ensures that appropriate services and facilities are accessible to students in its programs. Co-curricular activities and programs include adaptation for traditionally under-represented students, such as physically disabled, older, evening, part-time, commuter, and, where applicable, those at off-campus sites.

In keeping with the institutional mission, Linfield’s co-curricular activities and programs seek to further all students’ intellectual and personal development. The college adheres to the spirit and intent of equal opportunity by fostering widespread participation, ensuring the absence of discrimination and protecting the rights of protected classes in its programming. By regulation, clubs recognized and sponsored by the Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC) must remain open to all students.

Whether offered through the college or through the student government, co-curricular activities provide leadership development, career exploration, spiritual support, physical development, and volunteer options. To support the concise college mission of “Connecting Learning, Life and Community,” the McMinnville Campus now employs a full time community service coordinator to increase participation in that area.

Co-curricular activities and programs have adapted to the needs of traditionally under-represented students, such as the physically disabled, older, evening, part-time, commuter and off-campus enrollees (where applicable). The Residence Life program continues to expand the numbers of residence hall rooms accessible to the physically disabled.

The Portland Campus also implements co-curricular and campus programming intended to assist in the institutional mission. All campus programs are open to any individual in the campus community. Numerous campus clubs, covering a wide array of interests, encourage student involvement. Portland Campus Student Services, Multicultural Programs, and student government (ASLC-PC) sponsor educational, social, and community-building events throughout the year. The director of student services acts as advisor for ASLC-PC and consults on facility and program development issues. The Portland Campus sponsors one academic organization, Sigma Theta Tau. A description of ASLC-PC and a list of student clubs appear in the Portland Campus Handbook; the Portland Campus Handbook and Academic Planner also
list campus events [Exhibit 8]. The Portland campus calendar is available online as well.

Student demographics at the Portland Campus have changed with the move to a transfer-only population. Among the increasing numbers of non-traditional students are many parents, a situation that has led to the recent formation of Students who are Parents Also (SPA). This club plans special programs such as the annual Family Day held at the beginning of the academic year.

3.D.16 The co-curricular program includes policies and procedures that determine the relationship of the institution with its student activities; identifying the needs, evaluating the effectiveness, and providing appropriate governance of the program are joint responsibilities of students and the institution.

Linfield’s co-curricular program operates according to policies and procedures that define the relationship between college and student activities. Together the college and its students share responsibility for identifying the needs, evaluating the effectiveness, and providing appropriate governance of the co-curriculum.

Student governments on each campus make decisions based on published by-laws and student representation in their respective Senates. The Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC, McMinnville Campus) serves as the principal programming unit for students on that campus. The McMinnville director of activities and one of the area directors for Residence Life serve as advisors to the student government. On the Portland Campus, the ASLC-PC and the Offices of Student Life and Multicultural Programs collaboratively implement co-curricular programming. At the start of every academic year, students complete a survey about the co-curricular activities they would like and ASLC-PC implements all reasonable student requests.

Working with the college, the active Greek Life program has formed both a Pan-Hellenic and an intra-fraternity council. A Greek Life advisor works with those organizations and individual Greek chapters to foster leadership, sisterhood and brotherhood, risk management, philanthropic undertakings, and academic achievement.

The Greek relationship statement defines the rights, roles, and responsibilities of the college and each Greek unit. The faculty has adopted a set of Greek standards designed to set benchmarks and foster achievement in the areas of academics, chapter finances, recruitment, membership education, and campus/community relations. These standards remain controversial among some students who argue that the college holds Greeks to a different and higher academic measurement than other campus groups and organizations [Exhibit 53].

3.D.17 If appropriate to its mission and goals, the institution provides adequate opportunities and facilities for student recreational and athletic needs apart from intercollegiate athletics.

The McMinnville Campus provides recreational opportunities for students through an active intramural and club sports program. Intramural sports include flag football, volleyball, basketball, soccer, ultimate Frisbee, softball, and bowling. Students compete at the club sport level in men’s lacrosse, men’s ultimate Frisbee, men’s tennis, women’s ultimate Frisbee, women’s tennis, and co-ed water polo.

ASLC operates a student game room, including pool, ping-pong and video games. Residence Life also provides ping-pong tables.
and board games to residence halls via a checkout system.

The 2005 and 2007 NSSE results indicate that McMinnville Campus students exercise or participate in physical fitness activities at a very high rate [Exhibit 1]. The existing exercise facility is not large enough to accommodate demand. The college plans to build a new space allowing relocation of fitness facilities for varsity athletes to a separate structure. The current fitness room will then be upgraded to become a lifestyle fitness center [Exhibit 12]. Within available resources, efforts to improve the fitness facility have recently included moving equipment to better fit the space, adding equipment for core training, adding television sets for those using cardio machines, and removing old or broken equipment.

Students at the Portland Campus pay a refundable fee for key card access to Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital fitness facilities, which provide a swimming pool, weight room, exercise room, and fitness classes such as aerobics and yoga.

3.D.18 If the institution operates a bookstore, it supports the educational program and contributes to the intellectual climate of the campus community. Students, faculty, and staff have the opportunity to participate in the development and monitoring of bookstore policies and procedures.

The college operates two bookstores, one on the McMinnville Campus and one on the Portland Campus. Each exists to provide books, supplies, and other materials to students in a timely fashion and in ways that support their educational objectives.

Over the past decade, the services provided by these bookstores have changed to offer more and better service. In summer 2006, the McMinnville Campus bookstore added 1155 square feet to its original 3024 square feet, an increase of 38%. This expansion allowed the bookstore to accommodate additional faculty and student requests: for example, stocking more varied supplies as requested by the Department of Art and Visual Culture. The larger bookstore has also hired more students to support its sales efforts.

Portland Campus students previously relied on a local independent bookstore for their textbooks once the Portland Campus registrar provided textbook orders. In 1997 a college bookstore opened on-campus to sell and buy back textbooks, as well as offer school and medical supplies, including scrubs. In fall 2007 the bookstore director and student government leaders met to discuss merchandise stock and hours of operation to better serve student needs. Student leaders reported increased satisfaction with preliminary results of that meeting but the need to continue improving services.

The McMinnville and Portland Campus bookstores now support the online ordering of textbooks by Division of Continuing Education, students who previously ordered books on their own. This improvement earns a very favorable response from DCE students and staff.

3.D.19 When student media exist, the institution provides for a clearly defined and published policy of the institution’s relationship to student publications and other media.

Student-run media play an integral role within the Linfield community. These media promote student engagement and dialogue within the college. A variety of media serves this purpose: The Linfield Review, KSLC-FM, Wildcat Productions, and Camas.

The Linfield Review [Exhibit 54] is the college’s freely distributed student-run weekly
newspaper; it is also available online. It
operates on funds allocated by the student
government as well as on advertising sales.
KSLC (90.3 FM) is a student-run federally
licensed and commercial-free radio station
whose programming is broadcast to the
McMinnville Campus and the broader
McMinnville community. Its funding rests
upon a combination of student government,
college, and underwriting contributions. In
2007, the station installed a 90-foot antenna for
better signal coverage and took possession of
significantly upgraded production facilities in
Renshaw Hall. Wildcat Productions, a student-
rune electronic media production club,
broadcasts on McMinnville's cable television
public access channel. Student government
supports this work as well. Members of the
Department of Mass Communications advise
students running The Linfield Review, KSCL-
FM, and Wildcat Productions. Camas, the
semi-annual student-produced literary and arts
magazine, also relies on student government
funding. English Department faculty members
serve as its advisors.

Since the last accreditation, the Oak Leaves
yearbook has ceased publication due to lack of
student leadership. No Linfield yearbook has
been produced since 2000–01.

At this writing, the college does not have a
clearly defined, publicly distributed statement
delineating the relationship between the
college and student media. However, each
issue of The Linfield Review includes this
announcement, which in essence describes the
prevailing character of the college/student
media dynamic: “The Linfield Review is an
independent, student-run newspaper. The
contents of this publication are the opinions
and responsibility of the Review staff and do
not reflect the views or policy of the
Associated Students of Linfield College or of
Linfield College.”

Additional information about media
productions cited above may be found in
Standard 2’s departmental reports for Mass
Communications and English.

3.E – Intercollegiate Athletics

Linfield’s intercollegiate athletics program
exists to further the college mission by striving
for regional and national athletic excellence
while maintaining high academic standards
and upholding academic integrity among
student athletes. It places a high priority on
providing equal participation opportunities to
both men and women.

Linfield has enjoyed great success on athletic
courts and fields. The football team won the
NCAA Division III National Championship in
2004, and the softball team earned the NCAA
Division III National Championship in 2007.
The women’s tennis team has captured six
straight conference championships. As further
evidence of its quality, the program received
the Northwest Conference All-Sports Trophy
athletic excellence within the conference
across all fields of competition. This award
holds special significance for the college
because it is named in part for Jane McIlroy,
women’s athletics director and physical
education professor at Linfield from 1950–82.

3.E.1 Institutional control is exercised through the governing board’s periodic review of its
comprehensive statement of philosophy, goals, and objectives for intercollegiate athletics.
The program is evaluated regularly and systematically to ensure that it is an integral part
of the education of athletes and is in keeping with the educational mission of the situation.

Linfield’s president exercises oversight of
intercollegiate athletics mission, in
consultation with a cohort of other college
personnel: the vice president for student
services, the faculty athletic representative
(FAR), the Title IX officer, the chairperson of
the Health, Human Performance and Athletic Training Department, the NCAA compliance officer, the senior woman administrator in athletics, and the athletic director (AD). The president, FAR, and AD meet regularly with their peers in the Northwest Conference (NWC) to set policy ensuring academic integrity among conference members [Exhibit 55]. Individual sport coaches review conference guidelines on an annual basis and submit recommendations to their AD’s. When an AD chooses to take some action, recommendations are forwarded to the FARs, who consult with their respective presidents and then reach a decision about conference policy. Through June 2008, the Linfield AD reported to the vice president for academic affairs; on July 1st, he began reporting to the vice president for student services.

3.E.2 The goals and objectives of the intercollegiate athletic program, as well as institutional expectations of staff members, are provided in writing to candidates of athletic staff positions. Policies and rules concerning intercollegiate athletics are reviewed, at least annually, by athletics administrators and all head and assistant coaches. The duties and authority of the director of athletics, faculty committee on athletics, and others involved in athletics policy-making and program management are stated explicitly in writing.

The Linfield Intercollegiate Athletics Policy and Procedures Manual [Exhibit 6] clearly sets forth the goals and objectives of the intercollegiate athletic program in ways consistent with the Division III Manual and the NWC Policy Manual. Linfield’s manual undergoes periodic review in meetings between athletic administrators and the entire coaching staff. This manual also clarifies the duties of and procedures for all involved in policy-making [Exhibit 6]. Position announcements appear as openings become available [Exhibit 56]. Job descriptions for the athletic director, other athletic staff, the faculty athletic representative, the senior woman administrator, and the NCAA compliance officer are maintained and updated [Exhibit 57].

3.E.3 Admission requirements and procedures, academic standards and degree requirements, and financial aid awards for student athletics are vested in the same institutional agencies that handle these matters for all students.

All students at Linfield College undergo the same admission, academic, degree, and financial aid procedures and have equal access to institutional services; no preference is given to student athletes. Some sports offer specific academic support programs (study halls, tutoring, mentoring) not generally available to all students.

In 2007 the college reviewed the academic performance of student athletes compared to non-athletes [Exhibit 58]. The resulting report showed that while student athletes as a group had similar high school GPA’s and lower SAT scores than other students upon entry, these students performed comparably to their peers during the first year, with stronger retention into the sophomore year.

3.E.4 Athletic budget development is systematic; funds raised for and expended on athletics by alumni, foundations, and other groups shall be subject to the approval of the administration and be accounted for through the institution’s generally accepted practices of documentation and audit.

The annual college budgeting process determines all athletic budgets. Funds acquired through outside donors or fundraising activities are accounted for through the Office of College Relations and are recorded by the
institution’s accounting department. The AD and vice president for college relations authorize all athletics fundraising requests. Expenditure of funds from foundations and other outside groups must be approved by the AD and, when necessary, the vice president for finance and administration.

### 3.E Table 1 Male/Female Athlete Expenditure Per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male Total Operating Expense</th>
<th># Male Athletes</th>
<th>Expenditure Per Male Athlete</th>
<th>Female Total Operating Expense</th>
<th># Female Athletes</th>
<th>Expenditure Per Female Athlete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>$297,084</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>$842</td>
<td>$190,833</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>$900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03–04</td>
<td>$243,648</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>$657</td>
<td>$176,067</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02–03</td>
<td>$177,130</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>$535</td>
<td>$150,621</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>$610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01–02</td>
<td>$201,650</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>$607</td>
<td>$154,593</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>$672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00–01</td>
<td>$184,958</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>$651</td>
<td>$114,958</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>$581</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Report

An examination of the Equity in Athletics Disclosure Act Report (EADA) [Exhibit 59] regarding expenditures for male and female athletic teams over the past five years demonstrates that, on average, women athletes receive more funding per student than their male counterparts. This most likely reflects Linfield’s having full team rosters for most men’s teams, while women’s teams often do not fill their rosters. It has also proven challenging to field women’s junior varsity teams, since few competitive opportunities for such teams exist.

### 3.E.5 The institution demonstrates its commitment to fair and equitable treatment of both male and female athletes in providing opportunities for participation, financial aid, student-support services, equipment, and access to facilities.

Linfield revised its five year plan for athletic participation in 2005 so as to assure equitable treatment of female and male athletes [Exhibit 60]. The AD and Title IX officer (in consultation with the senior woman administrator) monitor the plan; funding for assessment comes from the college administration. Linfield publicly reports athletic-related income and expenditures, as required in the EADA Report. The most recent Women’s Intercollegiate Sports Participation Study at Linfield College, conducted in spring 2006 identified the key factors behind decisions by female student athletes to cease participation as these: (1) changing personal priorities and (2) lack of connection to teammates and/or coaches [Exhibit 61]. The athletic director, Title IX officer, and senior woman administrator work together to address the latter issue as they review and hire coaches for women’s sport teams.

### 3.E Table 2 Male/Female Intercollegiate Athletic Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Males Participating</th>
<th>% Females Participating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07–08</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06–07</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04–05</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03–04</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Institutional Research

A slight decline in the percentage of student athletes through fall 2006 is explained by the fact that, while overall Linfield enrollment increased, the number of students participating in athletics remained consistent, dictated by the five year plan cited above. A decrease in women’s participation after 2003–04 reflects the lack of competition for junior varsity programs.
3.E.6 The institution publishes its policy concerning the scheduling of intercollegiate practices and competition for both men and women that avoids conflicts with the instructional calendar, particularly during end-of-term examinations.

The Intercollegiate Athletes Policies and Procedures Manual contains the college’s published policy for scheduling athletic contests [Exhibit 6]. A policy statement governs practice schedules, academic conflicts, and both home and away contests to minimize absences from class by student athletes [Exhibit 62]. It also delineates the procedure for head coaches in scheduling their respective team competitions; each proposed schedule requires the AD’s approval.

Conclusion

Linfield College can be proud of the programs and services it provides to students. The staff of the college evinces passion for and professionalism in the work they do in support of the college mission. They share a commitment to adapt and improve services to meet the needs of an ever-changing contemporary undergraduate population. Areas of continuing improvement include: (1) communication around the financial aid awarding process; (2) residence life programming and housing options; (3) updated food service programs; and (4) successful transitioning to membership within NCAA Division III athletics. Physical space and financial resources have limited the programs and services the college can offer, but creativity and a desire to serve students well have overcome many of these obstacles.

This self-study has also pointed toward the desirability of Linfield’s formalizing a policy statement defining college/media relationships. In relation to its goal of enhancing the diversity of the student body, the institution must continue planning for ways to alleviate the stresses such change produces for the existing community and the individuals from previously under-represented populations who join that community. Ongoing tensions about the Greek standards adopted by the college in the last decade require further conversation as well.
## Standard 3 Required Table 1 Part 1
### Admission Report: McMinnville Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>05–06</th>
<th>06–07</th>
<th>07–08</th>
<th>08–09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inquiries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>22,965</td>
<td>24,471</td>
<td>26,582</td>
<td>26,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>1,116</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>15,343</td>
<td>16,767</td>
<td>25,210</td>
<td>22,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>2,232</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>2,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversion Rate</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange/visiting</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admitted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>1,560</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,637</td>
<td>1,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange/visiting</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Deposits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR Yield Rate</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange/visiting</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denied Applicants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Students Enrolled on Census Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange (non-degree)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>06–07</td>
<td>07–08</td>
<td>08–09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inquiries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>2,743</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>2,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>1,866</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,812</td>
<td>1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Admitted</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Transfers</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer entry</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall entry</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring entry</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr Acceptance Rate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paid Deposits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer entry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall entry</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring entry</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr Yield Rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returnees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denied Applicants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer/Fall Entry, Enrolled on Fall Census Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Transfers</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring Entry, Enrolled on Spring Census Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Transfers</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Men</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Women</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Standard 3 Required Table 2 Student Affairs Staff Profile (McMinnville and Portland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Professional</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Other*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD,EdD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD,JD,MSW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA,MS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA, BS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA, AAS, Cert.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Experience in Field:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time: 9/10 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time: 9/10 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>varies</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 3 Attachment 1 Student Services Organizational Chart, 2007-08

Please see Standard 6 Attachment 2, page 232.
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Standard Four — Faculty

Through their teaching, scholarship, creative endeavors, and service, the faculty of Linfield College actively support the institutional mission to “Connect learning, life, and community.” A survey of the faculty conducted by the Faculty Executive Council (FEC) in 2006 [Exhibit 1] indicated that 96% of respondents believed in the institutional mission and 68% strongly agreed or agreed that the mission statement accurately describes the college, with 19% neither agreeing nor disagreeing (p. 179). As a body the Linfield faculty continue a long-standing tradition of providing student-centered liberal arts and professional education to students preparing to become global citizens. The 1998 Institutional Self-Study identified three ongoing challenges regarding Standard IV: compensation, evaluation, and professional development assistance. While these concerns remain in 2008, the college has adopted strategies to address them and has made notable progress over the past decade.

From fall 1998 to September 2007, Linfield hired 66 new faculty members, resulting in a 45% change within the faculty population due to numerous retirements and the creation of 16 new faculty lines. Women constituted 61% of new hires over the decade so that their percentage in the full-time faculty grew from 39% in fall 1999 to 53% in fall 2007. During the same period, the percentage of regular faculty members 60 and older increased from 8% to 23% while the percentage aged 39 and younger remained relatively stable at 17% and 19%, respectively [Exhibit 2].

The FEC undertook the 2006 Faculty Survey to identify the most salient issues for the faculty during a time of major institutional transition. Responses were received from 69% of the regular faculty and fell into a representative distribution across academic divisions, tenure status/rank, and gender. Most respondents voiced satisfaction with major components of their work environment. For example, 87% reported a collegial overall climate/culture within their departments (p. 113). On the other hand, long-standing dissatisfaction with the compensation levels of the faculty surfaced in the survey results and continues as this self-study is being written—a concern understood at all levels of the institution, including the Board of Trustees. Similarly, ongoing anxieties associated with the faculty evaluation process were raised and are discussed in the following narrative. In 2006 the survey reflected a desire for greater diversity within the faculty, and in the last two years, new hires have continued to expand the numbers within underrepresented groups.

Linfield faculty embrace the ideals and practices of the teacher/scholar/artist in their ongoing professional work and collaborative endeavors. They contribute to disciplinary discussions at the regional, national, and international level through publications, paper presentations, artistic exhibitions, and performances. Between 2001 and 2006, 90% of 2006 Faculty Survey respondents reported receiving institutional support to attend professional events (p. 43). In summer 2008, 17 faculty members and 31 students from ten departments across all four academic divisions received institutional faculty/student collaborative research grants totaling $99,445.

Yet this productivity, when combined with the high caliber of instruction at the college, has come at a cost, and many faculty voice concerns over insufficient professional support in terms of the time and resources needed to accomplish their professional goals. Work load issues are discussed at length in what follows. Faculty governance demands also compete for faculty energies and are currently under review, as are the mechanisms by which faculty contribute to shared governance to make the entire enterprise more effective from the faculty perspective.

Linfield faculty place a high value on collegiality and community. Academic visitors to the college and new hires regularly remark on
the respectful and supportive environment that operates, in great part through a shared dedication to the academic advancement of the student body. It is perhaps emblematic of that atmosphere that faculty crave additional means of teaching together, sharing scholarship, and convening informally.

4.A – Faculty Selection, Evaluation, Roles, Welfare, and Development

4.A.1 The institution employs professionally qualified faculty with primary commitment to the institution and representative of each field or program in which it offers major work.

Linfield employs professionally qualified faculty hired with the understanding that their primary commitment rests with the college. Candidates for faculty positions are screened for professional qualifications in the discipline in which they will teach. Terminal degree requirements for each department are determined by the Faculty Assembly and published in the Faculty Handbook (IV.16). According to institutional data, 87% of full-time faculty held the designated terminal degree in 2007–08. 4.A Table 1 delineates the terminal degree percentages on the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, respectively. 4.A Table 2 lists the type of degrees held by full-time faculty members. Both tables are based on the Institutional Data 2007 (Fact Book, p. 46).

Additional summary information about faculty qualifications may be found in Table 1 and Table 2 Institutional Faculty Profile at the end of this report. Also see Standards 2.A.1 and 2.C.7.

When a department cannot recruit an individual with the specified degree, particularly where market forces interfere, the college permits hiring without the prescribed academic preparation with the understanding that “the faculty and administration will do all that is possible to foster the progress of the appointee toward the attainment of the terminal degree.” Unless explicitly waived in the hiring contract, the individual so hired will be informed that “holding the specified terminal degree will be a factor in all tenure decisions and all promotion decisions. The specified terminal degree will normally be required for tenure” (Faculty Handbook, IV.11).

The Portland Campus seeks to “grow its own” doctorally prepared nursing faculty where possible, given the national dearth of such applicants. The School of Nursing awards professional development funds to masters-level faculty who undertake further graduate studies; three tenure-track faculty are currently pursuing a doctorate, one of whom was hired since the Faculty Assembly designated the Ph.D. the terminal degree for nursing in 2005–06. Over the last 15 years, six Linfield-employed nursing faculty have completed their doctorates with

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Degree Earned</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>A.M.L.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>J.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>D.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.S.N.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D.M.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.F.A.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>D.N.Sc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L.S.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Dr.P.H.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.M.A.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.B.A. with C.P.A.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.N.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.A Table 1 Percentage of Regular Faculty with Terminal Degrees Fall 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Percentage with Doctorate</th>
<th>Percentage with Terminal Degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McMinnville</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
college support; one has since left the college and one is deceased. Full-time tenure track faculty pursuing the Ph.D. carry a reduced student advisee load. An associate dean of nursing assists these and other faculty with professional development.

Those without the terminal degree on the McMinnville Campus in 2007 included: (1) two ABD tenure-track faculty whose tenure is contingent upon completion of the Ph.D.; (2) one whose professional experience nationally and internationally merits favorable comparison with the terminal degree in the field; (3) one who possesses a master’s degree from an overseas university—a degree recognized as more advanced than its U.S. counterpart; (4) a part-time instructor who has moved out of a joint administrative/faculty line; (5) one senior professor who was promoted on merit and whose hiring date precedes implementation of the terminal degree requirements; and (6) four visiting instructors.

Standard 2.G discusses faculty serving the Division of Continuing Education, some of whom are current residential or emeriti faculty but most of whom are adjunct hires. All adjuncts are screened for their possession of the appropriate educational background to teach in the field where the courses reside; the CV’s of finalists for such assignments are forwarded to departmentally based faculty liaisons for review and approval. In 2008–09 the DCE dean will initiate a process of phone or in-person interviews between the liaisons and prospective hires. Most DCE adjunct faculty have been with the program for many years so turnover is minimal from year to year.

The Faculty Handbook states institutional policy on faculty consulting and outside work (IV.16). Those undertaking such arrangements must inform the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty or the director of the Portland Campus to avoid conflict of interest. This approval process has occurred more consistently in McMinnville than in Portland. Occasionally a faculty member negotiates a reduced teaching load in concert with outside professional commitments; college interests are protected by the scope of the outside work and the clear obligations accruing to Linfield. As noted in Standard 9, the vice presidents for academic affairs and finance/administration will, in 2008–09, review the application of conflict of interest policies to strengthen consistent practice throughout the college.

4.A.2 Faculty participate in academic planning, curriculum development and review, academic advising, and institutional governance.

**Academic Planning**

Academic planning occurs both institutionally and departmentally. Over the last decade the all-campus Planning Council has led extensive conversations around institutional goal-setting that have produced The Linfield College Strategic Agenda 2000–05 [Exhibit 3], the Linfield College Strategic Agenda 2005–10 [Exhibit 4], and The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 [Exhibit 5]. Production of these documents relied upon input from faculty generated at the departmental, divisional, and Faculty Assembly standing committee levels.

The Planning Council itself, chaired by the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty, includes four faculty members representing their respective divisions. One also serves as liaison to the Faculty Executive Council (FEC). See Standards 1.B and 6.D for further discussion of the faculty role in institutional planning.

Biennial faculty retreats provide opportunities for faculty members to discuss institutional planning initiatives. Importantly, they attend to curricular issues as well [Exhibit 6]. The fall 2006 faculty retreat included review of the Planning Council’s draft Foundational Education Principles, the cornerstone of what has since become the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12. During the retreat the faculty also deliberated over issues related to faculty governance and reviewed proposed revisions to the general education program known as the Linfield Curriculum (see Standard 2.C). This
effort was led from 2005–07 by the ad hoc General Education Review Committee (GERC) authorized by the Faculty Assembly. A reconstituted Linfield Curriculum was approved by the Faculty Assembly in spring 2007 and fully implemented in fall 2008.

A recent Portland Campus initiative offers an example of planning that occurs at the divisional level. In 2003 Portland began a consultant-led strategic planning process initiated by an all-campus retreat attended by faculty, administrators, and staff. The Portland Division then established a strategic planning task force with 13 members, six of whom were faculty. Sub-committees, each including faculty, undertook specific topics ranging from academic programs to facilities and technology. The task force eventually recommended that the Portland Campus become transfer-only and sent its proposal to the entire division for discussion, where it was supported by many but opposed by a dissenting minority; no formal vote is on record as a result of this discussion. The task force then forwarded its recommendation to the Planning Council, which advised its adoption by then-President Bull, who officially accepted it in spring 2005. Consultation with McMinnville academic departments about possible impacts on their campus did not occur prior to its fall 2005 implementation. See Standard 1.B.1 for additional discussion. Two of the original task force sub-committees continue their work in 2008: (1) Facilities and Technology and (2) Campus Diversity. The task force itself has been superceded by the Strategic Planning Oversight Committee (SPOC), which meets monthly to discuss issues on which to advise the director of the Portland Campus. This 12 member committee includes five faculty.

The move to an upper-division transfer-only campus was made in fall 2007 after a year of contentious but open discussion that prompted a Portland Division vote in opposition to the move. Consultation with faculty did occur throughout this process, as did communication explaining administrative rationales for ending admission of sophomore transfers to the Portland Campus; indeed, the precipitating factor in this decision involved the nursing faculty’s vote to accept only junior and senior transfers starting in 2007–08.

**Curriculum Development and Review**

Faculty oversight for the curriculum is affirmed in both the Bylaws of the Faculty Assembly and the Bylaws of Linfield College, as noted in the *Faculty Handbook* (III.2.4):

> The Faculty Assembly shall prescribe, with the concurrence of the President, subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, requirements for admission, courses of study, conditions of graduation, the nature of degrees to be conferred, rules and methods of conduct of educational work of the College, and maintenance of a suitable environment for learning and professional activity.

The Faculty Assembly approves academic requirements in general education as well as in all majors and minors, following review by and recommendations from the Curriculum Committee. To ensure the integrity of the curriculum, a college-wide process guides curricular changes at every level. Departmental proposals for course or program changes go to the Curriculum Committee, which makes its recommendations to the Faculty Assembly at each monthly meeting. In the 2006 Faculty Survey, 89% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that “faculty have a major role in the design/implementation of the curriculum” (p. 117). The School of Nursing operates an internal curriculum committee to remain current with the regulations from outside accrediting bodies and oversee revision efforts, which must be approved by the nursing faculty as a body before they move forward to the Curriculum Committee for further action.

The Office of Academic Affairs oversees delivery of the curriculum through its management of faculty load assignments and its responsibility for the Office of the Registrar. One of the deans within Academic Affairs has long been an ex officio member of the Curriculum Committee and keeps the office informed about ongoing curricular developments before they reach the Faculty Assembly. The Curriculum Committee proposal form explicitly
asks about the staffing and resource implications of proposed changes or additions (including new majors), another way by which the academic dean may weigh in on curricular evolution. In the recent case of the health sciences program on the Portland Campus, the dean of faculty directed the faculty responsible for the major to revise it in accordance with the newly adopted upper division transfer model. In this case, development of the revised major went through the above channels, albeit with intermediate review for its staffing implications by the Office of Academic Affairs.

Departments regularly review their curricula, as annual reports and assessment plans demonstrate [Exhibits 7, 8]. At the request of the dean of faculty in spring 2006, the Curriculum Committee began considering ways to formalize regularly scheduled departmental reviews that would involve the committee as well as the Office of Academic Affairs. Such a process would replace more scattered assessment practices of conducting yearly retreats, internal reviews, or outside consultancies. At the May 2008 Faculty Assembly the Curriculum Committee presented, as a first reading, a motion to “establish an ongoing departmental/programmatic review process effective the 2009–10 academic year” [Exhibit 9]. The faculty will discuss the motion in fall 2008. In tandem with efforts to improve the departmental review process, an examination of ways to strengthen the role of department chair will be undertaken by the new academic vice president in 2008–09; departmental agency within the institutional decision-making process could thus be strengthened as well. See Standard 2.B for fuller discussion of academic assessment.

In the Division of Continuing Education, the dean of DCE works with the appropriate McMinnville and Portland Campus departments, as well as with the faculty Continuing Education Committee (CEC) to initiate and/or review curricular changes appropriate to DCE majors. The CEC meets monthly and members report to their respective divisions about matters under discussion. Over the past year the CEC has examined a number of DCE practices and procedures in preparation for this report, including adjunct policies and the DCE mission statement [Exhibit 10].

Since 1998, the position of DCE departmental liaison has been created to improve residential faculty oversight of DCE courses and instructor hiring/performance data [Exhibit 11]. Increasing the effectiveness of this relationship has been a central focus of the CEC in 2007–08. As of fall 2007, the DCE dean hosts a dinner meeting each semester for departmental liaisons, CEC members, and the dean of faculty. As of spring 2008, liaisons receive the year-long schedule of DCE courses as soon as it is completed, as well as subsequent modifications that occur. Liaisons have also requested receipt of course syllabi and book lists early enough to allow feedback on both with adjuncts. Efforts to foster more direct contact between DCE adjuncts and residential faculty are also being strengthened. In 2008–09, DCE is contracting with a residential faculty member of considerable experience in the program and expertise in online education to mentor liaisons and faculty interested in pursuing online instruction. Also see Standards 2.A.7 and 2.C. 2.

Academic Advising
Linfield considers academic advising an integral part of the college mission and an important facet of teaching. Advising thus merits consideration in faculty performance evaluations. The Faculty Handbook states that “consistent and effective attention to the needs of advisees” constitutes one of several important areas of teaching effectiveness (IV.6.1.1). Through the first year Colloquium program as well as through direct departmental oversight of majors and minors, McMinnville Campus faculty conduct most student academic advising; 96% of the full-time faculty participated in 2007–08. Every first year student is assigned a faculty Colloquium advisor for the fall semester to assist with adjustment to college academic life. Colloquium sessions begin during new student orientation and continue through early November. The Office of Academic Advising organizes and supports this effort; it also publishes an Academic Advising Handbook.
Exhibit 12] and other materials for faculty advisors and student peer assistants.

By the end of the sophomore year, all students have declared their majors and moved on to departmental advisors. Faculty advisors meet with their charges each semester prior to registration to approve course selection for the coming term. Faculty regularly discuss graduation requirements with students and may also provide career counseling, professional planning, and graduate school advice.

On the Portland Campus, faculty advising assignments are made prior to New Student Orientation and continue as each student moves toward degree completion. Preliminary academic advising forecasts are provided to accepted transfer students by the Office of Admission and the Office of the Registrar.

The Division of Continuing Education employs professional advisors to guide students through their academic programs. The associate director of DCE provides information about degree progress and completion. Standard 2.C.5 and the Faculty Handbook (IV.2) provide further detail about the college’s academic advising programs.

Institutional Governance
Although perceptions of effectiveness vary, full-time faculty participate actively and widely in institutional governance through service on the 12 standing committees of the Faculty Assembly as well as through college-wide committees. Every standing committee includes a representative from each of the four academic divisions, as do most ad hoc committees. A faculty member is elected by the full Assembly to serve as faculty trustee, who is then ratified by the entire Board of Trustees and invested with full voting status. In any given year, 58 faculty members (40% of the current faculty) dedicate time to faculty governance through standing committee assignments; ad hoc task groups and college-wide committees boost the percentage. The 2006 Faculty Survey indicated dissatisfaction with the effort involved in faculty governance, both in terms of the commitment required and the lack of perceived effectiveness upon institutional decision-making. For example, 77% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that “it is important for all faculty members to play an active role in governance” (p. 143), while 67% noted that committee work was a source of stress for them (p. 168) either somewhat (40%) or significantly (27%).

A disjunction exists between the trustees’ acknowledged appreciation for faculty efforts on behalf of the college and the perception of over one-third (36%) of Faculty Survey respondents that the board does not value their role in shared governance (p. 147). President Hellie and Board of Trustees Chair Glenna Kruger have recently expanded initiatives begun by then-President Bull in 2003 to enhance understanding between the faculty and the board. Faculty liaisons from the relevant standing committees attend trustee committee meetings on academic affairs, finances, student life, enrollment, and facilities (see Faculty Handbook, III.2.5). Committee liaisons also join the trustees for lunch on the first day of each board meeting. Since 2007, President Hellie has organized a joint faculty/trustee dinner during each February board meeting. In a report to the community in February 2008, the president reaffirmed his commitment to strengthening communication between trustees and campus constituents [Exhibit 13]. Similarly, the President’s Cabinet and the Faculty Executive Council have entered an on-going dialogue about the most effective structures and methods for fostering shared governance. See Standard 6.D for further analysis.

The role of departmental chairs within institutional governance has generally operated through individual interactions with the Office of Academic Affairs and through the discussion mechanisms at work in the academic division structure. The academic vice president/dean of faculty calls meetings with department chairs at least twice per semester to provide administrative updates and solicit department feedback on various issues [Exhibit 14]. In developing the 2007–12 Strategic Plan, the Planning Council asked each department to provide a written overview of its current and future academic goals, using these as its basis.
for identifying Linfield’s Six Foundational Principles. While a department chairs’ handbook exists [Exhibit 15] and is provided in an updated form to chairs, little systematic guidance operates for new chairs besides that provided by one’s predecessor (chairs are typically determined through departmental rotation among its members or other consensus measures for selection). Strengthening the role and efficacy of department chairs—a major means toward increasing a sense of institutional agency within academic departments—will require more supportive processes by which new chairs learn their jobs and operate as effective administrative advocates for their programs within the broader faculty as well as the college as a whole.

4.A.3 Faculty workloads reflect the mission and goals of the institution and the talents and competencies of faculty, allowing sufficient time and support for professional growth and renewal.

In keeping with its mission, Linfield’s Bylaws describe an institution “committed to the teaching of undergraduates in an atmosphere of academic freedom that fosters intellectual rigor, creativity, and a sense of personal and social responsibility” (Faculty Handbook, II.2). Notably, students responding to the 2007 Senior Survey reported high levels of satisfaction with faculty engagement on the McMinnville Campus and in the Division of Continuing Education, and somewhat lesser but still marked satisfaction on the Portland Campus. See 4.A Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>McMinnville</th>
<th>Portland</th>
<th>DCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with faculty</td>
<td>Very Satisfied/Satisfied</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with faculty</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied/Dissatisfied</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn’t Use</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2007 Graduating Senior Survey, p. 10

Such results document the considerable effort expended by the Linfield faculty in their teaching role. To achieve the broader goals identified in the mission, faculty must also succeed as professionally engaged academics and contributors to the wider community on and off-campus. Faculty workloads and performance expectations stem from and support the college mission. Debate continues, however, about the relative emphasis placed on each performance area and the challenge of balancing them in ways supportive of a reasonable quality of life for individual faculty members. Workload concerns thus emerged as a significant finding of the 2006 Faculty Survey, with 46% of respondents reporting that they feel burned out by their work; in contrast, 38% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement and 15% neither agreed nor disagreed (p. 108). More than three-quarters (79%) of those responding to the survey stated that their teaching load had been a source of stress for them during the preceding three years (p. 169). In addition to high teaching loads, faculty workload concerns include a perceived imbalance between teaching and research, class size, teacher-student ratio, and staffing [Exhibit 16]. Four major areas emerged as central:

- **Designation of teaching load.** For years, the faculty load was defined as 25 credits per departmental faculty member. In 1994, an agreement between then-President Bull and the Faculty Executive Council created more flexibility in determining load through adoption of a required departmental average of 23 units among full-time faculty (Faculty
Handbook, IV.2). Disagreements in recent years involving implementation of this agreement, especially in terms of overload pay, have created dissension between the faculty and the Office of Academic Affairs. The decision in spring 2008 to initiate overload pay for all teaching credits tied to Jan Term duties that extend beyond the 23 load unit average marked then-Dean Seidman’s attempt to address this debate.

