

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1A. Institutional Context Statement</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1B. Institutional Mission Statement</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1C. Responses to 1999 WASC Recommendations</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Description of Outcomes to Support <i>Mission-Focused Learning</i></b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3. Constituency Involvement</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Approach for the Preparatory Review</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6. Workplan and Milestones for CPR</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>7. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>8. Proposal Data Tables</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>9. Off-campus and Distance Education Degree Programs</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>10. Institutional Stipulations</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Appendix A: Organizational Charts</b>	
<b>Appendix B: Professional Accreditation Agencies</b>	
<b>Appendix C: Wholeness Inventory</b>	
<b>Appendix D: Report on New Proposals / Awards</b>	
<b>Appendix E: Willed-Body Program Dedication Service</b>	
<b>Appendix F: Diversity Rubric</b>	
<b>Appendix G: Centennial Events</b>	
<b>Appendix H: One Hundred Dollar Value Chart</b>	
<b>Appendix I: Data Exhibits (Summary Data Form and Tables)</b>	
<b>Appendix J: On-Campus, Off-Campus, and Distance Education Degree Programs</b>	
<b>Appendix K: References</b>	

### **1A. Institutional Context Statement**

Loma Linda University is a Seventh-day Adventist coeducational health sciences university located in Loma Linda, California, 60 miles east of Los Angeles. Founded under the name College of Medical Evangelists by the Seventh-day Adventist church in 1905, the original schools of Nursing and Medicine have been joined over the years by Allied Health Professions, Dentistry, Public Health, Pharmacy, Science and Technology, Faculty of Graduate Studies, Faculty of Religion, and Library Faculty. In 1961 Loma Linda University was recognized as heir to the accreditation attached to the College of Medical Evangelists. Loma Linda University merged with La Sierra College (in Riverside, California) in 1967. The two campuses were defined as operationally separate for accreditation purposes from 1972-1976, after which it was accredited as a single unit in 1977. As the Loma Linda and Riverside campuses grew apart with differences in purpose (health sciences versus liberal arts), it became increasingly difficult to manage University-wide academic and financial planning, governance, and physical distance. This led to an action of probation by WASC in 1989. The two campuses separated into two independent entities, Loma Linda University and La Sierra University and in 1992, probation was removed and accreditation was reaffirmed for Loma Linda University. With its purpose refocused as a health sciences university, this returned the University to its 1905 founding mission in the healing professions. Accreditation was reaffirmed in 1999 for 10 years. The Capacity Review is scheduled for 2008, and the Educational Effectiveness Review for 2010.

In 1997 Loma Linda 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. Six LLUAHSC Institutes give opportunities for synergy to develop between educational, clinical, and research endeavors. A substantive change document was submitted to WASC, which clarified the nature of this corporate restructuring. Today Loma Linda University remains an integral part of LLUAHSC. The contributions of each component of the Center are summarized as follows:

First, Loma Linda University has primary responsibility for structuring and facilitating the activities and processes of the learning environment to support the education and research pursued by students, faculty, and staff in the various health science schools. Bridging the academic activities of all schools, the Faculty of Religion, Faculty of Graduate Studies, and Library Faculty foster the spiritual and ethical growth of students, and oversee graduate programs, and library services respectively. Three University Centers help to integrate the activities of select schools. (See organizational charts in Appendix A)

Current campus census figures indicate 1616 total faculty, comprised of 1276 (79%) full-time, 340 (21%) part-time (largely clinicians in the professional curricula, volunteers not included), for a total of 1389.3 faculty FTE. As of the Fall Quarter 2005, there was a total enrollment of 3906 students, including 1003 (25.7%) undergraduates, 1233 (31.6%) graduate students, 1278 (32.7%) professional students, 28 (0.7%) post-baccalaureate non-graduate students, and 364 (9.3%) non-degree students, for a total FTE of 3429.93. The 2005-2006 LLU Catalog lists over 150 programs. Thirty-six specialized accrediting agencies support the professional requirements of programs at LLU (see Appendix B). Graduates are eligible to take the qualifying examinations of the respective state and national licensing or registration bodies, and to join professional organizations.

Second, Loma Linda University Medical Center and its affiliate entities provide the core clinical facilities for the University. The rich continuum of clinical offerings give health professional students exposure to a comprehensive array of clinical rotations and enable the clinical faculty to model the delivery of excellent health care in clinical learning environments underpinned by the University's emphasis on "whole person care". These learning resources include the comprehensive tertiary facilities of the University Medical Center, the Children's Hospital, the reorganized East Campus Rehabilitation, Orthopaedic, and Neurological care facilities, the Behavioral Medicine Center (providing both inpatient and outpatient care), as well as outpatient support services including but not limited to mental health clinics and psychological services, home health services, adult day care and other ambulatory services.

Complementing these resources are the two clinics under the auspices of the School of Dentistry, the School of Medicine clinical faculty practice offices, and the University's network of low-income community clinics known as Social Action Community Health System (SACHS). The remaining corporations include Loma Linda University Health Care, Loma Linda University Health Services (overseeing institutional services such as Human Resources and the Foundation), and the Loma Linda University School of Medicine Faculty Practice Groups.

### **1B. Institutional Mission Statement**

As a Christian health sciences institution, Loma Linda University 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 to the present day 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*". God is the creator and sustainer of the universe; mankind's fullest development entails a growing understanding of the individual in relation both to God and society; and the quest for truth and professional expertise, in an environment permeated by religious values, benefits the individual and society and advances the healing and teaching ministry of Jesus Christ. These tenets guide the *mission-focused learning* and service purposes of LLU (i.e., Loma Linda University is to be a place for health-professional education; priority is to be given to the promotion of health and the prevention of illness; and service is to include ministry not only to the physical, mental and emotional, but also to the spiritual needs of human beings).

