

## **Chapter 6**

### **Faculty**

#### **Overview**

The key to the success of any college is its faculty. While the importance of quality staff and administrative personnel is in no way diminished, the faculty has the most direct contact with the students and, hence, the greatest opportunity to impact them. At LBC, the primary change agents are the faculty, as they strive to educate Christian men and women to think and live a biblical worldview and to proclaim Christ by serving Him in the Church and society. Therefore, this chapter will examine several issues regarding the greatest perceived needs of the faculty. Due to the recent rapid growth of the institution and the acquisition of various other institutions, the identified issues relate to the induction of new faculty, the ratios of adjunct faculty to full-time faculty and students to faculty, and development of faculty in the areas of teaching, scholarship, performance, and support services for the faculty.

#### **Standards**

##### *MSCHE Standard 10*

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

A reading of this chapter will also lend support to our compliance with MSCHE Standard 7.

##### *MSCHE Standard 7: Institutional Assessment*

The institution has developed and implemented an assessment plan and process that evaluates its overall effectiveness in achieving its mission and goals and its compliance with accreditation standards.

## **Compliance Documented**

In keeping with a comprehensive report with a focus on key issues, the reader is directed to our Documentation Roadmap showing evidence of our compliance with all appropriate fundamental elements of [Standard 10](#). Department chairs have the primary responsibility of tracking the assessment and planning aspects of this standard dealing with faculty. Each faculty member has an Academic Information folder in his or her p:\ drive which contains their Faculty Portfolio as well summaries of their previous course evaluations. Department chairs have access to these folders for the purposes of accountability and yearly evaluation. In addition to this systematic on-going monitoring of faculty via department chairs, occasional studies are also done. A prime example of such studies can be seen in Appendix 6A: [Course Evaluation Survey Report S16](#). This report documents how faculty use course evaluations in closing the teaching-learning-assessment-planning loop. As noted in that report, “The most frequent changes resulting from course evaluation feedback were to assignments and in-class learning activities. Instructors have added more group activities and web-based resources, and some have reduced the number of lectures. Instructors have also consulted with colleagues, read articles or books, accessed ‘Monday Mentors,’ and have attended workshops and seminars as a result of student feedback.”

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**

“The primary purpose of the self-study report is to advance institutional self-understanding and self-improvement” (*Self-Study: Creating a Useful Process and Report*, 2006, p. 4). With that purpose in mind, the following research questions guided the study group in preparing this section:

1. How effective are the means of inducting new faculty across all locations and delivery methods 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?
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?
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?

## **Analysis of Key Issues**

This study group noted three key issues which came to the forefront as having a major impact on the faculty. Thus they have been considered regarding their impact on the research questions in this chapter of the self-study. First is the rapid growth of the college through the addition of new program offerings and the acquisition of additional sites and the closing of sister schools (with some of those schools' students transferring to LBC).

A second key issue was the change in 2015 to a vertical academic structure (see [Appendix 6B](#)). Prior to that change, one dean oversaw undergraduate programs and another oversaw seminary/graduate programs. Both deans reported to the Vice President of Academic Affairs (VPAA). In 2010 the two dean positions were eliminated and the adult undergraduate accelerated programs were moved from under the VPAA to a vice president overseeing seminary/graduate and adult undergraduate programs. The 2015 change to a vertical academic structure put all programs

under the supervision of a provost and moved all seminary/graduate and adult undergraduate programs into appropriate departments. This meant that all levels of education in an area of study now fall directly under the direction of the department chair. While the vertical structure has allowed for consistency between degree levels and delivery models (especially in the face of growth and location expansion), there are a few minor areas still needing to be addressed.

A final key issue was the addition of new sites and use of new delivery methods, particularly the rapid growth of online education and blended courses. At the time of the 2007 Self-study, LBC had only one location and was just getting ready to launch its online education endeavors. As of May 2016 the College had grown seven locations with hundreds of courses per year being offered online and through blended offerings.

