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SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

Founded in 1944 as Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary (GGBTS), Gateway Seminary of the Southern Baptist Convention is a professional graduate institution that is committed to provide theological training for ministerial leaders in the western United States. The name of the institution and the location of its main campus changed in summer of 2016, when the institution moved from Mill Valley to Ontario, California. The Mill Valley campus was a large multi building campus on 120 acres overlooking San Francisco Bay. However, future development was limited, and the aging campus infrastructure had significant deferred maintenance needs. The sale of the Mill Valley campus has afforded the institution the ability to transform itself by building a modern campus in Ontario that provides more total square footage of usable space than was available on the Mill Valley campus. The new campus is located in a six-story office building that was finished and furnished to meet the seminary’s needs. Because it is actually larger than the previous campus, it feels spacious with high-quality learning and working spaces throughout. (The successful relocation of the seminary is addressed in Section II below.) At the Ontario campus and four additional locations in the western United States (Fremont, Denver, Phoenix, and Vancouver), the seminary enrolled more than 900 students in fall 2018 in on-ground and online programs ranging from ministry certificates to doctoral degrees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doctoral Degrees</th>
<th>Master Degrees</th>
<th>Certificates</th>
<th>Diplomas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Biblical Studies or Theology</td>
<td>*Master of Divinity</td>
<td>*Bible Teaching</td>
<td>*Educational Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Ministry</td>
<td>*Master of Theological Studies</td>
<td>Children’s Ministry</td>
<td>*Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*MA Educational Leadership</td>
<td>*Church Planting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Master of Missiology</td>
<td>Collegiate Ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*MA Intercultural Studies</td>
<td>*Mission Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry to Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*Youth Ministry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goal for all programs is expressed in the mission statement: “Shaping leaders who expand God’s kingdom around the world.”

Gateway, one of six seminaries of the Southern Baptist Convention, serves a more diverse student body than do the others. In fall 2018, the seminary’s main campus, offering all degrees, has no absolute majority (50% or higher) ethnic group. Similarly, the seminary’s most comprehensive and most heavily populated degree (MDIV) serves a population of students that is 40% Anglo, 29% Asian, 12% Unknown, 7% African American and 4% Hispanic. 85% of the students are members of the Southern Baptist Convention.

One of the nation’s ten largest seminaries, Gateway first sought and received full accreditation from the Association of Theological Schools (ATS) in 1961 and was last reaffirmed for an additional ten years in June 2011. The seminary received accreditation from WSCUC in 1971; most recently, the reaffirmation process was completed under the former WSCUC system with a Capacity and Preparatory Review in 2009 and an Educational Effectiveness Review in 2011, conducted conjointly with ATS. An Interim Report was scheduled for March 2014 and the next visit scheduled for 2017. The Off-Site Review, originally scheduled for fall 2017, was postponed to spring 2018 owing to the campus move and related issues, with this Accreditation Visit held in fall 2018. Members of the visiting team interviewed faculty and students and observed classes at the Vancouver and Fremont campuses; those reports, included in appendix B, verify the consistency and quality of program offerings.
B. Description of Team’s Review Process

The evaluation team reviewed the institutional report and supporting materials, Commission Action Letters, documents from a recent Special Visit, and the supplemental materials requested after the team’s Offsite Review (OSR) in February 2018. The team was provided with a very functional meeting room and found the institution’s staff to be hospitable and responsive to requests for information. During the Accreditation Visit the team toured the campus, reviewed communications sent to the confidential e-mail account, and met with multiple constituencies to explore further the issues raised in the institutional report and the lines of inquiry identified during the Offsite Review. The eight lines of inquiry were:

1. Campus Relocation  
   How has the move impacted core functions of the institution, e.g., faculty and staffing patterns, student demographics, student services, academic and field-based instruction?

2. Diversity  
   How do you imagine the diversity of the wider society and the move to southern California impacting student demographics over the next decade and beyond? How are reflections on those emerging trends shaping strategic planning for the institution?

3. Curriculum  
   How do you ensure graduate programs are more advanced than undergraduate programs in terms of curricula, standards of performance, and student learning outcomes (CFR 2.2b)? How do you ensure quality in bilingual program offerings?

4. Assessment and Program Review  
   Please clarify the alignment of mission, the Essential Leadership Characteristics, and program learning outcomes, including progress toward development of program competencies that replace the more general ELCs. The team will consider how the assessment infrastructure examines educational effectiveness and has mechanisms for identifying problems and finding solutions.

5. Online  
   How satisfied are you that online program delivery measures with the quality of your face-to-face programs? And specifically, how has your online programming course development and design changed with the LMS conversion and additional personnel?
6. Institutional Research
Describe your existing institutional research and data analysis capabilities and how results are used to improve the institution.

7. Strategic Planning
How are measurable outcomes developed in alignment with the strategic plan and how are financial resources aligned with those outcomes?

8. Changing Landscape of Higher Education
What trends in seminary education do you think will impact you directly over the next five years, e.g., the changing trends in church-going behaviors of millennials and changing financial models in higher education?

C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The institutional report submitted by Gateway Seminary for review by the team was well written. Requests for additional supporting documents were provided in advance of the visit. The campus community was broadly engaged in the self-study and spoke knowledgeably about the process and their role.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions

The Commission action letter following the February 2011 Educational Effectiveness visit endorsed these recommendations from the visiting team and requested the seminary to address them in an Interim Report presented in March 2014:

1. With a sound process for the assessment of student learning and academic program review now in place, the Seminary should continue its efforts to refine how it gathers information, how it can make optimal use of existing artifacts (e.g., the rich sources of information contained in the Theological Field Education reports), and how information that is electronically stored is accessed by the faculty for evaluative purposes (CFR 2.1; 2.3; 2.4; 2.5; 2.6; 2.7);
2. The Seminary should review its overall technology infrastructure, including additional staff support, in order to more effectively serve emerging program initiatives and achievement of long-range goals in an online environment (CFR 3.1; 3.3; 3.4; 3.6; 3.7; 4.1; 4.2; 4.3);

3. The Seminary should undertake a regular review of its assessment plan to ensure that the assessment structure is effective, simple, and sustainable (CFR 1.2; 2.1; 2.3; 2.4; 2.6; 2.7; 2.11; 3.8; 3.11; 4.4; 4.5; 4.6; 4.7);

4. The Seminary should determine what the faculty requires in terms of in-service training that will enhance faculty skills and knowledge in the use of the Seminary’s e-portfolio system, the development of rubrics, and the interpretation of assessment results for purposes of programmatic improvement (CFR 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 3.6; 3.7; 3.11; 4.2; 4.4; 4.7);