Central to our understanding of *mission-focused learning* is our ability to provide experiences which offer "teachable moments" which enable our students to integrate our core institutional values thereby transforming their personal lives and professional practice. The fundamental mission-driven values that shape our students' lives in these ways are:

- 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.

In the past year, Loma Linda University celebrated its centennial. From its small beginnings over 100 years ago, *mission-focused learning* has influenced the achievements of the University. The University has enjoyed wide-spread recognition for being a leader in the field of health-sciences education, research, and service (p. B1-2, WASC 1998 Self-Study). It is noteworthy that many of our graduates have been involved with, or committed their lives, to self-less international service.

As presented in *The Impossible Dream: Railway to the Moon* (Cheatham et al., 2005) the University recounts decade-by-decade a history that includes crisis and survival, giant leaps, a new name, and a new century in a new millennium. The history of Loma Linda University is more than a record of past events, it is the memories that live, the dreams that are reality, the hope that built success...it is about dedicated

students, alumni, faculty, staff and administration, whose service to humanity have left a positive impact upon our planet.

Because of the rich and personal nature of our history, this self-study proposes to inform and strengthen institutional commitment to make *mission-focused learning*, including the centrality of our core values, a continuing reality that will propel the normative culture of Loma Linda University for the next 100 years. Although we have made progress in our institutional learning over the past eight years, the serious reflections afforded by our centennial celebrations tells us that our own ontology is laced with “hitherto unimagined realms of ignorance”—and we view this as a challenge for our capacity to sustain what we cherish about our institution. The challenge is our capacity to fully understand LLU’s normative culture so we can share the campus environment to a world we increasingly access through technology. Particularly, the institution’s mission, as we understand it, depends on affective and repetitive expressions of ideas experienced through relationships with one another. We are aware that the expression and development of these relationships, or normative culture moments, reinforce our relationship with our Creator—an experience so central to our mission. As an institution we are committed to a Bible-based faith, a biblically informed world-view as defined by our mission to further the healing and teaching ministry of Jesus Christ *to make man whole*, and our commitment to the values that emanate from faith, hope and love. To this end, the self-study process will further our review and understanding of *mission-focused learning*, and provide opportunities for organizational research that will inform and sustain our educational effectiveness.

### **1C. Responses to 1999 WASC recommendations**

There follows a list of WASC *recommendations* and bulleted University responses from the 1999 WASC re-accreditation.

*The team finds “evidence that instructional assessment and evaluation of student outcomes take place in the various schools and individual programs” and many are exemplary.*

- A new University Educational Effectiveness Committee was formed in October 2005. This committee is charged with systematic campus-wide program review, and minutes are evidence
- Strategic Planning documents are available that demonstrate planning and development of institutional research
- The Dean of Students position restructured to Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Services resulting in broader capacity and oversight of integrated student processes
- Other areas that have a direct impact on student learning outcomes include migration to a common LLU catalog, upgrade to Banner™, EMAS™ Contact Management System, Singularity™ document imaging system, and university-wide site license for Oracle™ database
- Improved access to web-related student services; increase in “hits” from 44K per day in 2005 to over 114K per day twelve months later

*The Commission encourages LLU to maintain and expand its efforts not only to assess student outcomes but to evaluate as well the effectiveness of co-curricular programs, faculty governance, organizational structures, and research activities.*

- *Co-curricular programs*: Student Affairs developed materials that included content on LLU’s mission; information is provided to students about SIMS, CAPS, HOPE, Tutoring; the Wholeness Inventory is used to assess students relative to co-curricular activities (Appendix C); and the International Behavioral Health Trauma Team makes opportunities available to advanced behavioral health students
- *Faculty governance*: Faculty Colloquia, IFAC, and the recently formed Faculty of Graduate Studies, as evidenced by minutes and records of events
- *Organizational structures*: A revised organization chart indicating new positions including the Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and Vice Chancellor for Research Affairs; a shift in responsibilities for the Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs (a constituency report also catalogs these changes); and a newly formed Department of Educational Support Services

- *Research activities*: Under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Research Affairs, the Constituency Report documents our continuing progress in tracking research activities
- Since the last WASC Self-Study there has been a significant increase in extramural research funding that has increased the opportunities and rigor of graduate studies
- The Office of Sponsored Research Report of New Proposals/Awards as listed in Appendix D

*LLU should keep in mind that it is not this activity [wholeness inventory] in itself that is important but the way in which the results are applied toward improving the overall effectiveness of the institution. According to the team, LLU's assessment efforts are "comprehensive and becoming more cohesive". The Commission views this time as a unique opportunity for LLU to see how its assessment process can facilitate improved educational effectiveness and decision-making, especially in light of the fact that LLU has indicated a planned shift from a "teaching-centered" institution to a "learning-centered" one. The Commission anticipates that integrating systematic assessment data into the decision-making process will continue to assist the faculty and administration in achieving their expressed joint goal of becoming a learning-centered institution.*

- Review by University Academic Affairs Committee using a new program proposal template has increased awareness of University's stated outcomes
- Methodological refinement with the Wholeness Inventory (WI) led to revisions between 2001 and 2005; differences in school-specific response rates make it difficult to formulate comparisons; and these concerns continue to be addressed with progress toward a comprehensive data collection system
- Top rated items in the WI indicate for all years administered, the highest rated item contributing to students' sense of wholeness is that faculty show respect for students; the low ratings for the weekly chapel experience resulted in a change of time to 11:00 a.m. with improved participation by students, faculty, staff, and administration; and greater selectivity in quality of speakers and music

