

Introduction

The 1997 MSA self-study process provided significant assistance to LBC through both the institution's own recommendations as well as the suggestions and recommendations provided by the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team. Several team suggestions were offered and have been referenced throughout this document. Seven recommendations were offered by the evaluation team for LBC's consideration. Each recommendation is referenced below, followed by a narrative summarizing the college's response and progress.

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.”

The college recognizes that outcomes assessment is part of the larger function of institutional effectiveness. Section 4 provides a context for how outcomes assessment fits in the overall scheme of institutional effectiveness. The following narrative responds to the team's recommendation.

The college has made significant progress in developing and implementing its outcomes plan since the last self-study in 1997. While the college had, for many years, been engaged in extensive student testing, the college lacked a comprehensive approach, an organized plan, and a mechanism for the productive use of the outcomes data.

The first step taken by the college was to reaffirm that Dr. Ray Naugle, VPAA, would lead the outcomes initiative at LBC. While Dr. Naugle had been engaged in data collection and its analysis since the early 1980s, neither he nor the college community perceived him to be solely responsible for outcomes along with a mandate to develop a college-wide comprehensive plan. This clarification of responsibility was in response to the recommendation in the 1997 self-study as well as the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team recommendation.

The first task undertaken was to review, revise, adopt, and distribute a written outcomes assessment plan for LBC. Some initial work had been done on a written plan in 1997, but it had never been reviewed by the college community and adopted. The document, titled LBC's Comprehensive Outcomes Assessment Plan (COAP), was extensively revised, updated, and then distributed to the administrative team, the academic planning subcommittee, and all academic departments and division chairs for their review and input. The COAP was finalized and adopted in fall 2000. The latest revision was completed in August 2001. A copy is available in Appendix 10.

Several highlights from the COAP will provide a summary of the outcomes model for LBC. First, the plan is comprehensive—it involves every unit of LBC, both academic and non-academic while maintaining a central focus on academic/student outcomes. Second, it is outcomes driven. Each unit gathers written data on outcomes, both qualitative and quantitative based on the unit's objectives. Another important feature is the assessment of the outcomes. The college is committed to do more than just collect outcomes data. The data is evaluated and used for change and improvement. Another critical characteristic of the COAP is that it is unified with college operations and planning. Outcomes data document how well the college functions and also drives the planning process. Finally, the COAP is modeled after the excellent outcomes work done by James and Karen Nichols. The college has adapted their outcomes process. A copy of the handbook has been provided for each administrator, academic department, and division chair. Several working sessions have been conducted. This resource has been very helpful in explaining and implementing LBC's plan.

It was quickly evident, however, that creating a good written plan and making available excellent resource materials were not sufficient. Since the plan was comprehensive, unit leaders and supervisors across the campus needed to be included and involved. The idea that this was one person's plan and he/she would do all the work could not be given any opportunity for growth. Further, if this task was going to be embraced and be successful, every unit leader needed to be trained in how to engage in the six-step process – from writing unit objectives to using data for institutional renewal.

Initially four training sessions were held. The Nichols' materials were used and a data collection sheet was created to serve as a guide and to create some uniformity. The four sessions were for 1) the Academic Planning Subcommittee which includes the graduate and undergraduate deans, the three academic division chairs, and the Plus 20 director, 2) the eight academic/department chairs along with their faculty, 3) the administrative team for the non-academic and academic support areas, and 4) the administrators and non-academic support personnel not included or able to attend the earlier session. These sessions were most encouraging. Individuals embraced the concept, understood it, and became involved. Many individual follow-up appointments were held in the following weeks and months. Several departments submitted outcome materials. These were reviewed and returned for revision and further development.

In addition, two more sessions were held during summer 2001. These were open invitation sessions for anyone who wanted to come. The sessions were workshop oriented and designed to involve individuals with writing objectives and thinking about how and when they could be measured. Fourteen individuals attended these sessions representing nine different areas of the college. Two similar sessions were held during the fall 2001 semester for those unable to attend during the summer. The results were also very encouraging as nine different academic leaders attended.

