



Institutional Self-Study Design and Format

In preparation for a decennial MSCHE Self-Study Report
and Evaluation Team Visit in 2017



**LANCASTER
BIBLE COLLEGE**



CAPITAL
SEMINARY AND
GRADUATE SCHOOL

May 2015

This document has been approved by the President's Leadership Team consisting of:

Dr. Peter Teague, President

Mr. John Zeswitz, Executive Vice-President

Dr. Philip Dearborn, Provost

Mr. Joshua Beers, Senior Vice-President of Student Experience

Our Journey, In Focus
Lancaster Bible College’s 2017 Self-Study Design & Format

Table of Contents

I.	Mission, Vision, and Core Values & Goals	1
II.	Nature and Scope of Self-Study	2
II.	Specific Goals and Objectives.....	4
III.	Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Subcommittees	5
IV.	Charges to Subcommittees	8
V.	Inventory of Support Documents	19
VI.	Timetable.....	24
VII.	Editorial Style and Format.....	26
VIII.	The Organization of the Self-Study Report.....	28
IX.	Profile of the Evaluation Team.....	32
X.	Conclusion.....	32
XI.	Appendices	33

**Lancaster Bible College's
Institutional Self-Study Design
May 1, 2015**

**I. Lancaster Bible College | Capital Seminary and Graduate School's
Mission, Vision, and Core Values and Goals**

Mission: Lancaster Bible College | Capital Seminary and Graduate School exists to educate Christian students to think and live a biblical worldview and to proclaim Christ by serving him in the Church and society.

Vision: Lancaster Bible College | Capital Seminary and Graduate School will be a premier learning community that intentionally develops the head, heart, and hands of servant ministry leaders for global impact.

Vision: LBC will be...	Seven Core Values & Goals: LBC is...	Mission: LBC exists to...
<p>...a premier learning community...</p> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Committed to premier biblical education as evidenced by the encouragement of a Christ-centered learning community. 2. Committed to institutional excellence as evidenced by providing and maintaining God-honoring resources. 3. Committed to institutional distinctiveness as evidenced by preserving the integrity of our mission and legacy while planning for the future of the college. 	<p>...educate Christian students...</p> 
<p>...that intentionally develops the head, heart and hands...</p> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Committed to a biblical foundation as evidenced by the teaching of sound doctrine and the proper interpretation of Scripture in accordance with our statement of faith. 5. Committed to a spiritual foundation as evidenced by providing an environment which encourages spiritual life and growth. 	<p>...to think and live a biblical worldview and...</p> 
<p>...of servant ministry leaders for global impact.</p> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Committed to developing students for a ministry and service mindset as evidenced by preparing them both academically and experientially to serve Christ in the Church and society. 7. Committed to exemplifying a ministry and service mindset as evidenced by exerting a positive Christian influence both locally and globally. 	<p>... to proclaim Christ by serving Him in the Church and society.</p> 

II. Nature and Scope of Self-Study

Lancaster Bible College is a vastly different institution than it was during our last self-study process. The college has gone from primarily a regional college of less than 1,000 students with one physical location, to a national institution with just under 2,000 students at seven locations in six states as well as online. Part of that growth was due to the acquisition of the academic programming of Washington Bible College | Capital Bible Seminary, in Greenbelt, Maryland. The undergraduate and graduate programming was merged directly into our existing programming. While our traditional undergraduate population continues to grow, our greatest growth has been in the non-traditional areas. The six new locations each serve a primarily adult population. The following table provides more detail on these six new locations:

Name	Location	Academic Levels Offered
1. Capital Seminary & Graduate School	Greenbelt, MD	Adult Undergraduate Graduate, Seminary
2. Capital Seminary & Graduate School	Springfield, VA	Graduate, Seminary
3. Philadelphia Center for Urban & Theological Studies	Philadelphia, PA	Adult Undergraduate, Graduate
4. Memphis Center for Urban & Theological Studies	Memphis, TN	Adult Undergraduate, Graduate
5. Crossroads Bible College	Indianapolis, IN	Graduate
6. Spanish River Church	Boca Raton, FL	Graduate

In addition, we now offer a gap year program for high school graduates that has doubled in enrollment after just one year.

Besides our rapid expansion and growth in programs and student population, other areas that have been flourishing include our online education department, information technology, services to our students, and our tracking of assessment data and its use in the planning process.

Several years ago, the college felt comfortable enough with the planning and assessment processes we had put in place across campus that we were looking forward to doing a selected-topics approach to our self-study this time around. However, over the past two years it has become quite clear that because so many areas of the college have been impacted by the changes mentioned above, and the key issues that surround them, that another comprehensive study is required. Doing a comprehensive report with special emphasis on some key issues will be the approach that best fosters further self-study and planning in all the areas of recent and anticipated future developments.

The 2017 Self-Study Steering Committee officially met for the first time on September 9, 2014, and nine study groups were identified based upon the grouping of the MSCHE standards (See Section III of this document). During that meeting, key overarching issues were also identified, issues that impact most, if not all, areas of the college.

The members of the steering committee will serve as chairs or liaisons of study groups that will be tasked with specific areas of the study. While these study groups will not limit their study to these issues, they will be encouraged to give a high priority to the consideration of the key topics found in Table II.1. Study groups will:

- Evaluate the current status of their respective concerns, drawing upon valid data.
- Identify strengths and areas needing improvement.
- Submit to the steering committee their recommendations and suggestions for modification or refinement together with possible courses of action.

Table II.1 - Key Issues

<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Rapid growth and expansion of<ul style="list-style-type: none">• traditional on-campus at Lancaster• additional sites• online education2. Capital Seminary & Graduate School3. Leveraging the Teague Learning Commons4. The changing face of the Bible college student5. Move from a regional to a national institution6. Administrative structural changes7. Professional accreditations8. Solution Center

The steering committee will edit 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.

The self-study reporting document will consist of nine chapters.

- Chapter One: Institutional Identity will include LBC's mission, goals, objectives, and institutional integrity.
- Chapter Two: Institutional Effectiveness will include LBC's institutional planning, resource allocation, and institutional assessment.
- Chapter Three: Governance & Administration will address LBC's leadership, governance, and administrative structure.
- Chapter Four: Academic Programs will deal with our educational offerings including the library and other learning resources.
- Chapter Five: General Education will address our curriculum offerings that develop our student in the liberal arts.
- Chapter Six: Faculty will cover faculty development.

- Chapter Seven: Student Learning will focus on the assessment of student learning from the course level on up.
- Chapter Eight: Student Development will include sections on both student admissions and student support services.
- Chapter Nine: Related Educational Activities highlights several areas that have risen in prominence for our college, including distant locations, distance education, contractual relations, basic skills, and certificate programs.

