

Approved

INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY DESIGN

Lancaster Bible College
901 Eden Road
Lancaster PA 17601

June 1995

INSTITUTIONAL SELF-STUDY DESIGN

Presented to the
Commission on Higher Education
Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools
and to the
Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges

Lancaster Bible College
901 Eden Road
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17601

June 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Taken from Designs for Excellence: Handbook for Institutional Self-Study (20)

A.	Rationale for the Nature and Scope of the Self-Study	1
B.	Objectives of the Self-Study	6
C.	Plans for Incorporation of Outcomes Assessment Data	7
D.	Organizational Structure of Committees	9
E.	Charges to Steering Committee and Study Groups	12
F.	Description of Instruments for Collecting Data	16
G.	Inventory of Resources	21
H.	Self-Study Timetable	27
I.	Editorial and Format Expectations for Draft Documents	28
J.	Proposed Outline of the Final Document	31
K.	Team Composition and Leadership	33

A. RATIONALE FOR THE NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE SELF-STUDY

At the first meeting of the newly-formed Self-Study Steering Committee on March 10, 1995, the Academic Dean discussed the history and the nature of Lancaster Bible College's relationship to the Middle States Association (MSA) and to the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges (AABC). In summary, an institution-wide self-study had been submitted to AABC in 1984 and one to MSA in 1987. In addition, a Periodic Review Report for MSA in 1992 addressed specific areas of concern mentioned in the 1987 self-study.

Since 1992 major institutional developments have occurred. Also, LBC is due for visits from both accrediting associations within a relatively short period of time. Thus, arrangements have been made with MSA and AABC to schedule their visits simultaneously with one self-study document addressing both MSA's "Characteristics of Excellence" and AABC's "Criteria for Accreditation."

Lancaster Bible College is a small institution where every area has a significant impact on the entire campus community. An approach in which the entire college is evaluated against its mission and objectives fits our needs and interests. Therefore, after much discussion, LBC has opted for a comprehensive self-study. It is the approach that best fosters further self-study and planning in all the areas of recent developments.

Consultations among the President, the Academic Dean, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the chair of the Self-Study Steering Committee during the

early spring of 1995 resulted in identification of major institutional developments in the last ten years, especially since the "Periodic Review Report" to MSA in 1992. Consequently, our proposed design relates these numerous significant institutional developments to appropriate MSA "Characteristics" and AABC "Criteria" in order to show the relationship between the expectations of the accrediting bodies and the actual developments occurring on our campus. The resulting design as initially approved by the steering committee on April 10, 1995, and revised on June 27, 1995, is as follows:

1. INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY

MSA's Characteristics of Excellence

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Characteristics | 1. Institutional Integrity |
| | 2. Mission, Goals, and Objectives |
| | 7. Institutional Effectiveness |
| | 10. Organization, Administration, Governance |
| | 11. Governing Board |

AABC's Criteria for Accreditation

- | | |
|----------|---|
| Criteria | A. Institution and Its Objectives (A.1-A.5) |
| | B. Governance and Administration (B.1-B.4) |

Major Institutional Developments

Review of institutional identity and integrity

2. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MSA's Characteristics of Excellence

Characteristics 8. Planning and Resource Allocation
9. Financial Resources
14. Institutional Change and Renewal

AABC's Criteria for Accreditation

Criterion B. Governance and Administration (B.5-B.8)

Major Institutional Developments

1. Strategic planning
2. Stewardship developments
3. Budgetary developments
4. Endowment developments
5. Administrative restructuring
6. Presidential succession
7. Computerization of administrative functions

3. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

MSA's Characteristics of Excellence

Characteristic 5. Educational Program and Curricula

AABC's Criteria for Accreditation

Criterion D. Academics

Major Institutional Developments

1. Degree developments
2. Program developments
3. Revision of curriculum
4. Community/international service

4. LEARNING RESOURCES

MSA's Characteristics of Excellence

- Characteristics
- 4. Faculty
 - 6. Library and Learning Resources
 - 12. Facilities, Equipment, Other Resources

AABC's Criteria for Accreditation

- Criterion C. Faculty, Instructional, and Facility Resources

Major Institutional Developments

- 1. Faculty development
- 2. Library expansion
- 3. Information literacy instruction
- 4. Land planning/building design

5. STUDENT SERVICES

MSA's Characteristics of Excellence

- Characteristics
- 3. Students
 - 13. Catalogs, Publications, Promotional Materials

AABC's Criteria for Accreditation

- Criterion E. Student Development and Services

Major Institutional Developments

- 1. Admissions developments
- 2. Retention developments
- 3. Student services developments
- 4. Publications expansion

