Capacity and Preparatory Review

Loma Linda University

Loma Linda, California
July 2008

Table of Contents

Introduction and Focus of the Report

The Capacity and Preparatory Report (CPR) for Loma Linda University (LLU) is the result of two years of careful consideration and campus-wide organizational engagement. Under the direction of the University Accreditation Steering Committee, the content of this report adheres to the requirements set forth by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity. While the organization of this CPR substantially follows that found in the Institutional Proposal (submitted May 2006), an additional item has been included that describes the extensive effort that has occurred to improve the University's infrastructure supporting program review and assessment. The effects of this work go beyond assuring LLU's capacity for educational effectiveness, to that of transforming the University's culture of evidence. Although a narrative describing this transformation was not required, our transparency in journaling the change process has and continues to occur and reflect LLU's commitment to organizational learning. This additional essay follows the Response to the 1998-1999 WASC Recommendations.

In addition, threaded throughout the document is content referring to the University's transition from "silos of excellence" to a "community of shared excellence." Although seen as positive and essential, it is important that the presentation of this change process is not oversimplified or overstated. The reality is one of the challenges that result from much more than a history of developed organizational and financial independence of the schools. Rather, the complex and vast differences between the schools requires careful consideration of those areas, which through shared excellence, strengthen the University and further the purposes of *mission-focused learning (MFL)* while simultaneously preserving the distinctness and academic excellence of the schools.

Defining the Task. The development of LLU's Institutional Proposal began the process of reviewing our institution's capacity for educational effectiveness. Early on it was determined that this self-review should not only link to, but go substantially beyond the focus of the 1998 self-study that enriched our understanding of the University's mission of *wholeness*. Our agenda has been to use this learning opportunity to further our commitment to the centrality of our mission by examining our capacity to further *wholeness* through MFL—the essential social-

relational and transformative character-changing curricular, co-curricular, and extra curricular experiences provided for LLU students which support the development of lifelong attitudes and behaviors of selfless service to others.[1] From the beginning it was clear that any examination of MFL would also require that attention be given to the foundational and instructive nature of our University's core values, as well as a review of the related LLU student learning outcomes (SLOs).

> "'*Wholeness*' means the lifelong, harmonious development of the physical, intellectual, emotional, relational, cultural, and spiritual dimensions of a person's life through a loving relationship with God and expressed in generous service to others." LLU 1998

Subsequently, consideration of our institution's experience with MFL naturally led us to reflect on the self-sacrificing service that our students and alumni have provided around the world for over 100 years. As our institution celebrated its centennial birthday in 2005, it became apparent that the value-added nature of dedicated service has been sustained as part of the unique learning environment that began as the College of Medical Evangelists in 1905 and remains intact today as a central part of the education of health care professionals and related scientists at LLU. We therefore include this as part of the focus of our CPR research about LLU's *normative culture*. Our challenge, as we chose to identify it, was to utilize this CPR to embark on an examination of LLU's *normative culture* for the purpose of preserving our mission and educational philosophy of MFL. Through this examination we chose to identify and understand the essential elements that must be preserved, as well as factors that have the potential to threaten and/or significantly alter the nature of our institution. Supporting this plan was the identification of an additional research effort to address faculty concerns about the use of the phrase *Bible-based faith* in one of our shared LLU SLOs.[2] Thus it was proposed that two research themes, *normative culture* and *Bible-based faith* would be the focus of our institutional research. These two studies are presented as Research Themes following the Reflective Essay.

However, in choosing our institutional self-review we realized that the impact of LLU's growth as a Health Sciences Center (i.e., significant expansion of existing physical facilities, increases in student enrollment, and in clinical services locally and around the world, and the requisite ontogenesis of our organizational

structure), would have to be considered in our CPR self-assessment. Attention would need to be given to examining the capacity of our academic infrastructure to accommodate growth while sustaining our commitment to MFL. We chose to use the WASC Criteria for Review (CFR) to identify strengths and weaknesses in our capacity, and as required to improve educational effectiveness. The results of this effort are presented as a Reflective Essay following Exhibits and Displays. To this end, the Institutional Proposal and CPR have set in motion organizational learning and improvement and have shown us that despite the planned growth for LLU, *wholeness* through MFL will be sustained as a transformative academic experience for LLU students.

Institutional Context

LLU is a Seventh-day Adventist health sciences university located in Loma Linda, California, approximately 60 miles east of Los Angeles. Founded under the name College of Medical Evangelists by the Seventh-day Adventist Church in 1905, it became Loma Linda University in 1961.[3] In 1997 the University became part of a five-member corporation known as Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC), empowered to harmonize and coordinate the academic and health care components of the institution. As part of this new structure, the LLUAHSC Institutes provide opportunities for synergy among our diverse educational, clinical, and research endeavors. A substantive change document was submitted and approved by WASC in May 2006, which clarified the nature of this corporate restructuring. Today LLU remains an integral part of LLUAHSC. The

contributions of each LLUAHSC component are summarized in the adjacent text box.

