

Lancaster Bible College
Faculty Development Committee
Self-Study Questionnaire

Name of Responder _____

Department or Program _____

Research Question #1

With the continued growth of existing programs and the plans for additional new programs, how will LBC formulate and implement an appropriate ratio of full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty adequate for the needs of each department and program?

In order to assist in answering the research question, please answer the questions below.

1. Number of courses offered in department/program for academic year 2005-2006.
2. Of these courses how many are taught by:
 - a. full-time faculty?
 - b. part-time faculty?
 - c. adjunct faculty?

Please fill in the following chart to complete this information.

Year	Number of Courses	Full-Time	Part-Time	Adjunct
2005-2006				
2004-2005				
2003-2004				

3. Please provide an estimate for the next 3 years.

Year	Number of Courses	Full-Time	Part-Time	Adjunct
2006-2007				
2007-2008				
2008-2009				

4. To meet these needs, how many full-time, part-time, adjunct faculty would be optimal?

- 5a. Do you consider the current faculty (full-time, part-time, adjunct) to course ratios reasonable in light of the needs of your department/program?
- 5b. Other than yourself, who else determines optimal ratios (faculty : course).
6. Other than budgetary concerns, what other factors/variables are likely to influence the faculty/course ratios relative to the needs of your department/program?

**Lancaster Bible College
Office of Academic Affairs
Faculty Study - Biblical Division**

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Number of Teaching Faculty Per Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
Full-Time Faculty in Department	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Full-time Faculty out of Department	2	2	2	3	3	2	2
Administrative Staff	1	1	3	4	3	4	4
Part-Time	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Adjunct	4	3	3	2	4	2	4
TOTAL	13	12	14	15	16	14	16

Percent of Sections Taught by Faculty Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
# of Sections	32	32	32	32	34	35	35
Average Section Size	30	32	32	36	35	35	33
Full-Time Faculty in Department	53%	56%	53%	47%	47%	49%	51%
Full-time Faculty out of Department	22%	19%	13%	19%	18%	17%	6%
Administrative Staff	3%	6%	13%	16%	15%	14%	20%
Part-Time	9%	9%	9%	9%	6%	9%	9%
Adjunct	13%	9%	13%	9%	15%	11%	14%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Lancaster Bible College
Office of Academic Affairs
Faculty Study - Arts and Science Department**

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Number of Teaching Faculty Per Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
Full-Time Faculty in Division	6	6	6	5	5	5	5
Full-time Faculty out of Division	7	8	7	6	6	6	8
Administrative Staff	0	0	0	1	2	2	4
Part-Time	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
Adjunct	5	5	5	8	8	11	11
TOTAL	19	20	19	22	23	25	29

Percent of Sections Taught by Faculty Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
# of Sections	41	44	45	46	47	54	56
Average Section Size	18	21	21	22	22	19	19
Full-Time Faculty in Division	54%	52%	51%	41%	41%	35%	35%
Full-time Faculty out of Division	27%	30%	26%	24%	21%	20%	18%
Administrative Staff	0%	0%	0%	2%	4%	4%	9%
Part-Time	7%	7%	7%	11%	13%	6%	4%
Adjunct	12%	11%	16%	22%	21%	35%	34%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Lancaster Bible College
Office of Academic Affairs
Faculty Study - Biblical Counseling Department**

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Number of Teaching Faculty Per Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
Full-Time Faculty in Department	1	1	3	3	3	3	1
Full-time Faculty out of Department	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative Staff	0	0	1	1	1	0	0
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjunct	5	6	2	3	2	2	3
TOTAL	6	7	6	7	6	5	4

Percent of Sections Taught by Faculty Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
# of Sections	8	8	7	6	7	7	6
Average Section Size	14	15	16	19	18	19	15
Full-Time Faculty in Department	25%	29%	57%	33%	57%	57%	17%
Full-time Faculty out of Department	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Administrative Staff	0%	0%	14%	17%	14%	0%	0%
Part-Time	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Adjunct	75%	71%	29%	50%	29%	43%	83%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Lancaster Bible College
Office of Academic Affairs
Faculty Study - Intercultural Studies Department**

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Number of Teaching Faculty Per Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
Full-Time Faculty in Division	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Full-time Faculty out of Division	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjunct	2	1	2	2	3	2	3
TOTAL	3	2	3	3	4	3	4

Percent of Sections Taught by Faculty Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
# of Sections	4	4	5	4	5	4	6
Average Section Size	8	10	8	8	6	8	13
Full-Time Faculty in Division	50%	75%	60%	50%	40%	50%	50%
Full-time Faculty out of Division	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Administrative Staff	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Part-Time	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Adjunct	50%	25%	40%	50%	60%	50%	50%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Lancaster Bible College
Office of Academic Affairs
Faculty Study - Music Department**