Study groups, co-chaired by members of the steering committee, will address each of the five areas of institutional development. (For specifics, see "Organizational Structure of Committees," part D of this design.) Study groups will

1. Evaluate the current status of their respective concerns, drawing upon valid data
2. Identify strengths and weaknesses
3. Submit to the steering committee their recommendations and suggestions for modification or refinement together with a reasonable plan and timetable

The steering committee will serve as the editors for the rough drafts, which will then be returned to the study groups and eventually to the entire college community for response. After making appropriate revisions, the committee will forward the reports to one editor for final revisions.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE SELF-STUDY

The following objectives have been approved by the Self-Study Steering Committee and by institutional administration.

1. Pursue a self-study process and develop a self-study report that uses assessment strategies to describe accurately the extent to which Lancaster Bible College meets the standards of the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and the criteria of the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges
2. Foster a climate that encourages the campus community to support and participate in the self-study process
3. Assess the extent to which the college mission statement and goals control institutional programs, services, resources, and functions
4. Produce a documented analysis of institutional strengths, opportunities, and problems with recommendations for building on strengths, for addressing problems, for planning internally, and for instituting improvement consistent with Lancaster Bible College's distinctiveness

C. PLANS FOR INCORPORATION OF OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT DATA

Fully aware that the college mission statement must be the basis for effective outcomes assessment, the Self-Study Steering Committee formulated charges that encourage study groups to evaluate the level of congruence between the mission statement and outcomes of programs and activities. Furthermore, the charges were written as statements rather than questions to foster analysis rather than description, the verbs having been derived from Bloom's taxonomy.

Outcomes assessment will be woven throughout the self-study document, treated as concerns common to all study groups. However, one member of the steering committee will be responsible to work with the study groups to ensure the incorporation of outcomes, to help analyze data, and to recommend further research and analysis when warranted. (See section G for details.)

In addition to these duties, the outcomes coordinator will evaluate the total college outcomes assessment plan, addressing:

1. What is being measured
2. Procedures for gathering data
3. The effectiveness of the assessment tools
4. The extent to which data are used and by whom
5. Specific recommendations for improvement

Each study group will draw upon the institutional data readily available (as identified in parts F and G of this design). When possible, standardized instruments will be used to collect data sought by the various study groups. In-

house instruments are also available (as listed in part G) for collecting data necessary to interpret appropriate aspects of the college. When necessary data are not available, the outcomes coordinator, in collaboration with the study group co-chairs, will make recommendations to the steering committee for additional research measures. Any data collected will be added to the college data bank.

In new institutional endeavors, such as PLUS 20 and the graduate program, assessment procedures are being incorporated into the programs from the start, and a range of evaluation instruments are being developed as the programs progress.

Special attention will be given to the study of service to the immediate community, the nation, and the world as demonstrated by the evaluation mechanisms currently in use. This spectrum of outreach activities by students as well as by faculty and staff will be analyzed in accordance with the institutional mission statement, philosophy, and societal obligations.

As stated in Characteristics (16), to assess our institutional effectiveness, the study groups must raise questions, seek answers, and make plans to improve procedures.

D. ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF COMMITTEES

On February 20, 1995, the Academic Dean, in consultation with the President, invited eleven individuals to serve on the Self-Study Steering Committee. These men and women were selected to represent a cross-section of the institution professionally as well as individually with diverse perspectives, ideas, and judgments. All consented to serve. Subsequently, at its first meeting on March 10, 1995, the steering committee agreed to add a representative from the Department of College Relations and two students to ensure that all college constituencies were well represented.

Steering Committee

- Dr. Joan Tompkins, Committee Chair (1972)
Division of Arts and Sciences
- Mrs. Claire Bjorkman, Staff representative (1994)
PLUS 20
- Dr. John Brobeck, Board representative (1984)
- Mr. Phil Dearborn, Alumni representative (1994)
Admissions Office
- Miss Donna Fasnacht, Staff representative (1993)
Stewardship Office
- Mr. Brad Lau, Faculty representative (1994)
Student Development Office
- Mrs. Jean Lichty, Corporation representative (1982)
Former Board member
- Mr. Jerry Lincoln, Library representative (1993)
Biblical Division

Dr. Ray Naugle, Administrative representative (1982)
 Vice President; Dean of the Graduate School
 Former Vice President for Academic Affairs
 Former Executive Vice President

Mr. Harry Price, Comptroller (1990)
 Business Office

Miss Marion Scrutchings, Faculty representative (1994)
 Professional Division

Mrs. Marge Styer, Staff representative (1991)
 College Relations
 Former Business Office staff member
 Current student

Two students, one male and one female, will be added during the summer of 1995.