(See Section VIII of this document for a more complete outline of the intended design of the final report.)

II. Specific Goals and Objectives

LBC will be pursuing the following goals and objectives during the self-study process:

GOAL #1: To identify and analyze characteristics of excellence in our practices which meet the standards of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Objective #1a: During the self-study process, representatives from all of the college's constituencies will identify and demonstrate areas of "best practices" that are currently occurring at LBC.

Objective #1b: In the self-study report, data will be presented that will demonstrate how LBC currently meets MSCHE standards of excellence.

GOAL #2: To identify and evaluate areas which need additional attention in order to more fully meet the standards of the Middle States Commission on Higher Education.

Objective #2a: During the self-study process, representatives from all of the college's constituencies will evaluate areas that need additional attention in order to meet the MSCHE standards.

Objective #2b: In the self-study report, areas needing additional attention to meet MSCHE standards will be acknowledged and appraised.

GOAL #3: To investigate the impact our eight key issues have made upon the college and to project how these issues might be leveraged to further advance our mission and goals, and accomplish our strategic plans.

Objective #3a: During the self-study process, representatives from all of the college's constituencies will examine ways in which the college can improve its ability to effectively and efficiently fulfill its mission statement and to achieve its objectives, especially as we focus on our eight key issues and strategic plans.

Objective #3b: In the self-study report, suggestions will be made as to how the college can improve its ability to effectively and efficiently fulfill its mission statement and to achieve its objectives, especially as we focus on our eight key issues and strategic plans.

III. Organizational Structure of the Steering Committee and Study Groups

One of the outcomes from our last decennial study was the creation of our Committee for Institutional Effectiveness (formerly called the Committee for Institutional Research and Assessment). The CIE is a “by invitation” committee so that adequate representation of all major areas on campus can be guaranteed. Members of the committee serve as liaisons to the campus at large, ensuring that necessary input and feedback is received and issues addressed. The purpose of the CIE is to “coordinate all planning, research and assessment activities on campus with the goal of institutional effectiveness and renewal” (see Appendix 1). Therefore, back in 2007 it was built into the guidelines for our Self-Study Steering Committee that the CIE would form the nucleus for future Self-Study Steering Committees as well as future Periodic Review Report Committees (see Appendix 2). This approach served us well as our 2012 Periodic Review Report received notable commendations.

In the spring of 2014, the CIE started the self-study process by considering who else should join them to form the steering committee and what the timetable should be for the self-study process. The CIE is chaired by the Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness who will serve as the chair of the steering committee. With the input of the Provost, the Senior Associate Dean of the Seminary & Graduate School was identified as a co-chair of the steering committee.

In consultation with the provost and president, ten individuals were added to the CIE membership of nine to form the Self-Study Steering Committee. With a total of 19 individuals, the steering committee represents a cross-section of the institution, both professionally as well as individually with diverse backgrounds, perspectives, and ideas.

The 2017 Self-Study Steering Committee officially met for the first time on September 9, 2014, and nine study groups were identified based upon the grouping of the MSCHE standards. Each steering committee member will chair or co-chair a study group.

As noted above, the Senior Associate Dean of the Seminary & Graduate School was identified as a co-chair of the steering committee. In addition, a Capital Region Steering Committee (CRSC) was formed to ensure that the Capital Region programs, which include the seminary and graduate school, are being fully and adequately represented in the Self-Study. Each member of the CRSC will serve on an appropriate study group and will keep the CRSC informed of the overall self-study process. They will serve as conduits for information flowing to and from the Self-Study Steering Committee. (See Appendix 3.)

Table III.1 lists the membership of the Self-Study Steering Committee, the Capital Region Steering Committee, and the nine study groups. Mrs. Dawn Brandt, current administrative assistant for the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and former English instructor, was asked to serve as recorder and document editor.

Table III.1

2017 Self-Study Study Groups

Study Group	Standards	Study Group Memberships
Self-Study Steering Committee (SSSC)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dale Mort, AVP Institutional Effectiveness [Chair] 2. Mark Meyer, Ph.D. in Biblical Studies Coordinator, Capital Seminary & Graduate School [Co-Chair] 3. Dawn Brandt, OIE [recorder/editor] 4. Gordon Gregory, Bible & Theology Professor 5. Julia Hershey, Education Department Chair 6. Jessica Geist, Arts & Sciences Chair 7. Jeff Hoover, AVP Enrollment Management 8. Dan McClary, Associate Registrar 9. Mark Menga, Assoc. Dean, Accelerated Undergrad. Degrees 10. Betty Pompell, Admissions 11. Scott Boyer, Director of Student Success 12. Hal Pettegrew, Associate Dean for Doctoral Studies 13. Kurt Miller, Social Work Program Coordinator 14. Ruth Shertzer, Trustee 15. Timothy Koller, Associate Dean for Academic Advancement 16. Timothy Kraynak, Doctoral Student RA 17. Bill Hitz, Corporation Member 18. Hannah Graham, Junior/Senior Student 19. Evan Smith, Junior/Senior Student
Capital Region Steering Committee (CRSC)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mark Meyer, Ph.D. in Biblical Studies Coordinator, Capital Seminary & Graduate School [Chair] 2. Brian Pinzer, Associate Dean for Academic Advancement [Related Educational Activities] 3. Derrick Seegars, Advancement [Mission, Goals, Objectives & Integrity] 4. Carl Sanders, CR Faculty member [Faculty] 5. Phil Bena, CR Faculty member [Student Learning] 6. Valdenia Simmons, CR Student Support Specialist
1. Mission, Goals, Objectives & Integrity	<p>Mission, Goals, and Objectives (MSCHE #1)</p> <p>Integrity (MSCHE #6,)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dale Mort, AVP Institutional Effectiveness [Chair] 2. Derrick Seegars, Advancement 3. Doug Finkbeiner, Bible & Theology faculty 4. Scott Fetterolf, Corporation Member 5. Tom Fox, Ph.D. student, Director of Open Air Campaigners 6. Ethan Prouse, Soph/Jr Pre-Sem. Student, Community Assistant
2. Institutional Effectiveness	<p>Planning, Resource Allocation, and Institutional Renewal (MSCHE #2)</p> <p>Institutional Resources (MSCHE #3)</p> <p>Institutional Assessment (MSCHE #7)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dale Mort, AVP Institutional Effectiveness [Chair] 2. Matt Mason, VP Finance 3. Vince Johnson, VP Information Systems 4. Stu Levey, Trustee (People Development Committee) 5. Dave Hanson, Corporation Member 6. Kate Blest, Soph/Jr Education Student, Community Assistant

