CAPACITY AND PREPARATORY REVIEW

LOMA LINDA UNIVERSITY

Submitted to:
Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

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 community clinics known as Social Action Community Health System. The remaining corporations include LLU Health Care, LLU Health Services and the LLU School of Medicine Faculty Practice Groups. (Appendix – Organizational Charts: LLU Organizational Chart)

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	

University Mission

As a Christian health sciences institution, LLU remains committed to the unique vision of its founders and is sustained by its close association with the Seventh-day Adventist Church. Three fundamental tenets have defined this heritage and are at the heart of the University's mission that seeks to further the healing and teaching ministry of Jesus Christ "To Make Man Whole": (a) God is the creator and sustainer of the universe, (b) mankind's optimal development entails a relationship to both God and society, and (c) the pursuit of truth and professional expertise benefits the individual and society while advancing the healing and teaching ministry of Jesus Christ. These three tenets guide the *mission-focused*

learning (MFL) and lifetime commitment to service. This reflects our philosophy that LLU is to be a place for health professional education that promotes the prevention of illness, and that service is to include ministry to not only the physical, mental and emotional, but also to the spiritual needs of human beings.

Institutional Core Values

Central to our understanding of *mission-focused learning* is our ability to provide experiences that offer "teachable moments" which enable our faculty and students to integrate core institutional values, thereby transforming their personal lives and professional practice. The fundamental values that shape our students' lives are highlighted in the sidebar. As a part of the CPR process, the University community participated in the revision of the institution's shared student learning outcomes (SLOs). The result of this process appears in the text box.

Institutional Core Values

COMPASSION— The sympathetic willingness to be engaged with the needs and suffering of others. Among the most memorable depictions of compassion in Scripture is the story of the Good Samaritan, which LLU has taken as a central symbol for our work.

INTEGRITY— The quality of living a unified life in which one's convictions are well-considered and match one's actions. Integrity encompasses honesty, authenticity, and trustworthiness.

EXCELLENCE— The commitment to exceed minimum standards and expectations.

FREEDOM— The competency and privilege to make informed and accountable choices and to respect the freedom of others. God has called us not to slavery, but to freedom.

JUSTICE— The commitment to equality and to treat others fairly, renouncing all forms of unfair discrimination. The God of the Bible is One who calls people continually to justice. According to the prophets, religious faith could be genuine only when it led the believers to "seek justice, rescue the oppressed, defend the orphans, (and) plead for the widow."

PURITY/SELF-CONTROL— The commitment to be morally upright and moderate in all things with complete control over one's emotions, desires, and actions.

HUMILITY— The willingness to serve others in a sacrificial manner; the self-respect that renounces haughtiness or arrogance.

Student Learning Outcomes

Outcome 1: Students understand and apply the University philosophy of wholeness into their personal and professional lives.

Outcome 2: Students understand the importance of integrating LLU's Christ-centered values in their personal and professional lives.

Outcome 3: Students demonstrate critical thinking.

Outcome 4: Students develop a commitment to discovery and life-long learning.

Outcome 5: Students demonstrate effective communication skills in English.

Outcome 6: Students demonstrate effective use of technology appropriate to the discipline.

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.

Accreditation History

The Commission action in 1961 recognized LLU as heir to the accreditation formerly attached to the College of Medical Evangelists. In 1967 LLU merged with La Sierra College in Riverside, California. The two campuses were defined as operationally separate for accreditation purposes from 1972 to 1976, after which they were accredited as a single entity. During the years as a two-campus system, the distinct differences in purpose of each institution—health sciences versus liberal arts—made the management of administrative issues increasingly difficult. Prolonged inattention to Commission concerns resulted in an action of probation by WASC in 1989. Subsequently, the LLU Board of Trustees determined that the campuses should separate to form two distinctly focused institutions. As a result, LLU and the now La Sierra University separated in 1990. With its purpose rededicated as a health sciences university, LLU refocused on its founding mission to further teaching and healing professions. By 1992 WASC concerns had been addressed, the probation was removed, and the institution's full accreditation was restored. In 1998-1999 the University's accreditation was reaffirmed for 10 years. Now, once again under review for reaccreditation, LLU submitted its Institutional Proposal in May 2006. This document was accepted without revision. This CPR represents

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 committees have transformed our institution into a community of shared excellence. (Appendix – Response to WASC)

Capacity Building Through Assessment

LLU has long been known for its professional and academic excellence that resides in the independent school structures. As WASC moved from a compliance model to an inquiry model based on educational effectiveness, LLU continued to comply with professional accrediting bodies to facilitate assessment. Slowly, as members of the University attended WASC conferences, participated in accreditation workshops, and served as WASC

Commissioners, members of central committees, and site visitors, an increased understanding of WASC's new approach to assessment and educational effectiveness emerged. With this new understanding, LLU recognized the need to transition from a periodic intensive review process to one of continuous institutional learning. However, even in this early stage LLU's view of educational effectiveness continued to underscore the central role of schools and accredited programs as the repository for evidence on student outcomes.

In the Fall of 2005 the Chancellor's Committee established the Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC) to serve as an official subcommittee of the University Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC), its main purpose being to consider indicators and evidence of educational effectiveness across all academic programs. As originally designed, the EEC was established to determine the degree to which learning outcomes existed, were referenced in publications, and used by advisors. The committee was also assigned the task of considering how outcomes were assessed, the frequency of such assessments, and the methods used to create ongoing curricular program reviews that could support programmatic and faculty development. EEC was charged with revising program review guidelines and developing a program review schedule, as well as evaluating program review reports. In addition, it was charged with considering evidence of institutional learning, and assessing the level of commitment of faculty, staff, and institutional leaders to create and sustain a "culture of evidence." EEC also provided recommendations for establishing changes in institutional structures and processes as needed, as well promoting a climate of inquiry and serving as a resource to the University to identify the best means of educational effectiveness. Other responsibilities included preparing the WASC accreditation documents; the first of which was to develop the Institutional Proposal submitted in May of 2006.[4] (Appendix – Organizational Charts: Institutional Learning and Capacity Building for Educational Effectiveness Chart)

In an effort to learn more about WASC expectations for assessment, 13 LLU academic leaders attended the 2007 WASC Annual Meeting in San Jose. Attendees were challenged by the presentations and immediately recognized the necessity and value of improving our University-wide assessment structure. It was as at this point that we realized that LLU's dependence on the results of professional

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 Agencies)

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] WASC site visitors will be given full Academic Management System access.)

OA Professional Development. To support instructional learning with regard to assessment, the OA took an innovative approach to professional development through "just in time learning," allowing faculty to access these resources whenever and wherever they were needed. These resources included a series of assessment videos that can be found on the OA web site.[7] The Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs were featured in the initial assessment videos to introduce campus-wide assessment initiatives and demonstrate the University's commitment to a new system of assessment. The OA assessment web site is expanding regularly, adding more professional development resources. Face-to-face support was provided to each school as needed.

LLU's Assessment Plan. The OA, University Accreditation Steering Committee, and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs have developed the first campus-wide systematic program review and assessment plan that outlines, goals, structure, purposes of the OA, existing and future systematic program review and assessment initiatives. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLU Assessment Plan)

An Example of Capacity Building in Graduate Research Programs. Another example of institutional capacity building for educational effectiveness comes from the restructuring of our former Graduate School into the Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS). Our academic restructuring began with the recognition of the need to improve the academic capacity of our research-oriented health sciences education. For decades, the Graduate School housed and administrated most masters and doctorial degree programs requiring a thesis or dissertation. As programs grew in number and complexity, the Graduate School focused its efforts on managing students' records, budgeting, and creating new programs. A number of the new programs were not research intensive, but were clinical in nature (e.g., MSW and MFT). A few programs were even offered at the undergraduate level (e.g., BS in Geology and General Studies Certificates in Spanish, and Chinese Studies). Further complexity within the Graduate School came when it conceptualized and developed the new School of Pharmacy.

Reflecting on the situation, the Graduate School developed a plan to subdivide into three separate academic entities (two of those being the School of Pharmacy and the School of Science and Technology), and the Graduate School eventually became FGS. The creation of these academic entities was completed by the Trustees' action in the winter of 2003. By summer of 2004 a University taskforce was created, and for the next 10 months worked on assessing the needs of all graduate programs. The taskforce recommended a new infrastructure to establish a strong campus culture of research—the origin of the name FGS. All experienced research faculty were invited to assist the Interim Dean of FGS in developing a new governance system to establish oversight, guidelines, and quality standards. The new structure, unlike the previous Graduate School, would not focus on the everyday management of individual student files, finances, standard variances and record keeping, but would develop and maintain clear processes and standards to increase the University's capacity to achieve academic excellence for research.

FGS brought together researchers from across the University previously isolated in their individual programs. Since FGS is not tuition-driven or responsible for the day-to-day management of individual student processes, faculty salaries, and buildings, it can be less territorial or silo-oriented than the former Graduate School.

FGS created a two-tiered governance structure consisting of the FGS in General Session, and a representative Graduate Council. An elected faculty member chairs the FGS in general sessions. The monthly General Sessions engage all research scholars to establish policies and standards, and clearly define the expectations for a successful thesis or dissertation. Eleven 5-member working groups (all including representation from at least four schools) developed policies to insure educational effectiveness. The success of FGS has been significant especially given the diversity of the graduate programs it oversees. To date, 175 research-experienced faculty have been voted into the FGS membership.