*The Commission notes the team's observation that "the faculty and administration at LLU take seriously their commitment to high standards of teaching and scholarship".*

- The institution continues to receive external validation through board licensure and certification exams
- In 2003 the School of Medicine Clinical Skills Education Office purchased WebSP, a web-based data collection program which facilitates collection of data for assessment of students' clinical skills; in 2005 this was updated to include digital video capture and storage to an on-campus server; this facilitates creation of a digital portfolio for faculty and student review of data and video, tracking progress of clinical skills including professionalism, communication and clinical skills
- In 2006 the Medical Simulation Center opened with adult, child and infant full body simulators, part-task trainers, and computer-based clinical case scenarios; the center will provide a realistic learning and assessment environment which will enhance technical skills as well as team-building scenarios

*The concept of wholeness as espoused by the University manifests itself throughout the curriculum but particularly on the general education component of the undergraduate programs. This is particularly impressive in light of the fact that the undergraduate programs at LLU are professional health programs.*

- The published aim of general education is to produce graduates who value and provide competent, compassionate care to individuals with diverse capabilities from varied cultural, ethnic, gender, generational, socioeconomic, and workplace perspectives while recognizing the commonality of all people
- "Willed-Body" Program Dedication Services as coordinated by the Department of Pathology and Human Anatomy, School of Medicine (Appendix E)

*The Commission also observed that “the broader General Education perspectives which are so critical, and yet so often missing in professional preparation at the graduate level, are embedded” in the medical and dental curriculum as well. The Commission commends this forward looking perspective. This is an opportunity for the University to analyze how this campus-wide commitment to its mission of wholeness affects the curriculum and to determine what impact it has on the students themselves.*

- A summary of the Wholeness Inventory is available, complete with PowerPoint™ presentation files for years 2000-2004 PowerPoint™; the files comprise a hyper-linked presentation of eight separate files; these files are made available to the University community to use in custom reports and presentations which may be more focused than the parameters of the WI reports; the slides are in the PowerPoint™ format so that the graphs and charts can be copied into other reports.
- There is general education coursework embedded into the curriculum to continue the students learning across disciplines giving them opportunity to grow and have a more wholistic view of society; courses include: Communication and Documentation, HIV/AIDS and the Health Provider, Computer Application, World Religions, Aspects of Health Promotion, Christian Ethics, and others

*As the University moves “from a ‘teaching institution’ to a ‘learning institution,’” the Commission anticipates that institutional processes and structures will be examined and evaluated. This “evolution will require (evaluation) by the faculty of traditional teaching methods ... [and] challenge the faculty to engage in dialogue and educational innovation” as well as to explore new computing/information technology and learning resources for on and off-campus programs. [And] The Commission suggests that LLU examine carefully how it will make the transition to a learning institution and who will provide the leadership to enable it to meet the need for computing/information technology that will serve the academic needs of students, faculty and staff both on- and off-campus.[significant overlap warranted joining the responses for these two recommendations]*

- New hires in Vice Chancellor for Information Systems, and Director of Educational Support Services in July 2004 consistent with strategic planning documents
- Media Services was reorganized into the Department of Educational Support Services with additional responsibilities for assistance with the integration of technology into traditional classroom and online presentations (<http://www.llu.edu/llu/ess/>)
- Since 1999 the University has used Blackboard™, and in 2004 a new portal powered by Blackboard™ was deployed to give access to courses, organizations (committees), and campus resources; noteworthy is the ability to communicate minutes, agendas and documents from all committees to all university constituents, and the availability of on-line discussion forums (<http://lluonline.llu.edu>)
- All classes (N>1000) referenced in Banner (except independent studies) are now supported by the Blackboard Academic Suite™ learning management system (<http://lluonline.llu.edu>)
- A new hire to facilitate faculty support in the use of the Blackboard™ learning management system (<mailto:bbsupport@llu.edu> or phone extension 87637)
- New faculty orientation sessions were initiated in 2004, and agendas give evidence of sessions devoted to instructional technologies available to faculty
- In 2005 a new web content management system was deployed to facilitate distributed administration and timely updates of the University’s web content that is publicly available (<http://www.llu.edu/CMS/login.php>)
- For the 2004-05 Faculty Annual Reports cycle, the University switched from hard copy to online completion and submission; this now permits linkage of annual report data to web-based faculty profiles and data mining for institutional reports (<http://www.llu.edu/llu/faculty/directory/edit/login.php>)
- Syllabus guidelines (template) with links to university-wide policies were made available on faculty and staff portal in 2005 (<http://lluonline.llu.edu>)
- The University’s network increased connectivity from about 6MB/s to more than 30MB/s with the acquisition of a T3 in 2005; and the University’s network operates on a 100 MB/s backbone, with access to 1GB/s in some areas