First, LLU has primary responsibility for structuring and facilitating the activities and processes of the learning environment to support health sciences education and research. Bridging the academic activities of all eight schools, the Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS) and the Library Faculty oversee the graduate programs and library services respectively. (Appendix – Programs Offered)

Second, the LLU Medical Center (LLUMC) and its affiliate entities provide the clinical facilities for the University. The rich diversity of clinical offerings provides health professional students with exposure to a comprehensive array of clinical rotations. LLUMC enables the clinical faculty to model the delivery of excellent health care in environments underpinned by LLU's emphasis on "whole person care." These learning resources include the comprehensive tertiary facilities of the LLUMC, the Children's Hospital, the reorganized East Campus Rehabilitation, Orthopedic, and Neurological care facilities, and the Behavioral Medicine Center. Outpatient support services include mental health clinics and psychological services, home health services, adult day care, and other ambulatory services. Complementing these resources are a network of clinics under the School of Dentistry, the School of Medicine's clinical faculty practice offices, and the University's network of low-income comm[(nt[(a)-)5ty person care." Thf nCentemental Uninoci53 al

University at a Glance

Faculty	1695	(100%)
Full-time	1305	(77%)
Part-time	390	(23%)
FTE	~1458	(86%)
Students	4096	(100%)
Undergraduate	1226	(30%)
Graduate	2870	(70%)
FTE	3707	(90%)
Degree Programs	~100	
Religious Diversity	>75	
Countries of Origin	>93	
Specialized accreditations	36	

stage two of the WASC sequential model for institutional review, and the CPR visit is scheduled for October 8-10, 2008, with an Educational Effectiveness Review in 2010.

Responses To 1999 WASC Recommendations

Substantial changes have occurred since LLU's last reaccreditation. Highlights of these changes are presented here, whereas a comprehensive list of institutional achievements is included in the Appendix – Response to WASC. As such, the past decade provides evidence that there has been a deliberate attempt to steer away from independent "silos of excellence" to a new reality that is best described as a "community of shared excellence." (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: "Organizational Change: From Silos to Community?" Report) This transformation has been the work of LLU's new administrative team (i.e., Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, and all the Deans except one). Following a turnover in Deans, primarily as a result of retirements, search committees made a concerted effort to select new Deans who demonstrated commitment to inter-school collaboration. This has allowed our University community to benefit from the many aspects of shared excellence. Access to resources within the context of a decentralized financial model (i.e., the Harvard model) has also been important. The University's administrative team, including deans, work together to provide supplementary financial resources, in addition to the flat-rate contribution to central administration to support special projects for the purpose of improving the infrastructure of the University. The creation of Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (1997) initiated an integrated corporate structure that benefits all corporate players, including LLU. The addition of new centers and institutes to integrate interdisciplinary activities has further brought our University community together. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Centers and Institutes)

Directly emanating from our responses to the 1999 WASC recommendations has been an institutional movement to create infrastructures that strengthen central services. Of special importance has been our capacity to expand many aspects of Information Systems (IS) and Student Services (SS). The development of these areas is vitally important for us to meet current institutional needs and provide capacity for future growth. The transformation of IS

started in 2002 with the creation of a campus-wide eUniversity Committee. The work of this committee culminated in the establishment of the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Information Systems in June 2004. This new office has been working diligently toward four goals: (a) improved data integrity, (b) ubiquitous and appropriate access to information, (c) streamlined and consistent design, and (d) simplified business processes. A brief overview of the realization of each of these goals follows:

Improved data integrity: "Enter Once, Use Many"— A basic philosophy in which we move to an environment where information is entered once into one of the core systems. Information is then made available through integration to other applications that need access to the same information. This strategy avoids duplicate entry and ensures the data in all systems is up-to-date.

Ubiquitous and appropriate access to information: Implementation of a portal system that supports the University's global mission while securing the systems from external intrusion. Six levels of data security define how data are accessed, who can access those data, and what degrees of protection are required.

Streamlined and consistent design: We have moved from an environment with different programming languages and styles to an environment characterized by similar development environments and consistent styles. This results in a more productive development team plus a more consistent user interface when using the common system. There are now six core University systems: (a) EMAS™ Pro for recruitment and marketing, (b) Sungard's™ Banner for finance and student systems, (c) Peoplesoft™ for management of human resources, (d) Blackboard™ as the course management system, (e) Raiser's Edge™ for development and alumni relations, and (f) InfoEd™ for research management. Specialized software is developed by IS that integrates with core University systems.

Simplified business processes: "Facilitate Data Entry at the Point of Origin"— Our strategy is to empower people in authority to validate data for accuracy, including: (a) processing student forms, (b) approving academic course and program information, (c) approving content for the web, and (d) processing financial documents.