An important role for FGS is the systematic review of graduate level research programs conducted in partnership with the EEC. LLU is well known for its clinical expertise and its training of health professionals that often includes a focus on research. LLU continues its commitment to expanding its culture of research, especially within areas of its strengths in the basic and translational sciences. Faculty and students, directly and indirectly, benefit from research funding. In addition to the obvious fiscal benefits students are enriched by experiences that engage them in formulating research questions, designing successful experiments, and critically interpreting and presenting data. There is evidence that a new culture of research is developing on campus. LLU is now averaging between $35 to $40 million in funded research annually, a number that has increased five-fold in the last 10 years. All schools are involved in research activity with varying degrees of effort and success. The Office of Sponsored Research, Sponsored Project Management, and other parts of the research infrastructure work closely with FGS and all the professional programs that are involved in primary research or clinical trials. (Appendix – Selected Exhibits: Office of Sponsored Research Projects Expenses and Awards)

FGS has gone beyond its first continuous quality assurance (CQA) objective of establishing policies and community, and has now begun its second goal of

CQI, moving research oriented graduate programs towards best practices.

EXHIBITS AND DISPLAYS

Required Data Exhibits are included in Appendix – Required Data. Perhaps the most significant capacity issue that has become apparent as a result of this self-study is the incompatibility of the multiple data warehouses that exist at LLU. These identified problems include highly developed independent school systems, and different data definitions used to collect, store, and mine data both centrally and in schools. These issues have made it difficult to compile the required exhibits. There is a recognized need to support the vastly diverse data requirements of the schools while simultaneously developing a centralized system that facilitates efficient data mining. Steps have already been implemented or are in progress to improve our capacity to resolve and monitor these important data elements. Plans to address these challenging issues are referenced in the concluding essay and the Assessment Plan. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLU Assessment Plan)

Following are highlights and summative analyses of the information found in the data exhibits. Additional disaggregated data by programs will be presented in School Portfolios available at the time of the site visit.

Overall (1.1, 1.2). The majority of degrees offered at LLU are professional and graduate programs (approximately 75%) most of which are professionally accredited (Table 8.1). Overall LLU has shown significant increases in applicants for all (including admissions and enrollments) over the past five years with a slight slowdown for 2007. Our selectivity has increased as demonstrated by a higher percentage of admitted and enrolled students with complete credentials (1.1). The number of applicants with complete credentials has increased while at the same time a lower percentage of applicants with complete credentials were admitted and enrolled. Table 1.2 demonstrates this with the preparation and selectivity levels of entering students has improved (i.e., Graduate Record Exam [GRE] scores have improved during the last two years of the five-year reporting period).

Gender (1.3). The general distribution of male (one-third) to female (two-thirds) applicants has remained constant for most programs despite increased enrollment. During 2006 and 2007 there was a slight increase in the percentage of males admitted and enrolled in graduate professional programs.

Ethnicity (1.4). LLU continues to attract a large percentage of international students (approximately 400 on F1 and J visas; approximately 10% of enrollment). We continue to be challenged, however, to reflect the ethnic composition of our surrounding communities; this is especially true for professional programs. In response to this challenge, we have put in place a number of programs to actively recruit Hispanic and Black students into health professional programs. When comparing student profiles with the local population demographics using 2009 projected census data within a five mile radius, we found that the percentage of Black students was similar to that of our surrounding communities (9% vs. 6%), that we have a significantly higher Asian (30% vs. 6%) enrollment, and we were most challenged with regard to Hispanic students (12.5% vs. 36%). *Trend analysis*: Overall self-identified race/ethnicity by our applicants has varied little over time; although, there is a trend for decreases in White student enrollment and slight increases for Hispanic and Asian students over time. While the graduate programs continue to enroll the highest proportion of minority students on campus (a consistent five-year trend), Asian in addition to White students have a higher relative proportional enrollment in professional programs.

Headcount in Enrollments by Degree and Degrees Granted (2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1). The pattern of degrees offered over time indicates that we have an increase in student enrollment in associate degree programs, bachelor degrees, doctoral degrees, and first professional degrees. There was a noticeable decrease in non-degree enrollment. For current degrees awarded, patterns remain relatively stable for the majority of programs.

Students Receiving Financial Aid (2.4). Modest increases in the number of students receiving financial aid (both undergraduate and graduate students) occurred until 2006; data from the most recent year, 2007, reflect a significant decrease which is likely tied to the availability of loans.

Undergraduate Cohort, Graduation Retention, and Transfer and Operations (3.2, 6.1). LLU is not a traditional four-year campus. All undergraduate students are transfer students, most enrolling for a two-year period after completing their General Education course work elsewhere. They are primarily upper-division completing health science

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 emphases on core values and MFL.

Discussions on the University's core values have also progressed over the past two years. At the beginning of this process it was discovered that awareness of the institution's seven core values varied considerably from individual to individual. Faculty discussions in the Interschool Faculty Advisory Council (IFAC),[9] Deans Council, University Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC),[10] Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC), Spiritual Life and Wholeness Committee, school-specific committees (strategic planning, spiritual life and *wholeness*, and academic standards), University Leadership Council (ULC), Third Thursday LLU Faculty Discussions, and the University Campus Worship Committee, have facilitated the increased knowledge regarding the core values. As a result of this engagement one faculty member coined the acronym "J CHIEFS" (Justice, Compassion, Humility, Integrity, Excellence, Freedom, Self Control/Purity) to facilitate ready recall. Presentations on the University's values were included in the University Campus Worship's *wholeness* curriculum as part of our educational strategy to foster professional development and life-long learning.[11]

Refinement and alignment of the values identified by each of LLU's corporate entities will be necessary as we continue the process to grow synergistically as a health sciences enterprise. Essential to this process will be our expanded focus on system-wide strategic planning to include all aspects of Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC). This will be a critical step in our institution-wide strategic plan to sustain our *normative culture*. Committee actions and strategic plans give evidence that we are well underway toward making this a corporate reality. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLUAHSC Strategic Planning)

Finally, a considerable effort has been given to revising the 17 LLU SLOs created in 1998. In April 2007, it was determined that these outcomes were

appropriate aspirational statements of our corporate culture but were not readily measurable. To address this, we developed eight measurable SLOs that were fully vetted and approved. A more detailed discussion of the development of the SLOs is provided in a Reflective Essay.[12] [13]

CFR 1.4: The University will continue to provide for faculty input through existing Interschool Faculty Advisory Council and the newly formed Faculty of Graduate Studies (FGS). Stated in LLU's core values are the principles of justice, integrity, and freedom. All constituents are expected to model forthrightness and conviction of ideas in a way that pursues truth and furthers the enrichment of society while fulfilling the University's mission. Therefore, LLU encourages academic freedom in its rich and positive tradition of open discovery. It is believed that such faculty voice is essential to the principles and sustainability of higher education. LLU promotes faculty input in all academic matters. Faculty, guided by standards and competencies required by professional accrediting bodies and by current advances in research, develop lectures, courses, and programs that are approved by school-specific and faculty-administered curriculum committees. Faculty are included on all University-wide academic and campus life committees. Senior faculty are invited to chair school-specific rank and tenure committees, and populate the University Rank and Tenure Committee. FGS continues to provide a model system for interschool faculty participation. Similar structures for the faculty of undergraduate programs and those teaching in professional programs are being considered. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLU Faculty Handbook - 3.1.0, pp. 93-4; 3.49, p. 128)

IFAC has served as the campus-wide instrument for faculty input since the LLU Board of Trustees approved it in April 1990. Policies that address academic freedom are included in the Faculty Handbook.[14] Faculty elected representatives from each school and the Library Faculty meet monthly, host faculty leadership retreats, conduct faculty development workshops, sponsor educational fairs, and organize the annual Fall faculty colloquia which features speakers who promote scholarship, research, wholeness, and effective communication and learning skills. IFAC, through its monthly meetings and its subcommittees, vets all faculty-related policies and responds to requests from administration to participate in campus-wide problem solving and visioning for the purpose of improving and sustaining the learning environment and more fully develop a

campus-wide understanding of wholeness, core values, and MFL. The Chair of IFAC, a faculty member, meets with the Chancellor's Committee for final approval of items sent to the LLU Board of Trustees and is an invitee of the Board in regular session. The accomplishments of IFAC over the years have been many and have resulted in significant institutional quality improvement. However, in recent years faculty's interest in IFAC has appeared to wane and concerns exist as to the purpose and value of IFAC. Although faculty are deeply involved in guiding their academic and professional lives within programs and schools, there seems to be less time for dealing with issues and topics that span the diverse needs of the eight LLU schools. The impact of strong academic and fiscal autonomy of the schools appears to have greater value to faculty than shared governance campus-wide.

Because of this, IFAC is re-evaluating its faculty governance role for the campus. Recently, IFAC reaffirmed its commitment to promoting effective shared governance between faculty and administration, advancing faculty development and leadership skills, and improving campus-wide communication between schools and among disciplines. University administration encourages this open discussion. As our institution matures its understanding of a "shared community of excellence" it will need to discover the most effective ways to encourage and reward faculty for participating in shared governance. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: IFAC Self-review; Former IFAC Chairs Focus Group)

CFR 1.5a: Strategic planning to strengthen the linkage between mission-focused learning and institutional progress towards globalization (Interschool Faculty Advisory Council, Deans Council, Officers Committee, Learning & Technology Subcommittee, Strategic Planning in Schools and University, University Leadership Council). Since the last accreditation, the institution has continued to demonstrate its commitment to MFL. This has resulted in an expansion of the institution's global and community outreach, evidenced not only through the increased number of service-learning opportunities (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Community Partnerships) but also through the development of institutional and administrative infrastructures, policies and guidelines (e.g., application for international programs), and University-wide financial support for graduates who desire to go into international mission service

appointments. The University continues to develop and refine policies to guide the integration of academic programs and address the complexities of blending MFL with the institution's global and community outreach. The University has modified the functions of the Office of Diversity and its administrator to now include community outreach. The office has been re-established as the Office of Community Partnerships and Diversity.[15] The position of director has been changed to that of Vice Chancellor for Community Partnerships and Diversity, and an associate director position has been added to facilitate the expanded focus on partnerships. The Office of Community Partnerships and Diversity was recently elevated to encompass the entire LLUAHSC enterprise.