Study Groups	Standards	Study Group Memberships
3. Governance & Administration	Leadership and Governance (MSCHE #4) Administration (MSCHE #5)	1. Hal Pettegrew, Associate Dean for Doctoral Studies [Chair] 2. Phil Clemens, Board of Trustees Chair 3. Cliff Hurter, Corporation Member 4. John Soden, Bible & Theology faculty 5. Timothy Koller, Associate Dean for Academic Advancement 6. Timothy Kraynak, Doctoral Student RA
4. Academic Programs	Educational Offerings / Academic Programs (MSCHE #11)	1. Jeff Hoover, AVP Enrollment Management [Chair] 2. Ruth Shertzer, Trustee Ed. Comm. (retired librarian) [Co-Chair] 3. Dan McClary, Associate Registrar 4. Bill Burrichter, Counseling & Social Work Chair [2014-2015] 5. Deb Hunt (Library)
5. General Education	General Education (MSCHE #12)	1. Jessica Geist, Arts & Sciences Chair [Chair] 2. Michael Freeman, Communications Program Coordinator 3. Allison Byxbe, A&S Faculty Member 4. Rebecca Toews, A&S Adjunct Faculty Member 5. Sarah Dillon, Assistant Athletic Director 6. Keri Graybill, recent graduate 7. Rebecca Ness, recent graduate
6. Faculty	Faculty (MSCHE #10)	1. Gordon Gregory, Bible & Theology Professor [Chair] 2. Bill Hitz, Corporation member [Co-Chair] 3. Penny Clawson, Office of Teaching Effectiveness 4. Bob Dobson, Education Faculty Member 5. Carl Sanders, Capital Region Faculty member 6. Marti MacCullough, retired Dean, Cairn School of Education (former LBC Christian Ed professor)
7. Student Learning	Assessment of Student Learning (MSCHE #14)	1. Julia Hershey, Education Department Chair [Chair] 2. Kurt Miller, Social Work Program Coordinator [Co-Chair] 3. Hannah Graham, Junior/Senior Student [SSSC member] 4. Penny Clawson, Office for Teaching Effectiveness 5. Harold Kime, Bible & Theology Professor 6. Phil Bena, Capital Region Faculty member
8. Student Experiences & Services	Student Admissions & Retention (MSCHE #8) Student Services (MSCHE #9)	1. Scott Boyer, Director of Student Success [Chair] 2. Betty Pompell, Admissions [Co-Chair] 3. Evan Smith, Junior/Senior Student [SSSC member] 4. Ron Hoover, Trustee, Enroll. Man. / Student Services Comm. 5. Valdenia Simmons, CR Student Support Specialist 6. Colleen Noel, CS&GS Admissions Rep (Lancaster) 7. Tricia Wilson, Financial Aid Coordinator 8. Tom Starr, Counseling & Career Center Director 9. Cathy Rintz, Corporation Member (F&M Adm. Counselor)
9. Related Educational Activities	Related Educational Activities (MSCHE #13)	1. Mark Menga, Assoc. Dean for AUD [Chair] 2. Chris VanBuskirk, Director of Online Education 3. Sherry Jones, Dean of LBC@CUTS 4. Brian Pinzer, Associate Dean for Academic Advancement 5. Colleen Noel, Director of Adult Learning Services 6. Ed Scheuerman, Assoc. Prof. and Coord. Intercultural Studies 7. Jim Ayers, Professor at Large 8. Derek Melleby, OneLife Academic Architect

IV. Charges to Subcommittees

According to MSCHE's *Self Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*, there are several different ways research questions can be developed: "Some steering committees develop the detailed questions themselves at the outset, possibly in consultation with working committee leaders. Other steering committees choose to provide only general charge questions to working committees, with the expectation that these committees will develop more detailed and institutionally-specific questions as part of their initial work" (30).

In September of 2014, the steering committee decided to allow the study groups to develop specific research questions since the study groups are composed of individuals most closely associated with the outworking of the specific standards. The study groups were charged to focus on, but not be limited to, the identified key issues. The study groups met in October of 2014 and submitted lists of potential research questions to the steering committee. The steering committee then reviewed the research questions and made minor modifications "to assure the completeness and consistency of the overall self-study process" (*Design 25*). (See Timetable, Section VI of this document.)

Data collection to address the research questions will take place during the fall semester of 2014 and the spring semester of 2015. During the fall of 2015 the study groups will discuss their findings and start preparing drafts of their paragraphs. Each section of the document will give a brief description of the area or topic under review and an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses found. While the study groups will not be tasked with finding definitive solutions for every weakness or problem uncovered, they will include in their section recommendations for possible courses of action which might lead to improvement. (See Section II of this document.)

In the spring of 2016, the steering committee will collect the draft paragraphs and begin the editing of the document, calling for additional data as appropriate. During the fall of 2016, community feedback will be received and the final document prepared. (For a more detailed schedule, see Timetable, Section VI of this document.)

The following are the research questions that have been developed by study groups and revised by the steering committee. These are the questions which will be addressed during this self-study process.

Chapter One: Institutional Identity

Mission, Goals, and Objectives

MSCHE Standard 1

The institution's mission clearly defines its purpose within the context of higher education and explains whom the institution serves and what it intends to accomplish. The institution's stated goals and objectives, consistent with the aspirations and expectations of higher education, clearly specify how the institution will fulfill its mission. The mission, goals, and objectives are developed and recognized by the institution with its members and its governing body and are utilized to develop and shape its programs and practices and to evaluate its effectiveness.

Integrity

MSCHE Standard 6

In the conduct of its programs and activities involving the public and the constituencies it serves, the institution demonstrates adherence to ethical standards and its own stated policies, providing support to academic and intellectual freedom.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. How well are LBC's Mission and Core Values & Goals being communicated, appropriated, and accomplished through non-traditional and seminary/graduate programs in comparison to our traditional undergraduate programs? What evidence is there that all of our students and graduates are proclaiming Christ by serving Him in the church and society?	Graduating student, alumni, & employer surveys and focus groups
2. How effectively does the addition of new delivery methods and partnerships fit with our Mission, Core Values and Goals, Objectives, and our strategic plan?	Analysis of our strategic plan and the mission statements/objectives of our partnerships; surveys and focus groups

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Two: Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Resources

MSCHE Standard 3

The human, financial, technical, physical facilities and other resources necessary to achieve an institution's mission and goals are available and accessible. In the context of the institution's mission, the effective and efficient uses of the institution's resources are analyzed as part of ongoing outcomes assessment.