- **Increased requirement for professional activity.** As noted in 4.A.5, personal and institutional expectations for higher levels of professional achievement tied to tenure and promotion create both apprehension and frustration for those being evaluated, given the required teaching and service load.

- **Increased professional development opportunities.** While faculty desire more professional development opportunities and find the experiences currently afforded them invigorating, the lack of sufficient time and resources to implement new ideas in their teaching and professional work prove frustrating.

- **Time given over to faculty governance and other institutional service.** Although the majority of faculty responding to the 2006 survey agree or strongly agree that it is “important for all faculty members to play an active role in governance” (p. 143), the time required to serve on standing committees, not to mention ad hoc and college-wide bodies, conflicts directly with other faculty responsibilities.

Contributing to this workload challenge is the perception voiced by 78% of 2006 Faculty Survey respondents that their departments are understaffed (p.109). Between 1998 and 2007 the college added 16 new faculty lines—14 on the McMinnville Campus and two on the Portland Campus—to adjust staffing levels in the face of rising student enrollment. In addition, 12 new instructional/clinical associates (four on the Portland Campus and eight on the McMinnville Campus) have joined the academic staff of the college since 1998. Three of those new instructional associate lines were converted faculty lines (moving newly hired athletic coaches from the faculty to the administrative track) and thus do not represent new budget lines. While classified as administrators, instructional associates work directly with students in science labs, theatre production activities, nursing clinicals, and health and athletics activities, including coaching. In addition to overseeing lab sections and other experiential learning, some instructional associates teach general education classes and/or courses offered within majors. [Exhibit 17].

Staffing needs at the departmental level are examined through processes that combine the work of the faculty Staffing Committee (which solicits and reviews individual departmental proposals for new positions) and the academic vice president/dean of faculty (who shares with the committee an institutional perspective on broad-based curricular pressures and the budget prospects for the budget year in question). Existing practice has the Staffing Committee recommend to the academic vice president a position (or positions) for which to seek additional funding during the fall budget deliberations for the coming budget cycle. If recommended positions cannot be funded that year (or “runners-up are identified in any given year), no “waiting list” operates to give a proposal priority in the Staffing Committee’s next round of deliberations; the evaluation process begins anew each year so as to ensure responsiveness to changing circumstances in the curriculum since its last review of proposals. This practice also has drawbacks, however, not the least of which has been the disappointment experienced by departments who see an unfunded recommendation lose out in the next year’s deliberations. Moreover, the college does not at present have an approach to creating new faculty positions over the life of the current strategic plan, in part because of a budgeting process that is not able to predict available resources for new positions except year by year. When constructing its Budget Priorities memo each fall to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), the college Planning Council has recently emphasized striking a balance between compensation improvements and staffing additions when allocating new dollars, and this has resulted in incremental faculty growth over
the last decade. The McMinnville Campus student/faculty ratio has thus gone from 15:7 (1997–98) to 15:8 (2007–08); on the Portland Campus it has decreased from 11.7 (1997–98) to 11.0 (2007–08).

The majority of those completing the 2006 Faculty Survey (60%) also reported dissatisfaction with the balance between teaching and research/creative activity now operating in faculty performance expectations; 28% indicated satisfaction with the current balance and 11% indicated neither agreement nor disagreement (p. 106). Respondent results reported in 4.A Table 4 help elucidate this concern, particularly as changing faculty demographics converge with Linfield’s traditional identity as a teaching institution.

### 4.A Table 4 Faculty Preferences Re. Teaching and Research/Creative Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prefer more time on teaching &amp; less on research/creative activity</th>
<th>Prefer more time on teaching &amp; less on research/creative activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree or Agree</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree or Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know or Undecided</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree or Agree</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree or Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know or Undecided</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: 2006 Faculty Survey, pp. 110, 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because workload issues play such a major role in the lives of faculty members within and beyond campus, the concerns expressed in the survey are neither surprising nor unique to Linfield. To address this challenge, the *Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12* includes Foundational Resource Principle One—Developing Its Human Resource Base—to “examine issues related to and establish goals for faculty and staff load as it currently exists” [Exhibit 5].

In May 2007, the Faculty Assembly created an ad hoc Faculty Workload Committee to study the issues noted above and provide recommendations for consideration by the faculty and administration. The committee distributed its findings to the Faculty Assembly in May 2008 [Exhibit 18]. Discussion of the report will occur in 2008–09.

Teaching assignments reflect the talents and competencies of the Linfield faculty. Professors teach in their major areas of academic preparation, although many become generalists in small departments with broadly based disciplines or sub-fields. Most enjoy opportunities to develop courses that meet major requirements while also serving the Linfield Curriculum. Faculty with overlapping foci develop collaborative approaches to teaching and scholarship across disciplines and offer tangible evidence of Linfield’s Foundational Principle One—Integrated Learning. For example, a new history professor also contributes to the environmental studies curriculum alongside colleagues in economics, sociology, biology, philosophy and English. Several faculty have developed theoretical explorations of gender within their discipline-specific courses and thus support interdisciplinary gender studies. Faculty members from disparate fields with interests in specific regions of the globe contribute to the various international studies minors, including Asian, European, and Latin American Studies. Standard 4.A.1 contains additional details regarding faculty qualifications.

4.A.4 Faculty salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain a competent faculty and are consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Policies on salaries and benefits are clearly stated, widely available and equitably administered.
Policies on faculty salaries and benefits are published in several places. Benefits and leave policies are described in Sections I.6 and I.7 of the Common Chapter of each employee handbook under the title “Personnel Policies and Procedures Governing All Linfield Employees.” Chapters IV, V, and VII of the Faculty Handbook also provide this information, as well as clarification about faculty salary policies and procedures (IV.12–13). The annually recomputed faculty salary amounts accorded to each step in rank appear as an annually updated appendix to the Faculty Handbook.

The current salary step system pays all faculty on the basis of a uniformly applied step system or scale. As with past iterations of this model, the current faculty step system was adopted by a formal vote of the Faculty Assembly in 2002. In 2007–08, the Faculty Budget and Benefits Committee (FB&B) discussed concerns raised by some faculty about whether to retain or eliminate entry step B1, as well as the desirability of adjusting a perceived anomaly in the first two steps of the associate professor rank; the committee chose not to recommend any changes to the Faculty Assembly at that time.

Once the funds available for faculty salaries have been allocated through the annual budget process, FB&B (following criteria outlined in section IV.12 of the Faculty Handbook) recommends to the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty a model for distributing those funds through the salary step system. The dean may negotiate around this model before sending a recommended salary distribution forward to the president. See Exhibit 19 for a list of salaries from 1998 through 2008. Included in the exhibit are figures showing real values of the college’s total compensation expenditures for faculty and administrators and the real average level of compensation for faculty members by rank, all measured in 1997 dollars. Real total compensation expenditures for faculty and administrators have increased since 1997–98. This reflects both increases in staffing and increases in compensation expenditures per employee. While the average level of compensation for faculty by rank remained relatively constant in real terms between 1998 and 2003, real gains in each rank occurred between 2003–04 and 2006–07.

Despite the college’s successful efforts over the past decade to improve faculty compensation, the issue endures as one of Linfield’s most pressing strategic challenges. In the 2006 Faculty Survey, 67% of respondents indicated they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with salaries, while 44% reported dissatisfaction with benefits (p. 80). The issues around compensation thus contribute to low morale among faculty. In Objective II of the Linfield College Strategic Agenda 2005–10, the college states that in order to attract and retain an “engaged faculty and staff that are fully committed to the college’s mission,” Linfield must “ensure that faculty and staff have the compensation, support, and resources necessary for them to excel” [Exhibit 4]. The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12, adopted by the Board of Trustees in May 2007, encompasses not only three Foundational Education Principles but also three Foundational Resource Principles, the first of which (Developing Our Human Resource Base) recognizes the need to “propose, develop, and assess the impact of efforts that attempt” to “enhance compensation for college employees” [Exhibit 5].

Improving faculty compensation has thus remained a high priority for the last decade and will continue as such. The protocols in place to measure institutional progress on this front have changed, however. Prior to 2000, Linfield had set as a compensation goal the attainment of the median in average compensation among seventeen peer institutions. Given the difficulties in obtaining accurate data from this group, in 2000 the Board of Trustees adopted as a 2002–03 compensation goal of reaching the 80th percentile of AAUP Category IIB institutions for all three faculty ranks, excluding tuition remission and tuition exchange. The board then created a Compensation Committee to analyze institutional progress, consult with Linfield employee groups, and advise the full board and the senior administration. In an effort to obtain
consistent data for faculty and administrators, this committee in May 2005 recommended adoption of a new comparison group, the Pacific Consortium (PACCON) of West Coast Small Colleges, and identified a “benchmark range goal of between 85% and 100% of the geographically adjusted PACCON mean (set back one year) for both faculty and administrators” (Facility Handbook IV.12).

Every year since adoption of this system, two of the three faculty ranks have fallen within the benchmark range, with steps taken each of those years to move the third group—full professors—into the range as well. Preliminary PACCON data for 2007–08 suggest that, while compensation for assistant professors, associate professors, and administrators remained comfortably within the benchmark range, the college may have lost some ground relative to 2006–07. Exhibit materials include both AAUP and PACCON comparison data as well as the faculty salary schedule from 1998–99 to 2007–08 [Exhibit 19].

Some faculty voice the following concerns regarding compensation and the benchmarking process:

- Is the data provided by the PACCON group appropriate? Members of the Faculty Benefits and Budget Committee (FB&B) believe the AAUP Category IIB data provides a more appropriate comparison for Linfield, while the board relies on the PACCON comparison, whose data also derives from AAUP but whose participating institutions offer a subset of more similar schools to Linfield geographically and programmatically. Concerns also exist with the PACCON data since some schools include graduate and professional programs within their reported figures. Nor does every PACCON school report its data every year. To provide both historical and national contexts for Linfield’s compensation progress, the Faculty Benefits and Budget Committee continues to monitor faculty compensation within the context of AAUP IIB data [Exhibit 19].

- Does the institution want to be “just within” the identified compensation range? Are the faculty and institution satisfied with reaching 85%? If not, should there be a specified goal within the benchmark range? In considering this question, the trustee Compensation Committee has consistently emphasized its continued reliance on the designated range rather than identifying a specific target figure or goal. Both the Board of Trustees and the FB&B continue to discuss the general appropriateness of the benchmarking process.

- Compensation inequities exist across the three faculty ranks and within them due to the method for distributing benefit dollars. In 2006–07 full professors fell slightly below the 85% established PACCON range while assistants and associates on average exceeded 90% of the PACCON average [Exhibit 19]. Distribution of salary dollars in the 2006–07, 2007–08, and 2008–09 budgets sought to redress this imbalance.

In terms of faculty benefits, healthcare costs and coverage have become a point of contention among many. Linfield is clearly not immune from the general crisis in health care coverage in the United States. As institutional costs in this area have steadily escalated, the Board of Trustees adopted a policy whereby college contributions to healthcare insurance may not exceed the total percentage increase to Linfield employee salaries. As a result, the college has moved from covering the cost of full-family medical insurance to full coverage for employees only, with partial subsidy provided for spouse/domestic partner and/or family. As a result, employee out-of-pocket costs for healthcare coverage have generally increased, though that has not been the case for any employee group in 2008–09. General reductions in healthcare coverage have also resulted, even as the college’s total expenditures on health coverage have continued to grow. These changes have increased faculty frustrations related to compensation. Membership in the Oregon Independent Colleges Healthcare Consortium (known more colloquially as the Pioneer Trust) has mitigated the cost escalation seen in the
wider business community, though not every year has provided as happy an outcome as 2008–09, where the increase in premiums has been 0%. The option of participating in the less expensive Kaiser Health Care system is also available to all employees but requires enrollees who live in McMinnville to travel to Salem or Portland for services. Linfield also offers employees the option of participating in a tax-exempt FLEX program whereby salary deductions are set aside for non-covered medical expenditures.

In the past, a generous benefits package attracted faculty to Linfield as a counterweight to low salaries; indeed, faculty have voiced a majority preference for continuing the higher benefits package in a number of broad-based dialogues on the subject, even when the trade-off with new dollars potentially available for salary augmentation was pointed out. The college benefits package on its own has thus become less compelling for prospective hires than it once had been (though the generous 16% college contribution to retirement plans continues to impress candidates). The tension between the needs for salary augmentation to provide a satisfactory standard of living for faculty, and the weight of the (albeit less expansive) benefits package, will continue within the annual budgeting process, a fact compounded by studies that show Linfield’s benefits to be higher than that of competitor institutions while salaries for all employee groups, including faculty, are lower [Exhibit 19]. Addressing this situation will remain a challenge as the college seeks to hire and retain outstanding faculty.

In some disciplines (e.g. nursing, education, mass communications, and business), market demands make it difficult to attract, much less hire, the best candidates. In the three academic years between 2006–08, for example, among 24 searches for full time or visiting assistant professors conducted on the McMinnville Campus, 18 have successfully hired their first or second choice candidates while six have failed (25%). Those failed searches included two in education, one in the public relations area of mass communications, and two in business; in contrast, only one search has failed in a traditional liberal arts discipline (biology). Moreover, the candidate pool in the four departments mentioned above is consistently much smaller than those for liberal arts fields. On the Portland Campus, searches for new nursing faculty have succeeded in recent years but attrition in the ranks of employed nursing faculty or clinical associates has produced losses several years running. Given the faculty’s strong egalitarian culture, proposals to move either to market-driven or merit-based compensation plans will face difficulties in winning faculty support. The members of FB&B in 2007–08 instead suggested that the college consider other routes toward improving hiring results in market-driven fields, such as enhanced professional development or start-up funding. While these efforts may help, it remains an open question whether they can effectively substitute for higher salaries, as many past candidates have closely examined their longer-term earning potential at the college and not just starting salaries.

Some faculty have questioned salary step placement of new hires based on the weight accorded previous full-time teaching or research experience at other higher educational institutions. This has led some to wonder if hiring negotiations have adversely affected salary differentials across sub-groups. Since no data has been compiled regarding salary equity based on entering step assignment, Linfield may wish to analyze this matter in the future.

As in 1998, compensation concerns apply largely to faculty categories rather than to individuals. The change involving health care benefits means that faculty with full family coverage earn relatively higher levels of total compensation within their given ranks than those without dependents or co-beneficiaries. A possible strategy for improving faculty compensation may be to increase the overall pool of money available for compensation. This message has been clearly and consistently communicated to and acknowledged by President Hellie and the Board of Trustees, explaining its inclusion in the Linfield College Strategic Agenda for 2005–10 and the Strategic Plan 2007–12. One concrete strategy adopted to
address this situation has been the president’s announced effort to attract donors willing to create endowed faculty chairs. This will have the desired effect if the endowed chairs pay for existing positions by moving them out of the operating budget. The effect will be diminished if these chairs fund new faculty lines.

4.A.5 The institution provides for regular and systematic evaluation of faculty performance in order to ensure teaching effectiveness and the fulfillment of instructional and other faculty responsibilities. The institution’s policies, regulations, and procedures provide for the evaluation of all faculty on a continuing basis consistent with Policy 4.1 Faculty Evaluation.

Linfield College pursues a regular, systematic, and ongoing process for evaluating all faculty members, in accordance with NWCCU Policy 4.1. The Faculty Handbook uses AAUP guidelines as another framework for Linfield practice in this area. Faculty evaluation “provides formative information to the individual faculty member and to the college” in preparation for “summative decisions concerning the faculty member’s rank and tenure” (Faculty Handbook, IV.6). Beyond that, “faculty evaluation operates as a continuous process” throughout an individual’s career, taking different forms at different stages. Established to foster the successful development of each faculty member, evaluation occurs on the basis of three criteria: “teaching effectiveness, professional achievement with the field(s), and service to Linfield, [one’s] profession, and the community” (IV.6.1). Teaching effectiveness holds the central position in the evaluation process, and weak instructional performance cannot be compensated for by excellence as a scholar or college citizen (IV.6.2). This caveat stems from and reinforces the college mission as a teaching institution.

In keeping with Policy 4.1.c, the assessment of an individual faculty member’s teaching effectiveness involves students, colleagues, and department chairs. Student evaluations, required from each class taught by untenured faculty, are tabulated to provide individual results as well as a comparison with the all-campus faculty average for that semester. Tenured faculty must conduct at least two sets of student evaluations yearly, one set preferably coming from a lower division class and one set drawn from an upper division class.

Considerable attention is paid to untenured faculty by their senior colleagues in the march toward tenure. Tenured faculty must submit written colleague appraisals for departmental probationary faculty in the 2nd, 4th, and 6th (tenure) year. Department chairs also provide written summaries addressing untenured colleagues’ performance in the 1st, 3rd, and 5th years. The dean of faculty meets annually with each untenured faculty member and his/her department chair to discuss performance; in the 2nd, 4th, and 6th years, a member of the Promotion and Tenure Committee also participates to offer feedback on the individual’s progress toward tenure and to advise on development of the tenure file. In the 2nd year review, a member of the Faculty Development Committee also participates to discuss available college resources (as well as useful strategies) for continued professional growth (see the Faculty Handbook, IV.6.3 and Table IV-1 for a chart mapping this evaluation timeline). The schedule may be adjusted where a faculty member with full time teaching experience at another institution is granted years toward tenure eligibility, reducing the normal six years in rank at Linfield; in these instances every effort is made to provide the candidate with comparable opportunities for file review by Promotion and Tenure Committee members. The dean of faculty writes a summary of each meeting for review by all participants; it enters the candidate’s permanent file once all parties have confirmed its accuracy.

A written self-appraisal affords the untenured faculty member the opportunity to cite accomplishments and address areas for
improvement in the three designated performance areas. Given the forward-looking nature of the tenure decision, the personal narrative is expected to include the candidate’s professional plan for continued productivity beyond tenure and promotion. Access to a faculty member’s file, in accordance with Policy 4.1.b, is outlined in Section IV.4 of the Faculty Handbook; section IV.6.1 provides additional details on this process.

When evaluation efforts identify areas for improvement in a faculty member’s performance, the Office of Academic Affairs and one’s departmental colleagues advise on how to redress weaknesses, as required in Policy 4.1.d. Through the faculty development program, the institution provides “a variety of means for faculty to maintain their academic rigor, realize their scholarly and creative goals, and improve their teaching effectiveness” (Faculty Handbook, V). The associate dean for faculty development, a half-time administrative position created in 2005–06, offers “confidential consultation about teaching, service responsibilities, and career choices” and may assist by “sitting in on classes and providing feedback, sharing ideas and experience, suggesting meeting with other Linfield faculty, referring faculty to resource material relating to professional development, and providing information on professional development opportunities, both at Linfield and extra-institutionally (Faculty Handbook, V.3). Faculty may always consult privately with the dean of faculty on these matters as well.

Department chairs regularly mentor new faculty members and other colleagues seeking to improve their performance. Given the high premium placed on faculty collegiality, such mentoring often occurs through the outreach of individuals beyond as well as within one’s home department. General faculty development programming orchestrated by the Office of Academic Affairs and/or the Faculty Development Committee provides further means for individual faculty to work on their skills as teachers and their accomplishments as researchers/scholars.

In the 2006 Faculty Survey, 91% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that “regular reviews are important within the tenure process” (p. 158) and 75% strongly agreed or agreed that they “understand the tenure and promotion procedures at Linfield” (p. 153). The survey also identified where respondents viewed the process as problematic. Many faculty find a lack of clarity in the actual practices surrounding evaluation, despite its intentionally layered feedback mechanisms (36% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that “tenure and promotion criteria are clearly defined,” p. 154). Some perceive inconsistencies in the application of tenure and promotion criteria across the college. Almost three-quarters of respondents (72%) believed variability exists in the recommendations tendered to the president as a result of the changing composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee over time (p. 157). Almost half of survey respondents (48%) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that “getting along with the ‘right’ people” influences decisions; 22% disagreed or strongly disagreed; 20% neither agreed or disagreed, and 9% didn’t know (p. 156). These survey results suggest further analysis of faculty experiences in the evaluation, tenure and promotion process may be useful.

Survey respondents also differed in their perception of the appropriate role of student evaluations in assessing a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness. For example, while 74% agreed or strongly agreed that “Tenure/promotion decisions depend heavily on good student evaluations, almost half (48%) agreed or strongly agreed that “Student evaluations should be weighted less in tenure/promotion decisions” (see 2006 Faculty Survey, pp. 155–156). When faced with this concern in the recent past, each dean of faculty and chair of the Promotion and Tenure Committee has pointed out in review sessions and public meetings that numerical summaries of individual course evaluations do not hold center stage in the evaluation of an individual’s teaching effectiveness; rather, they provide readers of a candidate’s file with ways of assessing trends in overall performance (as well as responsiveness to student concerns that may
arise in the evaluation forms). The Promotion and Tenure Committee also emphasizes the value of colleague visits to one’s classes as an eyewitness means of placing an individual instructor’s pedagogical methods and effectiveness into disciplinary context.

In another attempt to respond to faculty anxieties about consistency within the evaluation process, the Promotion and Tenure Committee in 2005–06 invited each academic department to submit a weighted list of professional activities and achievements consistent with that department’s mission, operational priorities, and college responsibilities. Compliance with this request has been uneven although it has been repeated each of the last three years by the committee and the dean of faculty. Promotion and Tenure Committee members report that where such lists exist, they have proven very helpful to their evaluation of individual faculty files; where they don’t yet exist, the committee emphasizes to department chairs the importance of putting a tenure and/or promotion candidate’s accomplishments within a broader context of departmental and disciplinary expectations and standards. Admittedly, a faculty discussion of this approach to clarifying professional achievement goals has not been conducted, though no opposition to them has been brought to the committee, the dean of faculty, or the Faculty Assembly. The arrival of new dean of faculty Victoria McGillin provides a perfect opportunity to initiate a broad-based conversation clarifying institutional and faculty definitions of satisfactory professional productivity.

Within the Division of Continuing Education, faculty evaluation occurs in two ways. Every course is assessed by students each term. Courses delivered face-to-face use the same evaluation form used by the residential campuses; these are scored by Scantron with the results tabulated in relation to all other Linfield courses taught that semester. With online courses, a pilot online survey form has been created by combining questions about teaching taken from the standard college form with questions asking about the technology interface and the direct student/faculty contact provided. Review of the pilot form and its efficacy should be conducted by the Continuing Education and the Academic Support Committees in 2008–09. The results compiled to date from online courses have not been compared with one another or with those on the residential campuses because of technology limitations, but DCE is exploring the potential of new software to correct this situation. The DCE dean reviews all teaching evaluations and sends them to the appropriate departmental liaison; they are also shared with the instructors. Continued employment by DCE of any instructor (adjunct or residential) requires consistently good teaching evaluations. Where the need for improvement is indicated, the DCE dean discusses options with the instructor and preferably with the departmental liaison as well. Institutional efforts to better coordinate communication around this process are ongoing.

4.A.6 The institution defines an orderly process for the recruitment and appointment of full-time faculty. Institutional personnel policies and procedures are published and made available to faculty.

Institutional personnel policies and procedures are published in the Faculty Handbook in two areas: Chapter I (the Common Chapter enunciating “Personnel Policies and Procedures Governing All Linfield Employees”) and Chapter IV (“Faculty Personnel Policies and Procedures”). Each member of the faculty receives this handbook as well as annual updates. The entire handbook is also found on the college website through the Academic Affairs homepage.

The Faculty Handbook (chapter VI) describes the conduct of searches for full-time positions as well as for adjunct faculty. With the exception of the School of Nursing, search committees for full-time positions are typically chaired by the head of the department and include departmental faculty, faculty from outside the department, and
students. In the School of Nursing, the size of the department and the number of specialties within the discipline necessitate a different approach whereby an associate dean of nursing chairs all search committees and a select number of faculty in related fields participate in the search process.

Position announcements developed by the department and the search committee identify the job-related criteria by which candidates will be assessed. Appendix Q of the Faculty Handbook provides a search plan form along with strategies for conducting a successful and equitable search. The dean of faculty must approve and sign all search plans before searches begin. Respondents to the 2006 Faculty Survey hired within the preceding five years indicated general satisfaction with the Linfield search process: 85% said they were satisfied or very satisfied with their interactions with department chairs; 91% reported themselves satisfied or very satisfied with search committee interactions (p. 97).

Linfield’s Equal Employment Opportunity policy seeks “to continue to develop and maintain truly equal employment opportunity for all personnel, to eliminate all traces of discrimination in employment practices because of race, color, age, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, physical handicap or other disabling condition, and to develop a work force that reflects equitable distribution of minority group members and women at all levels of employment and throughout all departments of the college” (Faculty Handbook, IV.1). See Standard 6, Policy 6.1 for a more extensive discussion of Linfield’s non-discrimination guidelines.

4.A.7 The institution fosters and protects academic freedom for faculty. (See Eligibility Requirement 11 and Policy A-8 Principles and Practices Regarding Institutional Mission and Goals, Policies and Administration.)

To ensure institutional integrity around issues of academic freedom, the Linfield College Board of Trustees has adopted AAUP’s “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure,” the “Statement on Procedural Standards in the Renewal or Nonrenewal of Faculty Appointments,” and the “Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings.” These documents appear in the Faculty Handbook as Appendices C, D, and E. In accordance with Eligibility Requirement 11, Linfield faculty and students “are free to examine and test all knowledge appropriate to their discipline or area of major study as judged by the academic/educational community in general.” In discussing non-renewal of an individual’s appointment, the Faculty Handbook (IV.7) describes the review committee charged with hearing cases where violation of academic freedom is alleged.

The college also places academic freedom at the center of its mission, which states: “Linfield College advances a vision of learning, life, and community that . . . inspires the courage to defend freedom of conscience.” Responses to the 2006 Faculty Survey detailed below illustrate perceptions of Linfield’s adherence to this important ideal. In addition, 90% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that they have an adequate level of autonomy in determining the content of courses (p. 48).
4.A Table 5 Faculty Perceptions of Academic Freedom at Linfield

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree or Agree</th>
<th>I have freedom to do research/scholarship on controversial topics</th>
<th>I have freedom to teach controversial topics</th>
<th>The Board understands importance of academic freedom</th>
<th>Tenure processes adequately protect academic freedom</th>
<th>Linfield &quot;walks its talk&quot; re: free pursuit of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree or Disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree or Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't Know or Undecided</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2006 Faculty Survey, pp. 105, 106, 150, 159, 181

The college recognizes that tensions may exist among competing values affirming authentic freedom of inquiry and expression, personally held beliefs, and the need to “foster freedom of expression while protecting the rights of all members of the institutional community” in concert with Policy A-8.b.6. The college adopted an Anti-Harassment Protection and Academic Freedom Policy in May 2000 introduced with this statement: “Academic freedom and freedom of inquiry are values to which Linfield College subscribes and which it protects by prescribing boundaries on the extent to which college officials may regulate discourse, speech, and the articulation of conscientiously held beliefs” (Faculty Handbook, IV.3). The policy further describes the relationship between the college’s anti-harassment policies and the free exchange of opinions and vigorous debate over ideas central to the conception of academic freedom. It notes that “substantiated charges of sexual or other kinds of discriminatory harassment must be sanctioned both for the reasons articulated in the college’s anti-harassment policy as well as for the protection of academic freedom itself.” The Anti-Harassment and Sexual Harassment Policies include definitions of expressions that rise to the level of harassment. All employee handbooks, the Student Handbook, and the college website also publish these policies. Standards 4.B.7 and 9.A.5 contain additional discussion of academic freedom and institutional integrity.

4.A.8 Part-time and adjunct faculty are qualified by academic background, degree(s), and/or professional experience to carry out their teaching assignment and/or other prescribed duties and responsibilities in accord with the mission and goals of the institution.

Linfield defines adjunct faculty as “those employed for up to one year at a time on a part-time basis to teach particular courses” (Faculty Handbook, IV.5). The college selects its part-time faculty with a clear focus on academic qualifications and/or professional experience appropriate for the position in question. This is illustrated by the credentials of adjunct staff who have served Linfield over the last five years [Exhibit 20]. In several instances, adjunct faculty members for whom part-time teaching corresponds with personal priorities have worked many years for the college, although their contracts, like those of more sporadic hires, are issued a year at a time according to curricular and staffing needs. Some adjunct faculty may teach for all three arms of the college (McMinnville, Portland, and DCE).

The Faculty Handbook also prescribes institution-wide limits upon adjunct workloads per academic year (18 credits) and delineates
evaluation processes to accompany reappointment (IV.5). In exceptional circumstances, a load of no more than 20 load units may be approved by the dean of faculty. Adjunct faculty are not accorded rank and receive remuneration based only on payment per teaching unit, the rate determined by their highest earned degree in the required field. They do not participate in faculty governance nor do they have advising duties. Years of service to the college do not enter into the salary calculation. Adjuncts are not eligible for benefits beyond those required by law, nor may they apply for tenure, promotion in rank, or sabbatical leave. Adjunct faculty occasionally teach during January Term in both on-campus and off-campus courses.

The Faculty Handbook (VI.2) describes the hiring process involving adjuncts. Once the Office of Academic Affairs has approved adjunct hours for a given department, the chair initiates and oversees the search for qualified candidates. The dean of faculty (or an associate dean) on the McMinnville Campus interviews each finalist recommended for adjunct appointment; the director of the Portland Campus fulfills that role in Portland.

Qualifications for those teaching in DCE are determined by each department. All require a master’s degree; some require a Ph.D. Several demand additional licensures such as a CPA or RN. DCE staff advertise adjunct openings and gather applicants’ professional credentials. The CV’s of finalists are forwarded to departmental liaisons for review and recommendations go to the dean of DCE, who completes the actual hiring or continues the search. An adjunct hire must be approved separately for each course being taught [Exhibit 21].

4.A.9 Employment practices for part-time and adjunct faculty include dissemination of information regarding the institution, the work assignment, rights and responsibilities, and conditions of employment.

The Faculty Handbook, available to all through the college website, provides general information about adjunct faculty in section IV.5. On the McMinnville Campus, the Adjunct Faculty Handbook is distributed annually to each adjunct by the Office of Academic Affairs through department chairs; it may also be accessed through a link on the Academic Affairs home page [Exhibit 22]. The handbook includes institutional policies binding on all Linfield employees, a description of faculty responsibilities, and teaching support services. Department chairs are encouraged to discuss the handbook with their adjuncts and to provide other means of familiarizing them with the workings of their own program and the college. Some departments provide specialized departmental handbooks and/or include adjunct faculty in annual retreats and/or departmental meetings. In spring 2008, the dean of faculty hosted the first of what is expected to become an annual institutional reception for McMinnville Campus adjuncts to honor them for their contributions to its students.

The Portland Campus holds an orientation where new adjunct faculty tour the facilities and talk with campus administrators. The School of Nursing provides an Adjunct Faculty Handbook [Exhibit 23] which includes a position description of the course coordinator to whom the adjunct hire will report and offers other information related to handout preparation, faculty evaluations, and the like. Nursing adjuncts also receive a brochure describing the nursing curriculum [Exhibit 24]. An annual all-day workshop for nursing adjuncts (for which they receive a small honorarium) focuses on current issues in nursing education as well as information specific to the Linfield nursing program.

The Division of Continuing Education issues adjunct contracts, pays its faculty from its own budget, and gathers online student evaluations (which differ slightly from those used on the residential campuses; see 4.A.5). Evaluation results are shared with the respective
departmental faculty liaisons for review. DCE disseminates information regarding the college, the individual’s work assignment, employee rights and responsibilities, and conditions of employment through various materials: the individual contract [Exhibit 25], new faculty orientation materials [Exhibit 26], and the DCE Adjunct Faculty Handbook [Exhibit 27]. The DCE dean meets with each new adjunct hire in some formalized way (electronically or in person) to review this information and clarify Linfield’s educational philosophy. DCE staff also provide adjunct faculty with training in Linfield’s online course management system. Plans exist to add an interview between prospective hires and the departmental liaisons as well.

4.A.10 The institution demonstrates that it periodically assesses institutional policies concerning the use of part-time and adjunct faculty in light of the mission and goals of the institution.

The 1998 self-study indicates that a review of policies governing adjunct faculty on the McMinnville Campus took place in 1991–92. A regional analysis of the salary scale used for adjunct hires was conducted in 2005–06 by the Office of Academic Affairs and led to the conclusion that Linfield’s salaries were comparable to local peer institutions, which pursue a wide range of approaches to adjunct remuneration. In 2008–09, payment for credit taught was increased by 3.5%, the same increase accorded full-time faculty for that budget year.

Over the past decade the Faculty Assembly has been asked from the floor several times to reconsider the current payment system for adjuncts. In response, the Faculty Budget and Benefits Committee has deemed its first order of business the redress of full-time faculty compensation levels. Interest continues among some faculty to consider developing a seniority increment for long-time adjuncts who serve the college; discussion remains in the early stages.

The Portland Campus adjunct needs differ from those of the McMinnville Campus, since they typically serve in clinical settings away from the college. Gas mileage reimbursement consistent with the all-college policy is thus provided. The Portland Campus also operates its own payment schedule in keeping with the intense competition for qualified adjuncts in the nursing field.

Within the Division of Continuing Education, the DCE dean and the Continuing Education Committee reviewed policies concerning adjunct employment and salaries in 2007–08; the process resulted in several adjustments to the payment structure.

See Exhibit 28 for details regarding adjunct faculty salaries for all three arms of the college (McMinnville, Portland, and DCE).

4.B – Scholarship, Research, and Artistic Creation

4.B.1 Consistent with institutional mission and goals, faculty are engaged in scholarship, research, and artistic creation.

Linfield faculty actively pursue scholarship, research, and artistic creation, activity subsumed within the faculty evaluation system as professional achievement. The increasing importance placed on professional activity noted in the 1998 self-study (p. 174) has continued over the past decade and has fostered a dynamic climate of intellectual and aesthetic discovery whose ultimate beneficiaries are the students in Linfield’s classrooms, laboratories, and studios.
Candidates for faculty positions are evaluated in part on evidence of past and future scholarly/creative commitment, within the limits of a job where teaching remains central to the faculty role. Promotion and tenure assessments also include scrutiny of ongoing professional achievement within one’s discipline. This is understood to encompass a variety of means by which a faculty member formally shares his/her work with external peers, for example: publications, conference papers and posters, invited or juried exhibitions, invited competitive performances, grant awards, Fulbright selection and other such awards, etc. Members of the Promotion and Tenure Committee, in concert with the dean of faculty, regularly emphasize the importance of developing a professional agenda with a distinctive focus and coherent arc that affirms one’s plans for sustained professional inquiry and productivity. As a body the faculty supports the value ascribed to professional achievement, as evidenced by the self-reports provided in the 2006 Faculty Survey (Table 4.B.1.1). Similarly, 2006 and 2007 reports to the Board of Trustees entitled “Linfield College Faculty Professional Engagement: Selected Scholarly and Creative Endeavors” [Exhibit 29] offer extensive (but not comprehensive) evidence of the professional productivity of the faculty when measured by publications, conference presentations (papers and posters), and artistic endeavors. Faculty CV’s collected in departmental binders for this self-study provide the fullest picture of the faculty’s scholarly and/or artistic productivity. To assist such efforts, between 2003 and 2008, the Dean’s Faculty Travel fund supported 326 faculty trips to attend professional meetings or workshops between 2003 and 2008 [Exhibit 30].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.B Table 1 Faculty Professional Achievement</th>
<th>At Least 1</th>
<th>More than 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles Published</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Chapters</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books/Monographs</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibitions/Performances</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper/Project at National Conference</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper/Project at Regional Conference</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When viewed within the context of the faculty’s heavy teaching loads and institutional responsibilities, this productivity becomes even more impressive; indeed, many faculty cite the difficulty of finding sufficient time to pursue scholarly or creative work given other institutional demands and the desire for a balanced personal life. That they accomplish as much as they do professionally while retaining a strong teaching ethic is a testimony to the faculty’s ongoing professionalism—a lesson that the Board of Trustees and the senior administration regularly acknowledge in deliberations about strategic issues facing the college.

For the reasons cited above, the availability of sabbaticals plays a crucial role in supporting faculty professional growth and productivity. Between 2003 and 2008, 58 faculty members took sabbatical leaves supported by the college [Exhibit 31]. It is increasingly evident, however, that many faculty cannot afford to take the full year sabbatical they might prefer and need simply because the loss of half their salary for that year is not feasible. Nor does the college have an early sabbatical option for untenured faculty seeking to establish a professional track record before tenure review. A better funded and more extensive sabbatical policy could perhaps redress both of these limitations on faculty professional renewal and productivity.