## LLU WASC Proposal, page 6

- In 2004 the University deployed its first wireless network in the Webb Memorial Library; wireless access is now available campus-wide in most common student areas; the network is restricted to LLU&MC affiliated users and provides non-encrypted access to the Internet and SSL enabled LLU servers such as llonline, webmail, ssweb and catalog
- Educational Support Services facilitated synergy between school-specific course developers, instructional designers and educational support specialists; support personnel from the schools of Public Health, Nursing, and Medicine are located in adjoining office suites with personnel from the Blackboard™ learning management system
- In August 2005 a new event management system (EMS) for facilities and services scheduling was deployed; EMS links to a number of University and school-specific master calendars to communicate scheduled events to all constituents via the University's portal
- In April 2006 the University signed a contract with Turning Technologies™ to be the preferred provider of audience response systems; the "clickers" are now available to admissions committees for anonymous voting, faculty for formative assessment of learning outcomes, and other presenters desiring audience participation
- In 2005 the anti-plagiarism plug-in Safe Assignment™ was added to the features of our learning management system (Blackboard™)
- In 2004 Soft Chalk Lesson Builder™, a plug-in for Blackboard™ was deployed; this tool permits interactive instruction and assessment, and SCORM analysis in on-line courses
- Since 2004, Educational Support Services has installed "smart" lecture podium or conference table technology in over 40 rooms; this gives "pull-plug-play" access to power, RGB to ceiling mounted LCD or DLP projectors, network, sound, DVD/VHS players
- In April 2006, a site license for CourseEval3™ (Academic Management Systems) was acquired to permit university-wide web-based evaluations of courses, instructors, student services, and surveys such as this year's Wholeness Inventory
- The University continues to expand its capacity to deliver via teleconferencing its continuing education, degree and certificate programs to off-campus sites; and through realignment of audio visual technician responsibilities, a videoconferencing coordinator is now available to support the University's three on-site teleconference facilities that average 20-30 contact hours/week
- In April 2006 a new hire was made to develop the University's capacity to deliver streaming media to support online delivery of weekly chapel programs and course content
- In 2005 the University made two new full-time hires to support a central IT helpdesk; faculty and staff call IT611, M-F, 8-5, with their hardware and software support needs; all requests are tracked and followed up with a web-based survey to insure quality of service

*The Commission has long recognized that one key learning resource for academic excellence is an institution's library system and its library holdings. This resource is highly regarded at Loma Linda as an essential element in maintaining the quality of its teaching, learning and services missions. The Commission notes the visiting team's observation that funding for the Library, as well as for some aspects of technology support and development, has been decentralized. The University is encouraged to evaluate the results of this decentralization in order to ensure that the "shape of the whole is desirable and that the whole serves well all of its part".*

- Funding for the library budget is now provided by an assessment paid to central administration by the various schools; this move has added stability to the funding source and library operations
- Spending on library resources has increased 58% over the last 10 years
- The number of journal titles has increased 87% over the last 10 years due to the addition of multiple electronic packages
- Remote access is available for all electronic resources; on-campus and off-campus through authentication protocols
- The Library was the first building to provide wireless access throughout building
- Plans are underway to renovate current space to include a technology-rich Information Commons
- Additional group study rooms are being built
- Numerous site licenses provide access to specialized software applications such as GIS

The Commission commends Loma Linda University for the significant progress that has been made in addressing diversity. The team indicates that “there has been a flurry of activity on the LLU campus in addressing this (diversity) recommendation that speaks to the strong commitment the trustees and LLU have made to diversity issues”. The Commission applauds LLU for its efforts to date and encouraged LLU to continue its strong commitment to diversity, to build on its successes in this area, and to evaluate how its diversity program has affected the lives of students, faculty, and staff. The Commission suggests that LLU incorporate the findings of this assessment into its next report to the Commission.

- Loma Linda University intends that its graduates relate to all people with the same caring, compassion, and competence without regard to origin, religion, gender, or any other differences seen among individuals; the General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee believes that this goal can be best accomplished by recognizing both the diversity and the commonality of individuals; and it is the recommendation of the General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee that these differences and similarities among people be addressed in a variety of didactic and practicum experiences throughout the undergraduate curriculum. Purposeful efforts to incorporate such knowledge within a program’s curriculum may be documented in lieu of a single cultural diversity course. General education requirements include one course (or components integrated into several courses) dealing specifically with issues of human diversity
- The General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee actions show rigorous review of applications by those program’s requesting that the general education requirement for one class be replaced by diversity components integrated into several courses; a curriculum rubric (Appendix F) for diversity is available as an analytical tool to review a curriculum for understanding diversity
- Many schools, either as program or course requirements, have students (and faculty) visit the Museum of Tolerance; individual reflective essays may be required as in the case of the School of Allied Health Professions portfolio program or MSW Policy Administration program (<http://www.museumoftolerance.com>)
- School of Allied Health Professions “Lunch Power” sessions provide a forum for diversity and cultural sensitivity presentations
- National Benchmarks (10 years) AAMC Graduating Senior Survey show significant results, AAMC site team visited the School of Medicine to gain a better understanding of learning context leading to superior results in the areas of ethics and preparedness for residency programs
- Faculty mentoring during clinical rotations provide “teachable moments” guiding student understanding of themselves

**2. Description of Outcomes to Support *Mission-Focused Learning***

To further our understanding and successful implementation of *mission-focused learning* we propose the following institutional outcomes for this accreditation cycle:

PROJECTED INSTITUTIONAL OUTCOMES	CR (Fall 2008)	EE Review (Spring 2010)
Complete CFR internal review of programs with professional or specialized accreditation	LLU UEEC will review programs consistent with established review cycles	LLU UEEC will review programs consistent with established review cycles
Complete CFR internal review of programs lacking specialized accreditation	LLU UEEC will use establish review criteria to implement program review	LLU UEEC will review and complete evaluation of all programs without specialized accreditation
Theme 1: Sustaining the Normative Culture 1. Development of measures which inform the sustainability of the normative culture and organizational learning of LLU 2. Implementation of reliable measures which can be systematically applied as part of the decision support system of LLUAHSC.	Fall 2006: Complete data collection protocols  Winter 2007: Data collection and analysis of main unit and subunits  Fall 2008: Interpretation of findings, formation, and implementation of systematic measures	Implementation and integration of normative measures into LLUAHSC decision support system  Evaluation and presentation of two-years of institutional data