One of the logical extensions of LLU's commitment to MFL and *wholeness* (intellectual, physical, social-relational and spiritual) is evidenced in a unique partnership between the School of Medicine (SM) and the School of Public Health (SPH). Both entities had a long-standing commitment to addressing chronic disease health disparities in the local community from their own perspectives. The SM basic science research group did this through laboratory research seeking to better understand how high levels of overall stress result in oxidated cellular stress or "an augmented state of cellular oxidative stress" (ASCOS), by weakening cells and making them more vulnerable to a number of chronic diseases and as a result contributing to the overall pattern of health disparities. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Oxidative Stress and Health Disparities) The SPH research group on the other hand had a long history of doing community involved participatory research to address issues of practice and translation. Both groups had longstanding federal funding histories and through this collaboration were able to receive funding from the National Institute of Health Center for Health Disparities Research. The LLU Center for Health Disparities and Molecular Medicine[16] is now in its forth year of funding and has been successful in all three focus areas: (a) research, (b) training and community partnership, and (c) outreach. Since its inception the core collaborative group has expanded to a total of six of the eight LLU schools on campus (School of Allied Health Professions [SAHP], School of Nursing [SN], School of Pharmacy [SP], and School of Science and Technology [SST] are now affiliated with the Center); research is progressing and has resulted in a number of groundbreaking findings. An annual average of 55 students from underrepresented groups and disadvantaged

backgrounds (high school N=15; undergraduate N=15; medical N=10; graduate students N=15) participate in summer and/or year around training opportunities, and many translational community research projects have reached hundreds of community partners every year. This effort as an outgrowth of LLU's commitment to service and wholeness has in turn helped us as a university to bridge existing silos between schools and more effectively reach out to the local community at the same time.

Furthering this integration of MFL has been the creation of three new LLUAHSC institutes: (a) Global Health, (b) Community Partnerships, and (c) Lifestyle Medicine; that facilitate both horizontal and vertical relationships among and between LLU's larger institutional system. In addition to providing a more intentional way of unifying institutional purposes, these institutes also serve to address challenges that occur as our comprehensive institution continues to grow and to diversify its specialized services and academic departments. The development of these institutes has engaged numerous formal and *ad hoc* task groups including IFAC, ULC, UAAC, Deans Council, Academic Deans Council, University Officers, Learning and Technology Subcommittee, and representatives from existing Centers, research, academic, and clinical areas.

In recent months, the new senior leadership has broadened and invigorated the institution's approach to strategic planning. Now, instead of LLUAHSC providing the overarching linkage to primarily independent strategic plans developed by each of its entities, the new approach to strategic planning will begin with MFL as the unifying conceptual foundation. In this way, MFL will be the starting point from which relationships within and across all segments of the institution (35 corporate entities) will be examined and enhanced. It is anticipated that this approach will enable the entire LLU corporate enterprise to more cohesively pursue a unified vision and plan for the future of University and all its member groups (e.g., Medical Center and Physician Practice Plans). Also illustrating the integration between MFL and the priority given to respecting human diversity, the University has developed new SLOs that are infused throughout all programs. Knowledge of, and appreciation for, human diversity is a learning outcome expected of all LLU graduates.[17][18]

CFR 1.5.b: Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, and its administrative and organizational practices. The University's Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy articulates its stance against discrimination based on race, color, religion, creed, gender, ethnic or national origin, disability, or age.[19] The University is also in compliance with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).[20] The dissemination of University policies addressing nondiscrimination, affirmative action, and support for persons with disabilities is achieved through multiple approaches, including policy statements found in faculty, staff, and student handbooks, related personnel manuals, employee information bulletins, and other relevant University publications. In addition, they are included in the University Standardized Online Syllabus Template.[21] It is further the responsibility of the LLU Department of Human Resource Management to increase the awareness of employees regarding their rights, responsibilities, and opportunities. This awareness is accomplished in new employee orientations, regularly scheduled workshops, and information programs that provide personnel with the opportunity for increased understanding of University policies, relevant laws, and their implications. LLU educates managers and supervisors to ensure increased awareness, understanding, and handling of problems experienced by females, minorities, and individuals with disabilities. A special effort is made to inform prospective employees of equal employment opportunities by including statements from the University's Nondiscrimination and Affirmative Action Policy in orientation packets.

In addition to institutional policies and practices, the learning and social environment that supports all LLU programs is guided by the University's mission of *wholeness*, which places priority on providing a framework for maximizing the scholarship opportunities for all members of the University. A respect for human diversity is embedded in the principles of *wholeness,* our institutional core values, and the quality education that the University achieves. "At Loma Linda University, where more than 80 countries are represented, respect for diversity refers to the attitudes, actions, and values that are demonstrated through the importance and time given to building relationships and sustaining cooperation among the various groups on campus. It means that all groups—regardless of their ethnicity, culture,

gender, religion, and physical condition—are valued."[22] (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLU Official Enrollment by Country of Citizenship) To further its commitment, the University's Office of Community Partnerships and Diversity is a key part of the University's commitment to constructing a social and learning environment in which academic excellence thrives. At the May 2008 meeting of the LLUAHSC Board, the Institute for Community Partnerships was approved. This Institute will serve to further our commitment and response to an increasingly diverse society.

CFR 1.7: Educational Effectiveness Committee to continue review processes to insure that all published program materials are consistent with actual program requirements (e.g., time to completion, pre-requisite and co-requisite requirements are correctly stated). Motivated by the University's core values of justice, integrity, and excellence, the EEC works closely with other University committees to highlight concerns that impact the University's capacity for educational effectiveness. Implementation of a new system is underway to insure that in the future all University publications that include policies and procedures will be updated frequently and systematically, and will be accurate, searchable, and aligned with Board-approved policies. This system will be completed by 2010.

One of the initial steps toward developing a community of shared excellence was to combine all the school-specific bulletins into a single University Catalog.[23] While significant progress has been made in the last few years toward a University-wide standardization of campus processes, publications and policies have historically reflected our desire to have strong and independent LLU schools. This long-standing independence has contributed to a decentralization of numerous academic processes, a significant one being the publication of individual bulletins and catalogs by each school until 2006-07. During this time, the consistency of language describing various processes had been drifting—a drift that has now been halted.[24]

The University Policy Committee, working with the Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and library personnel, has put in place a system that will insure consistency and accuracy across all LLU's publications dealing with policies and procedures. The first step in this new process has been the creation of a complete index. The University Catalog

and all handbooks and policy manuals have been electronically "tagged," paragraph-by-paragraph according to content, and have been placed into a content management system. In step two of this process, all University publications have been topically reviewed across all paragraphs in every published document to insure accuracy and consistency. In step three, all appropriate University publications, policy and procedure statements will be automatically populated for print using the official language found in the Administrative Handbook. With the new system in place, all changes to policy and academic programs approved by the Board of Trustees will be automatically reflected in all University publications. Step four involves a systematic review and update of all LLU publications that contain policies and procedures for content, style, and clarity. Steps one and two are well underway, and it is estimated that all steps will be completed by 2010. The unification of a Catalog has required a substantial level of involvement by all academic program directors in every school, their faculty, and the various student service and finance offices. The University Catalog is now reviewed and updated annually.

For the past five years the UAAC has improved its new program approval process by developing a template and guidelines that schools follow when seeking approval of new academic programs. This format, which anticipated the template now used in WASC LiveText™, has significantly enhanced quality improvement measures in evaluating new programs. Curricular maps, assessment matrices, and attention to LLU's SLOs and core values have provided valuable guidance to our new program review process.[25] (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Institutional Processes for the Development and Approval of New Programs)

CFR 2.1-2.14: Educational Effectiveness Committee and Faculty of Graduate Studies will exercise oversight responsibilities to prioritize and review all academic programs for compliance with CFRs. With the development of FGS and the EEC, procedures were put in place to revise the institution's program review process in order to make it more systematic and equivalent between professionally accredited programs and those without specialized accreditation. Shortly after this process was established it became apparent that a more systematic approach to assessment would be required. The approach should inform all programs prior to their involvement in the EEC/FGS program review process (i.e., assurance

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.

CFR 2.7: There will be University-wide dissemination and sharing of results from specialized accreditation agencies. EEC and FGS serve to review and disseminate institutional learning generated by systematic program review. Enhancing this process, and specific to program assessment, is the OA that supports programs, departments, and schools in the assessment of the SLOs. The University Assessment Committee is supported by the OA in this effort.[26] IFAC and ULC provide institutional venues and heighten the collective appreciation in regards to the integration of sustainable capacity and educational effectiveness, as well as the efforts of colleagues to provide world-class education. Each entity has broad representation from across the academic and service segments of the institution, and offers significant opportunities for the infusion of shared institutional learning.

CFR 2.9; 2.11: All programs will be reviewed for inclusion of mission-focused learning, student outcomes, and indicators of educational effectiveness. As part of our overall programmatic and institutional assessment plan, all degree programs engage with processes that promote CQI. We have the capacity to identify the inclusion of SLOs in existing curricula, and develop new learning experiences if gaps are found. We also recognize that SLOs may need to be modified as we continue to reflect on our educational effectiveness.

Four of the eight University SLOs capture the essential elements of MFL:

- Outcome 1: Students understand and apply the University philosophy of *wholeness* into their personal and professional lives.

- 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 responses (tied for second and third respectively out of 27 essential questions). (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Student Climate Survey 1998-2008 Comparison).

Our newly developed web-based standardized course syllabi template further insures that information is presented to students in a consistent manner. The new system allows standard presentation of important right-to-know information regarding students' standards of conduct, rights, services, appeal processes, grading standards, schedules, as well as expected student outcomes and measures of assessment. The new system generates curricular program maps for learning outcomes and professional competencies.