5. The Seminary should strengthen its efforts to understand student success by tracking and analyzing retention and graduation rates (informed by alumni data) that are appropriately disaggregated by student demographics and degree (CFR 3.1; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 3.6; 3.7; 3.11; 4.2; 4.4; 4.7);

6. While the Seminary has demonstrated its current commitment to providing faculty resources for the Ph.D. program, it should develop long-range plans to recruit appropriately credentialed junior faculty to complement the cohort of senior faculty members currently staffing the program and it should articulate policies establishing expectations for research and publication for doctoral faculty (CFR 1.6; 2.1; 2.4; 2.6; 2.8; 2.9; 3.2; 3.3; 3.4; 3.11; 4.6)

The Interim Report Committee received the report and encouraged the Seminary to continue its progress in five areas leading to the Off-Site Review in fall 2017 and the Accreditation Visit in spring 2018 (see letter dated May 5, 2014). In the institutional report submitted November 2017, the progress in each area was evident to the visiting team and will be discussed in our report as noted below:

1. Results of program reviews including the impact of reviews on development of the curriculum. – in Component Six

2. Evaluation of further refinements in assessment, including the strengthening of faculty skill in assessing student learning. – in Component Four
3. The status of efforts to strengthen student success indicators, including a narrative that interprets the meanings of data on graduation rates and time to degree.—in Component Five

4. Efforts to strengthen infrastructure for the delivery of online learning. – in Component 2, Standard 3

5. Plans and policies for maintaining faculty resources appropriate for the Ph.D. program in Biblical Studies. – in Component 2, Standard 2

As mentioned above, Gateway made a strategic move to a new central campus in Ontario, California in 2016, which represents a significant change since the 2011 visit. Moving away from the San Francisco Bay Area prompted the change from the more regional, “Golden Gate” name to Gateway, which was familiar to their constituency as the title of the seminary publication. The move to southern California has entailed the sale of the Mill Valley, California campus; rebranding the institution as Gateway Seminary of the Southern Baptist Convention; a careful, two-year process of transitioning the workforce; the identification, purchase, and completion of a new facility in Ontario, including student housing; and the related closure of the Brea, California, campus and creation of a new campus in Fremont, California. The intentionality of this impressive set of changes to the operations of GSSBC is to be applauded, with the move and its planned outcomes driven by the mission, vision, values, and strategic goals set out in “The Diamond Plan: A Picture of a Preferred Future for Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, October 2014.” After an initial increase in enrollment in 2015 as students took large numbers of hours in the push to graduate before the relocation, the seminary saw a decline of 14% for the next two years, much less than the 25-30% the seminary projected as possible resulting from the move; the current year enrollment report seems to indicate a return to
growth. The move repositions GSSBC to address more nimbly the leadership needs of Southern Baptist congregations on the West Coast, provides excellent, new facilities to pursue the institution’s mission, and dramatically improves its financial position (discussed in Component 7).

In pursuing a line of inquiry about the impact of the move on core functions of the institution, the team found that the move has introduced significant shifts in faculty and staffing patterns, student demographics, and student services (where the appeal of the close, residential campus in Mill Valley remains strong among faculty and staff who transferred to the Ontario campus). However, these shifts track closely on the strategic vision of the move. On the other hand, delivery of both academic and field-based instruction, drawing on well-articulated and practiced modes of delivery, has remained remarkably stable.

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

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard.

A concise statement of the mission of GSSBC is prominent on the institution’s website, in the 2018-2019 Academic Catalog, and in other central documents: “Shaping leaders who expand God’s kingdom around the world” (CFR 1.1).

“The Diamond Plan: A Picture of a Preferred Future for Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary, October 2014” provides a clear and succinct statement of the seminary’s mission, vision, values and strategic goals for the period 2015-2020. Strategic goals include establishing the new identity as Gateway Seminary, the move, improvements to academic programs, fresh
organizational plans and performance standards for faculty and staff, and significant growth in the endowment and annual giving. Solid progress in reaching these goals demonstrates that the institution takes “The Diamond Plan” seriously and that it drives planning and performance (CFR 1.1).

The elaboration of the institution’s mission in the list of “Essential Leadership Competencies,” also communicated on the website and in the Academic Catalog, offers clear, overarching educational objectives for all the institution’s academic programs, which are carefully applied to each academic program in a list of degree outcomes. Student achievement at the institution level is tracked through sound academic registration processes and data gathering. Access to retention/graduation data is provided through an obvious link in the “About” section (or tab) of the institution’s website. The resulting “Retention” page offers site visitors a detailed spreadsheet of data for each academic program, covering the period 2009-2018. The data is disaggregated by denominational identification, ethnicity, gender, and marital status (CFR 1.2).

All trustee-elected faculty and members of the board of trustees affirm the faith statement of the Southern Baptist Convention, “The Baptist Faith and Message,” and GSSBC is a signatory to the “Covenant Between Our Seminaries and Our Churches,” documents readily accessible in the Academic Catalog and acknowledged as central to the mission of the institution. Faculty “are free to pursue the inquiry of truth central to their vocation” within the accepted constitutional and confessional basis of the seminary. An academic freedom statement and due process procedures are included in the Faculty Manual to safeguard the rights of faculty and students (CFR 1.3).

The student population of GSSBC is culturally diverse, a feature of the institution that is embraced by faculty and staff, with diversity-linked coursework required in some academic
programs, including the MDiv. The team notes that additional opportunities exist for GSSBC to become still more intentional in drawing on the demographic diversity of its student body to enrich learning, in planning for faculty and staff to mirror more closely the diversity of the institution’s students, and in growing into the cultural milieu of the new location of the institution’s central campus in Southern California (CFR 1.4).

A broad, educational mission is the clear focus of the resources and energies of GSSBC. That mission includes academic programs, non-degree certificates and leadership training, and the active engagement of faculty and staff with congregations and church entities. GSSBC has been owned and operated by the National Convention of the Southern Baptist Church since 1950, one of six such seminaries. The thirty-nine member board of trustees is appointed by the National Convention. Within this missional and governance context, GSSBC operates with appropriate autonomy from external entities (CFR 1.5).

In reviewing all reports and documents as well as publicly available materials, the team affirms that GSSBC is representing itself accurately, is adopting fair and equitable policies, and is committed to the timely completion of its students in the context of a graduate school setting where part-time students predominate (CFR 1.6). Similarly, every indication suggests that the institution operates with integrity, exhibits sound business practices, responds in a timely and fair manner to complaints, and monitors its own performance with an eye to improving its operations (CFR 1.7). This attitude of openness and integrity has also been demonstrated in communications with WSCUC and the visiting team and in the institution’s efforts to implement WSCUC policies. The team suggests that Gateway review its directory listing for all sites and programs with WSCUC to ensure accuracy (CFR 1.8).
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objective through Core Functions

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard.