Two other significant projects have also been undertaken which enhanced the outcomes effort at LBC. For decades, administrators have personally interviewed each senior during the month preceding graduation. The interview questions included plans of the graduate and strengths and weaknesses of LBC. While this was always a beneficial exercise and one the graduates appreciated, the data were never used as originally intended. In addition, not every area of the college was intentionally reviewed. The areas considered were limited to those the students initiated. Two changes were made for the 2000-2001 graduating class. First, after allowing the student to raise whatever issues he/she wanted, four specific areas of college operations were included for evaluation. In addition, the student was asked to respond to his/her academic program. This year the four areas were administration, athletics, admissions, and chapel. This has been very well received and has provided critical data. It is envisioned that over a five-year

period every area of college operations will be included and reviewed. Personnel across the campus are using this data in conjunction with their unit objectives and outcomes plan.

In addition, steps were taken to better organize and categorize the senior interview data. This has been done according to the various units of the college, resulting in 60 pages of outcomes data. Further, the entire document was distributed to each administrator, and he/she distributed the appropriate section to his/her personnel. A copy is also being distributed to the planning committee. The last step is for each area to select one or two items to address in the coming year. This will add to the use of data to improve LBC rather than just being satisfied with data collection.

The second project, which is still in progress, is a thorough review and evaluation of the student outcomes testing. To illustrate, the college has used for many years and continues to use the AABC Bible Test and LBC Doctrine Test to assist in measuring our Biblical Division outcomes. The Arts and Sciences Division has used the COMP test and Watson Glaser Critical Thinking Test to assess students' general education competencies. A review of these testing instruments is overdue. The institution is asking some tough questions. Are the tests really necessary? Are the data useful? Are the data being used? Are there other newer tests that would yield better data? Does every student have to take every test every year? It is envisioned that this review will sharpen and update student testing and possibly reduce the testing, which would be welcomed by staff and students, and at the same time produce better outcomes data with greater benefit to the specific department.

This next academic year (2002-2003), outcomes assessment development will focus on individual academic programs. The 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team suggested that objectives for each of the programs be developed and published in the catalog and various other places so that they become an integral part of the LBC academic community. Now that the college has a comprehensive and workable outcomes plan, this suggestion will be addressed and implemented.

Finally, it is recognized that this outcomes project is ongoing. While a good model is in place, outcomes and data collection is a process. As the plan is used year after year, there will be

refinements and adjustments to sharpen and strengthen it. Engaging personnel is also a process. Some have taken to the task very quickly and proficiently, while others need more coaching and encouragement. Personnel changes also are a reminder that this is an on-going process. With experience LBC will become more adept at using the data for change and improvement at the immediate program level and use it more efficiently and effectively in planning activities.

It is gratifying to report that all departments in both academic and non-academic areas have embraced this outcomes endeavor and have been active participants. Many areas have collected data and have used the results. Several examples are included below in Table 3.1; several pages are available in Appendix 11.

TABLE 3.1. Sample Outcomes Assessment

<i>Objective</i>	<i>Means of Assessment</i>	<i>Sum. of Data Collected</i>	<i>Use of Data</i>
Elementary Education Graduates will demonstrate a Biblical worldview as evidenced in a Christian philosophy of education.	Students are required to articulate this philosophy in a culminating paper submitted prior to student teaching.	Student papers were read by faculty advisors and critiqued and found to be satisfactory.	Develop a collection of superior philosophy papers that can be placed on reserve in the library for TE 211 students.
Graduate School Students will be satisfied with the quality of academic advising by Graduate School Program Directors.	The point-of-contact survey data will indicate student satisfaction with the quality of academic advising and friendliness of our Program Directors by 3.5 on a 5.0 scale.	Point-of-contact surveys average 4.89 on quality of academic advising and friendliness of Program Directors.	No change required.
Registrar's Office Potential graduation lists will be formulated 6 months prior to the given academic year.	The Potential Graduation list will be available on or before July 1 of a given year.	List was available by July 1; however, the list was not very accurate.	Strategize a better system for developing potential graduation list.

