

## **Chapter 3 - Standards 2b & 6**

### **Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning; Institutional Resources**

#### **Overview**

Lancaster Bible College (LBC) is an institution committed to improving, growing, and planning. Since the late 1990s, the college has engaged in a comprehensive operational practice of planning which drives the budget and resource allocation. LBC is committed to continuing its wise stewardship practices and operating with balanced budgets. These practices include building only when fiscally responsible and assessing progress and practices to ensure the college is operating consistently, efficiently, and effectively to fulfill its mission. This chapter will address the issues of institutional resources, planning, resource allocation, institutional renewal, and institutional assessment especially as they relate to the following Association for Biblical Higher Education Commission on Accreditation (ABHECOA) standards.

#### **Standards**

*ABHECOA 2b: Assessment of Institutional Effectiveness and Planning*  
[Standard 2a is covered in Chapter 1.]

The institution demonstrates that it is accomplishing and can continue to accomplish its mission, goals and program objectives and improve performance through a regular, comprehensive, and sustainable system of assessment and planning. Central to this plan is the systematic and specific assessment of student learning and development through a strategy that measures the student's knowledge, skills and competencies against institutional and programmatic goals.

### *ABHECOA Standard 6*

The institution has the human, financial, physical, and technological resources needed to achieve its mission and has implemented policies and procedures to manage these resources effectively.

## **Compliance Documented**

In keeping with a comprehensive report with a focus on key issues, the reader is directed to our Compliance Index showing evidence of our compliance with all appropriate essential elements of [Standard 2](#) and [Standard 6](#). We track the assessment and planning aspects of these standards through our Strategic Planning Initiatives Taskstream workspace. A primary example of our compliance with these standards is found in Appendices [3A](#), [3B](#), and [3C](#) where our 2012-2015 strategic plans can be found.

The remainder of this chapter includes additional evidences of compliance within the framework of the key issues we have chosen to focus on in this study.

## **Research Questions**

With the purposes of advancing institutional self-understanding and self-improvement in mind, the following research questions guided the study group in preparing this section:

1. What guidelines are in place to determine where our resources can produce the maximum impact? What additional procedures need to be put in place to guarantee institutional effectiveness throughout the institution?
2. How has our rapid growth and expansion, including the addition of Capital Seminary and Graduate School, impacted our human, technological, physical, and fiscal resources?

## **Analysis of Key Issues**

During our 2007 Self-Study process, the evaluation team made several recommendations and suggestions regarding planning, resources, and institutional assessment. Our [2009 Progress Report](#) (Appendix 1A) and Middle States Commission on Higher Education [2012 Periodic Review Report](#) (Appendix 1C) addressed these in detail. In the ten years since our last self-study, LBC has kept these issues at the forefront and taken additional steps in these areas. This chapter will first look at LBC's strategic planning initiatives and outcomes, and the tracking of our planning and assessment procedures. The remainder of this chapter will address institutional planning, resource allocation, assessment and renewal in the areas of human, financial, technical, and facilities resources. The focus in these four sections will be our staff's viewpoint on how our rapid growth and expansion has impacted these areas. Input from the faculty will be considered in Chapter 6 - Faculty.

### **2012 – 2015 Strategic Planning Outcomes**

There was a slight delay between the ending of one strategic plan and the beginning of another. Therefore, the "Preferred Future" vision, which was dated 2012-2015, was extended through the conclusion of the 2015-2016 academic year. At the writing of the self-study document a new strategic plan was in the hands of key leaders to flesh out initiatives associated with that plan.

As noted in our [Planning & Assessment Plan](#) (Appendix 3E), LBC recognizes the important role of planning and is "committed to a planning process that is cyclical, consistent, comprehensive, and current. The purpose of planning is to help LBC remain grounded in her mission and effective in its implementation, all the while being prepared to respond to her internal and external environments. LBC's planning is global in scope, readily absorbed, intentional,

outcome-based, and continuously articulated to her constituencies” (p. 4). Our planning document sets forth guidelines and procedures to assist LBC in implementing effective planning and assessment with the goal of institutional renewal. It is “A written comprehensive assessment document that describes how the institution measures its effectiveness in an ongoing and structured way” (Essential Element 1 of ABHECOA Standard 2b). This document is divided into four sections.