<p>Theme 2: Integrating a Bible-based Faith</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Develop and implement reliable measures which can be systematically applied as part of the decision support system of LLUAHSC.</li> <li>2. Develop and implement a case study database to be used as part of institutional methods for determining educational effectiveness</li> </ol>	<p>Fall 2006: Complete data collection protocols</p> <p>Winter 2007: Data collection and analysis</p> <p>Fall 2008: Interpretation of findings, formation, and implementation of systematic measures</p>	<p>Implementation and integration of reliable measures into LLUAHSC decision support system</p> <p>Evaluation and presentation of two years of institutional data</p>
---	--	---

### **3. Constituency Involvement**

The University continues to challenge itself to be a learning-centered institution. Our institutional familiarity with terms such as *learning outcomes*, *outcomes assessment*, *educational effectiveness*, and *alignment* have been reinforced by WASC, the 36 separate health professions accreditation organizations now overseeing programs on our campus, and by the University's desire to be a learning organization. Where possible we used existing committee structures to engage constituents about proposal development, and to clarify the elements of the subsequent capacity and educational effectiveness reviews. A University Educational Effectiveness Committee (UEEC) was formed in October 2005 (an outgrowth of the EE Working Group which first met in June 2005) to consider indicators and evidence of educational effectiveness across all academic programs and co-curricular experiences. Additionally, school-specific educational effectiveness committees are functioning to facilitate review and dialog, and provide guidance. Engagement has taken place in the following committees or professional interactions:

- Chancellor and Program Directors (four WASC-specific sessions to review and engage on the proposal)
- Chancellor's Annual Departmental Visits to each Department Chair and Staff
- Executive Leadership Interview with Lyn Behrens, President, LLUAHSC
- Deans Council (weekly)
- Officers Meeting (weekly)
- Interschool Faculty Advisory Council (monthly)
- University Academic Affairs Committee (faculty, staff and students)
- Learning & Technology Sub-committee, University Academic Affairs Committee (faculty, staff and students)
- University Educational Effectiveness Committee (faculty, staff and students)
- General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee (faculty, staff and students)
- University Leadership Council (administration, faculty, staff)
- Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Director's Meeting
- Research Affairs Committee
- Faculty of Graduate Studies
- Strategic planning in schools and university
- Wholeness Inventory website with results available to department chairs
- Portfolio Advisory Committee, School of Allied Health Professions (administration, faculty, staff and students)
- School-specific Educational Effectiveness Committees
- LLUAHSC and School-specific Spiritual Life and Wholeness Committees
- Student input *via* Wholeness Inventory
- Web presence for WASC-related activities, documents, and discussion
- Exit interviews for students with loans

### **4. Approach for the Preparatory Review**

Since the last WASC accreditation, LLU has taken steps to strengthen the infrastructure that supports *mission-focused learning*. See Section 7 for a detailed description of these initiatives. Some significant changes that have propelled our capacity to understand educational effectiveness include: the new positions and offices of the Vice Chancellor for Research Affairs, Vice-Chancellor for Information Systems, and the new Director of Institutional Research and Planning; implementation of a data warehouse; creation of an initial set of web-based, drill-down data reports; development of a web-based

survey research system; and establishment of a dashboard of metrics to assess the quality of the institution. The table that follows lists how the institution will continue to address its capacity to strengthen the infrastructure required to support educational effectiveness within the context of *mission-focused learning*.

Capacity and Preparatory Review	
WASC Standards	LLU Review Foci
Standard 1: Defining institutional purpose and ensuing educational purposes	CFR 1.2: UEEC will engage faculty to refine the component parts of the University mission and stated student learning outcomes
	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)
	CFR 1.5: Strategic planning to strengthen the linkage between mission-focused learning and institutional progress towards globalization (Interschool Faculty Advisory Council, Deans Council, Officers Meeting, Learning & Technology Sub-committee, Strategic planning in Schools and University, University Leadership Council)
	CFR 1.7: University 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)
Standard 2: Achieving institutional objectives through core functions	CFR 2.1-2.14: University Educational Effectiveness and FGS committees will exercise oversight responsibilities to prioritize and review all academic programs for compliance with CFRs
	CFR 2.7: There will be university-wide dissemination and sharing of results from specialized accreditation agencies
	CFR 2.2: General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee will give attention to resolving issues surrounding the increased numbers of GE academic variances at time of degree completion
	CFR 2.9, 2.11: All programs will be reviewed for inclusion of <i>mission-focused learning</i> , student outcomes, and indicators of educational effectiveness
	CFR 2.13: Integration of strategic planning and development of new Centennial Complex will continue to advance opportunities for mission-focus learning within the “global gateway”
Standard 3: Developing and applying resources and organizational structures to ensure sustainability	CFR 3.1-3.3; 3.5: Educational Effectiveness Committee and Director of Institutional Research are tasked to review and monitor respectively the instructional staffing of all programs; selected new programs are also reviewed by Faculty of Graduate Studies and/or University Academic Affairs Committee
	CFR 3.4; 3.6; 3.7: University Faculty Development Committee and Educational Support Services provide faculty development resources and instructional technology resources
	CFR 3.7: Learning and Technology Committee facilitates global access using appropriate technology-based infrastructures to support learning
	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, University Educational Effectiveness Committee, and the relationship to school-based decision-making processes
Standard 4: Creating an organization committed to learning and improvement	CFR 4.1; 4.2: Strategic planning process will continue to emphasize infusion of mission-focused learning and efforts to sustain LLU’s normative culture in the midst of virtual globalization
	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-support systems which facilitate measuring, sustaining, and improving educational effectiveness
	CFR 4.4: Existing (University Academic Affairs Committee and school-based structures) and new organizational structures (i.e., Faculty of Graduate Studies and the University 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
	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 effectiveness of educational programs

**5. Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review: Achieving *Mission-Focused Learning***

The last LLU self-study was guided by the theme of Wholeness as a means to further:

- Clarify its understanding of wholeness;
- Exhibit the ways in which the University sought to accomplish its mission of wholeness; and
- Evaluate the results of these efforts, thereby enabling future improvements.