These major advances in the IS infrastructure have enabled student services applications to move forward expeditiously. For example, SS developed a continuum of quality services that involve electronic responses to queries from prospective and existing students, and many points of electronic access to facilitate student success from recruitment through graduation.

In order for SS to achieve collaboration, many new working teams have been formed. In the first stage of strategic enrollment management, recruiters from each school were invited to create a team that involved financial support from the Deans. A variety of cross-school projects such as a more cohesive web site and a first-time-ever University Viewbook were developed. Subsequently, the directors of admissions for the eight schools were organized into a University Admissions team that simplified many admissions processes. An Enrollment Management team, composed of administrators from University Records, Financial Aid, Student Finance, Admissions, and Student Information Systems, began analyzing and coordinating processes within the registration system. This project moved forward upon receiving input from the newly formed Registration Round Up team, comprised of approximately 50 administrators and staff who led out in functions related to registration within the Schools and University. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Registration Round Up) In addition, a number of policy unification groups were created including Academic Deans Council, the Student Affairs Directors, and Deans of Students. At the core of these University infrastructure initiatives lies the goal to serve students better through the unification, simplification, and automation of multiple central processes. The collective efforts of administration, University, and various school

accreditation data to achieve assessment was inadequate to achieve institutional continuous quality improvement (CQI). This expanded vision required a fundamental change in philosophy, moving away from a sole reliance on professional accreditations. We now recognize and embrace the profound role that centralized assessment plays in improving LLU as a learning institution, complete with the opportunity to experience the synergy that can be created when multiple factors converge (e.g., a shared understanding of outcomes, curriculum maps, assessment matrices, educational strategies, intentionality of actions, program review, and strategic planning). (Appendix – Accreditation

In order to carry out this new commitment the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning (OA) was created by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs in the Fall of 2007. OA is charged with assisting schools, departments, and programs to develop assessment plans and to guide the use of analytics in promoting CQI. The OA coordinates assessment and institutional learning research activities to promote a culture of evidence. It also provides expertise in the design and implementation of assessment activities, as well as interpretation of data related to student development and learning outcomes. The OA works closely with the UAAC, its subcommittee the EEC, and the FGS to oversee and coordinate campus-wide assessment (policies and practices). To support the OA and this new culture of assessment, the University Assessment Committee was created and has representation from across the campus. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLU Assessment Plan; Program Review and Assessment Policy)

University Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). One of the initial steps taken to change our culture of evidence was to revise our original 17 SLOs. Our objective was to develop University-wide, measurable SLOs and their attendant performance indicators. In August 2007, Gloria Rogers was invited to facilitate a workshop for these purposes. As a result of the three-day workshop, participants created 8 new SLOs that replaced the original 17.[5] These SLOs are published in the University Catalog. The process for systematic assessment of University-wide SLOs is under development, whereas the assessment of program-level SLOs is maturing for the majority of programs. In January 2008, LLU offered an additional professional development assessment event with Gloria Rogers' "Choosing Assessment Methods" a webinar that primarily focused on the needs of

Academic Deans and assessment officers. A systematic approach to assessing the University SLOs will target specified SLOs on a cyclical basis. It is expected that one or two of the SLOs will be examined each year and supported by professional development resources to assist in the implementation of SLOs into curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities.

Systematic Program Review. To facilitate the systematic program reviews, we developed an online Program Review System and every program was requested to complete a baseline self-review. The Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and Information Systems Department worked closely with OA to create this online system that includes a Program Review Portfolio consisting of a self-review based on the WASC Standards, CFRs, and Guidelines along with LLU guidelines, and three assessment items: (a) program learning outcomes with performance indicators, (b) curriculum map, and (c) an assessment matrix. The development of this innovative system provides evidence of our commitment to providing the resources that promptly identify capacity needs. The system allows programs to conveniently access and update program information on a continuous basis thus permitting the University, schools, and departments to do comparative and cross-system analyses. At the end of each academic year a data snapshot will be taken of all programs to be assessed. Data analysis will assist the University in aligning program review and assessment with strategic planning. (See Online Program Review Portfolios.[6]

baccalaureate degrees or entry-level master's degrees. Because of this, the tables reflect the nuances of health science programs. Data portfolios for each school will demonstrate disaggregated data for their individual programs. This information will be provided in the Evidence Room.

Faculty (4.1). Over the five-year reporting period there has been a steady increase in full-time faculty with slightly increasing female percentages. Our faculty diversity has slightly increased in Blacks and Asians; our Hispanic faculty, however, remain steady. Similar patterns were observed with part-time faculty, with overall slight increases with non-White faculty.

Information and Computing Resources (5.2). Expenditures for library and computing resources have significantly increased during the five-year reporting period. Library collections, all categories, have increased 11% and computing information systems have increased 52%. The number of student, faculty, and staff information computing users has also substantially increased over the past five years.