Gateway offers master’s and doctoral programs with appropriate nomenclature that align content, standards of performance, and rigor with the level of degree; they do not offer undergraduate degrees (CFR 2.1). The institution’s catalog describes the prerequisite education and accomplishments necessary for entrance and the sequence of student learning and development required for graduation from each degree program (CFRs 2.2, 2.2b). All educational programs were originally founded on a philosophy of student progression in the development of Essential Leadership Characteristics that were introduced in a first-year course, but the institution has now moved to a competency model that promotes student competencies throughout each program. These remain central through required reflection in ePortfolio exercises throughout the curriculum, and are discussed in a capstone course (CFR 2.2). These competencies are understood as a developmental process throughout the students’ professional career, but the degree and course objectives are informed by them and intended to further initial, graduate-level student development of the leadership competencies in direct connection to the institution’s mission (CFRs 2.2, 2.2b). Programs have taken initial steps toward staging competency development; for example, MDiv students complete competency goals prior to external internship and assess attainment after the internship by self-report and field mentor evaluation. Delineation of a more thorough developmental process with benchmarks during the program is a logical next step for the incorporation of the competency model.

Degree objectives are defined for each program that reflect the student outcomes appropriate to the vocational outcomes served by that degree. Course objectives contribute to
the program objectives in an organized fashion, as demonstrated by degree maps for all programs that demonstrate the role of course objectives in the development of program accomplishment of objectives (CFRs 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). The degree map is a required aspect of degree program review and recent reviews indicate faculty engagement in establishing and assessing the achievement of the standards (CFRs 2.4, 2.7).

Gateway has an established degree program review process that evaluates all programs on a five-year cycle (CFR 2.7). The review format evaluates the student standards of performance and achievement of those standards, the learning process and student performance appraisal by faculty, and the consistency of graduate’s achievement of student learning outcomes (CFRs 2.5, 2.6, 2.7). Faculty conduct an annual review of signature student artifacts, ePortfolio elements, and any field education evaluations (CFR 2.3). The institution collects substantial data regarding progress toward completion of degrees as well as graduation rates and utilizes these data in the degree program review process (CFR 2.10). However, there is a recognized weakness in needed program data for thorough program review and institutional improvement. Recent reviews cite the unavailability of certain data or the absence of data disaggregated by program or appropriate student demographic categories as a weakness in their degree program review (CFR 2.10). The institution reports consideration of options to remediate this concern and program directors reported improvement in this area during the site visit. At this time, the institution uses a distributed model of data collection in which various areas are expected to enter and report data from that area (e.g., the Registrar reports enrollment data) and the office of the Vice President for Academic Services (VPAS) coordinates these reports. There is a half-time Institutional Research staff person, but the role primarily supports student course evaluation and occasional survey processes. The institution creates and administers its own course evaluation questionnaire. While
staff report significant progress in Information Technology and Institutional Research support, most services focus on supporting individual student evaluation and input for academic program review. Higher level analysis of institutional functioning, disaggregated by site or delivery modality or comparing programs to other programs are needed to enhance quality improvement processes. Consideration may be given to use of nationally validated and normed course evaluation and assessment instruments to improve reliability. Proactive steps to create a plan to develop the infrastructure for institutional research and fiscal resources to implement the plan are needed (CFRs 2.10, 4.2).

Faculty expectations for research, scholarship, and teaching are included in the Faculty Manual (CFR 2.8) and the institution promotes active reciprocity between teaching, scholarship, assessment, and student learning (CFR 2.9). There is a Faculty Evaluation Rubric in the Faculty Manual that facilitates annual assessment of faculty in instruction, promoting student success, scholarship and publications, professional development, and service to the department, program, institution, or denomination. Faculty have some freedom in weighting each category for their individual evaluation and they value this privilege. Each faculty member meets annually with the VPAS as part of the evaluation process and the faculty reported appreciation for his feedback and support. The final evaluation is a joint venture between the VPAS and a peer evaluation committee. The Faculty Manual demonstrates support for faculty scholarship through year-long sabbatical opportunities and by allowing for a course release for faculty who have a book contract in hand (CFR 2.8). However, there are no specific expectations for faculty scholarship related to program assignment, rank, or contract period. It is not evident that expectations for doctoral program faculty differ substantially from faculty in other programs, perhaps because of individual freedom to weight the scholarship component of the evaluation. The workload
teaching parameters outweigh the scholarship parameters and there is no evident expectation of higher scholarship parameters for those who have a major assignment in the doctoral programs. Further, there are limited on-going scholarship resources (e.g., workload unit release for scholarship) consistently provided to doctoral faculty. Elucidation of clear policies for research and publication expectations, as well as resources, especially for PhD faculty, should be considered (CFR 2.8).

Information about the admission standards, registration policies, requirements for academic programs, course descriptions, tuition costs, and financial aid is provided in the Gateway Seminary Academic Catalog and accessible online (CFR 2.12).

The institution provides co-curricular programs across its campuses consistent with its mission and the nature of its graduate programs (CFR 2.11). Student academic support services for research and writing are provided by library staff, and tutoring for individual courses is handled by the faculty member teaching that course. A librarian is embedded in all online courses to ensure support for online students. Students and faculty report positive library support services. The Office of Student Services responds to student requests for accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act and all buildings are compliant with ADA standards (CFR 2.13). There is a stated willingness to be responsive to student needs as they arise and the institution collects student input regarding service needs as part of program review and graduate exit feedback processes. Enhanced proactive assessment of student co-curricular and academic support needs to be conducted regularly and a plan that ensures consistency of support services across the various campuses is needed (CFR 2.13). The Transfer Credit Policy is clearly available in the catalog but difficult to find on the seminary website (CFR 2.14).
The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard.

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

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard.

Gateway has an FTE student faculty ratio of 14.4:1 with 70% of courses being taught by FT faculty, which is appropriate given the diverse geographical locations and graduate only nature of the institution. 97% of full time faculty hold terminal degrees (CFR 3.1). Most faculty are located at the main campus in Ontario, but all campuses have resident full time faculty. 78% of the faculty are "Anglo" and 89% male. There are no Hispanic faculty despite the location of the main campus being in a community with a significant Hispanic population. While pipeline issues and the gender and ethnic makeup of leaders in the Southern Baptist denomination have contributed significantly to these demographics, the seminary is committed to increasing its diversity as evidenced by 25% of the recent faculty hiring cohort being female. Discussions with campus leaders reflect a desire to improve diversity at all levels but a lack of formal plans and actions to effect such change.