Planning, Resource Allocation, Institutional Renewal, and Institutional Assessment

MSCHE Standard 2

An institution conducts ongoing planning and resource allocation based on its mission and uses the results of its assessment activities for institutional renewal. Implementation and subsequent evaluation of the success of the strategic plan and resource allocation support the development and change necessary to improve and to maintain institutional quality.

MSCHE Standard 7

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in: achieving its mission and goals; implementing planning, resource allocation, and institutional renewal processes; using institutional resources efficiently; providing leadership and governance; providing administrative structures and services; demonstrating institutional integrity; and assuring that institutional processes and resources support appropriate learning and other outcomes for its students and graduates.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. What guidelines are in place to determine where our resources can produce the maximum missional impact? What additional procedures need to be put in place to guarantee institutional effectiveness across the institution?	Analysis of existing guidelines, procedures, strategic plans/projections, budgets, and trends in all four areas; interviews with select administrators
2. How has our rapid growth and expansion, including the addition of Capital Seminary & Graduate School, impacted our human, technological, physical, and fiscal resources?	
3. What do the trends in our IPEDs data reveal about our institutional effectiveness? What steps need to be taken to address any issues noted?	

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Three: Governance & Administration

Leadership and Governance

MSCHE Standard 4

The institution's system of governance clearly defines the roles of institutional constituencies in policy development and decision-making. The governance structure includes an active governing body with sufficient autonomy to assure institutional integrity and to fulfill its responsibilities of policy and resource development, consistent with the mission of the institution.

Administration

MSCHE Standard 5

The institution's administrative structure and services facilitate learning and research/scholarship, foster quality improvement, and support the institution's organization and governance.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. In what ways are recent administrative structural changes essential for accomplishing the mission of the school—to educate Christian students to think and live a biblical worldview and to proclaim Christ by serving Him in the Church and society?	Interviews with president's leadership team and executive committee of board; analysis of existing documents and historical documents from past ten years, including job descriptions; review documents from peer institutions
2. How specific and effective are institutional guiding documents in defining criteria for personnel selection at the cabinet/council level and defining succession plans for the highest levels of leadership for the institution?	

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Four: Academic Programs

MSCHE Standard 11

The institution's educational offerings display academic content, rigor, and coherence that are appropriate to its higher education mission. The institution identifies student learning goals and objectives, including knowledge and skills, for its educational offerings.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. What evidence is there LBC Faculty give adequate oversight to curriculum for fast developing programs and delivery methods to ensure equal academic content and rigor appropriate to degree level? How effective is our process to determine rigor?	Faculty surveys and focus groups
2. Considering LBC's desire that some of our academic programs seek professional accreditation, to what extent do the faculty within those programs have the necessary autonomy to achieve the mission and goals of the college and the program in light of specific professional accreditation standards?	Interviews with faculty in programs currently seeking professional accreditation
3. With Capital Seminary & Graduate School's exclusive use of blended course delivery, what evidence is there that this format is best suited for the measurement of competencies?	Review of the literature; review of the CS&GS program approval documents; student and faculty focus groups
4. Should undergraduate programs consider a move to competency-based education?	Review of the literature; surveys and focus groups
5. What measurements are in place to assure that all students in all delivery modalities have sufficient access to all library and learning services?	Library usage counts; review of syllabi for required library access; survey and focus groups

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Five: General Education

MSCHE Standard 12

The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, technological competency, and information literacy.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. How effectively are we diversifying the curriculum for high achieving as well as academically at risk students?	Review of literature for best practices; comparative studies with the student population as a whole; focus group with advisers to clarify definition and parameters of an "advanced" course and to identify enrichment opportunities
2. Is rigor sufficient for students' academic/professional goals, and how is that rigor assessed and remediated?	Results from nationally normed instruments including SAILS, NSSE; use of select VALUE rubrics; focus groups with transfer students; comparative studies across modalities; glean types of assignments given in advanced courses; compare syllabi from advanced courses with syllabi from other colleges/universities
3. How effectively does course content encourage proficient use of technology by both the instructor and student?	Analysis of syllabi; analysis of data compiled by Online Education and HelpDesk
4. Are students exposed through general education curriculum to a diversified set of worldviews, and how they measure up against a biblical worldview?	Analysis of Assessment Annotations submitted; analysis of student work esp. in core courses; analysis of syllabi; examination of cross-cultural study experiences; faculty surveys; Writing Center data.
5. How effectively does curricular content support student growth in oral and written communication?	

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Six: Faculty Development

MSCHE Standard 10

The institution's instructional, research, and service programs are devised, developed, monitored, and supported by qualified professionals.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. How effective have been the means of inducting new faculty across all locations and modalities into the life and culture of LBC? Is there evidence that adjunct and contract faculty are qualified and adequately equipped for their teaching ministry at LBC?	Review of faculty curriculum vitae; analysis of faculty evaluations; analysis of faculty-to-support staff ratios; surveys and focus groups; data regarding faculty participation in professional development and institutional service
2. How effective have been the means of developing faculty and promoting performance in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service, particularly in light of the move to a vertical structure and the addition of locations and non-traditional modalities? Is there evidence that adjunct and contract faculty are adequately supported in appropriate areas?	Analysis of IPEDS trends in comparison to peer institutions; analysis of faculty-to-support staff ratios; surveys and focus groups;
3. How is our rapid growth impacting the faculty to student ratio, along with the adjunct to full-time ratio? How has faculty workload in general been impacted? Are there sufficient support services in place to compensate?	Surveys and focus groups;
4. With the restructuring of faculty committees, do faculty members at all locations and in all modalities feel they are properly represented and have a voice in decision-making?	

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Seven: Student Learning

MSCHE Standard 14

Assessment of student learning demonstrates that the institution's students have knowledge, skills, and competencies consistent with institutional goals and that students at graduation have achieved appropriate higher education goals.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. To what degree are we ensuring quality development and consistency of student learning outcomes and competencies in all programs, locations, and modalities that are consistent with goals?	Review of syllabi, policy manuals, minutes; interviews and focus groups
2. How effective are we at consistently assessing student learning at all locations, through all delivery methods and at all levels, and connecting student learning to broader institutional goals?	Analysis of pre/post Bible exams, assessment annotations, and rubrics from capstone projects from all locations and modalities; results from blind studies; faculty focus groups on assessment practices
3. How effective are we at meeting the learning needs of individual students across all levels, locations, and modalities?	Collect data on student needs from the Ally Center; survey/interview professors, tutors and staff of Ally Center; analysis of process of how a student reveals a need and how they access services
4. To what degree do our graduates have the necessary knowledge and skills for their future job and/or additional education?	Analysis of student exit interviews and surveys of alumni, employers and/or graduate schools; analysis of pre/post Bible exams; analysis of graduate tracking

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Eight: Student Experiences & Services

Student Admissions / Enrollment Management

MSCHE Standard 8

The institution seeks to admit students whose interests, goals, and abilities are congruent with its mission.

