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SECTION I -- OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History

1. History of Life Pacific College (LPC)

After its founding as the Echo Park Evangelistic and Missionary Training Institute in 1923, LPC moved to the historic Angelus Temple in Los Angeles in 1926 and was renamed Lighthouse of International Foursquare Evangelism (LIFE). The first class graduated from LIFE in April 1925 with the purpose of training women and men for vocational work within the Foursquare Church and of preparing individuals to live biblically in other occupations. The institution operated under the name of LIFE Bible College from 1937 to 1999 and was accredited by the American Association of Bible Colleges (now the Association for Biblical Higher Education) in 1980. In 1990, the college moved to its current location in San Dimas, California and consequently changed its name to Life Pacific College in 2000.

2. Degrees & Programs

LPC currently offers the following degrees (numbers are the full-time equivalent (FTE) reported for spring 2017:

- Bachelor of Arts (BA) programs
  - Biblical Studies (67)
  - Transformational Ministry (55)
  - Human Development and Psychology (128)
  - Business Administration (51)
  - Worship Arts & Media (30)
  - Communication (begun Fall 2017)
  - (Undeclared, 6)
3. **LPC’s Accreditation History**

LPC received its Initial Accreditation from the WSCUC Commission (the “Commission”) in June 2004 and scheduled the Capacity Preparatory Review (CPR) for fall 2008, and the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) for fall 2009. Subsequently, in 2005, the Commission approved the rescheduling of the EER to spring 2010. In February 2009, the Commission received the report from the October 2008 CPR review and approved proceeding with the EER for fall 2010. In February 2011, the Commission received the report from the September 2010 EER review, issued a formal Notice of Concern, scheduled the next CPR visit for fall 2017, and scheduled the next EER visit for spring 2019. At the same time, the Commission scheduled a Special Visit for fall 2012 to address a number of areas of concern: financial sustainability and stability, implementation of the Strategic Plan, enrollment management and data, faculty workload and policies and student/faculty ratios, and implementation of assessment-related practices. Following the October 2012 Special Visit, in February 2013, the Commission received the team report, imposed Probation, and scheduled a second Special Visit for fall 2014 to address the concerns: leadership and the governing board, financial...
sustainability and enrollment stability, retention and graduation rates, and strategic planning processes. In February 2015, the Commission received the team report from the September 2014 Special Visit, removed Probation, confirmed the scheduled Offsite Review (OSR) for spring 2018, confirmed the scheduled Accreditation Visit (AV) for fall 2018, confirmed the scheduled Mid-Cycle Review for spring 2015, and requested a Progress Report due fall 2015 to address enrollment, retention, diversity and advancement in fundraising.

4. History of LPC's Substantive Changes with WSCUC
LPC submitted seven substantive change proposals since its 2011 reaffirmation of accreditation. These proposals were for the LPC-Ignite Virginia Extension, BA degrees in Business Administration, Human Development & Psychology, Worship Arts & Media, Communication, the MA in Christian Leadership degree, and an online BA in Organizational Management adult degree completion program. The WSCUC Substantive Change Committee approved all proposals with various recommendations in areas such as assessment, program review process, faculty sufficiency and qualifications, and incoming student academic standards.

5. Off-campus Site, LPC-Ignite
LPC offers one program, an Associate of Arts in General Studies, at the Christiansburg, Virginia, site. The WSCUC Commission approved the LPC-Ignite additional location in Christiansburg, Virginia, in May 2012 and students enrolled in the AA program at the site beginning fall 2012. The LPC AA program is delivered through a
collaborative arrangement with Ignite Academy, a discipleship and ministry training program that prepares high school graduates for work in the world. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) granted authorization to offer the Associate of Arts in General Studies program at the Christiansburg location on July 19, 2011 and has reauthorized the program each subsequent year. In 2016 the site began offering some classes nearby at a second location less than 25 miles from the approved location; it was determined in consultation with WSCUC staff that another substantive change review was not necessary. Although the site has a capacity of approximately 225 students, the average enrollment over the past 7 years has been 55 students.

B. Description of the Team’s Review Process

The reaffirmation review for LPC occurred in two phases, an Offsite Review (OSR) held at the WSCUC’s office in Alameda, California on March 26-27, 2018, and the Accreditation Visit (AV) on the LPC campus in San Dimas, California on September 25-28, 2018. In addition, a member of the team visited the LPC-Ignite campus in Christiansburg, Virginia, on October 8, 2018 to provide the basis of the Off-Campus Location Review of LPC’s facilities there.

In preparation for the OSR and AV, the team carefully reviewed the institutional report and supporting documents and completed the worksheets designed by WSCUC to organize the review process. The team considered the collective findings from their review to identify institutional strengths and frame the areas for further inquiry. Each team member was assigned responsibilities for specific sections, with a second team
member acting as a “second author.” All team members read and evaluated LPC’s institutional report in their preparations.

For the OSR, team members reviewed the LPC report and materials and completed an Offsite Review Worksheet three weeks prior to the meeting in Alameda. This compiled worksheet served as the basis for a general discussion of LPC’s compliance with the WSCUC Standards. Through this process, the team identified four lines of inquiry: (1) transitioning to a university, (2) long-term sustainability, (3) diversity and enrollment growth, and (4) evidence-based decision making. Additional supporting documents were requested and subsequently provided by LPC.

The AV consisted of two days on the LPC campus, during which the team met with selected campus constituents, including the administrative leadership, faculty, and staff, as well as undergraduate and graduate students. The team conducted one-on-one and group meetings to confirm information provided in LPC’s institutional report and to gather additional information and perceptions of issues directly related to the lines of inquiry identified during the OSR in February. The team also spent time to review documents provided by the institution on-site as well as the documentation and evidence to complete the required federal reporting forms.

The team appreciated the cooperation, openness, and willingness to provide additional information by the LPC administration, faculty, staff, and students both before and during the AV. (CFR 1.7, 1.8)
C. The Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

LPC’s institutional report was well-written and organized, with convenient cross-references to supporting material and data. The team appreciated the thoroughness of the report and the institution’s acknowledgement of strengths and weaknesses identified during their self-study process. The report also served as a resource and guide to the team during the visit.

In preparation for the AV, LPC formed the Accreditation Steering Committee (ASC) in 2016 to conduct the self-study and prepare the institutional report. The ASC membership included staff, faculty, and administrators, who supervised the research, discussion, and drafting of each component of the report. The final draft was distributed to various stakeholders, including faculty and trustees, for final editing and eventual submission to WSCUC.

The team appreciated the thorough and vigorous self-evaluation in LPC’s institutional report and felt that it accurately described the many changes that have occurred in the institution since the 2014 Special Visit. The team greatly appreciated the prompt and complete disclosure of information and assistance when requested by the team (CFR 1.8).
SECTION II --EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC’S STANDARDS AND IDENTIFIED CFRs FROM PRIOR SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISITS

A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

Since the 2014 Special Visit, LPC has made a strong effort to address the concerns expressed by the Commission in its March 2015 Commission Action Letter. In it, the Commission emphasized four areas for further attention, as follows:

1. Supporting diversity (CFR 1.4) “... it is essential that LPC assess and prepare for the 'impact of a more diverse campus.' LPC should evaluate and provide the support services necessary to ensure student success.”

   LPC developed Strategic Plans and Retention Plans that included objectives to address diversity. Since the last WSCUC visit, LPC created a Diversity Committee (DC) consisting of faculty, staff, and students. This DC meets monthly to discuss issues of concern and propose solutions. Also, in December 2016, LPC engaged external consultants to conduct a diversity audit, including evaluation of student support services. This audit resulted in the development of a Strategic Diversity Action Plan and formation of a Diversity Task Force, which is a sub-committee of the DC. This task force revised the institutional diversity statement and created a “…theologically integrated statement on diversity and inclusion disseminated to the campus community.” During the AV, the DC reported that future plans include incorporating the new diversity initiatives into the institution’s Strategic Plan as well as enhancing the services of the Multi-Cultural Student Union to support diversity efforts.

   Although LPC has improved services to support a diverse campus, the team noted that additional attention must be given to this area to achieve the critical related goals of
welcome, inclusion, and cross-cultural competence for everyone in the LPC community.

(See p. 13.)

2. **Monitoring and improving student enrollment and retention (CFR 1.2, 2.10, 2.13)** "LPC needs to maintain a continued sense of urgency in the refinement, implementation, and monitoring of the college’s retention plan. LPC could include ‘the development of an institutional financial aid philosophy, and a strategy for implementation...’.”

The team confirmed that LPC’s Retention Plan, approved in 2014 and revised in 2017, defines student success and presents a plan to assess current retention strategies and implement new initiatives to achieve enrollment targets. The Enrollment, Retention, and Student Success Committee (ERSS) oversees the overall success of students and assists in the implementation of many initiatives, including the procurement of the MapWorks® retention software system and creation of several processes and initiatives for supporting at-risk students, conducting a student satisfaction survey, tracking retention and graduation rates, improving peer and academic tutoring, and comprehensively planning for scholarships. The average retention rate from 2012 to 2016 was 66.3%. Retention increased from 58.1% in 2012 to 70.9% in 2015 and then dropped to 64.4% in 2016. The average overall six-year graduation rate was 48.4% from 2007 to 2011, with an average time to degree of 4.5 years.

3. **Continue to strengthen financial sustainability (CFR 3.4)** “It will be important for Life Pacific College to accelerate its efforts to implement the new advancement plan, to raise the necessary revenue and, where funds fall short of the institution’s goals, to be able to modify targets based on actual results.”