Fiscal Resources (5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, 5.7). Loma Linda University has had some of its best years financially over the past five years. This is reflected in our overall increase in net assets of $198 million during this time period. We have also seen unqualified opinions on each of our audited financial statements during the same period.

The strength of LLU is in its students and alumni. Enrollment has steadily increased over the past 10 years providing the financial base needed to support the stability of the University. The giving of our alumni in support of buildings, equipment, scholarships, and many other areas too long to list, is significant. Our endowments have benefited from this giving as well, with an over $50 million dollar increase in value. This increase will provide the long-term viability needed to sustain the University for many years to come.

Financial planning plays an important roll in the University processes. The process begins each October with the approval of the next year's tuition. Tuition rates are set by the Financial Operations Committee of the University and then approved by the Board of Trustees. Following this approval the Operations Committee prepares the annual budget with input from the various schools and departments across campus. The final document also receives approval by the Board of Trustees in May of the following year. Each school is responsible for

monitoring their budgets for proper use of funds. However, it is the Senior Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs and the University Controller who are responsible for the overall management of the University budget.

Reflective Essay: CFR Foci

The following analysis of the CFRs presents a self-reflection on capacity issues (strengths and challenges) that have affected our *mission-focused learning* (MFL), our commitment to academic excellence, and our continued drive to expand our research capacity. This exercise supports our transition from "silos of excellence" to an expanded "community of shared excellence." (Appendix – CFR Self-Review)

CFR 1.2: The Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) will engage faculty to refine the component parts of the University mission and stated student learning outcomes (SLOs). A number of activities have assisted in furthering LLU's understanding and appreciation of the University's mission and its relationship to SLOs. The mission of *wholeness* continues to be understood and embedded in the personal and professional lives of students. Data available from the Wholeness Inventory provide nearly 10 years of information to demonstrate that students continue to have a deep appreciation for the University's mission. Students indicated that instructors showing them respect were one of the most important ways they experience the integration of wholeness at LLU (mean score = 4.59 on a 5 point scale). Other ways that students reported the integration of wholeness included comfort when working with persons from racial/ethnic groups other than their own (mean score= 4.38). (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Wholeness Inventory Preliminary Results)[8] The 2008 climate survey also illustrated that students' appreciation for the value and conceptual integration of *wholeness* in their personal and professional lives has increased when compared to data collected during the 1998 WASC self-study. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Student Climate Survey 1998-2008 Comparison)

To deepen students' understanding of the University's mission of wholeness (including the University's core values) the new wholeness curriculum was initiated in the Fall quarter of 2007-08 during the weekly Campus Worship experience. Data from the Wholeness Inventory indicate that students have been satisfied with Campus Worship. However, this

yearlong series of mission-focused speakers and topics was enthusiastically received by students, faculty, and administration. A comparative climate survey that looked at the difference between students' view of Campus Worship during 1998 and 2008 found that students' appreciation for Campus Worship remains strong. Anecdotal comments indicate they appreciate improved worship experience, including music, presentations, and

campus-wide understanding of wholeness, core

backgrounds (high school N=15; undergraduate

that all programs, regardless of specialized accreditation, had learning outcomes, assessment matrices, performance indicators, and curriculum maps). As part of this review process, other conclusions were reached that led the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning (OA) to conduct a campus-wide program review that was completed on June 16, 2008. In examining a snapshot of the program review data as of this date, we are impressed with the commitment of our colleagues and their engagement in completing the web-based program review portfolios that addressed baseline issues. Program reviews can be continually updated online as part of our commitment to continuous quality improvement (CQI). The OA will review and analyze the responses and will identify, based on program responses, areas that merit focused attention.

Working with the Vice Chancellor for Information Systems, a more comprehensive template for systematic program review was created that is part of an integrated web-based Academic Management System. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Academic Management System 2.0 Diagram) This Program Review System allows schools to see a summary of all of their respective program review portfolios through the University program review dashboard. The system will also allow University administration to select and analyze specified elements for further review. The WASC Visiting Team will have access to the University's Program Review System to evaluate our progress at the time of their visit.

Additionally, a timeline has been implemented for systematic review of all campus programs that are aligned with professional accreditation requirements where appropriate. (Appendix – Required Data: Tables 7.1 and 8.1) To support this, all programs, regardless of specialized accreditation, have provided, or are in the process of developing, program SLOs with performance indicators, assessment protocols, and curriculum maps. All of these items are presented by each program in an assessment matrix that reflects ongoing assessment plans that are linked to strategic and action plans, thereby closing the assessment loop. The nature of this program information supports the infusion of this content into school assessment plans that will dynamically inform the University's assessment plan as part of the larger institutional strategic plan.