Research Questions	Documented via...*
1. What changes or additions need to be made in our current advertising/recruitment plan as we move from a regional to a national institution?	A review of the literature and best practices; discussion with consultant; interviews with select institutions
2. What evidence is there that the Enrollment Management team is adjusting to a changing demographic of students (at all levels) yet remaining steadfast in collegiate mission?	Surveys and focus groups; evaluation by peer institution member serving on study group

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

(continued)

Chapter Eight: Student Experiences & Services (cont.)

Student Support Services

MSCHE Standard 9

The institution provides student support services reasonably necessary to enable each student to achieve the institution's goals for students.

Research Questions	Documented via... *
1. How effective are we at raising awareness of support services to all students in the LBC Community?	NSSE, AICUP, and in-house surveys; focus groups;
2. How effective are the services/experiences we provide to online students in supporting comprehensive development, achievement of learning outcomes, and support of the LBC mission? What evidence is there that the student service needs of the Capital Seminary & Graduate School are being met regardless of location or instructional delivery system?	
3. What evidence exists that our strategy for financial aid and Scholarshare Fund are meeting the needs of our current student population and poised to be successful for a growing number of incoming students in the future?	NSSE, AICUP, and in-house surveys; focus groups; review of the literature which will impact strategic plans and projections
4. How do the percentage of our students taking out loans and our cohort default rate compare to national and other norms? What steps, if any, can be taken to address any issues found?	Review of IPEDS data; focus groups; interviews with select institutions

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 – 22.

Chapter Nine: Related Educational Activities

MSCHE Standard 13

Institutional programs or activities that are characterized by particular content, focus, location, mode of delivery, or sponsorship meet appropriate standards.

Research Questions	Documented via... *
1. How is our rapid expansion of additional sites impacting the ability to serve the “basic skills” needs of our academically “at risk students”?	Pre/post test scores inc. SAILS; faculty perspectives/feedback, tutor feedback
2. Can massive open online courses (MOOCs), competency-based education and/or continuing education unit (CEU) courses (Biblical Enrichment / EQUIP), contribute further to the expansion of online education? How do they fit our mission and vision?	Review of the literature; focus groups
3. How can our traditional on-campus programs tap into the greater cultural diversity of our alternative academic programs to promote a greater global awareness on campus?	Review of the literature; focus groups; discussions with marketing consultant
4. How has the changing face of the Bible college student driven LBC to expand into a more non-traditional approach to biblical higher education? What additional characteristics of the non-traditional student need to be tapped, and how?	
5. What changes or additions to our alternative academic patterns need to be modified as we move from a regional to a national institution?	

* See also specific supporting documents listed by chapter on pages 20 - 22

V. Inventory of Support Documents

A number of support documents contain critical data that will be useful throughout the self-study process. These documents are categorized into two sets of documents. The first set contains documents that are more global in nature and will be useful throughout the self-study. The second set contains documents that are more specific to each of the four main sections of the self-study document.

All documents are available to the steering committee and its study groups. Many of the documents have been populated to the Taskstream planning and assessment database. Some of the documents are available through the Institutional Effectiveness website. The Office for Institutional Effectiveness will be the clearinghouse for other documents of a proprietary nature.

Set One – Global Support Documents

2007 Self-Study Document and Related Material. These are foundational documents since they summarize the 2007 decennial re-accreditation process. The self-study document, the team report, and the institutional response are included. The appropriate portions of the main document have been loaded into each study group's Taskstream workspace and can also be found on the publically accessible Institutional Effectiveness website.

2012 Periodic Review Report and Related Material. These documents summarize the five-year MSCHE required periodic review process. The documents address the 2007 visiting team's recommendations and also specifically outline LBC's approach to a comprehensive outcomes assessment plan. The 2012 PRR has been loaded into each study group's Taskstream workspace and can also be found on the publically accessible Institutional Effectiveness website.

The LBC Planning & Assessment document (2014). This document explains LBC's approach to collecting, analyzing, and using outcomes data in our planning processes. This document can be found on the publically accessible Institutional Effectiveness website.

Institutional Data. Data are generated annually across all major sectors of the college. It is the responsibility of each vice president to collect these data and analyze accordingly. Table V.1 provides examples of some these reports.

Five-Year Master Plan. This document provides a summary of planning initiatives across all sectors of LBC. It is set up intentionally as a working document that is updated regularly by the president and his leadership team. A redacted version can be found on the publically accessible Institutional Effectiveness website.

Academic Catalogs. There are three main college catalogs. The undergraduate education catalog, the Accelerated Undergraduate Degrees catalog, and the seminary & graduate school catalog provide specific information related to academic policies and procedures, along with specific curricular offerings and descriptions. Electronic versions of these catalogs can be found on LBC's website.

External Agency Reports. These reports are collected annually and provide summary data related to enrollment, persistence, graduation rates, budgeting, and personnel at LBC. The main external agencies for which these reports are generated include IPEDS, MSCHE, ABHE, and PDE.

Academic Database. The college's academic database, CampusVue, is readily available to generate any number of statistical reports. The Registrar's Office is available to assist in creating any desired report.

Taskstream Planning & Assessment Database. The college utilizes Taskstream as our means of collecting and storing assessment data for the purpose of planning. Each department and program on campus, academic and student support, has a Taskstream workspace. Taskstream allows the college to reflect upon the data collected and to make recommendations and develop action plans based upon the analysis of data. The Office for Institutional Effectiveness is available to assist all departments and programs in creating any desired report.