As stated in the institutional report (p. 9), “LPC continues to see strong Composite Financial Index and Federal Financial Responsibility Composite scores, and
recently hired a new Vice President (VP) of Advancement with over 20 years of fundraising, alumni, and development experience who recently revised and implemented the Advancement Plan.” LPC has also initiated the addition of intercollegiate athletics, obtaining membership in the National Association for Intercollegiate Athletics and Golden State Athletics Association as well as starting teams in women’s volleyball (2015), women’s and men’s cross country and track (2017), and women’s golf, women’s basketball, and men’s wrestling (2018). The team noted that LPC has not met goals they set for the athletic programs with recent resignations of coaches and challenges in recruiting student athletes for some programs.

4. Regularly evaluate institutional research effectiveness (CFR 4.2) “LPC should conduct periodic reviews of the IR function to ‘ensure the suitability and usefulness of the data generated.’” and “‘...where a deeper rather than broader analysis of the data is appropriate,’ data results can be more effectively used for ‘strategic decision making’ across the institution.”

LPC has undertaken a number of initiatives in response to this recommendation. In 2017, the Institutional Research Office (IRO) underwent a formal program review as part of the college’s institutional effectiveness program review cycle. To improve the dissemination of IR information, the college developed a robust and comprehensive Institutional Dashboard, containing financials, financial aid/tuition, advancement, admissions/enrollment data, retention/completion rates, as well as academic and human resources indicators. LPC utilizes three primary evaluation processes: annual assessments of student learning at the program level, annual assessments of departmental goals, and a cyclical program review for academic programs and institutional functions. Data from these evaluations and reviews help to inform the VP of Academic Affairs (VPAA) and
the Dean of Instructional Effectiveness, as well as program and departmental managers and supervisors in decision making and planning.

**B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators**

1. **Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives**

   LPC’s mission, vision, and values are well described and appear in publications, the institution’s website, in promotional materials, and throughout signage on campus. LPC clearly demonstrates its dedication to this mission in its policies, curriculum, programming, and co-curricular activities. (CFR 1.1, 1.2) The institution also regularly collects, analyzes, and makes public data about student achievement (CFR 1.2) in the areas of retention, graduation rates, and learning outcomes on its website. LPC has a clear commitment and understanding of academic freedom for trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students, described in the context of the institution in the current academic catalogue as well as the student handbook. (CFR 1.3)

   Although LPC has responded to previous WSCUC recommendations regarding its support of diversity, the team observed that additional development is clearly needed for policies and practices to support diversity, inclusion, and equity for all students. The team received reports from students, staff, and faculty in various forums during the visit that indicated dissatisfaction with the way various issues related to diversity and inclusion had been addressed by the administration. (CFR 1.4) Issues of diversity and inclusion appear to be a major concern at the San Dimas campus. For example, as the institution acknowledged, the racial ethnic composition of the faculty isn’t aligned with that of the
students. Groups of students reported a number of incidents of racist speech and behavior at the California campus, and concerns for their safety. (CFR 1.4) Diversity issues did not seem to be a concern at the Virginia campus.

The team recognizes that the institution must address these issues of diversity, equity and inclusion both for their own sake and for their potential to negatively affect future enrollment at the California campus. LPC has for years had staffed uniformed security guards all night, seven days a week. The chief of security (not uniformed) is present during the day and lives on campus. However, when questioned by the team during the visit, students were unclear about where to report their concerns and uncomfortable with reporting specific incidents of overt racist speech and behavior, microaggressions, or unconscious bias.

A close relationship of LPC with the Foursquare Church has existed since its founding and continues to this day. Church leaders frequently visit the college, participate in chapel services, and teach courses. Although the Foursquare Foundation is a major contributor to LPC’s budget, the team determined that an appropriate degree of independence exists between LPC and the Foursquare Foundation regarding the educational mission of the institution. (CFR 1.5)

LPC has clear and understandable information about costs, financial aid, academic programs and goals, academic and graduation requirements, and available student support services, which is readily available to students and the public in both the current academic catalogue and on the website. (CFR 1.6) These sources also include a clear grievance policy for curricular and co-curricular activities. Although information
about academic grievances is found in the Student Handbook, it is less clear to students where to go when such grievances exist, as there are several offices that handle complaints and grievances, depending on the context (academic, personnel, or student behavior).

2. **Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions**

   At LPC, teaching and learning are guided by student learning outcomes aligned at all levels: course, program, and institution. LPC has recently modified its general education to improve alignment with WSCUC core competencies and integration throughout the curriculum. A new undergraduate course schedule will further integrate general education, Bible, theology, and ministry outcomes. (CFR 2.2a) Graduate programs are differentiated through level of outcomes and course activity. (CFR 2.2b) Standards and outcomes, developed by faculty members, are clearly stated and are aligned with resources. (CFR 2.3, 2.4) Academic programs take into account students’ prior knowledge and offer opportunities to practice, generalize, and apply what they have learned. (CFR 2.5)

   LPC’s traditional programs are appropriate in content, standards of performance, and rigor. The range for number of hours of student work, including class time, corresponding to these programs is between 34 and 42 hours for every credit hour, which amounts to 102 to 126 hours for a 3-credit, semester-long course. Accelerated programs, offered online, require a lower workload for a 3-credit, semester-long course: 60 to 75 hours in the bachelor’s and 80 to 90 hours in the master’s for each course, as documented
in time-to-task worksheets. LPC further specifies that “LPC’s Adult Degree Completion courses are designed to lead to verifiable student achievement of learning outcomes equivalent to traditional semester-based courses with the same credit hour assignment, and in accordance with the mode of instruction used for course delivery.” Given the comparatively lower number of hours for the same credit awarded and the reliance on learning outcomes, it is recommended that the assessment of learning is comprehensive and detailed enough, particularly through direct methods, to show achievement. (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.6)

Expectations for research, scholarship, and creative activity are clearly defined. LPC recognizes and promotes appropriate linkages among scholarship, teaching, assessment, student learning, and service. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

LPC ensures that students graduate in a timely fashion. LPC’s 8-year average absolute graduation rate (66%) is higher than the average rate for schools in the WSCUC region (59%). The graduation rate for first-time, full-time students (IPEDS population) is lower than that of the WSCUC region but this group represents only 24% of LPC’s student body. The average retention rate between 2012 and 2016 was 66.3%. While coordination and evaluation of support and retention initiatives are areas of opportunity, LPC shows strong focus on student achievement and success. (CFR 2.10, 2.13) To enhance services in co-curricular areas, LPC instituted the position of Associate Vice President of Student Development/Dean of Students. (CFR 2.11) LPC has increased its efforts to ensure that prospective students understand the nature of the LPC degree. (CFR 2.12) LPC degree programs include sizable Bible, theology, and ministry components
and, as such, may pose challenges for transferring credit. Nonetheless, these components are being reduced in the new bachelor’s degree, not just to improve alignment and integration, but also to increase the number of open electives. (CFR 2.14)

3. **Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability**

**Faculty and Staff**

LPC’s faculty and staff seem deeply invested in the college and its mission. The institutional report indicates that students rate the faculty highly in terms of quality, and the students the team met at both the California and Virginia campuses confirmed they do think highly of the faculty. During meetings held during the visit, the staff and faculty also demonstrated their commitment to the institution. These factors indicate a match between institutional mission and employees. Additionally, faculty and staff appear to be of sufficient quantity with a current 10:1 staff to student ratio, which is better than the 16:1 staff to student ratio reported in 2014. The institution has a strategy in place to recruit more faculty and staff of color at the California campus and this should continue to be a priority so as to not negatively affect student retention and satisfaction. (CFR 3.1)

Despite the diversity issue, the institution has appropriate faculty and staff recruitment, hiring, orientation, incentives and evaluation processes that are aligned with educational objectives. Evaluations are consistent with best practices in the performance appraisal process and evaluation methods for both faculty and staff are in place. Non-academic staff at the Virginia campus are not employed directly by LPC but instead are leased employees from Ignite, a nonprofit that provides annual funding to the Virginia campus.
and provides non-academic services such as housing and meal plans for students. Although this arrangement is acceptable, it can create potential issues related to employee supervision and institutional loyalty. The institutional report indicates that full-time faculty workloads are such that faculty are allowed sufficient time for professional growth. The faculty workload policy is also indicated in the Faculty Handbook. The policy designates responsibilities in five areas including engaging in scholarship, committee work, assessment activities, advising, and involvement in community services. Faculty are also evaluated both through student evaluations at the end of each semester and bi-annually through peer reviews. Peer reviews are performed by a full-time faculty member, or adjunct faculty member with a minimum of five years of service, and reviews are focused on improving teaching and learning.