### **Faculty Selection, Induction, and Equipping**

With the expansion of programs at both the undergraduate and seminary/graduate levels, the growth in existing programs, and the addition of new sites, LBC hires additional faculty members on a regular basis. From 2007 to 2014, the number of full-time faculty positions grew from 38 to 66 (42% increase) and the number of adjunct faculty positions grew from 81 to 234 (190% increase). These numbers do not take into account replacements for retirement and other types of change. These kinds of changes highlight LBC's need for effective, efficient, and consistent procedures for the selection, induction, and equipping of "faculty and other professionals appropriately prepared and qualified..." (*Characteristics of Excellence*, 2006, p. 38). These three categories of selection, induction, and equipping of faculty are each examined separately in the sections to follow. The first and last of these categories focus on adjunct faculty where we have such a great need, while the issue of induction focuses on our full-time faculty.

### ***Adjunct Faculty Selection***

A fundamental element of Standard 10 calls for “criteria for the appointment, supervision, and review of teaching effectiveness for part-time, adjunct, and other faculty consistent with those for full-time faculty” (*Characteristics of Excellence*, 2006, p. 38). In light of the rigorous hiring practices required for full-time faculty members, the main issue related to faculty selection examined by this group was if adjunct faculty were given a less strenuous selection process. In order to determine whether adjunct faculty were qualified to teach their respective subjects, the current adjunct faculty members’ curricula vitae were examined as to their academic qualifications and teaching and/or work experience. It is understood certain teaching positions look for extensive practical experience in a field compensating for apparent deficiencies in academic qualifications. Some of those areas include ministry training, musical performance, and electronic media. Nevertheless, minimal academic credentialing is still required.

Curricula vitae of 211 adjunct faculty members were examined; 29 did not have a master’s degree in the area in which they were teaching. Those 29 curricula vitae were distributed to department heads, who were asked about these individuals. After meeting with the department heads, the credentials for 18 of the 29 were found to be sufficient, reducing to 11 the number of individuals (5%) with a bachelor’s degree or less. The teaching responsibilities of each of those faculty members were then examined, revealing that three had not taught at LBC for years, four are teaching either musical lessons or use of electronic media (where experience and technical expertise are key), one was teaching a course in Children’s Ministry (again, experience and expertise are key), and one was found to have a Master’s degree not included in her vita.

Only two of 211 adjunct faculty members had questionable credentials. Both are full-time employees in other capacities who are teaching courses in the Health & Physical Education Department. One graduated from LBC through that department and the other works full time in the Athletic Department. Neither has been teaching for more than one year and both are filling a short-term need.

This review proved the qualifications of adjunct faculty are sufficient for what they are teaching. One issue did arise that needs to be addressed. Several of the curricula vitae need to be updated to reflect either new academic credentials or additional experience that demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the field.

### ***Faculty Induction***

In the 2007 Self-Study document, the following was noted on this topic: “Once faculty members are selected and hired, LBC is recognizing the need to more thoroughly orient the new faculty to the culture and climate of LBC as an institution. Survey results revealed that currently there appear to be no uniform standards for orienting faculty to the department, division, or program” (pg. 49). To answer that need, a formal program of orientation for all full-time faculty members called “Building Community” was established at the Lancaster location in 2008. (See [Appendix 6C](#).) [This program has been cited in Banta and Palomba’s *Assessment Essentials*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (2015, p. 52).] Building Community has sessions for an hour a week over the entire fall semester and is led by the Provost. Besides an introductory session with the President and additional sessions with the Provost, participants hear from most of the academic support units with which they will have contact: Student Experience, Academic Mentoring Services, Disability Services, Institutional Effectiveness, Office for Teaching Effectiveness, and the Office of Digital Learning. The most

recent program can be seen in [Appendix 6C](#). In the past five years, 34 faculty members have taken part in this program. New adjuncts do not participate in Building Community but have a half-day orientation at the beginning of the fall semester. This study group suggests that, in the future, the Library should be one of the academic support units that new faculty hear from during their induction program. They could be introduced to the Library website and to the process for ordering materials.

The largest of our additional locations, Greenbelt, Maryland, is the result of our acquisitions of the academic programs of Washington Bible College / Capital Bible Seminary (WBC/CBS). While the faculty members at that location have integrated fairly well into LBC, there are still unique challenges indicative of issues related to acquiring an existing institution, particularly one located at a significant distance from the main campus. One impact of vertical integration is the administrative fragmentation of the resident faculty at the Greenbelt location. When LBC acquired the academic programs of WBC/CBS, Capital Bible Seminary had a unified faculty. They had seminary faculty meetings to discuss contextualized issues relevant for all their programs and for their students. Since vertical integration has been implemented, the full-time resident faculty members at Greenbelt are separated into three distinct departments and report to three different chairs irrespective of location. This has created some challenges dealing with Greenbelt-specific matters or issues generally applicable to institution-wide graduate programs.