CFR 2.2: General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee (GE) of UAAC will give attention to resolving issues surrounding the increased numbers of general education/undergraduate academic variances at the time of degree completion. The number of variances submitted by students and their advisors has been a subject of concern. Several factors contribute to the problem at the undergraduate level. First, students transferring to LLU often submit numerous official transcripts. As our number of undergraduate students increase, the demands on central admissions and records services have grown significantly. The need for additional highly trained academic advisors has also increased. Second, "misguided compassion," albeit for worthy reasons, has further challenged our capacity in that while trying to help one student, others have been caught in

a system stalled by exceptions. Third, our historic silo approach has allowed for school-specific systems of admissions and records to function without a standard, and synergistic connection to central processes. For example, in the not to distant past the University's central offices of admissions and records dealt with over 119 non-standard academic terms annually; all done in response to the perceived unique needs of our professional programs. These have been reduced to approximately 50 academic terms per year. This non-standard term accommodation alone reduced the efficiency of central services and added to delays in processing Degree Compliance Reports (DCRs) and variances. Fourth, there have been rapid changes, both completed and in progress, placing many of our processes online. These rapid changes have made it difficult to keep up with systematically educating academic advisors. To fully implement these changes we need to train our faculty advisors, and monitor staff-levels in admissions and records offices. Reflections on these challenges have resulted in significant changes with the goal of reducing the number of unnecessary variances. Those changes include:

- A new online Admissions System that has a dynamic capacity to reflect articulated courses.
- Newly developed software to track variances assisting schools in meeting degree compliance criteria.
- Campus-wide availability to access DCRs online by both students and faculty, critical to insure timely completion of degree requirements.
- The creation of the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Advisory Council, for the purpose of considering variances unresolved via established processes, has improved understanding between the Office of University Records and the Schools.
- A Task Force (to include external consultants) to evaluate quality improvement and capacity expansion of services in the Offices of University Records and Admissions has been recommended, and a go-forward plan has been approved by University Officers.
- Improved education of academic advisors, and the school-specific "manuals" that they use. The learning from these experiences will be shared campus-wide.
- Transfer articulation tables are now available online to assist advisors.[28]
- The publication of a new academic advisors manual. (LLU Advisors Manual: Will be available in the Evidence Room)

- 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 deployment of the first stages of our campus workflow management system have resulted in fewer variances being submitted to the Office of University Records and GE. As we move purposefully from school structures to a more standardized centralized system, the promise of continued capacity improvement is assured.

CFR 2.13: Integration of strategic planning and development of the new Centennial Complex will continue to advance opportunities for mission-focused learning within the "Global Gateway." The Centennial Complex, one of our most significant recent campus projects, embodies three themes developed over our history and evidenced in our institutional planning and strategic directions. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLU Strategic Plan) These are the themes of growth, innovation, and globalization. For many institutions, the first two themes of growth and innovation are "engines" of progress and serve to help define success. Throughout our 100 years of commitment to excellence in education and health care our vision has always included ideas, concerns, and activities that support global opportunities.[29] The Centennial Complex enhances this global orientation for our students, faculty, and graduates. Technologically, its reach will be extensive and it will become a powerful tool to fulfill both the educational and service dimensions of our University. The opportunities to use emerging communication technologies to facilitate MFL are exciting, and open a wealth of possibilities for LLU to fulfill its mission. The following descriptions of each of the four levels of the Centennial Complex give evidence of its "Global Gateway" capacity.[30]

Level One houses the Anatomical Sciences Center—a cluster of state-of-the-art anatomy laboratories serving primarily the Schools of Allied Health Professions, Dentistry and Medicine. Together, the laboratories contain 108 advanced technology anatomy workstations, each able to accommodate up to six students. Faculty and staff support offices surround the laboratories. Accompanying the traditional hands-on facility is a wealth of electronic technology that permits virtual anatomy dissections and related procedures. Also on Level One is the Amphitheater Center Lobby and Exhibition Hall,

areas for the display of student research, education, and outreach projects.

On Level Two, students, faculty, and visitors enter the Complex's south atrium leading to the Clinical Skills and Assessment Center, which will provide unique approaches to health care skills development through the use of "patient" actors. Level Two is also the site of five of the Complex's "smart" classrooms. Each of these classrooms utilizes the latest audiovisual and computer technology for effective and successful teaching and learning. Educational content can be sent live via Internet Protocol (IP) anywhere in the world or archived for later retrieval. Group study areas will be available for students to engage in discussion and information exchange. In addition to the Division of Anatomy faculty offices, Level Two is home to the Educational Technology Center with equipment, production resources, and staff facilities that will enable global communication as well as communication between a myriad of networks within the Complex. Two large teaching amphitheaters, one with 250 seats and another with 350 seats, are located on this level. These large venues are also "smart" and will be equipped with superior presentation facilities and wireless network access.

Level Three will house the School of Religion faculty offices, large and small group study areas, classrooms, an ethics library, and the Centers for Spiritual Life and Wholeness and Christian Bioethics. The School of Public Health is represented in the Centennial Complex by the Geographic Information Systems (GIS) laboratory. This high-tech facility houses one of health care's latest and most comprehensive technologies and blends satellites, computers, and highly specialized computer software to advance the institution's global reach to promote health and wellness. Two 100-seat teaching amphitheaters are a central feature of Level Three, which will be shared by all eight Schools.

The Fourth Level is highlighted by the Medical Simulation Center (MSC) that offers skills development through practice on lifelike, computer controlled, hi-fidelity mannequins ("smarties"). A series of specialized training areas provide opportunity for skills training to nurses, physicians, first-responders, and other health professionals. Areas of specialty in the MSC include pediatrics, surgery, anesthesia, emergency medicine, and many more including a full functioning pharmacy.

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) has been included into the design features and allows for the rapid conversion and deployment of a 27-bed emergency hospital in the MSC.

CFR 3.1-3.3; 3.5: The Educational Effectiveness Committee and the Office of Assessment and Institutional Research are tasked to review and monitor respectively the instructional staffing of all programs. Selected new programs are also reviewed by the Graduate Council of the Faculty of Graduate Studies and the University Academic Affairs Committee. The majority of programs at LLU are accountable to external professional accrediting agencies which determine the requirements for instructional and support staffing for their respective programs. Compliance with established criteria occurs during the regular reaccreditation review cycles. In the past, programs engaged in intensive evaluation of their needs. However, these early reviews were done within school-specific programs and were prompted by choice and/or the need to restructure the sequence and content of courses. As a result, the process did not produce the campus-wide systematic approach that we now desire. We welcome the opportunity to develop a community of shared learning and a systematic program review process developed by EEC in conjunction with FGS. This joint process puts into place a structure for systematic program review that essentially parallels those used by professional accrediting bodies. As such, LLU is on target with the timeline for implementation of the revised program review processes presented in the 2006 Institutional Proposal. Note: since the proposal was submitted, the University has established an Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning that now includes the Office of Institutional Research. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: EEC and FGS policies; Appendix – Required Data: Tables 7.1 and 8.1; Current Status of Institutional Outcomes Included in the Institutional Proposal)

The initial step toward implementing this process has been to have all programs, regardless of professional accreditation, complete an online program review template, which includes reporting of instructional staffing as part of this review process. The baseline data that emerges will assist LLU in conducting comparative analyses of how programs calculate faculty Full-time Equivalents (FTEs). The results will assist us in making comparative recommendations to programs without external accreditation.

Schools proposing new academic programs are required to use the New Program Proposal Template, fashioned after WASC guidelines. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: New Program Templates) The completed template is submitted to the UAAC for review, and requires that all aspects of capacity, including faculty-student ratios and faculty workloads, be well thought out when giving consideration to the development of a new program. Faculty workload is monitored to assure that faculty are neither overextended nor taken advantage of in spite of their commitment to mission.

Schools and programs with professional accreditation are required to maintain appropriate numbers of faculty with the required qualifications to assure academic quality. Processes exist for departments to work with their respective school administration to address both temporary and continuing program issues that require the adjustment of personnel sufficient to meet academic needs.

The University continues to develop the capacity of central services to provide the necessary support to meet students' needs and serve them better. Among the areas that continue to be addressed include the timely turnaround of Degree Compliance Reports, academic variances, admission of students, and final release of diplomas. All of these areas are currently being reviewed to insure that sufficient personnel are available and are adequately prepared to provide the necessary capacity to meet current needs and support future growth of the University.

All new programs are required to demonstrate that sufficient resources are available in a manner that does not jeopardize the quality of existing programs. The revised program review process has assisted in establishing a baseline understanding of program definitions and highlighted additional discussions on how to accurately count faculty FTEs. Although we determined that degree granting programs have adequate faculty resources, we discovered through our program review baseline the inconsistent use of terms, such as: (a) program, (b) track, (c) major, and (d) concentration. Awareness of this situation led to changes in the current 2008-09 University Catalog. Further refinement of program definitions will continue.

CFR 3.3: Faculty and staff recruitment, orientation, workload, incentive, and evaluation practices are

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 technologies are appropriately shared with the Learning and Technology Subcommittee of UAAC, thereby providing a forum for review of best practices.

Third, faculty development activities such as courses, online tutorials, and one-on-one peer assistance are used to educate faculty and related support personnel in the use of technology mediated instruction, Course Management System, videoconferencing, and off-campus delivery. In addition, there are school-specific faculty development activities that focus on curricular design and delivery as warranted in professional programs. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Faculty Development Activities by Schools)

Fourth, assessment of online and off-campus programs is focused on institutional and program outcomes, as well as the appropriate use of technology mediated instruction. Results from these assessment activities are shared at the course, program, school, and institutional levels to insure CQI. Best practices, as gleaned from program assessment analyses, are shared with the Learning and

Technology Subcommittee of UAAC, and reported to the UAAC.

A new aspect to our capacity to deliver educational content worldwide is found in the Centennial Complex. This building has been designed to function as a "Global Gateway" to share with the world the education, research, and service content of LLU. Until recently, preparing health care professionals in many parts of the world has almost always involved an individual's physical presence on our campus or faculty traveling to distant locations. New technologies now allow a "virtual presence" that exponentially expands the possibilities for MFL. While we may never wish to abandon the ideal of live, in-person relationships, communication technologies of many types expand the scope of what is globally achievable. As these technologies become more sophisticated, the potential for broadening the scope and quality of the learning experiences expands.