After charges for the five major divisions of the self-study were developed at steering committee meetings during April and May 1995, members agreed on May 23 to co-chair one study group according to interests or areas of expertise:

Mrs. Claire Bjorkman Miss Marion Scrutchings Mrs. Marge Styer LBC male student	EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM
Dr. John Brobeck Dr. Joan Tompkins	INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY
Mr. Phil Dearborn Mr. Brad Lau LBC female student	STUDENT SERVICES
Miss Donna Fasnacht Mr. Harry Price	INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Mrs. Jean Lichty Mr. Jerry Lincoln	LEARNING RESOURCES
Dr. Ray Naugle	Outcomes Coordinator

Responsibilities of the co-chairs of the study groups include:

1. Overseeing the process of research and analyses of charges
2. Making clear that each assignment requires a brief description of the topic, documented analysis of strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations with a timetable for addressing problems and building on strengths
3. Generating a report using existing committees when possible, forming ad hoc groups, and/or soliciting individual input
4. Arranging for general awareness and campus publicity for the area being studied
5. Assimilating analytical reports, following prescribed format
6. Submitting a rough draft to the steering committee by the prescribed date
7. Discussing and editing the drafts of other study groups
8. Helping to edit the final version of the self-study

E. CHARGES TO STEERING COMMITTEE AND STUDY GROUPS

GENERAL CHARGES:

1. Understand the standards and expectations of the accrediting bodies (Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools and Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges) with reference to Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education, Designs for Excellence, and Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges Manual.
2. Gather data that describe the current status of area of concern.
3. Evaluate available institutional data. (Are these data sufficient? What else is needed? How will additional data be gathered?)
4. After study of all data (and activities such as interviews, discussions, etc.), draw conclusions as to the strengths and weaknesses of assigned area.
5. In all appropriate cases, test the assigned area by evidence of outcomes and measure against the mission statement of the college.
6. Develop practical recommendations for continuing institutional development.
7. Submit written drafts to the committee for discussion, suggestions, and editing.
8. Present properly-formatted final copy of assigned area to the Self-Study Steering Committee.
9. Incorporate the entire college community in the self-study process.

SPECIFIC CHARGES:

I. INSTITUTIONAL IDENTITY

1. Analyze existing evidence to verify whether LBC periodically evaluates its mission statement.
2. Substantiate evidences that LBC's mission statement drives the evaluation of existing programs and future developments.
3. Identify and evaluate the strategies in place to improve equity and diversity of the Corporation and Board of Trustees.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of the relationship between the Corporation and the Board of Trustees and how well it fulfills its intended purpose.
5. Examine how effectively LBC is preparing for presidential change in order to safeguard institutional identity.

II. INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Study and appraise the effectiveness of LBC 2000 in shaping the future of the college.
2. Analyze the strengths and weaknesses of development strategy.
3. Substantiate that budgeting guidelines and endowment initiatives will lead us to projected goals.
4. Examine strategies regarding human resources to insure the implementation of long-term plans and goals.
5. Investigate how effectively LBC maintains an on-going process for long-term planning.
6. Analyze the effectiveness for planning and proper management of the physical plant with regard to short-term and long-term priorities and to the institutional mission.

III. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

1. Assess how well curriculum revision fulfills institutional goals and objectives. Examine the process of evaluating curriculum.
2. Analyze how effectively critical thinking skills have been incorporated into class syllabi and transferred to classroom activities.
3. Assess how well the new academic programs (graduate and undergraduate) instituted in the last five years fulfill LBC's goals and objectives. Examine the ways these new programs are achieving their particular goals and objectives.
4. Study and appraise the extent to which the new programs (undergraduate and graduate) affect the budget, library resources, faculty schedules, and the environment of the teaching-learning process.
5. Assemble evidence to show that LBC has a comprehensive plan that incorporates information technology into its educational program, the extent to which this plan has been implemented, and the effectiveness of the plan.
6. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of LBC's educational program in equipping students to live and serve in multi-cultural society.
7. Derive sound inferences that the educational program encourages, equips, and supports students for service to the community.

IV. LEARNING RESOURCES

1. Evaluate the procedures and criteria for periodic evaluation of faculty.
2. Assess the resources available to faculty to support teaching excellence and professional development.
3. Evaluate the opportunities for and effectiveness of faculty participation in the formation and governance of education policies, programs, and facilities.
4. Analyze the effects of institutional growth upon faculty morale, teaching loads, and faculty-student relationships.

