

The Past, Present, and Future

Lancaster Bible College (LBC) benefits from Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools (MSA) regional accreditation and the various processes required of such accredited institutions. One of these processes is the Periodic Review Report (PRR), the subject of this document. Many positive things have occurred at LBC in the last five years since the 1997 decennial self-study and reaffirmation of accreditation. To contextually understand the last five years, as well as gain an appreciation for a projection into the next five years, it is necessary to present a brief history of the college, a history rich in both tradition and change.

LBC was founded in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, in September 1933 as Lancaster School of the Bible. After being located in downtown Lancaster for 25 years, the college relocated to its present property in Manheim Township, several miles north of the city. The original campus of 36 acres has been expanded to 68 acres, with an additional 28 acres of non-contiguous acreage a couple miles from the campus. Today 19 buildings provide for the function of the institution. Two of these buildings are new since the 1997 decennial self-study.

Motivating LBC in every endeavor is its commitment to the institutional mission.

“Lancaster Bible College exists for the purpose of educating Christian men and women to live according to a Biblical world view and to serve through professional Christian ministries.”

This mission provides a filter through which every decision flows. Institutional and student goals further define this mission into a philosophy of operation. LBC faculty and staff are committed to meeting the spiritual, intellectual, physical, social, and emotional needs of the students.

As a means to achieve greater accountability of the application of the college mission, LBC maintains two types of accreditation. In November 1959 LBC received national and professional accreditation through the Accrediting Association of Bible Colleges (AABC), and in December

1982 LBC received regional accreditation through the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools.

LBC is a non-denominational institution authorized to grant the following degrees and certificates: Master of Arts in Ministry, Master of Arts in Bible, Master of Arts in Counseling, Master of Education in School Counseling, Bachelor of Science in Bible, Bachelor of Science in Education, Associate of Science in Bible, Associate of Science in Secretarial Studies, two one-year undergraduate certificates in Bible, and one Graduate Certificate in Children's Ministry. Each undergraduate student majors in Bible and selects professional training from 22 available programs. Plus 20 is LBC's non-traditional degree completion program, offering a Bachelor of Science in Bible Degree and a one-year Bible certificate. Evening Institute is LBC's extensive non-credit program with courses offered on various campuses in central Pennsylvania and New Jersey. CEU credits are granted for students enrolled in the institute's courses. Please reference the LBC Undergraduate Catalog, the Plus 20 Catalog, and the Graduate School Catalog for a more detailed discussion of the various certificates, degrees, and programs.

The president is Dr. Peter W. Teague. He assumed the presidency in 1999 and is now completing his third year of service. Previous presidents include Dr. Gilbert A. Peterson (1979-1999), Dr. Stuart E. Lease (1961-1979), Dr. William J. Randolph (1953-1961), and Dr. Henry J. Heydt (1933-1953).

A 23-member Board of Trustees, elected from the Corporation of over 100 individuals, governs the college. Trustees are energetically involved in securing the future success of the college. Quarterly board meetings, along with regular committee meetings, provide the opportunity for critical leadership input. The board continues to have a positive working relationship with the college community.

The administration is comprised of nine individuals representing all facets of the college (see Appendix 1 for the administrative structure). Together the administrators function as the Executive Council, meeting weekly to discuss pertinent issues. The vice president for academic affairs (VPAA) oversees the academic structure of the institution. Reporting directly to the

VPAA are the undergraduate and graduate deans who work together in leading the faculty. The Admissions Office services the recruitment and application process of traditional undergraduate students. The recruitment function of the Graduate School, Plus 20 Program, and Evening Institute are housed within their respective departments. The Student Development Department (SDD) is responsible for meeting the needs of students once they matriculate into a degree program. The department focuses mostly on the needs of traditional undergraduate students with the other educational levels meeting the needs of their students separately. The Business Office is charged with overseeing the business function of the institution as well as the students from all educational levels. The maintenance of the campus plant also falls under the auspices of the Business Office. Institutional planning is the responsibility of the Stewardship/Advancement Office. This office also oversees fundraising and gift processing. Public relations, marketing, and new construction initiatives fall under the auspices of College Operations. The president leads the Executive Council and meets with each member regularly.

Under the leadership of both the undergraduate and graduate deans are the faculty. Faculty members are committed to the mission of the institution as they model leadership for the students. The faculty continue to stay current in their fields and are encouraged to further their education. As of 2002, 26 faculty members have earned doctorates (62% of all faculty). Another two are in the midst of doctoral studies. Several faculty members have published both journal articles and books. Beginning in fall 2001 the faculty developed action plans to further enhance instruction in the classroom. Three divisions of education comprise the educational experience at LBC. The Biblical Division, Professional Division, and Arts and Science Division provide a well-balanced, integrated curriculum that incorporates theory with practical experience. Faculty from each of the three divisions teach at all educational levels of the institution.