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

Number of Teaching Faculty Per Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
Full-Time Faculty in Division	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Full-time Faculty out of Division	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Administrative Staff	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part-Time	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adjunct	0	1	1	1	2	3	1
TOTAL	2	3	3	3	4	5	3

Percent of Sections Taught by Faculty Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
# of Sections	6	7	8	5	6	8	8
Average Section Size	5	4	6	5	4	3	4
Full-Time Faculty in Division	100%	71%	75%	80%	67%	50%	88%
Full-time Faculty out of Division	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Administrative Staff	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Part-Time	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Adjunct	0%	29%	25%	20%	33%	50%	12%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

**Lancaster Bible College
Office of Academic Affairs
Faculty Study - Health & Physical Education Department**

Number of Teaching Faculty Per Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
Full-Time Faculty in Division	na	na	na	1	1	1	2
Full-time Faculty out of Division	na	na	na	0	0	0	0
Administrative Staff	na	na	na	0	0	0	0
Part-Time	na	na	na	0	0	0	0
Adjunct	na	na	na	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	0	0	0	1	1	1	3

Percent of Sections Taught by Faculty Category

	FA-99	FA-00	FA-01	FA-02	FA-03	FA-04	FA-05
# of Sections	na	na	na	3	2	4	8
Average Section Size	na	na	na	3	3	3	3
Full-Time Faculty in Division	na	na	na	100%	100%	100%	88%
Full-time Faculty out of Division	na	na	na	0%	0%	0%	0%
Administrative Staff	na	na	na	0%	0%	0%	0%
Part-Time	na	na	na	0%	0%	0%	0%
Adjunct	na	na	na	0%	0%	0%	12%
TOTAL	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Administrator Surveys – Faculty Selection and Evaluation

Faculty Selection

	Full Time	Part time	Adjunct
Current processes w/ variation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Department makes case for need ✓ Administration approves new position ✓ Requisition form and job description from HR ✓ Committee is formed using department members, representing all divisions and other college personnel ✓ Search committees may vary in membership and process according to the position or department. ✓ Leadership of the search committee typically is the head of the department or the division. ✓ Typically the administration monitors the progress of the committee. ✓ Advertising: some or all of ABHE; InterChristo; Colleges, Universities and Seminaries; Churches; occasionally selected periodicals (CT) and professional journals ✓ Candidate becomes candidate with completed questionnaire or essays, pre-employment questionnaire and résumé. ✓ Committee sifts résumés and checks references ✓ Phone interviews ✓ <i>Top candidates may visit campus</i> ✓ Committee narrows to one candidate ✓ Candidate interviews on campus with departments. ✓ <i>Candidate teaches a class</i> ✓ <i>May have full faculty interview</i> ✓ <i>Vote of faculty (may be done in departments)</i> ✓ Individual and corporate input offered ✓ Final decision with administration to offer contract 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ No real process in place ✓ Not a real issue since few actual part time employees, and not something we look for. ✓ Process is much like the full time professor. ✓ <p>**Not a clear process or not used enough to know, since each one interviewed saw it differently.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Actual in one department: No formal process, just word of mouth and informal approval by dean. ✓ Departmental responsibility role task to determine need ✓ Some advertising on web site. ✓ Application given with résumé. ✓ HR does initial check to see if fit, sends applications and responds with general comments. ✓ Meet with dept. head for interview. ✓ Recommend to dean for interview. ✓ Dean interviews ✓ President interviews ✓ Dean offers contract.
Effectiveness of current processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Good shift from previous lack of planning and loudest voice gets the position ✓ Concern that we are hiring a lot of faculty without terminal degrees ✓ Concern that we are hiring a lot of LBC people which may strengthen us or may only propagate ourselves ✓ Difficulty in addressing issues if there is real concern on the part of just a few without full faculty interview. ✓ Generally effective ✓ With no leadership or monitoring, the process has not been efficient or effective ✓ Some searches have continued for extended periods of time. ✓ 3 hires in 2003 in comparison to the recent year ✓ HR provides information only, helps in the role of legal knowledge 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ We tend to try them out and if they don't work, just not ask again. ✓ Ok ✓ Needs not always identified or reviewed effectively. It is solely the decision of the head of department. So should the institution help with total load picture and need analysis for adjuncts? ✓ Recruitment of adjunct is departmental rather than institutional ✓ Sometimes difficult to find credentialed individuals
Flexibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ No need for redundancy ✓ Different levels have different needs ✓ A need for maximum fluidity ✓ The urgency of the need requires more flexibility ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Adjunct has too much flexibility