The institution assists full-time faculty with their professional development and scholarship endeavors by providing $700 annually for each full-time faculty member. In addition, a pool of $5,000 is set aside for faculty members who are presenting at conferences in their field to assist them in attending the conference. The academic administration indicated that it intends to grow both the annual development funds and the conference pool over the next several years to support professional development, including the research activities of the faculty. Local adjunct faculty attend at least one faculty meeting each semester in order to participate in the faculty governance process. Per the Employee Handbook, regular professional development is required for staff managerial positions but not for non-managerial positions. However, LPC allocates funds for professional development for all employees as needed. (CFR 3.2, 3.3)
Fiscal, Physical and Information Resources

Recent financial audits for LPC have resulted in unqualified auditor opinions. An unqualified option indicates that the financial records of LPC are represented appropriately and fairly and in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. LPC has a history of operating within their financial parameters and prior to 2018, the institution had positive operating revenues in ten consecutive years. However, flat enrollment resulted in an operating deficit during the 2017-18 fiscal year. Coordinated planning among marketing, admissions, and advancement teams seems necessary to address enrollment issues, and LPC should coordinate these efforts among the departments. The institution understands the need to diversify revenue sources beyond the standard enrollment and fundraising sources, and the challenge they face in this area. However, it’s unclear how that will be obtained. Resource allocation and prioritization is well documented by the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and in speaking to staff and faculty, this was well understood. The institution has a lofty goal of raising $25 million over the next five years. What’s not apparent is how the $25 million will be raised, given that this would require raising more than double the amount raised during the prior five years. No specific roadmap was presented to show how this goal would be reached. The financial areas of the college are well-managed, and the stakeholders understand that financial performance is key to achieving the mission of the college. (CFR 3.4)

Resource allocation and resource prioritization have been well-documented by the SPC, and the Board and staff members seem to understand their importance. The
institution provides access to information and technology resources sufficient in scope and quality to support its residential and online academic offerings. As evidence, LPC’s librarian confirmed that resources at the California campus library include access to 56,000 physical books, 192,000 electronic books, multiple databases, audio and visual resources, and reciprocal sharing agreements with external libraries. Students at the Virginia campus have full access to the electronic resources available at the California campus. Students also provided positive comments on the information and technology resources available to support their academic goals. (CFR 3.5)

**Organizational Structure and Decision-Making Processes**

The team met with only half of the Board of Trustees but the ones we met with seemed well-informed and engaged to support the mission of the college. Several trustees have served on the Board for many years and are loyal, enthusiastic and engaged in the mission of LPC. The by-laws indicate that board members are elected to terms, but not limited to the number of terms they can serve. The president is well-respected and carries out his duties with integrity, appropriate responsibility, and accountability. The president’s cabinet is also held in high regard by fellow staff members and decisions are made collectively with all members freely able to provide input. (CFR 3.6)

The current administrative structure is connected to the mission of the institution and is currently sufficient in size relative to LPC’s student population. The academic leadership that works with students seems dedicated to student success and the mission of the college. Most students seem to like the administrative and academic leadership despite their passionate complaints about the lack of diversity in both the administrative
and faculty ranks. Employee and faculty handbooks are in place and are well-written. Strategic planning decisions are appropriately made based on data the institution collects and flows through various parties including the Budget Committee, President’s Council, Administrative Council, and Board of Trustees. (CFR 3.7)

Both the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and Chief Financial Officer (CFO) are employed full-time by LPC and are well-regarded and interact well with LPC’s administrative team. The other administrators seem well-connected to the institution and are clearly motivated in their positions to provide effective leadership and management. The Trustees we met with are well-aware of their responsibilities for oversight of institutional policies and operations but understand they should not get involved in day-to-day operational management. They also indicated they do not “rubber stamp” recommendations by the president. A written presidential Succession Plan is in place that demonstrates that the Board is aware of its responsibilities to find an effective replacement for the president, when the current president retires. (CFR 3.8, 3.9)

Academic leadership appears to be strong and serving LPC well. The institutional report indicates that both full-time and adjunct faculty participate in the faculty shared governance process. The Board of Trustees Handbook formally acknowledges the faculty’s role in driving the college’s academic processes and delineates various responsibilities to the faculty including planning and evaluation of the college’s academic programs and curricula, and maintaining academic freedom. Additionally, a full-time faculty member elected by the faculty serves as a voting member of the Administrative Council (CFR 3.10).
4. **Standard 4: Creating an organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement**

At the time when LPC is engaging in “dramatic, positive change,” as stated in LPC’s 2014 Special Visit institutional report, evidence-based and timely self-reflection about how the institution has effectively accomplished its purposes and goals in a changing environment has never been so critical. LPC demonstrates its commitment to quality assurance, institutional learning, and improvement through strengthening and periodically reviewing its institutional research functions by consistently collecting and analyzing data of various types and at different levels, as well as its efforts to utilizing data for strategic planning purposes.

**Quality Assurance Process (CFRs 4.1, 4.2).**

As one of the four main efforts LPC chose to focus on since the 2014 WSCUC Special Visit, the institution did a thorough review of its institutional research functions in 2017. As indicated in LPC’s institutional report, the administration expects all departments and programs to be engaged in institutional research to varying degrees appropriate for their context in order to make use of data to inform decisions and planning. Recognizing the limitation caused by the frequent transition in IR directors, and in order to better facilitate the campus-wide, data-informed decision-making efforts, a cabinet-level position, the Dean of Instructional Effectiveness, was created to oversee many key aspects of institutional effectiveness-related functions: institutional research, assessment, strategic planning, accreditation, and program review.
The centralized and empowered institutional effectiveness functions in the IRO enabled LPC to transform its institutional effectiveness from an area of needed improvement to an area of strength, which is clearly reflected in a large amount of data that informed LPC’s institutional report. The IRO leads and employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes documented in its annual Assessment Plan, in which the institution clearly maps out the relationship among the institution’s mission and its institutional goals and student outcomes, with the Advancement Plan, Financial Plan, Enrollment Plan, Retention Plan, Academic Plan, and departmental planning, through LPC’s Strategic Plan (“Alignment of mission, goals, strategies, measurement”).

LPC also links its assessment efforts with its 2014-19 Strategic Plan: “Develop and maintain organizational structures, institutional research capacity, and data systems that promote efficiency and effectiveness.” Connecting assessment with strategic planning is a critical element in ensuring a successful implementation of the institution’s Strategic Plan.

The IRO creates and manages a list of primary recurring data instruments that clearly identifies the assessment instrument used and the frequency of assessment, population assessed, primary data receivers, and the different types of use of assessment. This systematic approach of conducting assessment not only provides a road map of conducting various assessments and minimizes survey fatigue, but also connects assessment data with relevant decision-makers and assessment purposes to assure data are disseminated in a timely manner and incorporated in decision making at all levels.
LPC conducts periodic reviews of its academic programs. The Academic Program and Curriculum Review Committee (APCR) oversees an integral dimension approach of conducting academic program review. APCR reviews both self-study and the external reviewer’s findings. Programs track progress based on APCR’s feedback and submits an annual report to the VPAA.

It is impressive to see great evidence of a small IR office managing many key institutional effectiveness areas. Therefore, the WSCUC team expressed its concern in its Offsite Review’s lines of inquiry, about LPC administration’s expectations of IR with the staffing level of its IRO. LPC’s response to this concern was to add a part-time staff person to the IRO, contingent upon meeting enrollment targets. The WSCUC team wants to reemphasize the importance to prioritize the need of additional staff in the IRO to ensure it can successfully fulfill the administration’s expectation in a sustainable way.

Institutional Learning and Improvement (CFRs 4.1-4.7)

It is clearly stated in LPC’s various reports and plans that the administration has been focusing on embracing evidence-based and data-informed decision-making processes at all levels at LPC and using data to connect the institution’s planning efforts in various areas. LPC implemented a robust Assessment Plan to oversee assessment in both academic and co-curricular sectors, and to make sure that feedback from various stakeholders is included in the decision-making process, such as students, faculty and staff, and alumni. Its IRO also utilizes a wide range of assessment instruments that not only provide data for internal decision makers at all levels, but also comparative data from external sources, such as the National Survey for Student Engagement (NSSE).
In its annual assessment report, the LPC clearly identifies who is accountable in assessing student learning outcomes (SLOs) at the institutional, programmatic, and course level. As published in the LPC’s catalog, the institutional level student learning goals include the following areas: specialized knowledge, integrated learning, core competencies, practical ministry, global awareness, and character development. At the program level (including general education), faculty committees establish program goals and objectives, which are also used as the foundation for program designs and follow a set of annual academic program outcome assessment guidelines to close the assessment loop.

During its strategic move of transitioning from college to university, LPC has continued making efforts to stabilize leadership, implement Strategic Plans in key areas such as academics, facilities, athletics, enrollment and retention, new academic program development, and financial stability and sustainability. The WSCUC team recognizes LPC’s efforts in those areas, and encourages the institution to continue to focus on addressing challenges brought on by the rapidly changing higher education landscape and a more diverse student population and their needs.

C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees

LPC has put much effort into defining the meaning, quality, and integrity of its degrees (MQID) and has made it an important component of its Strategic Plan. (CFR 1.2) LPC faculty begin defining MQID by reflecting on desired characteristics of graduates using the Degree Qualification Profile (DQP) by the Lumina Foundation, and the
essential learning outcomes of the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U). The six institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) were derived from this reflection:

- **Specialized Knowledge**
  - Apply specialized knowledge and skills from their major field of study in order to effectively serve God in the Church, the workplace, and the world.

- **Integrated Learning (DQP category: Broad Knowledge; Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP) essential learning outcomes category: Knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world)**
  - Integrate knowledge from various fields (Bible, theology, ministry, Foursquare distinctives, science, history, culture, ethics, philosophy) in serving God and humanity.

- **Core Competencies (DQP category: Intellectual Skills; LEAP category: Intellectual and practical skills)**
  - Demonstrate competent communication, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and critical/creative thinking skills appropriate for their discipline and for ministering to humanity.

- **Practical Ministry (DQP category: Applied Learning; LEAP category: Integrative and applied learning)**
  - Apply the gospel, a knowledge of human needs, life-long learning, and personal spiritual development for effective ministry in the Church, the workplace, and the world.

- **Global Awareness (DQP category: Civic Learning; LEAP category: Personal and social responsibility)**
  - Acknowledge the multicultural diversity within humanity by practicing informed engagement in political discourse and caring for people and the environment from a globally aware, Christ-centered perspective.

- **Character Development**
  - Conduct themselves with Christ-like character in their personal and public lives, demonstrating a life lived in accordance with and empowered by the Spirit.