A second impact has been the increased distance between the Greenbelt resident faculty and the respective department chairs. Before vertical integration, one dean who oversaw the entire seminary program. After vertical integration, program faculty now report to their respective chairs who are only on site occasionally, meaning less personal interaction and possibly a lowered

awareness of some of Greenbelt’s distinctive attributes. This distance (both geographic and experiential) is another opportunity to contextualize the local concerns in the larger institutional ecosystem. This also relates to faculty representation and communication detailed under faculty workload below. Recognizing the need for cohesion among the faculty and staff at the Greenbelt location, a “Dean and Site Director” position was funded in July 2016 for the purpose of unifying the employees working at the Greenbelt location.

One of the key ways the effectiveness of an induction program can be measured is through the inculcation of the mission and values of the college in the understanding and practices of the faculty. The [2015 Faculty Survey](#) (Appendix 1I) administered for this self-study shows this has indeed been largely successful. Of the 118 faculty members who took the survey, 54 have joined the LBC faculty in the past three years and another 24 joined the faculty in the past four to six years. Of those in the four to six-year category, 17 (60.8%) can paraphrase or recite the Mission Statement while the remainder have a general concept of what it says. In the one-to-three-year category, 29 (53.7%) can paraphrase or recite the Mission Statement while 23 (42.6%) have a general concept of what it says. Regarding the Core Values & Goals of the college, 49 of the one-to-three-year group (90.7%) can paraphrase or have a general concept of what they are while in the four- to six-year group all 24 could recite them, paraphrase them, or have a general concept of what they are. It is interesting to note that the four- to six-year group reported higher numbers in each category, indicating that there is frequent reference to these concepts reinforcing them in the faculty members’ minds. The [faculty survey](#) also includes specific comments from several faculty members on how they expose students to the mission and Core Values & Goals in their work.

As faculty members evaluated how invested they were in the mission of LBC, 17 out of 18 who answered the question in the four-to-six-year group stated they were highly invested or invested in the mission (94.4%), while 37 out of 45 from the one-to-three-year group answered the same way (72.2%). The remainder of both groups stated they were somewhat invested in the mission. Most comments were very positive as can be seen the [survey summary](#) (Appendix 6D).

One question on the faculty survey relates directly to this issue of induction: “How effective were the means used to induct you into your tasks as a faculty member at LBC?” In the one-to-three-year group, 33 of 45 (73.3%) responded very effective or effective. In the four-to-six-year group, the numbers were 10 of 18 (55.5%) who responded very effective or effective. When asked what was most effective in helping the induction process, nine faculty members mentioned the “Building Community” program for new faculty as most effective, while three others mentioned a faculty mentor. Overall, induction processes seem to be working well for full-time faculty. On the other hand, there were several comments from adjunct faculty members, indicating the desire for more orientation beyond the half-day program. In the vertical structure, the main responsibility for this now rests with the department chairs, which might explain an uneven experience for adjunct faculty members in this area. (See [Appendix II](#).)

### ***Adjunct Faculty Evaluation and Equipping***

LBC seeks to provide “appropriate institutional support for the advancement and development of faculty” (*Characteristics of Excellence*, 2006, p. 38). As noted earlier, due to more adjunct and contract faculty, this section of the chapter focuses on the equipping of our adjunct faculty. This study group identified two key areas where this fundamental element currently relates to our adjunct faculty. First is the availability of staff to service the adjunct faculty. This area will be dealt

with later in this chapter, under the Support Services heading. The other area is training to help adjunct faculty fulfill the teaching/learning task primary to their role.

Chapter 4 of this report reviews a January 2016 survey of current students ([Appendix 4N](#)) who transferred in at least 30 credits. It examines their perspective of academic rigor at LBC compared to their previous institution(s). These students were more likely to attribute a lack of academic rigor to individual instructors (69%) rather than to course material (46% [more than one answer was allowed]). Adjunct instructors were considered to be less academically demanding (adjuncts 56%, full-time 33%). In addition, a fall 2013 [Bible and Theology Courses GPA Analysis report](#) (Appendix 6E) found students earned higher GPAs in the classes of adjunct faculty teaching Bible & Theology courses than students in the classes of full-time faculty. These findings reflect a need for more focused training of our adjunct faculty.