Adding the dimension of experience through the technological resources of the Complex will assist students in developing a high level of clinical and relational skills that are difficult to achieve in actual patient care situations. Students and faculty will have the capability for on-campus and global communication via a variety of media resources (i.e., computers, television, interactive videoconferencing, and audio systems). These will be adaptable for the needs of both lay and professional audiences and designed for establishing communication with remote sites, including those where connectivity is minimal. The ways in which this capability could be employed continue to expand. Among the possibilities are: (a) to enable education for off-campus students and other health care professionals in rural and foreign sites where such training is otherwise unavailable, (b) to demonstrate a new surgical procedure being performed in an LLU Medical Center operating room to physicians at distant locations, and (c) to consult on patient diagnosis and treatment with health care professionals in locations far from conventional patient care resources. All of these activities provide MFL experiences that enhance the awareness of global service for LLU students.

Finally, prompted by the LLU Telehealth Initiative, an infrastructure was deployed in late 2007 to facilitate seamless videoconferencing throughout the LLU enterprise and at off-campus locations. A video data center has the capacity to manage up to 20 simultaneous videoconference sessions that may be

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:

- Chancellor
- Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, with the recent addition of the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning
- Vice Chancellor for Research Affairs, and an Office of Sponsored Research for the entire campus
- Vice Chancellor for Information Systems, with the Department of Educational Support Services,[35] Data Management Applications, University Network Administration, and University Computing
- Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services, with multiple coordinating relationships across the University in the areas of student life, central student services, and marketing and admissions[36]
- Vice Chancellor for Community Partnerships and Diversity, and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Community Partnerships and Diversity
- Senior Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs

CFR 4.1; 4.2: Strategic planning processes will continue to emphasize infusion of mission-focused learning and efforts to sustain LLU's normative culture in the midst of virtual globalization. Within LLUAHSC there continues to be a high priority on placing our shared values at the core of corporate operations. LLUAHSC leadership is committed to uphold and support the philosophy of the Seventh-day Adventist Church in the overall mission and activities of the organization. They further recognize the importance of strategic planning that is guided by foundational commitments to insure institutional integrity— indeed for the first time, strategic planning fully incorporates health care delivery as an integrated function of our campus culture.

Strategic planning is guided by LLUAHSC to insure that all corporate entities, including LLU, plan for a future that embraces and sustains our *normative culture*. LLU, including its Board of Trustees and Officers, is aware that strategic planning must be driven by assessment data. The new OA is fully engaged to support strategic planning with dashboard metrics and research queries to assure that plans for the future are responding to real needs as identified by assessment analytics. Schools have already responded to the heightened focus on assessment and strategic planning linkages in higher education by creating and staffing new positions that are committed to institutional learning, such as the School of Pharmacy's newly created position of Associate Dean for Assessment and Professional Affairs. In Human Resources there is a new focus on core institutional values in the hiring process, when providing new employee orientation, and in conducting employee evaluations. Additionally, school-specific orientations provide a venue to present and clarify the *normative culture* at LLU. We have identified a need to further support a University-wide new faculty orientation. This process was initiated in the Fall of 2004 when Deans selected and ranked topics to be presented to new faculty, including the clarification of the University's mission, vision, and values.

The newly structured systematic program review process provides the oversight to both monitor and facilitate the infusion of MFL. The review process gives an opportunity for programs to be evaluated on their inclusion of MFL through the examination and reflection on the program's mission, outcomes, curriculum maps, and assessment protocols. Co-curricular opportunities to infuse MFL are evident in a newly developed educational strategy that intentionally addresses aspects of *wholeness*, such as Campus Worship, the *wholeness* portal, school portfolios, and required religion classes in three categories—relational, theological, and ethical—for all students.[37]

A special challenge has been our capacity to sustain what we value about the institution as we offer degrees both online and off-campus. To this end, we have adopted a Philosophy of Distance Education to keep at the forefront "the how" of transmitting our values to students who may never have the opportunity to experience the traditional face-to-face interactions that have for over 100 years been at the heart of what makes LLU distinctive. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Philosophy of Distance Education)

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 educational programs. Third, and integral, was to establish processes to strengthen our capacity through campus-wide feedback.

As stated in the Institutional Proposal we chose to engage in institutional research regarding two themes: (a) *Bible-based faith,* and (b) our *normative culture*. A focus group process was used to collect data for both of these research themes. The results of this extensive process revealed the depth and embeddedness of *wholeness* and the University's core values in all aspects of campus life. Subsequently, we now have more clarity in how to support the integration of students' *wholeness* and MFL in their curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular experiences while enrolled at LLU and later as alumni. Among the initiatives which have supported this, Information Systems (IS) and the Center for Spiritual Life and Wholeness have developed a *Wholeness Portal* which will serve as a virtual pathway to a synergism of information, tools, and resources that support achieving a balanced lifestyle. Ultimately, the *Wholeness Portal* will provide the University with a source of usable data to track the growth and development of students toward integrating the principles of *wholeness* and MFL in their lives. It is anticipated that the *Wholeness Portal*

will be implemented for student use as of the fall of 2008.

Because of the strong support for the community dialogue, this approach will continue to be used to support the implementation of the University's new SLOs, assessment of our educational effectiveness, and to further align assessment with institutional strategic planning. Other opportunities to further interdisciplinary dialogue will also be explored at the request of the focus group participants. (See Research Theme Essays, p. 22.)

CFR 4.4: Existing (i.e., University Academic Affairs Committee and school-based structures) and new organizational structures (i.e., Faculty of Graduate Studies, the Educational Effectiveness Committee, and school-based educational effectiveness committees) will continue to understand and integrate systematic evaluation processes to address continuous curricular renewal and improvement. A recent recognition of our over dependence on professional accreditation has led us to a campus-wide assessment commitment including the alignment of our strategic planning with our commitment to assessment and MFL.

The goal of connecting campus-wide assessment and strategic planning prompted the development of the new OA. (See Capacity Building through Assessment, p. 5.) Both existing and new University committees focus their efforts on empowering LLU toward becoming an even stronger learning organization by way of encouraging assessment for the purpose of informed strategic planning. To this end, the UAAC, EEC (subcommittee of the UAAC), OA, and FGS all work together to oversee and coordinate campus-wide assessment. (Appendix – Organizational Charts: Institutional Learning and Capacity Building for Educational Effectiveness Chart) The University's new Assessment Plan provides a framework for these efforts. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: LLU Assessment Plan)

In the past two years we have grown in our understanding and valuing of assessment-driven CQI. The LLU Board of Trustees requested that the Schools present assessment measures to them on an annual basis in the form of summative performance dashboards. Most importantly, LLUAHSC is developing a strategic plan that is driven by assessment analytics, and includes the assessment of educational effectiveness.

CFR 4.5-4.8: University and school administration, faculty, and appropriate stakeholders will continue to develop and disseminate information regarding institutional policies and practices which facilitate the review and improvement of the institution's capacity for institutional research and the systematic utilization of both quantitative and qualitative data for assessing and improving the educational effectiveness. Although many assessment systems have been developed, we continue to build our communication capacity among the academically sound programs that draw their identity from their distinctive disciplines. There has been progress through the use of electronic and committee structures to promote communication. At the core of electronic communications has been the development of a field-driven database that facilitates search features and insures alignment of all University publications dealing with policies and procedures with new information. This has been possible with a newly developed Information Technology infrastructure that is not just "webification" of existing hard copy content, but through a well thought-out plan for information data entry and management developed by the Vice Chancellor for Information Systems. (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: Academic Management System)

Research Themes

Achieving Mission-Focused Learning (MFL). As noted earlier, a desire to insure that MFL remains a core element was prompted in part by our centennial celebrations that highlighted our rich history of embedding service into the education of health care professionals. Seeing the larger picture of the last 100 years of community engaged scholarship and service left us feeling connected and empowered. Representative of this reflection is a statement made by a senior faculty member during her orientation of a group of junior faculty:

> *"You can't be value neutral and be happy at Loma Linda University. If you are value neutral you will not like it here and you'll leave. You'll leave because Loma Linda expects more of you and that's why you came here, because you want to be part of the more. Loma Linda University requires that you engage in emotional transference with it, and you are here because you want to experience emotional transference with Loma Linda University (Simon, 2006)."*

Examples like this one, led us to dedicate time to contemplating the "process at work in extraordinary moments" (Senge, et al., 2004), to consider the differences that exist between the past and present nature of LLU, and to imagine the possibilities of things to come. This dialogue resulted in the need to better understand the factors that sustained, and could significantly alter, the mission and educational philosophy of LLU that we cherish.

Two research themes were chosen to engage LLU constituents in the examination of issues that define and impact the intentional inclusion of MFL in the education of students at LLU. It is believed that the results of these two research efforts, as presented in the following reflective essays, inform and strengthen our institutional commitment to our *normative culture* and make MFL a continuing reality that will be part of LLU for the next 100 years.

Theme 1: Understanding LLU's *Normative Culture.* Many in higher education believe that a shared identity and purpose are critical to the continued success of a University. Most American universities began as religious institutions with the mission of integrating faith and learning. However, few have maintained their religious roots. Many speculate that a mix of striving for outside academic validation and the subsequent recruitment of faculty and enrollment of students from religious communities other than the institution's auspices, have led to identity shifts of these institutions, albeit intentional in some cases and inadvertent in others. As LLU finds itself at an important juncture of substantial institutional growth and change (Appendix – Supplemental Materials: "Organizational Change: From Silos to Community?" Report) the constituents—leadership, faculty, students, and staff—engaged in a discussion about the past, present, and future direction of LLU in light of the shared desire to sustain what is loved about LLU. The goal was to examine our shared understanding of our current *normative culture*, and provide an assessment of its strengths and/or weaknesses, including an examination of the likelihood of an identify shift as LLU intentionally expands its curricular offerings, clinical services, and MFL opportunities locally and around the world. As such, this essay describes the process and results of a six-month qualitative study to explore and better understand the *normative culture* of LLU.