The seminary has well developed faculty and staff handbooks with clear policies for academic freedom, governance, and decision-making responsibilities. In general, the evaluation of faculty and staff are appropriate and clearly communicated in the handbooks (CFR 3.2). Both faculty and staff have access to and funding for adequate professional development and scholarship opportunities. Faculty and staff described a wide variety of activities including
attendance at conferences, webinars, professional association memberships, and research publishing and financial support provided by the seminary for these endeavors (CFR 3.3). The "Diamond Plan" sets forth a bold vision for the academic reputation of GSSBC and its faculty members. Interviews during the on-site visit suggested that faculty and staff believe that the institution has not yet grown into that bold vision. In the view of the visiting team, an opportunity exists to sharpen and support plans for faculty scholarship.

The institution's recent relocation of its campus from Mill Valley to Ontario, California, has greatly enhanced the financial stability of the institution. In making the move, the institution increased its endowment four-fold and eliminated all deferred maintenance on a large, aging multi-building campus. The team reviewed financial information for the last four fiscal years. The institution had small reductions in net assets in each of the last three fiscal years related to spending from the relocation. Overall, the financial position of the institution is strong, with less than 40% of total revenues coming from students and the remainder coming from the national denomination and advancement. (CFR 3.4) Relative to Fall 2017, enrollment on the Ontario campus increased over 8% for the Fall 2018 semester. The institution boasts impressive physical and information resources. The relocation to Ontario into a freshly built out multi-story office building provides all new furniture, fixtures, and IT infrastructure. The team also observed quality facilities, information resources, and IT during offsite visits to campuses in Northern California and Washington (CFR 3.5).

The team observed excellent information technology resources to support both on campus learning and the growing distance education programs (CFR 3.5). GSSBC made major commitments to online learning with the hiring of a full-time Director of Online Education in January 2016. The director provides ongoing training in online pedagogy and provides
instructional design assistance to faculty designing new courses. Instructional design assistance is also provided to faculty updating existing courses. Conversion to a new learning platform (Canvas) was initiated in 2017 and is complete. The new platform has enabled GSSBC to provide a standard course shell and a variety of new features that promote best practices in online learning (cf. Distance Education Review).

The visiting team appreciated the direct access and candor from the senior leadership including the board of trustees during the visit and as reflected in the self-assessment report. No issues arose to cause any question regarding the integrity of the seminary's leadership team (CFR 3.6). The institution has a very experienced senior leadership team including an appropriately qualified and experienced full time CEO and CFO (CFR 3.7). The governing board, comprised of 39 individuals appointed by the national Southern Baptist Convention, exercise an appropriate governing body role including the hiring and evaluation of the president and approval of all full-time faculty appointments, annual budget, and the strategic plan (CFR 3.9). Faculty are appropriately involved in shared governance all levels of decision making at the institution including representation on committees including the strategic planning taskforce. Faculty are responsible for development of the curriculum and assessment of student learning outcomes (CFR 3.10).

**Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement**

The team’s finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution has provided sufficient evidence to determine compliance with the Standard.

Quality assurance processes are in place to collect and analyze data, and annual and periodic assessment procedures are in place to review programs (CFR 4.1). GSSBC
acknowledges that institutional research (IR) capacity is insufficient for the needs of the institution. Specifically, the Institutional Report identifies the “need for alumni data and the overall management of the ever-growing amounts of Gateway data” (page 25). GSSBC relies heavily on data reported to the Association of Theological Seminaries (ATS) but needs to develop its own data warehousing process for the expanding IR needs of the institution. The institution utilizes multiple modules in Jenzabar to provide data for reporting and analysis. However, data sharing and broader analysis is hampered by the use of “champions” of each module, which tends to silo utilization since no one has access to all the potential information. As a result, reported data is not always consistent, e.g., enrollment numbers provided in various reports to the team for a given year varied. The part-time director of institutional research does not have ample time or resources to deploy the full potential of this area (CFR 4.2).

Gateway shows a strong commitment to improvement based on data and evidence. However, while there is clear evidence of systematic assessment of teaching and learning (CFR 4.4), assessment of the campus environment is less clear, as is the utilization of results.

Faculty and administration were clearly involved in the development of the “Diamond Plan,” the current strategic plan, which was approved by the board. The relocation required adjustments to the plan, which were accomplished to keep the plan current. A task force has been established to work with the president on the development of the next strategic plan. The team was impressed by the distributive membership of this task force. Members clearly feel that their work on the task force is important and critical to the future of the institution (CFR 4.5, 4.6).

While the report indicates the parameters in place as a condition of Gateway’s affiliation with the Southern Baptist Convention (SBC), there is little discussion of how Gateway will
respond to the anticipated changes in the higher educational environment and seminary education. Conversations with the board, faculty, staff, and administration during the visit confirmed an awareness of issues related to membership in the Southern Baptist Convention and the changing dynamics of higher education, but no plans on how to address these issues were apparent (CFR 4.7).

Forms documenting compliance with federal requirements were reviewed by members of the team and are included in the appendices of the team report. Both the Credit Hour and Transfer Credit policies should be more readily accessible to students and reviewed periodically. Review of the Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators confirmed assessment of Gateway’s Essential Learning Competencies and degree learning outcomes is taking place. Final determination of compliance with the Standards rests with the Commission

**Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees**

The team affirms the Institutional Report’s claim that the institution offers quality graduate education that provides “a rich, coherent, and challenging educational experience” and exhibits integrity by defining standards of performance and monitoring student fulfillment of those standards.

An integrated system of education flows out of the institution’s mission, “Shaping leaders who expand God’s kingdom around the world” and conceptualized in the learning and experience of students as articulated in five categories of Essential Leadership Characteristics (ELCs) to “shape leaders by encouraging and promoting personal, spiritual and professional growth.” In the Institutional Report, Gateway demonstrated how degree objectives reflect the ELCs, which in turn yield course objectives that are codified in course templates and syllabi. These templates and syllabi define and communicate standards of performance on the course
level. This integrated system is captured in a curricular map for each degree program, which also identifies signature assignments for each program. Following a pattern of continuing reflection and improvement, Gateway shared at the time of the visit the list of characteristics were replaced with a new set of core knowledge, disciplines, and skills called the Essential Leadership Competencies, which are “essential for one prepared to lead a community of faith in service to God and to the world.”