In keeping with the college mission to integrate theoretical and practical knowledge, many Linfield faculty mentor students directly through collaborative research and artistic creation. Such
collaboration provides an ideal fusion of the teacherly and scholarly roles of faculty and has helped further individual faculty research (albeit more slowly than solo efforts would take). College evaluation processes regard collaborative research as faculty professional achievement when the results take the tangible form of professional presentations or publications shared with disciplinary peers by students and/or their faculty mentors. Since 1956, the Linfield Research Institute (LRI) has fostered such collaboration among students and faculty in the sciences. Under then-President Bull, the college aggressively sought to extend the present collaborative activity to other areas of the college, aided by endowment funds that in 2008 total approximately $1.8 million and support annual grant expenditures averaging $75,000 per year awarded to recipients on both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses. Collaboration among students and faculty in the visual, theatrical, and musical arts remains a Linfield hallmark. Faculty/student collaborative research across all four academic divisions often leads to the presentation of scholarly papers and artistic projects at local, regional, and national conferences and symposia. 4.B Table 2 documents the college collaborative research grants awarded during the last six years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Office of Academic Affairs

4.B.2 Institutional policies and procedures, including ethical considerations, concerning scholarship, research, and artistic creation, are clearly communicated.

The Faculty Handbook makes clear that, among other duties, faculty members are expected to “engage professionally within their field(s)” (IV.2). The weighting of the three evaluation categories is outlined in IV.6: while teaching effectiveness constitutes the most important facet of a faculty member’s performance, professional achievement and service “must not be slighted,” with professional achievement regarded as “more important than service.” As noted in 4.A.5, each faculty member’s evaluation meetings with the dean and others as specified by policy must include discussion of institutional and departmental expectations in this area. Categories of evidence in support of professional achievement recognize the diversity of scholarly and creative endeavors evident in a liberal arts institution (see Faculty Handbook, [Exhibit 32].

In describing faculty productivity, it is also important to cite the grant-writing efforts of many individuals to secure outside funding for their work (through the assistance of the college grants writer). This has recently borne considerable fruit for faculty in the sciences, particularly in biology, where two years running the department has earned start-up funds for incoming faculty. The School of Nursing has secured impressive HRSA grants to support its outreach to underrepresented student populations. Modern Languages faculty have worked with the International Programs Office to attain funds to support pedagogical development and Asian Studies. The early work of the Linfield Center for Regional Studies has been funded by successful grant applications jointly authored by college staff and the faculty coordinator of the center. Not every grant effort results in funding, but the college recognizes the time, energy and expertise involved in mounting a viable grant application as another measure of active professional engagement, and one with crucial significance to the aspirations of the college.
The handbook remains silent regarding prioritization of these items, though departmental templates provided at the request of the Promotion and Tenure Committee since 2005 explain the hierarchy of importance operating within the department itself.

Policies regarding sabbaticals, leaves, consulting and outside work, research, and grant support for released time are provided in the Faculty Handbook (IV.8, 16–18). College policy on public presentations is explained in VII.22. Information about the Linfield Research Institute and support for grant applications appears in VIII.6–7. Chapter V of the Faculty Handbook details the various institutional development and professional support programs available to faculty. Application forms for these programs appear in the Appendix of the Faculty Handbook and are electronically available through the Office of Academic Affairs webpage.

In the last decade three faculty members have received Fulbright fellowships of varying length to support their professional development as teachers and/or scholars. The International Programs Office director has made it a high priority to keep faculty informed about and engaged in designing Fulbright proposals; he also hopes to begin efforts to have Linfield identified as a possible destination college for international Fulbright recipients.

The Linfield grants website, available through a direct link from the Faculty and Staff webpage (www.linfield.edu/staff.php), explains policies and procedures for completing institutional and individual grants. It also provides information on external funding opportunities, as does the director for corporation and foundation relations through direct emails to targeted faculty groups and individuals.

Two faculty-run committees oversee and ensure institutional adherence to legal and ethical guidelines as well as research protocols regarding animal and human subjects: the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee and the Committee for Human Research Participation, also known as the Institutional Review Board (IRB). A faculty member serves as compliance officer and chairs the committee in each of these areas. General guidelines for these committees appear in the Faculty Handbook (III.2.3.2 and III.2.3.4). See Exhibits 33 and 34.

4.B.3 Consistent with institutional mission and goals, faculty have a substantive role in the development and administration of research policies and procedures.

Linfield faculty members recommend college research policies and procedures in accordance with institutional resources and the principles of academic freedom articulated in 4.A.7. As noted in 4.A.2, the Bylaws of Linfield College and those of the Faculty Assembly authorize the faculty to recommend to the president and the Board of Trustees on tenure and promotion matters as well as on policies regarding faculty competence, including professional achievement. The faculty exercises its responsibility through standing committees: the Faculty Development Committee advises on sabbatical requests and the distribution of professional development funds; the International Programs Committee evaluates proposals for international study supported by endowed and International Programs funds; the Promotion and Tenure Committee conducts faculty evaluation, in consultation with the academic vice president/dean of faculty, and makes promotion and tenure recommendations.

The Faculty Development Committee reviews applications for sabbaticals, faculty professional development grants, student-faculty collaborative research grants, and a grant writing course release program instituted in 2005–06. The committee then tenders its recommendations to the dean of faculty. It also proposes changes in policies and procedures affecting professional development activities and support, vets them with academic divisions, and brings them to the Faculty Assembly for
approval. Results from the 2006 Faculty Survey, as well as discussions with the current chair of the Faculty Development Committee, indicate that the faculty would like the committee to have more direct control of the funds available for faculty development projects. The role of the associate dean for faculty development has strengthened collaboration between the committee and the Office of Academic Affairs; it may be desirable for the faculty to grant the associate dean ex officio status on the committee in the future. In 2005–06 the Faculty Development Committee surveyed faculty about their preferences regarding dispensation of additional funds and found the strongest support lay with increasing professional travel funding for conferences [Exhibit 35]. With the recent attainment of the $1 million endowment for faculty development (see 4.B.4), the annual funding available for faculty development grants has been doubled by the Office of Academic Affairs. Deliberations continue around additional strategies for fostering faculty development with newly available dollars.

As noted in 4.B.2, faculty serve as institutional compliance officers, as well as chairs and committee members, for those bodies charged with oversight of research involving animals and human subjects. The faculty develop procedures to ensure compliance with federally mandated guidelines in these areas.

4.B.4 Consistent with its mission and goals, the institution provides appropriate financial, physical, administrative, and information resources for scholarship, research, and artistic creation.

As the Faculty Handbook states, “The college supports a strong faculty development program, providing a variety of means for faculty to maintain their academic vigor, realize their scholarly and creative goals, and improve their teaching effectiveness” (Chapter V). Several institutional programs provide financial, physical, administrative, and informational resources for faculty professional development and have been significantly enhanced during the past decade. In 2005–06, an associate dean for faculty development joined the Office of Academic Affairs, replacing the Faculty Development Coordinator (a senior faculty member who received one-third release time to guide the program between 2001–05). The associate dean “works with faculty on issues of the common good with respect to teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activity” and “concentrates in particular on a development agenda that transcends departmental and disciplinary boundaries” (Faculty Handbook, V). This associate dean regularly consults with the Faculty Development Committee, which recommends to the dean of faculty regarding professional development grants, student-faculty collaborative research grants, and the grant writing course release program. The Faculty Handbook describes these programs as well as others available to the faculty in Chapter V.

In support of faculty development and in concert with the Long Range Plan 1995–00, the college created a faculty development endowment as part of “The Defining Moment” Capital Campaign that remained short of its goal at the end of the campaign. In the 2006 Faculty Survey, 48% of respondents stated they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the level of funding provided by Linfield for research and creative endeavors (pp. 6, 45). This data assisted President Hellie in making a direct appeal to the trustees to help Linfield reach the $1 million goal quickly; the positive response of the trustees enabled the college to announce it had reached that goal in spring 2007. The market value of the endowment in April 2008 totaled almost $1.2 million. This fund augments operating budget allocations in support of faculty scholarship, research, and creative activity and supports the recent faculty professional development grant writing initiative inaugurated in 2005 by the Office of Academic Affairs. The expanded endowment has also led to a doubling of funds available for proposals reviewed by the Faculty Development
Committee. The dean of faculty has periodically drawn on revenues from this endowment to support targeted faculty development priorities of the college such as new faculty membership in Project Kaleidescope (sciences) and Project NExT (mathematics) or training/certification in modern language competency-based pedagogy.

Science faculty, especially in physics, have long been involved in student-faculty research under the auspices of the Linfield Research Institute (LRI). Depending on the level of grant funds available, LRI may buy faculty release time during the academic year and provide summer research stipends for students and faculty. Acknowledging that 20% of respondents to the 2006 Faculty Survey cited the general insufficiency of internal funding for collaborative research, and 44% noted the inadequacy of faculty stipends for such efforts (p. 38), the college continues to build its student/faculty collaborative research endowment, which totaled just over $1.8 million in April 2008. This fund provides grants ranging from $800–10,000 to support student research (including supplies); it also allocates small stipends ($1000 maximum) to mentoring faculty. The college has matched externally-secured grants for new faculty start-up funds, most recently in biology (two grants bringing in approximately $25,000 each). Such institutional support is available for other faculty who develop approved grant writing initiatives to outside funding agencies.

To energize faculty around prospects for securing external funding for their research, the Office of Academic Affairs inaugurated a grant writing program in 2005–06 which combines workshops and a one-course release to allow selected participants to learn grant writing techniques, research funding opportunities, and submit proposals to outside organizations. This program inspired one faculty participant to begin the entrepreneurial brainstorming and team-building that has produced the nascent Linfield Center for Regional Studies (for which he has secured two grants thus far). At least three other grant-writing participants have also secured outside funding for their research projects [Exhibit 36]. In addition to the associate dean of faculty development, the director of corporate and foundation relations (in the Office of College Relations) assists faculty seeking grants; recently hired by Linfield, this individual has generated significant enthusiasm for grant writing among faculty, whom she keeps regularly informed by email about new prospects for support of their work.

Recognizing that participation in and contributions to professional meetings “enhance intellectual development and invariably enrich Linfield’s academic program” (Faculty Handbook V), the college supports three funds for professional travel: departmentally budgeted funds for local professional activities, the Dean’s Travel Fund to cover expenses to attend professional meetings, and a $600 Fund for expenses associated with individual faculty development efforts (each full-time faculty member receives access to this $600 every other year). It is worth noting that in 1998 this was called the $500 Fund; obviously, then, the college has increased the monies available to eligible faculty through this vehicle by 20% over the last decade. Chapter V of the Faculty Handbook provides more detail on these programs. Still, 42% of those responding to the 2006 Faculty Survey noted the inadequacy of the Dean’s Fund and 57% cited the insufficiency of travel monies available in departmental budgets (pp. 32, 33).

Faculty and students may use college facilities for their scholarly and creative endeavors as long as that work does not interfere with regularly scheduled classes and labs. The summer proves an especially good time for use of science facilities in collaborative research activity. As noted in Standard 8, the college has long understood its deficiencies regarding science facilities, and this invariably compromises what is possible in terms of research by science faculty. In the 2006 Faculty Survey, 44% of respondents indicated that laboratory space was inadequate for their teaching and research, while 49% noted the lack of updated equipment presented challenges to their teaching and professional pursuits (pp. 32, 33). The opening of the Miller Fine Arts Center has significantly improved the studio facilities.
for faculty and students in the Art and Visual Culture Department, and the new Vivian A. Bull Music Center has done the same for music faculty and students. Incremental improvement efforts have also been ongoing. In spring 2008, for example, a new physiology lab was opened in Cook Hall. During summer 2008 improvements were made in lab space for psychology research involving human subjects; additionally, new departmentally-dedicated computer labs were built for Psychology and Political Science. In fall 2007 the Department of Mass Communications moved into renovated quarters in Renshaw Hall that included new newspaper, electronic media, and media writing lab spaces, together with a brand new radio station, complete with new antenna. The building also includes a new state of the art computerized classroom for workshop instruction. Improvements to the anatomy laboratory space (HHPA building) and the photography lab (Miller Fine Arts) are scheduled for fall 2008, as is the creation of a new environmental science laboratory (Renshaw Hall). See Standard 8 for discussion of the extensive science facilities improvements planned for the McMinnville Campus in the coming decade.

On the Portland Campus, the School of Nursing dispenses its own professional development funds, in addition to those handled centrally for the college through the Faculty Development Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs. The Nursing Dean’s Fund supports faculty who give presentations, serve as discussants or organizers at local or national conferences, or attend conferences of benefit to the department and college. The Professional Travel Program covers conference attendance or other professional activities related to faculty roles as teacher/scholars. Nursing departmental funds supplement participation in local conferences or workshops, purchase textbooks or software (that then become the property of the college), or pay for other expenses related to professional development. In addition to their access to college funds, the arts and sciences faculty on the Portland Campus have access to a campus-specific professional development budget proportional to that provided for nursing faculty [Exhibit 37].

Despite expanded resources over the last decade, it must be acknowledged that the college as well as the faculty recognizes the need to continue securing additional dollars for faculty professional achievement, as noted in the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12. That said, the faculty track record indicates steady and widespread productivity even with the limited resources available, for which the trustees and administration commend them.
4.B.5 The nature of the institution’s research mission and goals and its commitment to faculty scholarship, research, and artistic creation are reflected in the assignment of faculty responsibilities, the expectation and reward of faculty performance, and opportunities for faculty renewal through sabbatical leaves or other similar programs.

Increased expectations around faculty professional achievement derive from an institutionally-shared conviction that one’s effectiveness as a teacher is directly enhanced by a faculty member’s remaining a practicing scholar in his/her field; as such, the faculty also serve as exemplars of their respective disciplines for the students with whom they work, particularly in their majors. Nonetheless, the current faculty load formula considers only teaching assignments (curricular and co-curricular), with credit also accorded those with administrative duties such as department chair, FEC chair or secretary, writing program director, and the like. No load credit per se is accorded for professional engagement, although the previous two deans of faculty (Henberg and Seidman) have occasionally negotiated course releases for individuals facing imminent publication deadlines for contracted scholarship. The move in the 1990’s to a required average load of 23 units across departmental faculty was introduced to facilitate adjusted workloads for individuals with pressing professional projects to allow them to bring them to fruition. Some departments specifically used the 23 credit average to provide reduced load to new faculty (often compensated for by higher loads assumed by more senior departmental colleagues). Other departments set the faculty load for each member at 23 units.

The May 2008 Report of the Ad Hoc Faculty Work Load Committee demonstrates the level of faculty concern over the current load credit formula, given the professional achievement expectations of the college, particularly among those seeking tenure and/or promotion [Exhibit 18]. Results of the 2006 Faculty Survey prompted the formation of the Ad Hoc Work Load Committee; it is worth noting that respondents who reported devoting an average of 54 hours per week to their academic duties identified only 14% of that time spent on professional development and achievement (pp. 3, 26, 27, 28). New Dean of Faculty McGillin will undertake further conversations with the faculty in 2008–09 based on the report’s recommendations.

Positive decisions regarding tenure and promotion stand first and foremost among the institutional rewards accorded faculty who excel in the area of professional achievement. Faculty development grants and student-collaborative research grants recognize faculty performance in this area as well, as do negotiated course release arrangements for a book contract deadline and college matching funds for successful external grant proposals. See 4.B.1 and 4.B.4.

Sabbatical leaves have been granted to 58 faculty members between 2003 and 2007, illustrating Linfield’s commitment to providing regular funded opportunities for faculty renewal and professional activity. Two areas invite future improvements. First, because faculty members receive full salary during semester-long sabbaticals but only half salary for full-year sabbaticals, the vast majority of sabbatical applicants pursue half-year sabbaticals, which necessarily curtails the potential for significant outcomes. On the 2006 Faculty Survey, 88% of respondents indicated they were somewhat or very interested in the creation of fully funded year-long sabbaticals (p. 52). Second, the current sabbatical policy requires six years of previous full-time service for eligibility consideration. This time frame coincides with the normal timeframe leading to tenure review. More than half of survey respondents (53%) indicated that they were somewhat or very interested in early sabbatical opportunities for untenured faculty (p. 52). Rank appears to have influenced answers to this question: 40% of tenured respondents voiced interest in early sabbaticals compared to 74% of tenure-track respondents (p. 6). The need for greater resources to support faculty sabbaticals is well known by the administration and the Academic Affairs Committee of the
Board of Trustees, both of which have been kept informed of the current situation by the dean of faculty.

Linfield College annually presents three awards in public recognition of individual faculty excellence; all three are described in the Faculty Handbook (IV.14). The Samuel H. Graf Faculty Achievement Award celebrates the accomplishments of a faculty member “who has accomplished during a particular year some outstanding performance, beyond his or her regular duties, that is worthy of special recognition, involving research, publication, or some other special academic or civic achievement.” The Edith Green Distinguished Professor Award recognizes a faculty member “who has demonstrated outstanding teaching effectiveness.” The new Allen and Pat Kelley Faculty Scholar Award, presented for the first time in spring 2008, honors a faculty member “in recognition of outstanding scholarly achievement in the preceding academic year, to be understood as publication in a refereed academic site.” All three awards include a special cash stipend; the Kelley Award also provides a two-class course release for the coming year to permit completion of an already-contracted major scholarly publication. Sponsored research and programs funded by grants, contracts, and gifts are consistent with the institution’s mission and goals. Sponsored research and programs funded by grants, contracts, and gifts support Linfield’s mission and strategic Foundational Principles of integrated learning, global and multicultural awareness, and experiential learning. The following paragraphs describe only a few of many examples on both the Portland and McMinnville Campuses.

Recent receipt (and renewal) by the School of Nursing of a three year grant from the federal Health Resources & Services Administration (HRSA) directly supports recruitment and retention of underrepresented populations, including Hispanics, among the college’s nursing students [Exhibit 38]. To date this initiative has helped increase minority nursing students to an estimated 20.8% in fall 2008. Toward a similar end, the Black United Fund of Oregon established a scholarship for nursing students that has begun supporting its first Portland Campus recipient.

Various funding agencies have long recognized the commitment of Linfield’s science faculty to conducting collaborative research with undergraduates. Since the founding of the Linfield Research Institute (LRI) in 1956, science majors have worked alongside their faculty mentors to conduct research activities. Major foundations including the Murdock Foundation and the National Science Foundation continue to fund proposals submitted by Linfield faculty. Exhibit 39 contains more information regarding grants, contracts, and gifts supporting science research.

The Linfield Center for Regional Studies or LCRS (a pilot college initiative affirmed by a strong vote of the Faculty Assembly in May 2008) has already secured two outside grants, has submitted a third, and seeks to provide a venue for faculty and students interested in seeking additional external funds for specific research or community service projects within the Willamette Valley. See Exhibit 40 for the LCRS Mission Statement and Objectives, derived directly from the college mission.

Exhibit 41 provides additional examples that demonstrate ways in which grants support the work of Linfield faculty members and their students.

4.B.7 Faculty are accorded academic freedom to pursue scholarship, research, and artistic creation consistent with the institution’s mission and goals.

Linfield’s commitment to academic freedom is documented in the Faculty Handbook (IV.3) in conjunction with AAUP guidelines and the Bylaws of Linfield College itself (see also 4.A.7). Academic freedom extends to faculty professional endeavors as well as classroom
teaching; neither the Faculty Development Committee, the central administration, nor the Board of Trustees has attempted any curtailment of faculty research subject matter. The Institutional Research Board provides guidance about the ethical parameters of research methodology with human beings, as the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee does in regard to animal-based research. Linfield’s American Baptist heritage, combined with the college’s long-standing pursuit of institutional integrity, informs the college mission in support of a community “that engages thoughtful dialogue in a climate of mutual respect” and “inspires the courage to live by moral and spiritual principle and to defend freedom of conscience.” As discussed in 4.A.7, a strong majority of respondents to the 2006 Faculty Survey believe they work in an environment that guarantees them the freedom to teach about and conduct research on controversial topics. See Standard 9.A.5 for additional discussion.

**Conclusion**

Amidst all their differences in background, outlook, and disciplinary orientation, Linfield faculty consistently derive their greatest satisfaction from mentoring students and assisting them to become informed, caring, and imaginative citizens who think critically about their lives and the world around them. Faculty relationships with one another mirror the same level of commitment to collegiality. Moreover, the vast majority of the faculty demonstrate their dedication to the college’s continued improvement through their daily efforts on Linfield’s behalf. By thus embodying the Linfield mission, the faculty provide leadership within a community of learners.

To sustain and reward such faculty commitment, Linfield must provide an environment where teaching, scholarship, and creativity can flourish. The strategic issues emerging for the college from this standard, then, include the following:

- Improved compensation and professional development support to safeguard the competitiveness of its faculty hiring and retention efforts;
- Improved balance among teaching, professional achievement, and institutional service to permit continuous professional growth while according individuals the time necessary for a fulfilling personal life;
- Improved communication around evaluation processes to ensure their integrity and consistency. This should include conveying as clearly as possible the institutional and departmental expectations of each faculty member at every career stage;
- Improved governance structures and process that combine efficient use of faculty energies, attentiveness to multiple perspectives, and meaningful influence within institutional decision-making. This should include efforts to enhance the role of department chairs in institutional consultation and decision-making;
- Expanded formal and informal opportunities for faculty interaction and partnership in all facets of the work they do.

As the faculty, administration, and Board of Trustees continue their collective advancement of the college mission within a changing higher educational landscape, the faculty will provide pragmatic and imaginative perspectives on the challenges identified above and in pursuit of the aims outlined in the *Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12*. 
## Standard 4 Required Table 1, Institutional Faculty Profile, Fall 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank or Class</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number of Terminal Degrees</th>
<th>Salary, 9 Months*</th>
<th>Years of Experience at Institution</th>
<th>Total Years of Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Previous Fall Term Work Load Units**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>Dr</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Prof License</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Assistant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Lecturer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Assistant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Instructor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Adjunct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For faculty whose positions carry less than 1.0 FTE but whose primary responsibility is instruction at Linfield (full-time by NWCCU definition) and for faculty whose positions are year round (greater than 1.0 FTE), salaries have been converted to 9 month equivalent.

**Faculty load at Linfield is calculated in terms of work load units. A full year’s load is typically 23–25 load units. The work load includes some activities other than teaching (department chair, clinical instruction, etc.). Load units are roughly equal to course credits when credit instruction is involved, but load units may be divided when teaching is shared (extensively used in the School of Nursing) and more load units may be awarded when courses carry heavier than typical responsibilities (very large classes, international travel, etc.). Faculty on sabbatical or on leave are omitted from the work load column (librarians are omitted by NWCCU definition).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Granting Terminal Degree</th>
<th>Number of Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. New Mexico U., Golden Gate U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Institute of Technology</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard U.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana U.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linfield College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Linda U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State U.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National College of Naturopathic Medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Graduate Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Health Sciences U.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State U.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State U.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois U.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford U.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State U. of New York, Binghamton</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State U. of New York, Stony Brook</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Arizona</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of California, Davis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of California, Riverside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of California, San Francisco</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Cincinnati</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Granting Terminal Degree</td>
<td>Number of Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Colorado, Denver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Edinburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Houston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Iowa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Nebraska, Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Notre Dame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Phoenix</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Portland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Southern California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Texas Health Science Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Texas, Austin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Trondheim, Norway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Utah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington U., St. Louis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale U.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Standard Five – Library and Information Resources

Linfield has made many improvements in the delivery of information technology and library resources and services over the past decade. The challenge that the college faces in reaching a balance between limited resources and providing excellent services is familiar to all in small liberal arts colleges. Since the last accreditation visit of 1998, Linfield has consistently supported the library and information technology services of the college. The most visible representation of this support is Nicholson Library which opened its doors in August 2003. The text that follows documents the progress that the college has made in sustaining the collections and services that the library and information technology services provide for the students and faculty.

Part 1 Library Resources

**NOTE:** Throughout this document generic references to “library” or “library system” includes Nicholson Library in McMinnville, the Portland Campus branch library, and all distance learning sites, unless otherwise indicated.

### 5.A – Scope and Purpose

The Linfield library is critical to the college mission and the support of its curriculum. The library provides exceptional services and resources to faculty, students and staff on the McMinnville Campus, the Portland Campus, and the Division of Continuing Education. The mission of Linfield’s library is unusual among college libraries in that it emphasizes collaboration with faculty to teach students effective information retrieval and evaluation strategies in all formats. In this way the library system actively fosters the Linfield mission of “Connecting learning, life and community” [Exhibit 1].

#### 5.A.1 The institution’s information resources and services include sufficient holdings, equipment, and personnel in all of its libraries, instructional media and production centers, computer centers, networks, telecommunication facilities, and other repositories of information to accomplish the institution’s mission and goals.

The library’s identity and scope reflect the goals of the college mission, as well as those of all institutional curricula. Nicholson Library and the Portland Campus branch library have provided recognized models among professional peer institutions for their successful integration of information literacy across the curriculum. At Nicholson Library, teaching statistics have grown quite steadily, particularly with the advent of the new building [Exhibit 2]. The director of the Portland Campus branch library has effectively focused on incorporating information literacy within the nursing curriculum [Exhibit 3]. For Division of Continuing Education students, the distance learning librarian undertakes numerous ways to reach students, be it face-to-face or within online classes [Exhibits 4, 5]. Assessment in this area has deepened over the years, as have the library’s teaching partnerships with Linfield faculty [Exhibit 6].

Nicholson Library houses a collection of approximately 172,000 volumes/volume equivalents of books, bound journals, microforms, government documents, and media material [Exhibit 7]. Nicholson is also a partial depository for federal documents. It currently subscribes to 808 print journals, a number that has declined as access to electronic journals through direct subscriptions, consortial purchases, and full-text journals has increased to 28,364 titles [Exhibit 8].
The collection at the Portland Campus branch library uniquely fits its purpose to support two academic programs (Nursing and Health Sciences). With the recent transition of the campus to a two-year transfer program, the collection focus will likely shift again. The director of the branch library works closely with Portland Campus faculty to provide professional continuity and coherence in developing a necessarily non-linear collection. The branch library houses a collection of 14,000 volumes/volume equivalents of books, bound journals, and other formats, and maintains subscriptions to 143 journals. Access to online journals has expanded the availability of periodicals [Exhibit 9].

Beyond collection (print and electronic), Nicholson Library offers students a variety of places to study and work individually or in groups. In 2008–09, Nicholson Library was open 105.5 hours per week during the academic year, in contrast to 91.5 hours in 1998. The Portland Campus branch library is open 73 hours per week during the academic year. It has also undergone some needed renovation to make its space more inviting, though it would clearly benefit from further improvements to better address students’ learning needs.

The staff of Nicholson Library fosters an informal learning environment. On weekdays, some departments set up tables for tutoring in the following areas: Business (for accounting majors), English (for broad-based writing support to the student body), and Theatre and Communication Arts (for similar outreach to students preparing public presentations). Students regularly use the library conference room and the 12 study rooms for group study sessions. Nicholson also houses five listening/viewing rooms for student and faculty use, as well as a large media viewing room where students in classes or clubs view films of varying lengths. Nicholson also plays an expanded role in the McMinnville community than did its predecessor, Northup Library, by co-hosting author readings and the annual MacReads program made possible by the Friends of Nicholson Library. The library annually partners with the English Department, the McMinnville Public Library, and McMinnville’s Third Street Books to further Linfield’s larger mission of connecting learning, life, and community [Exhibit 10].

Over the last ten years, technology has expanded the resources and services available to faculty and students at both campuses as well as in DCE. Wired and wireless network access is available in both libraries, online library resources are accessible, and physical materials are delivered to off-campus students and faculty.

Nicholson also houses Educational Media Services (EMS) for the McMinnville Campus. Since 1998 EMS has greatly expanded its role in support of the evolving technology landscape within higher education. EMS staff provide equipment to classrooms for faculty use; order and install equipment for classrooms and other special projects like Ice Auditorium; and deliver and maintain equipment for campus meetings and selected campus events. Importantly, EMS personnel now provide extensive hands-on training in new electronic pedagogies through Nicholson’s Faculty Development Lab (FIDL). Media Services on the Portland Campus is housed within IT.

At Nicholson Library, five librarians, five administrators, and three support staff (as of July 2008) join with 105 work study students (10.5 FTE) to serve the needs of the McMinnville Campus, DCE, and some aspects of the Portland Campus. Since 1998 the library has added two administrators, one support staff, and has reclassified all support positions. At the Portland Campus branch library, one librarian and two part-time staff serve that campus in a space operated jointly with the Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital Library staff. In the last decade, the library has added one part-time administrator to the branch library [Exhibit 11].
5.A.2 The institution’s core collection and related information resources are sufficient to support the curriculum.

Linfield has provided consistent average institutional support for library collections in McMinnville and Portland since 1998. Looked at within the Northwest Pacific College and University libraries comparison group, the library is lowest in terms of overall collection numbers and in the middle for media collections [Exhibit 12].

Nicholson Library’s physical collections have increased steadily over the decade, from approximately 126,000 volumes/volume equivalents in June 1999 to approximately 173,000 volumes/volume equivalents in June 2007. The average growth rate for Nicholson Library collections has been 3.99%. The average growth rate for collections at the Portland Campus branch library has been 4.57%. The combined average is 4.02% [Exhibits 13, 14, 15, 16].

Budgeted materials expenditures have increased from $358,693 (1998/1999) to $560,994 (2006/2007). Various gift funds supplement the budget. Thus the average growth in collections expenditures at Nicholson has been 6.25%, while the average increase in expenditures in Portland has been 2.49% (a lower figure reflecting the decline in non-nursing courses). The budget for electronic resources, nonexistent in 1998, has increased at an annual average of 15.12% for both libraries since 2000 [Exhibit 17]. Restricted funds allow special one-time purchases such as ArtSTOR and the New York Times Historical database.

Over the next five years Linfield’s collection will become increasingly digital. Nicholson currently subscribes to 808 print journal titles. In January 2007 the college reached a tipping point in access to electronic journals: consortial agreements for Cambridge, Sage, and Wiley packages have brought the total of electronic titles to 28,364. The library will continue to seek collaborative agreements for electronic resources through the Orbis Cascade Alliance. Additionally, the library will work on other collaborative collection development opportunities within the consortium through the vendor Yankee Book Peddler [Exhibit 18].

Expenditures for Nicholson Library, the Portland Campus branch library, as well as overall figures, are mapped in the graph below. As with many academic libraries, collection expenditures have remained fairly flat for monographs but have increased for electronic resources [Exhibit 22].
WildCat (the local online public access catalog) provides access to 7,129 electronic books; one collection was purchased in 2001 and another in 2006. Usage is minimal, as E-books are still in the developmental stage [Exhibit 23]. Reference books are moving quickly to electronic format and the library has begun subscribing to some basic titles [Exhibit 24].

The materials, collections, and environment provided by the library system offer a robust starting point for the analysis, interpretation, criticism, communication, and intellectual engagement on which Linfield curricula are based. Linfield’s libraries foster and join in the learning culture of the college through their modeling of the changing informational landscape. The deepened and broadened content available to the Linfield community in 2008 stands in striking contrast to that of 1998.

5.A.3 Information resources and services are determined by the nature of the institution’s educational programs and the locations where programs are offered.

Linfield’s educational mission determines the purpose and scope of its libraries. The design of Nicholson Library reflects Linfield’s focus on small classes, collaborative research between faculty and students, and the ideal of “Connecting Learning, Life and Community.” Nicholson’s personnel deliver the message that learning matters through information literacy instruction, the work of the Faculty Development Lab, the variety of available study and learning spaces, its long hours of operation, the expanding repertoire of web-based resources, and the close attention paid to the diverse needs of faculty and students. At the Portland Campus branch library, the integration of teaching/learning and research operates through its exemplary library services and collection but is not reflected in its limiting physical space [Exhibit 26].

Prior to Nicholson’s opening in August 2003, Northup Library’s physical deficiencies overshadowed student and faculty opinion of the collection and services. Since moving to Nicholson in 2003, library personnel have administered a campus-wide survey, conducted several focus group sessions, and sent out small, focused surveys about specific services [Exhibits 26, 27, 28, 29]. In addition to responding to these various surveys each and every time, the staff have regularly assessed the effectiveness by which the library delivers on Nicholson’s primary mission—information literacy across the curriculum—through assignments developed to support Inquiry Seminars, introductions to majors, and junior or senior capstone courses [Exhibit 30]. The library’s five-year plan, written in spring 2006 and updated in December 2007 following adoption of the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2000–12, outlines flexible, reasonable, and
measurable goals related to overall institutional planning. The faculty Academic Support Committee and the Office of Academic Affairs have endorsed this plan. The library staff reviews it annually along with yearly goals [Exhibits 31, 32, 7, 9, 5].

The Portland Campus branch library benefited from the LibQual survey in two ways: it documented the exceptional service provided by the staff and identified the deficits of the space, some of which have been resolved [Exhibit 33]. The branch library director is directly connected with the planning around Portland Campus curricula since she has chaired the School of Nursing’s curriculum committee (2006–09) and belongs to the Strategic Planning Oversight Committee (SPOC). She also represents the Portland Campus on the Linfield College Planning Council (2007–09).

The library works closely with the Linfield community on both campuses, as well as with the faculty and staff of DCE, to ensure that library services and collections make sense in themselves and meet reasonable expectations of the faculty and students. The college librarian meets regularly with the Academic Support Committee, administrators in the Office of Academic Affairs, and academic departmental chairs to facilitate assessment and secure guidance on library-related issues.

Future plans
The natural expansion of electronic access for all materials will continue to dominate the landscape of academic libraries. Shifting budget allocations will change how the collections present themselves, from print to electronic. The current Web 2.0 world, which emphasizes pushing information out to the current generation of students and faculty, will present ongoing challenges and opportunities for the library, educational media services, and instructional support as each area explores feasible ways to maintain well-established service excellence. Recruitment and retention of sufficient trained staff will remain a challenge. Supporting faculty to incorporate meaningful technology into their teaching will increasingly absorb staff attention and energy. Information literacy instruction through direct collaboration with faculty will remain central to the library’s primary mission—assisting students to develop critical thinking skills across all formats for a lifetime of learning.

5.B – Information Resources and Services

The library affects student learning most directly through its information resources and services, and the trained staff who develop and deliver them. The library collections directly reflect the teaching mission of the college. Hence the library’s commitment is two-fold: (1) to build excellent collections of and access to a broad and deep landscape of resources, and (2) to teach students, in collaboration with faculty, how to use those resources effectively. The library supports the college’s strategic plan “to prepare students to be thoughtfully engaged in a world that demands ever more flexible, creative, and critical thinkers and communicators.”

5.B.1 Equipment and materials are selected, acquired, organized, and maintained to support the educational program.

The library selects and acquires information resources in a variety of formats: print, electronic, and other media. The primary criterion for selection is curriculum relevance. The library consistently meets the requirements of the professional organizations that accredit many of the college’s academic programs. The library files formal and informal reports to those departments undergoing accreditation reviews. Sample reports are included in Exhibit 34.
Collection development builds on a collaborative effort between faculty and librarians. On the McMinnville Campus, the faculty request approximately 60% of orders for the circulating collection and exercise real ownership of the collection. Librarians are responsible for developing reference, electronic, and journal collections. The Technical Services Librarian serves as an ex-officio member of the Faculty Curriculum Committee and assures development of appropriate resources for new classes, programs, and majors. To plug holes in the collection, she closely monitors Linfield’s requests to Summit and interlibrary loan, as well as personal faculty copies placed on reserve. Staff also regularly weed and inventory the collection.

Library personnel assess the collection continually using the 2006 edition of Resources for College Libraries and the WorldCat Collection Analysis product. For example, using these tools in 2007–08, Nicholson Library collected in Environmental Studies, Gender Studies, Asian Studies, and Francophone Literature. Nicholson will continue to use RCL as new academic programs are added. Also in 2007–08, the Outstanding Academic Titles comparison on WorldCat Collection Analysis was used for collection development in anthropology, music, and religion [Exhibits 35, 36]. Nicholson Library will continue to develop appropriate core collections in service to other departments as funds permit.

On the Portland Campus the collection development process is informal due to the small and collegial nature of its academic programs. The branch library director alerts the faculty to new areas of the library’s collection and services during semi-monthly Nursing Department meetings and at monthly Portland Campus Division meetings. Occasionally she uses SurveyMonkey to canvass faculty opinion when quick decisions must be made. The branch library subscribes to the two standard collection development tools for nursing and health sciences: Majors Weekly New Book List and Doody’s Core Titles [Exhibit 37].

See exhibits for Cost per Search, World Cat Collection Analysis by Age, Database Statistics Report, and Electronic Resources Report for more detail [Exhibits 38, 39, 40, 41].