With five locations in four states, as of August 2016, plus the ability of online adjunct faculty to teach from anywhere in the world, the training of our adjuncts cannot be limited to when they are on our main campus. Therefore, the Office of Digital Learning has put together a series of training videos related to our online learning management system. In addition, the Office for Teaching Effectiveness has made available weekly videos from Magna Publications on various topics related to teaching, and hosts an in-house [Professional Development Series](#) (Appendix 6F). Videos and presentations are available to faculty on topics such as creating rubrics, backward curriculum design, teaching unprepared or English as a Foreign Language students, and creating and using effective visual presentations. The Office for Institutional Effectiveness has a site devoted to [Faculty Resources](#) (Appendix 6G) which includes materials or links to other resources regarding

classroom assessment techniques, rubrics, information literacy, and instructions on completing Assessment Annotations, a form used to document the results of course-embedded assessments.

To investigate this issue further, adjunct faculty members' responses to this question on the faculty survey were examined: "In the past five years, how effective have been the means of developing faculty and promoting performance in the following areas?" Those areas are teaching, scholarship, internal service (includes college-related work such as committee participation, advising/mentoring students, etc.), and external service (includes work in the community and church). In the area of teaching, 39 out of 46 (84.8%) who responded to this item chose "very effective" or "effective." When asked what helped the most in regard to their effectiveness in the area of teaching, the services provided by the Office for Teaching Effectiveness were mentioned several times. Also mentioned was help from department chairs and other faculty members, plus quick responses from the Information Services department and the Office of Digital Learning. Opportunities needed to improve effective teaching include time availability on the part of adjunct faculty, available technology when needed, and facility/space. While facility/space was not tightly defined, most respondents are likely referring to a lack of office space for adjunct faculty as opposed to teaching space. This was an acknowledged deficiency for some time until the Charles Frey Academic Center was opened in spring of 2016.

While training is helpful, as noted in a Standard 10 fundamental element, "reviewing all individuals who have responsibility for the education program of the institution" is also critical (*Characteristics of Excellence*, 2006, p. 38). With the change to a vertical structure, department chairs have additional responsibilities in the evaluation of adjunct faculty members. Additional procedures have been put into place in the past three years to enhance that process. Adjustments

were made to course and faculty evaluations so that standardized evaluation forms are completed by students in every course at all levels. These evaluations are meant to assist the adjunct faculty in self-monitoring for the purpose of self-improvement. They also assist the academic program coordinator in providing guidance to the adjunct faculty member. While end-of-course evaluations have been in place for years, they are now embedded within each course's learning management system page, and now include multiple opportunities for students to offer open-ended responses, a change from previous end-of-course evaluations that provided mainly numerical data. For traditional undergraduate semester-long courses, the course evaluation is completed in the middle of the course. This mid-course evaluation serves as formative assessment so the instructor can make appropriate adjustments for the remainder of the semester. Graduate and AUD courses continue to administer course evaluations at the end due to the condensed timeframe of these programs.

In a [spring 2016 survey](#) (Appendix 6A), faculty noted that they take these course evaluations very seriously and have incorporated student feedback in making changes to the course and their teaching. The most frequent changes resulting from course evaluation feedback were changes to assignments with 78.8% of the faculty responding to the survey indicating they have made changes based upon student feedback on course evaluations. Over 65% of respondents indicated they have made changes to in-class learning activities. Instructors have added more group activities (56.7%) and web-based resources (51.7%), and many have reduced the number of lectures (38.3%). Based upon student feedback on course evaluations, instructors have taken steps to improve their teaching skills by consulting with colleagues (65.2%), reading articles or books (43.5%), accessing LBC's "Monday Mentors" (26.1%), and attending workshops and seminars (21.7%).