The *Planning Philosophy* section of our plan includes statements regarding our philosophy that planning and assessment are shared processes, and addresses “A planning process that is comprehensive, involves representatives of the various institutional constituencies, and is subject to a periodic review process” (Essential Element 4 of ABHECOA Standard 2b). Specifically mentioned are the President’s Cabinet (former designation), the Academic Council (made up of all academic department chairs), and all student support units. The *Essential Elements* section outlines how LBC has built its planning process and procedures around eight Essential Elements: its Mission, Vision, Institutional Core Values & Goals, Academic Core Knowledge & Skills, Student Success Outcomes, Strategic Goals, Measurable Planning Objectives, and Assessment. These elements form the basis of “A plan that reflects the institution’s mission” (Essential Element 5 of ABHECOA Standard 2b). The *Planning Process* section details how plans are “based on assessment results, and...aligned with realistic resources projections” (Essential Element 5 of ABHECOA Standard 2b), and are “comprehensive, [and involve] representatives of the various institutional constituencies (Essential Element 4 of ABHECOA Standard 2b). Our *Assessment Plan* completes the requirement of this Essential Element by describing our “periodic review process.” It addresses other Essential Elements of Standard 2b as follows: It allows for “Meaningful analysis of assessment data and use of results by appropriate

constituencies for the purpose of improvement” (2), provides “Substantial documentation ...that the institution is effective in fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals and objectives” (3), and “... ongoing provision of reliable information to the public regarding its performance” (7).

While we have a well-defined plan, it was acknowledged during our 2007 Self-Study visit that we could do more to put the plan in place. The MSCHE evaluation team recommended “a better coordinated planning and budgeting process, possibly on a three-year cycle, that integrates budgeting with the planning process.” While some progress was made during the next four years, on September 12, 2011, the President’s Cabinet set aside a half-day to specifically discuss planning goals in preparation for submitting our 2012 Periodic Review Report for MSCHE. The following agenda items were accomplished during the fall of 2011 as a result of the discussions that took place at this meeting (see [Appendix 3F](#)).

1. The combining of our Core Values and Institutional Goals into one set of seven statements
2. Approval of Assessment & Planning links and the numbering of our Preferred Future Focus Areas
3. Analysis and assessment of the accomplishment of our planning goals as set forth in the “Strategic Impact” 2006-2011 document
4. Update and revision of the *LBC Planning: Philosophy, Pillars, Process, Procedure and Cycle* document (Planning Guidelines) to include organized and sustained processes for assessment of institutional effectiveness and student learning (PRR section Five)
5. Approval of responses to our 2007 Self-Study recommendations and suggestions
6. Discussion of LBC’s Major Challenges and/or Opportunities (PRR section Three)
7. Update of our Comprehensive Outcomes Assessment Plan document

The final item on the agenda was to develop a rolling five-year plan based upon our Preferred Future document. After further discussions, the Cabinet decided to start with a three-year rolling

plan (2012-2013, 2013-2014, 2014-2015) and then add two more years after the 2012-2013 year and then another two years after the 2013-2014 year, thus bringing the plan up to a five-year plan. Over the next several months, the Cabinet led the college through the development of a three-year plan organized according to the four main areas of the college: Academics ([Appendix 3D](#)), Student Enrollment & Services ([Appendix 3A](#)), Finance ([Appendix 3B](#)), and Advancement ([Appendix 3C](#)). A review of these four documents shows that:

- All of the Student Enrollment & Services goals were met on schedule.
- All three Finance goals were met on schedule.
- Eight Academic Affairs goals were accomplished on schedule, two were delayed, one was modified, and three academic programs were not implemented due to lack of market potential.
- Most of the Advancement goals set for these three years were not met which resulted in the need for a reorganization of the Advancement team (covered later in this chapter).

As noted in our 2009 Progress Report and our Middle States Commission on Higher Education 2012 Periodic Review Report, a Planning Database was created in the fall of 2011 that tied this plan to budgeting processes as “A plan that reflects the institution’s mission, is based on assessment results, and is aligned with realistic resources projections” (Essential Element 5 of ABHECOA Standard 2b). Planning initiatives were to be entered by department administrators, allowing each Cabinet member to easily review all initiatives in one central location. Each initiative was to include a budget estimate and be tied to institutional goals and objectives. This central planning database was meant to provide a “A system for monitoring institutional progress in achieving planning goals” (Essential Element 6 of ABHECOA Standard 2b), thus empowering the President’s Cabinet to make planning and budget decisions with a broader picture than was previously possible.

It became quickly apparent that maintaining this database was cumbersome; the system did not flow naturally from the planning to the budgeting process. Further, the administrative structure changed significantly during this time. The President shifted his leadership team from having a President's Cabinet with eight members to having a President's Leadership Team of five members. This was not only a shift in size, but a shift in the purpose of this leadership team. Central to the agenda of this new leadership team is strategic thinking, planning, and budgeting. Every Monday, the team gathers together and conducts college business with strategic planning at its core. Instead of strategic planning being limited to a list that is formulated once a year, it is an organic process that is shaped every week.