The library’s resources, including government documents and media materials, are organized and cataloged according to international standards using OCLC (Online Computer Library Center). Resources are available through WildCat (Linfield’s local online catalog), Summit (the catalog of Orbis Cascade), and OCLC’s WorldCat (an international catalog of library holdings).

Nicholson Library contains 50 public computers [Exhibit 42]. The circulation of laptops is high [Exhibit 43]. Due to student comments on the LibQual Survey in spring 2005, six additional circulating laptops were purchased, bringing the total available for check-out to 16. Statistics indicate an increasing faculty reliance on EMS laptops. Every public computer can access all library resources as well as the expected range of Microsoft Office products (Word, Excel, PowerPoint, and the like). Nicholson Library also provides adaptive technology for students with visual or hearing impairments. The Portland Campus branch library provides six public access computers. Both libraries are Wi-Fi enabled. The library continues to provide photocopiers, microfilm reader/printers, a fax machine and a scanner for public use.

Nicholson Library provides faculty with equipment and software in the Faculty Development Lab (FIDL) to assist their incorporation of appropriate technology into their teaching [Exhibit 44]. Nicholson’s Educational Media Services (EMS) also makes multimedia equipment available. The Portland Campus branch library operates independently from Educational Media Services.
5.B.2 Library and information resources and services contribute to developing the ability of students, faculty, and staff to use the resources independently and effectively.

The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 focuses upon “developing students’ abilities to solve problems, adapt to changing circumstances, and synthesize various streams of information.” The Linfield library system contributes substantively to this goal through teaching, reference, and online tools.

The library has consistently defined its mission in terms of teaching students how to discover, evaluate, contrast, and synthesize information from different resources. The library did this long before the arrival of the Internet because it made sense to do so in a teaching college without a substantial research collection. The change wrought by online access to massive amounts of unsubstantiated information has strengthened the librarians’ collaboration with faculty to ensure that students learn how to think through the material available to them. Compared to 1998, library personnel now spend more time teaching students how to find credible information through various databases in different formats. Students learn how to think about any and all information they find, since research demonstrates that students are otherwise quite likely to settle for “good enough” information acquired through no more than three or four clicks in a Google search. Moving beyond the “good enough” syndrome stands at the center of the library’s information literacy program [Exhibits 45, 46, 47, 48].

On the McMinnville Campus, the librarians teach within each Inquiry Seminar, most departmental introductions to the major (if appropriate), and many senior seminars (or junior pre-thesis seminars). The teaching librarians developed this plan of action in 2003 after evaluating their teaching over the past eight years and realizing that the move to Nicholson had dramatically increased faculty requests for on-site library instruction in their classes [Exhibit 49]. The work of librarian Jean Caspers in the Association of College and Research Libraries’ Institute for Information Literacy [Exhibit 50] has also fostered adoption of this strategy in Nicholson. Three Linfield librarians (McCulley, Caspers, and O’Donovan) have attended the Association of College and Research Libraries Institute for Information Literacy; college librarian Susan Barnes Whyte serves on the Institute faculty.

The library’s teaching statistics speak for themselves. In 2006–07, 256 teaching sessions took place, compared to 121 sessions in 1998–99. The faculty/librarian collaboration characteristic of these activities deepens the learning experience for students, who regularly pursue further consultation through individual appointments, phone call, or electronic communications with the librarian who conducted their session. Reference librarians have historically not tracked these follow-up appointments adequately but are making an effort to do so going forward. The library’s Special Collections still lacks an archivist and a budget line despite significant more demand on the archive (from the entire college, alumni, faculty, and the public) since the opening of Nicholson. Associate Director of Technical Services Mary Margaret Benson spends hundreds of hours each year trying to meet those demands [Exhibit 51].

At the Portland Campus branch library, the library director has made great strides incorporating information literacy into the nursing curriculum, particularly as it relates to evidence-based practice. She spent her spring 2006 sabbatical working on this integration and currently coordinates a faculty task force to further the goals of the project [Exhibits 52, 53, 54]. As a result, the number of teaching sessions at the Portland Campus had reached 51 in 2006–07, compared to 23 in 1998–99.

The assignment of the director of instructional support to Nicholson Library began in July 2006 and has deepened the library’s connection with technology, teaching, and learning on-campus—an improvement that speaks directly to results of the 2006 Faculty Survey, which indicated only 37.3% of faculty agreed or strongly agreed that training in the use of teaching technology was adequate [Exhibit 55]. Following her arrival at
Nicholson, Dr. Jo Meyertons conducted 16 workshops in 2006–07 with attendance varying from 1 to 49 [Exhibit 44]. Topics ranged from BlackBoard instruction, Turnitin, Dreamweaver, Captivate, iMovie, Xythos, ePortfolios and ArtSTOR. Faculty feedback has been generally positive [Exhibit 30]. Demand continues to grow and faculty are enthusiastic for more, particularly around the potential for departments to adopt electronic portfolios as an assessment tool for their major(s). The challenge Nicholson faces is having sufficient staff to support such growing interest and ambition [Exhibit 44].

Nicholson has produced newsletters once or twice a year for more than 10 years. Starting in Spring 2007, Nicholson sent out a merged newsletter with Integrated Technology Services [Exhibit 56].

DCE students have access to library training through the traditional face-to-face format when and if their classes meet in that way. The distance education librarian maintains a lively presence within Blackboard courses that contain a library research assignment. She has also created web pages and online video tutorials for students who take only online courses [Exhibits 57, 58, 59, 60].

In spring 2006, Educational Media Services (EMS) on the McMinnville Campus began to assume more responsibility not only for delivering equipment to classrooms, but for ordering, installing, and maintaining such equipment. This occurred without additional staff until summer 2008. The number of deliveries rose through 2006–07 [Exhibit 61] but, as more classrooms become “smart” through technology additions to the classrooms themselves, EMS staff made fewer deliveries in 2007–08 and have more time and energy to assist in the Faculty Development Lab 2008–09 [Exhibit 62]. EMS staff have also been actively engaged in equipment purchase, installation, and maintenance for projects such as the new Vivian A. Bull Music Center, Ice Auditorium, and the Renshaw Hall remodel. Nicholson Library is developing assessment strategies for the expanded EMS role [Exhibit 29].

Traditional library reference continues to play a role in providing research assistance, but the volume of person-to-person reference requests has decreased slightly [Exhibit 63], in keeping with today’s Google-saturated environment. The library also does a heavy trade in email reference (staff do not yet adequately track this activity); in spring 2007 Nicholson Library started IM reference. Students often drop in to librarians’ offices unannounced, and these contacts also fall outside current record keeping. The lead student workers report that students often ask for reference librarians by name. Linfield community use of countable resources such as databases or e-journals continues to rise, an indicator that students are responding constructively to faculty and librarian emphasis on the use of academic sources for their class assignments [Exhibit 40].

Nicholson started employing electronic reserves in fall 2004, whereas the Portland Campus branch library started in fall 2005. The statistics reveal their heavy use [Exhibit 64], another indicator that students are finding it easy to consult the academic resources assigned them because the library makes them available in the online format they expect.

In the area of interlibrary loan, the library has gone from being a net borrower to a net lender [Exhibit 65]. This means that other institutions increasingly look toward Linfield’s collection for their needs and find the service provided by the college satisfactory. Clearly too, the library’s electronic resources, combined with Summit, meet many student and faculty research needs once addressed through interlibrary loan.

Circulation of media materials at Nicholson has more than doubled in the past decade, indicating the importance of DVDs and CDs for teaching, research, and leisure pursuits [Exhibit 66]. Circulation statistics by patron type document the increased usage that has occurred since Nicholson opened in 2003 [Exhibit 67].

In summer 2005, the library implemented an OpenURL link resolver that seamlessly connects all electronic resources by verifying citations against library-owned materials and offering click-through ability across databases. This allows students and faculty greater likelihood of finding
the actual article they may be looking for. In summer 2006 the library purchased a federated Google-like searching tool permitting a simultaneous scan of WildCat, Summit, and several periodical databases; with it, students and faculty can now search across a wide swath of databases from Summit to Humanities Index. The product has met with mixed success as librarians have introduced it in classes. Like all technological “fixes,” such federated tools open the floodgates in terms of the amount of information made available with one search [Exhibit 40]. The results can prove overwhelming for some users. For others, it can be very helpful to see at a glance which databases may yield more results for a particular search. No perfect approach exists; Linfield librarians place a high premium on taking different approaches to helping users find the best sources of information for their needs.

5.B.3 Policies, regulations, and procedures for systematic development and management of information resources, in all formats, are documented, updated, and made available to the institution’s constituents.

The library has developed and routinely revises policy and procedure manuals. Policies that directly affect patrons may be found on the library’s webpage, www.linfield.edu/library [Exhibit 68].

The library also participates in the Collection Development and Management Committee of the Orbis Cascade Alliance. This group develops recommendations to the consortium’s governing council regarding cooperative collection development and management. The committee works to further the development and use of member library collections as an integrated whole. Through its efforts, consortial bargaining power with Yankee Book Peddler, a major monographs vendor, has greatly improved, with commensurate benefits for Linfield [Exhibit 69]. The library’s membership in this project influences but does not substitute for local collection development. Linfield’s library system defines its collection goals as the maintenance of a core collection while also working at the consortial level to build a strong cross-institutional collection.

5.B.4 Opportunities are provided for faculty, staff, and students to participate in the planning and development of the library and information resources and services.

The Linfield library system provides various opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to advise on the planning and development of its resources and services including surveys, professional program reviews, attendance at departmental and divisional meetings, participation in the faculty Curriculum and Academic Support Committees, informal emails, a suggestion box, telephone calls, and hallway conversations.

5.B.5 Computing and communications services are used to extend the boundaries in obtaining information and data from other sources, including regional, national, and international networks.

Over the past decade the library and the Office of Integrated Technology Services (ITS) have, by necessity, learned to work closely together because of the complete dependence of the library on information technology. Library and ITS staff meet together as needed. The addition of a library computer technician to Nicholson’s staff in July 2008 provides a needed bridge between the two organizations [Exhibit 70]. The Portland Campus
branch library and Computing and Educational Media Services also meet as needed.

Beyond ITS, the library relies upon many vendors and commercial product lines for assistance: OCLC, Serials Solutions, Clio, ARIEL, various software packages, interlibrary loan access, e-proxy access to library search engines from off-campus, and the like. Many of these vendors need attention from both the library staff and the ITS staff. Even closer connections between the two areas are likely in the future. Membership in Orbis Cascade Alliance remains crucial to many of the library’s electronic information needs.

**Future plans**

**5.C – Facilities and Access**

Nicholson Library opened in August 2003. After several decades of making do with Northup Library’s inadequacies in the face of insufficient institutional resources (a situation commented upon in several accreditation commentaries over that period), Nicholson has made a dramatic difference in the academic climate of the McMinnville Campus and in the attitudes of faculty and students about how the library can contribute to the daily life of the college [Exhibit 26].

Planning for Nicholson followed a consultative process focused primarily on faculty and students. The planning committee, co-chaired by then-Associate Dean of Faculty Barbara Seidman and College Librarian Susan Barnes Whyte, brought together library staff and faculty representatives from each McMinnville Campus academic division, as well as the chief technology officer (CTO) and two student representatives. Several open campus meetings encouraged input, advice, reactions and questions from the Linfield community. For eight weeks, open planning notebooks and posted architectural drawings/blueprints were made available in Northup Library, and written comments and suggestions were solicited. Once building began, the college librarian also participated in weekly construction meetings. Near the end of this phase, tours of the new facility happened frequently.

The LibQual Survey conducted at the Portland Campus branch library revealed great discontent with the library space, leading to the hiring of a consultant in 2005 to conduct a comprehensive assessment. Though significant constraints mitigate against major changes to the space, some renovation occurred in 2005–06: in addition to painting and re-carpeting, all new furnishings and shelving end panels were purchased. Albeit primarily cosmetic, this effort has produced a substantial difference in the library atmosphere and hence in user attitudes toward the space.

**5.C.1 Library and information resources are readily accessible to all students and faculty. These resources and services are sufficient in quality, level, breadth, quantity, and currency to meet the requirements of the educational program.**

Providing students and faculty maximum intellectual and physical access to its many resources stands as the central priority of the Linfield library system. During the academic year
Nicholson’s hours increased significantly due to student demand in fall 2003: the facility now remains open 105.5 hours per week. Access continues during breaks in the regular school year, when the library stays open forty hours per week. The Portland Campus branch library is open 73 hours per week during the academic year. The Portland library director makes herself available via email on evenings and weekends of high research activity.

The 2006 Faculty Survey indicates that 76.6% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that library resources are adequate. The 2007 Senior Survey indicated that 90% of students agreed or strongly agreed that they were able to find library resources relevant to their major program [Exhibit 55]. The spring 2005 LibQual Survey indicated that Portland faculty perceived the library collection to be less than adequate, while students perceived it as adequate [Exhibit 26].

5.C.2 In cases of cooperative arrangements with other library and information resources, formal documented agreements are established. These cooperative relationships and externally provided information sources complement rather than substitute for the institution’s own adequate and accessible core collection and services.

The library participates in consortial and cooperative arrangements that extend and enhance its resources and services. Membership in the Orbis Cascade Alliance brings significant benefits to the college. Linfield was an early member of this consortium, which now includes 35 members in Oregon and Washington, serves 211,000 students (FTE equivalent), and provides over 9.2 million titles representing 28.7 million items. In 2006, students, faculty and staff at consortial institutions borrowed 335,789 books, CDs, DVDs, and videos. The cost per item for a member institution is about $3, compared to the $14 average cost for an interlibrary loan transaction. This consortium also provides ample cost savings through group purchases of databases and e-journals [Exhibit 21]. Linfield staff members participate in many Alliance committees; over the past nine years the college librarian held the position of chair in 2005–06 and served five years total on its executive committee over the past 9 years.

As the use of electronic resources indicates [Exhibit 71], many library resources are now available online all days and hours of the week. Students and faculty in each arm of the college have the same access to these resources and services, which include electronic reserves, e-journals, e-books, article databases, ArtSTOR and the Faculty Development Lab.

Nicholson Library provides assistive devices for hearing and sight-impaired students in the Educational Media Services area. EMS works closely with the Office of Learning Support Services each year to ensure that the library has the appropriate closed-captioned films available for students as well. Nicholson Library is ADA compliant.

The chart below illustrates the borrowing/lending activity for Linfield within the Alliance over the past decade. Lending and borrowing items through Summit constitutes a significant part of the daily workflow, administered by highly trained students [Exhibit 72].
The library also participates in the Online Computer Library Center (OCLC), a worldwide library consortium whose services are central to core library functions such as interlibrary loan, cataloging, and professional development workshops. It also provides management tools for collection development and analysis. The college librarian served as an elected member of the OCLC Members Council from 2004 to 2007 and has recently been re-elected to that group.

Nicholson Library provides free services to Yamhill County residents. No formal agreements exist but a strong town/gown relationship between the college and the local community dating back to the 1930’s (when Northup Library was built) lies behind this tradition. Nicholson Library maintains a few formal agreements with several Oregon community college libraries for the benefit of DCE students and faculty.

5.D – Personnel and Management

The library, like the college as a whole, remains committed to recruiting and retaining highly qualified staff dedicated to the vision of the Linfield library and its service to the institutional mission. The library and the college encourage and support staff to continue their professional development, in keeping with The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12.

5.D.1 The institution employs a sufficient number of library and information resources staff to provide assistance to users of the library and to students at other learning resources sites.

The staffing of Nicholson Library remains low in the areas of circulation and Educational Media Services [Exhibit 73]. Having added two administrators in ten years, opened a new building with increased services such as archival support, an expanded EMS, and widened technological expertise and outreach, the dedication and work ethic of library personnel is taxed to the limit. When one staff member leaves for an extended period of time (for example, sabbaticals), the toll on remaining staff is marked and generates system-wide stresses.

Nicholson thus stands at a tipping point in terms of staff energy and ability; adding any more value-added services is hardly possible, particularly given the need to keep up with the challenging technology landscape that dominates academic libraries. A fall 2007 survey of 15 colleges within the Orbis Cascade Alliance reveals that the size of Linfield’s circulation staff holds last place in the consortium [Exhibit 74]. The Portland Campus branch library is also stretched thin, a situation accentuated by the library director’s excellent contributions to faculty governance; this produces gaps in effective reference service and puts undue demands upon her time and energy. Nicholson has addressed the reference desk conundrum by hiring and training lead-student workers, which has provided some relief to the professional staff [Exhibit 75]. However, service levels suffer with so much of the library workforce consisting of students whose central priorities and expertise do not involve librarianship. Turnover means that staff must perpetually train new student hires, which takes time and attention away from other duties [Exhibit 76].

5.D.2 Library and information resources staff include qualified professional and technical support staff, with required specific competencies, whose responsibilities are clearly defined.
Library faculty and staff are highly qualified and skilled in their areas of expertise. All librarians have graduate degrees from American Library Association accredited programs. Two administrators hold master’s. The director of instructional support has an Ed.D [Exhibit 77].

5.D.3 The institution provides opportunities for professional growth for library and information resources professional staff.

The library staff is fully supported in professional development [Exhibits 7, 9].

5.D.4 Library and information resources and services are organized to support the accomplishment of institutional mission and goals. Organizational arrangements recognize the need for service linkage among complementary resource bases (e.g., libraries, computing facilities, instructional media, and telecommunication centers).

The library organizational chart shows a relatively flat organizational structure [Exhibit 11]. Staff participation in institutional governance has made the library a presence on many campus committees: Curriculum, Academic Support, the Faculty Executive Council, ITAC (Information Technology Advisory Committee), the ad hoc One Level Down midlevel administrator group, and others. The college librarian attends academic chairs’ meetings and was an active member for the two years during which the ad hoc General Education Review Committee did its work. In the recent past, librarians have also served on the Continuing Education Committee, the Faculty Development Committee, the Sesquicentennial Planning Committee, the School of Nursing curriculum committee, the President’s Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), and the college-wide Planning Council. They often participate on faculty search committees. The library also has formal links to Integrated Technology Services (ITS); for example, the director of instructional support attends bimonthly Technology Overview Group meetings [Exhibit 78]. Educational Media Services meets frequently with ITS representatives.

5.D.5 The institution consults library and information resources staff in curriculum development.

The associate director of technical services attends the weekly meetings of the Curriculum Committee as an ex-officio member. This practice, in place for 20 years, solidifies the library’s participation in curricular initiatives. As noted in 5.D.4, the college librarian served in the same capacity on the General Education Review Committee from 2005 to 2007. Curriculum Committee guidelines require all new proposals to address the sufficiency of existing library resources for the new course [Exhibit 79]. The Portland director of the branch library currently chairs the School of Nursing curriculum committee—an example of her influence on that campus.

5.D.6 The institution provides sufficient financial support for library and information resources and services, and for their maintenance and security.
Overall financial support for the library has increased 60% during the past decade. Despite funding dips over that time (which corresponds to tight fiscal years), the overall average of library financial support is adequate [Exhibit 14]. McMinnville Campus acquisitions spending has increased from $310,165 (1997–98) to $604,517 (2006–07). On the Portland Campus, acquisition spending has increased from $55,966 (1997–98) to $71,692 (2006–07).

The chart below describes the changes in library spending over the past decade. It contrasts salaries, materials, consortial spending, services, and supplies via its differently shaded bars [Exhibit 80].

$87,195 has been saved in database subscriptions, and $640,500 through consortial deals with Cambridge, Sage and Wiley Interscience Publishers [Exhibit 21].

Nicholson Library’s budget for maintaining EMS equipment is strained by the addition of more than $100,000 worth of inventory in recent years. The director of the library has worked with the Office of Academic Affairs to provide central funding to assist with this challenge in the last seven years; adjustments to the library’s own budget may need to be made in the future to make the process more streamlined and immediate. [Exhibit 81].

5.E – Planning and Evaluation

5.E.1 The institution has a planning process that involves users, library and information resource staff, faculty, and administrators.

The library participates in several ways in the institutional planning process. The college-wide Planning Council includes representatives from all three employee groups. Communication from this body is frequent, particularly since fall 2005. Library personnel regularly contribute to the work of standing committees of the faculty, administration, and the Linfield Employees’ Association (LEA). For example, the college librarian served as an ex-officio member of the
General Education Review Committee from 2005 to 2007. The associate director of technical services is a long-standing ex-officio member of the all-college Curriculum Committee. The Portland Campus library director chairs the Nursing Department curriculum committee (2006 to 2009) and represents the Portland Campus on the Planning Council (2007 to 2009). Other faculty librarians serve on various faculty committees. The college librarian reports to the Faculty Academic Support Committee and periodically makes presentations at the monthly academic chairs meetings. She is also an ex-officio member of ITAC.

Nicholson Library staff meet biweekly, as do the librarians (with the Portland Campus library director attending via speaker phone). EMS holds meetings each week and other times as needed [Exhibit 82]. Within its relatively flat organizational model, the library maintains a largely consultative, participatory culture. Each department proposes annual goals; everyone participates in setting each year's overall library goals. The library tries to meet as a whole once a year, bringing all staff members together. In addition, the college librarian travels to the Portland Campus about every six weeks to meet with the director of the branch library. Organizationally the library is process-driven, both in its internal and campus-wide dealings.

5.E.2 The institution, in its planning, recognizes the need for management and technical linkages among information resource bases (e.g., libraries, instructional computing, media production and distribution centers, and telecommunications networks).

The library has a long history of collaborative work with the Integrated Technology Services (ITS). Details have been outlined in other sections of this document.

5.E.3 The institution regularly and systematically evaluates the quality, adequacy, and utilization of its library and information resources and services, including those provided through cooperative arrangements, and at all locations where courses, programs, or degrees are offered. The institution uses the results of the evaluations to improve the effectiveness of these resources.

As noted earlier, the library uses a variety of measures to evaluate its services and collections. The staff assesses all work in the context of annual and longer-range planning. The exhibits demonstrate the breadth and depth of this assessment effort. The library has used LibQual, focus groups with faculty and students to pursue LibQual-informed recommendations, email surveys, SurveyMonkey inquiries, meetings with academic departments and divisions, academic chairs' meetings, and innumerable conversations with library users and institutional administrators to ascertain public opinion about the library’s services and resources [Exhibits 83, 28, 29, 30, 49].

From LibQual, the library learned that Nicholson offers users a wonderful space and that the Portland Campus branch library needs a better space. Some renovation followed at the branch library, as noted earlier. LibQual also revealed that users found Nicholson too noisy, so the staff posted signs and enforce quiet more explicitly. The library also learned that faculty would like a better collection, hence faculty now have access to many, many more e-journals than were available in 2005. Similarly, LibQual results prompted purchase of Web of Science, Science Citation Index and Social Science Citation Index, a critical online tool for scientists and social scientists. It led the library to buy six more circulating laptops based on results of the LibQual survey. From focus group work, the library heard that students and faculty mostly appreciated the library’s resources and services but needed better trained student workers. The library has thus sought to improve the training given work-study students; in summer 2007 staff created a series of short online
Emerging Needs and Next Steps for the Linfield Library

New faculty represent new frontiers for library development. Most hires now arrive at Linfield expecting more institutional resources such as bandwidth; direct journal, audio, and video digital access; and support for teaching in an online environment. The Linfield library and ITS will continue to push for resources to sustain faculty teaching and research at a high level. The addition of CatFiles offers a first step towards creating digital research space and sharing it within the college and beyond. The addition of a new position—library computer technician—in July 2008 further addresses the pressing need to improve library support of faculty teaching.

High priorities for the coming years include development of expanded research support for faculty and improvement of the means whereby they can communicate their scholarship with the rest of the world. The 21st century college library serves not just to bring information into the institution but must also to push content out to the wider academic community. Libraries around the world are exploring how to house, make discoverable, and preserve information (both published and non-published) that has been generated within the organizations they serve, and Linfield needs to participate. Such archiving also supports student work (for example, theses, electronic portfolios, and collaborative research results). Librarian Carol McCulley’s spring 2009 sabbatical will be devoted to investigating institutional repositories so as to provide models as Linfield’s entry into the world of digital information storage. McCulley’s research will also intersect with the nascent Linfield Center for Regional Studies (LCRS), which seeks to become a data repository for applicable research by faculty and students. Finally, Linfield’s archives need to be digitized and made available to the community and to alumni.

Creating and sustaining adequate funding models for content will persist as a challenge for the Linfield library.

Assessing the digital world’s impact on learning will continue to absorb library personnel in their information literacy teaching. As many audio and video sources become digitized, the Linfield library and ITS will together need to devise sustainable models both for content management and staff training to handle the content.

Managing resources and expectations in an increasingly digital world will challenge Linfield faculty, staff and students. Making content and services immediate and accessible will push the library in ways not imaginable at the present.

Part 2 Information Technology
5.A – Scope and Purpose

In September 2000, then-President Vivian Bull created a committee to review information technology providers at the college and recommend whether reorganization would better serve the needs of the college. As a result, Integrated Technology Services was created by merging three units providing support for administrative computing, telephony, networks, servers, and end users. Since that time Integrated Technology Services (ITS) has operated under the direction of the chief technology officer (CTO).

Integrated Technology Services supports the Linfield community by identifying and meeting tutorials for this purpose. The library analyzes e-resource use patterns every summer and consults a large spreadsheet with relevant data to guide decisions. The associate director for technical services reviews all Summit and interlibrary loan requests each summer and purchases items requested frequently by students and faculty [Exhibit 84].
current and future needs for hardware, software, and networks for voice and data. With regular feedback from students, faculty, and staff, Integrated Technology Services plans, develops, and implements technology infrastructure to meet Linfield’s standards of teaching excellence and to enhance institutional productivity in an efficient, cost-effective manner.

The full statement of the Integrated Technology Services mission, including goals and objectives, can be found on the web [Exhibit 85].

5.B – Information Resources and Services

The Office of Integrated Technology Services provides outreach to support the IT needs of the Linfield community in a variety of ways including workshops, office consulting, a regularly staffed help desk, development of single sign-on procedures, and participation in new student orientation.

ITS offers faculty and staff workshops on a variety of office productivity topics. Some workshops are open to the entire community and some are tailored to the needs of specific academic or administrative departments or other groups as requested. The director of instructional support also provides workshops to faculty on a variety of current and emerging technologies of interest in the field of pedagogy. Many ITS support staff regularly engage in one-on-one instruction. The following chart provides information on the number of workshops offered and attendees since ITS started keeping records in 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Workshops</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07–08 (though 1/08)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06–07</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04–05</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03–04</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>1267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ITS help desk operates from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday. It is staffed by one full time employee who is assisted by an administrative aide and student workers. This service responds to employee and student requests received via walk-ins, email and phone; to a certain extent prospective students and their parents are assisted as well.

Several ITS staff provide one-on-one desk side assistance and consulting. One staffer began tracking these visits in January 2007. In spring 2007 she made an average of 35 office calls per month with an average of slightly less than an hour per visit [Exhibit 86].

Integrated Technology Services participates in new student orientation by helping set up network and email access, as well as by providing short presentations on the Linfield email system. ITS believes this assistance partly explains the relatively high use of email (94% at least every 2 days) by Linfield students compared to those at other institutions.

Integrated Technology Services has brought most information resources requiring authentication under a unified id/password combination named CatNet. This ID and password provides access to the Exchange server for email and calendaring, online storage, web access to administrative systems, Blackboard, the college’s learning management system, and proxy access to off-campus library resources.

In terms of Internet access, while attaining “enough” access is impossible, the following chart and graph indicate how Linfield has responded to increased demand by adding more bandwidth.
### ITS 5.B Table 2 Bandwidth Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Bandwidth (Megabits/second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08–09</td>
<td>(anticipated) 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07–08</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06–07</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02–05</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99–02</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93–99</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92–93</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph below depicts twenty-four hours of bandwidth starting about 9 a.m. on April 28, 2008. Each data point on the graph is the five minute average bandwidth utilization. Green represents data coming in to the Linfield network from off-campus; blue represents data going from campus to the outside world. The top of graph represents the maximum available bandwidth, 30 Megabits per second at the time the graph was made. Bandwidth use on this day is typical for any day when classes are in session.

While the graph does reveal that bandwidth use is over 80% of the available resource for many hours a day, it does not reach the maximum during this time period and only rarely exceeds 90% of full use. This data support the statement that Linfield’s Internet bandwidth is adequate. Nonetheless, the college will increase bandwidth to at least 45Mb/second to meet anticipated expanding demand.
Use of BlackBoard, the college’s web-based course platform, has steadily increased. The creation of the director of instructional support position in 2004 has proven instrumental in this growth.

Most administrative functions (accounting, registrar, admissions, financial aid, development) are facilitated using Colleague, a commercial software program produced by Datatel. Several important academic processes are facilitated by this system including online registration, faculty grade reporting, 24 hour student access to class schedules and grades, acceptance and applicant access to application status, and financial aid package information. ITS has had significant success integrating Colleague into other information technology systems including the CatNet ID creation process, by automatically adding students to Blackboard course sections from registration data. This system also allows automatic creation of course and advisee email lists.

ITS recently provided extensive assistance to the Office of College Relations, in its evaluation of Linfield’s software system in support of fundraising. This involved comparing Datatel’s new successor to Benefactor, Colleague Advancement, with The Raiser’s Edge from the company, Blackbaud. The college decided to adopt The Raiser’s Edge. Conversion about conversion strategies began in early 2008 with a projected “go live date” of the week of September 15, 2008.

Integrated Technology Services has also assisted the Office of the Registrar with a document imaging project to store and access digitally converted images of documents, replacing the original paper. This project aims to reduce storage space needs and increase access to the information found on the documents. Plans exist to extend this project to other departments, most immediately Admission.

Integrated Technology Services makes all of its policies available on its webpage [Exhibit 87].

5.C – Facilities and Access

Linfield makes 258 computers available to students through a combination of open and departmental access facilities (compared to 160 in 1998 and 256 in 2003. In 2003 Linfield had 19 older machines for email-only in locations around campus, compared to the 1998 figure from 18 such machines in residence halls for student use. Residence hall sites are no longer needed. Most equipment in the current distribution is four or fewer years old, indicating that Linfield has overseen more growth in computing facilities than raw numbers might first suggest [Exhibit 88].

All faculty, administrators, and staff with office jobs have computers in their offices connected to the campus network and appropriate printers. Inventory data shows that on average these machines are replaced every five years with new equipment [Exhibit 89].

The campus network consists of a 1Gb/s fiber network configured in a redundant ring topology connecting every academic, administrative and residential building on-campus. Office, classroom and residential network connections are CAT 5 or 5e connected to 10/100 Mb/s ethernet switches. The connection off-campus is via fiber leased from the City of McMinnville.

Information technology resources are increasingly subject to security threats from a variety of sources. Integrated Technology Services continues to work diligently to improve the security of Linfield networks and servers. A recent vulnerability assessment done by an outside security company also provided risk levels for all identified vulnerabilities and suggested specific mitigation steps [Exhibit 90]. ITS plans to engage this consultant for annual reviews.

Every instructional space (classroom, lab, and library) has 802.11b/g wireless access. The student center, the dining hall, and the gathering space in Withnell Commons also provide wireless access as do the two newest residential buildings, Elkington and Terrell halls. A pilot project is
under way to assess the feasibility of extending wireless access to all residence halls.

All classrooms have wireless access; thirty-four also have wired jacks. In addition to computer facilities and labs, several classrooms are equipped with information technology equipment. About 15 classrooms also have computers and technology display devices, most incorporating Smart® technology. In addition, Educational Media Services has several laptops and projectors for delivery to classrooms. More information on classroom facilities is contained in the Standard 8 document.

The Faculty Development Lab (FIDL), opened in Nicholson Library in 2006, is equipped with a variety of high end hardware and software. This facility functions both as a place for faculty to explore and learn about technology and as a production facility for projects to enhance teaching, learning and scholarship. More information on FIDL may be found in Part I of Standard V.

For detailed information regarding Portland Campus Computing & Educational Media Services, refer to Exhibit 91.

5.D – Personnel and Management

In 2001 then-President Bull commissioned the Technology Integration Task Group to study the disparate technology organizations on-campus and recommend possible reorganization for improved efficiency and service. The group advised combining web services, administrative computing, telecommunications, and academic computing functions into one organization, Integrated Technology Services (ITS), headed by the chief technology officer (CTO).

In 1992 Linfield increased two part-time positions in ITS to full-time to bring the technology staff up to 5 FTE at that time. Since then, staff growth has remained steady and now includes 21 positions, two of which report to the library director. The seven most recent additions since 2002 are below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hire Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Engineer</td>
<td>8/2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datatel Programmer/Analyst I</td>
<td>1/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>7/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Instructional Support</td>
<td>10/2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows System Administrator</td>
<td>8/2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Media Support</td>
<td>7/2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Programmer</td>
<td>9/2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Increasingly common and more sophisticated security threats strongly suggest that Linfield will require additional staffing to address this challenge. Growing numbers of requests for new administrative software modules in the Datatel system, as well as enhancements to existing modules, are also difficult to accommodate with existing ITS staff. Both areas will require attention in the not too distant future.

5.E – Planning and Evaluation

Funding technology at Linfield is adequate for current needs and is well established in the budget process. Equipment is purchased from a variety of budget sources, including small amounts in the Integrated Technology Services budgets. Other larger funding sources include separate allocations from the general budget for administrative and academic technology purchases. In addition, since 1994 each student has paid an infrastructure fee; initially set at $50/year, the fee has increased annually at the same rate as tuition. In 2007–08 that fee was $176/year. A voice and data access fee is added to the college residential fees to support those services. This fee increases proportionally to room fees and is $158/year for the 2007–08 year. Finally, departments have the
option of adding laboratory fees for supplemental equipment, including information technology, if other funding sources are not sufficient to meet pedagogical goals. While Linfield College’s goal is to allocate sufficient funds to replace computers on average every four years, we achieve a somewhat longer replacement cycle of a little less than five years [Exhibit 89].

The Information Technology Advisory Committee (ITAC) has oversight of planning and policy activities related to Integrated Technology Services. This committee was created by the then-President Bull and includes membership from the Cabinet, ITS, and the library as well as two faculty members, one administrator, one student, and one hourly employee.

Surveys conducted periodically by faculty standing committees often address technology issues. The 2006 Faculty Survey conducted by the Faculty Executive Council (FEC) poll faculty on a variety of issues, including several related to technology. The Academic Support Committee polled faculty on the McMinnville Campus in 2007 about various aspects of instructional support, including technology. The chief technology officer is an ex officio member of that committee, which provides oversight of ITS as it fulfills its mission of providing support for the academic mission of the College. Significant results of each survey are described below.

While overall satisfaction with Integrated Technology Services was good, responses to several questions in the 2006 Faculty Survey revealed dissatisfaction with levels of support and training available to faculty in technology areas [Exhibit 92]. In response, the library director, strongly endorsed by the chief technology officer, requested a media support position to assist with classroom technology needs. Because of the growing use of the web to provide a wide range of services to internal and external campus constituencies, the CTO requested an additional web programmer. Both positions have been funded in the 2008–09 budget.

Similarly, the 2007 Academic Support Committee survey affirmed faculty hunger for better technology support and training, as well as for more “smart” classrooms equipped with projectors, computers and network connections. Several academic departments seek better computer lab facilities as well [Exhibit 92]. See Standard VIII for discussion of the institution’s efforts to plan for these needs into the future.

Conclusion

Linfield has used the past decade to make wise and necessary investments in an increasingly sophisticated and interconnected informational technology resource base that includes the library. Taken together, the improvements made to each of the two areas addressed in this standard have enabled the college to rise to the challenges of delivering a 21st century undergraduate education while supporting a professionally engaged, pedagogically ambitious faculty. Given the dizzying speed of change in these areas, the need to keep both the library and the informational technology infrastructure sufficiently prepared to support teaching and professional activity will only become more intense. Like all small liberal arts colleges, Linfield struggles to balance limited resources with a high standard of service in the fields of librarianship and information technology. While this document accurately portrays Linfield as achieving such balance, it is inherently precarious and will require continued vigilance to maintain. This self-study has thus highlighted a number of strategic concerns going forward in each area.

The Library

What is a reasonable expectation for Linfield in the pursuit of enough bandwidth for the digital world of scholarship, teaching and learning, and social activities on the Internet? The past and present make clear that there is never enough bandwidth available for all worthy needs.
How will the college manage to sustain adequate content delivered over the bandwidth? In this format-agnostic age, students primarily want digitally delivered information. Faculty want excellence of scholarly information, preferably available online. Pricing models push libraries to ignore archived material in favor of appropriate resources that will actually be used.

How will the professionals in the library and Integrated Technology Services keep student and faculty attentive to both the promise and the perils of the digital age? In the past, the Linfield community operated in a culture of resource scarcity compensated for by an abundance of attention. Now community members move within a culture of resource abundance but scarce attention. Research demonstrates that students use information that is quick and good enough. Faculty members want students to use scholarly information that may be more than two clicks away.

How might a deeper and wider culture of assessment at Linfield operate within the library so that all are working together to help students understand that bandwidth and resources, data and information, must be used in a meaningful way to create knowledge?

How can library personnel provide the training faculty seek to inform their pedagogy with appropriate technological applications to make a meaningful difference in student learning?

