April 21, 2009

Grinnell presents workshop on self-study and leadership for the common good

Contact: Scott Baumler, Director of Institutional Research, Baumler@Grinnell.edu
Henry Morisada Rietz, Associate Professor of Religious Studies, Rietz@Grinnell.edu

CHICAGO – The Higher Learning Commission, one of the six regional agencies in the United States that accredits colleges and universities, invited Grinnell College to present findings from its reaccreditation self-study process at the Commission’s 114th Annual Meeting April 17-21, 2009.

Henry Morisada Rietz, Associate Professor of Religious Studies and chair of Grinnell’s self-study committee, and Scott Baumler, Director of Institutional Research, presented two workshops titled, “Self-Study as Story and Map: Process, Evidence, and Presentation.” Rietz and Baumler talked about conducting a self-study and Grinnell’s special emphasis: How can the College reinvigorate its traditional commitment to educate leaders for public service and social justice in the 21st century? The two Grinnellians gave practical advice about the process of self-study, gathering and compiling evidence, and producing a final report.

Eighty-eight college presidents, deans, provosts, professors, and higher education professionals attended the sessions, representing schools from New Mexico to Ohio and from Wisconsin to Arkansas.

Rietz and Baumler also met personally with scores of conference attendees at a “Program to Evaluate and Advance Quality” self-study fair where they discussed accreditation procedures. As the Commission explains, “Accreditation assures quality, primarily for the sake of the public, and it assists the improvement of quality, for the benefit of both the institutions and the public.” Rietz and Baumler distributed dozens of Grinnell’s self-study documents, and fielded 17 requests for follow-up information, to extend and share Grinnell’s work.

“It was a great opportunity to practice the type of sustainable ‘service leadership’ we discussed in the self-study document itself,” Baumler said. Rietz emphasized a call to “continue to report on the process to various constituencies,” including peer institutions.

“A self-study could not – and should not – have been accomplished without the hard work and sustained efforts of a community of leaders,” Rietz said. Input for the study was gathered from students, staff, faculty, alumni/ae, Trustees, and community members. Grinnell’s reaccreditation documents can be found online at http://www.grinnell.edu/offices/president.

The 2008 Reaccreditation Steering Committee also included Vicki Bentley-Condit, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Laura Sinnett, Associate Professor of Psychology, Joyce Stern, Dean for Student Academic Support and Advising, and Karen Voss, Associate Treasurer.

The Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools serves institutions in 19 Midwestern, south-central, and western states, as well as Department of Defense schools and organizations in sovereign U.S. tribal nations within these areas. Educational institutions must have their accreditation reaffirmed periodically; for institutions like Grinnell College, reaccreditation is examined every ten years.

###
Self-Study as Story and Map: Process, Evidence, & Presentation

Henry Rietz & Scott Baumler
A Special Emphasis

• **Special emphasis.** In conjunction with its focus on self-study, an organization obtains Commission authorization to focus in-depth attention on a select group of issues critical to its pursuit of continuous improvement and educational excellence. The organization provides evidence that it fulfills the Criteria for Accreditation and reports on agreed-upon strategies and efforts it will use in pursuing ongoing organizational improvement. The Commission sends an evaluation team to the organization not only to address assurance issues associated with accreditation review but also to spend considerable time in a consultative role related to the previously agreed-upon special emphasis foci. *(Handbook of Accreditation, 5-3).*
A Special Emphasis

• Grinnell College Administration: “Let’s examine the success of our Strategic Plan!”