Finally, LLU has accelerated the timeline for implementation of the revised program review

processes as presented in the 2006 Institutional Proposal. Two departments that do not have specialized accreditation have agreed to complete the institution's systematic program review cycle. These departments include, Basic Sciences (School of Medicine) and Earth and Biological Sciences (School of Science and Technology). As a result of this collaborative support for the new program review processes, a total of 7 Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree programs, 13 Master of Science (M.S.) degree programs, and 2 Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree programs are currently being reviewed. These programs are on track to complete the in-depth program review process during the 2008-09 academic year.

- Outcome 2: Students understand the importance of integrating LLU's Christ-centered values in their personal and professional lives.
- Outcome 7: Students understand the importance of embracing and serving a diverse world.
- Outcome 8: Students demonstrate the importance of collaborating with others within and across disciplines.

Curriculum maps developed by each program reflect the educational strategies of the University and demonstrate the multiple ways that MFL is integrated within courses, co-curricular, and extracurricular activities.[27] The Student Climate Survey results showed opportunities for "service" to others (Question 14 in the Student Satisfaction Survey), was scored 4.2 on a 5-point scale over a 10-year comparison. It is also noteworthy that "service learning opportunities" and "ample opportunities to practice *wholeness* at LLU" are ranked in the top six

- The creation of a new Department of Humanities, housed in the School of Religion, will work with GE to develop an academic strategic plan for expanding services to our undergraduate students.

Recent policy changes (e.g., In Progress/Unofficial Withdrawal and religion transfer credits), and the

It is also noteworthy that with intentionality and funding, the new Centennial Complex expands the emergency response capacity of LLU as part of the Inland Empire's disaster response infrastructure. The CURE Project (Convertible Use Rapidly Expandable)

aligned with institutional purposes and educational objectives. Evaluation processes are systematic, include appropriate peer review, and, for instructional faculty and other teaching staff, involve consideration of evidence of teaching effectiveness, including student evaluations of instruction. To support the quality of education, recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive programs, and evaluations are guided by University policies. School policies must be consistent with, but can exceed, University policies. All schools are involved with the evaluation of their respective faculty, guided by professional accreditation requirements when applicable. Instructor and course evaluations are systematically required. Evaluation data are used in promotional activities and contract renewal. Methods of how peer review is implemented and used vary across the schools. Peer review is consistently required for rank and tenure evaluation. Programs that do not have professional accreditation follow standards that are closely aligned with the professional accrediting body of their respective school or department. For those programs that do not have professional accrediting bodies, LLU has insured that there are workload policies that appropriately address all elements of a culture of scholarship.

Faculty orientation consists of three elements. First, there is a general orientation sponsored by Human Resource Management (HRM) that covers institutional policies, rights, and benefits. Second, on an annual basis the University sponsors the Fall Faculty Colloquium; a venue with a mission-focused emphasis to orient new faculty and to rededicate all faculty to the highest aspirations of the University. Also, faculty, staff, and students are oriented to the University's mission through a dedication segment during the Fall Convocation service. University Campus Worships provide additional opportunities for all faculty and staff to understand the foundations of our *normative culture*. Third, the Schools provide faculty orientations that focus on: (a) policies and procedures; (b) teaching effectiveness; (c) teaching strategies; (d) student discipline; (e) classroom decorum; (f) faculty responsibilities in academe, rank, and tenure promotion processes; and (g) a general orientation to the University's culture of *wholeness* and navigation of the institution's organizational landscape.

The institution has maintained a long history of fiscal stability and resources in place to insure the University's viability. Resource planning and

development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Independent audits are conducted in compliance with required standards and have demonstrated fiscal strength and solvency as evidenced by external audits, bond ratings, endowments and fund raising successes. To support the quality of education, schools work with their departments and programs to address financial stability and insure that programs will thrive in today's competitive market. Furthering this process, the University administration provides assistance in addressing resource planning and development, including consultation and resource support for special initiatives. Central services are supported by a 10.5% flat-rate contribution by schools. (Appendix – Required Data: Section 5, Information, Physical, and Fiscal Resources)

CFR 3.4; 3.6; 3.7: University Faculty Development Committee and Educational Support Services provide faculty development resources and instructional technology resources. As part of our approach to engage faculty, staff, and administration and prepare them for the CPR visit, a series of video podcasts were made available. These podcasts were designed to familiarize University constituents with consistent, timely, and convenient access to all elements necessary to insure CQI for programs. All video podcasts are linked to ancillary materials that include handouts and additional resources. The areas addressed using this method are available at the OA web site.[31] A list of school-specific faculty development activities can be found in Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Faculty Development Activities by Schools.