The Philosophical Drift of Universities with Religious Auspices. Most universities define

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 is this latter point that begins our examination. Supporting this study is a brief review of the historical experiences of religious institutions regarding the degree of faith integration and its effect on their philosophy of education and curriculum delivery.

Historical Context. In the mid to late 1700s and through the 1800s, most universities and colleges were founded by churches primarily due to a lack of tax-based public funding for state-run institutions. Many of these first colleges became what are currently referred to as the "Ivy League" schools (Goodlad, 2002). The founding administrators and faculty of these colleges were typically appointed religious leaders.[38] These individuals were responsible for implementing the behavioral and communal standards of the sponsoring faith community (Glanzer, 2008). These standards were reflected in required worship services as well as strict admission policies implemented to assure the goodness of fit of students with institutional purposes (Glanzer, 2008). And, although the educational philosophies of these were based on strong religious foundations, over time most became increasingly secular in their orientation (Glanzer, 2008). Uniquely, and in contrast to this trend, some schools sustained their religious heritage and continued to emphasize the importance of administrators, faculty, staff, and students emulating the core values of the sponsoring faith community.

Furthering one's understanding of the historical transition of universities with religious roots, two different categorizations classify these universities based upon the degree to which faith has been integrated into their mission and curricula. The first categorization created by Robert Benne (2001), is called the "typology of schools." Benne's (2001) typology helps to identify the depth of faith-

integration that universities have embedded in their philosophies and mission statements. Moreover, this typology also aids in explaining how these institutions operationalized their identity, including but not limited to their normative cultures. Benne (2001) classifies institutions into four subsets based upon the institution's integration of faith into its overall philosophy and mission statement: (a) orthodox, (b) critical mass, (c) intentionally pluralist, and (d) accidentally pluralist. According to Glanzer (2008), "as the types move from orthodox to accidentally pluralist, they become more secular or permissive" (p. 169). For instance, unlike the "orthodox" group that required strict adherence by all members, institutions defined as belonging to the "critical mass" type did not insist that all of their members adhere to their or other Christian traditions, as long as their members upheld the institution's standards in academics (Benne, 2001). This category includes a number of American Christian institutions that do not require all students and professors to acknowledge adherence to their respective doctrines (Benne, 2001). The "intentionally pluralist" category describes institutions that mention their Christian heritage, but publicly link the university to more general values such as diversity and social justice (Benne, 2001), while the "accidentally pluralistic" group no longer claims linkage to its religious roots.

The second categorization of universities with religious origins was created by Goodlad (2002). Goodlad (2002) noted that one can, at the risk of oversimplification, "place schools that retain Christian links into one of three types in terms of their Christian identification and affiliation" (p.12)— strong, intermediate, and weak—with respect to clarity of school identity and faith integration. Strong Christian identification and affiliation is defined as, "those that require exacting standards of belief and behavior of their members that proclaim their Christian mission loudly" (p. 12). The intermediate type describes identification and affiliation as "support from Christian churches and that facilitate Christian beliefs and practices as part of their policy" (p. 12). Lastly, weak identification and affiliation is simply an institution "founded by Christians, but is now weakly Christian," if at all (p. 12).

Using either Benne's or Goodlad's categorizations can help an institution recognize how its *normative culture* influences and defines its identity and how it might be unconsciously moving from one category to another. Glanzer (2008) in his comparison of Christian higher education in England with the

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 required. Participants 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 students and faculty/appointment of leaders (i.e., high percent Seventh-day Adventist), and tenure.*

The following focus group questions and probes were noted in the semi-structured outline to assure complete exploration of issues and were explored as the discussions naturally evolved.

- What is LLU's *normative culture*?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses inherent in our *normative culture*?
- Is the LLU concept of *wholeness* connected to our *normative culture*? How well do we individually fulfill the concept of *wholeness*? In what ways do we fall short? What are some examples that truly make us different from other universities?
- Is there a clear connection between our *normative culture* and our Health Message? Historically? At this time?
- How is our *normative culture* linked to our stated commitment to a Christ-centered identity?
- Does it conflict with our stated respect for other world religions among our students on campus, in our international work and in our global mission? Are they congruent?
- How can we avoid the fate of other Christian institutions that have moved away from their religious roots (e.g., Harvard, Emory, Yale, etc.)? Why do you think this happened to them? Is there anything we can learn from their experiences?

Results. As a result of the qualitative analyses six major themes emerged:[39]

- *Normative culture* (definition and meaning in the context of LLU)

- *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 *normative culture*. That said, some individuals within the groups seemed to appreciate the opportunity to confidentially voice their concerns about the University, which suggests that the *normative culture* is not without its own pressures for conformity.

Most groups, whether faculty, staff, or students, initially struggled to define LLU's *normative culture*. Students gave many examples of what they saw as *normative culture* on campus, observing that the University encourages principles, values, and morals and noting that LLU's *normative culture* is seen as one of *wholeness* and commitment to service. Several observed that this included (or should include) adhering to the religious foundations of the Seventh-day Adventist Church, while still welcoming and accepting those from other faith communities. More often than not students noted that faculty and staff were accepting of individuals who were different from faith communities other than the Seventh-day Adventist Church, and felt that they were generally welcomed and valued as individuals. Also identified were various elements seen as making up the *normative culture* on campus, including but not limited to: (a) devotion, (b) prayer, (c) required worship, (d) living a healthy lifestyle, (e) *wholeness*, and (f) overwhelmingly a shared commitment of service to others. Briefly, this commitment to others—"To Make Man Whole," and to act in a Christ-like fashion—was a universal value that seemed to be the shared passion driving all respondents' strong commitment to the University. Service to others as a theme was so strong that regardless of the school of origin, faculty, staff, and students emphasized the centrality of service to others as the personal and professional focus in their lives.

Individuals in some groups believed that there was little shared *normative culture* across the university. Rather, they noted the existence of sub-cultures within each school that stemmed from the "former strong silo orientation." On this point there was generally a consensus that each school has its own unique way of expressing what LLU's *normative culture* is and should be. However, many others disagreed with this observation and felt that there was a definite *normative culture* that overarched the existing sub-cultures in each school. In addition, a number of respondents state that they had already begun to observe a seemingly deliberate change toward a more unified identity—an "us as LLU" vs. "us as LLU School X." It was concluded by some that while a shared *normative culture* had always been somewhat present, the unifying theme was only more recently emergent and therefore was not yet consistent across campus. As a result, individual schools still maintained their own culture for its members. As one staff focus group participant noted, "… I think we are in a state of flux. I think there is a tug of war and [we are] kind of figuring out what is right, what is okay."

Whether it is maintained centrally or occurs within schools, LLU's *normative culture* seems to be intricately tied to the concept of *wholeness*. In each group, participants brought up the subject of *wholeness* before facilitators, and all expressed their approval of LLU's focus on *wholeness*. Faculty, staff, and students alike could define the term in surprisingly similar ways, and the participants in each group expressed a universal desire toward the goal of achieving and encouraging *wholeness*. There were, however, mixed opinions about LLU's consistency in adopting *wholeness* in all areas. Many saw it as a process of ongoing commitment, but one that often fell short of the ideal, especially when it came to the personal and professional lives of the participants. More specifically, many raised concerns that the demands of servant leadership as a part of LLU's *normative culture* directly counteracted their efforts toward achieving personal *wholeness*. Most focus group participants were sincerely struggling to be whole in their personal and professional lives. Many stated that they found it very difficult to find a balance between professional, personal, spiritual, and healthy living, as is meant by the extension of LLU's mission statement "To Make Man Whole." Each of the constituent members noted the following struggles to achieve wholeness:

Students universally noted that while *wholeness* is a crucial part of LLU's *normative culture*, they found it extremely difficult to juggle schoolwork, family responsibilities, spirituality, and healthy living. Many said that they felt discouraged or frustrated because each attempt seemed to end in failure. However, students also noted that faculty were very encouraging and consistently advised them to continue to work toward the goal of *wholeness* regardless of their success rate.

Staff likewise expressed their struggle with incorporating *wholeness* into their personal lives. Many agreed that most professional staff and faculty work long hours and forget about balancing the various areas of their lives. Many were concerned that too often, as a University, we preach *wholeness*, but do not actually practice it. Others described it as an ongoing challenge but pointed to the various opportunities the University offers to incorporate *wholeness* into their lives such as (a) memberships to the Drayson Center; (b) programs encouraging weekend time for family; (c) educational credits; and (d) other educational, social, and spiritual events and activities.

Faculty as well expressed difficulty in incorporating *wholeness* in their personal and professional lives. Faculty discussed how the long hours spent on campus interferes with their personal lives, though at the same time wanting to honestly encourage and portray *wholeness* to their students. Faculty recognized the apparent contradiction of advocating *wholeness* but not practicing it in their own lives. The resulting frustration they attributed to the required academic rigor overlaid coupled with their desire to "do more" for their students.

Despite these noted challenges, many faculty, staff, and students commended the University for advocating *wholeness* and voiced a continued commitment to mirror this value in their interactions with each other.