GSSBC seeks in its programs to shape students cognitively/academically, vocationally, and spiritually. Vocational and spiritual “shaping” occurs to a significant degree through Theological Field Education (TFE), an integrated system of courses (with “Introduction to Ministry Formation” beginning the sequence and “Reflections on Ministry Formation” concluding it), ministry practica in which ministry mentors contribute to the vocational and spiritual development of students, peer reflection, and individual student reflection (captured in the student’s ePortfolio). As the degree maps articulate, this pattern of TFE applies to the MDiv, MAEL, MMiss, and MACC programs and to a lesser degree in the MTS and MAIS programs. It does not apply to the ThM, DMin, or PhD programs.

Student fulfillment of the standards of performance established by GSSBC is monitored through faculty assessment of student performance in courses and through a process of shared, department-level evaluation of the quality and grading of “signature assignments” at an annual faculty retreat. The participation of faculty from all sites in this process ensures that performance standards are shared by all campuses. The team judged this aspect of GSSBC to be notable enough that it deserves a commendation for the intentional and systematic inclusion of online and regional campuses to ensure a cohesive academic program.
The team was impressed by the GSSBC integrated system of educational delivery and assessment and would encourage continued refinement of an already solid system. Plans exist to continue to align the ELCs with program learning outcomes and to ensure consistency in the assessment of signature assignments. The monitoring of student fulfillment of program standards could be expanded and enhanced through further development and use of graduation and retention data.

The team found responses to the line of inquiry about curriculum (ensuring that graduate programs are more advanced than undergraduate ones and ensuring quality in bilingual program offers) to be wholly satisfactory, demonstrating careful thought and reflection on accreditation standards and thorough application of broad strategies for quality control. Responses to an additional line of inquiry about online program delivery (overall quality and equity with face-to-face programs; the impact of LMS conversion and added personnel) were also very satisfactory. As reflected in Appendix C, the addition of a full-time Director of Online Education has had a very positive impact and the conversion to a new learning platform (Canvas) is complete. The team found a strong online program with well-designed faculty training and support. This was so much the case that it evoked a commendation for the development and implementation of a high quality online program that exhibits best practices in distance education.

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

The meaning, quality, and integrity of Gateway degrees is demonstrated in the alignment of institutional mission, Essential Learning Competencies, and program outcomes as demonstrated through curricular maps designed for each program. Described in this essay are the results of the assessment process that lead to continuous improvement of student learning.
Gateway purports that the educational quality of its academic programs begins with curriculum design at the course level, which includes identification of signature assignments that fulfill program learning outcomes and are collected in a student e-portfolio, and culminates in self-reflection of student learning each semester. Faculty review of the signature assignments and course evaluations occurs annually at a fall Faculty Retreat and in the five-year program review (discussed in component 6).

Faculty retain control of curriculum quality throughout its master degree program offerings at its six locations or modalities through the design of course templates that link course learning outcomes to the institutional-level Essential Learning Competencies (rather than program learning outcomes) and mandate three assessment activities: CoursEval assessments, ePortfolio reflections, and ePortfolio artifacts when a signature assignment is included in the course. Templates for new courses or those with substantive changes are reviewed by a Curriculum Committee, with representatives from at least four different departments/schools/divisions, the Registrar, Librarian, a student, and the VPAS (ex officio), and are brought to the full faculty for approval. All contingent faculty must use the approved course syllabus. The three advanced research degrees – PhD, ThM, and DMin – fall under the oversight of a director and the Academic Graduate Studies Committee. Faculty in these programs utilize course templates, grading rubrics and results of comprehensive exams, but also rely on individualized faculty assessment and expertise to evaluate student progress. Review of sample documents indicates that faculty are able to incorporate these key elements while customizing their course syllabi to their own instruction.

CoursEval assessments, which are standard faculty and course evaluations with only brief comment on institutional and course outcomes, are reviewed annually by the VPAS for faculty
performance. Although program faculty review these data at the fall Faculty Retreat, little change in course design or content appears to result for outcomes assessment purposes. Degree-seeking students must post to their ePortfolio a reflection on the work completed in required courses, commenting upon the manner in which the course contributed to his/her growth in relation to at least five Essential Leadership Competencies identified in the course learning outcomes. Faculty review student comments to monitor both student progress and course alignment with institutional goals. In their capstone course, students review their progress throughout the program, using these reflections and the signature assignments. The signature assignments are connected to the specific degree program learning outcomes and are accompanied by a rubric provided in the course template and syllabus. Assignments are submitted to the instructor for grading and an anonymous submission is posted separately to the ePortfolio for assessment purposes. It was noted in the institutional report and in course syllabi that the signature assignments are reviewed by faculty for program effectiveness after the student’s graduation; these are discussed more fully in component 6.

Gateway utilizes a set of courses to support vocational and personal competencies, assess student performance near graduation, and support program review. A cornerstone course, P1111 Introduction to Ministry Formation, promotes student self-awareness in areas vital for a life of ministry. Furthermore, the ePortfolio is introduced here, and students are informed of the personal and program assessment purposes of the reflections and signature assignments. P1116 Reflection on Ministry Formation is a capstone course designed to assist students in assessing various components of their seminary career and to plan for post-graduation success and lifelong learning. In so doing, students draw upon their ePortfolio postings, reflections on the Essential Learning Characteristics or Competencies, a seminary timeline, a personal retreat, and a personal
assessment paper. Finally, in P112/122 Leadership in Ministry Practicum students complete the required theological field experience (TFE) required by their Association of Theological Schools accreditation. TFE provides a structure and a process that shapes Christian leaders through a practicum that provides “360-degree feedback.” Results of these assessments are not referenced in the program reviews.

The report and the “Gateway Seminary Degree Organization and Assessment Overview” provide a narrative of the educational effectiveness process but without evidence. Therefore, in the Lines of Inquiry, the team asked GSSBC to provide samples of the use of the ePortfolio as an assessment tool and examples of signature assignments and how they are evaluated and used to assess student success. In its review of the evidence, the team found some inconsistency in the language and reports used to assess signature assignments for program results, which may illustrate the ongoing process of Gateway’s realignment of assessment protocols. For example, the grading rubric for the Biblical Hermeneutics course scores student work according to course outcomes as to adequate or inadequate fulfillment. These results are used to assess a key program outcome according to student achievement according to low, moderate, or high competence but without explanation of the conversion between the two scales. Finally, more specific information for program improvement would be gained by recording the number of scores in each category and/or by task dimension on the rubrics, rather than by an average level of student achievement as is currently requested. Gateway should continue development of educational effectiveness processes and mechanisms to ensure alignment of the Essential Leadership Competencies and program learning outcomes and to refine consistency of language used in assessment of signature assignments (CFRs 2.2b, 2.3, 2.6).

Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation
In the Institutional Report, Gateway indicates that student success is assessed in the context of core values, specifically, “academic competence combined with practical experience both of which develop the person as a more prepared minister in whatever context she or he is called.” Curricular design and learning outcomes were apparent in the documents provided. Personal development is integrated into the curriculum to help students develop both affective and academic strengths. Student success was highly valued in the culture (CFR 1.2).

Perhaps consistent with Gateway’s recognition of the need for greater IR capacity, a great deal of student demographic, satisfaction, retention, and degree completion data are presented, but a limited amount of analysis and potential findings is provided in the Institutional Report. For example, some interesting variations in the GSQ are identified around Contextualized Vocational training/skill development, and personal and spiritual growth, but no analysis of what may have led to these responses nor what the institution may do in response were provided.

Student retention and completion data are made public (CFR 1.2), and explanations of how these data are collected and reported are provided. Again, perhaps due to the IR capacity issues, analysis and institutional responses to this data are not provided. Program data is presented, but there is no retention data or analysis at the institutional level. Gateway uses a 200% time to degree model, which is justified by the fact that most students are enrolled halftime. The report indicates that traditional data utilized in IPEDS for full-time students is not particularly helpful. However, even though comparison data for undergraduates would not necessarily be helpful, IPEDS data has improved in recent years and there is increasingly useful data available on graduate, transfer, and non-traditional students. The team recommends that annual data (first-to-second year, first-to-third year, etc.) will be helpful in determining when
attrition occurs and how to address it. Since GSSBC has a strong retention data collection process, more detailed analysis can become a model for other graduate seminaries.

Utilizing the same terminology and groups as are used in most retention and student success studies would make the data and analysis more meaningful. For example, GSSBC combines all student types into single cohorts for each year of entry. Useful subsets of the cohorts would include full-time students, part-time students, and transfer students. While the “n” of these subsets may be low at the program level for some programs, useful information may be gained at the institutional level. From this data GSSBC can determine if there are pressure points for retention, and if these pressure points vary depending on student type. After determining the major trends within programs and at the institutional level, meaningful retention plans can be developed to promote improvement. Another factor that impacts meaningful retention data is the inclusion of students whose intention is to take some coursework but not a complete program (e.g. those who wish to qualify for SBC International Mission Board). Identifying these non-degree seeking students in the student information system would allow GSSBC to track their completion rates separately from those students pursuing a degree, giving more accurate data on both groups of students.

As an example of further analysis, the retention report indicates that retention is “approximately 90%...from first year to second year of study…Student Services surveys of students who do drop following their first semester or year indicate the two dominant reasons for doing so are financial stress, or personal/familial issues.” Since six to eight-year graduation rates are approximately 60%, a significant number of students are leaving between year two and eight. A number of questions might be addressed around retention/attrition: Has this attrition rate changed over time? Are attrition rates different for full-time vs. part-time students? Are there
differences for transfer students vs. those who began graduate study at GSSBC? What is Gateway doing to address financial stress and personal/familial issues? Are there other unreported factors contributing to attrition? Are these patterns different at the program level or at individual campuses and online? Collection, analysis, and improvements based on this data are recommended (CFRs 1.2, 2.7, 2.10, 2.13).

The transition to the new campus at Ontario and shift to a more commuter institution has changed student support needs. Faculty and staff described changes in student culture and behavior since the move; however, a clear plan to address these changes was not articulated. Programs designed for residential students continue, but the dynamics of apartment style living vs. residence halls has changed student interaction. Students expressed a desire for more academic advising and career assistance. An assessment of student support needs is warranted, and a plan should be drafted, implemented, and periodically assessed. Assessment and implementation should address the needs of all students; those at all campuses and online (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).

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

Gateway has a degree program assessment process that ensures that most programs are evaluated on a five-year cycle by faculty. A schedule for program review is included in the Faculty Manual and an annual timeline specifying deadlines for completion of components of the review is provided (CFR 2.7). There are two aspects of each review-- an examination phase and a strategic planning phase – each conducted by a different faculty group but with opportunity for interaction between the two. A Degree Review Task Force, appointed by the vice president for academic services, gathers data related to the program and presents a report addressing program
alignment with institutional mission, degree and course objectives, indicators of educational
effectiveness, degree integrity, student demographics, alumni information, and institutional
impact (CFRs 4.3, 4.4). The Degree Program Assessment Committee utilizes this report to
conduct an analysis of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats, and barriers experienced by
the program in order to arrive at a recommendation of choices for disposition of the program,
including the potential fiscal and institutional effect (CFR 4.6). The administration receives
progress reports and may speak into the process as it proceeds. An external qualified reviewer
has been recently added to the process. Both reports and accompanying recommendations are
forwarded for review and vote by the faculty of the whole. Approved faculty recommendations
within the scope of faculty governance are implemented by the relevant academic area; those
requiring institutional approval are sent to the institution’s administrators for review and
potential inclusion in the budget process (CFRs 2.4, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7). Although they do have
methods to ensure consistency in course offerings and assignments across locations, the current
process does not specifically include the analysis of degree program variation by site, nor specify
how stakeholder input is disaggregated by location of program delivery. There may be important
variations between delivery locations that should be noted in the review process.

Data are accumulated for use in the degree program review process (CFRs 4.1, 4.2). The
Faculty Manual describes a variety of data sources utilized in the degree program review,
including student statistics, alumni survey results, and indicators of educational effectiveness.
Student statistics include admission and enrollment patterns, student counts, retention trend data,
and graduation trend data (CFRs 2.7, 2.10). Alumni survey results focus on employment
outcomes, satisfaction with their degree, evaluation of their program, and suggestions for
improvement (CFR 2.10). A review of recent program reviews finds that basic data are included
in the review process (e.g., ELC survey data). However, the institution reports its own awareness that centralized data collection and management is “the most widely agreed upon weakness of the institution” due to problems in obtaining alumni data and the internal management and reporting of data. For example, some data are not disaggregated by degree program (e.g., ELC survey data, grades) or there were insufficient population responses by program to justify interpretation of the data. Although there have been improvements, as reported during the site visit, more institutional research infrastructure is needed for advanced student and alumni data analysis and the ability to disaggregate data by important student categories, degree program, and delivery location in order to conduct degree program reviews and ensure success among different student populations in the same program (CFR 2.10). Data collection and data analysis are crucial to identifying problems and finding solutions in the program review process.