While the course evaluations are standard procedure for all courses whether taught by full-time or adjunct faculty on campus, online, or at an additional location, another procedure to assist adjunct faculty in self-monitoring for improvement is the use of the [Assessment Annotation form](#) (Appendix 6H). While full-time faculty are required to submit at least two Assessment Annotations per semester, Adjunct faculty members are required to submit at least one, though some departments require more. The Assessment Annotation is a self-evaluation of a course-embedded assessment technique that allows an instructor to assess how well a specific learning outcome, or a portion thereof, was demonstrated by the students during that activity. The form also allows the instructor to reflect on how he or she might improve the learning process if deficiencies were noted.

One additional equipping process currently incorporated for full-time faculty and which needs to be assimilated into the adjunct faculty process involves supervisor/peer reviews. It is the goal of each department chair to evaluate each full-time faculty member once a semester and to have peer reviews conducted periodically. This same goal needs to be adopted for adjunct faculty, possibly on a less frequent basis, but certainly a regular one.

The results of all of these evaluations/assessments are collected in the individual adjunct faculty member's Academic Information folder on his or her personal college network drive. This folder is accessible by the faculty member's department chair and the Provost, and also contains other information comprising an electronic portfolio. This becomes a useful tool for summative assessment and improvement for following semesters.

While all of these procedures are set forth as the ideal and are being carried out in most departments by full-time faculty in traditional undergraduate programs at the Lancaster campus, they are not

yet being fully used for adjunct faculty, especially those at our additional locations, in our non-traditional programs, and in our seminary/graduate programs. This can be directly tied to recent vertical integration and we anticipate improvements in these areas now that department chairs oversee all faculty who teach within their programs.

## **Faculty Development**

While doing a good job of inducting and evaluating faculty is critical, continuing success and growth comes through development. In order for the faculty to “demonstrate continued professional growth” it is necessary for the institution to “support the advancement and development of the faculty, including teaching, research, scholarship, and service” (*Characteristics of Excellence*, 2006, p. 38). The faculty survey asked a question in four parts: “In the past five years, how effective have been the means of developing faculty and promoting performance in the following areas?” Those areas are teaching, scholarship, internal service (includes college-related work such as committee participation, advising/mentoring students, etc.), and external service (includes work in the community and church). The first three of these are included as measurement criteria in the Faculty Portfolio which each full-time faculty member updates each year. In each of those areas, faculty members were then asked to make comments as to what had been most helpful and what has proved a challenge in each of those areas. Due to growth in the number of adjunct faculty who generally have less access to resources, this section of the report will look at all faculty members’ responses but also include a few comments related to adjunct faculty and scholarship.

### ***Effectiveness of Developing Faculty and Promoting Performance***

The following chart gives a summary of the data from the faculty survey in relation to the question mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

Table 6.1

How Effective?	All Faculty		Adjuncts	
	Very Effective/ Effective	Somewhat Ineffective/ Ineffective	Very Effective/ Effective	Somewhat Ineffective/ Ineffective
Teaching	91 (87.5%)	13 (12.5%)	39 (84.9%)	7 (15.1%)
Internal Service	76 (74.5%)	26 (25.5%)	30 (68.2%)	14 (31.8%)
Scholarship	63 (60.6%)	41 (39.4%)	31 (68.9%)	14 (31.1%)
External Service	62 (61.4%)	39 (38.6%)	29 (69%)	13 (31%)

Teaching has the highest rating in this chart due to its weighted emphasis for faculty at LBC. Additional comments regarding the emphasis placed on teaching were noted earlier in this chapter’s section on adjunct faculty evaluating and equipping. The answers given by the total faculty were similar to those given by adjunct faculty.

Scholarship does not have as high a profile among our faculty as it would at a research institution, or if we were further along in the development of our seminary/graduate programs. Comments made regarding the challenges in this area centered on time and resources. Several mentioned efforts in this area were mainly on their own initiative, although some recognized a supervisor or colleague’s encouragement to move forward. Unlike research institutions, a “publish or perish” mentality does not exist on LBC’s campus. Faculty find positive reinforcements for improvement in scholarship from the college, including payment for membership in a scholarly society, encouragement to attend conferences (many of which were paid for by the college), sabbatical time for writing, and public recognition for those who do publish. Plus, several survey respondents noted the positive influence of LBC’s Alcuin Society. “The Alcuin Society, comprised of LBC’s faculty, seeks to encourage deep and scholarly conversations among themselves and with students. The Society provides multiple platforms for faculty members to share scholarship with one another

and with students, and for outside scholars to present scholarship with the LBC community. The Alcuin Society commits itself to supporting the college's mission by fostering thoughtful conversations about ideas and issues relevant to its faculty, staff, and students.”