Most of the focus group participants were aware of a number of dangers inherent in LLU's *normative culture*. A large number of the concerns focused on the potential to take things for granted. For example, it was noted that while everyone at LLU freely offers prayer and LLU offers a Campus Worship experience with required attendance, this is not necessarily sufficient to make LLU a functioning religious institution. Many (students and faculty) attend worship but are not truly "present," using the time for

other activities such as texting, working, socializing, or even resting. Because of this, the majority of the students felt that Campus Worship was not as effective as it could be. A number of students articulated their disappointment with Campus Worship after witnessing this type of behavior. They hoped that in the future the University will revamp Campus Worship services.[40] However, these same students also took the opportunity to provide meaningful suggestions on how to revamp the process. For example, some suggested that Campus Worship should not be required so that only those who truly want to be there attend. Those in attendance would get more out of the Campus Worship service. In contrast, other students felt strongly that it was probably a "good thing" to require Campus Worship attendance to insure that students had exposure to religious/spiritual experiences. Other suggestions included the belief that there should be a dress code at Campus Worship to help instill a sense of devotion and reverence. Students discussed the importance of keeping the Seventh-day Adventist principles, values, and religion alive and prominent on campus. When pressed on how best to accomplish this, many felt it was necessary to have a specific number of Seventh-day Adventist faculty and students on campus in order to keep the *normative culture* alive. Other students agreed with this idea, but also believed it should be expanded to include committed Christians. Only a few students felt that regardless of the religious beliefs that faculty members professed, the best-qualified individuals should be hired, and hiring should not be primarily based on the fact that someone was a Seventh-day Adventist.

Students also noted that Campus Worship attendance alone, without an explicit connection to religion or spirituality, would fall short of what LLU should offer. Thus numerous participants, many of whom were from faith communities other than the Seventh-day Adventist Church, felt strongly that current leadership should recommit to seeking and expressing Adventist values as part of LLU's core values. This was necessary in order to demonstrate an appreciation for LLU's religious identity over secular service commitments and the pursuit of outside acceptance as a quality academic institution. As one faculty member put it, "we have to reinvent ourselves based on our values." Surprisingly, this belief was reiterated by many students who were somewhat puzzled about the relative lack of exposure to the Adventist culture that non-Adventist students receive. Several suggested (tongue in cheek but somewhat seriously) that there should be a required orientation to LLU's *normative*

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 strong commitment to remain anchored to this University's religious foundations and heritage. All felt that sustaining the roots of LLU's *normative culture* as a Seventh-day Adventist Christian University can be done without a loss of perceived academic excellence or "standing" in the face of other institutions of higher education. Challenging the categorization of Benne and Goodlad, in light of Burtchaelle's signs of slippage and secularization, our focus group respondents believe that LLU can maintain its foundational orientation and continue to welcome students, faculty, and staff from other faith communities as long as it remains truly committed to respectful engagement regarding its own core values and principles.

The prospect exists for LLU to even more boldly express its commitment to *wholeness* and service to others as a part of the education of health care professionals and related sciences, while also addressing the desire of campus constituents for increased cross-school engagement and learning. The combination of these factors present opportunities to develop and strengthen the institution's capacity to operationalize MFL. It is evident that the richness of this engagement will further LLU's efforts to move from "silos of excellence" to a "community of shared excellence."

Our research on *normative culture* suggests that LLU's philosophy closely aligns with the views found in the "intentional pluralism" category. Pluralism within many conservative religious groups is considered to be an anathema. Religious pluralism is often thought to be a notion in which all truth is relative, and all views are of equal value. Therefore, pluralism on a distinctly religious campus can be

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] Four of the original 17 SLOs were clearly ranked by faculty as having the greatest priority for further study. Following additional dialogue with the Deans Council, Interschool Faculty Advisory Council (IFAC), University Academic Affairs Committee (UAAC), and the General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee, the Educational Effectiveness Committee (EEC; charged with the development of the Institutional Proposal) decided to limit the initial analysis of the SLOs to one outcome: Develop a Bible-based faith in God relevant to their personal lives and professional ministry. Priority was given to studying this SLO as dialogue with multiple faculty groups revealed substantial ambiguity and emotionally charged frustration regarding the intent of the term Bible-based faith. It was found that faculty's interpretation of the intended meaning of this term varied considerably. The most frequently expressed concern was that the term relayed an undesirable conservative theological orientation that could be translated into an incorrect connotation regarding LLU's organizational and educational purposes. Equally important, the EEC chose to focus on this outcome, as it was perceived as having the furthermost centrality to all aspects of the social and learning environment of LLU. In addition, it was felt that engaging the campus community in a dialogue regarding this SLO would not only offer insight into some extraordinary teachable moments with students, but also provide opportunities for connecting with alumni, as well as support the development of processes where consensus could be challenged by the presence of strong personal beliefs.

Subsequently a six-month intensive focus group dialogue involving all LLU constituent groups (i.e., faculty, staff, students, and leadership) ensued. Procedurally, the process involved the use of campus-wide discussion groups, across the University, to first clarify and then build consensus around the meaning behind the term/s used to describe the intended orientation to the selected SLO. To support this, the discussion was broadened to explore with participants the association and linkage of the term *Bible-based faith* with the University's core values and unique *normative culture*. The following summarizes the procedures used along with the results of this research effort.

   Methods: A modified focus group methodology was used that began with a script delivered via a video podcast in which LLU's Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs explained the importance of the topic and provided instructions for participants. As such, participants also were provided four key questions for group discussion. It was noted that question numbers three and four would require that they participate in a formal vote and the development of a list of alternative wording preferences which could support revising the identified SLO, should that be the final campus consensus. The questions provided to participants were:

1. What do you think is meant by the term *Bible-based faith* in the LLU student learning outcomes?
2. What are examples of ways individuals demonstrate a *Bible-based faith*?

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 interactions with students—something many students as well as faculty and staff refer to as the "special LLU touch"(i.e., access to and time for students to talk to their professors regarding issues ranging from academics, to personal, and to spiritual). All, and especially faculty participants of faith communities other than Seventh-day Adventist, stated that they valued the ability to share their values and beliefs without feeling odd or pressured to do so. All were in agreement that the overall atmosphere and shared value system at LLU was more driven by a Christ-like service orientation than by religious doctrine.

This is not to say that participants did not grapple with letting go of the "Bible-based' wording, even with its varied interpretations. Nearly all acknowledged the importance of having a strong Bible-based foundation. Many stated that LLU should not make apologies or hold back "who we are," but recognize that this is the reason most students choose to attend LLU. Participants also felt that many of our students, while coming from different faiths, attend LLU to find a spiritual, safe home that is organized around transformational values that will impact their professional preparation and future careers. Others pointed out that for many of our off-campus programs in countries with non-Christian cultures, it was important to insure that final wording be inclusive enough to embrace these students without compromising our core identity to serve as "Christ-like." As such, it was noted that "service to others

transcends cultures" and shares what LLU truly represents.

Final Reflections: Notably, the majority of the ardent dissenters who argued for retaining the "Bible-based" language were non-Seventh-day Adventist faculty. These individuals felt strongly that there was "nothing wrong" with the term and that it should not concern us if some disliked the phrase, as it clearly represented the institution's position with respect to doctrine. In summary, participants supported SLO language that emphasized a strong Christian foundation, embraced Christ-like values, and demonstrated commitment to service and the concept of *wholeness*.

Concluding Essay

In the years to come the learning that has and continues to take place on our campus is likely to be regarded as a notable period of transformational and organizational growth in our history. We now build upon the activities and accomplishments of the capacity review process to address the requirements needed to insure our ability to demonstrate educational effectiveness. Although we consider our institution to be one capable of self-evaluating and intentionally progressive in ways that have led to substantial change, we now realize that this is likely to reveal the need for yet more profound and introspective engagement. This emphasis on learning within the organization reflects our commitment to continuous quality improvement (CQI) and is directly associated with our need to strengthen the University's culture of evidence within the context of moving towards a "community of shared excellence." This effort as having three major foci: (a) strengthening our infrastructure to conduct assessment across diverse academic environments, (b) further implementing SLOs that embrace both the shared and diverse academic nature of the programs, and (c) infusing assessment results into our strategic planning, for CQI in support of our mission. The following outlines our plan:

Strengthening the assessment infrastructure across diverse academic environments.

Expansion of the understanding of our normative culture. Building on the learning derived from our organizational research, we recognize the need to learn how to capitalize on the richness of our shared understanding and appreciation for the mission and purposes of LLU. We did not know the depth to which our University community shared in their

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 reside with schools and programs, we intentionally chose to develop systems that would not only strengthen the previous capacity, but also promote institution-wide learning that can only be achieved through University-wide assessment. Thus far, this effort has required the University to develop a vision for changing existing processes and to put forth considerable resources, including hardware and software, as well as personnel with sufficient expertise to develop and deploy these operations.

Action Plan. To further what has been accomplished thus far we must proceed to: (a) develop consistency in the use of shared academic definitions (e.g., what constitutes a distinct degree program, or how do we consistently calculate full-time faculty within a diverse clinical context); (b) establish coherence between the academic system

(Banner™), the human resources system (PeopleSoft™), and multiple existing clinical tracking systems (varied approaches) that count faculty numbers differently; (c) procure external consultation to assist in a review of campus-wide data processes and related issues, and to provide recommendations to address the alignment of the University's data needs with strategic planning to sustain its mission and purposes; (d) continue to refine our business processes and re-engineer to support systematic program review and record keeping (e.g., document flow and online management systems); (e) expand faculty development using activities that strengthen capacity (i.e., the advising and utilization of new academic systems to support assessment); (f) realize the maximum potential of the Centennial Complex as a global gateway that facilitates a University-wide shared learning environment that supports institutional learning as well as the enhanced capacity for life-long learning through coordinated continuing education activities; and (g) continue to invest the needed financial resources to complete software design and infrastructure development.

Implementing University-wide SLOs and furthering systematic program review. A major shift from our original proposal was the perceived need to develop a framework for campus-wide assessment activities that are focused on the centrality of *mission-focused learning*. Although this added considerable effort to an already full capacity review agenda, we believe a correct choice was made in prioritizing the building of an infrastructure from which University-wide assessment could occur.

Action Plan. Prior to the Educational Effectiveness Review visit we will continue to refine and implement the Assessment Plan over the next 18 months. This will further enhance the University's capacity to evaluate if we are achieving our SLOs. In addition, we will continue with the original schedule, as outlined in the Institutional Proposal, to execute the systematic program review cycles for all University programs.