There is a biblical and theological component in all LPC degrees focused on developing the Christian formation pertaining to the Foursquare Church. As such, there
are 30 units of Bible and theology and 9 units of ministry in all traditional bachelor’s
degrees. LPC has structured this together with the 48 general education units to form the
“core curriculum” and provide “a broad foundation for intellectual, character, and
spiritual growth”. Non-traditional bachelor’s degrees, offered online to students older
than 24 years and structured as degree-completion programs, include a minimum of 18
units of Bible, theology, or Bible-integrated courses. Currently LPC is working on a new
traditional bachelor’s degree structure that includes a core curriculum of 64 units,
including general education and Bible courses, majors of 52 units, and 12 open electives.
Changes will coincide with LPC becoming a university. Traditional undergraduate
majors include internships and outreach to the community. Master’s degree programs
include 36 credits that combine leadership with ministry and theological studies. Practical
application and hands-on experience are part of the curriculum. (CFR 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.3)

There is alignment of ILOs and program learning outcomes (PLOs). General
education objectives have been revised to align with WSCUC’s core competencies.

Faculty qualifications contribute to the rigor of instruction. Full-time faculty teach
half of the courses. A majority of them have a terminal degree (75% of the 15 full-time
faculty). The remaining classes are taught by part-time faculty with ‘real world’
experience. A high percentage of students believe their instructors display genuine
concern and challenge them intellectually.

There is evidence of faculty regularly reviewing appropriateness of the learning
outcomes, establishing standards of performance, and aligning learning outcomes at
institutional and program levels. It is clear from the visit that there is also a high level of
faculty ownership of the assessment process, and collaboration within and outside of the discipline. Faculty ownership is exercised through academic program committees and the Academic Planning and Curriculum Review Committee (APCR). This committee, which includes all program chairs, and is supported by the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness, has also revised the program review process for enhanced consistency and simplicity. Additionally, faculty have collaborated on the development of the ILOs and the General Education objectives. Student achievement is assessed through a process that includes both annual assessments and cyclical, comprehensive program reviews. (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7) Nonetheless, program reviews are not consistently assessing achievement of all PLOs and direct assessment is only partially employed. The large number of outcomes for each academic program may be part of the reason for inconsistencies in student performance, data availability, and breadth and depth of assessment.

Achievement of ILOs, as assessed through direct methods, was generally lower than the established benchmarks. Several reasons were provided: incomplete alignment of the curriculum with the new ILOs, new programs are still being improved, and actual deficiencies in student work. Despite these results, student perceptions of their achievement is high.

The team is concerned about learning assessment in accelerated programs, which require less coursework as documented in course time-to-task worksheets. For these programs, LPC relies on “verifiable student achievement of learning outcomes” to be equivalent to traditional semester-long courses with the same credit-hour assignment.
The program review for the Bachelor of Arts in Ministry and Leadership (BAML) was made available to the review team. It is stated in this document that the program assessment plan has not been executed consistently and that assessment of learning outcomes has been erratic over the years covered by the report. The program has 22 learning outcomes under the four main goals corresponding to the areas of Bible/Theology, Ministry, Leadership, and Personal Formation. No direct learning assessment is presented for the six learning outcomes under Goal 1-Bible/Theology, and only a few outcomes under the other goals are assessed through direct methods. Given the inconsistencies in assessment and the reduced volume of work, it is recommended that LPC strengthen assessment to provide the necessary evidence of the achievement of learning in the accelerated degree programs. (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.6)

D. **Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation**

In 2016, LPC’s faculty redeveloped the general education objectives to align with the transition to a multi-major university. There are now six objectives reflecting the five WSCUC core competencies, plus an objective focused on diversity. An institutional Assessment Plan exists with a curriculum matrix identifying where each outcome is addressed and where signature assignments are pulled for assessment of student learning. (CFR2.2a) All programs have capstone or senior seminar assessments that will be utilized for summative assessment.

An assessment of achievement of the WSCUC core competencies is presented in the institutional report. As with the assessment of ILOs and PLOs, the method of
concluding whether objectives were met was unclear for some competencies (e.g. communication competency and diversity). Student performance was high for the oral communication competency. There was a decline in achievement from 2010-2011 to 2016-2017 for the critical thinking and information literacy competencies, based on data from direct methods of assessment. In both cases, faculty had a similar concern regarding whether the senior assignment provides an appropriate measurement of the competency. Capstone assignments are being modified in response to better capture achievement. An external assessment for critical thinking is also being added to measure the development of the competency from the beginning to the end of the program.

As with the assessment of ILOs, student perceptions show better results than the direct assessment data. The report states that there is “almost universal agreement among students in their ability to perform the competencies.”

It is important to note that LPC’s response to the direct assessment results is frequently to revise individual courses, in particular signature assignments and capstone projects, to better capture achievement. Alternatively, a more comprehensive approach, focused on a variety of data, on the development of the competencies throughout the curriculum, and on the corresponding academic support services may contribute information and highlight other areas of intervention beyond the alignment of the course assignments. The depth of looking at these assignments and the faculty’s willingness to modify them are laudable. (CFR 2.4) Nonetheless, given the varied level of skills at entry for LPC students and the overarching nature of the competencies, a more comprehensive approach may make a stronger impact.
LPC has been working to develop a graduate culture since the introduction of its first master’s program in 2010. Graduate PLOs, entrance and graduation requirements are distinct from undergraduate requirements. Diverse research elements are included across the graduate curriculum. Students are expected to engage primary sources in their research and to demonstrate evaluation of research methodology and outcomes. The DQP was used to guide the development of graduate outcomes and attention was paid to research, scholarship, and higher order objectives such as analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. (CFR 2.2b)

Consistent with the institutional mission, faculty scholarship is broadly defined and will continue to be “focused on advancing the institution’s mission rather than advancing the field,” There is funding for conference travel and presentations and clear accounting for research in the faculty workload. LPC is continuing to refine the role of scholarship in the faculty evaluation processes and wishes to increase its emphasis on scholarship and research. (CFR 2.8, 2.9)

E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation

Aiming to engage the whole campus in student success efforts, LPC has a Strategic Plan that highlights student success and retention as a high priority in its Strategic Goal 1 (“LPC will support and demonstrate high quality student learning and high rates of retention and graduation”); and Strategic Objective 1D: (“Improve student retention and graduation rates through the creation of a comprehensive Retention Plan”). (CFRs 4.2, 4.7)
Developed by the Enrollment, Retention and Student Success (ERSS) Committee and approved by the faculty and the Administrative Council, LPC’s Retention Plan 2017 creates a comprehensive and dynamic context to support student success that involves seven areas: student expectations, student goals, institutional goals, program goals, student persistence toward degree, student on-time graduation, and student placement. LPC’s institutional report indicates that ERS determined that thirty-two initiatives (48%) have been implemented.

LPC’s graduation rate dashboard (LPC-GRD) reveals a much higher eight-year average absolute graduation rate (AGR) (66%) than the graduation rates calculated by the IPEDS first-time, full-time freshmen cohort formula (41%). LPC identifies a variety of reasons for the difference, including the significant percentage of transfer students, the higher completion rates in the adult degree completion program, and the AA degree program at the LPC-Ignite extension site. (CFR 2.10)

The Institutional Research Office (IRO) uses various assessment instruments to collect and analyze student success data, including various student surveys, and tracks retention and graduation rates data according to different student characteristics. The institution makes student success data available internally through the institutional dashboard and externally through the institutional effectiveness webpage. (CFRs 1.2, 2.10, 4.3, 4.5)

The ERS reviews the data collected and analyzed by the IRO to measure student success and establish completion goals (CFR 4.2) and benchmark its completion rates
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with its peer institutions in WSCUC and professionally accredited Association of Biblical Higher Education (ABHE) institutions of similar size. (CFR 4.1)

LPC implemented new student success and retention initiatives such as the Academic Resource Center and Mapworks® software, with a holistic approach to identify at-risk students at an early stage to make early intervention possible. (CFR 2.10, 2.13) Currently the Mapworks system is monitored by the Student Development Office. It was clear from the visit that LPC is aware of the potential of using this software system more fully. The team suggests that LPC not only keeps monitoring at-risk students through Mapworks but, more importantly, develops a comprehensive protocol that clearly identifies resources on campus and communicates with at-risk students about these resources in an appropriate and timely fashion.

LPC uses its Diversity Report to inform the Board of Trustees of student and employee demographic data and the results of various surveys. The 2015-2016 Continuing Student Survey shows that 23% of students disagree or strongly disagree that LPC values rich ethnic diversity, and the same survey administered in 2016-2017 shows a decrease in the percentage of students making that choice. (16.3%) When responding to the statement “the LPC community provides opportunities for the voices of diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives to be heard,” 41% of students in the 2015-2016 survey chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree, and in 2016-2017 17.1% students made the same choice. Student survey results show some early signs of improvements of LPC’s efforts in diversity, but there was a significant group of students who voiced concerns about the current level of effort to address issues of inclusion, safety, and respect among students,
in the classroom and more generally. The team encourages the institution to continue focusing in this area, track the progress of its initiatives, and keep monitoring retention and graduation rates of minority students. (CFRs 1.4, 2.2a, 3.1, 4.2)

F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence

LPC identifies data-informed decision making and quality assurance processes as its priority in its Strategic Plan and has strengthened institutional research functions to better support its quality assurance and improvements commitment. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3) The visit confirmed LPC’s acknowledgement of the importance of establishing an evidence-based decision-making culture; LPC utilizes data in daily practices.

The annual assessment report describes the data instruments used in collecting data for program review, as well as the components, process, and timeline of assessing both academic and co-curricular departments. Faculty conduct annual assessments of program quality and student achievement of learning outcomes through evaluation of direct, indirect, and descriptive evidence guided by each program’s Assessment Plan. The IR Office has helped programs to use more standardized data templates and provides training on assessment. Facilitated by the IR Office, a high percentage of departments (95%) complete annual assessment reports. The institution shows diligence in carrying out program reviews and making changes as the result of its program review process. (CFRs 1.4, 2.7, 3.1, 3.2, 3.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3) Earlier in this team report, the team suggested that program reviews include data on achievement of all PLOs and that efforts aimed at
improving PLOs should be based on a more comprehensive consideration of the entire curriculum and support systems.