• Higher Learning Commission: “That would be deadly boring. Try again.”
A Special Emphasis

• Eventually we agreed upon “... examining a question central to the College’s mission: how can the College reinvigorate its traditional commitment to train leaders in public service and social justice as it enters the 21st century?”
Forming a Steering Committee

• Associate Academic Dean
• Director of Institutional Research
• Vice President for Student Services
• Associate Treasurer
• Professor of Anthropology
• Professor of Psychology
Initial Sources for the Steering Committee’s Deliberations

- Special Emphasis Question
- Mission Statement
- Committee members’ own sense of the College
Context of Leadership:
Modeling healthy leadership;
Integrity btw what we do what we say;
Healthy constructive communication;
Governance vs. administration;
Self governance

Academics

- Individually mentored curriculum (IMC)
- Distribution
- Interdisciplinarity vs. disciplinarity
- Integrity

Special Emphasis:
- Creating leaders for social justice
- Servants of the common good
- Agents for social change

Student life

Well-being:
- Balancing workload
- Changes: technology, reinventing the wheel

Supported by financial, physical and human resources
Identify and Communicate with Constituencies

- Faculty
  - Executive council
  - Faculty Meetings
  - Special faculty members: librarians, athletics, early career, faculty of other colors
- Students
  - Student Government Association
  - Student Newspaper
- Staff
  - Various offices
  - Public Relations Office
  - Dining Services (often left out)
  - Facilities Management (Union?)
- Alumni/ae
  - Grinnell Magazine and G-Notes
  - Alumni/ae Council
  - Reunion
- City of Grinnell (cf. Strategic Plan 5)
- Board of Trustees
- Parents
- Employers of alums
- Graduate school mentors
- Internship supervisors
- Prospective students
- High School counselors
Accreditation 101

- Introduce and then continue to report on process to various constituencies
- Faculty, alumni/ae, students, trustees
- The Higher Learning what?
Gathering Data

• Reuse, reduce, recycle
  – Resist the urge to have a flurry of new activity just for the sake of activity!
  – Gather previous Institutional Research studies
  – Gather previous administrative reports, especially Dean’s Reports and President’s Reports
  – Departmental reviews!
    ▪ Your own self reflections as well as those of other external reviewers
  – Inventory of what your institution is already doing
Gathering Data (continued)

• New Data—both qualitative and quantitative (appeal to different constituencies)
  – Interviews of key faculty
  – Surveys—summative and formative
    ▪ Staff
    ▪ Alumni/ae
    ▪ Students
  – Discussions among constituencies (faculty, staff, students, administration, alumni/ae, trustees)
“Would you tell me, please, which way I ought to go from here?”

“That depends a good deal on where you want to get to,” said the Cat.

“I don't much care where,” said Alice.

“Then it doesn't matter which way you go,” said the Cat.

-- Lewis Carroll, *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*
Process

• Metaphors
  – Blueprint, map, story

• Knowing where you want to go
  – “Serendipity by design”

• Structures
  – Theme-based
  – Criteria-based
  – Cross-cutting themes
  – Core components
  – Special emphasis

• Integrated, evaluative
Grinnell’s anchors

Grinnell College Mission Statement

When Grinnell College framed its charter in the Iowa Territory of the United States in 1846, it set forth a mission to educate its students “for the different professions and for the honorable discharge of the duties of life.” The College pursues that mission...

Foundational Documents

Memo of Understanding

Handbook of Accreditation

Third Edition

The Higher Learning Commission

A commission of the North Central Association
Chicago, Illinois
Self-Study *Special Emphasis* Model

**Context of Leadership**

- Modeling healthy leadership
- Integrity: what we say & what we do
- Healthy, constructive communication
- Governance vs. administration

**Special Emphasis**

Creating leaders for social justice
- Servants of the common good
- Agents for social change

**Student Life**

**Diversity**
- Self Governance

**Academic Life**

**Individually Mentored Curriculum**

**Well-being**

- Effort vs. outcome
- Community morale
- Balancing the workload
- Change — technology, reinventing the wheel

Supported by financial, physical, and human resources
The Table of Contents as a “Storyboard”
Goals & activities
Unaligned
Goals & strategies
Aligned – but flexible