The student body at LBC varies from traditional first-time college students recently graduated from high school to retired adult learners. This broad range of students enhances the campus atmosphere. As one can imagine, meeting the needs of the student body takes on many forms. Instead of a centralized office, each of the various levels of education meets the needs of its students. The largest student body is the traditional undergraduate students with half of them

living on campus and the other half commuting. Approximately 75% of the students come from Pennsylvania. Recruitment strategies have grown over the last several years to target out-of-state students. Heavy recruiting in New England, the Middle Atlantic states, and Ohio is beginning to increase the out-of-state campus population. Students from all educational levels support the mission of the institution. Since all the programs focus on ministry, students are actively involved in local churches, para-church organizations, and community groups.

This past academic year LBC serviced over 1,700 students with its degree programs and non-credit Evening Institute. There are 131 students in the Graduate School and 798 undergraduate students in both traditional and non-traditional programs (2000-2001). Servicing the needs of the student body are 157 employees, including 42 full-time faculty, 7 part-time faculty, 37 adjunct faculty, 30 professional staff, 39 staff, and 9 administrators.

The library serves as the learning resource center for all levels of education. Currently there are 148,000 volumes, 529 paper and microform periodical subscriptions, and over 3,000 electronic full-text periodicals. The library is the third largest among colleges accredited through the AABC. Computer labs as well as networked study carrels provide opportunity for students to access the network and the Internet.

LBC is benefiting from a vibrant five years of new initiatives, new facilities, growth in enrollment, new faculty, and new staff. LBC also faces new challenges as it reaches to the future. The keystone connecting the last five years to the next five years is a concentrated focus on the planning process. Under the leadership of the new president, a comprehensive planning process began with an assessment of what LBC does. From there it moved to identifying pillars that provide a framework for institutional effectiveness incorporating institutional research, outcomes assessment, and planning. The process has been inclusive of all stakeholders with a vested interest in the success of LBC.

The construction of two new buildings has significantly enhanced the campus atmosphere. The 54,000 square foot Good Shepherd Chapel (GSC) provides a common place for daily chapel services as well as three office suites, three classrooms and additional room for expansion. The

Olewine Dining Commons (ODC) doubles in size the previous food service facility. It also centralizes food service so that faculty, students, and staff all eat in the same facility. This has greatly enhanced the esprit de corps on campus.

The college has an annual operating budget of approximately \$11 million, a small but growing endowment, no deferred maintenance, and up until the construction of the GSC and ODC no debt. The college has maintained a history of balanced budgets in 21 of the past 22 years. Gift income to the Scholarshare Advancement Fund, which provides tuition assistance to students, was over \$1.2 million in 2000-2001. Total giving to all funds in 2000-2001 was \$4,494,191 from a donor base of 2,969 people.

Many challenges await the college in the next several years. Of critical importance is the need to continue to attract students committed to pursuing ministry training at the various educational levels. New programs on the undergraduate and graduate levels provide opportunity for continued enrollment growth. The campus expansion plans and fundraising campaigns must be in tune with academic planning pursuits on both the undergraduate and graduate levels. The continually changing world of technology has many potential applications. Balancing the use of technology as well as the initiation of programs resulting from technology will become an increasing challenge. Rising above all current and future challenges is the need for LBC to remain focused and consistent with its mission and goals. The mission and goals will continue to drive the desire to be effective as an institution.

Objectives, Format, and Methodology of the PRR

Planning for the production of the 2002 PRR document started in December 2000. The VPAA asked Dr. Harold Kime, faculty member and Chair of the Computers in Ministry Department, and Mr. Philip Dearborn, College Registrar, to co-chair the PRR process. Several meetings occurred in the subsequent months to begin formulating objectives, format, and methodology of the 2002 PRR document. The objectives identified were:

1. Initiate a PRR Committee.
2. Formulate a comprehensive list of significant changes from 1997-2002 and provide a description, purpose, and analysis of the significant changes listed.
3. Review 1997 decennial team's recommendations and suggestions as well as the self-study recommendations and report on actions taken.
4. Report and analyze institutional self-study, outcomes assessment, and institutional planning as components of institutional effectiveness.

The format of the PRR appears in Table 1.1.