## **2016 Strategic Long Range Plan**

During a focused retreat from February 26-28, 2015, the Board of Trustees devoted significant time to identifying priorities for our strategic long range plan. The Board began by looking at six thematic areas: 1) college to university status, 2) people development, 3) enrollment and retention growth, 4) academic program refinement, 5) campus facility enhancements, and 6) fiscal planning and resources. From the two days of discussion in these areas, a list of ten priorities emerged.

In August 2015, to better “[involve] representatives of the various institutional constituencies,” and to provide for “a periodic review process,” (Essential Element 4 of ABHECOA Standard 2b), discussion groups of faculty and staff gave broad input into each priority. During a day-long summit on October 8, 2015, a task force of influencers and emerging leaders filtered this feedback through the grid of the Board of Trustees retreat discussions. The report of the task force was presented to the President's Leadership Team in December 2015 and they devoted a

full day on January 11, 2016 to interacting with the report and making further refinements. On May 17, 2016 the Board gave its final approval of the president's [Strategic Long Range Plan](#) (Appendix 1D). This strategic plan is fluid, providing destination points and empowering implementers to determine the road map to those destinations and adjust course as needed for changing conditions in the economy, government regulations, market conditions, etc. As of May 2016, the strategic plan is now in the hands of those implementers to develop five-year road maps to take us through 2020.

### **Tracking of Planning and Assessment**

Two other recommendations made by the 2007 evaluation centered on the documentation of assessment results and subsequent planning initiatives, both academic and non-academic.

“The Team strongly recommends special attention be given to [linking student learning outcomes to the strategic planning process] and yearly assessment of success be monitored internally.”

“The Team recommends that the college document and demonstrate how assessment results are used to improve teaching, learning, and institutional programs and service.”

Our 2012 PRR to MSCHE explained that we first started tracking planning initiatives and their assessment via a “home-grown” system. However, after a few years using this system we determined it was cumbersome and created data silos that did not allow for “cross-pollination” of our data. Therefore, in 2013, the college started contracting with Taskstream for our planning and assessment tracking. Each academic program, academic support unit, and student support unit has a planning and assessment workspace. Documentation of campus-wide loop-closing can



be found in the [Office for Institutional Effectiveness workspace](#) (Appendix 2E). While the yearly expense of Taskstream is somewhat steep for a small institution like LBC, it proves to be cost-effective because it provides “A system for monitoring institutional progress in achieving planning goals (Essential Element 6 of ABHECOA Standard 2b) and “Substantial documentation issuing from its assessment processes that the institution is effective in fulfilling its mission and achieving its goals and objectives (Essential Element 3 of ABHECOA Standard 2b). After a delayed start on the part of many departments and programs, Taskstream is now being utilized more effectively. Additional steps can still be taken to harness the capabilities of Taskstream to record and track our planning and assessment. It is suggested that as the College rolls out operational plans that they emphasize the greater utilization of the Taskstream database as a tool to assist departments in recording and tracking of LBC’s planning and assessment.

## **Standard 6 Institutional Resources**

Since the other chapters of this document focus on other major issues of institutional effectiveness (mission, goals, assessment of student learning, student admission, student retention, faculty, general education, related educational activities), the remainder of this chapter focuses on the assessment of LBC’s institutional effectiveness with regards to the four resources identified by Standard 6; human, physical, fiscal, and technological.

### **Human Resources**

In the past ten years LBC has grown from a single location in Lancaster, Pennsylvania with a headcount enrollment of fewer than 1,000 undergraduate and seminary/graduate students to an institution with over 2,000 students spanning seven locations (strategically reduced to five with the closure of two locations after 8/2016). This rapid growth is due to several factors including

the implementation of online education, expansion in locations, and the acquisition of the academic programming of Washington Bible College & Capital Bible Seminary. This section will examine the impact this rapid growth has had on our human resources.

### ***Staff-to-Student Ratio***

The college has added more than 50 new full-time positions in the last five years, including both staff and faculty classifications, and had reallocated several others to address current needs. According to IPEDS data filed for the past five years, overall staffing at LBC has increased at almost the exact same rate as our student population. LBC's student FTE grew by 74%, from 746 in 2011 to 1,297 in 2015. Likewise, our full-time-equivalent staff grew by 74%, going from 145 in 2011 to 252 in 2015. However, as these figures are broken down, the increase of our FTE instructional staff skewed the overall percentage. We had a 103% increase in faculty during this five-year period, most of which occurred in the last three years. This increase helped to return our student/faculty ratio to 14/1 in 2015 from a high of 17/1 in 2013. On the other hand, there was only a 53% increase in non-instructional staff during those five years, representing a decline from roughly an 8.8/1 staff/student ratio in 2011 to a 10/1 ratio in 2015.