Goals of the Self-Study

Strategy to Address Criterion

Activities

Activities

Activities

Strategy to Address Criterion

Activities

Activities

Activities

Strategy to Address Criterion

Activities

Activities

Activities

Mission of the Institution
Pulling things together

• Speak in one voice
  – Consistency of tone
  – Readable report
  – Supposed to be about connectedness, so watch for discontinuity (or unnecessary repetition)

• Should be evaluative, not simply descriptive
  – Data-driven dialogues, not diffuse discussions using just anecdotes
  – Use evidentiary statements
Pulling things together (continued)

• Make it concise (!)
  – Equal treatment is not necessary due to organizational structures of the institution; expand on important areas for the HLC criteria

• Build credibility through transparency & broad participation
  – It’s not just to prove, but to improve
  – “To make the best better”
Humility with chutzpa

- Honesty & openness
- Integrity of the self-study report
  “The team found the self-study report to be accurate and straightforward in factual material, comprehensive in nature, and honest in presenting the College's self-assessment.”
- But for goodness sake – MAKE YOUR CASE!
  - This is an opportunity to brag a little bit too
  - It’s an opportunity for some “free consulting”
- This is not a place for “spin”
Evidence & Presentation

• Consider the need to separate/specialize the process management from the evidence collection/creation duties. Depends on circumstances.

• Core team needs recognition ("authority") for getting self-study resources

• Plan forward for file sharing, layout, production of graphics, default software specifications, etc.

• Tell and show
Tracking Mission accomplishments

Broad programs reflecting on process & achievement

Mission: ...The College aims to graduate women and men who can think clearly, who can speak and write persuasively and even eloquently, who can evaluate critically both their own and others’ ideas, who can acquire new knowledge, and who are prepared in life and work to use their knowledge and abilities to serve the common good.

Communications development
- writing assessment program
- oral presentation/speaking

Research skills evaluation

Transcript analysis
- Degree audits & advising

Global outlook project

Each is an in-depth multi-year project tapping constituencies across campus

Information literacy project
Evidentiary materials

**Direct assessment: Faculty ratings of students’ writing skills**
Percent of students rated *generally adequate* or *consistently excellent* on each of ten criteria, 1st & 4th semesters

![Bar graph showing changes in faculty ratings from beginning of first semester to end of fourth semester from 2003 to 2006.](image)

**This one simple bar graph represents six years of work!**

Matched pair cohorts with sample sizes of 85, 97, 75, & 69, respectively.

Rating scale: Consistently excellent | Generally adequate | Variable quality, usually some problems | Student needs significant work on this.

Dimensions (criteria): Central claim, maintains unity, opening, closing, stays focused, connected, grammar, use of info., engagement, complexity.

Source: Office of Academic Affairs, Office of Institutional Research.
### Senior Snapshot surveys: Leadership & the common good

How well did Grinnell College prepare you to use your knowledge & abilities to serve the common good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How well Grinnell College prepared you to become a community leader?</th>
<th>Not very well</th>
<th>Reasonably well</th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Extremely well</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonably well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of observations: 5 25 50 100

Responses from graduating seniors, 2006-08. N = 474 (rho(472)=.583, p<.01).
# Evidentiary Materials

**Indirect & direct measures**

## Direct & indirect assessments: Preliminary investigations into the relationship between intellectual curiosity and leadership

Correlation between faculty ratings of students’ intellectual curiosity (via MAP evaluations) and students’ self-ratings of enhanced leadership skills (via senior surveys)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student self-rating: Grinnell enhanced my ability to be a leader</th>
<th>Faculty MAP ratings: Intellectual curiosity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student was passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greatly</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>■</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of observations:**  

| Number of observations: | 1 | 5 | 10 | 20 |

Matched data from student senior survey responses and faculty MAP evaluations. N = 94 [rho(92)=.264, p<.05].
Figure 6: Concept map for “What does it mean for a person to be a leader?”

- Critical thinking 7%
- Communication skills 18%
- Engaging people 47%
- Role modeling 18%
- Heart & humility 16%
- Vision & planning 35%
- Strengthening others 12%
- Internal motivation 10%
- Authenticity 10%
- Structure 4%
- Decisiveness 3%
- Specialized knowledge 3%
To what extent did Grinnell College enhance your ability to...