In relation to internal and external service, much of the motivation comes from the faculty member due to the Bible's emphasis on service to others. With the move to vertical integration and the centering of much of the decision-making with the Academic Council, almost all faculty committees have been eliminated, reducing one means of opportunity for internal service. However, as many survey respondents noted, the college regularly communicates opportunities to serve, most notably through volunteering for community-focused events on campus. As with scholarship, the greatest challenge has been available time. Heavy involvement in churches vies with internal volunteering opportunities for limited time. Regular attendance at a church is a prerequisite for employment at LBC and, for faculty, involvement in some form of service ministry in that church is expected. However, “External Service” is an optional item faculty can address in their portfolio, so it may be easy for this priority to be neglected.

Besides the expectation for faculty to be involved in their own church, the college also promotes various community service projects. While many of these are focused on student participation, others like the Martin Luther King, Jr. service day are built into the college's schedule and included as part of the workweek for full-time faculty members.

Several factors helpful to adjunct faculty in the area of scholarship were also of help to full-time faculty, including encouragement from department chairs, involvement in scholarly societies, and the ability to access journals and books through the Library.

## **Rapid Growth and Its Impact on Faculty**

As mentioned in relation to the first research question, our rapid growth has led to an increase in the number of faculty members, both full-time and adjunct. How has this impacted the faculty members and their ability to do their jobs? One of the major questions related to this is whether there are sufficient faculty members to serve the students and whether there has been too large an increase in adjunct faculty numbers since adjunct faculty tend to have less time to serve the students outside the classroom than full-time faculty members. A second question is whether faculty workload has increased. Finally, a third question revolves around availability of sufficient support services to allow faculty members to do their jobs.

### ***Student to Faculty and Adjunct to Full-time Ratios***

One of the issues which came out of this study group's initial investigation into the rapid growth of the student body came from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data on student to faculty ratio along with adjunct to full-time faculty ratio. The data on [student to faculty ratio](#) (Appendix 6I) was encouraging. According to IPEDS data, in 2007 the ratio was 13 to 1, rising to 17 to 1 in 2013, and declining to 14 to 1 for the past two years thanks to a 103% increase in faculty over a five-year period. With regard to student to faculty ratio, LBC is in compliance with the Standard 10 fundamental element which calls for "faculty . . . sufficiently numerous to fulfill [their] roles appropriately" (*Characteristics of Excellence*, 2006, p. 38).

The adjunct to full-time faculty ratio was of major concern at first glance. From 2007 to 2009, the percentage of full-time faculty increased from 46.91% to 56.76%. From that point on, there has been a steady decline in the percentage to 43.52% in 2012, 38.51% in 2013, and finally to 28.21% in 2014 (the last date for which we have data). In raw numbers, the number of adjunct faculty has

grown from 81 to 234 during that time period (190% increase) while the number of full-time faculty members has grown from 38 to 66 (42% increase). In light of these numbers, the Office for Institutional Effectiveness conducted a study titled [Reliance on Adjuncts Study](#) (Appendix 6J).

The Executive Summary of the study gives a helpful overview of its findings, which show that the situation is not as alarming as the raw numbers indicate, though it is still a cause for ongoing diligence.

It is quite apparent that LBC is relying more and more on adjunct faculty to teach undergraduate courses at the Lancaster campus. Through 2010 to 2012 there was a fairly consistent split of approximately 60% full-time instructors and 40% adjuncts. Beginning in 2013 and continuing through to the fall of 2015, the split becomes closer to 50%/50%.

Three items that impact the full-time/adjunct ratios emerged from the study group's examination of this issue. These were not directly investigated by the Reliance on Adjuncts Study; they remain important considerations.

- New and growing programs rely heavily on adjunct faculty until a critical mass of students is realized (i.e., enough students to offer electives and multiple sections of courses).
- Some programs include diverse areas of study (e.g., Communications and Business – two of our newest majors) demanding faculty members with diverse areas of expertise and academic qualifications, making it difficult to hire one generalist when several specialists are needed.