CFR 3.7: Learning and Technology Subcommittee facilitates global access using appropriate technology-based infrastructures to support learning. Since 1999, LLU has submitted 23 degree programs for review by the WASC Substantive Change panel. All new programs are developed within the context of LLU's Philosophy of Distance Education. The University's capacity to successfully support online and off-campus programs has resulted in WASC granting the institution Fast Track Review status. There are four noteworthy components that contribute to our success in offering online and off-campus programs. First, Program Directors and/or Department Chairs are required to complete the template for new program proposals. The University's New Program Proposal Template is submitted for review to the UAAC. New program proposals that involve online or other forms of technology-mediated

instruction or off-campus delivery (synchronous or asynchronous) are also reviewed by the Learning and Technology Subcommittee of UAAC who then gives appropriate recommendations to UAAC. In addition, the International Program Review Subcommittee of UAAC reviews all off-campus programs, international and domestic. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Philosophy of Distance Education)

Second, a robust infrastructure that includes a Course Management System is utilized (Blackboard™ Academic Suite 7.1).[32] Each term approximately 1,000 courses are uploaded and ready in our Course Management System for faculty to activate. Only about 25% of those courses are activated by faculty— a use that ranges from 100% online to web-enhanced classes. LLU's Blackboard™ web site receives over 17,000 hits per day. Technical support is provided both centrally through a dedicated helpdesk available at phone extension IT611 and also via web support.[33] Additionally, the University's Department of Educational Support Services is ready to provide technical support to all constituents. Many schools have their own staff (e.g., online course developers) that complement central services. Recent upgrades to LLUAHSC connectivity provide a sufficient dedicated bandwidth of over 100Mb/s to connect the University to the worldwide web. Instructional

used for clinical, educational, and research activities and connect LLU to remote sites as well as between numerous sites on our campus.[34]

CFR 3.8; 3.11: Emphasis will continue to be placed on clarifying divisions of responsibility as related to recent organizational changes, including the Faculty of Graduate Studies, the Educational Effectiveness Committee, and the relationship to school-based decision-making processes. The University has welcomed new paradigms to promote effective learning and has developed a much needed administrative focus to insure CQI. Many key changes in our infrastructure, both at the senior administrative and school levels, provide evidence of our commitment to institutional learning, including the creation of the following positions and offices:

-

Through focused-planning, opportunities to elevate and define MFL can be found from the initial student application process through graduation. As applicants enter the admissions portal we engage them with questions that highlight our values. Applicants are required to write an essay on how their personal philosophy relates to the mission and values of LLU. At graduation, the baccalaureate services feature presentations during which students share their life-changing experiences while on campus. In between these initial and capstone experiences are curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular educational strategies that intentionally put MFL at the center of academic life for students at LLU.

CFR 4.3: Selected themes for the self-study process will be used to identify qualitative data sources that can be integrated into the University's and LLUAHSC's decision-making systems which facilitate measuring, sustaining, and improving educational effectiveness. As part of our movement toward improving educational effectiveness through both qualitative and quantitative research, we engaged in a number of processes intended to guide our decision-making. The first was to explore our formative research themes. Second, was to develop processes to directly and indirectly measure the effectiveness of gies thattowareffng.irdr educ(m)2.4(ic)5.5(Unl-10.85Tc.00 -1mprblishended tos thation an(i -1.0nc.0005 Tw|

themselves through their mission statements and the creation of stated core values. These attributes serve to articulate the institution's expectations of faculty, staff, and students. It is through this process, and the subsequent engagement of its constituents, that an institution's *normative culture* develops. Unfortunately, very little research has been conducted on the congruence that exists between an institution's shared identity as expressed by its *normative culture* and its defined purpose over time. Equally important in the case of institutions with religious auspices like LLU, is the added impact that the integration of faith into an operationalized philosophy of education has on the sustainability of these institutions over time. It

experiences of American Christian universities found that American universities with strong religious influences expressed a greater desire to continue to integrate faith in their curricula and campus lifestyle. This was stressed through the practice of requiring students to take theology classes, attend communal worship services, and make a firm commitment to adhere to their philosophical doctrines (Glanzer, 2008). According to Glanzer (2008), these elements tend to give Christian-based universities their identity which leads to the establishment of their *normative culture*.

Slippage or secularization, which has affected even the most traditional religious higher education institutions over time, is a complex phenomenon and rarely a uniform process (Davie, 2002). In some instances, slippage, or secularization, is accidental; in other cases, it is somewhat deliberate. Burtchaelle (1998) suggests a repeating pattern that may occur in no particular order but usually involves compulsory worship becoming voluntary; a less restrictive/directive code of student behavior (e.g., dress); non-clerical appointments in leadership; reductions in numbers of students, staff, and faculty from the institution's denominational background; and a movement toward academic theology, or religion as a social phenomenon. In the hope of avoiding this type of movement away from our Seventh-day Adventist Christian roots, the constituents of LLU implemented the following study to better understand its *normative culture*.