Set Two – Specific Support Documents as Related to the Self-Study Chapters

Chapter 1 - Institutional Identity

Mission, Goals, Objectives, and Institutional Integrity (MSCHE #1, 6)

- All documents referenced in Set One
- Selected portions of minutes from Board and Corporation meetings
- Selected portions of minutes from Cabinet meetings
- Minutes and other documents created by Rebranding Taskforce
- Organizational Charts
- Best Christian Workplaces Surveys
- Graduate Surveys
- Employee Surveys
- Community Surveys
- Results from specific questions attached to field experience reports

Chapter 2 - Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Resources; Planning, Resource Allocation, Institutional Renewal and Institutional Assessment (MSCHE #2, 3, 7)

- All documents referenced in Chapter 1 list
- Annual Audited Financial Statements
- Planning & Assessment at LBC (2014) document

Chapter 3 – Governance & Administration

Leadership, Governance, and Administration (MSCHE #4, 5)

- All documents referenced in Chapter 2 list

Chapter 4 - Academic Programs

Educational Offerings and Resources (MSCHE #11, 12, 13)

- All documents referenced in Set One
- Taskstream workspaces for all academic programs will be available for review. These workspaces include a wide variety of means by which course and programmatic outcomes are measured. The workspaces include analyses of the data collected in the form of reflections, recommendations, and action plans.
- Alumni Surveys
- Senior Interview Results
- Program Evaluations
- Retention/Attrition Reports
- Undergraduate Enrollment Reports
- AUD Enrollment Reports
- Seminary & Graduate School Enrollment Reports
- Evening Institute / Equip (non-credit programs) Enrollment Reports
- At-Risk Student Report
- New Student Testing Report
- Graduating Student Testing Report
- Grade Distribution Reports
- AUD Policies and Procedures Manual
- AUD Assessing Prior Learning Manual

Chapter 5 – General Education

General Education (MSCHE #12)

- All documents referenced in Chapter 4 list

Chapter 6 - Faculty Development

Faculty (MSCHE #10)

- All documents referenced in Set One
- Academic Affairs Council Minutes
- Faculty Surveys
- Aggregate data from SUMMA evaluations
- Aggregate data from IDEA evaluations
- Aggregate data from in-house SurveyMonkey evaluations
- Selected portions of minutes from Academic Affairs Council meetings

Chapter 7 – Student Learning

Assessment of Student Learning and Development (MSCHE #14)

- All documents referenced in Set One
- Taskstream workspaces for all academic programs will be available for review. These workspaces include a wide variety of means by which course and programmatic outcomes are measured. The workspaces include analyses of the data collected in the form of reflections, recommendations, and action plans.

Chapter 8 - Student Development

Student Admissions (MSCHE #8)

Student Support Services (MSCHE #9)

- All documents referenced in Set One
- Taskstream workspaces for all student support departments and programs will be available for review. The workspaces include analyses of the data collected regarding to how well each department or program is accomplishing its goals and objectives. Each workspace includes reflections, recommendations, and action plans based upon the data gathered.
- Spiritual Formation Evaluations
- Enrollment Reports
- Marketing/Recruitment documents
- Student Services Outcomes Assessment Grid
- Admissions Outcomes Assessment Grid
- Student Handbooks

Chapter 9 - Related Educational Activities

Related Educational Activities (MSCHE #13)

- All documents referenced in Set One
- Each of the programs or activities covered in this chapter has its own Taskstream workspace and these will be available for review. The workspaces include analyses of the data collected regarding how well each department or program is accomplishing its goals and objectives. Each workspace includes reflections, recommendations, and action plans based upon the data gathered.

Table V.1. – Institutional Data Examples

1. President's Office

- a. Board of Trustees
- b. Corporation Members
- c. Institutional Surveys/Reports
- d. LBC Organizational Chart
- e. President's Report/Annual Report

2. Provost's Office

- a. Biblical Enrichment / Equip
- b. Enrollment Reports
- c. Graduate Education
 - Advertising
 - Courses Offered
 - Enrollment Reports
 - Faculty Load
 - Grade Analysis
 - Graduation List
 - PDE Approvals
 - Program Initiatives
- d. Undergraduate Education
 - Christian Service
 - Enrollment Reports
 - Journey Teams
 - Placement
 - AUD
 - Ally Center (basic skills)
 - Seminars
- e. Academic Affairs
 - Graduation Rates
 - Library
 - Outcomes
 - Registrar's Office–Internal Reports
 - Reports and Surveys (ABHE, AICUP, IPEDS, MSCHE, etc.)
 - Senior Interviews

3. Admissions Office

- a. Admissions Activities
 - Application Data
 - Campus Visitors
 - Entering Class Data
 - New Student Survey
- b. Recruitment Activities
 - Advertising
 - Literature Distribution
 - Prospective Students

4. Business Office

- a. Fiscal Affairs
 - Accounts Payable/Receivable
 - Audit
 - Investments
- b. Student Financial Aid

5. College Operations Office

- a. Alumni
- b. Building/Grounds Management
- c. Campus Computerization
- d. College Operations
 - Events Reports
 - Outside Group Use of Campus
 - Technical Support
 - Visitors on Campus
 - Website
- e. Copy Center
- f. Mail Room
- g. Media Center
- h. Public Safety
- i. Publicity

6. Advancement Office

- a. Fund Raising Activities
 - Cash Flow Comparison Report
 - Cost Ratio Report
 - Deferred Gifts Report
 - Direct Mail Analysis
 - Donor Segmentation Report
 - Donor Type Comparison Report–Scholarshare
 - Fiscal Year Comparison Report
 - Fiscal Year Giving Report–All Funds by Month
 - Golf Tournament Reports
 - Statistical Report Comparison
 - Total Giving Report–Donor Type–All Funds
- b. Human Resources & People Development
- c. Planning Activities

7. Student Services Office

- a. Athletics
- c. Food Services
- d. Health Services
- e. Student Development
 - Discipline
 - Spiritual Development
 - Student Groups/Organizations
 - Student Life

VI. Timetable

2017 SELF-STUDY SCHEDULE

(items accomplished as of the writing of this document are crossed-out)

Time Frame	Responsibilities	Group
Friday September 19, 2014 10:00-11:30 am	First meeting of the full Self Study Steering Committee (SSSC) Organization & Delegation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss Study Groups Formation • Review resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ MSCHE Handbook ○ LBC's 2007 Self-Study Documents ○ LBC's 2010 Periodic Review Report 	SSSC
October, 2014	Convene Study Groups Organization & Delegation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charge with answering questions • Discuss approach to answering questions • Assign tasks to members • Start to collect data needed to answer questions 	Study Groups
October 15, 2014	First Meeting of the Capital Region Steering Committee (CRSC)	CRSC
November, 2014	Study Groups continue to collect data needed to answer questions	Study Groups
November 10-11, 2014	MSCHE Self Study Institute	Drs. Meyer & Mort
Thursday, November 13, 2014 2:00-3:30 pm	Self Study Steering Committee Meets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review first meeting of Study Groups • Answer questions, provide additional guidance 	SSSC
December 2014 January 2015	Study Groups continue to collect data needed to answer questions Design & Format sent to MSCHE VP (2 weeks prior to visit)	Study Groups Office Institutional Effectiveness (OIE)
February 3, 2015	MSCHE Vice President Visits Campus Study Groups Meet <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review progress of data collection • Answer questions, provide additional guidance 	Study Groups
March 11, 2015	Self Study Steering Committee Meets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review progress of study groups • Provide guidance regarding the writing of draft paragraphs 	SSSC
April 29, 2015	Self Study Steering Committee Meets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation about Academic Structure • Review progress of study groups 	SSSC
Spring & Summer 2015	Study Groups continue to collect data needed to answer questions	SSSC
Fall 2015	Self-Study Steering Committee Meets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance regarding the writing of draft paragraphs 	Study Groups
Fall 2015	Study Groups meet to discuss findings Study Groups prepare draft paragraphs	