Indicators of educational effectiveness include comparison of entrance and exit surveys, surveys of field education faculty regarding entrance versus exit readiness for ministerial leadership, samples of student work in ePortfolio and other student products that may be compared against students earlier in degree progression, and various competency evaluations (CFRs 2.4, 2.6, 2.7). The institution has initiated efforts toward alignment between their mission, the competencies, and program learning outcomes (CFR 2.4). Recent program reviews demonstrate mapping of competency objectives to program curricula. The institution places a major focus on Signature Assignments for evaluation of educational effectiveness. Recent program reviews suggest some challenges with using the correct Signature Assignment, the need to make the assignment clearer to students, and improving the grading rubric in order to be able to make program improvement decisions based on the assessment of student artifacts. Consequently, the entire faculty engaged in a workshop to modify the assignment rubrics and
recalibrate their assessment of learning in Spring 2015 and faculty described on-going efforts to improve the Signature Assignment during the site visit (CFR 4.1).

The most recent degree program reviews have been the MDiv (2014-15), the MAEL (2015-16), and the DMin (2016-17); each resulted in recommendations for program improvements (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.3, 4.4). The MDiv review resulted in significant modification to the Biblical language requirements and the addition of a hermeneutics course. The MAEL review resulted in an improved strategy for student retention and graduation, as well as a plan for data collection and assessment of the online version of the program. The DMin review resulted in enhancements to the project proposal process and the assessment protocols, as well as a revision of the chair responsibility allocation process. These were specifically focused on improving the DMin graduation rate, including addressing the disparity between the Korean-English bilingual cohorts and the other cohorts. The PhD and ThM reviews were underway in the 2017-18 academic year and initial outcomes were reviewed in the site visit. The quality of doctoral dissertations is enhanced by the involvement of external readers on each dissertation committee and the role of the program director in reviewing all dissertations for uniformity to standards.

Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

The seminary’s sale of the Mill Valley campus in 2015 and relocation to Ontario was a significant and bold undertaking, directed effectively through the institution’s strategic planning process, which has contributed significantly to the overall sustainability of the institution. In
conjunction with this major initiative, other actions were also taken in the last few years to further transform the seminary, including the renaming and rebranding of the institution, creation of the Fremont Campus, closure of the Brea campus, significant investment in new IT infrastructure, investment in new student housing in Ontario, and the initiation of a new strategic planning process. The team was especially impressed with the robust, inclusive, and comprehensive nature of the current strategic planning process, which inspired a commendation from the group. All of these efforts have combined to well position the institution to respond to the changing environment of higher education in the 21st Century and more specifically graduate seminary education.

The cash received from the sale of Mill Valley was successful in not only purchasing and developing the new Ontario campus and student housing and the Fremont Campus, but it also significantly increased the unrestricted endowment. The institution now has an endowment that places it in the top 10% of all seminaries nationally based on the size of the endowment. This resource will be critical to ensuring long term sustainability and allow the board and administration to be bold and to take advantage of future opportunities for mission and ministry (CFR 3.4).

The Mill Valley campus was a large multi building campus on 120 acres overlooking San Francisco Bay. However, future development was limited, and the aging campus infrastructure had significant deferred maintenance needs and was as much as 60 years old. The sale of the Mill Valley campus has afforded the institution the ability transform itself by building a modern campus in Ontario that provides more total square footage of usable space than was available on the Mill Valley campus and eliminating the deferred maintenance burden. The new campus is located in a six-story office building that was finished and furnished to meet the seminary’s
needs. Because it is actually larger than the previous campus, it feels spacious with high-quality learning and working spaces throughout. The new Fremont campus is similarly equipped and both locations position the seminary to meet its strategic objectives well into the future (CFR 3.5).

In addition to the new campus facilities observed by the team in Ontario and Fremont, the other campus locations are also well equipped and serve the seminary community well. The campuses in other states are owned and maintained by other denominational organizations, which provides low cost resources for the seminary to offer its programs throughout the Western United States (CFR 3.5).

The Information Technology infrastructure is modern and well maintained with new backbone installed recently and end-user computers on an appropriate replacement cycle. The ERP system is well maintained and properly updated, but the institution could benefit from additional end user training and customization of modules to maximize efficiency and end user experience. This is particularly important at this sized institution with lean staffing levels in many areas. The seminary has a well-developed LMS and overall system for the delivery of distance education. This modality is growing rapidly at the institution and is vital to meeting the diverse needs of adult learners who often do not live near a campus (CFR 3.5). Library resources are appropriate to support doctoral level graduate education with experienced research librarians that provide high-touch services to students and faculty. The library in Ontario is large and provides a beautiful location to house the physical collection as well as significant options for individual and group study (CFR 3.5).

A critical element in ensuring the long-term sustainability, viability, and overall effectiveness of the seminary will be developing a strategy to ensure diversity at all levels of the
institution. Conversations with the board of trustees, administration, and staff all revealed an awareness of the need to improve diversity, however actionable plans and allocation of resources have not yet been developed. To paraphrase one trustee, the seminary has the strategic component in place and now needs operationalize that commitment. In the view of the team, this would happen best through a formal plan that includes actions steps and assigns resources to implement them. The institution may be limited in its ability to directly affect its board composition, which is appointed by the denomination, yet it is important for the board to continue to value diversity and promote it among its ranks and to closely monitor this at all levels (CFR 1.4).

The seminary has made significant changes to its staffing model as the needs of the institution have changed in recent years. Approximately 50% of all staff have been hired in the last three years. Some departments have seen significant reductions, such as facilities, with others growing, such as IT. The institution is currently appropriately staffed for current enrollment levels, but given the size of the institution, staffing levels are lean in many areas without extensive cross-training of duties and individuals readily available to move into some positions from lower level functions. The staffing model will need to be closely monitored as the institution continues to mature into its “new normal” and experiences growth online and at campus locations (CFR 3.1).

As discussed above, the institution is well positioned to take advantage of significant opportunities in its rapidly growing new home in Southern California and across the West. The development of a new strategic plan will be crucial to guiding it into the future and ensuring not mere sustainability, but the growth and development of a more vibrant, efficient, and effective seminary to meet the needs of the Church and the broader community it serves well into the 21st
Century (CFR 4.7).

Component 8: Optional essay on institutional specific themes - none

Component 9: Reflection and plans for improvement

The GSSBC Institutional Report concludes by reflecting on the process of the self-study, which occurred during the move to Southern California. Performing the study while the move was in process enabled GSSBC faculty and staff to appreciate the efficacy and durability of the both academic and financial “institutional processes” - and also to improve them. The training related to the self-study helped to strengthen further important processes related to academic quality and student outcomes, especially the calibration of rubrics used in assessing “signature assignments.”

GSSBC faculty and staff have identified a number of opportunities to further strengthen the meaning, quality, and integrity of degrees and the overall operation of the seminary: 1) To enhance student advising; 2) To improve data collection, management, and accessibility, especially with regard to information about concerning alumni; and 3) To pursue vigorously (just as the institution is doing) a fresh round of strategic planning focused on the future in a new location. The visiting team affirms these reflections and conclusions on the part of GSSBC.