Methods. Using qualitative data collection methods, 29 structured focus group discussions were conducted between October 2007 and January 2008 (5 University leadership, 14 faculty, 5 staff, and 4 student focus groups). In total, more than 300 individuals participated. A systematic sampling approach was used to assure triangulation of opinions. To this end, current LLU leadership, students, faculty, and staff participated in the study. Attendance was invited, but not requirtobyParticipants were not recruited on the basis of their religious affiliation, however participants did self identify during focus group discussions. To optimize attendance, faculty, staff, and student focus groups were held in school pairings matched by location (access/proximity), occurring generally during the lunch hour with food provided for the participants. The leadership focus groups were conducted as part of an annual administrative retreat.

Before discussions began each group was given a written definition of *normative culture* that had been developed by the Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) Research Subcommittee. This definition was then outlined by the facilitators to insure that participants understood the concept. As such, *normative culture* was loosely defined for the context of this study as:

> *It (normative culture) is based on (often informal) consensus, agreement, and similarities of values; pertinent elements include common objectives, standards/rules/norms (implicit and explicit), and behavior. It is often maintained by self-exclusion, sanctions (informal and formal), visible markers (e.g., Good Samaritan Statue, pledge, core values), reinforcement of common themes/slogans at meetings, (i.e., seven core values, pledge, Motto of "To Make Man Whole"), recruitment of Seventms (impTJ.0. TD.0023 Tc(MTwfmat1 0 TD.0014 Tc(.)TJ*

- *Normative culture* and service as Identity
- *Normative culture* and *Wholeness*
- Future trajectory for LLU/Interventions
- *Normative culture* and its role for LLU as a university with religious auspices
- Communication/isolation as challenges to a shared *normative culture*

Summary of findings. Participants across all groups were enthusiastically loyal to LLU and were excited about taking part in discussions about the institution's *normative culture*. Individuals were happy to share their views and voiced a desire for more such opportunities. Group responses were mostly positive to the questions, with few overtly negative responses. In many cases, facilitators had to probe participants about the existence of negatives in LLU's

Students universally noted that while *wholeness* is a
crucial part of LLU's

culture, including Seventh-day Adventist doctrine so that more of a deliberate exposure could take place. Similarly, staff focus group respondents believed strongly that the University should make more of a concerted effort to increase knowledge about the Adventist culture on campus since they perceive LLU's *normative culture* to be based on Seventh-day Adventist religious principles. They feared that too many people on campus are unaware of these principles, and should have the opportunity to learn about Adventism to better understand our *normative culture*, regardless of their own individual religious affiliation. Many noted that we should not be "apologetic" for who we are and that those who join the Loma Linda University community, be they faculty, staff, or student, should be welcomed warmly and given ample opportunity to recognize and appreciate who we are and what this institution stands for. In a similar vein, several staff members noted that many students not from Adventist backgrounds might have found it difficult to "fit in" around campus without such an orientation. Staff were concerned that students coming into the University were not properly educated about Adventism or given the necessary support to become acclimated to our institution and our beliefs. Therefore, many felt that education about Adventism should be provided, not to evangelize but to create a shared understanding that would allow everyone to be more at ease and thus able to engage in open discussion. Students expressed these concerns, stating that other students ostracized them if they did not engage in what is considered appropriate behavior by the Adventist community. On the other hand, it was noted that many non-Christian students view LLU as a safe, respectful place in which to live, work, and study.

A recurring theme that was thought to threaten the cohesion of LLU's *normative culture* is the lack of cross-school interactions and the perceived isolation of students within their schools or even within their respective programs. Many students noted that only when they made extraordinary efforts to develop relationships outside of their schools did they have contact with, or even recognize students from other schools or learn what other schools had to offer. It was felt that this structure of isolation could inadvertently help undermine LLU's religious roots unless it is carefully monitored. The recent move toward a unification of previously isolated schools is seen by many as a step in the right direction. Under the leadership of former president Dr. Behrens, and now Drs. Hart and Carter, LLU is centrally focusing on its core values (e.g., through a more deliberate

Campus Worship curriculum and requiring all degree and University certificate programs to include a religion/ethics cognate). Although this direction is coming from top leadership, many faculty, staff, and students are welcoming and recognizing these efforts as initial steps that should be taken further. For students, but also to a slightly lesser degree for staff and faculty, the desire for more opportunities to engage across schools is an important issue. Many students have a strong desire both to socialize and to share academic and service experiences with students from different schools. They question why there are not more cross-listed core classes that support interdisciplinary engagement.

Final Reflections: Almost unanimously, faculty, students, staff and those in leadership voiced their

perceived as one more indicator of slide toward the slippery slope of secularism—one more step away from the institution's foundational commitment.

Our *normative culture* research indicates that the notion of pluralism, as practiced at LLU, may require the development of a fifth category, unique to LLU, to be added to the four identified by Benne (2001). Further research on this topic will be conducted in the coming years. What we value and identify within the category of intentional pluralism is the focus that goes beyond mere diversity for the sake of tolerance, but truly engages diversity for the purpose of understanding and learning.