Some of the additional workload on our staff has been offset by technology efficiencies gained through a \$3,000,000 investment in information systems infrastructure. In addition, a vertically integrated approach has also enabled aspects of strategic reallocation of resources where workflow has been expedited. For example, the upgrades to our campus management platform have allowed us to go paperless, an environmentally responsible decision that reduces the need for labor-intensive filing and maintenance. In addition, the transition to an ADP Human

Resources platform in 2015 puts team members increasingly in control of selecting and receiving updates on benefits, while expediting the recruitment and hiring process.

While both faculty and staff acknowledged increased workloads due to LBC expansion, as reflected in the IPEDS numbers, the greatest impact is on staff members. Although a [survey](#) (Appendix 3G) taken in the summer of 2015 showed that over 50% of staff members consider recent growth to have impacted their roles to a major degree, focus group members indicated that their workloads have been impacted more than the survey numbers suggest. In fact, there had been additional impact even since the survey was taken four months earlier. Many department representatives expressed a need for increased staff, space, and more suitable technology and training. Another difficult aspect of growth noted by the focus group involved the many recent staff changes, which have resulted in a lack of consistency in procedures and challenges in communication. Participants noted increased difficulty in knowing who handles which tasks and who needs to know specific information; furthermore, there is no centralized way to find the answers to these questions. These types of issues are normal growth pains related to rapid expansion, but nonetheless are noted here as areas in which to continue improvement.

### ***2014 Best Christian Workplace Survey - Doing Well***

In the Fall of 2013, LBC participated for the third time in the Best Christian Workplace (BCW) Survey conducted by the Best Christian Workplace Institute (BCWI). The resulting BCW report was released in February of 2014. With a very strong participation rate of 82%, the survey results show LBC as a very strong and well-managed Christian organization which has improved greatly over the past seven years. (See [Appendix 3H](#) for the full report and [Appendix 3I](#) for a follow-up phone interview with BCWI staff.)

The BCW Survey classifies institutions at one of four levels: Toxic, Critical Moment, Healthy, and Flourishing. The following list shows that LBC has moved from an institution in a Critical Moment to one that is now Flourishing.

1. Toxic
2. Critical Moment – LBC’s 2007 results
3. Healthy – LBC’s 2011 results
4. Flourishing – LBC’s 2014 results

According to the 2014 survey results, 70% of LBC employees are “engaged,” a significantly higher percentage compared to our peer Bible colleges which average 53% engagement. LBC’s employee level of engagement at a “neutral level” is 27%, compared to our peers, whose employees average 39%. Our “disengaged” population is extremely low at 3%. To use the analogy that the president of the BCWI used, if our staff and faculty were in a row-boat race, seven out of ten employees are rowing with us and three are not using the oars. At our peer institutions, only five out of the ten are rowing with their organizations.

In reviewing our trend comparisons with our 2011 results, it is important to note that there were a total of 13 questions on which we improved by 20 or more points. The most important item is #33 - LBC is well-managed. Other examples of significant improvement over the last survey period include promoting well- qualified staff/employees (up .41 pts.) and the monitoring of an employee’s progress (up .39 pts. due to increased emphasis on Performance Evaluation Process).

LBC did score lower on a few questions in 2014 compared to the 2011 results. The scores were still high (above 4.0), and about 15 points higher than our peers, therefore they would not be considered “red” or “yellow” flags. According to BCW Survey staff, all five items are among the

“I” or “me” questions. (See [Appendix 3H](#).) These questions are directly or indirectly related to an employee’s relationships with his or her supervisor. These are issues to consider and to monitor. In a phone discussion, the president of BCWI indicated that LBC was doing all the right things. He said we have a “consistently thick [healthy] culture” and that he would like to use Lancaster Bible College as a “case study” example of best practices. Since then, BCW has asked the president of LBC to participate in two national podcasts about our organizational culture.

### ***2015 Staff Survey and Focus Groups – Workload Issues Appearing***

In June 2015, more than a year-and-a-half after the Best Christian Workplace Survey was conducted, LBC administered its own Staff Survey and convened several follow-up focus groups. The purpose behind this survey and the focus groups was two-fold: (1) to validate the findings of the BCW Survey and to (2) see if the continued growth of the college over the ensuing months might have impacted the viewpoints of the staff.