TABLE 1.1. PRR Format

PRR Format

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Significant Developments

- I. External Economic Developments
- II. Administrative Developments
 - Presidential Change
 - Academic Affairs Restructuring
 - Stewardship Restructuring
 - Business Office Restructuring
 - Performance Appraisals
- III. Academic Developments
 - Undergraduate Education
 - Merging of Christian Education and Pastoral Studies
 - Health and Physical Education Program
 - Cancellation of Missions Aviation Program
 - Graduate Education
 - M.A. in Counseling Degree
 - M.Ed. in School Counseling Degree

- Graduate Certificates
 - Graduate School Program Coordinators
 - M.A. in Bible Evaluation
 - Learning Resources
- IV. Faculty Developments
- Professional Grant
 - Revised Faculty Load
 - Faculty Evaluations
- V. Student Developments
- Revised Admissions Standards
 - Student Development Office Restructure/Mission Statement
 - Director of Spiritual Formation
 - Student Enhancements
- VI. Technological Developments
- VII. Buildings and Grounds Developments
- Advancing the Vision Capital Campaign
- Section 3: Responses to Self-Study Recommendations
- Develop a Campus-wide Assessment Plan
 - Make Measurable Progress in Achieving Greater Diversity
 - Prioritize Objectives in LBC 2000+ Plan
 - Better Coordinate Planning and Budgeting Process
 - Plus 20 to Include Christian Service
 - Program Review of Missions Aviation
 - Strive to Meet ACRL Standards for Budget Support of the Library
- Section 4: Evidence of Institutional Effectiveness Demonstrated by Continuous Institutional Research, Outcomes Assessment, Planning, and Budgeting
- Model for Institutional Effectiveness
 - Institutional Data and Research
 - Outcomes Assessment
 - Planning and Budgeting Processes
-

Methodology consisted of identifying, collecting, and analyzing data in the context of the PRR format. In the spring of 2001 a PRR ad-hoc committee was formed. Committee members and their years of service at LBC appear in Table 1.2.

TABLE 1.2. PRR Committee Members

Committee Members

Mrs. Anna Allshouse, Faculty Member, Early Childhood Coordinator (8 years)
Mr. Philip Dearborn, Faculty Member, Registrar (8 years)
Ms. Deborah Hunt, Faculty Member, Associate Library Director (21 years)
Dr. Harold Kime, Faculty Member, Chair of Computer Studies Department (26 years)
Ms. Laura Kime, Junior Year Student in General Ministries Program
Mr. Mark Miller, Administrator, Director of Finance (2½ years)
Ms. Mary Anna Rutt, Secretary for Vice President for Academic Affairs (4½ years)
Dr. Rich Wilson, Administrator, Vice President for Stewardship and Advancement (16 years)

Careful attention was given to assembling a group of individuals who best represented the campus community. Also, personnel were identified that had direct responsibility related to the various sections of the format. Data collection, data analysis, interviews, meetings with individuals, and subcommittees collectively provided input for the process. Special attention was given to the 1997 self-study document, the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team report, and institutional data. Appendix 2 provides a timeline for the entire 2002 PRR process.

By the end of the summer all input and data were collected, and the committee began formulating the document. By March 2002 the document was ready for campus review. The entire month was dedicated to an extensive campus review to ensure accuracy and relevance. All campus stakeholders were provided with the opportunity to read the document. Presentations were made to the Board of Trustees, the Education Committee of the Board, the Executive Council, Faculty, Alumni Council, and the student body (including traditional undergraduate, non-traditional undergraduate, and graduate school students). Interaction and discussion with the document also occurred at each of the various levels. Forms were made available for individuals to submit their comments. Upon completion of the review period, time was spent reviewing the comments and suggestions for a June 1, 2002, submission to MSA.

Specifics Related to the PRR Narrative

There are several key areas of the narrative worth highlighting.

1. *New Programming.* The addition of two new graduate degrees and a graduate certificate will continue to expand the graduate school. The undergraduate program will also experience growth due to the enhancement of the Health and Physical Education/Bible Education Program. Students now receive Pennsylvania state teacher certification in addition to ACSI (Association of Christian Schools International) certification. It is planned that within the next year a second degree in education will further enhance the program.
2. *Technology.* Technologically, the college has made significant advances. Workstations, library automation, ID cards, Internet access, and databases have all experienced change.
3. *New Construction.* Two new buildings, the Good Shepherd Chapel and the Olewine Dining Commons, have positively changed the atmosphere on campus.
4. *Institutional Effectiveness.* Institutional research, outcomes assessment, budgeting, and planning have been brought together to form a comprehensive plan for institutional effectiveness. The plan, while still relatively new, has already benefited the institution simply by providing a framework from which institutional effectiveness will be built.

As the committee worked through the production of the document, it became apparent that several of the recommendations offered by the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team were discussed in different sections. Section 3 is dedicated to a discussion of each of the evaluation team's seven recommendations; however, issues related to the recommendations are discussed in other places. To aid the reader, Table 1.3 lists the seven team recommendations along with page numbers where relevant discussion occurs.