As a member of the president’s cabinet, the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness has opportunities to present important data and research to the cabinet, the Board of Trustees, the Administrative Council, faculty and staff. The Institutional Research Office (IRO) makes data available to internal audiences through an institutional dashboard and to external audiences through the Institutional Effectiveness webpage. Those efforts reflect LPC’s commitment to making student learning outcomes, student success, and institutional effectiveness data transparent. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6)

LPC’s efforts in building an evidence-based decision-making culture is recognized by theWSCUC team. As stated in Standard 4, the team urges LPC to invest more in its Institutional Research Office. Furthermore, during LPC’s transition from college to university, LPC will have new academic programs to implement, more students to serve, and a more complex institution to manage, which will not only require more data, but also extra workload to adjust the current database to include the new programs and reflect major organizational changes. In order to address the increasing data needs to help LPC successfully transition from a college to university, the Institutional Research Office (IRO) needs to continue to evolve. Other than equipping the IRO with adequate staffing, the team encourages LPC to consider the following strategies: prioritizing its IR resources; utilizing Information Technology (IT) support and/or data visualization tools to automate data reporting; educating and empowering data users to make the best use of data.
G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

Adequacy of Financial Resources

Tuition and fees continue to drive LPC’s budget as 67% of its revenues come from this category. When student housing and meal plan revenue are added, the figure rises to 87%. Changes in enrollment and enrollment-related revenue will therefore have an impact on LPC’s long-term financial sustainability. LPC has nonetheless achieved a good level of financial stability and operating strength with positive net operating revenues for ten of the last eleven years. Additionally, all financial audits have been unqualified. Positive net operating revenues are an important metric in achieving financial sustainability. Given the issues many small private colleges are currently facing, this is an admirable achievement in light of the student population that LPC attracts.

One measure of financial health is the Composite Financial Index (CFI) which evaluates the financial well-being of higher education institutions. Data shows that in the past seven fiscal years, LPC’s CFI scores have exceeded the minimum ratio deemed sufficient to indicate financial health. Its CFI scores have ranged from 4.57 to 7.84; 3.0 is the minimum threshold for financially strong institutions. LPC’s average score of 6.14 over the past seven years indicates strong financial grounds to move confidently into the future and be able to adapt to a changing higher education landscape. (CFR 3.4, 4.6)

Although the majority of its operating revenues come from tuition and fees, LPC also relies on funding from its founding organization, the Foursquare Church.
Foursquare’s funding commitment in 2014 was for a four-year, $800,000 per year contribution to support scholarships and general operations. The final payment of that commitment is scheduled to be received by LPC in 2019. LPC received a new commitment from the Foursquare Foundation during the team’s visit for continued support of LPC, but a dollar amount was not specified as before. It should be noted that Foursquare supports both the California campus and Virginia campuses through the Foursquare Foundation, which is related to the Foursquare Church.

LPC has made investments in infrastructure and investments in new programs without utilizing long-term debt, although a new $330,000 mortgage was taken to purchase a condominium to be used for visiting instructors and/or staff relocations. Being substantially debt-free will allow LPC to direct more of its operating budget toward student programs and less toward debt service. (CFR 3.4)

LPC’s current Strategic Plan establishes a priority for increasing scholarship support through fundraising so that LPC’s Academic Plans remain affordable and competitive. This is especially important given that more than 50% of its students receive federal Pell Grant funding, which is provided only to students with exceptional financial need. Advancement activities would be helpful to provide additional revenue streams, which is an area that has lacked attention at LPC over the years. Recently hired staff members in Advancement are planning to focus their efforts primarily on a capital campaign. A formal Fundraising Plan, while aggressive, has been created with the goal of raising $25 million within the next six years. In addition to focusing on scholarship support, the campaign will also focus on program support, faculty support and capital
improvements. Included in the six-year goal is a $1 million donation for naming rights to the LPC’s College of Ministry. Given what appears to be a relatively small donor base, the financial capability of the LPC’s existing donor base is impressive. LPC has also invested in software programs to support its fundraising campaigns. The fundraising efforts appear to be paying off. Fiscal year 2018 gifts totaled $987,466, an impressive increase of 45% over Fiscal 2017’s gift total. (CFR 3.4, 4.6)

Because LPC revenue depends on tuition and fees, student enrollment and enrollment management are critical to its success. After six consecutive years of increasing enrollments, LPC experienced their first decline 2017-2018. Due to this decline, LPC created a formal Action Plan to supplement its existing Enrollment Management Plan. The Action Plan highlights several recommendations to attempt to reverse the declining enrollment trend: (1) establish a dedicated financial aid counselor for all incoming students; (2) enhance communication with all applicants; (3) add marketing messaging to financial aid communications; (4) create proactive deadlines; (5) enhance training for both the admissions and financial aid staff; and (6) assess financial aid for each student. The Admissions Department also created and implemented a separate Marketing and Operational Plan that supports its master Enrollment Management Plan. The team was provided five-year revenue and expense projections by program that include projected enrollments, but we found it unusual that the specific enrollment goals were not included in its formal Action Plan or Enrollment Management Plan with a roadmap for reaching the enrollment goals.
LPC’s data indicated that the primary driver of the enrollment decline was a large drop in transfer students. Further analysis indicated that most of these transfers were applicants who had little to no communication with an admissions counselor. LPC responded by increasing the level of communication for applicants, which demonstrates how the institution uses data appropriately to make decisions to improve financial sustainability.

In response to market research, LPC began enrolling students in new academic programs in 2016 in an effort to increase enrollment. Additional programs are scheduled to begin at both the bachelor’s and master’s levels over the next 8 years, which will aid in increasing enrollment. LPC will need to watch these programs closely to ensure a positive contribution to net operating revenues, and revise strategies if enrollment targets are not met. It will also need to monitor enrollment at its Virginia campus, which has experienced a 37% decline in enrollment over the past two years and is operating at only 20% of capacity. Continued enrollment declines in Virginia could be a potential future drain on resources. It also appears that LPC’s online programs have not received adequate financial support and development to thrive. Successful online programs are the result of strategic initiatives. Faculty buy-in is crucial and online faculty need professional development and adequate support for the technology.

Admissions and non-academic staff at the Virginia campus are employees of Ignite, which while unusual, does relieve LPC of a financial burden. The team also discovered that LPC has no enrolled students at its California location during the summer months. The institution might consider using their facilities during the summer months.
The institution might consider using its facilities during the summer, for example, by beginning a pre-college summer program for high school students. This would allow high school students an opportunity to experience LPC over a few weeks, could boost fall start numbers if students return to its degree program, and generate additional revenue. (CFR 3.4, 4.6, 4.7) LPC should also consider becoming a member of the Common App, an application portal open only to regionally-accredited institutions. Becoming a member will allow the institution to cast a wider net to potential applicants.

Alignment of Financial Resources

It is important that educational institutions properly align its resources to support institutional priorities, the most important of which are student learning and success. The Strategic Plan should therefore provide goals that lead to initiatives that align with LPC’s mission and contribute to the sustainability of the institution. LPC’s 2014-2019 Strategic Plan focuses on these priorities and provides a blueprint for goals it hopes to achieve. Specific priorities mentioned in the Strategic Plan include revisions of the core curriculum, Institutional Effectiveness program reviews, and contains plans to achieve targeted student/staff ratios across all departments, improvement of retention and graduation rates, and program improvements in graduate-level programs. It also appears that the budget and resource allocations are in line with these priorities and provides a good basis for educational effectiveness and student success. (CFR 1.2, 2.2, 3.6)

The 2017-2018 budget allocates 37% of the total to instructional and student-related segments of the college. If including other student services segments, such as residential life, campus dining, athletics and others, the total resources allocated to the
student experience is 72%. This suggests that LPC does make student success and educational effectiveness a priority. However, with the number of initiatives planned and in light of level or declining enrollment numbers, LPC will need to be prudent with spending resources and the timing of when these resources are expended. (CFR 3.4, 3.5, 4.3)

Evaluating the Evolving Higher Education Landscape and Anticipating Changes

To help determine what might lie ahead for LPC with the evolving higher education environment, the institution formed the SPC, described previously. The SPC reviews a variety of data, including labor statistics, trends in higher education, reports on the future of the Foursquare Church, local demographics, and comparisons with peer institutions, as well as internal data from student and alumni surveys, enrollment, retention, and budget trends. Based on data collected, the SPC created a 2014-2019 Strategic Plan with due dates for each objective, metrics, the staff member in charge of the objective, and most importantly, the estimated cost of each objective for budgeting purposes. The SPC assesses threats and potential opportunities for higher education in general, and for LPC, specifically. The Strategic Plan is supported by plans created by related stakeholders including an Academic Plan, Enrollment Management Plan, Advancement Plan, Athletics Plan and Five-Year Budget Plan. The Strategic Plan ultimately became Vision 2020, the branded title of their 5-year Plan. Vision 2020 includes five priorities: (1) supporting student learning and high rates of retention and graduation; (2) ensuring long-term sustainability and diversification of revenues; (3) ensuring that LPC’s programs prepare graduates for careers; (4) increasing
institutional governance and administrative structure; and (5) recognition as the flagship college of Foursquare Church. The Strategic Plan continues to guide LPC’s decision making, and during regular meetings the SPC reviews progress on initiatives scheduled for completion and identifies new strategic initiatives to add to the Plan. LPC properly treats its Strategic Plan as an evolving document that has the flexibility to change and adapt to current market conditions. It is admirable that LPC has completed 73% of the strategic initiatives thus far with another two years remaining in the Five-year Plan. LPC has taken and acted on prior recommendations related to strategic planning and it is apparent they have successfully incorporated strategic planning in their decision making with decisions informed by data. LPC has already begun creating its next Strategic Plan that will guide the institution’s efforts from 2020-2025. The process for the new Strategic Plan will be the same as the prior plan by compiling data and conducting meetings with internal and external stakeholders. LPC correctly recognizes that changes in higher education pose threats to its current model including the value, relevance, and efficacy of faith-based institutions of higher education. (CFR 4.3, 4.7)