Infusing assessment results to support strategic planning and continuous quality improvement. We believe that new senior leadership has revolutionized the institution's approach to strategic planning with *mission-focused learning* at the foundation. This will enable Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC) to pursue a shared vision for the institution's future. A high priority will be placed on reflecting our core

values in all corporate operations—indeed for the first time, comprehensive strategic planning is an integrated function of our campus culture.

   Action Plan. Assessment results will be used to inform the new LLUAHSC strategic planning process. As a part of this process, attention will be given to documenting where assessment results are used to drive continuous quality improvement. Our online assessment matrix will allow us to track program changes, including any that result at the University, school, or program levels. The achievements of this process will be evaluated for their impact on *mission-focused learning* and our capacity to realize educational effectiveness.

In conclusion, the assessment process, development of capacity, and quality improvement initiatives have required considerable effort and commitment, but the results achieved are regarded both as essential and as invigorating for our institution. The lessons learned from these experiences have allowed us to expand our own development as mature learners, committed to the transparency of our processes, and the need for critical self-assessment of our strengths and challenges. We also recognize our need to continue this valuable journey.

Endnotes

[1] *Mission-focused learning* (MFL) combines the best traditions of an outcomes-based education and learning by doing, with service to community. MFL combines the goals of "service-learning" with those of selfless volunteerism; it is motivated by the example of Jesus Christ who lived to bring hope, healing and happiness to mankind. LLU's commitment to MFL derives from its belief that learning transforms lives. The greatest transformation comes through selfless service to others. This reinforces our core values and encourages civic responsibility within communities. MFL, as well as service learning, utilize experiences that originate and grow from contemplation on the meaning of events; clinical approaches; the needs of others; and the development of skills and knowledge to create a healthier society and world. MFL is a learning approach that looks for, and plans for, "teachable moments" where theory and practical reality come together in "ah-ha" moments. LLU is committed to providing an approach to higher education that blends the professional with the personal and where graduates approach their health care profession not as a mere job, but as a calling to service. Such learning brings a truer understanding of our core values, builds character, and brings meaning to the saying "who you are is more important than what you know." Through MFL we prepare students for a dedicated life-long journey of service to all mankind.

[2] This added examination later supported the revision of all of LLU's SLOs.

[3] The Seventh-day Adventist Church owns and operates the largest Protestant health care and educational delivery system in the world, and LLU is often referenced as the flagship of this system. LLU is known for its health care leadership in many disciplines and is considered one of the major academic medical centers on the west coast. A recent presentation to the LLU Board of Trustees by noted economist John Husing, highlighted LLU's positive impact on the regional economy at two billion dollars annually.

[4] As the EEC moved forward to implement the Institutional Proposal, it was found necessary to increase the input of campus constituents as well as attend to the multifaceted nature of the Committee's charter. Subsequently, three subcommittees—Research Themes, Program Review, and Capacity Review—were created and populated with representatives from all schools. In the case of the Capacity Review Subcommittee, members represented all of the central administrative and student services on campus.

[5] The following entities have endorsed the University's SLOs to ensure that they are understood and integrated into curricular, co-curricular, and extra curricular programs: LLU Board of Trustees, University Leadership Council, Interschool Faculty Advisory Council, Chancellor's Committee, Dean's Council, University Officers, University Academic Affairs Committee, Academic Deans Council, Assessment Committee, student leaders who have been exposed to the revised LLU SLOs through their membership on central academic committees, and faculty who have been given the new LLU SLOs at faculty meetings and via the standardized online syllabi. In addition, the SLOs are posted on the Office of Assessment and Institutional Learning web site.

[6] http://myllu.llu.edu/apps/acadman/programs/
[7] http://www.llu.edu/assessment/

[8] Methodological refinement with the Wholeness Inventory (WI) led to revisions between 2001 and 2005. Differences in school-specific response rates limits comparative study, and these concerns continue to be addressed with progress toward a comprehensive data collection system.

[9] Interschool Faculty Advisory Council (IFAC) - http://www.llu.edu/llu/ifac/

[10] Office of Academic Affairs - http://www.llu.edu/academicaffairs/

[11] ChapelCasts - http://www.llu.edu/llu/chaplain/chapelcasts

[12] In the Institutional Proposal the primary focus on student learning outcomes was the research study related to the Bible-based faith. Although it was known that some attention would be given to the revision of LLU's 17 original student learning outcomes, the effort summarized here goes far beyond what was originally conceptualized.

[13] University Student Learning Outcomes, p. 3.

[14] *LLU Faculty Handbook* - http://www.llu.edu/llu/handbook/facultyhandbook/
[15] Office of Community Partnerships and Diversity - http://www.llu.edu/llu/diversity/

[16] Center for Health Disparities and Molecular Medicine - http://www.llu.edu/llu/medicine/chdmm/

[17] *LLU University Catalog* - http://myllu.llu.edu/apps/publications/view_pub.php

[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] University Assessment Committee -
http://www.llu.edu/assessment/assessmentcommittee.html

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

[28] Course Articulations -
http://myllu.llu.edu/apps/acadman/articulation_schools.php

[29] The Sun Never Sets on LLU (global map) -
http://llu.edu/assessment/globalmap.html

[30] Centennial Complex - http://llu.edu/centennial/complex/

[31] Office of Assessment - http://www.llu.edu/assessment

[32] LLU Blackboard™ -
https://lluonline.llu.edu/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp

[33] LLU Helpdesk - http://www.llu.edu/llu/lluis/support.html

[34] LLU Telehealth - http://www.llu.edu/telehealth/about.html

[35] Educational Support Services - http://www.llu.edu/llu/ess/

[36] Student Services - http://www.llu.edu/ssweb/

[37] Center for Spiritual Life and Wholeness -
http://www.llu.edu/llu/wholeness/

[38] The nexus between colleges and churches continued even after the establishment of land grant colleges under the Morrell Act of 1862 (Burtchaell, 1998; Goodlad, 2002), which provided homesteaders with 40-acre allotments to form colleges emphasizing agricultural and related community development.

[39] These themes are discussed in more detail in the complete report that will be available in the Evidence Room during the October 2008 site visit.

[40] Note: the groups were done during the Fall quarter. Since then a new more formal Campus Worship curriculum has been implemented. We will be exploring how this may have changed students' opinions on this issue.

[41] At the time of the Faculty Colloquium it had not yet been determined that prioritizing and focusing on select SLOs was preferred over revising all of the SLOs simultaneously.

From humble beginnings (the original Loma Linda Sanitarium)…

In The Impossible Dream:
Railway to the Moon (Cheatham, et al., 2005), the University recounts decade-by-decade a history that includes crisis, survival, giant leaps, a new name, and a new century in a new millennium. The history of LLU is more than a record of past events; it is the memories that live, the dreams that become reality, the hope that builds success. It is about dedicated students, alumni, faculty, staff and administrators, whose service to humanity has left a positive impact on our planet.

...to a state-of-the-art teaching and learning environment (Centennial Complex)

REFERENCES

Argote, L. (2005). *Organizational learning: Creating, retaining and transferring knowledge.* New York: Springer.

Benne, R. (2001). *Quality with soul: How six premier colleges and universities keep faith with their religious traditions.* Grand Rapids, MI: Erdmans.

Brandon, D. P., & Hollingshead, A. B. (2004). Transactive memory systems in organizations: Matching tasks, expertise, and people. *Organization Science, 15*(6), 633-644.

Burtchaell, T. J. (1998). *The dying of the light: The disengagement of colleges and universities from their Christian Churches.* Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans.

Cheatham, W. A., et al. (2005). *The impossible dream: Railway to the moon.* Boise, ID: Pacific Press.

Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods, 4*(1), 62-83.

Davie, G. (2002). *Europe: The exceptional case: Parameters of faith in the modern world.* London: Darton, Longman &Todd.

Glanzer, P. L. (2008). Search for the soul of English universities: An exploration and analysis of Christian higher education in England. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, *56(2)*, 163-183.

Goodlad, S. (2002). *Christian universities and colleges: A conceptual inquiry.* Retrieved on June 14, 2008, from http://www.episcopalchurch.org/53810_62306_ENG_Print.html.

Hodson, R. (2004). Organizational trustworthiness: Findings form the population of organizational ethnographies. *Organization Science, 15*(4), 432-445.

Husted, B. W., & Folger, R. (2004). Fairness and transaction costs: The contribution of organizational justice theory to an integrative

model of economic organization. *Organization Science, 15*(6), 719-729.

Lick, D. W. (2005). A new perspective on organizational learning: Creating learning teams. *Evaluation & Program Planning, 29*(1), 88-96.

Orthner, D. K., Cook, P., Sabah, Y., & Rosenfeld, J. (2005). Organizational learning: A cross-national pilot-test of effectiveness in children's' services. *Evaluation & Program Planning, 29*, 70-78.

Senge, P., Scharmer, C. O., Jaworski, J., & Flowers, B. S. (2004). *Presence: An exploration of profound change in people, organizations, and society.* New York: Doubleday Publishing. Society for Organizational Learning.

Simon, D. (May, 2006). *Personal communication.* Department of Social Work and Social Ecology Curriculum Committee, Loma Linda University. Loma Linda, CA.

Spector, J. M., & Davidsen, P. I. (2006). How can organizational learning be modeled and measured? *Evaluation & Program Planning, 29*(1), 63-69.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Szulanski, G., Cappetta, R., & Jensen, R. J. (2004). When and how trustworthiness matters: Knowledge transfer and the moderating effect of causal ambiguity. *Organization Science, 15*(5), 600-613.

Umphress, E. E., et al. (2003). The role of instrumental and expressive social toes in employees' perceptions of organizational justice. *Organization Science, 14*(6), 738-753.

White, E. (2008). *Institutional change: From silos to community.* Loma Linda University 1998-2008. Report conducted for 2008 WASC self-study.

INDEX