LBC is committed to maintain this outcomes endeavor. Each summer a review of the accomplishments of the past year will lead to making plans for the coming year. Each fall will launch another round of outcomes activities. Training sessions will be held, encouragement will be provided, and individuals who have helped set the pace will be recognized. LBC remains enthusiastic and positive and at the same time realistic, realizing that not everyone will be engaged at the same level every year. However, LBC is confident that quality outcomes data will

be available and profitably used for each area of the college on an annual basis. LBC is convinced that the result of outcomes initiatives will produce a stronger LBC and a continuous striving for excellence in all areas.

Recommendation #2

“That the college makes measurable progress in fulfilling its commitment to achieve appropriate representation of diversity on the board and in the administration, faculty, staff, and student body.”

LBC historically has welcomed ethnic diversity in an attempt to prepare students to live according to a Biblical world view and to serve through professional Christian ministries in a world increasingly interconnected and pluralistic. The very nature of a Bible college education, as practiced at LBC, is one that values the search for truth and knowledge as it is contained in the Word of God. LBC combats intolerance in our society daily as it teaches students the Biblical view that all men and women are created in the image and likeness of God. LBC contributes to a more inclusive society by responding to any ignorance or fear that the students might have by allowing them to dialog openly in both classrooms and informal settings. In 1990 a presidential task force appointed to address the issues of equity and diversity issued a statement defining LBC’s position on equity and diversity. The statement (Appendix 12) was reaffirmed by the Executive Council on January 11, 2002.

The college has paid special attention to fostering a culturally diverse Corporation and Board of Trustees. In October 2001, Dr. Ken Staley, of African-American heritage, was elected to a four-year term on the trustee board. He is project manager of Covenant Consulting Corporation and associate pastor and vice president of finance at Christian Stronghold Baptist Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Currently, two board members are of African-American heritage. In 2001, LBC invited an African-American corporation member to join the Education Curriculum Committee of the Board. The president and the board remain committed to continue recruiting corporation and board members of ethnic diversity.

Since 1996, three new employees of ethnicity were hired. A part-time faculty member in the Biblical Counseling Department was hired in fall 1999 and faculty secretary was hired in the fall of 1997. At the end of 1996, a part-time faculty member in the Music Department was hired. As of fall 2001, 63% of LBC employees were over the age of 40, 51% were female, and 49% were male. The hiring process at LBC includes sensitivity to ethnicity and those considered part of a protected class.

The ethnicity of the student body has consistently maintained a 6%-10% level as seen in Table 3.2.

TABLE 3.2. LBC Ethnic Population by Percent (1992-2001)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Percent</i>
1992-1993	6.4%
1993-1994	8.1%
1994-1995	8.9%
1995-1996	6.6%
1996-1997	7.8%
1997-1998	8.0%
1998-1999	9.5%
1999-2000	7.9%
2000-2001	7.3%
2001-2002	6.9%

The percentages are lower than the reported 15% minority population in Pennsylvania where LBC draws 75% of its student body. However, the numbers are consistent with 8.5% minority population in Lancaster County (percentages based on the 2000 Census).

The college recognizes the need to continually pursue an ethnically diverse student population. This is evidenced in the non-credit Evening Institute of LBC. Since 1997 LBC has established several affiliations with area urban churches, composed mostly of minority parishioners, by offering courses granting CEU credits. In 2000 Emmanuel Baptist Church in Newark, New

Jersey, started offering courses through their Bible Book by Book Training Institute. Approximately 50 students enrolled, with the first set of CEU certificate students graduating May 2002. Another affiliation started in summer 2001 with Emmanuel Missionary Baptist Church in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The first courses were offered in fall 2001. Several other affiliations exist in the cities of Lancaster and Harrisburg. All of these affiliations further establish a relationship between LBC and organizations of diversity.

In 2000 the VPAA initiated a comprehensive feasibility study for the addition of an Urban Ministries Program. A committee representative of urban ministries in Lancaster, Lebanon, and Philadelphia met on several occasions to consult and offer recommendations as to what the program may look like. The committee has consolidated in size and is beginning to develop the curriculum and courses. It is anticipated that the program will be in the proposal stage sometime in the next year. Upon approval, this program has the potential to significantly increase LBC's attempts to draw diversity across all constituencies. Faculty and staff will have to be hired, students will have to be recruited, and the program will have to be promoted.