5. Examine the opportunities for faculty development, particularly in relationship to academic specialization and advances in technology.
6. Evaluate the library resources and facilities in light of academic program growth and in relationship to standards set by the Association of College and Research Libraries.
7. Analyze key concepts in the bibliographic instruction and information literacy program.

V. STUDENT SERVICES

1. Pursue relevant information to show that LBC is effective in recruiting and admitting students whose goals are consistent with those of the institution.
2. Assess the extent to which LBC fosters a familial atmosphere among faculty, staff, and students.
3. Evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of student services in assessing and meeting the needs of students in ways that are consistent with institutional goals and objectives. Evaluate how well student regulations are effectively articulated, explained, and valued by the college community.
4. Draw conclusions about LBC's effect in targeting programs, publications, and promotional materials to diverse audiences.
5. Analyze existing evidence to verify the effectiveness of the institution in placing graduates and maintaining positive alumni relations.
6. Evaluate the student retention program, deriving sound inferences about its effectiveness.
7. Determine the significance of providing empowerment and leadership opportunities for students in ways that are complementary to the formal classroom experience.
8. Analyze the effectiveness of our financial aid program.

F. DESCRIPTION OF INSTRUMENTS FOR COLLECTING DATA

Guidelines and procedures for outcomes assessment should be based upon "Outcomes and Institutional Effectiveness" found in Characteristics of Excellence (16-17) and the Framework for Outcomes Assessment. Also helpful will be the "Inventory of Resources" located in part G of this design. This inventory lists reports, former self-study documents, and other resources on file in the library and in the President's office. These data, gathered and organized into seven administrative areas by the Vice President, offer a variety of assessment tools to be utilized, ranging from informal discussions to performance tests, internship evaluations, and comprehensive exams.

Quantitative tests, like the AABC Standardized Bible Content Test, ACT, the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes (SSHA), the Test of Standard Written English (TSWE), and the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal are used for entry-level evaluation purposes. Qualitative assessments will be especially beneficial in assessing biblical and theological knowledge, student and alumni perceptions, and classroom and campus environment.

Each of the five study groups will conduct in-depth interviews on specific topics with students, faculty, staff, administrators, and other relevant groups or individuals. Substantive qualitative data should result not only from careful questioning based on the respective charges but also from general solicitation of comments and recommendations. Obviously, such assessments may be more

subjective than others; nevertheless, careful analyses and sound rationales for conclusions and recommendations are expected.

An outcomes-related approach will prove valuable in analyzing such areas as retention and graduation rates, passing rates for certification at the elementary education program level, and participation by students, faculty, and staff in community service.

Direct assessment of learning can be made at the program level through learning objectives in general education and Bible as well as individual disciplines.

A value-added approach with its pre-assessment and post-assessment will be used for evaluation of general education, Bible and theology, and critical thinking skills. Attempts will be made to interpret these results isolating the characteristics that may have made the difference in scores.

Since the proposed outline consists of five major divisions, instruments for collecting data are discussed under these headings:

Institutional Identity. The college mission statement and goals will be reviewed by students, employees, and Board members. The connection between the institutional mission and goals and the outcomes of programs and activities will be analyzed through a questionnaire to be completed by various college constituencies. We will also examine the administrative structure, the organizational pattern, and the relationship of the Corporation to the Board through various data available in the institutional data collection.

Institutional Development. The administrative area of Business and Finance keeps data such as investment reports; weekly cash flow reports; monthly updates; annual budgets and their revisions; and the major planning instrument, the Independent Annual Audit Report. It will be necessary to evaluate effectiveness through

retrospective and comparative data. Also beneficial will be the Development Software used by the Stewardship Office for fund raising and deferred giving.

Of particular interest will be strategic planning and development in light of increased enrollment, land acquisition, and building plans. We intend to assess this area carefully through the LBC 2000 planning document and through the data presently being accumulated, taking into account that plans must be adaptable to changing conditions and issues.

Data regarding physical plant planning and management that has been gathered since the "Periodic Review Report" will be valuable to establish the adequacy of present facilities. Also to be noted will be the attention to deferred maintenance.

Educational Program. The standardized COMP, given to seniors, will be used to assess general education outcomes, especially since it is compared with entering ACT scores and scores from liberal arts colleges of similar size. Results of the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, used as entering and exiting exams, will be used to measure critical thinking skills of all students. Since critical thinking has been the academic in-service focus for the current year, syllabi are being revised to reflect these skills. These, too, will be evaluated.