During the approximately 18 months between the BCW and LBC surveys, the following changes were seen at LBC:

- Fall 2013: Start of the second semester at our Greenbelt, MD and Springfield, VA locations
- Fall 2013: Fifth location opened in Indianapolis, IN
- Fall 2013: Restructuring of LBC’s academic administration
- August 2013: LBC partnered with OneLife, a gap year program, to offer our one-year certificate within the parameters of their on-campus model
- September 2013: Partnership launched with Memphis Center for Urban Theological Studies for our sixth location
- January 2015: Partnership formalized with Compassion International
- January 2015: Partnership formalized with Pastors Discipleship Network in Uganda

- Steps being taken to move toward the vertical academic administration structure
- Two overlapping major building projects in progress

The Self-Study Survey of Staff was completed by 138 staff members (73%) at five locations including some who work remotely. The most common themes running through the survey responses and feedback from the focus groups were:

- Staffing as the highest priority need for most departments
- More space for Health and Physical Education/Athletics and Worship & Performing Arts programs
- Either replacements for CampusVue, our enrollment database, and EdgeWeb, our purchasing software, or more training in how to use them effectively
- Consistent channels of communication
- Better training in how to communicate remotely with other LBC locations

**Communication:** The issue of communication was noted many times under the category of *Other Initiatives*. There were 17 comments regarding lack of information, communication, and training. These comments seemed to be at odds with the high marks LBC received on the 2014 Best Christian Workplace (BCW) survey. As noted earlier, employees ranked communication higher than the average of all other best Christian workplaces in our industry, and we have seen a steady increase over the past three administrations of the BCW survey. However, the staff focus groups suggested that there is not as much of a disconnect between the 2014 BCW survey and the 2015 LBC Staff Survey as it might seem. The focus group members indicated they believe big items are communicated well, and this is probably what many were thinking of when they answered the BCW survey. But often small things are not communicated until after problems arise. As one commenter summed up, “A large part of the issue is that our rapid growth and recent restructuring is making it extremely difficult to communicate all the changes taking place

and to keep information available and current.” Additional comments, examples, and analysis can be found in the [report](#) (Appendix 3J).

### ***Impact of College Growth on Workload and Resources***

One of the findings of the 2015 staff survey was that many staff members serve more than one area of the college; 76.6% serve the traditional undergraduate programs on the Lancaster campus, 50% serve Capital Seminary and Graduate School, 43% serve our Accelerated Undergraduate Degrees (AUD) programs and 33% serve our online programs. In addition, with Student Services, the Business Office, and the Registrar’s Office serving all students, this is clear evidence the vertical structure is taking root.

On the same survey, over 77% of staff indicated LBC’s rapid growth had an impact of moderate to major on their workload, with over 50% indicating that recent college growth has had more than a moderate impact on their abilities to accomplish their roles.

When asked, “Are your resources appropriate to help accommodate future growth?” the majority of staff members indicated that most resources are appropriate to accommodate future growth. However, the minority who did not agree is significant. Most notable is the fact that almost 40% of respondents indicated a need for more staff to accommodate future growth.

This question generated 73 additional comments, which indicate concern about:

- Insufficient staffing (mentioned 36 times, with at least 10 comments including specific concerns about staff overwork, burnout, and morale)
- Inadequate technology (mentioned 26 times, with 11 specific references to CampusVue and/or EdgeWeb)
- Space issues (offices, storage, and classrooms) were mentioned 21 times

- Intangible items, such as lack of information, communication, and training, were mentioned 17 times

[Focus groups](#) (Appendix 3K) confirmed the impact that college growth has had, with participants indicating that their area and other areas with which they are familiar have been impacted even more than the survey numbers suggest. The participants also believed there had been additional impact since the survey taken four months prior to the convening of the focus groups and definitely since the Best Christian Workplace Survey 18 months prior to that.

Based on the review of the [five year staffing history](#) (Appendix 3L), changes in traditional undergraduate enrollment, and new program offerings, the following changes were essential: the addition of professors, coaching staff, and student support personnel. Additional key positions were also necessary for the adult learner program. While each of the eight strategic plans is affected by the staffing changes, the most recent fiscal year changes primarily support maintaining the core and expanding adult education. Some positions have been shifted, are on hold, or have been eliminated, all to align the resources in each location, department, or program.

While acknowledging there is a definite need to continue monitoring and addressing [human resources](#) (Appendix 3M) in the midst of rapid growth, it should be mentioned that an overwhelming majority of those responding to the staff survey indicated they are willing to take on extra, short-term responsibilities because they are committed to the mission of the college and are excited about the opportunities they have to take the mission beyond the main campus.