Previously this effort was viewed as an essential formative step in advancing our understanding of wholeness as an organizing principle for education and patient care. During the nearly ten years since this

inquiry began, the results of this exploration have provided a greater sense of homogeneity for our members, and led to further inquiry. For instance, as part of this process, the LLU Wholeness Inventory was developed and implemented and has provided the institution with five data collection cycles between 2000 and 2006 to support its evaluation of educational effectiveness. Although much has been learned, at this juncture it appears that we should delve deeper into our understanding of the fundamental quintessence *that is* Loma Linda University. With this, we have chosen to navigate new methods of institutional knowing which require that we learn more about the whole by learning more about the parts (Senge, et al., 2004).

It is important to point out that this self-imposed institutional challenge matured while honoring Loma Linda University's centennial birthday. During each of the celebrations that have occurred during the past year (Appendix G) observers were asked to explore with LLU the "process at work in extraordinary moments" (Senge, et al., 2004). To paraphrase an entry from the Senge's (2004) book *Presence*, seeing the larger picture left people feeling connected and empowered. Reflecting on the summative impact of the heritage of LLU with a group of faculty, one senior faculty member said:

*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).*

The dynamic interaction between past and the present natures of LLU gives pause to consider the possibilities of things to come. At the same time, the exponential rate in which technology will impact LLU's future raises concerns. Time needs to be spent understanding the living system *that is* LLU so that *what is* LLU can be sustained as the inevitability of organizational evolution marches forward. Thus, the topics chosen for this self-study are intended to engage LLU in processes of self-examination that will lead to a deeper understanding of the *mission-focused learning* which has been an integral part of our past and present, and one that we wish to sustain as uniquely Loma Linda University.

### **Theme 1: Sustaining the Normative Culture**

Questions: 1) How can LLU define and adapt strategies to sustain its values-driven normative culture?; and 2) In what ways does LLU learn, how can that be measured, and how can the information gained be used to implement improved and sustained changes?

Objectives: 1) To conduct organizational research as a means of deepening the institution's understanding of the critical pliable factors which comprise and ultimately influence the sustainability of Loma Linda University's normative culture; 2) To understand and mature LLU's capacity for organizational learning; and 3) To strengthen LLU's culture of evidence based decision making for the purpose of strengthening institutional decision-support systems

Outcomes: 1) Development of measures that inform the sustainability of the normative culture and organizational learning of LLU; and 2) Implementation of reliable outcomes measures that can be systematically applied as part of the decision support system of LLUAHSC

Integration with Strategic Planning: 1) Utilize the results of this study to develop stronger linkages with alumni while simultaneously identifying the degree to which graduates' learning at LLU has been sustained and/or matured; and 2) Utilize the results of this study to inform learning communities in the new Centennial Complex

Nature and Statement of the Problem:

The celebrations of this past centennial past year have brought to mind the great sacrifices and perseverance of the institution's founding pioneers. In addition, these events have engaged thousands who have been and are still part of Loma Linda's history in examining LLU's organizational phenomenology.

This process of social and organizational construction has highlighted the shared meanings that individuals have derived by recalling and interpreting the milestones which have made Loma Linda University the organization it is today. What has emerged is a shared understanding that Loma Linda University has developed a unique normative culture which is Loma Linda that is not fully explained by its Seventh-day Adventist auspices or distinction as part of a health science center. There is appreciation that the normative culture that is LLU influences how members experience events, interpret information and develop shared meaning, and subsequently make decisions for the organization. Along with this appreciation of the power of LLU's normative culture is the concern that the essential elements be understood so that these can be sustained.

An examination of related research (Chen, et al., 2001; Umphress, et al., 2003; Brandon and Hollingshead, 2004; Hodson, 2004; Husted and Folger, 2004; Szulanski, et al., 2004) suggests that several factors should be examined to understand the degree to which each influence the sustainability of LLU's normative culture. These factors include, but may not be limited to: *Influence of mission-driven self-less service; Members' perceptions of organizational trustworthiness; Members' perceptions of organizational justice; and the Relationship between transactive organizational memory and member self-efficacy.* Research (Lick, 2005; Spector and Davidsen, 2006) has also brought to light the reciprocal relationship between an organization's culture and its patterns and practices of organizational learning. As such, deepening our understanding of LLU's normative culture should also expand our conception of the patterns and capacity for organizational learning at LLU. And, although the process of learning from the past to inform the present and future is not a new practice at LLU, the question is, how can the richness of LLU's essence be sustained as it increasingly experiences and is required to respond to the profound new forces embodied in virtual globalization? To sustain change in truly demanding circumstances requires greater depths of organizational understanding and commitment (Senge, et al., 2004). Thus, in order to assure that "what is" LLU remains intact, regardless of the learning or practice venue, attention must be given to achieving a deeper way of knowing who we are and how we learn. Given this, a deeper level of examination should also tell us about how we unlearn, how we remember, how we share and transfer our knowledge and how we forget, "Deeper levels of learning create increasing awareness of the larger whole—both as it is and as it is evolving—and actions that increasingly become part of creating alternative futures (Senge, et al., 2004)".