- For core courses all students must take, the rapid enrollment increase has necessitated more sections of courses to keep the student-to-faculty ratio reasonable but not enough additional sections to hire additional full-time faculty.
- Where previously an adjunct might teach three or four sections in a semester, now they can only teach two; we may have up to twice as many adjunct faculty teaching the same number of sections as before. The IPEDS data doesn't track number of sections taught by adjunct faculty, rather the number of adjuncts vs. full-time. This would help to explain how the percentage of sections taught by adjunct faculty may not be significantly higher than the raw data would indicate.

With that in mind, the final word of the Executive Summary of the Reliance on Adjuncts study must be reiterated here: "The Academic Council and individual program coordinators are encouraged to review these data for further analysis and recommendations. Only program coordinators and department chairs have the insight necessary to account for some of the factors causing these trends." This is an area of concern and any further decline in the percentage of sections being taught by full-time faculty members needs to be addressed.

### ***Faculty Workload***

While LBC is able to keep a reasonable student-to-faculty ratio, three other major factors were examined related to whether the faculty felt their workload had increased: the rapid growth in the number of students, the change to a vertical structure, and the current structure of faculty committees precipitated by the vertical structure.

Faculty members saw the first of these (rapid growth in number of students) as increasing their workload. On the [2015 Faculty Survey](#) (Appendix 1I), out of 86 who answered the question, none

said they have less work, while 39 (45.4%) had about the same amount of work. Thirty-three (38.37%) said they had more work and 14 (16.28%) indicated much more work. When asked to explain, a few mentioned more overloads that must be covered. Still, overloads are voluntary and never mandated. Others commented their workload increased related to support services being stretched thin so the faculty member has to take on tasks that a faculty assistant may have taken on in the past. This issue related to support services is covered in the next section of this report.

Faculty members saw the change to a vertical structure and the current structure of faculty committees as having little or no impact on their workload. Those who said they had about the same workload relative to the change to a vertical structure numbered 77.1% (64 of 83) and 70.4% (57 of 81) indicated the same workload despite the reduction in the number of faculty committees.

While not related directly to workload, an important issue surfaced in the [comments](#) (Appendix 6K) following the survey questions about workload. While faculty have welcomed the decrease in committee meetings related to the vertical structure, an unintended consequence is that communication to all faculty members has become more challenging, particularly for those not connected with a department because they serve in academic support areas. This is because communication tends to flow from the Provost to the Academic Council and then to the departments through their chairs.

Faculty members also commented on the loss of a voice to the administration. Various ideas as to how this could be regained were mentioned; for example, through a faculty concerns committee, a faculty senate, or some other mechanism. The faculty survey showed that 47% felt less represented since LBC started having fewer faculty meetings and the Academic Council took over the responsibilities of most faculty committees. Some faculty members feel they no longer

understand the “big picture” or what is going on behind the scenes. One member of the [faculty focus group](#) (Appendix 6K) suggested having a representative from the faculty on the Cabinet. [In spring 2016, the President’s Leadership Team made the decision to add a faculty member to the Cabinet on a rotating basis annually to provide faculty perspective at that level of leadership.]

### ***Support Services***

To free up faculty to spend time ministering to students both in and out of the classroom, key support personnel are needed “for the advancement and development of faculty, including teaching, research, scholarship, and service” (*Characteristics of Excellence*, 2006, p. 38). Support services fall into two main categories: those who work directly with faculty members to assist them in their work, and those who work indirectly with faculty but primarily help students succeed in the classroom. In the first category are faculty assistants and other support staff who reside in the Office of Digital Learning, the Office for Teaching Effectiveness, and the Office for Institutional Effectiveness. In the second category are student support services that have an impact on academic success such as the Library, Disability Services, Academic Mentoring Services, and the Writing Center.

With regard to faculty assistants, a significant change took place with the move to vertical structure. Faculty assistants took on more responsibility when graduate programs were added to their department’s oversight. Some impact has been mitigated by reduced paperwork through the use of the online learning management system. For example, syllabi are no longer distributed to students via hard copy and many exams and quizzes are given online, reducing the need for photocopying. In addition, faculty members also adopt textbooks directly online rather than

through a labor-intensive paperwork system that necessitated the faculty assistant collecting paper forms. Many of the tasks that formerly required faculty assistants no longer do so.