## **Technological Resources**

As was mentioned earlier, LBC has been blessed with a board-approved infusion of \$3,000,000 over the past four years. Ensuring excellence in technology was a focal point of these



investments, resulting in a significant upgrade of our Campus Management Student Information System and in an emphasis on technology during the Capital campaigns for the Teague Learning Center, East Hall dormitory, and the Charles Frey Academic Center. Those capital provisions have enabled the Information Systems department to quadruple the bandwidth of our dual redundant internet connections in order to provide faculty, staff, and students with no disruption of service at peak periods. The new data center in the Teague Learning Commons includes infrastructure with automated monitoring systems with proven metrics of greater than 99% uptime of all of our key institutional systems.

The most important result of the commitment of capital dollars in the area of technology is the enabling of our mission. Recent investments in technology infrastructure, enterprise systems, repeatable processes, and ongoing support have intentionally been modeled after industry best practices. Knowing that every institution faces limited resources, LBC's Information Systems team has worked with the President's Leadership Team to build a methodology around a culture of continuous improvement focused on vertical integration and sustainability.

Several enhancements to our Campus Management system provide the critical technical platform to enable scalability, sustainability, and flexibility across the diverse processes of traditional undergraduate, accelerated undergraduate, and seminary/graduate programs. All these enhancements involve a high level of complexity. This complexity, coupled with the need for accuracy in data input and a thorough understanding of the workflow requires training. Currently LBC relies on a few employees who are subject matter experts with full schedules, yet are needed to provide some of that training. As seen in the 2015 staff survey, this can create a tension as multiple areas of the college all utilize these limited resources.

Of those responding to the question, the majority of staff members (75%) believe that most of our technological resources are appropriate to accommodate future growth. This represents 90 staff members out of the 120 who responded to this question. Only 25% of staff responding felt our technological resources were not sufficient to accommodate future growth. However, these 30 individuals who felt the need for additional or better technology do represent a significant minority. On the survey, they included 26 comments about technological resources being inadequate with 11 of those comments making specific reference to CampusVue, our enrollment database, and/or EdgeWeb, our purchasing software. Likewise, participants in the two staff focus groups had similar comments.

Our online education programs, facilitated by our Office of Digital Learning, are major consumers of our technological resources. With the rapid growth of our non-traditional student population, the Office of Digital Learning has assisted in meeting the needs of students while holding to the student learning outcomes for courses and curriculum. More than half of all faculty members are including online elements in their courses, using fully online, blended, and supplemental formats. Nearly all students have at least one course with online elements. A full review of our online education programs and our projected goals and requirements can be found in Chapter 10 of this report.

Additional comments, examples, and analysis regarding our technological resources can be found in [Appendix 3N](#).

## **Physical Resources**

Four major construction projects have taken place on campus since our last self-study. Each of these meet a need as identified in our [2012-2013](#), [2013-2014](#), and [2014-2015](#) strategic plans (Appendices 3O, 3P, and 3Q).

### ***Student Housing***

Over the past five years LBC's total undergraduate population has steadily grown, creating a need for more dormitory space. This problem is a testament to LBC's unique on-campus experience and how students are cared for academically, emotionally, and spiritually. The dormitory space challenge created an incredible opportunity for growth.

In 2011, three existing apartment buildings standing adjacent to one another were joined together by the addition of common spaces between them. The two oldest buildings were gutted and completely renovated. The renovation increased capacity from 96 beds to 112.

With only a few beds added by the Weber Hall renovations, the ongoing on-campus housing shortage continued, and East Hall was built next. Until the opening of the new East Hall in the fall of 2015, LBC's residence halls generally housed up to 498 students, with 450 traditional undergraduate beds and 48 OneLife (gap year program) beds. Over the past three years, with large numbers of residents in the fall, LBC was given permission to house three students per room on one floor of Peterson Hall, bringing the total number of beds to 524, with 476 reserved for traditional undergraduate students. With the opening of the new East Hall (110 beds), the number of rooms with triple beds was reduced, and Brubaker Hall, which housed 34 students and was in need of extensive repair, was closed. Eighty-nine percent of the available beds (426 out of

476) were filled at the start of the fall 2015 semester including those in the new dormitory. If no rooms had been tripled, which is preferred since it is a last resort, there would have been only 24 beds available and 95% of available dormitory space filled. In previous fall semesters, there has been an occupancy rate of 97% (fall 2014) and 95% (fall 2013). In spring of 2016, at the time of this writing, the dormitories were at 86% capacity, even though there were 30 more resident students than there had been in spring 2015. With this many beds full there is discussion that plans may be needed to once again begin tripling up beds for the 2016-2017 academic year.