Different cohorts of stakeholders

Legend:
- Current students, classes 2008-2010, ages 18-24, n = 313
- Recent graduates, classes 1998-07, ages 23-32, n = 260
- Midlife alumni, classes 1976-87, ages 33-64, n = 113
- Seasoned alumni, classes 1960-75, ages 55-80, n = 99

 Asterisks indicate significant group differences at p < .05.
**Evidentiary materials**

**Inclusive & broad-based**

---

**Figure 1: Individuals’ Experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>Percent agree or strongly agree by employee type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I can rely on my co-workers when I need help</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the right resources to do my job well</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My direct supervisor <em>appreciates</em> what I do at work</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I <em>appreciate</em> what my supervisor does at work</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I <em>understand</em> what my supervisor does at work</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My direct supervisor <em>understands</em> what I do at work</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see my job as contributing to the greater good of society</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the right people around me to do my job well</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 3: Mission of the College**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>All respondents</th>
<th>Percent agree or strongly agree by employee type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand the mission of Grinnell College</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I value &amp; believe in the mission of Grinnell College</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work contributes to the mission of Grinnell College</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of valid responses. Percentages in bar chart do not add to 100 because the “neutral” category is not displayed.
Writing the Report

• Draft a table of contents early
  – Provides an outline of your process
  – Provides benchmarks for your process

• Start writing certain sections early!
  – Importance of the history chapter
    • Evaluated on being true to yourself
# Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction (write last)

I. Section on General Issues

Chapter 2: A History of Grinnell College until 1998
Chapter 3: History of Grinnell College since the 1998 Site Visit: Grinnell’s “Fifth Rebuilding”
Chapter 4: Issues Raised from 1998 Site Visit Report
Chapter 5: 5 Criteria

II. Section on Special Emphasis

Chapter 6: Posing the questions
   - Past studies that led to question
   - History of leaders for social justice at Grinnell College

Chapter 7: Current ways that we are creating leaders for social justice

Chapter 8: Models of leadership and social justice; conceptions of power
   - Surveys
   - Interviews with key faculty: “Priming the Pump”

Chapter 9: Discussion of leadership and social justice within constituencies
   - Survey Results and Discussions

Chapter 10: Reflection and formative evaluation: Towards a Vision for Sustainable Leadership for Social Justice

Chapter 11: Conclusion

Appendices
Writing the Report (continued)

• Research, reflect, then write other sections
  – Can’t we see through papers that didn’t do that?
• Snapshot in time of your institution
• Be honest
• Provide evidence
• Read instructions (i.e., use the HLC Handbook)
• It will take longer than you expect
A storyboard of substance

“There is always an easy solution to every human problem – neat, plausible, and wrong.”

-- H.L. Mencken

Life after accreditation

• Like many institutions, Grinnell distinguishes itself from other institutions in our unique ability to promote life-long learning
Yes, there is life after accreditation

• Institutional life-long learning

• Push through the finish line
  “The ambitious agenda the College set for itself exceeded the time available to address every item originally envisioned. The wide array of Grinnellians interviewed by the accreditation team all look forward to continuing to explore and refine these questions, and we fully anticipate that they will be answered and acted upon to the benefit of the College in the coming years.”

• Creating assessment data
  – Collecting learning goals
Don’t forget the niceties

• Acknowledge when “we need your expertise in this area/on this topic” – limit time frames, break up commitments, and focus on specific tasks – don’t wear people out

• Throw parties to recognize achievements; celebrate

• Thank you notes
GRINNELL COLLEGE

Scott Baumler
Director of Institutional Research
Baumler@Grinnell.edu

Henry Morisada Rietz
Associate Professor of Religious Studies
Rietz@Grinnell.edu

Self-study documents online at:
http://www.grinnell.edu/accreditation