Several questions that LPC will continue to face include: (1) a saturated student recruitment market in Southern California; (2) tuition dependency; (3) efforts to increase enrollment at its off-campus Virginia location and in new programs it intends to launch; (4) an LPC student population that likely will not be able to sustain increased tuition costs, (5) an increasingly diverse population in Southern California and the United States more generally, (6) the potential and difficulties of reaching and serving a global student population. With a formal strategic planning process in place, LPC seems well-positioned
to get an informed perspective on its strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to maintain stability and sustainability. While they have created various long-term plans in finance, academics, admissions and strategy, LPC will need to stay flexible, responsive, and data-driven. Additionally, it should continue to help staff and faculty understand their roles in the prudent use of financial resources. On a regular basis, LPC should also create staff development opportunities that bring awareness of the future changes in higher education and how these changes can impact its sustainability. (CFR 3.4, 4.7)

H. Component 8: Optional essay on institution-specific themes, N/A

N/A

I. Component 9: Reflection and Plans for Improvement

LPC has been working to position itself as a small, faith-based, high access, diversity-embracing university on the move, and has been engaged in an impressive, five-year turnaround effort that has improved its decision making and shared governance processes, stabilized its finances, and strengthened its enrollment management, including retention and graduation rates. The clarity of its mission, vision, and goals has inspired the entire campus – faculty, administration, and staff – to reflect deeply on their identity, adopt a “can-do” attitude toward problem solving and goal attainment, and work collaboratively and vigorously to achieve noteworthy program development success as well as administrative effectiveness. They have moved from one traditional undergraduate major and one degree-completion program to the current six undergraduate majors, two online degree-completion programs, two master’s degrees
(online), and one extension campus. Their long-term plans (2026-2027) project an additional four online master’s degrees, four undergraduate majors, and one online degree-completion program as part of their move toward university status. A number of key factors have contributed to this achievement: the visionary, skillful leadership of the president; the enthusiastic, robust embrace of evidence-based decision making by faculty, staff, and administration under the tutelage of the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness; the spirited commitment of a reconstituted Board of Trustees; and the reframing of the relationship with the Foursquare denomination.

The WSCUC Team applauds the dynamism of the Enrollment Management team in the current competitive and disrupted environment of higher education, and particularly in the faith-based institution space. Looking ahead, however, the WSCUC Team worries that LPC’s approach to enrollment is reaching the limits of its current delineated market.

- The Foursquare Church has fewer than 300,000 members and is not growing.
- Other Pentecostal denominations, e.g., the Assemblies of God, have their own seminaries and Bible colleges.
- While LPC is the flagship of the Foursquare Church, it competes generally with other Christian colleges and universities for students, especially in California.
- 40% of traditional undergraduate (TUG) students and 53% of all students are from a Foursquare background.
• The most successful recent recruitment innovation has been the addition of the athletic programs, especially basketball. How much more can the athletic programs contribute to enrollment growth?

• It’s not clear whether adding new degree programs and majors now contemplated at the undergraduate or master’s level will yield significant numbers of additional students. Is LPC’s market research aligned on this question?

• LPC does not have a specific overall enrollment goal. Enrollment goals are calculated on an annual basis, based on the previous five years. Translated, this means that there is not a well-defined strategic initiative for increasing enrollment.

• While the appeal of small colleges for some is undeniably positive, it is difficult for colleges and universities with fewer than 1000 students to survive. LPC’s enrollment is 70% of that.

• More generally, LPC may need to invest more resources in the development of its brand in the competitive world of higher education.

LPC’s Strategic Plan has served it well over the past five years. Moreover, the trustees and administration have worked to modify the Strategic Plan as needed based on new data, analysis, and changing conditions. However, in light of the challenges faced in the area of enrollment, now may be the right time for LPC to consider a fresh strategic planning process that reimagines LPC ten years hence as a way to open up the core questions that will form the basis for its work in the decade ahead. LPC could not have
undertaken such a bold, visionary process five year ago. But now it has achieved a position of strength that allows it to address the future in a fresh way.

There may be a strong desire, after so many years of rapid change, for LPC to “take a breather” and consolidate its work in the next couple of years. The WSCUC team hopes that LPC will resist this temptation, given the rapid demographic changes happening in the church and the world. Developing a new Strategic Plan will allow LPC to celebrate its successes, consolidate its gains, and think anew about how it can serve God’s purposes and make its unique contribution to the world God loves.
SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS, AS APPROPRIATE, N/A
SECTION IV -- FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

LPC has many strengths to draw upon as it faces the challenges inherent in higher education, especially as a faith-based institution. They have already addressed many issues in a short period of time. The commendations and recommendations below can help LPC navigate its future, building on its strengths and addressing the challenges currently on the horizon. The team witnessed an institution that has mobilized its resources and galvanized its cabinet, faculty, staff, and board to move the college to the next level, including university status.

A. Commendations

The team commends Life Pacific College for the following accomplishments and practices:

1. Clarity of identity and purpose as reflected in the mission statement;
2. Positive financial results in ten of the last eleven years, with low long-term debt and strong financial ratios;
3. High degree of institutional intentionality and energy to address previous commission actions;
4. Commitments to student success including the redesign of the first-year experience courses and the addition of an associate vice president for student development;
5. Strong faculty collaboration on student learning assessment;
6. Establishment of an evidenced-based decision-making culture;
7. Integration of the budgeting process into the development of new educational programs.

B. Recommendations

The team recommends that, as a part of its effort to be recognized as a university, Life Pacific College:

1. Address the immediate concerns of students, faculty, and staff regarding racial insensitivity, student safety, inclusion, and equity; hire a qualified Chief Diversity Officer to operate at the president’s cabinet level; and work with urgency to achieve LPC’s strategic goals for diversity, equity and inclusion, engaging the entire community and elevating the goals to the first tier of the Strategic Plan.

2. Increase its institutional infrastructure and capacity to support rapid growth and manage the complexity of a university model.

3. Develop a new ten-year comprehensive Strategic Plan as a university that includes enrollment targets, financial goals and contingencies for programs that fall short of expectations.

We also have one, very specific recommendation to offer as well:

4. Strengthen assessment to provide the necessary evidence of the achievement of student learning in the accelerated degree programs, given established equivalency of student work for credit hours. (CFR 2.1, CFR 2.6)
# APPENDICES

## A. CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible? × YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where is the policy located? 2017 LPC Faculty Handbook, pp. 61-63; 2018 LPC Faculty Handbook pp. 70-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Course workload is specified for traditional programs. For non-traditional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPC states that “achievement of equivalent outcomes, not equivalent volume of work, is the primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>concern.” The self-study refers to traditional programs hours only. The team acquired additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information on credit hour for the nontraditional programs during the review process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>periodic audits)? × YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the institution adhere to this procedure? × YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: The institution has developed a “time-to-task” worksheet which faculty use to evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courses. Faculty designing new courses submit this worksheet as part of the approval process. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>review has been made part of the program review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet</td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>× YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: LPC has a sixteen-week semester, comprised of 15 weeks of instruction plus finals; classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are based on a 50-minute hour in order to comply with the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? One for bachelor’s, one for master’s, as well as seven time-to-task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worksheets, and one program review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? undergraduate and graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? BAML, Conflict Management, Leadership Ethics, Cultural Anthropology, Cultural Trends and Ministry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☐ YES X NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Courses pertaining to online accelerated programs require less hours compared to traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>courses, for the same number of credits. LPC states that adult learners can process information more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>quickly and that there should be verifiable achievement of learning outcomes for these programs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in lieu of the traditional course workload. The time to task worksheet of one online course that was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not part of the accelerated programs was also found to require lower hours. A recommendation has been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>made as part of the reaffirmation review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</td>
<td>How many syllabi were reviewed? – See above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of courses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hours to warrant the credit awarded? ☐ YES ☐ NO -See above for accelerated programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See comments above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)</td>
<td>How many programs were reviewed? all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kinds of programs were reviewed? Bachelor’s and master’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What degree level(s)? all levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What discipline(s)? all disciplines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length?  × YES □ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: The number of credits for each program is adequate. Associate programs are a minimum of 64 units. Bachelor programs a minimum of 120 units (most are 128). And Master’s programs a minimum of 36 units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Review Completed By: Mihaela Tanasescu  
Date: 10/7/18
B. MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal regulations** | Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? YES  
Comments: Admissions Counselors are compensated hourly and some by salary. No bonuses are given for enrollment, and promotions are not based on enrollment. |
| Degree completion and cost | Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? YES  
Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? YES  
Comments: Degree Description “Fact Sheets” are made available via hardcopy and online via the Academics pages. For an example see the BA in Human Development & Psychology program page. Tuition & Fees webpage highlights cost breakdown per each program. |
| Careers and employment | Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? YES  
Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? YES  
Comments: The college’s “Career Services” webpage provides information on employment and links to the “Foursquare Job Link” which provides a career platform for job placement available to LPC students. Program webpages list potential careers for each major as well as graduate schools accepting LPC graduates. The Institutional Data webpage includes data on employment of graduates. |

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)  
**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.*

Review Completed By: Richard Crowe  
Date: October 10, 2018
### C. STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW

Institution: Life Pacific College  
Date: September 27, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
<th>Verified Yes/No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Policy on student complaints** | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  
Is the policy or procedure easily accessible?  
Yes, the academic policy is:  
• Website: [http://www.lifepacific.edu/institutional-data](http://www.lifepacific.edu/institutional-data)  
• 2017-2018 Student Handbook, p. 51, 61-63  
Less clear on non-academic grievances and complaints. | Yes |
| **Process(es)/procedure** | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? Please describe briefly:  
The procedure is outlined in the current catalogue and student handbook. In talking with administration, they indicated that the procedure was followed. The procedure is operationalized in a very informal way.  
Does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
Comments: The process would benefit from clearer information to students. | Yes |
| **Records** | Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
The procedure in the catalogue does not indicate any record-keeping. The Vice President of Academic Affairs maintains academic records  
Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? Please describe briefly: Reported by administration that the VP of Academic Affairs tracks and monitors.  
Comments: It is recommended by the team that a formal process of documenting grievances be established. A clear articulation of the complaint, the evidence from all parties involved, and the resolution of the issue is necessary. This information should reside in separate files to allow for tracking and reporting as necessary. | Yes |

Review Completed By: Denis Meerdink  
Date: 9/28/2018
## D. TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW

### TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transfer Credit Policy(s) | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit?  
YES  
If so, where?  
http://lifepacific.edu/degree-completion-admission-process  
http://lifepacific.edu/graduate-admission-process  
Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education?  
YES  
Comments:  
The institution’s website indicates that transfer credits are only accepted from accredited institutions. The evaluation team learned during staff interviews that this policy is not always followed, as credits from unaccredited institutions have been transferred in at Life Pacific’s discretion. |

---

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

1. Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
2. Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.*

Review Completed By: Yang Zhang  
Date: 9/28/2018
E. OFF-CAMPUS LOCATION REVIEW

Institution: Life Pacific College
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation
Name of reviewer: Richard Crowe
Date of review: October 8, 2018

1. Site Name and Address

Life Pacific College – Ignite
900 Life Drive & 100 W. Main Street
Christiansburg, VA 24073

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a branch campus standalone location, or satellite location byWSCUC)

Life Pacific College offers one program, its Associate of Arts in General Studies, at the Christiansburg, VA site as an additional location. After consultation with WASC, a pilot program took place during 2011-12 in which students enrolled in ten courses (less than 50% of the degree program) at the Virginia site. The WSCUC Commission approved the LPC-Ignite Additional Location at the Cross Pointe Conference Center in Christiansburg, VA in May 2012 and students enrolled in the AA program at the site beginning Fall 2012. The LPC AA program is delivered through a collaborative arrangement with Ignite Academy, a discipleship and ministry training program that prepares high school graduates for work in the world. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV) granted authorization to offer the Associate of Arts in General Studies program at the Christiansburg location on July 19, 2011 and has reauthorized the program each subsequent year. A member of the Substantive Change committee visited the campus for the six-month site visit required following the approval of the additional off-campus location and issued a report on 4/19/2013. In 2016 the site began offering some classes nearby at 100 W. Main Street. Since this address is less than 25 miles from the approved location, it was determined in consultation with WSCUC staff that another substantive change was not necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2016</th>
<th>Fall 2017</th>
<th>Fall 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student FTE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty FTE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to Faculty</td>
<td>18:1</td>
<td>15.8:1</td>
<td>19:1</td>
<td>20:1</td>
<td>20.7:1</td>
<td>15.1:1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Cohort</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1 to Y2 Retention</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>For a recently approved site.</em> Has the institution followed up on the recommendations from the substantive change committee that approved this new site?</td>
<td>The site is entering its seventh year of operation. The institution submitted a progress report on the substantive change committee recommendations in 2012, six months after its approval, to the member of the Substantive Change committee who visited the campus for the six-month site visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Fit with Mission.</em> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</td>
<td>The institution’s mission is to develop leaders prepared to serve God in the Church, the workplace, and the world. The college has always recognized that delivering education to students regardless of location is part of its mission. It has extended educational opportunities through distance education since its founding in 1923 and extension sites since 2009. Admission requirements at the location are the same as those of the main campus. The additional location falls under the administration of the V.P. of Academic Affairs and the Academic Office. The college has employed a Site Director since the establishment of the additional location in 2012. The Site Director oversees the academic affairs, student services, and administrative services at the site. Ignite provides additional staffing from its own budget and these staff members work primarily in non-academic areas including recruitment, admissions, faculty support, student development, and ministry formation. The Site Director and Ignite staff is supported by the college’s administrative and departmental staff from the home campus who provide administrative, library, finance, financial aid, human resources, registrar, admissions, and academic support. Staffing levels are assessed annually as part of the institution’s budget process. LPC-Ignite is included in the institutional budget as a “department” for which income and expenses are tracked and reviewed in LPC’s monthly and annual financial statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Connection to the Institution.</em> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</td>
<td>Affiliation of the campus with LPC is clearly evident through signage and marketing materials. Students, faculty, and staff seem to also understand the connection of their site to the larger LPC institution because transactions such as transcript requests occur with California staff. LPC’s President, VP of Enrollment, and Dean of Institutional Effectiveness visit the location at least once a year. Additional LPC staff including the Librarian, Registrar, Director of Student Development, etc. also visit the campus periodically. Some Ignite staff comes to the home campus for training on student and faculty support and compliance with institutional policies and procedures. Students at the site are included in weekly emails from the President’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Quality of the Learning Site.</em> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</td>
<td>The location includes classrooms where classes are taught in newly renovated facilities with modern furnishings and equipped with LCD televisions. Facilities include a new library space, modernized administrative offices, designated space for a writing lab/study hall, and a large meeting hall. The campus is equipped with high speed internet which includes public areas and classrooms, as well as apartments and dorms. There are two part-time employees who provide comprehensive IT support to students, faculty and staff. A few students complained about the lack of printing service so this is something the institution might want to review. The Site Director, supported by the college’s administrative and departmental staff from the home campus, oversees management of the facility as well as academic affairs, student services, and administrative services at the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Student Support Services.</em> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other</td>
<td>Students at the additional location have access to student services including the Academic Office, Registrar, Financial Aid, Information Technology, and Finance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life Pacific College  
Reaffirmation Report

| Faculty. Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty is involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6) |
| Courses are taught by 6 to 8 adjunct faculty and the site director. Faculty are approved by the VP of Academic Affairs applying the same standards as the home campus and SCHEV requirements that faculty have at least 18 units of graduate studies credit relevant to the field in which they teach. Faculty meetings occur three times a semester. The relevant academic program committees at the home campus approve all course outlines and faculty at the site are encouraged to consider and propose changes in course design to improve student learning. For the last three years, faculty at the site have been involved in annual assessments of student learning either in face to face sessions or through LPC’s Aqua assessment software, conducted by the General Education Committee and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. |

| Curriculum and Delivery. Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6) |
| The AA curriculum is identical to the same program offered on the main campus. Any changes to course syllabi must be approved by LPC’s General Education Committee (a faculty committee) or by the LPC program committee (faculty committee) that oversees the particular course. Students complete course evaluations at the end of each course which are reviewed by the site-director and academic office. |

appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)

offices. LPC and Ignite staff work in a collaborative manner to provide student services, student support, and communication.

Registration for students at the location is provided through the Registrar’s Office by the Senior Registrar for Adult and Graduate Studies. The Registrar’s Office is available for phone or email advising. All students receive a degree audit with their registration information to ensure they understand the courses needed to complete their degree and to assist them in planning their workload for each semester. Student academic records are maintained at the home campus.

Students receive advisement on projected costs and financial aid availability by representatives at the Ignite Campus. Students are also advised to contact the Financial Aid Office at the home campus by email or phone. Counseling on financial aid awards is repeated annually for students and, upon separation or graduation, students are required to complete Financial Aid Exit Counseling, which covers loan repayment and prepares a student to successfully repay their student loans.

LPC’s Registrar and Academic offices determine and enforce academic policy and handle student appeals. The college has processes in place to identify students who are struggling due to academic or personal reasons. Intervention procedures include allowance for incomplete contracts, academic support resources such as the Writing Center which extension students can work with by email and phone, and referrals for personal counseling which are provided through the Cross Pointe Center for Spiritual Renewal.

The location includes library space dedicated to fulfill student and faculty information resource needs. The library is approximately 1550 sq. ft. and has seating for approximately 20 students, as well as an area for group study. The library provides Wi-Fi access. In addition to the on-campus library staff, students have access to library staff at the San Dimas campus through Skype for Business, email, and a live chat feature on the library website. The on-site library maintains approximately 8,000 volumes in its physical collection. Students and faculty can access the home campus library’s online catalog, search for books and fill out loan requests at a distance. Students and faculty can request material from reference books and periodicals to be photocopied and e-mailed as a .PDF attachment, faxed, or mailed to them at no charge. Student survey data shows a high level of satisfaction with these services.
**Retention and Graduation.** What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)

The college updates retention and graduation rate data for the additional location annually and is able to disaggregate the data according to gender, ethnicity, and other demographics. Y1 to Y2 retention rates are higher than the home campus at 72.6% for a five-year average. Graduation rates are comparable with the home campus with a five-year average of 54.6%.

**Student Learning.** How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)

LPC assesses student learning at the site through the same process used at the home campus. Faculty evaluates student work drawn from signature assignments connected to program goals with the use of a rubric to identify the level of student achievement. These annual assessments of student learning are conducted either in face to face sessions or through LPC’s Aqua assessment software, led by the General Education Committee and the Dean of Institutional Effectiveness. In addition, course evaluations include questions on student perception of accomplishment of course objective related to program learning outcomes.