Early indicators and research (Orthner, et al., 2005; Argote, 2005) suggest that an investment in organizational learning should also help us better understand the factors that influence our capacity for organizational learning. Factors that affect organizational learning that have been identified for examination at LLU include, but may not be limited to: *Leadership engagement; Tolerance for errors; Vision sharing; Asking learning questions; Use of tacit and practical knowledge; Time given to reflect on learning; Value given to new knowledge and ideas; and Process driven toward results.*

### *Methodology*

Understanding Normative Culture is considered an embedded case study with formative purposes. Distinctive in this approach is the recognition that the normative culture of LLU has both a main unit and subunits of analyses which are best examined using mixed methods. The main unit of analysis, i.e., the overarching institutional culture will be analyzed using primarily qualitative methods. Qualitative methods used for such purpose include: 1) content analysis of archived data and documents; 2) retrospective event histories (case narratives) of the identified milestones which have been observed to repeatedly be used in describing LLU; and 3) personal perspectives and experiences of individuals from each segment of LLU's institutional culture.

In order to obtain a deeper understanding of LLU's normative culture the embedded subthemes, i.e., factors related to member perceptions as well as identified aspects of organizational learning will also be examined. The analysis of these subunits will make use of multiple methods including: surveys and other quantitative measures; interviews of key informants; focus groups; and group observation. This research approach is also considered to have formative aims in that one of the primary outcomes of this study is to engage LLU's members in a process of discovery which will lead to the development of reliable measures

which can be applied systematically and be compatible with the requirements of institutional research and monitoring.

Existing Evidence: 1) Wholeness Inventory; 2) Archived documents; 3) Retrospective historical documents; and 4) School and program level data

Data to be added: 1) Interviews of Key Informants; 2) Focus groups; 3) Group observations; and 4) Surveys and other quantitative measures

Phase 1: Completion of data collection protocols

Completion Date: Fall 2006

Aim 1: Finalize data collection protocols to be used in systematic analysis of archived data and documents

Aim 2: Finalize data collection protocols to be used retrospective event histories of the identified LLU milestones

Aim 3: Finalize data collection protocols and instruments to be used in subunit analysis i.e., factors related to member perceptions as well as identified aspects of organizational learning

Phase 2: Data collection and analysis of main unit and subunits

Completion Date: Winter 2007

Aim 1: To conduct systematic analysis of archived data and documents

Aim 2: To conduct, collect and analyze retrospective event histories using narrative cases of the identified LLU milestones

Aim 3: To conduct, collect and analyze subunit data

Phase 3: Interpretation of findings, formation, and implementation of systematic measures

Completion Date: Fall 2008

Aim 1: To interpret findings of main unit and subunit analysis

Aim 2: To develop and operationalize measures which can be systematically applied to evaluate LLU's normative culture

Aim 3: To pilot test measures to determine the reliability and identify measurement errors, and implementation barriers

Aim 4: To implement the completed measures as part of institutional research

**Theme 2: Integrating Bible-based Faith**

Questions: 1) What does it mean to integrate a Bible-based faith in one's personal and professional practice?; and 2) How should the integration of a Bible-based faith in one's personal and professional practice be measured?

Objectives: 1) To conduct organizational research as a means of deepening the institution's understanding of the meaning of the LLU student learning outcomes; and 2) To conduct organizational research which will support the development of approach to systematically measure the LLU student learning outcomes and integration of core values

Outcomes: 1) Develop and implement reliable measures which can be systematically applied as part of the decision support system of LLUAHSC; and 2) Develop and implement a case study database to be used as a part of institutional methods for determining educational effectiveness

Integration with Strategic Planning: Utilize the results of this study to develop stronger linkages with alumni campus-wide while simultaneously identifying the degree to which graduates' learning at LLU has been sustained and/or matured

Nature and Statement of the Problem:

As part of the preparation for reaccreditation, we began to seek input on the focus of the institutional proposal. Specific to this essay, the fall 2005 Faculty Colloquium was used to engage faculty in a process of prioritizing which of the student learning outcomes should be the focus of the next self-study. Faculty

were given the *One Hundred Dollar Value Chart for LLU Goals* (Appendix H) to facilitate this process. The result of this process was the identification of the following four learning outcomes to be considered for further study.

- *Develop a Bible-based faith in God relevant to their personal lives and professional ministry*
- *Think critically and logically, analyze and problem-solve*
- *Enhance personal health and well-being through healthful lifestyle choices*
- *Develop and maintain healthy professional relationships with patients, clients, peers, and subordinates*

These outcomes were also reviewed by IFAC (Interschool Faculty Advisory Council), General Studies and Transfer Education Subcommittee, the Academic Affairs Committee, Deans Council, and the Educational Effectiveness Committee. Based upon the input from other groups and additional analysis, the Educational Effectiveness Committee determined to limit the initial analysis of student learning outcomes to: *Develop a Bible-based faith in God relevant to their personal lives and professional ministry*. The committee chose to focus on this outcome as it was perceived as having the greatest centrality to all aspects of the social and learning environment of Loma Linda University. Although it was recognized that this was one of the hardest outcomes to grapple with, measurement discoveries could render some of the greatest advances in organizational learning, not only because it could inform how to measure other student outcomes and provide ways of engaging with alumni, but because discovery could provide insight into extraordinary teachable moments, including transforming and integrating life experiences.