Ideal / necessary parts to the process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Must have full faculty input ✓ Must have opportunity to observe teach ✓ *if teaching experience must be contrived (mid summer) not a good situation and should be abandoned. ✓ Must have good communication between departments (whole faculty) ✓ Preliminary visit is healthy if at all possible ✓ Having wife come along is healthy if possible ✓ Personal perspective from staying at the President's manse is helpful. Could also be housed by other personnel or have personal interviews ✓ All divisions represented in search committee ✓ Presidential interview ✓ Non-negotiable elements include: doctrinal statement, salary ranges, divorce, and life-style standards 	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Maintain a file of possible adjunct in a central location as dept heads change ✓ Candidates must exhibit a desire to teach online since that will be a frequent new dynamic in some programs such as DCP
Suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ If there are significant red flags, we should automatically have a full faculty meeting/interview to resolve the issues or clarify ✓ Increase the pool of candidates with better advertising in industry journals, etc. ✓ Could ask for tapes and videos to supplement if teaching is not possible (or even if it is) ✓ May want to have more individual interviews in addition to the groups (one on one) for input. 	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Need better system of mentoring to help them rather than try and keep or discard. ✓ Some may need to be encouraged to hire adjuncts rather than be overloaded.

Naugle: "These are the biggest decisions an institution ever makes."

Dearborn: "Faculty hire is the most important thing a college does. ...When the product is less than the best, we only have ourselves to blame."

Faculty Evaluation

Current processes w/ variation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Portfolio (see handbook) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Partial Portfolio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Very partial portfolio 	
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Unclear ✓ Should be to evaluate job performance for maintaining job and improvement although the idea of improvement should fall under supervision and mentoring. ✓ Accountability, rehash past achievement and determine personal growth ✓ Better faculty through personal growth ✓ Faculty development and improvemnt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Same as full time 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Same as full time 	
Effectiveness of current processes	Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Ineffective busy work. ✓ OK but not great ✓ Busy work for dean and not getting done to date. ✓ Ineffective because they do not go far enough and because they are not being used at this point. What happens to them? ✓ It is smooth in some pockets of faculty, bumpy in others ✓ "A lot to monitor." ✓ The process of non teaching or non-ranked faculty is unclear and currently most are not using the portfolio. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Not being used well ✓ May not be used at all at this point. ✓ May only be using the summa at this point 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Not yet applied to adjuncts by all departments ✓ May only be using the summa at this point ✓ Opportunity for encouragement ✓ Opportunity to provide the mentoring
	Positives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Has introduced more formality and consistency to the process. ✓ Paper trail for promotion or denial, sabbatical requests or further education. ✓ Open process ✓ Non-threatening for the faculty member, takes away the threat ✓ "Cutting edge" in the current higher ed environment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Opportunity to see strengths
	Negatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ No particular strength behind it. ✓ Not being used yet for substantive change or help, just accumulating data (mostly because of inconsistency of the dean position) ✓ Not good coordination with dean yet. ✓ No one seems to know what happens to it after the evaluation. ✓ These are not effectively evaluative, but are mainly self promotion in which the faculty can put in only the good stuff. ✓ No clear indication as to the distinctions (or lack) with grad or undergrad faculty and role of both sets of administrators. ✓ Administrators need training and need to take responsibility in supervising what is done as well as perhaps doing more direct evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Coordination/ interviews takes time ✓ Harder for adjuncts, especially if only one class or only once in a while. ✓ Adjunct evaluation is "not clean."
Suggestions and Issues to adjust in the current process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Institutional use and leadership from administration in using the results. ✓ Clarify the purpose and use of results. ✓ Set up plan for evaluating the effectiveness and use of the evaluations every few years. ✓ Should be multifaceted, not just one dimensional. Should include student input (surveys like the summa), faculty input through self evaluation, dean and department chair input through direct evaluation and supervision (visiting class, interacting with professor). All parties should get all of the data (no hidden files) including the promotions committee. ✓ Promotions should be more rigorous and qualitative (evaluative) and not simply quantitative (# of years served). ✓ Encourage faculty to have students evaluate their classes for their own growth, not for the formal process only. ✓ Most necessary for good evaluation for new faculty and those new to LBC from other institutions—especially the first 3 years. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Need a comprehensive plan for part timers and adjuncts ✓ Needs the supervisors of part-time faculty to require the submission of artifacts ✓ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Have department head deal with it and not bother the dean with all of the adjuncts. ✓ Set up plan for evaluating the effectiveness and use of the evaluations. ✓ Design a plan to evaluate the adjunct that will teach Online ✓ Faculty observation 	