**Information Technology Services**

How will the college handle the funding challenges ahead? Funding for ITS is structured to grow along with enrollment and tuition increases, while the cost of equipment continues to fall. Yet expectations for the increased use of technology continue to put pressure on budgets, especially for infrastructure costs associated with networks, servers, and Internet bandwidth.

How will the accompanying staffing challenges of expanding informational technology infrastructure be managed? Determination of essential services will continue to provoke debate and compromise for the college as a whole.

In a world fraught with identity theft, viruses, and hackers, constant vigilance will need to be maintained. Sufficient—and sufficiently sophisticated—security also has budget and staffing implications.

How do we know that what we do is the right approach for Linfield faculty and students? ITS will continue to assess its services and acquisition options rigorously and regularly.

How does ITS contribute in a necessary and productive way to faculty and staff professional development regarding new technology? Employees have difficulty finding time to keep up with technology. Accessible training is the answer, but providing it when and how they might best be able to participate proves more challenging.

How does the college keep up with escalating demands for a multipurpose website that needs to serve a wide variety of distinctive needs? The addition of a second web programmer in fall 2008, as well as the acquisition of more tools to assist content providers in placing information on the web, will benefit the college, yet the need will continue to swell beyond current resources (human and financial) to manage.
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Linfield College has a proud and continuous tradition of governance under an independent Board of Trustees since it was granted a charter in 1858. The board bears formal and final responsibility for the constitution and succession of its members, for control and management of all college assets, for the hiring of college officers, including the president, and for delegating proper scope and authority to the administration and faculty, so that these groups enjoy powers and responsibilities appropriate to their respective positions within the college.

Subject to board oversight, the administration bears primary responsibility for administering the budget, for acquisition and maintenance of physical resources, for hiring and supervision of personnel, for recommendations on tenure and promotion, and for maintaining positive relations with alumni, friends, and leaders outside the immediate Linfield community.

The faculty bears primary responsibility for defining the substance of and delivering the college's academic program. It also has a prominent role in tenure and promotion decisions, in establishing admissions and retention policy, in advising on the annual budget, and in establishing and monitoring the college's strategic plan.

The Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC) is responsible for the administration of student clubs and club sports and for overseeing all student-run media, including The Linfield Review (newspaper), KSLC (radio station), and the electronic bulletin board available as a public folder through the email server for posting student news, events, for sale items and a general forum. An association of nonexempt employees (the Linfield Employees Association) advises the administration on policies with respect to their employment at the college.

A partnership between faculty and students comprising the College Judicial Council advises the dean of students and president with respect to student conduct. A partnership among administration, faculty, students, and nonexempt employees is responsible for advising the president and trustees on establishing the annual budget and the three-year budget projections. Students are represented on all faculty and college-wide committees dealing with student issues, including the Curriculum Committee; the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee; the Enrollment, Retention and Student Life Committee; the Academic Support Committee and the College Judicial Council. Both faculty and students hold one position each as full voting members on the Board of Trustees.

6.A – Governance System

6.A.1 The system of governance ensures that the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among and between the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students are clearly described in a constitution, charter, bylaws, or equivalent policy document.

The Bylaws of Linfield College, last significantly revised in 2007 and further revised as to membership in May 2008, [Exhibit 1] establish the size and composition of the Board of Trustees, outline its duties, describe the roles of the president and other officers of the college, and delegate appropriate responsibilities to the Faculty Assembly. The bylaws are published in key documents such as the Faculty Handbook and the Linfield College Trustee Handbook [Exhibits 2, 3]. They are also available on the college website (www.linfield.edu/policy/bylaws.pdf). Institution-wide policies appear in the Common Chapter of all Linfield College employee handbooks [Exhibit 6].
6.A.2 The governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students understand and fulfill their respective roles as set forth by the governance system’s official documents.

The college bylaws outline the roles and responsibilities of the board, the president, the officers of the college, and the Faculty Assembly. The duties of each constituency are also defined in their respective handbooks [Exhibit 2–16]. Formal orientations introduce new trustees, faculty, and students to these documents and include sessions explaining the governance system. Both the Office of Human Resources and direct supervisors provide an introduction to the college for employees at the time of hiring and thereafter. Members of the various college constituencies participate on college committees and report information back to the appropriate assembly or association to foster coordinated implementation of the college’s mission and goals. Committee memberships are updated annually. See Exhibits 17 for a list of 2007–08 standing committees, ad-hoc committees, task forces and compliance officers. Committee membership and terms of service appear in each constituency’s handbooks.

6.A.3 The system of governance makes provision for the consideration of faculty, student, and staff views and judgments in those matters in which these constituencies have a direct and reasonable interest.

The governance system facilitates communication and provides forums for each constituency to express its views and judgments in matters of common interest. As noted in 6.A.2, each constituency—students, faculty, administration, and nonexempt employees—has appropriate membership in key committees throughout the college governance structure [Exhibits 3–16]. Key administrators such as the president, vice president for academic affairs, dean of continuing education, director of international programs, dean of students, dean of nursing, director of the Portland Campus, library director, and registrar are voting members of the Faculty Assembly. In spring 2008 the president began convening meetings at least once a semester between the cabinet and the Faculty Executive Council. The dean of students and director of college activities regularly attend meetings of the Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC), and the ASLC president routinely attends the open meetings of the Faculty Assembly. The Board of Trustees proudly includes both a student and faculty member as officially elected members.

As noted in Standard 1, Linfield’s institution-wide Planning Council arose in 1999 as a direct response to the college’s 1998 accreditation process. Its purpose has been to provide a college-wide forum (through membership from each of the college’s constituencies—the President’s Cabinet, trustees, faculty, administrators, nonexempt employees, and students) to discuss strategic issues of import across the college. The Council serves as an advisory group to the president on planning and assessment at the institution. Through its membership, it intersects with other deliberative groups on-campus but makes recommendations only; the Council does not prescribe policy or issue directives.

6.A.4 In a multi-unit governance system (state or district), the division of authority and responsibility between the central system office and the institution is clearly delineated. System policies, regulations, and procedures concerning the institution are clearly defined and equitably administered.

Linfield College does not have multiple units of governance as defined by this standard.
6.B – Governing Board

6.B.1 The board includes adequate representation of the public interest and/or the diverse elements of the institution's constituencies and does not include a predominant representation by employees of the institution. The president may be an ex officio member of the board, but not its chair. Policies are in place that provide for continuity and change of board membership.

The Linfield College Board of Trustees may total a maximum of 51 members. Following a bylaw change in May 2008, at least six trustee positions must be allocated to members of the American Baptists Churches U.S.A. Three board members can be proposed by the Alumni Council; one member is nominated by the Faculty Assembly; and one nominee represents the Associated Students of Linfield College. All nominations are submitted to the Committee on Trustees, which recommends action to the full Board of Trustees. Members serve staggered three-year terms, with the exception of the student trustee, who is elected annually, and the faculty trustee, who is elected every two years. The college president is an ex officio member of the board and serves at its pleasure. Historically, no members nominated by the Board of Trustees, the local regions of the American Baptist Churches, or the Alumni Council are employees of the institution at the time of appointment. The vice chairs and secretary are elected from among the members of the board. Currently the Linfield College Board of Trustees has 37 members consisting of 21 at-large, eight affiliated with the American Baptist Churches, two alumni, one faculty, one student, and the president of Linfield College [Exhibits 1 and 19]. The 23 current emeriti members may attend board meetings and sit on committees but do not vote.

The board meets three times per year. It sets policy for the college as a whole, hires and evaluates the president, and approves appointment of administrative officers. This includes the vice president for finance and administration/chief financial officer, who also serves as treasurer of the college. The board approves the annual budget and monitors expenditures, manages the endowment, acts on tenure and promotion recommendations of the dean and president, engages in strategic planning, approves faculty recommendations for awarding degrees, bestows honorary degrees and emeritus status, and acts in all other ways to fulfill custodial and fiduciary responsibilities associated with the general welfare of Linfield College.

6.B.2 The board acts only as a committee of the whole. No member or subcommittee of the board acts in place of the board except by formal delegation of authority.

The board acts as a committee of the whole, save where college bylaws have delegated specific authority to its Executive Committee. The Executive Committee is empowered in special circumstances to act on “orders and resolutions not otherwise specifically committed or provided for.” In all cases it must report its actions to the full board, which has authority to accept or reject an action of the Executive committee. The Executive Committee typically meets once or twice between each of the regular board meetings.

6.B.3 The duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, organizational structure, and operating procedures of the board are clearly defined in a published policy document.
College bylaws clearly specify the duties, organizational structure, and operating procedures of the board and are widely publicized. The college conflict of interest policy binds the trustees in the same fashion that binds other constituencies (administrators, faculty and nonexempt employees) with authority to transact college business. Trustees are obliged annually to sign a “no conflict of interest” statement. Institution-wide policies and a copy of the Bylaws of Linfield College are included in the Common Chapter of all Linfield College employee handbooks and in the trustee handbook [Exhibits 2, 6].

6.B.4 Consistent with established board policy, the board selects, appoints, and regularly evaluates the chief executive officer.

The board selects and appoints the president of Linfield College (its chief executive officer). The Executive Committee of the Board evaluates the performance of the president on an ongoing basis throughout the year and each spring leads a discussion on their conclusions in executive session with the full board. Board officers will be available to the accreditation team to answer questions about this process.

6.B.5 The board regularly reviews and approves the institution's mission. It approves all major academic, vocational, and technical programs of study, degrees, certificates, and diplomas. It approves major substantive changes in institutional mission, policies, and programs.

The Board of Trustees approves major substantive changes in institutional mission, policies, and programs, reviews the strategic recommendations of administration and faculty, and approves all major academic certificates and degrees [Exhibit 1]. In April 2001 the board convened a Mission Statement Revision Committee to lead an institution-wide conversation about the mission of Linfield College. Subsequently the board adopted a revised mission statement in May 2002. At its May 2007 retreat, the board reviewed its practices and developed strategies for improved operation in light of the revised mission statement. (See Standard 1).

6.B.6 The board regularly evaluates its performance and revises, as necessary, its policies to demonstrate to its constituencies that it carries out its responsibilities in an effective and efficient manner.

The board’s May 2007 retreat made individual trustee evaluation a central topic for discussion and future action. The 2008 board work plan identifies creation and implementation of these processes as priorities. The Committee on Trustees has established a framework for moving toward implementation and expects an individual trustee evaluation process to be approved in 2008. Prior to adoption of this more formal process, the Committee on Trustees has been responsible for board member evaluation and recommends improvements regarding board make-up, process, and function. The president provides a summary of board action following every Board of Trustees meeting and distributes it electronically to all members of the Linfield community so as to promote understanding of board process and decisions.

6.B.7 The board ensures that the institution is organized and staffed to reflect its mission, size, and complexity. It approves an academic and administrative structure or organization to which it delegates the responsibility for effective and efficient management.
The board reviews and approves the academic and administrative structure of the college. In addition to the president, the senior officers include the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty; the vice president for finance and administration/chief financial officer/treasurer; the vice president for student affairs; the vice president for college relations; the associate vice president for academic affairs/director of the Portland Campus, and the dean of enrollment management. The staffing and reporting structure for each senior officer is reviewed periodically. Organization charts, both administrative and academic, are included in Exhibit 20. Each officer meets regularly with the entire board, with its Executive Committee, and with other associated board committees.

While the board delegates appropriate academic authority to the president and the vice president for academic affairs, it retains responsibility for reviewing and assuring that staff levels reflect the overall institutional mission and sufficiently support the academic programs of the college. This oversight occurs particularly through the work of the board’s Academic Affairs Committee and the Executive Committee.

According to information presented in Institutional Data 2007 [Exhibit 21], a 1.0 faculty FTE is defined as a standard nine month contract (12 month = 1.22; 11 month = 1.11) while a 1.0 exempt FTE consists of a standard, full-time 12 month contract. A 1.0 nonexempt FTE is defined as 40 hours/week over 12 months of the year. Linfield College currently operates with 37% full-time administrative, 36% full-time instructional and 27% full-time staff employees (see 6.B Figure 2 below). In 2007, the college employed 148 faculty FTE, 151 administrator FTE, and 106 staff FTE. This represents an increase of 10% FTE in faculty, 44% FTE in administration, and 9% FTE in staff over the last decade. The higher growth in administrative positions is partially due to a reclassification of nonexempt staff to administrative lines, particularly in 2000. The increase also reflects expansion of services to students and a revision of some educators’ categories. As such, it mirrors national trends toward growth in administrative ranks for similar reasons across higher education. For example, since 1998, newly hired athletic coaches hold administrative rather than faculty appointments. Certain other educational support personnel hold the administrative title “instructional associate” (in computer science and theatre, for example). See Standard 4—Faculty for further information. Trends in staffing appear in 6.B Figure 1 below.

According to information presented in Institutional Data 2007 [Exhibit 21], a 1.0 faculty FTE is defined as a standard nine month contract (12 month = 1.22; 11 month = 1.11) while a 1.0 exempt FTE consists of a standard, full-time 12 month contract. A 1.0 nonexempt FTE is defined as 40 hours/week over 12 months of the year. Linfield College currently operates with 37% full-time administrative, 36% full-time instructional and 27% full-time staff employees (see 6.B Figure 2 below). In 2007, the college employed 148 faculty FTE, 151 administrator FTE, and 106 staff FTE. This represents an increase of 10% FTE in faculty, 44% FTE in administration, and 9% FTE in staff over the last decade. The higher growth in administrative positions is partially due to a reclassification of nonexempt staff to administrative lines, particularly in 2000. The increase also reflects expansion of services to students and a revision of some educators’ categories. As such, it mirrors national trends toward growth in administrative ranks for similar reasons across higher education. For example, since 1998, newly hired athletic coaches hold administrative rather than faculty appointments. Certain other educational support personnel hold the administrative title “instructional associate” (in computer science and theatre, for example). See Standard 4—Faculty for further information. Trends in staffing appear in 6.B Figure 1 below.

### 6.B Figure 1 Trends in Employee FTE


At present, Linfield College appears to have slightly more full-time administrative and full-time instructional employees as a percentage of total employees, and slightly fewer full-time staff employees, in comparison to the average among Linfield’s PACCON (Pacific Consortium of West Coast Small Colleges) comparison group (see 6.B Figure 2 below).
6.B Figure 2 Full-time Staffing Proportions – Fall 2006 Peer Comparison

Linfield, full-time employees only - All Campuses

- Staff, 27%
- Instructional, 36%
- Administrative, 37%

PACCON Average, full-time employees only

- Staff, 32%
- Instructional, 34%
- Administrative, 34%

Source: IPEDS, Employees by Assigned Position, Fall 2006.

6.B.8 The board approves the annual budget and the long-range financial plan, and reviews periodic fiscal audit reports.

The board reviews budgetary information at each of its meetings. The Financial Affairs Committee meets at least three times per year to receive budget updates and projections, and reports to the full board on the college’s budget status. Additionally, the chair of the Financial Affairs Committee sits on the Executive Committee of the board and participates in each of its three sessions apart from the full board. At all six meetings the president and vice president for finance and administration/chief financial officer report on the financial health of the institution.

Upon consultation with the administration, the Financial Affairs Committee presents the next year’s budget to the full board at its winter meeting, at which time revenue decisions involving tuition, fees, room, and board are approved. The expenditures side of the upcoming budget is finalized at the spring Executive Committee meeting, when student recruitment projections are more advanced. To date, the original proposed budget presented to the trustees at the winter meeting has consistently been submitted for approval at the spring meeting.

An independent auditor is annually selected by the Board of Trustees upon the recommendation of the Audit Committee (once a subcommittee of the trustee Financial Affairs Committee but in September 2007 established as its own standing committee). The Audit Committee receives the audit report and accompanying management letter. Copies of the audit are distributed to and reviewed with trustees at the fall board meeting (See Standards Seven and Nine).

The college budgeting process has been informed at its early stages by a long range planning model, although this model has not played a direct role in budget negotiations themselves [Exhibit 22]. With the 2007 hiring of Vice President for Finance and Administration/Chief Financial Officer Glenn
Ford, the college has begun working toward a formalized budgeting procedure that projects impacts of current planning efforts across three years. This approach should be in place for the 2009–10 budget. The *Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12* also assists in developing multi-year budget planning in line with the long range institutional priorities identified in the annual Planning Council Budget Priorities memo [Exhibits 23, 24].

6.B.9 The board is knowledgeable of the institution's accreditation status and is involved, as appropriate, in the accrediting process.

Oral reports on the progress of the self-study have been given regularly at board meetings since spring 2006. The board knows the institution’s accreditation status and recognizes the importance of re-accreditation. Two board members sit on the Accreditation Steering Committee that drafted this report (Rev. Bernard L. Turner and attorney Pamela L. Jacklin); they are responsible, respectively, for Standards 1 and 9. Trustees have also been involved in strategic planning efforts, which comprise an essential facet of the accreditation process.

6.C – Leadership and Management

6.C.1 The chief executive officer's full-time responsibility is to the institution.

The president of Linfield College serves as the chief executive officer of the institution and undertakes very broad and far ranging responsibilities, both internally and externally. His position description in Article IX of the bylaws [Exhibit 1] makes clear that his full-time responsibility lies with the college. Additional summaries of the position are found in administrator and faculty handbooks [Exhibits 3 and 4]. The performance of the president is assessed on an ongoing basis by the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. The board chair leads discussion of the evaluation with the trustees during the yearly spring meeting.

6.C.2 The duties, responsibilities, and ethical conduct requirements of the institution's administrators are clearly defined and published. Administrators act in a manner consistent with them.

The duties, responsibilities, and ethical standards of the administration hold vital importance for the college’s effectiveness in executing its institutional mission. Linfield’s conflict of interest, standards of performance, and anti-harassment policies combine to outline the ethical conduct requirements for all employees and representatives of the college [Exhibit 6]. The duties and responsibilities of senior officers are detailed in the Bylaws of Linfield College [Exhibit 1]. The *Administrators Handbook*, revised and updated in October 2006, details conditions for employment. The senior director of Human Resources keeps a file of job descriptions for all positions. Performance evaluations of every administrator are submitted to the Office of Human Resources, where the director reviews them to ensure that each employee fulfills assigned duties and responsibilities competently and ethically while adhering to college policies and procedures.

6.C.3 Administrators are qualified to provide effective educational leadership and management. The chief executive officer is responsible for implementing appropriate procedures to evaluate administrators regularly.
Hiring practices for all administrative positions are centralized in the Office of Human Resources. Each administrator employed is qualified to provide effective educational leadership and management at the institution [Exhibits 25, 26]. Linfield consistently hires and retains dedicated staff, many holding regional and national leadership roles within their professional fields.

Each senior officer of the college is evaluated by the president yearly. Current college policy states that all administrators are to be reviewed annually. The most recent set of annual evaluations was completed by September 1, 2008 and have been submitted to the Office of Human Resources. The new Director of Human Resources, hired in February 2008, has begun to review existing administrator evaluation policy for further improvements in the near future.

6.C.4 Institutional advancement activities (which may include development and fund raising, institutional relations, alumni and parent programs) are clearly and directly related to the mission and goals of the institution.

Institutional advancement activities (including development and fund-raising, external relations, and programs for parents and alumni) clearly support the mission and goals of the college (see Standard 1.B.4). Linfield’s mission also provides the foundation upon which the Office of College Relations and the president base their outreach to friends and supporters of the college. Proposals to outside granting organizations regularly incorporate the college mission into the submitted documents.

Linfield’s 33 years of balanced budgets reflect, among other factors, the effectiveness of institutional advancement efforts to engage others in its mission and vision. In 2006–07 the endowment grew 19% due to new gifts, market growth and prudent spending policies [Exhibit 27]. Since 1998 net assets have risen by 89% (see Standard 7–7 Table 1).

In 2006–07 the college budget totaled $48.4 million. Unrestricted funds received from the Annual Fund (“Linfield Fund for Excellence”), local fund-raising (McMinnville’s “Partners-In-Progress”), and general appeals to parents, alumni, and friends, furnish a portion of the college’s operating budget. The annual goal for unrestricted giving originates in the President’s Cabinet, which sends it as a recommendation through the college budgeting process (see Standards 7.A.1 and 7.A.3). This recommendation reflects consensus within the cabinet and rests upon the advice of the vice president for college relations, who considers such factors as past contribution levels, present
donor sources, donor base demographics, consultants’ advice, and future campaign expectations.

During its very successful capital campaign “The Defining Moment,” Linfield enjoyed higher levels of restricted giving than had been the previous norm until 2004. Like many colleges, Linfield has also experienced declines in unrestricted giving while enjoying increases in restricted gifts. Nonetheless, the college has recovered from its lowest levels of unrestricted giving (2002–03). See Standard 7–Finance for further detail.

Like a great many institutions of higher education, Linfield seeks to increase the percentage of alumni who contribute to the college. A decline in that percentage over the past few years reflects larger graduating classes, higher student debt loads, and intensified competition for charitable dollars. Current participation stands at 22% of McMinnville Campus alumni. In 2006 a new Alumni Leadership Council was launched, and the volunteer board members of the President’s Circle (annual gifts exceeding $1000) now actively solicit new donors [Exhibit 28].

Linfield has experienced growth rates of 20–30% per year in gifts at the $1000+ level thanks to increased staff and volunteer efforts in this area. A new parents' organization provides both advice and fund-raising support to the college. At present the college has entered the early "quiet" stage of a major multi-year fundraising campaign. All of these efforts should lead to growth in unrestricted gifts.

Alumni of the Portland Campus and the Division of Continuing Education receive one direct mail solicitation per year [Exhibit 29] and give modestly in comparison to McMinnville Campus alumni. Fundraising is expected to increase on the Portland Campus with the addition of an Alumni and Development Officer in fall 2008.

The Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 [Exhibit 24] identifies the importance of expanding the financial resources of the institution, both through restricted funds (primarily from foundations, corporations and major donors) and increased unrestricted gifts, as well as other means of expanding the endowment. The newly launched capital campaign cited above has grown directly out of the strategic planning process (see Standard 1–Introduction and 1.A.4). Headed by the vice chair of the Board of Trustees, the Capital Campaign Committee has adopted a three-pronged focus: endowed faculty resources, endowed scholarships, and renovated facilities. A Business Advisory Council was created in 2006–07 to assist with fund-raising for Department of Business facilities improvements and outreach programming.

The president meets at least twice monthly with the vice president for college relations to discuss foundation and individual donor prospects while reviewing college needs and priorities. The vice president for academic affairs also meets regularly with the president and/or vice president for college relations to discuss these priorities. Additional administrators (both from college relations and academic affairs) often participate in such meetings. The director of corporate and foundation relations works directly with individual faculty members interested in submitting grant proposals to support their work and advance college educational goals. When initiatives seen as furthering the priorities articulated in the strategic plan arise among faculty or administrators, they are recommended for further campus analysis by the Planning Council and the relevant standing committees.

6.C.5 Administrators ensure that the institutional decision-making process is timely.

Administrators ensure that the institutional decision-making process is timely.
6.C.6 Administrators facilitate cooperative working relationships, promote coordination within and among organizational units, and encourage open communication and goal attainment.

The senior administration places a high priority on decision-making guided by collaboration, communication, and consensus. Some at the college feel decisions occur too slowly; others contend they happen too quickly. All three employee groups (nonexempt, administrative, and faculty) conduct assembly meetings every month [Exhibits 30, 31, 32]. The college’s institutional committee structure assures representation from all constituent groups, as noted in faculty and administrator handbooks as appropriate [Exhibits 3, 4].

While the president is ultimately responsible to the board for institutional decisions, he relies on the various assemblies for advice. He also consults the President’s Cabinet (the officers of the college) and the Planning Council (chaired by the vice-president for academic affairs and populated by four faculty members, four administrators, two nonexempt staff, one trustee and two students).

Decisions are sometimes announced at various assembly meetings; more often they are communicated through email. The president and other senior officers attend the faculty and administrative assembly meetings every month; the dean of students and/or designee attends all meetings of the Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC). The President’s Cabinet meets with the executive board of the Linfield Employees Association at least twice per year, as well as annually with the Administrators’ Leadership Council. Beginning in spring 2008 the cabinet will convene at least once each semester with the Faculty Executive Council.

Members of the current Accreditation Steering Committee conducted a number of employee surveys asking faculty, staff, and administrators about governance, particularly with regard to communication and cooperative decision-making. Faculty were surveyed in fall 2006, nonexempt staff were surveyed in fall 2007, and administrators were surveyed in spring 2008. All three constituencies affirmed the desire to have their voices heard during deliberations on important college issues. Amid clear improvements in this area, evidence indicates that room for improvement remains. Faculty survey results are reported in 6.D.

While the response rate among nonexempt employees proved too low to suggest any conclusions (due in great part to lack of access by most workers to equipment on which to complete the electronic questionnaire), the co-chairs of the Accreditation Steering Committee subsequently met with the governing board of the Linfield Employees’ Association (LEA) to discuss governance. The board members explained efforts to enhance employee attendance at their monthly meetings as a significant means of fostering familiarity with the college mission and the contributions of all staff members to its enactment. More sustained efforts have been launched to involve Portland Campus employees in LEA meetings and board deliberations. During the 2005–06 interim presidency of Dr. Marv Henberg, the LEA board began bi-annual meetings with the cabinet, a practice continued under President Hellie. The LEA Board regards this action as having strengthened communication and good will among nonexempt employees. Board members reiterated the dedication to Linfield that makes nonexempt employees eager to understand institutional challenges and decisions. For this reason, two members of LEA sit on the all-college Planning Council.

The administrators’ survey drew a 59% response rate. The 88 respondents registered a collective 3.0 (on a five-point scale) regarding a question asking whether they had adequate opportunity to contribute to college governance. In a meeting of the Administrators’ Leadership Council with the accreditation co-chairs, the participants noted that the monthly Administrators’ Assembly meeting is now run by the chair of the Leadership Council rather than the college
president, as was true a decade ago. Council members explained that administrators recognize their assembly is not a policy setting body but rather serves to distribute information and solicit feedback on key issues. They understand that the nature of “shared governance” emphasizes the interplay among the board, senior administration, and the faculty and as such does not directly encompass the general administrative ranks. They also acknowledge the existence of communication avenues to allow them input into governing decisions at the college. For example, three administrators (aside from the vice president for academic affairs) sit on the Planning Council; some administrators are voting members of the Faculty Assembly (director of the library, registrar, director of international programs, dean of continuing education); many sit ex officio on various faculty standing committees. Through the college officers under which each administrator serves, individual and departmental concerns can also surface at the bi-monthly cabinet meetings. That said, the Leadership Council sees a value in taking greater measures to educate the collective administrator cohort in the relevance of the Strategic Plan 2007–12 for their respective areas.

Both former President Bull and President Hellie have introduced new opportunities for trustee interaction with faculty and staff. Faculty liaisons (typically the chairs of the relevant faculty committees) have joined administrative resource staff at the board’s standing committee meetings three times a year. During board sessions, lunch and dinner sessions also provide opportunities for informal interaction and discussion across groups.

6.C.7 Administrators responsible for institutional research ensure that the results are widely distributed to inform planning and subsequent decisions that contribute to the improvement of the teaching-learning process.

From 2003 through 2007, the college employed one full-time institutional research (IR) administrator who reported to the registrar and oversaw compilation of the annual college fact book (Institutional Data). Research is also conducted throughout the college administrative structure; for example, the Office of Finance and Administration reports IPEDS financial data; the Office of Enrollment Services oversees retention analysis; and the Office of Academic Affairs currently handles salary benchmarking. In 2008–09, management of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will fall to the IR administrator (having previously been handled in the Office of Academic Affairs). In January 2008, the institutional researcher began reporting to the senior advisor to the president and now more fully oversees the coordination, collection, analysis and distribution of college data.

The annual fact book (approximately 85–90 pages) includes longitudinal detail on admission, enrollment and retention, financial aid, student body, faculty and staff, academic programs, alumni, finances, grounds and facilities [Exhibit 21]. Its selected annual distribution list appears on p. iv and its contents are available to everyone with appropriate login access on the college website (www.linfield.edu/research/index.php).

6.C.8 Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointment, evaluation, retention, promotion, and/or termination are published, accessible, and periodically reviewed.

Policies, procedures, and criteria for administrative and staff appointment, evaluation, promotion, and/or termination are published, accessible and periodically reviewed to ensure compliance with federal and state employment laws, update changes in benefit plans, and reflect changes in college policies. The Office of Human Resources publishes and explains the
policies and procedures guiding personnel decisions. As an equal opportunity employer, the college strives to recognize the individual circumstances and qualities of its employees while following policies to assure fair and legal practices.

The college continually strives to improve working conditions, build employee morale, and maintain a congenial working environment. Employees may at any time meet with a supervisor or human resources staff member to consult about and/or seek interpretation of the policies and procedures governing their employment. All employee policies and handbooks are accessible through Linfield’s Human Resources home page at www.linfield.edu/policy/. The Common Chapter found in each employee handbook (last updated in spring 2008) contains policies and procedures applicable to all employees. In addition to providing definitions of employees and the college’s equal opportunity statement, it delineates the following policies: internal job posting, background investigation, retention of personnel records, employees’ standards of performance and corrective action, anti-harassment, drugs and alcohol, smoking, violence in the workplace, safety standards, emergency preparedness plan, conflict of interest, employee benefits, and leaves of absence. The Common Chapter is updated as needed to reflect changes in employment laws and college policies [Exhibit 6].

In addition to the personnel policies and procedures manual, the Linfield Employees’ Association (LEA) Agreement outlines the conditions of employment operative for nonexempt (hourly) employees [Exhibit 5]. The agreement is reviewed every three years and may be revised at any time by mutual consent (the last revision occurred in spring 2008). It describes procedures for hiring, internal job posting, classification and pay guidelines, the 90-day assessment period, job performance counseling as a disciplinary measure, discharge for cause, and conflict resolution.

Administrators’ conditions of employment are outlined in the Handbook for Administrators. Reviewed periodically by the director of human resources in conjunction with the Administrator Handbook Committee, the document was last revised in October 2007 [Exhibit 4]. The handbook delineates standards of performance and explains procedures for performance evaluations (including corrective action), conflict resolution, recruitment, and request for reclassification. It also contains the job classification system, including position grades and the accompanying salary matrix.

Administrators and nonexempt staff may be promoted through the reclassification system. Individuals may apply for a position with a higher grade through the internal job posting process, or may be promoted from within their current department by the department head. The college is an “at-will” employer. Terminations are decided in consultation with the director of human resources and the vice president for finance and administration/chief financial officer, requiring their prior approval.

Linfield’s web site provides employees and potential employees with easy access to handbooks, agreements, manuals, open positions, and benefit summaries (www.linfield.edu/humanresources/). Employees’ personnel files, benefit plan documents, job descriptions, benefit forms, job applications, application files, salary matrixes, and other employment documents reside in the Office of Human Resources.

6.C.9 Administrators’ and staff salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain competent personnel consistent with the mission and goals of the institution.

To retain its institutional vitality the college recognizes the importance of hiring and retaining qualified personnel through competitive salaries and benefits. Toward that
end, the Board of Trustees in May 2005 adopted the PACCON colleges as the relevant comparison group for monitoring faculty and administrator compensation, with the understanding that the compensation data from these schools will be geographically adjusted to reflect cost of living differences. The Board of Trustees has adopted a benchmark range of 85% to 100% of the geographically adjusted PACCON mean for both faculty and administrators [Exhibits 34 and 35]. The Trustee Compensation Committee reviews the benchmarking model yearly but has not revised it since its May 2005 implementation. The committee makes compensation-related recommendations to the president but budget decisions remain with the president.

Each year the college utilizes the compensation consulting firm HR Answers to conduct administrator and staff compensation surveys and analyze the data for all three employee groups to determine where each employee group stands relative to the benchmark range. Individual administrator positions are compared to similar positions at other PACCON institutions. Nonexempt salaries are compared to those in like positions within the local market [Exhibit 36]. Faculty compensation benchmarking procedures are discussed in Standard 4.A.4.

Recent analyses indicate that administrators’ and staff salaries and benefits are adequate to attract and retain competent personnel consistent with the mission and goals of the college. The administrative benchmarking process indicates that the average level of total compensation for administrators outside the President’s Cabinet lies within the college’s benchmark range of 85% to 100% of the average level of total compensation at PACCON schools for these employees (roughly at the median of the PACCON colleges). Because nonexempt staff positions are filled from the local labor market, compensation levels for those positions are gauged accordingly and have been judged to be competitive. The average length of service for all regular status employees (non-temporary status) as of March 2008 is 10 years of service. The Campus Benefits Committee consists of members from each employee group and meets yearly to advise on compensation and benefits issues. It has met yearly with the Trustee Compensation Committee to discuss pressing issues of the moment such as health care benefits, college retirement contributions, etc.

6.D – Faculty Role in Governance

The role of the faculty in institutional governance is stated clearly in the Bylaws of Linfield College, which are printed in both the Faculty Handbook and Linfield College Trustee Handbook. The bylaws may also be found on the college website under the human resources page (www.linfield.edu/policy/bylaws.pdf).

The bylaws [Exhibit 1] describe the Faculty Assembly as a deliberative legislative body empowered and required to perform certain functions in the educational life of the college. With the concurrence of the president and subject to approval by the Board of Trustees, the Faculty Assembly prescribes requirements for admission, courses of study, conditions of graduation, the nature of degrees conferred, rules and methods of conduct for the educational work of the college, and maintenance of a suitable environment for learning and professional activity. The Assembly also recommends candidates for academic degrees, reviews and discusses finalists for honorary degrees, and forwards the names of candidates for fellowships, scholarships, and prizes.

The Faculty Assembly meets monthly during the fall and spring semesters. Portland Campus faculty participate through video-conferencing with the McMinnville Campus. Members of the Faculty Assembly include (1) the president of the college and the vice president for academic affairs/dean of faculty, (2) those members of the teaching staff with the academic rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor who hold academic-year
contracts calling for teaching at least 40 percent of a full teaching load, and (3) the library director and those librarians who have academic rank and whose positions call for at least 40 percent of a full workload as professional librarians during the academic year.

The Faculty Assembly establishes, with the concurrence of the president, policies for the regulation of student publications, intercollegiate athletics, and musical, dramatic, forensic, political, and similar student organizations. In addition, the Assembly advises the president and appropriate college officers on policies governing extra-curricular activities.

The structure of the faculty governance system, developed to support the Faculty Assembly in carrying out its designated responsibilities, is defined in Chapter III of the Faculty Handbook [Exhibit 3]. Delivery of instruction occurs at the departmental level. Departments in turn constitute the college’s four academic divisions: Social and Behavioral Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Natural Science and Mathematics, and Portland Campus. The Faculty Executive Council (FEC) provides leadership for the Assembly, coordinates its standing committees, and acts as its proxy when the Assembly is not in session. FEC consists of an at-large chair, a faculty secretary, a faculty trustee, and the chairs of each division. According to the Faculty Handbook, the chair of the Faculty Executive Committee is the chief elected officer of the Faculty Assembly.

The faculty’s twelve standing committees are staffed by divisional representatives, and, in most cases, are led by an at-large chair nominated by FEC or from the floor of the Faculty Assembly. All committee chairs report to the full Assembly. In addition to faculty representatives, the majority of standing committees include students and administrators (ex officio). The standing committees of the Faculty Assembly are structured in direct relation to the Assembly’s areas of responsibility. For example, the Curriculum Committee recommends to the Assembly courses of study, conditions of graduation, and the nature of degrees to be conferred. The Admissions and Financial Aid Committee establishes the standards for admission. The Enrollment, Retention, and Student Life Committee recommends policies governing student organizations and extra-curricular activities. See Exhibit 17 for a full list of campus committees and chairs and Exhibit 18 for a chart aligning each faculty standing committee with its responsibilities as charged by the college bylaws. Though the Portland Campus School of Nursing has its own set of faculty committees, they are required to feed into the standing committees of the Faculty Assembly.

While the faculty governance system exists to enable the faculty to fulfill its role in college governance, heavy teaching loads and other service/administrative responsibilities tend to undermine its ability to operate effectively. Fully staffing standing committees is becoming increasingly difficult due to other faculty commitments. The Faculty Executive Council held a special all-division meeting in spring 2008 to begin discussing these issues, particularly as they intersect with the ongoing analysis being conducted by Faculty Workload Committee (see Standard 4.A.3).

The role of the faculty in planning and budgeting is delineated in the Faculty Handbook. The Faculty Benefits and Budget Committee advises the Faculty Assembly on compensation and other means to enhance the recruitment, retention, and professional growth of faculty. This committee also names three of its members to serve on the all-campus Budget Advisory Committee (BAC), which recommends a negotiated budget to the president each February. Four members of the faculty serve on the college Planning Council (see 6.A.3 above).

The faculty also play a significant role in the evaluation of faculty members. Through the standing committee structure, faculty advise the president and the board on standards of faculty competence and ethical conduct. Faculty members also review and recommend applicants for faculty appointment (through faculty search committees), and evaluate candidates for tenure,
promotion, and the granting of faculty status (through the Promotion and Tenure Committee). See Standard 4 for a complete discussion on this matter.