### ***Teague Learning Commons and Charles Frey Academic Center***

The 43,000 square-foot Teague Learning Commons (TLC) demonstrates LBC's commitment to academic scholarship in training the next generation of well-informed servant leaders. The building was opened on August 28, 2012. The centerpiece of the TLC is the Charles and Gloria Jones Library. In addition, the TLC houses classrooms, collaborative study rooms, a music media lab, small group study spaces, and quiet spaces for individual reflection. The fifth floor is home to our Ally Center learning support services that include a writing center, disability services, mentoring services, and a math lab. The TLC is also home to a Hospitality Suite for large group meetings and seminars, and to Bennee's Bistro café.

Early in March of 2016, six of our seven academic departments moved into the brand new Charles Frey Academic Center (CFAC). This four-story, 50,000 square-foot building houses not only six academic departments but also numerous academic support units. With all these departments under one roof, LBC will be better able to serve our undergraduate and seminary/graduate students, both traditional and non-traditional.

Additional descriptions of how the TLC and the CFAC have enhanced LBC's academic programs can be found in Chapter 7 of this self-study document.

### ***Current Physical Resources Needs***

As noted earlier in this chapter, the majority of staff members (62%) responding to the 2015 staff survey believe we have sufficient physical resources for the present and to accommodate future growth. Still, a significant minority felt the need for additional physical resources (38%), with 21 staff members commenting on space issues (offices, storage, and classrooms).

The survey was administered almost a year before the new 50,000 square-foot academic center was completed, so some of these comments may have been based on the "before" picture. Nevertheless, during the focus groups which were conducted less than six months before the center was available for use, there were still comments regarding space issues that would not be alleviated by the new building. Comments were specifically made about the Horst Athletic Center, the Good Shepherd Chapel, Esbenshade Enrollment Management Center, and the Teague Learning Commons.

Major renovations were made to the Horst Athletic Center in the summer of 2015 to maintain our traditional undergraduate core; renovators replaced the bleachers, installed additional seating for spectators, and created additional office space for expanded coaching staff. Yet, there is still insufficient room in the Horst Athletic Center to house the current athletic facilities, which clearly precludes room for future growth. Considering the increasing enrollment in our Health & Physical Education programs, as well as our co-curricular sports programs and the general emphasis on the physical well-being of our students, additional fitness facilities are needed to continue to draw students to the college.

Although it was originally designed as a multi-purpose building, since 2007 the Good Shepherd Chapel (GSC) has evolved into the hub of our Worship and Performing Arts Department (WPA). Even though one department moved out of the building several years ago, and some storage areas and coat closets were converted into offices and practice rooms, there is still a need for more practice rooms in order for the WPA to obtain professional accreditation for its programs.

In 2007 the original dormitory building on campus was remodeled into the Esbenshade Enrollment Management Center. The upper “west wing” of the dorm was reconfigured into the President’s Office suite which now houses the President, the Executive Vice President, their staff, and a conference room. A spacious reception area was created and later modified slightly to accommodate the Solution Center, a one-stop-shop for visitors, prospective students, and current students to access Admissions, the Registrar’s Office, the Business Office, and Financial Aid. The dorm rooms in the other three wings of Esbenshade were repurposed into offices and the Information Systems department. Due to the lack of reconfiguration in these wings and the increase in the number of employees moving into those areas, it has been noted that this building lacks the working and storage space needed for staff to function efficiently.

Several steps to alleviate some of the space issues have recently been completed or are in process. The lower level of Esbenshade was slightly renovated over the summer of 2016 to allow for the Registrar’s office to be relocated to the lower level and open up three offices on the first floor. A consultant is being engaged to work with members of our building committee to evaluate the repurpose of the Academic Affairs building to help meet the needs of additional fitness facilities. A comprehensive plan for the Good Shepherd Chapel to meet growing needs

and NASM requirements was developed over the spring of 2016 to be implemented as funding and enrollment targets are met.

As has been alluded to in the previous sections of this chapter, growth pains are welcomed at an institution of higher learning in these times. Nevertheless, the pain must still be acknowledged and attended to. It is suggested that the College continue to consider ways in which to alleviate the space utilization issues. Additional comments, examples, and analysis regarding our physical resources can be found in [Appendix 3R](#).