	<p>Perhaps with good evaluations, could go multiple years after that before full evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Termination should be several year process in which the problems are spelled out with a plan to address them (clear action plan), the process is documented with clear expectations and goals set and if those are not achieved, the last contract should be issued with a clear statement that it is a last contract. The only exceptions would be for egregious sin or misconduct. ✓ Training is needed for the supervisors to do the portfolio evaluations ✓ Supervisors, such as department and division chairs, should do the evaluations and monitor this process, not the deans ✓ 100% ownership of all faculty members ✓ A prescribed cycle for the type of artifacts or components to be included 		<p>should be expected for all adjunct, not just the student Sumas</p>
--	---	--	---

Participants: Penny Clawson, John Soden, Bob Spender, Janet Smith, Ray Naugle, Philip Dearborn, Skip Lewis, John Pugh, Dale Mort, Raymond Ide,

3. To your knowledge, has this process been applied to all faculty in your department/program?

4. Under what circumstances would you **not require** a new faculty member to participate in the orientation process?

5. Describe differences you have observed between faculty who have participated in the orientation process and those who have not.

6. In what ways do you measure/determine successful completion of the orientation process?

7. Besides yourself who else contributes to the orientation process?

c. Mentoring

1. Do you currently have a mentoring process in place for faculty members (full-time, part-time, adjunct)?

If your response to this question is no, this is the end of your questionnaire.

If your response is yes, please proceed to question number two.

7. Besides yourself who else contributes to the mentoring process?

A Comprehensive Approach for DCP Adjuncts

Since its inception, DCP has been able to establish a well-rounded roster of primary, secondary, and, for many courses, tertiary instructors for each of its 27 courses, with each instructor contracted for one course at a time. Because of this full roster of instructors, the hiring of additional faculty is rare. When a need does arise, the DCP director relies on any recently submitted resumes or vitae on hand or networks with existing faculty to find qualified individuals.

Once a potential new instructor is found, a recently implemented procedure calls for the candidate to complete an online workshop entitled “A Cram Course on Adult Christian Education.” This workshop, as well as the reading of certain sections of the faculty handbook, orients the candidate to the uniqueness of teaching adults, especially in an accelerated format. If the candidate feels comfortable with proceeding with the process, he or she completes instructor’s background and pre-employment questionnaires and proceeds through a series of interviews with the DCP director, the appropriate division or department chair, the undergraduate dean, and the president.

If the candidate completes all of the steps in the selection process and is contracted for the course, he or she completes a 90-minute orientation with the director and an online workshop entitled “Redeeming the Time in your DCP Classroom (Striving for all ‘A’s).” A mentoring program is being considered. A major drawback with a mentoring program that has kept DCP from implementing such a program is the time factor on the part of both the new instructor and the mentor.

Currently, DCP faculty are assessed at the end of each module by means of student evaluations and self-evaluations. In addition, DCP adjuncts complete the portfolio process as outlined earlier in this chapter. If any evaluations indicate an area of concern, the DCP director conducts additional observations and/or discussions with the instructor. Additional development activities need to be implemented. In the past, DCP proposed the establishment of adjunct faculty ranks based upon completion of additional training options and teaching of a specific number of courses over a specific number of years. DCP would like to see a campus-wide adoption of this proposal rather than implement it just in our program.

See next page for Table 3.1: DCP Adjunct Hiring, Orientation, Mentoring, Assessment, and Development.

Table 3.1 DCP Adjunct Hiring, Orientation, Mentoring, Assessment, and Development

Process	In Place	Recently Implemented / Being Considered
Selection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Application/vita <input type="checkbox"/> Instructor's background form <input type="checkbox"/> Pre-employment questionnaire <input type="checkbox"/> Read 60-page faculty handbook <input type="checkbox"/> Interview with director <input type="checkbox"/> Interview with division or department <input type="checkbox"/> Interview with dean (optional) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview with president 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Online workshop: "Cram Course on Adult Christian Education"
Orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 90-minute orientation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Online workshop: "Redeeming the Time in your DCP Classroom (Striving for all 'A's)'" <input type="checkbox"/> Assigned to and meets with mentor <input type="checkbox"/> Observes mentor for 2 class sessions or full 5-week course
Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Observed and debriefed by program director during first course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Online workshops: "Learning Outcomes, Parts 1, 2 & 3" <input type="checkbox"/> Assigned one or more online workshops according to observations made by program director <input type="checkbox"/> Observed and debriefed by mentor during second course <input type="checkbox"/> Assigned additional workshops as appropriate
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student end-of-module evaluations <input type="checkbox"/> Self-evaluation of modules <input type="checkbox"/> Portfolio process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Additional observations by mentor and program director
Development		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Advance through adjunct levels by completing additional training options and teaching a specific number of courses over a specific number of years