Other attempts to achieve greater diversity have also been made. In 2000 Dr. Buster Soares, an African-American, senior pastor of First Baptist Church of Lincoln Gardens in Somerset, New Jersey, and the Secretary of State for New Jersey, spoke at the annual Friends Fellowship Dinner. The purpose of this annual dinner is to provide corporation members and board members the opportunity to invite guests who have an interest in becoming financial contributors or future corporation members. In the summer of 2001, Dr. Tony Evans, a noted African-American author and speaker, filled the GSC auditorium.

While measurable progress has been made, the college also recognizes that there is significant room for improvement. This realization dates back to the presidential task force assembled in 1990 charged with making recommendations related to equity and diversity. The new president looks forward to establishing a new task force that will re-evaluate the earlier task force's recommendations by making them more explicit, purposeful, and proactive as well as studying proven strategies to recruit and retain an ethnically diverse community of students, staff, faculty, administrators, and board members. This committee will make recommendations on eliminating

barriers to access equity. Ultimately, it is of utmost importance that the curricula and programs reflect LBC's commitment to diversity and equity and an institutional climate that values the uniqueness and preciousness of each life, regardless of ethnicity.

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.”

Lancaster Bible College's LBC 2000+ planning process surfaced 52 planning objectives. Though the planning objectives were not formally prioritized before their distribution, each initiative was given to a specific and appropriate administrator to begin the process of prioritizing and implementing. All of the initiatives were important and relevant for LBC's future, and it was the college's desire to move forward with as many initiatives as possible. It should be noted that LBC has made measurable progress in addressing all 52 initiatives in the last five years. Some of the initiatives required budgeted resources, while others were concerted efforts or adjustments rather than financial expenditures.

Appendix 13 provides a summary of the progress achieved among the 52 initiatives. It does not numerically prioritize the planning objectives; however, it does reflect the remarkable accomplishments and progress LBC has made toward achieving its LBC 2000+ planning objectives. The appendix also highlights several significant priorities that continue to drive Lancaster Bible College's planning function. Those priorities are noted in the left hand column and reflect the current scope of LBC's planning sub-committees.

First priority has been given to the enhancement of the college academic program. Within the new planning structure, an academic planning sub-committee has been formed and a planning pillar developed to help guide LBC's academic program and future. A second priority was given to students' needs and comprehensive development. Students are the focus of all that LBC does, and caring for their academic, social, spiritual, and physical development is critically important.

LBC has created a student planning sub-committee to address undergraduate, graduate, traditional, and non-traditional students, as well as commuter and resident student needs. A third priority is the college's fiscal condition and development. LBC has developed two planning sub-committees to address fiscal operations and resource development. A fourth priority has emerged which is facilities development. Two facility planning sub-committees were formed: one to address the use, maintenance, and upkeep of current facilities; the other to address future facility needs.

These new planning priorities are guided by a set of seven comprehensive planning pillars (see Appendix 14). The planning pillars were developed by a new planning process that replaced LBC 2000+. Further discussion relating to the new planning process, as well as a discussion of how planning fits into the college's overall plan for institutional effectiveness, can be found in Section 4.

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.”

Since 1997, LBC has significantly modified its planning and budgeting process. Section 4 provides a detailed account of both the planning and budgeting processes from LBC 2000+ to the present. This section will simply demonstrate how LBC has addressed the team's recommendation.

With the installation of a new president in 1999, planning became a core focus of the institution. As previously mentioned, the president began the planning process with a comprehensive vision audit that yielded ten vision themes. A central planning committee was formed, and sub-committees began addressing the vision audit themes. Planning initiatives were encouraged and then submitted to a central budgeting committee. The central budgeting committee, made up of the president, two vice-presidents, and director of finance, began to budget for planning initiatives. At the conclusion of the president's first budget process, initiatives of more than

\$180,000 were funded. The remaining planning initiatives were returned to the appropriate planning sub-committee for further consideration.