We must learn to engage and embrace others, their philosophies, culture, and the various ways of viewing challenges. We do this to eliminate ignorance, half-truths, and stereotypes. Being intentionally pluralistic in the modern sense does not require LLU to abandon its standards, beliefs, and history in order to be accommodating to diverse points of view. Instead, such a stance insures that we will openly encounter others, value them as individuals, and reflect upon their ideas in keeping with the example of Jesus Christ who loved all the world unconditionally while remaining steadfast to his principles of integrity, belief, and selfless service.

   Theme 2: Bible-based Faith. The second research theme identified during the development of the Institutional Proposal emphasized attention to studying the 17 student learning outcomes (SLOs) developed in 1998. It was felt that this type of study would assist in reaching consensus of meaning and aid in resolving the measurement challenges associated with original SLOs. As such, an exercise was conducted in the Fall of 2005 during the Faculty Colloquium for the purpose of prioritizing which of the SLOs would be the focus of this initial inquiry.[41]

3. Do you think the term "Christ-centered" is an accurate substitute for the term *Bible-based faith*?
4. Are there terms other than "Christ-centered" that you prefer?

All the groups were enthusiastic about their participation in the redesign of a SLO considered to be essential in reflecting the educational philosophy and purposes of LLU. Twenty-four focus groups were held which involved over 300 participants from across campus.

Results: Ultimately, the majority of participants felt that the symbolism of the message needed to convey an idea that supported the University's emphasis on *wholeness,* of "service to mankind in Christ," and "to do as Christ did." These sentiments were strongly reflected in the participants' explanations of how they strive to demonstrate a *Bible-based faith* in their everyday interactions with students. Many noted that this is accomplished by openly sharing about faith and personal responsibility, including short reflections and/or devotions before class, and notably in numerous one-to-one

commitment to this institution's core character—we never assessed…we simply assumed. We now see this is an opportunity to move forward and be purposeful in quantifying a definition for our *normative culture* and use that knowledge to "grow what's good and challenge what's weak."

Action Plan. Building on our shared understanding of LLU's core character, we propose to continue the assessment dialogue of the *normative culture* focus groups. Initially, campus-wide discussions will emphasize the benefits of identifying ourselves with the classifications presented in the research. Those discussions also will address the challenges of other private religiously oriented universities that lost their initial and essential purposes. An understanding of the category that most closely approximates LLU's *normative culture* will assist in guiding institutional decisions that reflect openness to possible changes while simultaneously maintaining a commitment to our Adventist heritage. This dialogue may provide additional insights as to how we should continue this journey from silos to community, how we choose to expand both globally and locally, as well as how we identify opportunities to capitalize on our shared values, and ultimately, our *mission-focused learning.*

Infrastructure to support assessment and institutional learning. Extraordinary progress has been made in building an infrastructure to support the development of shared assessment and learning about our institution. With progress has come an even stronger desire to make sure "we get it right." For example, rather than relying only on the individual assessment processes that wsf002 T4 T6.8962 -1.15l

[18] University Standardized Online Syllabus Template - http://myllu.llu.edu/apps/acadman/classes/course_information.php

[19] *LLU Administrative Handbook,* I-01: "Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action" - http://www.llu.edu/llu/handbook/administrativehandbook/index.php?dir=I-Personnel/

[20] *LLU Student Handbook*: p. 56 - http://www.llu.edu/llu/handbook/documents/2006-07student-handbook.pdf

[21] Online Syllabus Template System - http://myllu.llu.edu/apps/acadman/classes/course_information.php

[22] *LLU Student Handbook*, Office of Diversity, p. 40 - http://www.llu.edu/llu/handbook/documents/2006-07student-handbook.pdf

[23] *LLU Catalog 2008-2009* - http://myllu.llu.edu/apps/publications/view_pub.php

[24] A recent discovery stimulated by our WASC self-study CPR process has been the awareness that Schools define "programs" differently. Differences in definitions of "programs" even vary within some Schools at the academic department level. Efforts to standardize definitions of such terms as concentrations, tracks, majors, and minors have again re-focused our attention to the need of becoming a more unified and systematic university.

[25] Online Program Review System - http://myllu.llu.edu/apps/acadman/programs/academic_dashboard.php

[26]

Index

N

normative culture · 1, 10, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30

O

Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning (OA) · 6, 7, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 31

S

School of Allied Health Professions (SAHP) · 11
School of Medicine (SM) · 2, 11, 14
School of Nursing (SN) · 11
School of Pharmacy (SP) · 7, 11, 20
School of Public Health (SPH) · 11, 16

School of Science and Technology (SST) · 7, 11, 14
Seventh-day Adventist · 2, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31