While no full-time faculty lines are associated with the Division of Continuing Education (DCE), its administrators and staff operate within the same governance system as the rest of the college through the oversight and consultation provided by the faculty’s Continuing Education Committee. Discussion of adjunct faculty (the vast majority of the instructors in DCE) occurs in Standard 4.

With regard to support from other constituencies for their role in shared governance, some faculty express concern that their responsibilities within the standing committee structure are not fully understood or supported by other constituencies of the college. On the 2006 Faculty Survey, the majority of respondents reported that the faculty are involved in the development of policies for student programs/services, but only 40% agreed (23% disagreed) with the statement that the faculty has a great deal of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility. Among respondents, 42% agreed (36% disagreed) with the idea that the faculty’s role in governance is valued by the central administration, and 18% agreed (36% disagreed) that the Board of Trustees values the faculty’s role in governance. Approximately 41% agreed (36% disagreed) that both their concerns and recommendations are taken seriously by the administration. These findings can be at least partially explained by perceptions that communication and working relationships between the faculty and other constituencies need redress. The survey reports competing readings of the situation: while 28% agree (38% disagree) with the statement that the faculty and the central administration work cooperatively in making decisions, 46% agree (19% disagree) that communications have been carried out in good faith. [Exhibit 37]. Efforts to improve in both of these areas are high priorities for senior administrators.

While long a part of the Faculty Handbook in both its online and print version, the college bylaws have not been available to all constituencies on the college website in a consistent fashion prior to spring 2008. Nor have the handbooks written for other employee groups mentioned the role of the faculty in institutional governance. These facts may explain the tensions that arise over faculty exercise of its governance responsibilities.

Discussions with the Faculty Executive Council indicate that governance concerns revolve primarily around the Faculty Assembly’s level of participation in some recent decisions that involve or intersect with its areas of responsibility. One example involves the Portland Campus transition from a four-year to a transfer-only two-year program. The first phase of this move followed two years of strategic analysis on the Portland Campus. After being vetted by the Planning Council, a recommendation was made to the president that the Portland Campus transition to a transfer-only program and action to that effect was taken administratively. Enrollment and staffing consequences of that move for the McMinnville Campus were not vetted with department chairs or the Faculty Assembly as a whole, however. Given the complexity of this change, the avenues taken to effect it did not fully prepare faculty for its impact, an outcome that suggests more structured involvement of standing committees might have helped to manage the resultant challenges.

Inviting more immediate concern is the fact that the current administrative governance structure does not provide for regular direct communication between the FEC, on behalf of the Faculty Assembly, and the president (although the FEC chair and vice chair meet at least monthly with the vice president for academic affairs to set the agenda for the upcoming Faculty Assembly). The previously existing President’s Advisory Council had provided one venue for such interaction with the full cabinet but it ceased to operate in spring 2007. After discussions on this matter, the president in spring 2008 began to schedule a joint meeting of the President’s Cabinet and FEC every semester.
FEC has also raised concerns that no formal intersecting structures exist between itself and the Planning Council (aside from the designated faculty liaison chosen from among the faculty representatives on the Council). Because the Council was created as a vehicle to foster improved communication about strategic planning, Council members share FEC’s desire to establish a clearer understanding of the scope of the Council’s responsibilities and its involvement with the standing committee structure. Accordingly, efforts at enhancing communication between the Planning Council (which the president regularly attends as a guest) and FEC are ongoing in 2008–09.

In relation to faculty concerns about the trustees’ understanding of and attentiveness to faculty responsibilities and concerns, President Hellie has made it a priority to foster increased interaction between board members and faculty both within the structure of trustee meetings and beyond. As noted in 6.A.3, faculty liaisons join each standing committee of the board during its meetings three times a year. Faculty attend small group dinners with the trustees at the winter board meeting—an opportunity that has been welcomed by both groups. Trustees are also welcome to attend classes when they are on-campus, and several have already done so. For its part, the board’s 2007 self-survey expresses members’ high regard for faculty expertise, dedication, and successes with students. The board seeks additional ways of communicating this appreciation for and attention to the issues that concern the faculty.

6.E – Student Role in Governance

Linfield College strongly believes in student representation in institutional governance. Students thus gain valuable leadership experience and often work with professionals from a variety of fields. They also bring an important perspective to administrative and faculty deliberations; in turn students learn the rationales behind college policies and practices. Those contributing to college governance processes provide a valued avenue of communication between the larger student body and the college administration.

In this regard, students serve as full voting members on many college-wide committees. The vice president of the Associated Students of Linfield College (ASLC), McMinnville Campus, is a fully vested member of the Board of Trustees. The ASLC president belongs to the Budget Advisory Committee. Students appointed by the ASLC president participate in all committees of the Faculty Assembly dealing with curriculum and curricular policy [Exhibits 11 and 12]. Students regularly sit on search committees for new faculty, administrators, and staff. The ASLC Senate is often asked by college committees and the President’s Cabinet to provide feedback on matters ranging from parking fees to master planning. ASLC student leaders in McMinnville reported to the accreditation co-chairs that they have been pleased with the opportunities available to students to contribute in meaningful ways to the shared governance of the college.

On the Portland Campus, the student government (ASLC-PC) functions in many of the same ways. The president appoints students to such bodies as the Nursing Curriculum Revision Committee [Exhibit 14, 15, 16]. Student leaders interviewed for this self-study report considerable satisfaction with faculty and administrative responsiveness to their concerns and input, particularly in relation to student life issues resulting from the move to a transfer-only campus.

Since most students in the Division of Continuing Education are distance learners and part-time students, they do not participate in most institutional governance activities regarding college planning, budgeting, and policy development. A DCE student does hold a voting position on the Continuing Education Committee, which advises on DCE issues. The DCE student handbook exists online.
Faculty, staff, and students all play a role in developing policies for student programs and services. Student clubs and organizations are expected to have a faculty or staff advisor.

Policy 6.1 Affirmative Action and Nondiscrimination

Educational institutions should contain within their environment the essence of the qualities they endeavor to impart, including the essential of nondiscrimination. They have a responsibility to develop selection and promotion standards and procedures based on principles which consider qualities, aptitudes, or talents simply as they pertain to the requirements of the position, with due regard for affirmative action. Institutions are expected to review their policies and procedures regularly to determine their validity in keeping with these principles.

Linfield College subscribes at all levels to the principle of nondiscrimination, as well as to the premise that promoting diversity through affirmative action enhances the learning environment. Both stand engrained in the explicit language of Linfield’s mission statement, which states that the college “honors the rich texture of diverse cultures and varied ways of understanding.” The Strategic Plan’s Foundational Education Principles Two and Three focus on Global and Multicultural Awareness as well as on Experiential Learning. Each reinforces the importance of nondiscrimination and diversity throughout the campus community. Accordingly, Linfield makes due regard to affirmative action in admission and hiring.

The college’s non-discrimination policy (printed on the inside front cover of the Linfield College Catalog and in the Common Chapter of all employee handbooks) commits the college not to discriminate in every legally mandated case: age, gender, race or ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, or disability. The depth of the college’s commitment to this principle is evidenced by its history. For example, the college archives hold a photograph of the class of 1902—four men, four women. Much more recently, the college adopted a policy of nondiscrimination based on sexual orientation in admissions and employment even though it was not then required to do so by law. Plainly, communal resolve to support nondiscrimination and diversity remains central to its commitment to fostering global and multicultural understanding throughout the college.

Linfield has long recognized its responsibility to develop selection and promotion standards and procedures for employees and students based on the qualities, aptitudes, or talents that pertain to the requirements of a position or the eligibility of future matriculants. Through its employment and admission practices, the college seeks to attract a diverse candidate pool. In 1998, considerable debate existed nationally about the legality of various affirmative action programs. Since then the United States Supreme Court has affirmed the importance of diversity in educational institutions and provided guidance on permissible programs to promote diverse student bodies. Linfield’s admission policies and practices have been legally affirmed by these decisions.

While Linfield observes many affirmative action procedures in spirit, the college has never been required to operate as an official affirmative action employer. With respect to the hiring of individuals from categories protected by federal statute, Linfield takes special measures to assure that the credentials of individuals from underrepresented populations are affirmatively presented. For instance, any member of a search committee may nominate to the finalist list an individual whose credentials may have been undervalued during the initial screening. Search committees are carefully instructed to evaluate credentials only on job-related factors.
Evaluation forms are tied explicitly to the position announcement to assure that only job factors publicized in advance are weighted in the screening process. After these affirmative measures are taken, however, committees recommend for appointment only the top-rated candidates, irrespective of gender, ethnic background or other protected classes. The college regards its policy and practice to be both ethically and legally sound. Given the hiring of a new director of human resources in February 2008, a further review of these policies and practices will occur in 2008–09 as part of her responsibilities.

With respect to admissions, affirmative measures are taken to attract as diverse a pool of applicants as possible. Gender is a neutral factor in admission decisions. Data on applicants’ ethnic status or disability are self-disclosed. No specific number of slots is dedicated to students in these categories, but when such information is available, data on ethnicity and disability are presented to the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee. These factors are weighed along with others (GPA, test scores, extracurricular accomplishments and interests, etc.) in deciding on individual cases. Members of the Admissions and Financial Aid Committee subscribe to the college's goal of attracting as diverse a student population as possible, consistent with the college’s view that diversity among students enhances the educational experience for all at the college. Admission is never given to a student whom the committee believes does not have a reasonable chance of success at Linfield.

In practice, claims of discrimination are dealt with by the processes appropriate to the category of employee or student as outlined in the appropriate handbook.

Conclusion

In a complex institution in which employees at all levels demonstrate passionate engagement with the health and well-being of the college, as well as commitment to its advancement, a participatory governance structure holds high value. To sustain active goodwill across the community, leaders in all sectors of the college recognize the importance of continuing to develop improved communication about concerns, priorities, and decision-making processes. All constituencies of the college have affirmed their desire to contribute to discussions around the key issues facing Linfield, particularly when the bylaws charge them with responsibilities in specific areas of college governance.

The preeminent roles in shared governance at Linfield College involve the trustees, the central administration, and the faculty. Recent revision of the college bylaws demonstrate trustee engagement with and commitment to Linfield’s smooth operation and advancement. With the successful hiring of a new president under a relatively new board chair, concerted effort is under way to strengthen the board’s role in building college resources and increasing faculty/trustee interactions to further the shared institutional mission. As the board moves the college firmly into the 21st century, it takes its responsibilities for the quality and integrity of the institution quite seriously and is particularly cognizant of the fact that the vitality of the college stands at the center of its vision for Linfield’s future. In this regard, the concerns raised in this standard regarding compensation have achieved special salience with the board, as evidenced by its creation of a standing Compensation Committee since the last accreditation visit. Improved compensation continues to be a priority across all constituencies. Although efforts have been made to establish benchmarking goals in all three areas, achieving and maintaining these goals continues to be on-going.

As noted in the preceding pages, approximately 23% of faculty respondents to the 2006 faculty survey disagreed with the statement that the faculty exercises significant autonomy in relation to its areas of responsibility under the bylaws; the number rises to approximately 36%
disagreement when the central administration or
the Board of Trustees is referenced directly. In
an effort to improve the consultative relationship
around college planning and decision-making,
the President’s Cabinet, the Faculty Executive
Council, and the Planning Council continue to
seek ways of ensuring timely discussion with the
faculty. On the other side of the issue is faculty
dismay with the workload impacts of current
governance practices. The spring 2008 report of
the ad hoc Faculty Workload Committee has
made a solid contribution to further institutional
examination of workload, while the 2008–09
FEC will look into ways of streamlining the
proliferation of committees that currently
support the governance role of the faculty.

As Linfield moves forward, questions about
balancing collaboration and consultation with
reasonable workload in service to institutional
governance will remain. Similarly, the college as
a whole faces the challenge of developing and
maintaining a nimble decision-making structure
to respond to dynamic changes in the higher
education landscape regionally and nationally.
Widespread interest exists, for example, in
reducing the labor-intensive demands of the
existing budget-making process undertaken
every year.

In keeping with Linfield’s strong student-
centered orientation, undergraduates play a
significant role in institutional governance,
planning, budgeting, and policy development.
Such collaboration provides students with
valuable leadership experience and the
opportunity to work on various college
committees with professionals of wide-ranging
expertise. Similarly, student participants bring
an important perspective on the issues under
consideration even as they gain insight into the
rationales behind certain policies and
enforcement protocols—insights they can then
share with their peers. The prominent role of a
student as a member of the Board of Trustees
and on the Budget Advisory Committee
underscores the value placed on the inclusion of
student voices at the highest level of institutional
deliberation. Recent conversations for this self-
study with officers of the ASLC on both the
McMinnville and Portland Campuses verify the
appreciation students feel about their ability to
be heard by administrators and faculty. DCE
students have less direct engagement with
college processes but provide feedback to the
institution about their experience at Linfield and
the processes of the Division of Continuing
Education through a regularly administered web-
based survey (see Standard 2.G). Despite the
limitations posed by their lack of proximity to
the residential campuses, then, DCE enrollees do
have means to influence institutional policy-
setting and practices.
## Standard 6 Attachment 1 Board of Trustees, 2007–08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Current Employment</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Board Position</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Year Elected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Phillip</td>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO of Information Technology Association of America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev. Dr. W.</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Executive Minister, American Baptist Churches of Oregon</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sarojini</td>
<td>Budden</td>
<td>Assoc. Prof. of Pediatrics, Oregon Health &amp; Science Univ.</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pamela</td>
<td>Claassen</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer, Am. Baptist Homes of the West</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Martha</td>
<td>Cox</td>
<td>Chief Financial Officer, Columbia Steel Casting Co., Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Theodore</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Senior Partner, Dacole Co.</td>
<td>Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Vernon</td>
<td>DeLap</td>
<td>Retired CPA, DeLap, White, Caldwell &amp; Croy, LLP</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dave</td>
<td>Dillon</td>
<td>Executive Vice President, Oregon Farm Bureau Federation</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kirby</td>
<td>Dyess</td>
<td>Principal, Austin Capital Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Leroy</td>
<td>Fails</td>
<td>Vice President K-12, Relationship Development, The College Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Lucinda</td>
<td>Fournier</td>
<td>Retired Elementary School Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. Kent</td>
<td>Harrop</td>
<td>Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David C.</td>
<td>Haugeberg</td>
<td>Attorney at Law, Haugeberg, Rueter, Gowell, Fredricks, Higgins &amp; McKeegan, P.C.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dr. Thomas L.</td>
<td>Hellie</td>
<td>President, Linfield College</td>
<td>ExOfficio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Standard 6 Attachment 1 Board of Trustees, 2007–08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Current Employment</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Board Position</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
<th>Year Elected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Rev. Dr. Richard</td>
<td>Ice</td>
<td>President Emeritus, American Baptist Homes of the West</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td>Chair Emeritus</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Pamela</td>
<td>Jacklin</td>
<td>Attorney at Law, Stoel Rives LLP, Standard Ins Ctr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David</td>
<td>Jubb</td>
<td>Owner, Jubb &amp; Company LLC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Glenna</td>
<td>Kruger</td>
<td>Retired, Intel Corp.</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Ronni</td>
<td>Lacroute</td>
<td>Owner, Willakenzie Winery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ron</td>
<td>Lane</td>
<td>Retired, Lexus of Portland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gary</td>
<td>Magnuson</td>
<td>Senior Vice President, Wealth Mgt., Smith Barney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Michael</td>
<td>McBride</td>
<td>Independent Real Estate Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mahmood (Moe)</td>
<td>Momtazi</td>
<td>President, Tecna Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dawn</td>
<td>Nowacki*</td>
<td>Professor of Political Science, Linfield College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Daniel</td>
<td>O'Leary</td>
<td>Professor of Chemistry, Pomona College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rev. Timothy</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Pastor University Baptist Church</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Rodney</td>
<td>Romney</td>
<td>Retired Senior Pastor, First Baptist Church</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Debra</td>
<td>Seifert</td>
<td>Senior Communications Counsel, McClennen Bruer Communications</td>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Larry</td>
<td>Sims</td>
<td>Environmental Engineer</td>
<td>American Baptist Churches, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Delford</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Founder, Owner, Chairman, Evergreen International Aviation, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
None of the individuals above are compensated for board service.
*Indicates individuals are currently employees or a student of Linfield College.
President Thomas Hellie

Senior Advisor and Assistant to the President
Frederic Ross

Director of Institutional Research
Jennifer Ballard

Assistant to the President
Jolene Smith

Shaded box – position added since 1998
Underlined name – new to position since 1998

2008–09 Organizational Charts are available in the exhibit room.
Organizational Charts 2007-08: Academic Affairs – Advising to Athletics, Page 2/9

Vice President for Academic Affairs/ Dean of Faculty Barbara Seidman

Director, Academic Advising Kate Elias

McMinnville Campus Academic Department Chairs

Asst. Dean of Faculty Jeff Summers

Administrative Asst. Meredith Symons

BIO Lab Coord Heather Long

CHE Lab Coord Kay Johnson

CSC Systems Adm. Arber Davidhi

EDU Director, Pre-Kindergarten Susan Sager

Melisa Clements Pre-Kindergarten Teacher

HHP Lab Coord Sarah Coste

MUS Coordinator Donna Root

PHY Lab Coord Don Schnitzler

TCA Technical Dir. Ben Alexander

BIO Lab Coord Ken Kebisek

CHE Lab Coord Amy Wolcott

Shaded box – position added since 1998

Underlined name – new to position since 1998

Academic Affairs changes in 2008-09:

- Athletics moved to Student Services
- Learning Support Services moved to Academic Affairs
- Environmental Health and Safety moved to Finance and Administration

2008–09 Organizational Charts are available in the exhibit room

Director, Athletics Scott Carnahan

Asst. Dir. Athletics/ Facilities Director Doug Hire

Sports Information Director Kelly Bird

NCAA Compliance Officer/Women’s Tennis Coach Amy Smith

Aquatics Dir./Swim Coach Gary Gutierrez

Head Football Coach Joseph Smith

Asst. Football Coach/Fitness Ctr. Spv. Neil Fendall

Women’s Soccer Coach/Equip. Room Supervisor Melanie Langley

Head Softball Coach/FB Def Coord. Jackson Vaughan

Men’s Tennis Coach Carl Swanson (+ also SS – Greek Life)

Asst. Track & Field/Asst. Cross Country Coach/ Athl. Adm. Asst. Travis Olson
Academic Affairs changes in 2008–09:
- Athletics moved to Student Services
- Learning Support Services moved to Academic Affairs
- Environmental Health and Safety moved to Finance and Administration (HR)

2008-09 Organizational Charts are available in the exhibit room
Organizational Charts 2007-08: Academic Affairs – Portland Campus Detail, Page 4/9

Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty Barbara Seidman

Ascc. Vice President/Dir. of the Portland Campus David Groff

Portland Campus
Academic
Department Chairs

Dean of Nursing
Bonnie Saucier

Dir. Business and
Finance
Freddie Chew

Dir. Computing &
Educational
Media Svcs.
Derrin
Arnett

Dir. Enrollmenct
Services
Beth
Woodward

Ptd Library
Dir.
Patrice
O’Donovan
x33-7820
(faculty)

Dir. Registration
& Records
Todd
McCollum

Dir. Student
Services
Lisa Burch
(see also SS)

Ascc. Dean Peggy
Wros (half faculty,
half adm.)

Clinical Ascc.
Ann Chamberlain

Asst. Director,
Financial Aid
Richard
Heath

Asst. Dir. Admission

Access
Services
Matthew
Gage

Technical End
User Support
Spec.
Aaron DeClerck

Technical End
User Support
Spec.
Anton Emery

Dir., Nursing
Learning Res.
Cntr. Georgia
Maudsley

Clinical Facilities
Adm. Debra Henry

Scholarship
Outreach
Adm.
Gerardo
Ochoa

Shaded box – position added since 1998
Underlined name – new to position since 1998

2008–09 Organizational charts are available in the exhibit room.
Organizational Charts 2007-08: Academic Affairs – Division of Continuing Education Detail, Page 5/9

Vice President of Academic Affairs/Dean of Faculty Barbara Seidman

Dean of Continuing Education
Kate Bemis

Associate Director/Registrar
Joanne DeMay

Advisor: Salem
Ann Sukalac

Technology & Web CT Admin
Brett Hardee

Associate Director/Director of Marketing
Janet Gifford

Admission Advisor: Portland
Sally Alkazin

Advisor: Albany & Eugene
Jim Garaventa

Academic Advisor: Portland
Mindy Cowan

Assistant Technology Admin. & Publications
Charlotte Allen

Shaded box – position added since 1998
Underlined name – new to position since 1998

2008-09 Organizational charts are available in the exhibit room.
Vice President for College Relations Bruce Wyatt

Administrative Assistant Jennie Ramer

Assistant Vice President for College Relations Jodi Kilcup

Dir. Development Research Craig Williams

Dir. Corporate/Found-ation Relations Catherine Jarmin Miller

Development Officer Jessica Meyer

Dir. Planned Giving Craig Haisch

Dir. Advance-ment Services Kurstin Finch Gnehm

Advance. Database Administrator Debbie Harmon (see also Finance & Admin. ITS Programmer Analyst)

Dir. Alumni Relations Debbie Harmon

Dir. Annual Giving Elaine Burke

Annual Giving Officer George Galbraith

Dir. Public Relations Mardi Mileham

Dir. Publications Candido Salinas

Assistant Director, Public Relations Laura Davis

Shaded box – position added since 1998
Underlined name – new to position since 1998

2008-09 Organizational charts are available in the exhibit room.
Organizational Chart: Enrollment Services, Page 7/9

Dean of Enrollment Management Dan Preston

Dir. Financial Aid
Crisanne Werner

Asst. Director of Financial Aid
Keri Burke

Financial Aid Counselor
Sandra Tello

Loan Coordinator
Sharon Sweeney

Senior Asst. Director of Admission
Kristie Patterson

Asst. Director of Admission
Jay Smith

Asst. Director for International Admission
Floyd Schrock

Operations Manager
Jill Searle

Assistant Director of Admission
Janet Sasaki

Admission Counselor
Ryan Clark

Admission Counselor
Dayson Tioganco

Admission Counselor
Patrick Wilson

Visit Outreach Counselor
Michelle Morain

Shaded box – position added since 1998
Underlined name – new to position since 1998

2008-09 Organizational charts are available in the exhibit room.
The Finance and Administration Division has undergone significant re-organization in 2008-09. 2008-09 Organizational Charts are available in the exhibit room.
Organizational Charts, 2007-08: Student Services, Page 9/9

Vice President for Student Services/Dean of Students Dave Hansen

- Asst. Dean & Director of Housing
  - Jeff Mackay
- Ptd Campus, Dir. of Student Services
  - Lisa Burch
    (see also AA-Ptd)
- Chaplain
  - David Massey
- Dir. Activities
  - Dan Ferguson
- Dir. Multicultural Programs
  - Barry Tucker
- Dir. Counseling Services
  - John Kerrigan
- Dir. Career Services
  - Anne Hardin Ballard
- Dir. Learning Support
- Health Services (contracted)
  - Dr. Crit Houston
  - Coordinator/Nurse Practitioner
    - Patty Haddeland
  - Nurse Pract.
    - Yvette Graynor

Area Director: Housing
- Joni Claypool
Area Director: Clubs & Activities
- Katee Keen
Area Director: Residential Life
- Rachel Rickinger
Area Director: Judicial Affairs
- Delane Hein
Area Director: Greek Life
- Advisor Carl Swanson
  (see also AA-McM-Athletics)
Student Wellness & Health Promotion Coord.
- Christina Ries
Counselor
- Dawn Williamson
Volunteer Coord.
- Jessica Wade
Program Coord.
- Kristi Mackay
Asst. Dir. Learning Support
- Eileen Dowty

Shaded box – position added since 1998
Underlined name – new to position since 1998

Changes in 2008-09:
- Athletic moved into Student Services from Academic Affairs.
- Learning Support Services moved to Academic Affairs
Standard 6 Exhibit List

1. Articles of Incorporation and Bylaws of Linfield College
2. Board of Trustees Handbook, Agenda, and Minutes
3. Faculty Handbook
5. Linfield Employees’ Association (LEA) Agreement
6. Common Policy Chapter of all Employee Handbooks
7. Adjunct Faculty Handbook, McMinnville Campus
8. Department Chairs’ Handbook, McMinnville Campus
9. Adjunct Faculty Handbook, Division of Continuing Education
10. Faculty Manual, School of Nursing
11. Student Handbook, McMinnville Campus
12. Student Policy Handbook, McMinnville Campus
13. Student Handbook, Division of Continuing Education
15. Student Handbook, Portland Campus
16. Student Handbook, Portland Campus School of Nursing
17. Active Committees and Task Forces
18. Chart aligning Standing Committee with Faculty Responsibilities as Delineated in bylaws
19. Board and Committee Membership
20. Organizational Charts
21. Linfield College Institutional Data 2007 (A Fact Book)
22. Long Range Planning Overview 2007–08
23. Annual Planning Council Budget Priorities Memo
24. Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12
25. Administrator Resumes
26. Administrative Position Descriptions
27. President’s Annual Report
28. Publications of the Alumni Leadership Council and President’s Circle
29. Fundraising Publications for the Portland Campus and Division of Continuing Education
30. Linfield Employee Association (LEA) minutes
31. Administrator Assembly Minutes
32. Faculty Assembly Minutes
33. Linfield Employee Association (LEA) Bylaws
34. Trustee Compensation Resolution
35. Salary Matrix for Each Employee Group
36. HR Answers Local Market Compensation Survey
37. 2006 Faculty Survey
38. Charter of Student Association
Linfield manages its finances prudently. The annual budget of the Portland Campus has produced surpluses each of the past 10 years. The combined annual budget of the McMinnville Campus and the Division of Continuing Education has had surpluses all but one of the past 10 years (fiscal year 2001–02). In fiscal years 2005–06 and 2006–07, both budgets experienced record surpluses. In addition, unrestricted reserves have grown for all programs with total Quasi-Endowment assets in excess of $27 million. Enrollment stabilization (reserve) funds were established in 2001 for all programs as a hedge against budget shortfalls. See section 7.B.7 for current amounts available.

The college still faces yearly financial challenges on several fronts: (1) its dependence on tuition, room, and board; (2) the pressure to meet enrollment objectives; and (3) the need to improve faculty and staff compensation. When Linfield’s financial health is considered in light of the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 (three of whose six Foundational Principles are resource-based), it is clear that a substantial increase in the college’s endowment remains central to the institution’s future plans.

Since 1998, net assets as reported in college financial statements have increased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7 Table 1 Net Assets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporarily Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanently Restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**7.A – Financial Planning**

7.A.1 Governing boards and, where applicable, state agencies have given the institution appropriate autonomy in financial planning and budgeting matters within overall mandates and priorities.

The college prepares a balanced budget annually. The process begins with iterative discussions between the administration and the Board of Trustees’ Finance and Executive Committees. During these discussions the trustees provide direction for expected tuition and fee increases, enrollment levels, and other overall goals (e.g. compensation increases and the unfunded financial aid percentage). Based on these budget assumptions, a budget message is prepared by the vice president for finance and administration, [Exhibit 1] approved by the president, and delivered to the entire campus community. Since the budget serves as the financial manifestation of Linfield’s mission and strategic planning via its instruction, student, administrative, and support programs, the message focuses the campus community on the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 and sets out two basic principles: (1) the college will operate with a balanced budget and (2) budget discussions will focus on program needs. Early in the process the college-wide Planning Council meets at least twice with the Budget Advisory Committee (the all-college body responsible for recommending a budget to the president) to discuss the Council’s recommended budget priorities for the upcoming budget cycle. See 7.A.3 for additional information on the budget process.

7.A.2 The institution demonstrates that financial planning for the future is a strategically guided process. This planning includes a minimum of a three-year projection of major categories of income, specific plans for major categories of expenditures, and plans for the management of capital revenue and expenditures. Short
and long-range capital budgets reflect the institution’s goals and objectives and relate to the plans for physical facilities and acquisition of equipment.

The college uses a three year budget planning model to help identify how its current budget assumptions will impact the future [Exhibit 2] early in the budget and planning process. Given the adoption of the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12, the college anticipates that it will more fully develop a multi-year budget and planning approach that will be the focus throughout the entire planning and budget process. A recent reorganization (July 2008) in the Division of Finance and Administration provides for a new position of director of budget and financial analysis (reporting to the vice president for finance and administration/chief financial officer). In addition, facilities operations has been aligned with auxiliary services and a new capital planning and development group has been carved out to boost the focus on capital planning. These adjustments provide for additional resources (assistance to the senior director of accounting services/controller), via a reallocation of existing funds, that will improve the connection between the operating budget and the capital budget; assist with tracking performance related to the strategic plan; build on the long-range focus of the institution; and provide for an even stronger link between the budget allocation process and the new strategic plan. The President’s Cabinet and the Budget Advisory Committee will thus be able to analyze the effects of various resource allocations in real time and help the college make informed decisions for the future.

The Master Plan Addendum referred to in Standard 8 provides an excellent planning guide for short and long-range capital budgets that reflect the institutions priorities.

7.A.3 The institution publishes an annual budget distributed to appropriate constituencies, and the policies, guidelines, and processes for developing the budget are clearly defined and followed. Budget revisions are made promptly, and, when necessary, a revised budget or schedule of budget changes is developed and distributed to appropriate constituencies.

Each year the college community receives notice about and directly participates in budget planning and development. Based on the annual budget message and instructions, departments submit their budget requests for the subsequent year to the appropriate member of the President’s Cabinet [Exhibit 3]. Each cabinet member reviews, adjusts, and consolidates the requests for his/her area of responsibility prior to presentation to the full Cabinet. Based on this input, the Cabinet prepares a balanced budget proposal for the college that is forwarded to the Budget Advisory Committee (BAC) for review; it is also shared with the campus communities. The BAC then begins its deliberations with the Cabinet proposal as a baseline; BAC results are then tendered as recommendations to the president.

The Budget Advisory Committee is chaired by the vice president for finance and administration. Membership on the committee consists of three cabinet representatives, three faculty (including one member from the Portland Campus), and individual members representing students, non-exempt employees, and administrators. The BAC recommends a budget to the president for presentation to the board’s Finance Committee, which in turn recommends a final budget to the full board for approval and adoption. The proposed BAC budget is shared with the respective campus communities through open meetings held on both the Portland and McMinnville Campuses.

The budget is approved by the trustees in a two-step process. At the February board meeting the revenue side of the budget is approved including the rates to be charged for tuition, fees, room and board. Approval of the expenditure side of the budget is delayed until the April Executive
Committee meeting to allow additional time to assess recruitment prospects for the following year in case it might be necessary to reevaluate the proposed budget. To date, the original proposed budget the trustees receive each February has been approved.

After the board approves the budget, each department receives a copy of its budget, which is implemented through the accounting system. Currently, the McMinnville Campus/DCE budgets are developed and managed separately from the Portland Campus budget. As the three arms of the college become increasingly intertwined programmatically, however, integrated budget information is more regularly presented to various college publics to foster awareness of Linfield as one institution.

As its final task each year, the BAC identifies a set of budget related questions for consideration before budget deliberations resume the following fall. These questions are shared with the trustees, the President’s Cabinet, the Planning Council and the wider college community. Begun about five years ago, this process helps link future planning with ongoing budget development.

Financial reports to officers, departments and trustees continue to be timely. The president and the vice president for finance and administration are informed of the college’s financial position within the first week after the close of the previous month. Managers can review their departmental expenditures using WebAdvisor, which provides up to the minute budget information.

7.A.4 Debt for capital outlay purposes is periodically reviewed, carefully controlled, and justified, so as not to create an unreasonable drain on resources available for educational purposes. The institution has a governing board policy guiding the use and limit of debt.

The college has had four tax-exempt debt offerings in the past decade, the latest in 2005. This financing has allowed the college to address critical deferred maintenance, build new on-campus apartments and residence halls, acquire a portion of the Hewlett Packard property, and remodel existing facilities. All of these efforts have allowed the college to expand its physical and enrollment capacities.

Proposed new debt obligations must be approved by the trustees. During the budget process, the college reviews the amount of its debt service obligations [Attachment 1] to assure that sufficient funds are available. Capital markets may improve enough to make it advantageous to refinance some existing debt but at this time no additional debt funding is planned.

7.B – Adequacy of Financial Resources

7.B.1 The institution provides evidence that it seeks and utilizes different sources of funds adequate to support its programs and services. The commitment of those resources among programs and services reflects appropriately the mission and goals and priorities of the institution.

Linfield balances its operations with available resources and has no accumulated operating deficit. Through past and current capital campaigns and deferred giving efforts, the college is also diversifying its financial base. For example, the board designated the $1.6 million unrestricted gift from the Glicksman estate (received in FY 2006–07) to provide institutional matching funds for future gifts in support of new faculty chairs or other faculty-directed endowments. By bringing in additional outside funds, this type of matching program could relieve pressures on the operating budget. The college has also begun factoring an endowment
figure for operating and maintenance costs in the fundraising targets needed to open new buildings (see Standard 8). With almost $10 million in life income trust and annuity principal, future income from endowment will increase significantly when those instrument terms are fulfilled. Other revenue is received annually from a significantly expanded endowment and from gifts, grants, and federal financial aid (see 7.B.3).

Nevertheless, the college recognizes its continued dependence on student-generated revenue sources (tuition, fees, room, and board). This dependence has increased from 88% (1998) to 89% (2007) as other revenue sources have not grown at the same pace as the annual budget. The need for additional endowment was acknowledged in the Linfield’s Long Range Plan 1995–00. Accordingly, the capital campaign concluded in 2004 raised $22 million in endowment for scholarships and other program areas. In total, the capital campaign brought in $73,924,870 for scholarships, land acquisitions, new building, and other program areas, exceeding the campaign goal by $3,924,870 (6%).

With the acquisition of the Hewlett Packard property in 1999, the college further diversified its revenue sources. Six new undergraduate apartment buildings expanded student residence options and generate additional rental income. Since July 2003 the college has leased seven acres, known as Phase I of the Hewlett Packard commercial property, to a developer. This lease generates annual income both to the endowment fund and the annual operating budget. Currently the college is working with a developer (Trammell Crow Company) to lease the commercial property known as Phase II. Linfield College and Trammell Crow Company have received approval from the Planning Commission (December 20, 2007) and the McMinnville City Council (January 22, 2008) to rezone approximately 23 acres of College property. The rezoned land combined with existing commercial property owned by Linfield College provides for a potential development of nearly 49 acres. The developer and the College are currently in the due diligence phase of the process.

7.B.2 Adequate resources are available to meet debt service requirements of short-term and long-term indebtedness without adversely affecting the quality of educational programs. A minimum of three years’ history of the amount borrowed (whether internally or externally) for capital outlay and for operating funds is maintained. A five-year projection of future debt repayments is maintained.

Within its operating budget Linfield provides resources to meet annual debt service requirements. Four different debt issuances are currently outstanding but annual debt payments are designed to remain relatively flat each year so that over time they will decrease as a percent of the total operating budget. The college maintains records on future debt payments due for the next five years. This information is updated in the annual audit and can be found in the audited financial statements [Exhibit 4].

7.B.3 Financial statements indicate a history of financial stability for the past five years. If an accumulated deficit has been recorded, a realistic plan to eliminate the deficit is approved by the governing board.

Over the past decade, Linfield’s operating revenue has exceeded expenses, permitting significant non-mandatory transfers for capital improvements and quasi-endowment. The market value of the entire endowment fund, including life income principal which ultimately will join the endowment, has increased from $37.7 million at the end of fiscal year 1996–97 to $81.7 million at the end of fiscal year 2006–07.
7.B.4 Transfers among the major funds and interfund borrowing are legal and guided by clearly stated policies in accordance with prudent financial planning and control.

Annually the college budget includes mandatory transfers for debt service and federal loan fund matching requirements. At the end of each fiscal year, any budgeted surpluses are transferred to accounts covering capital projects, renovations, or the quasi-endowment. All mandatory transfers are budgeted; non-mandatory transfers are pre-approved by the president and trustees. No management letter comments from the audit process have been received concerning transfers.

7.B.5 The institution demonstrates the adequacy of financial resources for the support of all of its offerings including specialized occupational, technical, and professional programs.

Within the institutional operating budget, the college maintains two separate budgets: one that combines the McMinnville Campus and Division of Continuing Education and one for the Portland Campus. Both of these budgets have resources sufficient to meet the needs of the programs provided (see 7.B.7). Deficit budgeting is not permitted. The college has not had to use quasi-endowment reserves to balance budgets. As stated in item 7.A.3, the college realizes the need to more fully integrate all programs into one overall college budget in coming years.

7.B.6 The institution identifies the sources of its student financial aid for current enrollments and provides evidence of planning for future financial aid in light of projected enrollments. It monitors and controls the relationship between unfunded student financial aid and tuition revenues.