**Quality Assurance Processes:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)

The quality assurance processes reflect processes from the home campus. Students complete course evaluations at the end of each course which are reviewed by the site-director and academic office. Annual student satisfaction surveys are conducted to identify any areas of concern. Student achievement of learning outcomes are measured through the annual assessment process. Assessment findings are used to measure instructor quality, which sometimes results in interventions to improve performance or change in instructors. Findings are also used to refine course design such as assignment instructions, course materials, and clearer linkage between program goals and course objectives. Surveys of student satisfaction reflect a high level of satisfaction with services provided at the location.

Review Completed By: Richard Crowe
Date: 10/13/2018
F. DISTANCE EDUCATION REVIEW

Institution: Life Pacific College
Type of Visit: Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Name of reviewer/s: Mihaela Tanasescu
Date/s of review: 10/7/2018

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)

Programs running at the time of the visit: BA in Ministry & Leadership degree (BAML) completion program, MA in Strategic Leadership (MASL), MA in Christian Leadership (MACL) – LPC degree in cooperation with TCA College in Singapore

Courses available for review:

LDST 410 Contemporary Approaches to Leadership
LDST 610 Strategic Leadership, Innovation, and Change
(Others available upon request)

2. Background Information (number of programs offered by distance education; degree levels; FTE enrollment in distance education courses/programs; history of offering distance education; percentage growth in distance education offerings and enrollment; platform, formats, and/or delivery method)

Life Pacific College has offered online courses since 2001. The college typically offers 8-12 courses in its traditional program online each semester to provide students with additional scheduling options. LPC currently offers four programs online using the Moodle learning management system (all programs went through the WSCUC substantive change approval process):

BA in Ministry & Leadership degree completion program (since 2005)
BA in Organizational Management degree completion program (beginning in Fall 2018)
MA in Strategic Leadership (since 2010)
MA in Christian Leadership – Collaboration with TCA College in Singapore (since January 2018)

From the beginning of the BAML online adult degree completion program in AY 2005/06 to AY 2017/18 490 students have enrolled in the program. The graduation rate for all cohorts up till AY 2014/15 is 64% and the average rate for the last five years is nearly 70%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Student Enrollment</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Enrollment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note that the 2014/15 cohort rate will increase as students who completed the program curriculum finish final leveling unit requirements.
From the beginning of the MASL online program in AY 2009/10 to AY 2017/18 253 students have enrolled in the program. The graduation rate for all cohorts up till AY 2014/15 is 67.7%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall Student Enrollment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Enrollment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The MACL’s first cohort consists of 10 students.

3. Nature of the review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

Observations and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry (refer to relevant CFRs to assure comprehensive consideration)</th>
<th>Observations and Findings</th>
<th>Follow-up Required (identify the issues)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fit with Mission.</strong> How does the institution conceive of distance learning relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How are distance education offerings planned, funded, and operationalized?</td>
<td>The institution’s mission is to develop “leaders prepared to serve God in the Church, the workplace, and the world.” The college has always recognized that delivering education to students unable to attend the residential campus is part of its mission. It has extended educational opportunities at a distance; first through independent study (correspondence) courses, and, since 2001, through online courses. The third goal in the college’s Strategic Plan identifies the importance of non-traditional programs to its mission and strategies, stating “LPC will offer an array of biblically-integrated traditional and non-traditional programs preparing graduates for careers in ministry, psychological and social services, business, communication, education, and leadership serving the public good.” The college’s Academic Plan which lays out the schedule for additional programs including detailed budget projections through 2025 includes distance education programs. All distance education programs went through the institution’s academic approval process which includes review from faculty, the administrative council, and the board of trustees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> How are distance education students integrated into the life and culture of the institution?</td>
<td>All online courses include new-student orientation, discussion forums and prayer request forums. Class sizes are kept to about 20 students, allowing faculty to have a high level of interaction and relationship with students. In addition, distance students are able to access weekly livestreaming of school events including chapel services. The library conducts online webinars to inform students on research and access to information resources. Students also have access to student services such as the writing center tutoring, advising, and career services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the DE Infrastructure.</strong> Are the learning platform and academic infrastructure of the site conducive to learning and interaction between faculty and students and</td>
<td>Life Pacific College has offered online courses since 2001, demonstrating its ability to support teaching and learning through online delivery for over fifteen years. The college offers online courses and web-enhanced sections of on-campus courses using Moodle as its course management system. The college is currently running Moodle 3.1.5. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
software is hosted by an external agency, Remote Learner, which provides consistent updates, data backup, and 99% uptime. The LPC Faculty Assistant for Online Learning serves as the administrator for the LPC Moodle and ensures that the appropriate technology supports this Online learning platform.

**Student Support Services:** What is the institution’s capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services, academic support and other services appropriate to distance modality? What do data show about the effectiveness of the services?

Distance education students have access to student services including the Academic Office, Registrar, Financial Aid, Information Technology, and Finance offices. The various departments communicate with students concerning policies, schedules, and resources during orientation and through the college catalog, and regular emails.

Since LPC’s distance education programs are delivered through a cohort structure of lock-step courses, there is less need for advising over the length of the curriculum than in a traditional program. The college has processes in place to identify students who are struggling because of academic or personal reasons. Intervention procedures include allowance for incomplete contracts, stop-out procedures, academic support resources such as the Writing Center, and referrals for personal counseling.

LPC’s library provides off-site students and faculty with all vital library services. Students and faculty can access the library’s eBook resources and online catalog, search for books available through the Life Pacific College Library and fill out loan requests. Students and faculty at a distance can request material from reference books and journals to be e-mailed as a .PDF attachment. Most resources can be accessed from any location.

Student surveys demonstrate satisfaction with these services.

**Faculty.** Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? Do they teach only online courses? In what ways does the institution ensure that distance learning faculty are oriented, supported, and integrated appropriately into the academic life of the institution? How are faculty involved in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? How are faculty trained and supported to teach in this modality?

LPC traditionally seeks a 33/67 ratio between full-time and adjunct faculty for its online programs due to its value for practical experience in the field. All faculty receive a 30-minute video overview about Life Pacific College. The video, featuring several members of LPC’s staff and faculty, introduces new faculty members to LPC’s mission, history, values, and the way LPC views course/class-session design. The program chair works with faculty to help them understand the program and its purpose.

Any faculty who do not have previous online experience goes through online training through the AGS office. The AGS Office provides technical support as well as orientation and ongoing training to faculty members working directly with non-traditional students through workshops, one-on-one training and mentoring, and opportunities to participate in external conferences to each online teacher. The training addresses issues ranging from online learning theory, working with the course management system, copyright policy, and developing an online course. It also provides sample course outlines, discussion questions, and lectures. New online instructors are able to access an online course, taught by an experienced instructor, before their course begins. The AGS Director and the Program Chair spend time with each new online professor providing personal training on the course management system and designing an online class, and frequently communicate with online faculty as they prepare and teach their courses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Curriculum and Delivery.</strong> Who designs the distance education programs and courses? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to on-ground offerings? (Submit credit hour report.)</th>
<th>Distance education programs are designed by a committee made up of faculty and field experts and approved by the college’s Academic Planning and Curriculum Review Committee prior. LPC uses a team of 2-3 faculty to design each course. Typically, one member of the design team will teach the course during its initial offering. The relevant academic program committee gives final approval to newly designed courses.</th>
<th>As noted in the report, the volume of work for courses in non-traditional accelerated programs is lower than LPC’s traditional courses. A recommendation was made as part of the review to strengthen assessment of learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Graduation.</strong> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students taking online courses and programs? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to on-ground programs and to other institutions’ online offerings? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed?</td>
<td>The college updates retention and graduation rate data for its online programs annually and is able to disaggregate the data according to gender, ethnicity, in-state/out-of-state resident, Foursquare/Non-Foursquare, marital status, and age. Graduation rates are surpassing the institution’s benchmarks with five years averages around 70%. Data for the BAML program shows that graduation rates are similar for most of the disaggregates except for age, where the youngest group has the highest graduation rate and the oldest group (over 50) the lowest, and ethnicity where White and Asian student graduation rates are 15% to 20% higher than Hispanic and African American. Program committees and departmental staff are considering this data in developing additional student support services.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning.</strong> How does the institution assess student learning for online programs and courses? Is this process comparable to that used in on-ground courses? What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results of on-ground students, if applicable, or with other online offerings?</td>
<td>The relevant academic program committee assesses student achievement of program outcomes following the same process as all traditional and non-traditional programs. This process includes assessment of collected student work from signature assignments (direct evidence) relating to the program outcomes evaluated that year using rubrics, reporting and providing reflection upon the data as well as making recommendations for improvement. In addition, student perception regarding accomplishing learning outcomes (indirect evidence) is reviewed through the use of course evaluations and surveys. All distance education programs are included in the institution’s academic program review cycle.</td>
<td>A recommendation was made to strengthen assessment of outcomes for distance education program, including assessing all PLOs in the program reviews through direct data. This is particularly relevant given credit hour equivalency for these programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts with Vendors.</strong> Are there any arrangements with outside vendors concerning the infrastructure, delivery, development, or instruction of courses? If so, do these comport with the policy on Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations?</td>
<td>LPC uses the Moodle learning management system contracting with Remote Learner for offsite hosting. The contract complies with the Contracts with Unaccredited Organizations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Quality Assurance Processes:** How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover distance education? What evidence is provided that distance education programs and courses are educationally effective? | Programs and courses are assessed by the relevant academic program committee. Student evaluations at the conclusion of each course provide summative assessment on curriculum, faculty, technology, online support resources, and the online experience. Achievement of student learning outcomes is measured through the annual student learning assessment process described above. Student satisfaction is measured through course evaluations and annual student surveys.

All distance education programs are included in the institution’s academic program review cycle which includes an in-depth analysis of program quality including program design, course quality, student achievement of learning outcomes, and program sustainability every 5 to 6 years.

Graduation rates for distance education programs exceed those for traditional programs. | See comments above. |