2017 SELF-STUDY SCHEDULE
Page Two

Time Frame	Responsibilities	Group
Spring 2016	SSSC receives study groups' drafts and reviews them	SSSC
	SSSC follows up with study groups as needed	
	SSSC receives final reports from study groups	
	SSSC compiles and reviews first self-study draft	
	Office for Institutional Effectiveness (OIE) sends self-study draft and college catalog to team chairs	OIE
Fall 2016 Nov. 2016	Receive community feedback	OIE
	Compile final draft	
	Work with liaisons in selection of team	
	Obtain administrative and board approval	
	Send first self-study draft, schedule, and other information for preliminary visit to team chair (two wks. prior to visit)	
	Chair's preliminary visit	
Jan./Feb. 2017	Identify full-time documentation person	OIE
	Mail final self-study report to team and MSCHE (at least six wks. prior to team visit)	
	Send logistical information to team (four wks. prior to visit)	
Mar.–May 2017	Team visit	
	Team report and the institution's response	
Summer 2017	MSCHE action	

VII. Editorial Style and Format

The purpose of the following guidelines is to assist writers in preparing reports for LBC's self-study. These guidelines should help to promote consistency among various writers in the study groups, reduce editing problems, and create efficiency in producing the final document.

Outline

Our general outline consists of nine chapters: Chapter One: Institutional Identity, Chapter Two: Institutional Effectiveness, Chapter Three: Governance & Administration, Chapter Four: Academic Programs, Chapter Five: General Education, Chapter Six: Faculty, Chapter Seven: Student Learning, Chapter Eight: Student Development, and Chapter Nine: Related Educational Activities. Each of these chapters should include five subsections:

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of key issues as they relate to [section title]
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Strengths and concerns should appear in list form, with each item numbered. Materials for appendices should also be submitted to the steering committee at the time the rough draft is presented. Hard copy with electronic backup should be submitted to the steering committee.

Format Specifications

1. Writers should use the Word template and instructions provided on the self-study website.
2. When it is necessary to create a new style, writers should keep a record of all formatting choices made and submit them with the rough draft.
3. Base font is 12 pt. Times New Roman.
4. Paragraphs are not indented. The space after the paragraphs has already been assigned to the style.
5. Paragraphs are justified.
6. Margins are set for one inch except for the inside gutter, which is 1.25 inches.
7. For proofing purposes body copy will be double spaced. In the final document, body copy will be reformatted to single spacing with double spacing between paragraphs.
8. Page numbering will be automatically assigned to the bottom center of each page.

Style

1. Use lower case for disciplines: mathematics, art. Proper nouns like French and English are exceptions. "College," "department," and "division" should be in the lower case unless used as proper titles. "Biblical" should also be in the lower case unless used as a proper noun, such as "Biblical Division."
2. Capitalize unit names: Admissions Office.
3. Write out acronyms at first usage in each of the four sections: Self-Study Steering Committee (SSSC).
4. Use commas between all elements in a series: faculty, staff, and students.

5. Avoid the following:
 - a. Contractions
 - b. Overuse of semicolons
 - c. Excessive passive voice
 - d. Gender-based language
6. Use figures for numbers over ten, words for smaller numbers.

Other Specifications

1. Major chapter titles should be centered, bold-faced, 24 pt., with only the first letter of each main word capitalized. Major chapter titles should appear on separate pages.
2. Division headings should be centered, bold-faced, 16 pt., with only the first letter of each main word capitalized.
3. Subheadings should be aligned left, bold-faced, 14 pt., with only the first letter of each main word capitalized.
4. For other matters of particular relevance, writers should refer to the MLA Handbook.

VIII. The Organization of the Self-Study Report

Current “Institutional Data Summary”
“Executive Summary”

Introduction

- A. Identification of Committee Members and Significant Participants
- B. Brief History of Lancaster Bible College and Capital Seminary & Graduate School
- C. Significant Institutional Developments from 2007 to 2017

Chapter 1 - Institutional Identity

Mission, Goals, Objectives, and Institutional Integrity (MSCHE #1, 6)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Institutional Identity
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 2 - Institutional Effectiveness

Institutional Resources; Planning, Resource Allocation, Institutional Renewal and Institutional Assessment (MSCHE #2, 3, 7)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Institutional Resources; Planning, Resource Allocation, Institutional Renewal and Institutional Assessment.
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Leveraging the Teague Learning Commons
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 3 – Governance & Administration

Leadership, Governance, and Administration (MSCHE #4, 5)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)

4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Leadership, Governance, and Administration
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Leveraging the Teague Learning Commons
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Administrative Structural Changes
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 4 - Academic Programs

Educational Offerings and Resources (MSCHE #11, 12, 13)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Educational Offerings and Resources
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Leveraging the Teague Learning Commons
 - The changing face of the Bible college student
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Administrative Structural Changes
 - Professional Accreditations
 - Solution Center
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 5 – General Education

General Education (MSCHE #12)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Educational Offerings and Resources
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Leveraging the Teague Learning Commons
 - The changing face of the Bible college student
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Administrative Structural Changes
 - Professional Accreditations
 - Solution Center
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 6 - Faculty Development

Faculty (MSCHE #10)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Faculty Development
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 7 – Student Learning

Assessment of Student Learning (MSCHE #14)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Assessment of Student Learning
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Professional Accreditations
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 8 - Student Experiences & Services

Student Admissions (MSCHE #8)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Student Admissions
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - The changing face of the Bible college student
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Solution Center
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Student Support Services (MSCHE #9)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)

4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Student Support Services
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - Online Education
 - Capital Seminary & Graduate School
 - Leveraging the Teague Learning Commons
 - The changing face of the Bible college student
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Solution Center
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

Chapter 9 - Related Educational Activities

Related Educational Activities (MSCHE #13)

1. Overview (including why standards are grouped as they are)
2. Standard(s) (stated)
3. Compliance Documented (Data Sources)
4. Analysis of Key Issues as they relate to Assessment of Student Learning and Development
 - Rapid growth and expansion
 - additional sites
 - OneLife (certificate program)
 - Online Education
 - Leveraging the Teague Learning Commons (basic skills)
 - The changing face of the Bible college student
 - Move from a regional to a national institution
 - Other issues
5. Recommendations for Growth and Improvement

IX. Profile of the Evaluation Team

As a Bible college, LBC has a distinct mission of preparing Christian students to think and live according to a biblical worldview and to proclaim Christ by serving Him in the Church and society. With that mission in mind, the college recommends that any evaluation team should include individuals from institutions with similar faith-based mission statements. Ideally, the team should also include individuals from institutions which have graduate programs, an accelerated degree completion program, a strong online program, and additional locations.

