

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

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