## **Fiscal Resources**

As noted earlier in this chapter, the majority of staff members responding to the survey think most resources are appropriate to accommodate future growth. However, a significant minority felt the need for additional staff, technology, and physical resources, as well as other initiatives. All of these require fiscal resources to be funded. The following paragraphs describe how LBC's planning and budgeting processes are interrelated and interdependent. (See also [Planning & Assessment at LBC](#), Appendix 3E of this document.)

As noted in the 2016 Strategic Long Range Plan section of this chapter, the "Preferred Future" vision that details strategic initiatives from 2012-2015 was extended through the conclusion of the 2015-2016 academic year. Therefore, for the past five years all departments on campus have been using the filters of the 2016 Strategic Long Range Plan for allocation of resources. Annual audits analyze our performance, which our auditor reviews in detail with our Finance Committee each November. The auditor provides financial highlights including benchmarking ratios and an advisory letter which is then used to make appropriate changes in our practices.

Part of the budget planning and review process is to evaluate resources for maximum impact. The President's Leadership Team regularly reviews the strategic initiatives to evaluate the impact on the budget, identifying the most significant needs and prioritizing funding. As funding becomes available, those initiatives are funded. In the last two budget years, they identified funds to be reallocated and used elsewhere. Two examples include the [major capital improvements](#) in the Horst Athletic Center (Appendix 3S) and the additional investment in CampusVue by implementing their Customer Relationship Management (CRM) tool as mentioned earlier. The improvements of replacing the bleachers, additional seating for spectators, and additional office space for expanded coaching staff in the Horst Athletic Center continue to enrich our traditional undergraduate core. The CRM tool not only helps maintain the core but also contributes to expanding adult education.

As a part of this year's review, the prior [five years of departmental staffing](#) (Appendix 3L) was analyzed to determine if the set goals were met and reallocated accordingly. Three professors, a site director, and other key positions were added to help maintain our traditional undergraduate core and expand adult education. The decision to eliminate certain positions was based on their limited impact on students and/or efficiencies gained within a department. Unfilled faculty positions will be filled when enrollment targets are met or, in some cases, when qualified candidates are found. Several full-time and part-time staff positions on hold will be filled as additional resources become available and prioritized according to need and impact.

Thanks to careful fiscal management at all levels, we are grateful to have finished every year (since our last self-study review ten years ago) with a balanced budget. Even during the 2013-2014 fiscal year, we were able to offset a \$160,000 shortfall in the Scholarshare Fund by



managing expenses. The next two years ranked with the top four record-year finishes in total overall giving, with 2014-2015 being the third-largest on record at that time with \$6,109,914, followed by 2015-2016 as the second-largest on record at \$7,438,706.

Despite the healthy overall bottom line, it became obvious during the summer months of 2014, that our Advancement team was not making progress in the goals they established for themselves nor additional goals which had surfaced during the previous two years. Therefore, the Advancement department was recast and the integration of technology tools was implemented. The equivalent of one-and-a-half additional personnel was added to the team. The gift processor was transferred to the Business Office but took all of her responsibilities with her. The Alumni Director was transferred to Student Services which represented a loss of at least a half-time Advancement position as he had been responsible for building relationships and seeking gifts. Two new positions were created. The Advancement team's professional development, strategy, and daily practices have changed since the reshaping and it is expected that these changes will pay dividends in the future.

### **Key Strengths Noted in This Section**

1. During the past ten years the College has been blessed to see construction of three new buildings and the major renovation of two others.
2. The College recently invested \$3,000,000 into information systems infrastructure.
3. The two most recent years saw LBC reach some giving milestones with 2014-2015 being the third-largest on record at that time, and 2015-2016 the second-largest on record.
4. Through the self-study process for this chapter it was evident that LBC has employees committed wholeheartedly to the institution.

## **Suggestions**

1. It is suggested that as the College rolls out operational plans that they emphasize to a greater extent the utilization of the Taskstream database as a tool to assist all departments in the recording and tracking of LBC's planning and assessment.
2. It is suggested that the College continue to consider ways in which to alleviate the space utilization issues.
3. It is suggested that the administration examine more fully the reallocation of staffing and the need for additional staff.
4. It is suggested that the administration consider replacements for CampusVue and EdgeWeb or more training in how to use them effectively.
5. It is suggested that the administration examine the need for more consistent training in communication within and between all LBC locations.

## **Recommendations for Growth and Improvement**

1. It is recommended that as the College continues the process of turning the 2016 Strategic Long Range Plan into operational plans, that a three-year rolling plan is developed, complete with budget implications.
2. It is recommended that the College sets in place a systematic monitoring of the staff-to-student ratio and staff workloads.