The college recognizes that, aside from employee compensation, unfunded financial aid is the largest consumer of college resources. A great amount of planning and discussion occurs when allocating resources to financial aid during the budget process. The fiscal year 2007–08 McMinnville Campus budget reflects a planned allocation of 36.0% (compared to 29.31% in fiscal year 1998) for unfunded aid and a similar percentage is projected for future years. As required, Linfield reports this unfunded financial aid as a reduction of tuition revenue rather than an expenditure. Prospective students have become more astute consumers, weighing schools against each other in search of the best financial aid package. This creates enormous pressure to enroll the number of students necessary to meet budgets and yet maintain the appropriate discount rate. Colleges with large endowments can more easily handle this pressure, but schools such as Linfield, with relatively small endowments, work to keep unfunded financial aid at manageable levels.

Net tuition revenue is the single largest factor in determining the annual funding for the college. Net tuition reflects the total tuition less financial aid discounts provided by the college, while net tuition per student is simply the division of net tuition revenue by the fall enrollment FTE. During fiscal year 2006–07, net tuition per student climbed to $15,700. This was 6.0% more than the prior year and represented the second largest percentage increase since FY 2000–01. Reducing the total tuition discount (unfunded and funded aid) from 38.8% to 38.1% was a key reason for net income growth in FY 2006–07.

7.B.7 The institution maintains adequate financial reserves to meet fluctuations in operating revenue, expenses, and debt service.
The McMinnville/DCE program has "reserves" in the quasi-endowment fund of $16,504,612. Portland program "reserves" are $10,512,861. With approval of the trustees, these funds are available if needed to fund operating deficits. This has not been necessary during the past decade.

To provide further stability, the McMinnville Campus created an enrollment stabilization fund in 2001. These reserves are available to cover a budget shortfall should actual enrollments fall below budgeted enrollments. The fund offset a deficit in 2001–02 and has since been fully replenished with operating surpluses in years 2003 through 2007; the fund totaled $972,000 on June 30, 2007 (2.5% of McMinnville’s budgeted revenues for 2007). The Portland Campus enrollment reserve account stood at $638,000 on June 30, 2007 (10.4% of its budgeted revenues), while the DCE fund was $151,000 (5.2% of its budgeted revenues).

7.B.8 The institution demonstrates an understanding of the financial relationship between its education and general operations and its auxiliary enterprises and their respective contributions to the overall operations of the institution. This includes the institution’s recognition of whether it is dependent on auxiliary enterprise income to balance education and general operations or whether the institution has to use education and general operations income to balance auxiliary enterprises.

Linfield relies on net revenue from auxiliary services (bookstore, conferences, dining commons, and residence halls) to balance the overall college budget each year. Per the financial statements for fiscal year 2006–07, auxiliary enterprises contributed net income of $3.4 million; $3.6 million is projected for 2008.

7.C – Financial Management

7.C.1 The president reports regularly to the governing board about the financial adequacy and stability of the institution

The Board of Trustees Finance Committee holds three meetings a year as part of full board meetings. The Executive Committee of the board meets six times annually. At each of these sessions the president and vice president for finance and administration report on the fiscal health of the institution. All trustees receive current operating budget reports at each of the full board meetings [Attachment 2].

7.C.2 Financial functions are centralized and are under a single qualified financial officer responsible to the president. Institutional business functions are under one or more qualified officers, are well organized, and function effectively. The complexity of the business organization reflects the size of the institution and the significance of its transactions.

Linfield’s business and financial operations are the responsibility of the vice president for finance and administration/chief financial officer. The vice president reports to the president and to the board of trustees through its finance, audit, investment, real estate, and facilities committees. The college bylaws prescribe the duties of this college officer.

The effective functioning of the business department is evidenced by the absence of
management letter comments from the independent auditors each year.

7.C.3 All expenditures and income from whatever source, and the administration of scholarships, grants in aid, loans, and student employment, are fully controlled by the institution and are included in its regular planning, budgeting, accounting, and auditing procedures.

All revenues and expenditures including the administration of scholarships, grants, loans, and student employment, flow through Linfield’s accounting system. The financial aid office awards federal, state, and institutional funded and unfunded aid. Reconciliations are performed to assure that accounting office records agree with expenditure amounts. The college conducts two audits annually. The first involves preparation of the college’s financial statements. The second is an A-133 audit of the college’s federal grant funds. [Exhibit 5]. Opinions for both types of audits have been unqualified (clean) for each of the last ten years.

7.C.4 The institution has clearly defined and implemented policies regarding cash management and investments which have been approved by the governing board.

Linfield has clearly defined and implemented policies regarding cash management and investments which have been approved by the trustee finance committee. The investment policy covers assets held for the endowment and life income funds [Exhibit 6]; the cash management policy covers assets held short-term [Exhibit 7]. Investment policies are communicated to the various investment managers by the investment subcommittee of the trustee finance committee. Performance is monitored by an independent consultant and shared with the investment committee at least quarterly.

7.C.5 The institution’s accounting system follows generally accepted principles of accounting.

Linfield uses Datatel’s Colleague system for its financial and many other administrative operations. This commercially developed software conforms to generally accepted accounting principles. Financial statements are completed under the same principles.

7.C.6 For independent institutions, the governing board is responsible for the selection of an auditing firm and receives the annual audit report.

The college’s independent auditor is selected by the board of trustees upon the recommendation of the audit committee (a subcommittee of the trustee finance committee until September 2007 but by board action that month established as a new standing committee). The audit committee reviews agreed upon procedures with the auditors. Upon completion of the financial statements, the committee receives the audit report and accompanying management letter, if any. It then reports the results to the board. Copies of the audit are normally distributed to and reviewed with trustees at the annual fall board meeting.

7.C.7 Independent institutions are audited annually by an independent certified public accountant and the audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. The audit includes a management letter. A summary of the latest audited financial statement is made available to the public.
As stated in 7.C.3, the college is audited annually by an independent international certified public accounting firm. The audit is conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. Copies of the college’s audited financial statements for the past three years are available as Exhibit 4.

7.C.8 & 7.C.9 A proprietary institution makes available annually a financial summary which includes, as a minimum, a list of company officers, a statement of profit and loss, expenditures, indebtedness, and companies which have a controlling interest in the institution.

These standards are not applicable to Linfield, which is neither a proprietary nor a public institution.

7.C.10 All funds for financial aid and other specific programs not subject to governmental audit are audited annually by an independent certified public accountant and include a management letter.

Linfield has an annual A-133 audit performed by an independent auditing firm covering its federal financial aid programs. A management letter is issued if deemed necessary. Non-federal financial aid is audited in conjunction with the federal audit as deemed necessary by the auditors to support their opinion on the college’s financial statements.

7.C.11 The institution demonstrates a well-organized program of internal audit (where appropriate) and control that complements the accounting system and the external audit.

The college does not have a program to perform internal audits of the college’s accounting system. However, checks and balances are in place to limit the exposure inherent in the system. College officers review all purchases over $1,000 and no person has signature authority for reimbursement of expenses for him/herself. Two signatures are required for any expenditure over $10,000. The sufficiency of such safeguards is supported by the fact that audit findings have been minimal; moreover, the college has not received a management letter in the last four years. As another indication of institutional integrity, only one charge of an alleged violation of ethical conduct has been reported to the college’s confidential online reporting process administered by EthicsPoint. Following college review, it was determined that no violation had occurred in this case involving the sale of a badly functioning lawnmower to an employee.

7.C.12 The institution demonstrates that recommendations in the auditor’s management letter accompanying the audit report have been adequately considered.

As noted above, the college has not received a management letter in the last four years in connection with its annual audit of financial statements. In years where a management letter was received the college immediately addressed the issue and made sure the same comment was not reported subsequently.
7.C.13 Federal, state, external, and internal audit reports are made available for examination as part of any evaluation conducted by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

The college has and will make available as exhibits its financial statements or other audit reports that it receives to the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities.

7.D – Fundraising and Development

7.D.1 All college/university fundraising activities are governed by institutional policies, comply with governmental requirements, and are conducted in a professional and ethical manner.

Campaigns to raise capital and operating income are coordinated with the priorities and goals established through the college’s strategic planning and budgeting processes. See also 6.C.4. Fund raising activities and gift accounting procedures are conducted in a professional and ethical manner and conform to all existing regulations and standards of governmental agencies and industry associations.

7.D.2 Endowment and life income funds and their investments are administered by an appropriate institutional officer, foundation, or committee designated by the governing board. The organization maintains complete records concerning these funds and complies with applicable legal requirements.

Endowment and life income funds and their investments are administered by the Investment Committee, a subcommittee of the Board of Trustees’ Finance Committee. All records are maintained by the college. The college uses an outside consulting firm to monitor the performance of the various investment managers.

7.D.3 The institution has a clearly defined relationship with any foundation bearing its name or which has as its major purpose the raising of funds for the institution.

Linfield College does not have any related foundation or entity that raises funds in the name of the institution.

Conclusion

Linfield’s sound financial position and its strong financial management system results from several interrelated factors: (1) a stable enrollment; (2) a growing endowment; (3) a transparent and participatory system of financial planning and budget development that generates community-wide awareness of budget priorities; (4) a growing realization of and focus on the community-developed Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12; (5) a strong team approach to budget control; and (6) Board of Trustees oversight based on accurate and timely financial data. Historically these factors derive from multiple sources: (a) emphasis on the need for strong and stable enrollments; (b) the creation and maintenance of programs and physical resources to attract students; (c) insistence that the college, including its component parts, operate within an established budget; and (d) the continuing development of the Adult Degree
Program (ADP) within the Division of Continuing Education which makes a significant net contribution to the operating budget, as do the respective auxiliary enterprises. By retaining a well managed fiscal infrastructure, the college can best control costs to students and their families.

In many respects, Linfield resembles other small private colleges that are highly dependent on student tuition and fees. The institution continually faces challenges to provide the resources necessary to faculty and staff both for programmatic support and for competitive compensation. In addition, the physical capital needs of the college are persistent and growing. Linfield continues to seek the best balance between its competing needs and believes the Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007–12 will guide future decisions.
## Standard 7 Attachment 1 Projected Debt Service

**Summary as of June 30, 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Interest Due</th>
<th>Principal Due</th>
<th>Total Due</th>
<th>Change from Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$1,878,885.63</td>
<td>$910,000.00</td>
<td>$2,788,885.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,827,553.75</td>
<td>$1,070,000.00</td>
<td>$2,897,553.75</td>
<td>$108,668.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$1,764,637.50</td>
<td>$1,275,000.00</td>
<td>$3,039,637.50</td>
<td>$142,083.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,692,156.25</td>
<td>$1,440,000.00</td>
<td>$3,132,156.25</td>
<td>$92,518.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,614,481.25</td>
<td>$1,530,000.00</td>
<td>$3,144,481.25</td>
<td>$12,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,531,762.50</td>
<td>$1,630,000.00</td>
<td>$3,161,762.50</td>
<td>$17,281.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,443,737.50</td>
<td>$1,730,000.00</td>
<td>$3,173,737.50</td>
<td>$11,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,350,550.00</td>
<td>$1,825,000.00</td>
<td>$3,175,550.00</td>
<td>$1,812.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$1,251,937.50</td>
<td>$1,935,000.00</td>
<td>$3,186,937.50</td>
<td>$11,387.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>$1,147,218.75</td>
<td>$2,055,000.00</td>
<td>$3,202,218.75</td>
<td>$15,281.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>$1,035,862.50</td>
<td>$2,185,000.00</td>
<td>$3,220,862.50</td>
<td>$18,643.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>$918,993.75</td>
<td>$2,310,000.00</td>
<td>$3,228,993.75</td>
<td>$8,131.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>$796,556.25</td>
<td>$2,445,000.00</td>
<td>$3,241,556.25</td>
<td>$12,562.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>$666,968.75</td>
<td>$2,585,000.00</td>
<td>$3,251,968.75</td>
<td>$10,412.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>$529,825.00</td>
<td>$2,735,000.00</td>
<td>$3,264,825.00</td>
<td>$12,856.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>$383,831.25</td>
<td>$2,925,000.00</td>
<td>$3,308,831.25</td>
<td>$44,006.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>$264,037.50</td>
<td>$1,740,000.00</td>
<td>$2,004,037.50</td>
<td>$(1,304,793.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>$167,606.25</td>
<td>$2,015,000.00</td>
<td>$2,182,606.25</td>
<td>$178,568.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>$105,125.00</td>
<td>$415,000.00</td>
<td>$520,125.00</td>
<td>$(1,662,481.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>$83,750.00</td>
<td>$440,000.00</td>
<td>$523,750.00</td>
<td>$3,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>$61,250.00</td>
<td>$460,000.00</td>
<td>$521,250.00</td>
<td>$(2,500.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>$37,625.00</td>
<td>$485,000.00</td>
<td>$522,625.00</td>
<td>$1,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>$12,750.00</td>
<td>$510,000.00</td>
<td>$522,750.00</td>
<td>$125.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals** $20,567,101.88 $36,650,000.00 $57,217,101.88
## Standard 7 Attachment 2 Example Budget Projections Provided to Trustees

### Linfield College 2007-08 Budget Status Report, As of March 31 2008 (Page 1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>06-07 Fiscal</th>
<th>07-08 Fiscal</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>08-09 Fiscal</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>09-10 Fiscal</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY 07-08</th>
<th>FY 08-09</th>
<th>FY 09-10</th>
<th>FY 10-11</th>
<th>FY 11-12</th>
<th>FY 12-13</th>
<th>FY 13-14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>MARCH FY 07-08 COMPARISON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>NINTH MONTH FY 07-08 BUDGET REPORT (75%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>COLUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>MCMINNVILLE/DCE CAMPUSES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>YEAR-END</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>06-07 ACTUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>07-08 ACTUAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(D-B)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>PROJECTION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>YEAR VARIANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>VP ACADEMIC AFFAIRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1,850,240</td>
<td>1,730,500</td>
<td>219,740</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>2,073,066</td>
<td>231,796</td>
<td>133,226</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>2,395,056</td>
<td>63,706</td>
<td>33,650</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>2,708,762</td>
<td>113,706</td>
<td>61,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>VP FINANCE &amp; ADMIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1,082,857</td>
<td>1,011,802</td>
<td>1,000,705</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>1,211,721</td>
<td>1,000,705</td>
<td>1,000,705</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,336,682</td>
<td>1,000,705</td>
<td>1,000,705</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,476,643</td>
<td>1,000,705</td>
<td>1,000,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>VP TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>585,450</td>
<td>595,002</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>584,902</td>
<td>584,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>VP FACILITY SVCS/SAFETY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>355,552</td>
<td>335,002</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>105.0%</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>354,902</td>
<td>354,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>VP PROPERTY MGMT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>1,350,450</td>
<td>1,330,002</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
<td>1,329,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>TOTAL REVENUE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>19,581,567</td>
<td>19,130,592</td>
<td>19,109,592</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>20,356,237</td>
<td>19,109,592</td>
<td>19,109,592</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>21,611,932</td>
<td>19,109,592</td>
<td>19,109,592</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>22,911,932</td>
<td>19,109,592</td>
<td>19,109,592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- The table above provides budget projections for various departments and campuses at Linfield College for the fiscal years 2007-08 and 2008-09.
- The projections include actual and budgeted figures, with variances indicated where necessary.
- The report is dated as of March 31, 2008.
### Standard 7 Attachment 2 (Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06-07 FISCAL</th>
<th>06-07 ACTUAL</th>
<th>07-08 FISCAL</th>
<th>07-08 ACTUAL</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Year Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(K)</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06-07 FISCAL</th>
<th>06-07 ACTUAL</th>
<th>07-08 FISCAL</th>
<th>07-08 ACTUAL</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Year Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(K)</td>
<td>(K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PORTLAND CAMPUS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06-07 FISCAL</th>
<th>06-07 ACTUAL</th>
<th>07-08 FISCAL</th>
<th>07-08 ACTUAL</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Year Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(K)</td>
<td>(K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LmcD Field Year End Surplus**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06-07 FISCAL</th>
<th>06-07 ACTUAL</th>
<th>07-08 FISCAL</th>
<th>07-08 ACTUAL</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Year Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(F)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td>(G)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(H)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>(J)</td>
<td>(J)</td>
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</table>

**Linfield College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06-07 FISCAL</th>
<th>06-07 ACTUAL</th>
<th>07-08 FISCAL</th>
<th>07-08 ACTUAL</th>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Year Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td>YR BUDGET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>(G)</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>(I)</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>(J)</td>
<td>(J)</td>
<td>(K)</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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</tbody>
</table>
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Standard Eight – Physical Resources

Since Linfield College’s last accreditation visit, significant improvements and additions to the academic and student life spaces have enhanced the college’s ability to fulfill its mission. In McMinnville, these improvements began with development of the new south campus on property previously owned by the Hewlett Packard Corporation. On that property a new fine arts center, theater, library, and music building have been constructed. These facilities have created a southern academic anchor for a new corridor extending from the south to the historic north campus. In that connecting corridor, new residence halls and apartment buildings now stand. The college has also improved its athletic and dining facilities. Enhancements to existing classrooms and labs as part of a multi-year renovation program have introduced pedagogical technologies such as new computer labs and smart classrooms.

Improvements have been made on the Portland Campus as well. Over the past few years, new nursing simulation labs have opened. In spring 2008 a substantial remodel of Peterson Hall began and will turn an unused lecture hall into modern classrooms.

These efforts and those to come are informed by Linfield’s master planning process. With the assistance of architects from SRG Partnership, the college completed a science feasibility study for the McMinnville Campus in fall 2005 [Exhibit 3]. Upon trustee selection of a planning option from among three tendered by this study, the college has launched several of the preliminary steps needed to make the plan a reality. A Master Plan Analysis completed in spring 2008 now delineates the pressing facilities issues facing the college on both campuses in the next two decades [Exhibit 4]. This document builds on and supplements the 2000 Master Plan for the McMinnville Campus [Exhibit 5]. The master planning documents, along with the science feasibility study, form the core of Linfield’s facilities planning framework. They link academic needs and financial abilities to institutional mission, as the evidence for this standard demonstrates.

8.A – Instructional and Support Facilities

8.A.1 Instructional facilities are sufficient to achieve the institution’s mission and goals.

Linfield’s instructional facilities are sufficient to achieve the institution’s mission and goals. This is perhaps best illustrated with reference to the new buildings on McMinnville’s south campus – the Miller Fine Arts Center, Marshall Hall and Ford Theater, Nicholson Library, and the Bull Music Center [Exhibit 1]. Each of these buildings addresses facilities needs identified in the college’s 1998 self-study report. Their design rested upon the active participation and input of faculty and staff in every department affected: Art and Visual Culture, Theatre and Communication Arts, the library, and Music. These facilities demonstrate the college’s commitment and ability to capitalize on opportunities for facility improvements to support the instructional program and further Linfield’s mission.

Ongoing needs for facility upgrades certainly continue. On the McMinnville Campus, efforts to address classroom modernization intersect with faculty readiness to employ new technologies. Current space constraints in science labs will remain a serious challenge until completion of the science facilities project.

Recognizing that classroom and laboratory modernization are necessary for the college to
maintain its competitive position, since 2005–06 the McMinnville Campus annual budget has included $50,000 to fund remodels. Augmented by grant funds, selected classrooms and labs in Melrose, Pioneer, Graf, Murdock, Health and Human Performance, Renshaw, Walker, Cook, and Taylor Halls have undergone improvements in the past five years featuring various combinations of new furniture, fixtures, and pedagogical technologies. In August 2007, a new instructional lab opened in the former Renshaw Gallery space as part of a $500,000 renovation project that also included a new technology-enhanced classroom and technology upgrades for two existing classrooms.

The Renshaw remodel also features a new facility for the student operated FM radio station, KSLC. Changes included the installation of a new 90 foot transmitting tower that allows the college to protect its broadcasting area from encroachment by other stations and helps secure Linfield’s FCC operating license well into the future. The new station provides valuable experiential learning opportunities for students from a variety of majors and enhances the college’s local visibility in service to the mission of connecting learning, life, and community.

The college has also begun planning for the modernization and improvement of instructional facilities on the north side of the McMinnville Campus. Schematic design work by SRG Partnership for the renovation of Northup Hall (the former library) was completed in fall 2007. At this writing, both design-development and construction document preparation for this project has been approved by the Board of Trustees and by September 2008 a working group of faculty and staff will have shepherded design-development to completion. Once renovation ends, possibly as early as 2011, Northup will offer much improved facilities to four key academic departments—Business, Economics, English, and Philosophy. The building will contain nine technology-equipped classrooms and a computer lab serving the campus. Placing the Department of Business in the same building with two core liberal arts departments like English and Philosophy, as well as with the bridge Department of Economics, links the professional disciplines and the liberal arts and encourages the faculty to pursue many of the integrated learning opportunities envisioned by the college’s strategic plan.

The Northup Hall project represents the first component of a McMinnville north campus effort likely to stretch out over at least the next decade. It will include the renovation of science facilities in Murdock and Graf Halls, as well as construction of a new science building located where Mac Hall now stands. Following the relocation of the Business Department from Taylor Hall to Northup, Taylor Hall may be modernized to provide a new, improved home for the Mathematics Department. This will free up space in Graf Hall and allow the science facilities renovation to begin in earnest.

On the Portland Campus, modernization and space needs in selected facilities also require improvement, and progress is occurring there as well [Exhibit 2]. Nursing lab facilities have been upgraded and expanded over the past three years. In summer 2004 a nursing lab that had remained essentially unchanged for more than thirty years underwent complete renovation. The following spring, with grant support from the State of Oregon for the purchase of a state of the art high fidelity simulation manikin, Room 102 in Peterson Hall was converted into a simulation lab complete with a control room, a debriefing room and a three-bed clinical practice area. In 2007 a second classroom in Peterson Hall (Room 107) became a third lab facility for use by nursing classes as well as by individual students wishing to hone specific nursing competencies. At this writing, a major remodel of Peterson Hall is under way to convert unused lecture space into modern classrooms ready for use in fall 2008.

All classrooms used by the Division of Continuing Education (DCE) on the
McMinnville and Portland Campuses are adequate for DCE’s mission of providing a Linfield education to adults for whom a residential college experience is not possible or appropriate. Required on-site sessions between instructors and students are held either on the McMinnville or Portland Campuses or at community colleges accredited by the Northwest Commission. Facilities at non-Linfield venues also adequately meet DCE’s needs. However, the classroom requirements of the DCE are receding in importance as online delivery methods become the preeminent mode of instructional delivery for that program.

8.A.2 Facilities assigned to an instructional function are adequate for the effective operation of that function.

Instructional facilities at Linfield adequately support the effective operation of the college’s educational program. This adequacy can be gauged using the metrics of quantity, quality, and perception. Opportunities for improvement always present themselves and are addressed on an on-going basis.

To gauge adequacy in the quantity of classroom and lab spaces, the McMinnville Campus commissioned the 1998 Paulien report to establish baseline comparative data [Exhibit 6]. Consultants from Paulien and Associates studied classroom and laboratory utilization, as well as science space needs, in terms of FTE enrollment measured on a student credit basis of 1548 students. The Paulien summary report presented the following conclusions:

1) Application of guideline factors to weekly student contact hours of classroom use at Linfield College indicated the classroom space needs on-campus to be approximately at balance for the current enrollment level….Guideline application at the current enrollment level indicated a need for 23,604 assignable square feet (asf) or a 982 asf surplus. (p. 2)

2) For the base year, the Science Departments had existing space in all categories of 28,047 asf compared to a guideline space of 37,038 asf, or a deficit of 8,631 asf. The deficit space was found in open laboratories and service, undergraduate research laboratories and service, and faculty research laboratories and service space. (pp. 30–31)

Between fall 1998, when the Paulien report was completed, and fall 2007, FTE enrollment on the McMinnville Campus had increased from 1548 to 1646. Extrapolation based on Paulien’s guidelines suggests that to accommodate this growth the campus should have added approximately 2,500 assignable square feet in classroom space and 3,800 in science lab spaces to remain consistent with the report’s 1998 analysis.

Paulien’s classroom analysis was based on an inventory of 38 rooms. In 2007, the classroom inventory included eight new classrooms (Graf 205; Renshaw 103, 105, 201, and 206; Nicholson 178; Miller Fine Arts 123; and one room in Cook Hall). An additional lecture space (Delkin Hall) has also been added since the Paulien analysis [Exhibit 8]. Only one classroom (in what had previously been the Communications Annex) has been eliminated. The net additional classroom spaces provide assignable square footage (asf) that greatly exceeds the 2,500 additional asf needed to keep pace with enrollment growth. This information leads to the conclusion that the number of classrooms on the McMinnville Campus remains adequate for the current enrollment level and provides some capacity for enrollment growth.

Paulien identified 25 teaching laboratories in McMinnville, with “teaching lab” defined as dedicated, discipline-specific rooms that require unique materials, equipment, or space beyond that required by traditional classrooms (Paulien, p. 19). These labs were assigned to the Departments of Art and Visual Culture,
While the new Miller Fine Arts Center, Vivian A. Bull Music Center, and the renovation of Renshaw Hall have eliminated any lab deficits for Art and Visual Culture, Music, and Mass Communications, the only addition to the science lab space on the McMinnville Campus since 1998 has been the opening of a new physiology lab in Cook Hall. This facility allowed dedication of the existing HHP lab to anatomy only. A small lab in Renshaw Hall to serve Environmental Studies should open in spring 2009.

Except for these improvements in anatomy, physiology, and Environmental Studies, students entering the other sciences have been accommodated by expanding the size of science lectures and adding lab sections. Given expansion both of the general student body and of those enrolling in basic science classes, the McMinnville Campus finds itself very close to its absolute capacity utilization point for science education—especially in biology—but to a certain extent in chemistry and physics as well. Capacity constraints thus exist in both lab space (general use and for collaborative research) and science lecture hall space.

The Linfield Board of Trustees and senior administration recognize the need to address these quantity constraints. As a first step in the college’s response, SRG Partnership was commissioned to complete a science facilities feasibility study in 2005 [Exhibit 3]. Subsequently, the Board of Trustees identified that study’s Option 3 as the preferred approach. Since then, a planning process has moved forward with the active engagement of science faculty from all the affected departments. In spring 2007, the college sent a team of faculty from chemistry, biology, physics, and environmental studies, accompanied by Jon Weiner from SRG, to attend a workshop on science facilities development sponsored by Project Kaleidescope. This workshop presented new classroom design concepts and pedagogical innovations that collectively encouraged programmatic partnerships across disciplines in the development of a shared science facilities vision. In spring 2008 a noted classroom/lab design expert visited Linfield to lead a campus workshop for interested faculty from the sciences and other fields.

Adequacy in the provision of classroom and lab space on the Portland Campus is gauged with reference to the faculty survey conducted by the Campus Facilities and Technology Planning Group [Exhibit 7]. As a result, the college affirmed the need to expand facilities to support enrollment increases and desired programmatic improvements. In particular, the nursing faculty convincingly argued for additional classroom space designed to support current pedagogical practices. With the help of external grants, the college has undertaken a substantial remodel of Peterson Hall in which an unused lecture hall is being converted into needed classroom space.

Nursing lab facilities adequately support present Portland Campus enrollment. However, if enrollment expands, additional lab space and simulation capability will be required. After the additional classrooms are completed in Portland, an existing, lower demand classroom could be converted into a fourth nursing lab facility to meet this need.

The science lab on the Portland Campus has served well for many years, but it will need modernization and upgrading if laboratory science courses continue to be offered on that campus. With the move from a four-year to an upper division program in 2007, however, lab needs have changed. Future renovation of the science laboratory may thus depend on the success of the newly redesigned health sciences curriculum.

On the McMinnville Campus the quality of classroom spaces can be gauged with reference to the classroom condition index, a qualitative analysis tool administered by Facilities Services [Exhibit 20]. It evaluates the physical attributes of most classrooms, including flooring, walls, woodwork, and furniture, using
a scale of 1 to 3 (where 1 indicates a relatively low level of depreciation, 2 indicates mid-level depreciation, and 3 indicates a relatively high level of depreciation). The average index value across all attributes and classrooms in fall 2007 was 1.4. Predictably, the lowest relative levels of depreciation are observed in the newest buildings on-campus such as Nicholson Library and the Miller Fine Arts Center.

The Portland Campus does not use a formalized classroom condition index. However, all classrooms have been maintained and upgraded with new AV and computer capabilities. The additional renovations associated with the Peterson Hall remodeling project are designed to accommodate current teaching practices and will be a welcome addition to the campus.

In the Division of Continuing Education, college-owned classrooms and laboratories host many of the on-site meetings associated with the DCE program. These facilities are adequate for DCE’s purposes. Any improvements to them accrue benefits to DCE as well as residential programs.

User perceptions can also help to gauge the physical quality of instructional spaces. Information about students’ perceptions may be gleaned from the 2007 Senior Survey for the McMinnville Campus [Exhibit 9]. In that survey 86% of the seniors majoring in the sciences said they were very satisfied/satisfied with the lab spaces (10% said they were dissatisfied). In the same survey, 90% of all those who responded indicated they were very satisfied/satisfied with campus classroom spaces.

A survey conducted in spring 2007 by the Faculty Academic Support Committee provides insight into faculty opinion about pedagogical facilities issues on the McMinnville Campus [Exhibit 10]. While it is not possible to use the survey results to formulate specific action plans, it may be possible to conclude that faculty opinion as expressed in the survey centered on three important issues. First, many faculty in McMinnville would like to see improvements in the campus’ science spaces. This desire presumably reflects the challenges of managing the science curriculum in a space-constrained environment, as discussed above. Second, many faculty in McMinnville would like to have more classrooms equipped with the specific technologies they wish to use when teaching. Third, concern exists about the ergonomics of some classrooms.

Addressing the first issue will require long term effort already under way. The science facilities planning process is designed to help the college gather the information necessary to design and complete McMinnville science facilities improvements. The second issue can be addressed in the short and medium run by systematically continuing to remodel and upgrade McMinnville Campus classrooms. Information about the types of improvements made and being planned for the classrooms is provided in sections 8.A.3 and 8.A.4

8.A.3 The institution’s facilities are furnished adequately for work, study, and research, by students, faculty, and staff.

Furniture purchase and replacement processes at Linfield are designed to ensure that facilities are adequately furnished for effective use. On both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, the furnishing needs of academic and administrative departments are usually expressed as part of the annual equipment allocation processes managed by the vice president for academic affairs, the associate vice president for academic affairs in Portland, and the vice president for finance and administration. Academic and administrative departments also have supplies and equipment budget lines from which they may purchase furnishings, but larger purchases are usually provided from the centrally administered funds.
While furnishing requests compete with central funding requests for equipment of all types, units are asked to state their priorities. This helps to insure that monies allocated on an annual basis flow to their best uses as defined by the users themselves. [Exhibit 11] presents the academic affairs new equipment worksheet used by McMinnville academic departments to identify their preferences for new equipment (including furnishings) for the coming year. The vice president for finance and administration (through the controller’s office) manages a priority-based request process addressing administrative department furnishings in McMinnville.

New faculty on the McMinnville Campus receive a standard office furnishing package which includes a desk, desk chair, side chair, one or two seven-foot bookcases, and filing cabinets as requested. The same package is provided as needed when faculty offices are remodeled or relocated. The package is often modified to include other items such as a small conference table and chairs, a computer desk, or keyboard tray as appropriate to the pedagogical and professional needs of the individual user.

All faculty and staff whose positions require use of a computer at Linfield are provided with either a desktop or a laptop computer as appropriate to their needs. Each new faculty member on the McMinnville Campus receives a new computer. The average McMinnville replacement cycle for faculty and staff computers operates on an approximate four year rotation [Exhibit 12]. All faculty and staff offices are equipped with a telephone that includes voice messaging service. All offices have internet access.

All new building or modernization projects on the McMinnville Campus completed during the past decade have included ample budgets for new furnishings in all offices, classrooms, and other spaces. Replacement classroom furnishings are provided by the Office of Academic Affairs from its equipment budget, grant funds, and annual budget for classroom remodels. The Office of Academic Affairs follows a blended strategy that allocates replacement furnishings to classrooms with the highest levels of depreciation, as measured by the Classroom Condition Index presented in Exhibit 8, and in the highest demand.

A similar process is used for the non-academic spaces of the McMinnville Campus. Furniture additions or replacements occur either through the annual administrative equipment budget, the department’s operation’s budget or through funds in the facilities remodel account.

Portland Campus administrative and academic departments draw on departmental supplies and equipment budgets for purchasing some furnishings. Purchase of larger items such as desks, as well as all classroom furniture, happens through the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. In 2005, the three principal classrooms for nursing and health sciences classes in Peterson Hall (Rooms 103, 104, and 106) were refurnished using centrally administered funds. Tables and chairs that can be easily rearranged to suit the teaching preferences of the faculty replaced small individual desks.

The new classrooms in Peterson Hall will be outfitted with furnishings suitable to the faculty’s pedagogical needs. Faculty and staff members in Portland receive a basic office package consisting of desk, chairs, bookcase, and filing cabinets. Additional furniture is provided to fit individual needs. Over the past two years, 17 out of 21 offices in Peterson Hall have received replacement furnishings.

DCE occupies a suite of offices in Malthus Hall on the McMinnville Campus which is adequate for its purposes. New or replacement office furniture is purchased by DCE as needed from its budget.
8.A.4 The management, maintenance, and operation of instructional facilities are adequate to ensure their continuing quality and safety necessary to support the educational programs and support services of the institution.

The McMinnville Campus has nearly 150,000 square feet of good quality instruction space and is continually planning for upgrades and improvements to enhance student learning. The campus employs an in-house maintenance staff as well as student workers, augmented by contractors as needed to manage, maintain, and operate its facilities [Exhibit 13]. Maintenance and operations of facilities assets are funded through both reoccurring and non-reoccurring sources including the general operating budget, the major repair and renewal (MR&R) account, and the deferred maintenance account (see 8.C.2 for additional discussion).

Since the 2003 mid-term accreditation review, Linfield has added a new 54,243 square foot library, a 15,970 square foot theater and communication arts building, and a 16,874 square foot music building on the McMinnville Campus. Several classroom remodels have also been completed, along with significant renovations to Ice Auditorium and Renshaw Hall. In Pioneer Hall, the remodeling of a classroom and the old radio station space (for use by the Psychology Department), as well as the creation of a small computer lab for the Political Science Department, will occur in summer 2008. In fall 2008, the current photography lab in Renshaw Hall will move to Miller Fine Arts Center; in the vacated area, a new faculty office, small lab, and common area for the Environmental Studies program will be built. Improvements to classrooms have often focused on technology integration and have included smart board rear projectors, lecterns with computers, and overhead projection and sound equipment.

Improvements to classrooms have often focused on technology integration and have included smart board rear projectors, lecterns with computers, and overhead projection and sound equipment.

Linfield’s McMinnville Campus has a well-developed safety information and management program coordinated by the college safety team [Exhibit 14]. This group manages the processes associated with accident/incident reporting and follow-up. It also conducts quarterly safety inspections and advises the administration about safety improvements. All safety officers are certified by the State of Oregon and the director of campus safety is licensed by the State of Oregon.

8.A.5 Facilities are constructed and maintained with due regard for health and safety and for access by the physically disabled.

Buildings on both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses were constructed to comply with code and applicable safety regulations at the time of construction. As buildings are remodeled, the work complies with relevant code and safety regulations.

The college’s ADA survey [Exhibit 15] identifies enhancements to accessibility for each building. The survey provides an action plan as facilities are upgraded and improved. The college ensures reasonable accommodations when needed; to this end, the director of Learning Support Services serves as liaison for students with disabilities.

The Division of Continuing Education specifies that all classrooms and offices utilized on community college campuses must be ADA compliant. The only exception involves Chemeketa Community College where the Linfield advisor arranges to meet with students in an ADA compliant conference room as needed.

8.A.6 When programs are offered off the primary campus, the physical facilities at these sites are appropriate to the programs offered.
Linfield’s international programs and associated courses are offered away from the primary campuses of McMinnville and Portland and fall into three categories. Standard 2.G — International Programs provides additional information on these practices.

The first involves courses and programs offered through affiliation and agreement with bona fide foreign institutions. The college enters into these agreements only after inspection of each organization’s facilities by the director of international programs. Linfield students directly enroll as visiting students at these institutions, taking classes alongside their counterparts in a particular country. Classes occur in regular classrooms and laboratories. Linfield students have access to all available academic and co-curricular facilities such as the library, computer labs, sports and recreation, health center, and the like.

The second category consists of overseas courses and programs specifically developed for Linfield students at the following sites: San Ramon, Costa Rica; Oaxaca, Mexico; and Vienna, Austria. Classes take place at a cultural, historical, or language/academic institute. Students either use an in-house reference library specifically arranged for that program, have access to the library of a local university by special arrangement, or continue to access Linfield’s library resources on-line. At these locations, students typically rely on cybercafés for their internet and email needs. Linfield staff and faculty pay frequent site visits to these locations to insure that study facilities are adequate for the size and type of program offered. At the Vienna location, students with advanced proficiency in German may take courses at the University of Vienna.