Schools in the MSCHE region that LBC considers competitors and that should **not** be considered when choosing members for this team would include:

- Cairn University
- Baptist Bible College & Seminary
- Eastern University
- Messiah College
- University of Valley Forge

Our top choices for institutions that could provide team members and a chair includes:

- Geneva College
- Nyack College
- Roberts Wesleyan College
- Waynesburg University
- Washington Adventist University

X. Conclusion

While still at the early stages of the process, we are excited about what we will be accomplishing through this self-study. As we look at Section III of our design draft, we are especially pleased with the level of participation by our internal constituents: students, staff, faculty, trustees, and corporation members, as well as a few other select individuals from outside the current LBC family.

We are pleased not only with the level of participation by the members of our study groups, but also by their early commitment to the process. During the fall of 2014 the steering committee met twice, in September and November, and conducted discussions via email as well. The study groups met during October and some utilized Taskstream to hold additional virtual discussions. Our research questions were “finalized,” albeit with the understanding that they may still be refined based upon preliminary findings of the study groups. While limited data collection was conducted before the holiday break, all groups are now poised to begin in earnest in the spring of 2015. With this level of commitment, we anticipate this self-study process will turn out to be a very profitable experience for Lancaster Bible College | Capital Seminary & Graduate School.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Structure and membership of the standing Committee for Institutional Effectiveness (which serves as the assessment committee for the college)

Appendix 2 - Structure and membership of the Self-Study & Periodic Review Report Steering Committees

Appendix 3 - Capital Region Steering Committee

Appendix 1
Lancaster Bible College
Office of Academic Affairs
Committee for Institutional Effectiveness

- Primary Task:** To coordinate all planning, research and assessment activities on campus with the goal of institutional effectiveness and renewal.
- Responsible To:** Provost
- Chair:** Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness (AVPIE)
- Membership:** *Permanent* - AVPIE
Assigned - Faculty (up to four with no more than one from a single department, one being a department chair, and including some who teach seminary/graduate, AUD, and online courses), Student Services, Capital Seminary & Graduate School (CS&GS) Administration, Institutional Advancement, Enrollment Services, Registrar's Office
Student Representation - Student input will be received as relevant issues are taken to specific student organizations
- Assign. Mode:** Provost and AVPIE collaboration
- Term of Office:** Three years rotating with renewal of membership a possibility
- Responsibilities:** Train all departments in effective and efficient research and assessment procedures.
- Coordinate all research and assessment activities on campus, organizing the data into coherent and consistent reports.
- Follow-up with all departments in the use of data collected.
- Lead the decennial self-study process and serve as the nucleus of the Self-Study Steering Committee which will be formed at least two years prior to each accreditation review date (see description of Self-Study Steering Committee).
- Lead the Periodic Review Report process and serve as the PRR Steering Committee at least one year prior to each PRR due date.

Membership (effective August 2014)

Office	Representative	Term Ends
Institutional Effectiveness	Dale Mort^ (AUD, CSGS, online)	Permanent*
Registrar's Office	Jeff Hoover (A&S, AUD)	August 2016
Faculty	Gordon Gregory (B&T, AUD, CSGS, online)	August 2016
Student Services	Scott Boyer	August 2016
Faculty	Julia Hershey (ED)	August 2017
Faculty	Kurt Miller (CSW)	August 2017
Enrollment Management	Betty Pompell	August 2017
CS&GS Administration	Hal Pettegrew	August 2015
Institutional Advancement	Amy Henriques	August 2015

* So long as the individual holds the appropriate title ^ Indicates Chair

Appendix 2

Self-Study & Periodic Review Report Steering Committees

Primary Task:	To assist the Committee for Institutional Effectiveness in preparing MSCHE/ABHE reaffirmation of accreditation documents
Responsible To:	Provost
Chair:	Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness
Membership:	Members of the Committee for Institutional Effectiveness and other appointed individuals representing appropriate aspects of the College
Term of Office:	Self-Study = Two years, beginning two years prior to the review date PRR = One year, beginning one year prior to the review date
Responsibilities:	Coordinate the research necessary to accomplish the review process. Chair or co-chair study groups to research and review the data and to draw conclusions as to the information gathered. Process the information gathered into a written form for the document. Support the Office for Institutional Effectiveness in general tasks required to implement the construction of the document.

Appendix 3

Capital Region Steering Committee (CRSC)

Representing:

- Capital Seminary & Graduate School
- Greenbelt Accelerated Undergraduate Degree Program
- EQUIP Program

Purpose:

To ensure that the Capital Region (CR) programs are sufficiently and accurately represented in the 2017 Self-Study process and to provide support to the Self-Study Steering Committee as needed.

Membership:

Members		Represents the CR on the following Study Groups
1	Mark Meyer, Chair Sr. Assoc. Dean, Seminary & Graduate Studies	
2	Derrick Seegars Director of Church & Ministry Relations	Mission, Goals, Objectives & Integrity
3	Sue Kolodziejski Library & Technical Services Manager	Academic Programs / Library & Learning Services
4	Capital Region Faculty member	Faculty
5	Capital Region Faculty member	Student Learning
6	CS&GS Admissions Rep	Student Experiences and Services
7	Brian Pinzer Associate Dean for Academic Advancement	General Education / Related Educational Activities

Responsibilities:

The Capital Region Steering Committee will represent the Capital Region programs during the self-study process and will provide support to the Self-Study Steering Committee as needed. The CRSC will meet periodically to discuss the self-study process and to ensure that the Capital Region programs are being sufficiently and adequately represented. Each CRSC member serving in a Study Group will keep the CRSC informed of the overall self-study progress. They will serve as conduits for information flowing from and to the SSSC.

Timeline:

The CRSC will convene during the fall of 2014 and will meet at least every other month during the 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 academic years.