In subsequent years, planning has continued to precede the budget process. Planning initiatives continue to be presented, evaluated, and recommended for budgeting or further development. Once planning initiatives are approved, the college commits the resources needed to implement the initiative within the appropriate fiscal year budget. Further discussion of planning and budgeting can be found in Section 4.

Recommendation #5

“That the Plus 20 Program mandate Christian Service and list it as a graduation requirement (AABC: D.2.0).”

A critical component of the undergraduate experience at LBC is the integration of service experiences throughout a student’s educational career. Such experiences are coordinated through the Christian Service Department. Its purpose is to combine curricular content with practical experience. While this has been an integral requirement for traditional undergraduate students for some time, it was excluded as a requirement for students enrolled in Plus 20, LBC’s non-traditional degree completion program. Agreeing with the team’s recommendation, the college added the Christian Service component to the Plus 20 program. In the college’s response to the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team report, LBC stated, “This recommendation has already been adopted and is being implemented with new explanatory guidelines and expectations.” These new guidelines and expectations are available for review in the Plus 20 Student Handbook (see Appendix 15).

The Plus 20 office is in the midst of developing outcomes assessment procedures as part of the institution-wide attention on outcomes. Plus 20 students and graduates will be asked to evaluate the Christian Service component of their education to determine if it is/was helpful in preparing them for professional Christian ministry. In addition, other means of assessing the effectiveness of the Christian Service component may be instituted.

Recommendation #6

“That a comprehensive review of the Missions Aviation Program be conducted and appropriate action taken. “

In response to the 1997 evaluation team recommendation, an ad hoc committee was convened for the purpose of analyzing the Missions Aviation Program and offering a recommendation about its future. Committee members included representatives from the administration, faculty, student body, and external missions aviation organizations. The committee formed in December 1998 and offered a final report approximately one year later. (See Appendix 5 for the full evaluation report.) In order to provide a comprehensive review, the committee sent representatives to other successful Missions Aviation programs at Moody Bible Institute and Piedmont College, as well as the training facilities LBC used in the program. After review of the data collected, the committee recommended, “The discontinuation of the current Missions Aviation Program as presented in the 1997-2000 LBC catalog, allowing current students enrolled in the program the opportunity to complete their program” (Evaluation Report, page 6).

Major reasons for the discontinuation included concern over the sequence of training, curricular content, uncertainty as to the market need, the high cost of funding a quality program, the lack of personnel, and the fact that in the program’s existence not one student had completed the entire program. At the end of the report the committee offered several suggestions to improve the program had the college expressed an interest in its continuation.

On April 13, 2000, the Executive Council unanimously voted to recommend to the Trustees that the Missions Aviation Program be phased out over the next several years. On May 23, 2000, the Board of Trustees unanimously ratified the recommendation. The decision was communicated to the campus constituency and to the six Missions Aviation students. As of the spring 2002 semester, one student was still enrolled in the Missions Aviation Program.

Recommendation #7

“That the institution strive to meet the ACRL standards for budget support of the library.”

In 1997, according to the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) standard, 6% of the E&G budget should have been devoted to library expenses. The ACRL has since changed their standards from criteria to outcomes based and removed the language of 6%. Table 3.3 provides a chart of the library percentage of the E&G since 1997 as well as the total library expenditure by year.

TABLE 3.3. Library Percentage of the E&G and Total Expenditures (1997-2002)

<i>Year</i>	<i>Percent</i>	<i>Expenditure</i>
1997-1998	3.40%	\$226,685
1998-1999	3.03%	\$248,801
1999-2000	3.16%	\$259,188
2000-2001	4.45%	\$301,940
2001-2002	3.60%	\$323,474

The percentage of overall budget has not changed significantly since the 1997 MSA/AABC evaluation team report. However, the library expenditures have steadily increased each year from \$226,685 in 1997-1998 to \$323,474 in 2001-2002. The new ACRL standards suggest comparisons with peer institutions. In 2000-2001, the average library percentage of E&G of similar-sized AABC schools was 4.4%. By comparison, LBC was at 4.45% for the same year. LBC remains consistent with similar-sized AABC colleges and is committed to providing the necessary learning resources that adequately support undergraduate, graduate, and non-credit education.