The LBC Alumni Survey, an in-house five-year follow-up survey, will be used to assess educational profiles and professional experience of our graduates. In addition, results students have achieved on the GRE will be studied.

The AABC Standardized Bible Content Test together with an in-house Bible Doctrine Questionnaire will serve well to measure Bible outcomes for every student, especially since both are used as entering and exiting exams.

The professional departments utilize qualitative and quantitative measures to clarify and define performance in field experience. For example, the Department of Teacher Education measures professional competencies of student teachers using in-house evaluation forms along with NTE examination results.

Additional qualitative data that will be used to assess the educational program are essay-type questions, surveys, and interviews, especially the Senior Exit Interview, which is a

comprehensive administrative interview with each senior. The steering committee outcomes coordinator and faculty members with psychometric knowledge and training will be involved in analyses and interpretation of the qualitative data.

LBC generates on-going internal data pertaining to student, faculty, and administrative evaluation of classroom instruction.

A descriptive progress report of the new graduate program is being prepared for the Pennsylvania Department of Education. This report will be closely analyzed by the Educational Program study group. Additional measurement tools are being developed as the program progresses.

Learning Resources. Instruments for collecting data pertaining to learning resources include quantitative and qualitative measures. Extensive data are available to assess faculty development, professional growth, and classroom performance. We will also incorporate data concerning compensation, teaching loads, attrition, professional grants, and fringe benefits.

Library resources and facilities will be closely scrutinized, since major developments have taken place within the last few years. Assessment will involve readily available use data, comparative data on other similar colleges, and data being compiled in the light of acquisitions expansion, the need for more space, and computerization.

To assess the information literacy program, various qualitative data computed in the last five years will be especially beneficial. The committee recognizes that it is difficult to define a "quality" program and to measure it; however, course syllabi in general are beginning to reflect library-based assignments. These syllabi will be closely evaluated, especially for increasingly complex library research skills.

Student Services. Of particular interest will be the assessment of retention and graduation rates. Scrutiny of existing data will center on procedures and methods for collection of outcomes information and the interpretation of that data. Especially in focus will be the ways the retention figures reflect the diversity of educational goals among our students. Admissions strategies will be specifically evaluated with regard to the impact they have on diversity, remediation services, and retention/graduation rates.

From comparative and retrospective institutional data, the crucial area of financial aid will be evaluated.

The following tools will be used to assess student services: personal interviews, questionnaires about residence halls, departmental evaluations of disciplinary measures, attrition reports, and general professional networking.

In accordance with our timetable, the Self-Study Steering Committee co-chairs and their study groups will

1. Become familiar with the self-study documents, reports, and distributed MSA outcomes assessment materials (April-May 1995)
2. Obtain descriptive information about the specific area of study based on respective charges (June 1995)
3. Conduct appropriate interviews (July-August 1995)
4. Gather data to provide feedback from as many members of the campus community and appropriate constituencies as possible (August-September 1995)
5. Complete analyses and research (October 1995)
6. Begin writing first draft of assigned area (November 1995)
7. Submit completion of draft version to the Self-Study Steering Committee (March 1996)

As the data are being collected, co-chairs and/or study groups will meet with the committee outcomes coordinator. Together they will analyze data using computer help when needed and draw valid conclusions and recommendations.

G. INVENTORY OF RESOURCES

Reports

A complete inventory of resources did not exist in print at the beginning of the self-study process. Although many valuable reports were filed in the office of the President since 1990, the contents of those reports were not generally known nor extensively utilized by the college community.

Organized according to administrative units, the following listings of available reports from 1990 to the present have proved helpful, even at this early date, to the Self-Study Steering Committee, to the study groups, and to the faculty and staff in these respective administrative areas:

Academics
Admissions
Business and Finance
College Relations
President's Office
Stewardship
Student Development

Academics

Listing of Faculty (by semester)
Budgets (by academic units)
Annual List of Academic Program Changes
Faculty Committees (annually)
Five-year Events Calendar
IPEDS
Senior Interviews (student responses)
Data Reports on Seminars (Biblical Counseling, Christian Education, Christian Service, Secretarial)
Christian Service and Internship Report (numbers involved, organizations, grades)
Christian Service Projects (and churches involved)
College Choir (Conestogans) Report
Continuing Education Report
Evening Institute Profile
Fine Arts Report
H.I.S. Ministry Reports (international and cross-cultural trips by students and faculty, with dates, numbers, locations, cost)
Library Report
Annual Statistical and Evaluative Report (comprehensive)
Placement Report
Plus 20 Degree Completion Report
RAP Report (study skills program, with numbers participating, hours, topics)