Nevertheless, according to comments made during an October 2015 focus group with administrative assistants, a couple of those present expressed concern for their ability to assist department faculty, especially adjunct faculty, due to workload. While additional support staff is needed across all academic departments, according to a [spring 2016 study](#) (Appendix 6L) conducted by the Office for Institutional Effectiveness, there does seem to be a lack of consistency in departmental support staff levels. For instance, for the past five years one full-time department assistant covered two departments, Bible & Theology and Arts & Sciences. Looking at a snapshot of the spring 2016 semester, this individual was supporting faculty members from the two departments at a ratio of one assistant to 31.7 FTE faculty members (estimating that three adjunct faculty would equal one full-time faculty member). Splitting this one full-time position into two was part of an earlier Academic Affairs strategic plan realized in the fall of 2016. The one full-time Bible & Theology and Arts & Sciences position will be divided into two 25-hour-a-week positions, one for each department, thus reducing the ratio to the equivalent of one assistant to 25.4 FTE faculty. According to the spring 2016 snapshot time period, this ratio would still be much higher than other professional departments.

1 to 31.7 = Bible & Theology / Arts & Sciences [previous]

1 to 25.4 = Bible & Theology [current]

1 to 25.4 = Arts & Sciences [current]

1 to 16.3 = Worship & Performing Arts<sup>1</sup>

1 to 14.4 = Church & Ministry Leadership<sup>2</sup>

1 to 10.0 = Health & Physical Education

1 to 9.0 = Counseling & Social Work

1 to 4.3 = Education

---

<sup>1</sup> This number includes music coaches who teach individual lessons and who don't need much support from the department assistant.

<sup>2</sup> Includes 15 seminary/graduate adjuncts as Church & Ministry Leadership has quite a few graduate programs.

One move to enhance the efficiencies of administrative assistants was taken in spring 2016. The Provost's Executive Assistant was tasked with the responsibility to meet regularly with all academic-related department assistants for the purpose of sharing best practices and considering ways to develop shared responsibilities. Within months of regular meetings, we are already seeing positive results. For example, the Department Assistants worked together to establish a new adjunct faculty contracting process as well as a new faculty load monitoring system. It is anticipated that additional efficiencies will be created through future meetings.

While faculty assistants work directly with faculty members to help them accomplish their main task of teaching, other offices do this indirectly. Three with a major impact on students' ability to learn are Disability Services, Academic Mentoring Services, and the Writing Center. These three support the faculty by assisting students in basic skills related to classroom success as seen in Chapter Nine of this document.

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

1. Intentional inducting and developing of all full-time faculty members at our Lancaster location has improved since our last self-study and is a real strength at Lancaster and Greenbelt locations. Some of this is related to the implementation of the Building Community program and the establishment of the Office for Institutional Effectiveness and the Office for Teaching Effectiveness.
2. Almost 99% of current adjunct faculty are qualified academically for the subjects they teach (two of 179 have questionable qualifications; these were temporary positions for emergency situations).

3. Attempts are being made to make training available to all faculty members at all locations and in all modalities through the Office of Digital Learning and the Office for Teaching Effectiveness, many of which have been available online in an asynchronous format. In addition, the Office of Digital Learning has a large number of training documents and videos available on the college's Learning Management System dealing with technical aspects of using that resource.
4. In general, the move to a vertical structure has not increased faculty workload, since it has decreased committee responsibilities for faculty members. In addition, much of what was decided upon in faculty meetings was outside the area of expertise of many of those who were voting, so the decrease in meetings has been welcomed.

### **Suggestions**

1. The Academic Council and individual program coordinators are encouraged to review the data regarding use of adjunct faculty members for further analysis and recommendations. They should also review the selection, induction, and equipping of adjunct faculty.
2. Since the hours of the Faculty Consultant within The Office for Teaching Effectiveness have gone down due to her semi-retirement, the college should consider returning this position to full-time as soon as possible.

### **Recommendation for Growth and Improvement**

1. The current processes for the intentional inducting and developing of full-time faculty members at the Lancaster campus must be replicated, as appropriate, to all locations and delivery formats, for full-time faculty as well as adjunct faculty.