TABLE 1.3. 1997 MSA/AABC Evaluation Team Recommendations with Page Number(s)

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Section 3</i>	<i>Other Pages</i>
Recommendation #1: “That an assessment plan developed by a campus-wide task force, which includes procedures and instruments for data collection, analysis, and use of data be written in a timely fashion.”	p. 45	p. 58 p. 74 Appendix 10 Appendix 11
Recommendation #2: “That the college make measurable progress in fulfilling its commitment to achieve appropriate representation of diversity on the board and in the administration, faculty, staff, and student body.”	p. 50	p. 34
Recommendation #3: “That the current objectives stated in LBC 2000+ be prioritized through discussion with the campus community and become an integral part of the administration and faculty working landscape.”	p. 53	p. 74 Appendix 13
Recommendation #4: “That planning drive the budget and not the reverse. The team would recommend a better coordinated planning and budgeting process possibly on a three-year cycle that integrated budget with the planning process.”	p. 54	p. 58 p. 74 Appendix 14 Appendix 21 Appendix 22
Recommendation #5: “That the Plus 20 Program mandate Christian Service and list it as a graduation requirement (AABC: D.2.0).”	p. 55	NA
Recommendation #6: “That a comprehensive review of the Missions Aviation Program be conducted and appropriate action taken. “	p. 56	p. 22
Recommendation #7: “That the institution strive to meet the ACRL standards for budget support of the library.”	p. 57	NA

Outside of the direct recommendations listed above, the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team report also contained suggestions both in the text of the report and at the end of each section. Many of these were addressed by the college and are noted as such throughout the PRR.

Table 1.4 provides a summary of the major LBC self-study committee’s recommendations with page numbers where they are discussed.

TABLE 1.4. LBC Self-Study Committee Recommendations with Appropriate Page Number(s)

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Page #</i>
A committee or individual should be appointed to develop a comprehensive outcomes program.	p. 45
The process of gathering appropriate institutional data, analyzing that data, and above all, utilizing the results should be re-examined and refined.	p. 61
The nine areas of recommendation of the 1990 Task Force on Equity and Diversity should be reviewed by appropriate administrators for suggested strategies for further action.	p. 50
Evaluate the need for an additional employee to enhance the planned program for deferred giving.	p. 18
Re-evaluate the planning process to ensure that it is cyclical, participatory, and broadly based, and that it results in an annual planning document that is effectively utilized to provide direction for the institution.	pp. 54, 59 74
Develop a formal and consistent evaluation process for all departments.	pp. 19; 32
Develop a strategic plan for campus technology, including both the administrative and academic areas.	p. 39
Develop a plan for comprehensive analysis of the new programs.	p. 22
Hire directors of each Master's degree program as soon as it becomes fiscally possible and maintain sensitivity to other personnel needs as the program grows.	p. 27
Continue the commitment and budgeting necessary to establish a library that adequately supports the graduate programs.	pp. 24; 57
Conduct a comprehensive study regarding graduate school program expansion in light of financial, facility, and personnel resources.	p. 23

TABLE 1.4. (Con't) Self Study Recommendations with Appropriate Page Number(s)

<i>Recommendation</i>	<i>Page #</i>
Continue the long-range plan for library automation.	p. 29
Consider the advisability of an annual written evaluation that can be given to each faculty member by the academic dean.	p. 32
Monitor teaching loads in light of institutional growth.	p. 32
Seek more variety and creativity in chapel programs and formats.	p. 36

Relevance of Appendices

The committee was very careful to include appendices that were relevant to the issues being discussed. They erred on the side of inclusion rather than exclusion to provide the reader with a proper context of the circumstances related to the discussion.

Appendices were included that best support the text. For example, when responding to the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team recommendations, documentation of actions taken is included in the appendices. Also, appendices relevant to significant changes were included. For example, administrative structural changes were summarized as appendices. Of most importance were the appendices related to institutional effectiveness. These appendices also meet the PRR requirements as stated in the *Handbook for Periodic Review Reports*. These appendices are referenced in Table 1.5.

TABLE 1.5. Relevance of Appendices

<i>Appendix</i>	<i>Relevance</i>
Appendix 10 – Comprehensive Outcomes Assessment Plan	LBC’s comprehensive outcomes assessment plan
Appendix 16 - Enrollment Reports	Five-year enrollment trends, five-year enrollment projection among all educational levels
Appendix 17 - Graduation Rate Reports	Five-year graduation trends, five-year graduation projection among all educational levels
Appendix 18 - Attrition Rates Reports	Reports demonstrating institutional data/research
Appendix 19 - Budget Reports	Five-year fiscal trends, five-year fiscal projections
Appendix 21 - LBC’s Planning Document	LBC’s comprehensive planning document
Appendix 22 - LBC’s Five-Year Plan	Institutional plans for the next five years

The committee decided to include the relevant institutional planning documents as appendices instead of separate documents as listed on page 18 of the *Handbook for Periodic Review Reports*. Please reference Appendices 13, 14, 20, 21, and 22 for discussion related to LBC’s institutional planning documents.