The third category of off-campus international education involves courses led by Linfield faculty during the four-week January Term. Depending upon the theme and location of these courses, classes occur either on-site in museums and galleries, at local universities by special arrangement, or in hotel suites or conference rooms where the students stay. Faculty work with the international programs office and travel vendors to ensure facilities adequate to the curricular needs of these courses.

8.A.7 When facilities owned and operated by other organizations or individuals are used by the institution for educational purposes, the facilities meet this standard.

Linfield’s educational use of facilities operated by other organizations takes place in consultation with relevant faculty or staff. This ensures that the facilities adequately serve specified instructional purposes. At Westwind on the Oregon Coast, for example, the college often arranges to rent the center for retreats, educational activities, and research [Exhibit 16] and www.westwind.org/. With over 500 acres of wilderness beach, salmon-bearing rivers and upland forests and meadows, the facility ably meets the needs of Linfield’s Environmental Studies program, the Departments of Philosophy and Biology, and the chaplain’s office, among others. Departments wishing to use Westwind during the academic year transmit their requests to the Office of Academic Affairs which handles the scheduling and necessary budgeting details.

Nursing clinicals take place at a wide range of agencies and hospitals away from the Portland Campus. These sites are identified by faculty to insure the kind of educational experience called for by the nursing curriculum. Clinical sites invite comparison with student teacher assignments in practicing K–12 classrooms.

DCE courses operate in three off-campus locations in Bend, Eugene, and Salem at community colleges accredited by the Northwest Commission. Linfield advisors in those locations inspect the assigned classrooms in both the fall and spring semesters. Any concerns are directed to and addressed by the dean of the Division of Continuing Education.
8.B – Equipment and Materials

8.B.1 Suitable equipment (including computing and laboratory equipment) is provided and is readily accessible at on- and off-campus sites to meet educational and administrative requirements.

Linfield’s equipment purchase and replacement processes (including computing and lab equipment) are designed to insure that suitable equipment is available to users.

On the McMinnville Campus the equipment needs of academic and administrative departments are often expressed as part of the annual equipment allocation processes managed by the vice president for academic affairs and the vice president for finance and administration. Academic and administrative departments also have supplies and equipment budget lines from which they purchase equipment. Larger purchases usually draw on centrally administered funds.

To bolster the abilities of academic departments to manage their equipment inventories, in 2002–03 the McMinnville Campus implemented a course fee system. Departments are invited annually to submit course fee proposals to the vice president for academic affairs. Students enrolled in these courses pay associated fees as part of the college’s regular billing processes. Fee revenue is deposited into restricted accounts under departmental control. Fund balances carry over from year to year, allowing departments to accumulate funds and plan for large or multiple/phased purchases as needed. At the end of 2006–07, the average balance carried over to 2007–08 in these departmentally controlled funds was $9,501, with a high of $41,168 and a low of $250.

[Exhibit 17] lists McMinnville fee-bearing courses and the associated amounts.

Effective equipment inventory management requires balancing the allocation of funding between new and replacement equipment. In 2004–05, the Office of Academic Affairs thus adopted a bifurcated process for allocating centrally controlled equipment funds on the McMinnville Campus. In the fall of each year, academic departments submit requests for new equipment using the prioritized request worksheet shown in [Exhibit 11]. These requests inform the academic affairs budget request for new equipment funding during the college’s budget deliberations. In the spring, departments submit prioritized requests for replacement of depreciated equipment. Academic Affairs then considers the totality of requests for new and replacement equipment in relation to the total central equipment budget, including its increase over the course of the budget cycle. The distribution of funding between new and replacement equipment takes into account the need to fund depreciation adequately.

In 2004–05 central equipment funding was allocated only to replacement equipment purchases. No new equipment was purchased from the centrally administered funds that year. In 2005–06 approximately 90% of available central funds went to replacement equipment. This percentage fell to approximately 80% in 2006–07, and about 70% in 2007–08. It rose slightly to 75% in 2008–09. The balance of replacement versus new requests and the growth of the central equipment budget will determine future allocation percentages.

On the Portland Campus, departmental budgets for nursing and the sciences provide funds adequate to meet the equipment needs of those curricula. Computing equipment for all faculty and staff is regularly upgraded on a four-year cycle using funding from the computing and educational media services budgets. Upgrades of two computer labs, classroom computers,
and AV equipment occur through a designated technology fund account replenished annually through each new budget. Balances carry over from year to year.

DCE supplies and maintains its own computing equipment including hardware, software, databases, servers, and printers. Its funds are adequate for ongoing updates as needed. The division hosts and administers the Blackboard course management system for the entire college. A relational database was created for DCE in 2007 which has greatly enhanced all advisors’ and support staff’s abilities to interact effectively with prospective students. At the community colleges where DCE classes are taught, classroom needs such as AV equipment are provided by the host institution on a prearranged basis.

8.B.2 Equipment is maintained in proper operating condition, is inventoried and controlled, and replaced or upgraded as needed.

See 8.B.1 for discussion of management and funding processes for new and replacement equipment. Inventory control for equipment items occurs both at the departmental and at central administrative level.

Academic and administrative departments monitor the operating condition of their equipment and the replacement needs of their inventories. New and replacement equipment purchases are funded from both departmentally controlled funds and central funds as described in 8.B.1.

Departments also monitor the need for new and replacement computer equipment and initiate requests for computers, but most computer purchases are centrally funded. A computer inventory for the McMinnville Campus is managed and annually updated by Integrated Technology Services [Exhibit 12]. The average replacement cycle for faculty and staff computers in McMinnville is approximately four years.

On the McMinnville Campus, classroom equipment installation and replacement is managed by the Office of Academic Affairs in partnership with educational media services (EMS) housed in the library. EMS maintains the inventory of classroom equipment [Exhibit 18] so as to track and manage this equipment stock.

The Portland Campus implemented a regular upgrade process for faculty, staff and lab computers beginning in 1998. Faculty and staff computers are replaced on a four-year schedule budgeted through Computing and Educational Media Services. This schedule is adhered to closely, with adjustments for sabbaticals and personnel changes. Lab, classroom, and library public access computers are regularly upgraded using Portland Campus funds.

DCE uses its budget to employ a full time technology and online course administrator to maintain computers and software for all advisors and to update and recommend replacements on a regular schedule.

8.B.3 Use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials are in accordance with the institution’s prescribed procedures.

Use, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials on both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses follows the guidelines set forth in the Linfield College Hazardous Waste Plan [Exhibit 19]. College environmental health and safety procedures and policies are detailed on the Linfield webpage (www.linfield.edu/ehs/env/env_services.php).
8.C – Physical Resources Planning

8.C.1 The master plan for campus physical development is consistent with the mission and the long-range educational plan of the institution, and the master plan is updated periodically.

Three planning documents currently guide decision making involving physical development: (1) the May 2000 Master Plan, (2) the SRG Science Feasibility Study, and (3) the 2007–08 Master Plan Analysis. Informed both by Linfield’s mission and its ongoing efforts at long-range planning, these documents provide a framework for linking academic needs and financial capacity in an institutionally responsible way.

In May 2000 the college replaced an earlier draft version with a new McMinnville Campus Master Plan [Exhibit 5]. The committee responsible for this effort lay the foundation for facilities planning across the coming decade by identifying which academic programs would occupy the former Hewlett Packard site – now the Keck Campus. Buildings acquired in 1998 ultimately became the Miller Fine Arts Center, the Jereld R. Nicholson Library, and Kenneth W. Ford Hall. The completed plan also specified construction of a new music center on the Keck Campus, and in fall 2006 the Vivian A. Bull Music Center officially opened its doors. These new facilities have redressed long-standing needs in areas central to Linfield’s liberal arts tradition and serve as the academic anchor to the expanded college footprint.

As noted earlier, the college has also undertaken the early stages of planning for improved science facilities on the McMinnville Campus. The Science Feasibility Study [Exhibit 3] augments the 2000 Master Plan and provides the basis for much of the staging of facilities renovation and construction informing the 2007–08 Master Plan Analysis.

The 2007–08 Master Plan Analysis [Exhibit 4] was completed in draft form in August 2007. In early 2008, it was posted on the college website and reviewed by the President’s Cabinet, the Planning Council, faculty, and staff at their respective assembly meetings. The Facilities Committee of the Board of Trustees considered it at its February 2008 meeting. The analysis along with its associated North Campus Project timeline and the cost estimate inventory analysis that flows from it jointly serve as guiding reference documents for current facilities project planning at the college.

8.C.2 Physical facilities development and major renovation planning include plans for the acquisition or allocation of the required capital and operating funds.

In May 2003 the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution requiring that all new construction include a maintenance endowment [Exhibit 21]. This ensures that all new buildings will have a funding vehicle for maintenance so as to moderate their impact on the operating budget.

Over the past five years an average of $623,000 per year has been spent on the McMinnvile Campus for major repair and renewal work, renovation and modernization, and deferred maintenance projects [Exhibit 22]. This funding derives from both reoccurring and non-reoccurring sources. As shown in 8.C Figure 1, the total spent has recently trended upward.
To assist on-going facilities appraisal, Linfield contracted Sightlines, Inc. in 2006 to evaluate the funding levels necessary to maintain the McMinnville Campus. The resulting report benchmarked the campus against other colleges [Exhibit 23]. It will help guide future facilities funding decisions; for example, it provided an important source of information for the trustees as they recommended that the annual budget steadily move toward designating $1 million a year for asset stewardship [Exhibit 24].

All buildings on the Portland Campus are owned by Legacy Health System. Under the affiliation agreement that established the Portland Campus in 1983, Good Samaritan Hospital and Medical Center (now Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital) retains responsibility for maintaining the buildings and hence conducts routine maintenance and repairs through the Legacy Facilities Department.

Housekeeping responsibilities are divided between the Legacy Housekeeping Department, which cleans Loveridge Hall and the Library, and United Building Maintenance, a private housekeeping firm that services Peterson Hall under contract with Legacy. In spring 2008 the college successfully negotiated a new lease agreement with Legacy which covers both Peterson and Loveridge Hall and permits renovation of Peterson.

8.C.3 Physical resource planning addresses access to institutional facilities for special constituencies including the physically impaired and provides for appropriate security arrangements.

The college maintains an ADA compliance evaluation survey [Exhibit 15] which identifies successes and opportunities for improvement. The college upgrades disabled access during modernization cycles as feasible and provides systematic ADA improvements as part of its regular operations budget funding.

Security arrangements on the McMinnville Campus have continued to improve over the past decade. The Department of Safety has grown by 17% over that period. Its annual report details security procedures and policies and reports Cleary crime statistics for McMinnville, Portland, and DCE [Exhibit 25].

On the McMinnville Campus, twelve emergency blue phones have been stationed around campus during the past decade. All residence halls have electronic lock access and are in permanent lock down with card access by inhabitants. Each building is equipped with access control systems that can be operated by people with disabilities. Several digital cameras are used to augment security in critical areas. Each new building project or
major remodeling project is a candidate for security camera installation as appropriate.

On the Portland Campus, Legacy Health System had made changes over the past decade to ensure ADA compliance for Peterson Hall, Loveridge Hall, and the Legacy Health System-Linfield Library. Under terms of the affiliation agreement between Linfield and Legacy, security on the Portland Campus is provided by the Legacy Security Service. Front door access to Loveridge Hall (the Portland Campus student residence) is restricted from 6:30 PM until 6:30 AM Monday through Friday as well as on the weekends. Legacy Health System Security also provides safety orientations for students living in the residence hall. For commuter students, security escorts are available for those working in the evening on-campus or in the hospital.

8.C.4 Governing board members and affected constituent groups are involved, as appropriate, in planning physical facilities.

Building stakeholders, administrators, students, and trustees collaborate to plan facilities at Linfield. Three examples illustrate this collaboration.

The first involves the planning for Northup Hall’s renovation. Since the building will house four academic departments, the effort has been managed by the Office of Academic Affairs. The schematic design process included group meetings of the architects with faculty representatives from each of the four departments, facilities administrators, and the dean of faculty. The architects presented process updates to the President’s Cabinet, which then carried that information to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. At their spring 2008 meeting, the trustees approved both design/development and construction documents planning. As of September 2008, design/development are complete thanks to the collaborative work of faculty from all four Northup departments and the facilities staff.

The second example is process that produced the 2007–08 Master Plan Analysis [Exhibit 4]. That process began with the president appointing a working group composed of faculty and administrative representatives both the McMinnville and Portland Campuses, as well as the trustee chair of the board’s facilities subcommittee.

The third example results from the hiring of a professional facilities planner in the fall of 2007. Although facilities planning processes have been well managed at Linfield, there is always room for improvement. This planner now acts as project shepherd and is responsible for communication and coordination among the design and construction team, the campus community, students, and building stakeholders. This communication and coordination ensures the appropriate voices are heard, issues are adequately discussed, and institutional integrity is maintained as the college plans for its facilities improvements.

Conclusion

Linfield College engages the challenges and opportunities associated with its facilities management and improvement goals in a collaborative manner that involves all college constituencies. The 2007–08 Master Plan Analysis identifies facilities planning options that can help focus discussion and planning over the next several years.

The college manages several hundred thousand square feet of physical assets. These facilities will continue to require attention. It will be necessary to determine which buildings should be modernized and in what order so as to further the institution’s mission. In addition to major building renovation, individual classrooms and labs will continue to need
upgrades and improvements to keep Linfield competitive in the 21st century. Financing all of the college’s physical facility and equipment needs will remain a significant institutional challenge in coming years.
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Institutional integrity must inform every facet of an academic organization. As the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities’ Policy Statement points out, “[b]y academic tradition and by philosophical principle, an institution of higher learning is committed to the pursuit of truth and to its communication to others.” Establishing and maintaining a sound body of ethical ideals is critical to accomplishing this mission. Accordingly, an academic institution must recognize that (1) written policies and procedures reflecting sound ethical principles and directing the enforcement of ethical norms provide a starting point but not an end point; (2) the operation of ethical norms within and by each college constituency provides the foundation for institution-wide integrity; and (3) it is easier to identify occasions or environments where a breakdown of institutional integrity has occurred than it is to document successful realization of the ideal itself. That said, the task at hand involves an examination of Linfield’s performance for indicators of institutional integrity—or failings therein.

In completing this report, numerous college policies and publications have been reviewed to assess whether the board, administrators, faculty, and staff subscribe to and advocate high ethical standards. Results of the 2006 Faculty Survey, as well as a sampling of articles from the student newspaper (The Linfield Review), also provided information upon which to evaluate the operation of high ethical standards in the conduct of the institution’s various constituencies. Focused interviews with key administrators, faculty and student leaders offered additional qualitative data regarding practices of the board, administrators, faculty and staff.

9.A.1 The institution, including governing board members, administrators, faculty and staff, subscribes to, exemplifies, and advocates high ethical standards in the management and operations and in all of its dealings with students, the public, organizations, and external agencies.

In the 1998 self-study, Linfield’s ethical consensus coalesced around respect for civility, truth-telling, and freedom of conscience. The revised 2002 mission statement foregrounds an appreciation for diversity as well as a concern for equity and fair treatment of all individuals [Exhibit 1]. A heightened awareness in the campus community about environmental ethics resulted in President Hellie assigning a task group on environmental awareness and sustainability. The task group’s work and reports helped President Hellie conclude that he should sign the American College and University Presidents Climate Commitment, which he did in April 2008.

A significant aspect of institutional integrity involves maintaining consistent and transparent practices in the college’s business operations. To help insure that lapses in sound business practices are identified and corrected, Linfield introduced EthicsPoint, an internet-based reporting system. In his October 5, 2006 email to the community announcing the system, controller Greg Copeland wrote the following:

As Controller of Linfield College, one of my most important duties is to help ensure that all of our community members are operating in a safe, secure and ethical financial environment. As key contributors to our success, your honest and open communication is critical in establishing and maintaining this environment. We have just installed a new phone and internet-based reporting system called EthicsPoint to foster this communication. This new system allows employees, students, and others
to report financial issues or concerns in a totally anonymous and confidential manner.

EthicsPoint is somewhat like the old suggestion box, but provides much more, such as a follow-up and response mechanism, while at the same time protecting reporter anonymity. As a member of the Linfield community you are in a position to observe not only questionable or unethical behavior by our Accounting and Finance employees, but also see areas in need of change. If you would like to communicate your observations anonymously, please consider utilizing EthicsPoint.

The tone and content of this communication exemplify the importance placed upon ethical practice throughout the college by its senior leadership.

9.A.2 The institution regularly evaluates and revises as necessary its policies, procedures, and publications to ensure continuing integrity throughout the institution.

The 1998 self-study identified inconsistencies among college publications both in mode of expression and commonly used facts. Since that time the college has taken a number of steps to ensure the integrity of its publications. In 2004 then-President Vivian Bull organized an integrated communications team to address issues related to the accuracy, consistency and effectiveness of external communications. The team has also sought to coordinate the college’s decentralized communications programs. Exhibits documenting these efforts include the group’s 2005 interim report and a 2007 memo documenting a discussion of progress and ongoing issues [Exhibit 2]. Since 2003, the presence of an institutional researcher has served as a foundational resource for ensuring consistency and integrity of information used in Linfield’s communications [Exhibit 3]. Discussion of policies and the periodic review of those policies are discussed in detail in Standards One and Six.

9.A.3 The institution represents itself accurately and consistently to its constituencies, the public, and prospective students through its catalogs, publications and official statements.

Linfield pursues its mission in a highly competitive environment, not only for the recruitment of students, faculty and administrators but also in the quest for philanthropic support and public visibility. Communications addressed to external audiences must convey the strengths of the college in a comprehensive, consistent, and integrated fashion without exaggerating strengths or minimizing weaknesses. Accurate self-representation of the institution and its many programs to all constituencies must characterize the college’s communications, whether print, online or broadcast, so that those who decide to attend, support, or accept employment at Linfield do so with sound information. Institutional integrity demands nothing less.

Toward this end, employees responsible for college publications must understand and commit to the importance of accuracy in their productions. The integrated communications team (composed of administrators who oversee Linfield’s external public relations and communications programs) expressed confidence that their staffs have internalized the value of accuracy. Two concrete steps taken by the college to foster this goal have included the establishment of a full-time institutional researcher and the policy stipulation that factual assertions about the college be based on institutional research data. The Office of Institutional Research provides consistent, well-researched information to departments across campus. In turn, those
departments charged with the preparation of external publications work with institutional research to verify factual statements and coordinate with the director of public relations to ensure that official statements are both accurate and approved.

All print or online references to qualitative evaluations of Linfield and its programs, based on rankings, reviews, or surveys, are substantiated with source information to validate the accuracy of institutional claims. For instance, Division of Continuing Education (DCE) materials published in 2006–07 include the following statement: “ranked #1 since 2001 by US News and World Report.” The asterisk leads to the following footnote on the same page: “Ranked #1 by US News and World Report for the ‘Comprehensive Colleges-Bachelor’s category in the western region.’” Other examples of this practice may be found in documents produced by the Office of Admission and the Division of Continuing Education. It should be noted that in 2007–2008, US News and World Report included Linfield in the national liberal arts college category, rather than the western regional comprehensive college category it had previously occupied. As a result of this change, Linfield no longer ranks number one in the west and has made a college-wide effort to avoid citing the previous ranking. A review of publications completed for this self-study has produced only one example of its appearance in 2007–08 college promotional materials: a spring 2008 football recruiting brochure. That document has since been pulled from circulation [Exhibit 4].

Other ways by which the college has fostered improved coordination and consistency in external communications include the following: (1) implementation of coherent, interconnected communications strategies for enrollment services and college relations; (2) standardization of a design template for the college website; and (3) introduction of a campus-wide logo for Linfield’s 150th anniversary. Such examples demonstrate how the college seeks to create accurate and flexible messages for external constituencies usable by all campus entities.

The integrated communications team grappled with the challenge of internalizing the importance of consistency across Linfield’s public relations and communications programs. Because the college has not yet approved an institution-wide policy addressing these issues, departments continue to exercise independent creativity and initiative that will require innovative strategies to channel those efforts toward the shared goal of greater consistency in public representations of the college. For instance, Athletics, the Portland Campus, and the Division of Continuing Education maintain separate graphic/message identities in their print and online communications. And they are not alone. As in any complex organization, Linfield can point to an array of diverse communications efforts. Various types of surveys, ranging from instruments that are nationally-normed to those that are in-house and deployed via “Survey Monkey”, are conducted by departments across campus. Information gathered in this way helps shape specialized departmental recruiting publications and other external messages. But these types of information-gathering at the program or departmental level can complicate the pursuit of a coordinated institutional communications strategy.

The integrated communications team’s recommendations for improving both the accuracy and consistency of Linfield’s public relations and communications include: annual review of “boilerplate” text describing Linfield in various media; regularly updated online resources for external communications (official text, publications procedures, graphics manuals, Wikipedia, Quick Facts, the Linfield fact book); and distribution of quarterly emails alerting Linfield personnel about these online resources. Once the necessary research has been completed, the college intends to develop a logo and style sheet meant to coordinate, focus, and build institutional buy-in for a comprehensive college communications strategy.
9.A.4 Institutional policy defines and prohibits conflict of interest on the part of governing board members, administrators, faculty, and staff.

The Trustees of Linfield College adopted the college’s first formal conflict of interest policy in 1998, during its last full accreditation self-study. That policy was revised and again approved by trustees on May 14, 2005. In keeping with increased state and federal scrutiny of non-profits as a result of the 2002 Sarbanes-Oxley Act, higher education institutions show heightened interest in assuring the integrity of trustee relationships with the organizations they oversee. The 2005 revisions to Linfield’s conflict of interest policy reflect changes under discussion within the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. The current policy is consistent with the model policy published by the Association in 2006 [Exhibit 5]. This policy defines conflicts of interest broadly, requires prior disclosure of actual or potential conflicts, requires written approval of transactions where an actual or potential conflict exists, and prohibits any unapproved activity involving an actual or potential conflict of interest.

The college’s conflict of interest policy relies on self-disclosure. This approach reflects the college’s belief that full disclosure helps prevent conflicts of interest in two ways. First, the person who articulates the extent and nature of an actual or potential conflict will often be the first to recognize and take steps to avoid it. Second, disclosure allows further scrutiny and careful consideration by disinterested decision-makers, which serves to protect the college.

Under the policy, the trustees, college officers, and departmental directors must file disclosure statements with the vice president for finance and administration. The policy is set forth in the Linfield College Personnel Policies and Practices for all employees including exempt, nonexempt and student employees (known as the Common Chapter) [Exhibit 6]. Faculty and other non-managerial employees must file statements when an actual conflict arises or when their activities might create the appearance of a conflict.

All disclosure statements must be reviewed by an officer of the college. In practice, review has been handled by the President’s Office or delegated to the vice president for finance and administration. The policy calls for a written response to each filing. If the reviewing official determines that a conflict exists or may exist, the transaction may be approved if it meets clearly defined standards: that the transaction is in the college’s best interest and that the terms are fair and reasonable to the college. In addition, the transaction must be one for which the college could not obtain more advantageous arrangements from another with reasonable effort. The vice president for finance and administration takes each case where a potentially controversial conflict is identified to the chair of the Trustees’ Audit Committee. If the chair concludes that the issue requires additional discussion or review, the entire Audit Committee considers it, reaches consensus on the matter, and communicates the board’s response to the trustee, though not necessarily in writing. The college will examine if a more formal notification procedure is necessary going forward into 2008–09. Such an examination would take place at the Trustee level, with the Audit Committee. On average, fewer than five such reviews have been conducted each year.

The 2006–07 leadership transition in the Office of the President as well as the Office of the Vice President for Finance and Administration delayed review of the conflict of interest statements filed that year by trustees and administrators. During that period, the chair of the audit committee reviewed any form that had comments; the controller did not perform a substantive preliminary screen. After his arrival at Linfield in July 2007, the new vice president for finance and administration reviewed all conflict forms filed during the 2007–08 academic year.
Best practices as identified by this standard indicate that the college should enforce an outright prohibition of any conflicts of interest among trustees. Currently Linfield College pursues a policy of review and imposition of reasonable terms regarding possible conflicts. This disjunction will also be addressed by the board at its fall 2008 deliberations.

Some confusion has existed about whether the process for approving outside employment for faculty should result in the filing of a conflict of interest statement. It has been the practice of the vice president for academic affairs to require McMinnville Campus faculty to request approval for outside employment; approval has been issued either via written or electronic communication, without the submission of a conflict of interest form. The director of the Portland Campus has not required such requests or conflict of interest forms, nor has written approval for outside employment been issued. Written records have not always been used to document discussions and decisions about actual or perceived conflicts. To address this issue, the vice president of academic affairs will work with the vice president for finance and administration during fall 2008 to review the procedures for applying college conflict of interest policy to faculty. They will report their findings to the Audit Committee of the board and make recommendations, as appropriate, to ensure consistent practices on both campuses.

In addition to the conflict of interest policy, other college procedures and policies provide ethical safeguards for the institution. Examples include the following: (1) no employee may authorize payment to him- or herself; (2) operating procedures require that any payment over $1,000 be authorized by a college officer; and (3) requests for travel reimbursements require adequate documentation. Independent auditors have not identified any improper expenditures, nor have the independent auditors issued any management recommendations. As noted in 9.A.1, the college implemented EthicsPoint, an online financial ethics and fraud reporting procedure, on September 8, 2006 (announced to the community in October), to provide an easy and anonymous avenue for employees to comment about college financial practices. Their potential contributions range from whistle-blowing around unethical or questionable practices to suggestions for improving financial management and accountability. To date, one report has been filed through EthicsPoint regarding the $10 sale of an inoperable lawn mower to an employee without making all employees aware of its availability for purchase. Upon investigation, it was determined that no wrong-doing had occurred. The complaint led to a clarification of policy around the sale of unwanted college property [Exhibit 7].

During the 2006–07 search for a new vice president for finance and administration, President Hellie appointed Paul Aslanian as Linfield’s part-time interim CFO. Mr. Aslanian brought the college a wealth of experience and a national perspective on financial management and integrity. During this tenure he conducted a high-level evaluation of Linfield practices and made some targeted suggestions for improvement. To strengthen the college’s compliance with the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, he recommended that the trustee Audit Committee become an independent entity of the board rather than continue as a subcommittee of the Financial Affairs Committee. The board approved this proposal at its May 2007 meeting. Since his year as interim CFO, Mr. Aslanian has himself become a college trustee and thus continues to share his expertise with the board, particularly as a member of the Compensation and Investment Committees.

9.A.5 The institution demonstrates, through its policies and practices, its commitment to the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge consistent with the institution’s mission and goals.
Academic freedom and integrity hold a central position within the mission of Linfield College as the necessary engines of sustained intellectual vitality. Linfield has long incorporated the American Association of University Professors’ standards into its faculty personnel policies. Through its participation in the Association of American Colleges, Linfield joins with institutions across the nation to protect the free pursuit and dissemination of knowledge in higher education.

Assurances of academic freedom and integrity are woven throughout the college’s foundation documents. The mission statement highlights Linfield’s commitment to “intellectual challenge and creativity,” “thoughtful dialogue,” and “freedom of conscience.” Appendix C of the Faculty Handbook consists of AAUP’s published “Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom” as a means of validating the college’s commitment to those nationally recognized guidelines [Exhibit 8]. The organization and government statement specifically points out that “the college is committed to the teaching of undergraduates in an atmosphere of academic freedom that offers intellectual rigor, creativity, and a sense of personal and social responsibility.”

Linfield College plainly demonstrates support for and furtherance of academic freedom through its policies and practices. Administrators and faculty members conduct themselves in a manner consistent with the college’s dedication to this fundamental intellectual principle. A review of faculty CV’s demonstrates the breadth, creativity, and vitality of their research interests and service activities. Respondents to the 2006 Faculty Survey evinced confidence that they pursue their work in an open atmosphere encouraging intellectual rigor, innovation, and personal as well as social responsibility. Over 90% reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the autonomy they enjoyed in determining the content of their courses. Over 75% were satisfied or very satisfied with their ability to influence the courses they taught. Lower figures resulted in response to questions as to whether the college “walks its talk” in relation to the free pursuit of knowledge (65%) or whether the current mission statement accurately represents Linfield College (67%).

Evidence also indicates that the trustees support the institution’s commitment to and furtherance of academic freedom. The board understands and affirms the model of shared governance by which it works with the Faculty Assembly to fulfill Linfield’s academic responsibilities. The bylaws, revised and approved by the trustees in 2007, provide substantial delegation of authority to the faculty in academic decision-making, including prescription of policies regarding the maintenance of a suitable environment for learning, professional development, and hiring/promotion.

In its lively discussions and approval of the 2007–12 Strategic Plan, the trustees affirmed the centrality of the liberal arts mission of Linfield College, understood to rest upon academic freedom and integrity as crucial to intellectual vitality. In the 2006 Faculty Survey, almost 75% of the faculty acknowledged some trustee appreciation for the faculty role in safeguarding institutional academic freedom, but a significant minority questioned the board’s understanding of that fact. Recognizing the importance of increasing faculty/trustee interaction to foster greater familiarity between the two groups, President Hellie initiated faculty-trustee dinners in February 2007 and continued them in winter 2008.

One aspect of the college’s history and governance that deserves examination in relation to academic freedom involves its American Baptist heritage and continuing affiliation. That tradition has been institutionalized within the college’s governance structure: the bylaws require that American Baptists or those recommended by the church fill at least six dedicated slots on the Board of Trustees [Exhibit 9]. In keeping with Standard 9’s directive that church-affiliated colleges clearly articulate whether they exist to
promote higher education or a religious mission, it should be noted that Linfield’s mission statement aligns the institution with liberal arts values recognized by the faculty as the definitive priority for the college. Over 94% of respondents to the 2006 Faculty Survey agreed or strongly agreed that Linfield operates as an institution of higher learning, not a religion or church, notwithstanding its American Baptist affiliation.

Yet the college’s mission continues to reflect its American Baptist origins in that the American Baptist Church has long insisted that no authority, civic or religious, may legitimately force individuals to make a declaration of faith or conscience. Not coincidentally, the founder of the American Baptists, Roger Williams, is also cited as a progenitor of First Amendment protections. In the recent college history, *Inspired Pragmatism*, Marvin Henberg (not a Baptist himself) suggests that American Baptist leadership over the past 150 years has both informed and strengthened Linfield’s commitment to and respect for truth-telling, freedom of conscience, and civility. As noted extensively in Standard 1, the Linfield College mission statement expressly advances a vision of learning, life, and community that “inspires the courage to live by moral and spiritual principle and to defend freedom of conscience.” It also urges a vision of learning that “honors the rich texture of diverse cultures and varied ways of understanding.” Together with others on the board, American Baptist trustees unanimously supported this language [Exhibit 10].

Because of these deeply held institutional values and their dissemination throughout college policies and practices, members of the Linfield community, including the senior administration, are disturbed when anecdotal evidence suggests that students sometimes fail to respect other students’ religious or conscientious choices. The college chaplain has initiated efforts to promote religious tolerance and provide support to students of various faith groups. One prominent example has involved the contracting of a rabbi to conduct monthly services on the McMinnville Campus beginning in 2008–09.

**Conclusion**

The leadership of Linfield College seeks to foster the highest ethical standards at all levels of the institution. The review involved in producing this self-study has unearthed no evidence to the contrary. That does not mean that areas for improvement have not surfaced. As the discussion of Linfield’s integrated communications efforts make clear, those associated with creating external messages for various constituencies have made progress toward a more coherently organized approach to their respective representations of the college, but further work remains.

College practices to ensure effective monitoring of potential conflicts of interest have worked well to date but some of the steps in the process need improvement. As noted, the board will address the desirability of putting in writing its decisions on cases of potential conflict. Moreover, the vice president for academic affairs, together with the vice president for finance and administration, will work together to clarify and consistently enforce the college conflict of interest policy across all arms of the college.
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As the preceding discussions have made abundantly clear, Linfield takes great pride in its efforts on behalf of its students’ education in all sectors of the institution. Its accomplishments derive from the tireless commitment of hundreds of faculty members and staff dedicated to their disciplines, professions, and—again—their students. The passion to keep Linfield moving forward rather than letting it rest on its laurels motivates the creative problem solving that goes on daily throughout the college and explains the pervasive ethos of doing more with less that illuminates Linfield’s past and present successes. This should not be construed to mean, however, that the members of the Linfield community are oblivious to the difficulties and challenges that exist side by side with these achievements. Indeed, the usefulness of this self-study may lie most in what it documents about pressing challenges arising from consideration of the college in the light of the accreditation standards.

In that spirit, the Linfield College Accreditation Steering Committee has identified a range of issues for further attention by the appropriate entities of the college. Initially borne of specific standards, they have been collected here as composite suggestions about the strategic issues that have surfaced in more than one place during the 30 months of deliberation conducted by the Steering Committee.

• The increasing complexity resulting from the integration of planning, budgeting, and assessment has generated layered organizational processes that at times have collided with established college practice. Clarifying processes for effective communication and consultation in light of the principles of shared governance will foster trust in institutional decision-making and a sense of collective ownership of the decisions.

• In recent years the three distinct branches of the college—McMinnville Campus, Portland Campus, and Division of Continuing Education—have become increasingly intertwined in terms of curriculum and even infrastructure. Yet the process of integration is difficult and partial at this stage. Further steps along these lines will need to be taken in ways that foster a shared sense of purpose in service to a common mission.

• As noted in the *Linfield College Strategic Plan 2007-12*, the resource needs of the college are significant, particularly in view of its aspirations and the talents brought to the institution by so many skilled professionals. Increasing the college endowment remains the linchpin to a great deal of the future planning summarized in this document. The degree of tuition dependency at Linfield has long posed challenges for the college (even as its excellent fiscal management has produced balanced budgets for decades).

• People at Linfield College work extremely hard with modest compensation compared to Linfield’s aspirations. There seem never to be enough hands to do all the work of the college, and thus every department (academic and administrative) voices its need for additional staffing. Compounding this challenge to the operating budget of the college is the fact that, to remain competitive for new faculty and staff, and, as importantly, to retain the talented individuals already at work at the college, the pressures to improve compensation are high. As more baby boomers approach retirement, hiring challenges will only intensify in the coming years. Complicating the picture further are the escalating salaries operating in specific job categories and disciplines. The college will need to determine a roadmap for the future that works within the institutional culture while also addressing real market force challenges.

• The faculty governance structure itself would benefit from streamlining that would reduce the service obligations of the faculty, given their heavy teaching loads. The faculty might also develop means for its
various faculty committees to grapple
together with the challenge of balancing
needs for improved faculty compensation,
additional staffing, innovative educational
programming, better facilities, and expanded
operating budgets.

- Faculty commitment to scholarly as well as
  instructional responsibilities has steadily
grown in the last decade, and has been
reflected in the faculty evaluation process.
Yet faculty workload has not changed to
accommodate those expectations. Finding an
institutionally viable means of supporting
faculty in the work required of them for
professional advancement and intellectual
currency (both of which pay significant
dividends in the education of Linfield
students) will require attention in the near
future.

- The costs of a private liberal arts education
continue to grow even as Linfield seeks to
remain accessible for first generation
students, those of modest economic
backgrounds, and a more diverse student
body than it has traditionally had.
Developing sufficient student scholarship
funds to support these aspirations and lessen
unfunded financial aid costs to the
institution will be important to future
enrollment success, both in terms of raw
numbers and in terms of diversity. Meeting
this challenge is all the more important
because the very mission of the college is
founded in part on building understanding
and appreciation of cultural diversity within
our nation and world.

- Linfield accomplishes a great deal of
instructional assessment at the departmental
level but does not yet have a comprehensive
evidence-based culture of assessment
focused on student learning outcomes. This
project should become a central one for the
college in the coming years. Departmental
reviews conducted in a more systematic way
would also expand the culture of assessment
for educational improvement.

- The rich opportunities made possible by
contemporary educational technologies have
begun to leave their mark in all sectors of
Linfield. As their potential to enhance

student learning grows, so do the resource
and staff development demands that will
make them not only possible but useful. The
college will need to develop a plan for
supporting these needs that will be crucial to
effective educational delivery to 21st century
students.

- The single biggest facilities deficit on the
McMinnville Campus at present involves
the outdated and at-capacity science
educational spaces. Steadily moving the
college toward that master building project
will be crucial to the morale of the science
faculty as they struggle with growing
enrollments and inadequate teaching spaces.

- Portland Campus reliance on property
owned by Legacy Health Systems has
proven a challenge to its educational
programs and their ability to adapt to
changing teaching practices in their fields.
The college may need to think about a
different model for the Portland Campus in
the near future.

- Millennial generation students come to
college with greater personal challenges
than were true of previous generations. They
also come with different kinds of
expectations about the quality of life they
will have at college. Linfield’s ability to
deliver on both needs and wants will also
have to keep pace both with the expanding
numbers of students (in McMinnville) and
commensurate expansion of programming
and facilities infrastructure to ensure
successful education of the whole person.

None of these is a simple problem inviting easy
solutions. Nor would the Accreditation Steering
Committee suggest any specific routes for
addressing them. Rather, they are presented for
further campus deliberation and creative
thinking as the college plans for its next 150
years.