Dialogue with multiple faculty groups during the process of development of the WASC essays revealed that there may be substantial ambiguity regarding the intent of the term “Bible-based faith”. Although faculty’s interpretation of the intended meaning of this term varied, the most frequently expressed concern was that the term relayed an undesirable conservative theological orientation which could be translated into incorrect connotation regarding LLU’s organizational purposes. The extent of this ambiguity, as well as the variability in faculty’s awareness of other student learning outcomes and the seven Christ-centered core institutional values, led the proposal committee to adopt formative purposes for the study of these issues. This variability in faculty understanding underscores the reality of risks to the sustainability of LLU’s normative culture and the importance of developing greater knowledge about methods of organizational learning.

### *Methodology*

Our overall approach will be supported by [w]holistic case study methods with documentation, formative and exploratory purposes. While we will begin with the notion that “Bible-based” is a singular concept, the formative aspects of our inquiry will employ qualitative methods and related group process to engage carefully selected theoretical samples of University members in a process of clarifying and building consensus regarding the meaning of the term “Bible-based”. Using representative samples from groups within LLU should result in broad feedback and allow us to identify consensus as well as deviations in individuals’ interpretation of the concept. The exploratory aspects of this study allows for openness of viewpoints while guarding systematic methodological adherence which we intend to utilize in developing better informed quantitative measures and scales for future data collection and monitoring. We believe that this careful mixed methods process of discovery should lead to the development of reliable measures which can be applied systematically and will be compatible with the requirements of institutional research.

Existing Evidence: 1) Wholeness Inventory; 2) Archived documents including case studies, student portfolios, and exist interviews; 3) School and program specific practices and processes that operationalize Christ-centered core institutional values; and 4) Other school and program specific data, including specialized and normative course and program evaluations

Data to be added: 1) Interviews of Key Informants; 2) Focus groups; 3) Group observations; and 4) Surveys and other quantitative measures

Phase 1: Completion of data collection protocols

Completion Date: Fall 2006

- Aim 1: Finalize sampling and data collection protocols including semi structured key informant outlines for the use of engaging University members in a process of clarifying the meaning of the terminology used in the identified student learning outcomes
- Aim 2: Finalize the data sources to be used in the study
- Aim 3: Finalize the data collection protocols and instruments to be used, including the criteria and concepts that will be used to indicate the presence of a Bible-based faith
- Aim 4: Finalize the design of the case study database
- Aim 5: Establish criteria by which the study will be judged as successful

Phase 2: Data collection and analysis

Completion Date: Winter 2007

- Aim 1: To conduct systematic content analysis of identified archived case study documents resulting in emerging themes and sub-themes
- Aim 2: To use this information to design, collect and analyze new data including surveys, interviews and group processes as appropriate

Phase 3: Interpretation of findings, formation, and implementation of systematic measures

Completion Date: Fall 2008

- Aim 1: To interpret findings utilizing case study database
- Aim 2: To develop and operationalize measures which can be systematically applied to evaluate LLU's normative culture
- Aim 3: To pilot test measures to determine the reliability and identify measurement errors, and implementation barriers
- Aim 4: To implement the completed measures as part of institutional research

**6. Workplan and Milestones for CPR**

2006	2007	2008
Fall: 1) distribute institutional proposal to task forces and committees that are reviewing the institutional response to capacity issues; 2) Office of Institutional Research and Planning continues to assemble the institutional presentation; 3) review and amend organizational structures to guide CPR and themes, including establishment of CPR sub-committee of UEEC	Winter: CPR sub-committee makes initial recommendations for the institutional presentation  Fall: CPR sub-committee reviews progress and make recommendations regarding institutional presentation	Winter: CPR sub-committee circulates for review the CPR institutional presentation  Spring: submit CPR report to WASC  Fall: capacity review site visit by WASC team

[Note; see page 7 for EER timeline]

**7. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems**

LLU is committed to developing a culture of evidence focused on student learning and organizational learning. A regular and sustainable process of assessment of students and programs characterizes such a culture across the University. Successful assessment must have effective data gathering and analysis systems. LLU consists of eight highly autonomous, largely professional schools. This decentralized organizational structure results in learning assessment data being gathered with diverse methods, at

various times, and stored in multiple formats. LLU has taken steps to improve its information and analysis infrastructure as follows:

- Established the new position of Vice Chancellor for Information Systems to be a chief Information Officer for the university
- Established new position for Director of Institutional Research and Planning in 2001
- Implementation of a data warehouse with designated analysts from each school who are able to respond to the diverse data requirements of each school
- Created an initial set of web-based, drill-down data reports (fact book) on student admissions, enrollment, retention, and degree completion
- Developed a web-based survey research system to implement various assessments of students, faculty, and staff; the first use of this system was the Wholeness Inventory 2006
- Established a dashboard of metrics to assess the quality of the institution on a regular and on-going basis. The dashboard was presented to the Board of Trustees.

Plans for enhanced data gathering and analysis systems as part of the accreditation process include:

- Web-based system accessed through the University portal for exchange of student learning outcomes, educational effectiveness indicators, and program review cycles, including a section dedicated to WASC reports
- Enhance the data warehouse to be a central repository of assessment information that is gathered in various schools and programs. This will enable programs to analyze their individual program assessments (surveys, clinical evaluations, comprehensive and qualifying exam results, etc.) in association with the academic outcomes such as grade-point average, graduation rate, retention rate, and time to degree that are in the data warehouse
- Create a formal assessment data team with representatives from each school to coordinate and report the status of assessment data gathering and analysis across the university and to support decision-making and program review processes. This team will work to enhance the quality of all assessment systems

## **8. Proposal Data Tables**

See Appendix I

## **9. Off-campus and Distance Education Degree Programs**

See Appendix J

## **10. Institutional Stipulations**

Refer to beginning of this document.

References are located in Appendix K.