SECTION III – OTHER TOPICS

There were no additional issues addressed by the seminary in the self-review or by the WSCUC Team during the Accreditation Visit.
SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Over the past two years, the Gateway Seminary community has actively engaged in the WSCUC review process and sentiments expressed by those involved indicated the self-review was a valuable and informative experience. Since the relocation of the university’s main campus from Mill Valley to Ontario, California, major changes have occurred including enrollment growth, campus facilities expansion, branch campus closure, and increases in faculty and staff. It is within this context that the following commendations and recommendations were identified by the team.

Commendations

1. The leadership and bold vision to rename and rebrand the institution and relocate it to Southern California

2. The planned, actualized, and significant improvement in the institution’s financial sustainability that has resulted from the sale of the Mill Valley campus and the move to Ontario.

3. Demonstrating an exceptionally strong sense of commitment, community, and common purpose among the faculty and staff, and between faculty and staff and the administration.

4. The thoughtful design of tasteful, modern educational facilities, a design that captures the institution’s past and prepares for its future.

5. Pursuing a robust, inclusive, and comprehensive Strategic Planning process that has the potential for significant and positive impact on the future of the institution.

6. The development and implementation of a high quality online program that exhibits best practices in distance education.
7. The intentional and systematic inclusion of online and regional campuses to ensure a cohesive academic program.

Recommendations

The visiting team recommends the institution respond to the following issues:

1. Gateway should continue development of educational effectiveness processes and mechanisms to ensure alignment of the Essential Leadership Competencies and program learning outcomes and to refine consistency of language used in assessment of signature assignments. (CFRs 2.2b, 2.3, 2.6)

2. Gateway should create a plan for institutional research that satisfies the need for program and institutional assessment processes, encompasses development of the infrastructure for institutional research, and provides the fiscal resources to implement the plan. (CFRs 2.7, 2.10, 4.2)

3. The institution should provide an increased level of intentional and structured student support services and build and maintain a robust system for tracking effectiveness for all delivery modalities. (CFRs 2.12, 2.13, 4.1)

4. The institution should continue to develop, refine, and utilize retention and graduation data that is consistent with student success research. (CFRs 2.7, 4.1)

5. Gateway should develop a clear understanding of faculty scholarship that aligns with the stated vision of institutional excellence, and is supported by appropriate resource allocation. (CFRs 2.8, 2.9, 3.1, 3.3)
6. Gateway should develop and implement a comprehensive diversity plan for administration, faculty, staff, and students. (CFRs 1.4, 4.7)
## APPENDIX A

### 1 - CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Under the federal requirements referenced below,WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s credit hour policy and processes as well as the lengths of its programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy on credit hour [Catalog, page 172; Faculty Manual Section III-5B; Syllabus Template, Faculty Manual, Appendix 22; , Course Template Guidelines (Faculty Manual Appendix 25), Independent Study Request – Note workload calculator (Faculty Manual Appendix 23)]</td>
<td>Is this policy easily accessible? □ YES x NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, where is the policy located? Not stated as a policy; statements are not parallel. Does not address other out-of-class academic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: Catalog: “The unit of credit is a semester hour. Three-hour courses normally meet for 2 hours and 50 minutes once a week. Two-hour courses ordinarily meet for 1 hour and 50 minutes once a week. Generally, the student should spend two hours in study outside the classroom for each hour spent in the classroom.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syllabus: SEMINARY POLICY ON ACADEMIC CREDIT AND WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS (required in all syllabi) In all Gateway face-to-face, hybrid or online courses, the seminary assigns a workload of approximately 45 clock hours of academic learning activities per academic credit hour earned. Traditional in-class format normally apportions 15 hours of in-class instruction and 30 hours of instructional exercises to be completed outside of class meetings per credit hour granted. For andrological reasons, individual courses may adjust the ratio of assignments inside and outside class meeting times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour [New Course Approval Process (Faculty Manual Section III-4E); Syllabus Approval Process ; Syllabus Template]</td>
<td>Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? □ YES x NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet <a href="https://registration.gs.edu/ICS/Quick_Cou">https://registration.gs.edu/ICS/Quick_Cou</a></td>
<td>Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? □ YES x NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses

Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level. See: https://www.gs.edu/academics/course-syllabi/ Also see Exhibit List for examples of these types.

Comments: How many syllabi were reviewed? L1113-11, L1111-92 (online), L5217, P1111-91, E1111-91

Type of courses reviewed: x online   x hybrid

What degree level(s)? □ AA/AS   □ BA/BS   x MA   □ Doctoral

What discipline(s)? History, Theology

Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? X YES □ NO

Comments: Some syllabi do not contain statement; Unable to determine credit hours in online and field experience courses

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. See: https://www.gs.edu/academics/course-syllabi/ Also see Exhibit List for examples of these types.

How many syllabi were reviewed? P2121 Leadership Formation, L5211 Soteriology (one week intensive)

What kinds of courses? field experience

What degree level(s)? □ AA/AS □ BA/BS   x MA   □ Doctoral

What discipline(s)? Leadership, Theology

Are students doing the amount of work per the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? □ YES □ NO

Comments: Unable to determine credit hours in online and field experience courses

Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)

How many programs were reviewed? All

What kinds of programs were reviewed? All

What degree □ BA/BS   x MA   □ Doctoral level(s)? □ AA/AS

What discipline(s)? All

Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? □ YES □ NO

Comments:
SEMINARY POLICY ON ACADEMIC CREDIT AND WORKLOAD EXPECTATIONS

For each hour of academic credit granted for a GGBTS face-to-face, hybrid or online course, the seminary assigns a workload of approximately 45 clock hours of academic learning activities per academic credit hour earned. Traditional in-class format normally apportions 15 hours of in-class instruction and 30 hours of instructional exercises to be completed outside of class meetings per credit hour granted. For androgogical reasons, individual courses may adjust the ratio of assignments inside and outside class meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Formula for hours of coursework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td># pages required X 3 hours per page = # of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Reading</td>
<td># pages required / 25 pages per hour = # of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td># of exams x 8 hours = # of work hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (workbooks, exercises, etc)</td>
<td># of hours required to complete the activities Or 1 hour per page of reading reflections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, students should expect to spend at least 95 hours outside of class for three units.

Review Completed By: Kay Llovio, Ed.D.
Date: November 29, 2018
Under federal regulation §602.16(a)(1)(vii), WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions and Comments: (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Federal Requirements** | Does the institution follow federal requirements on recruiting students? Gateway Seminary does not receive federal financial assistance and is therefore not a Title IX eligible institution. Gateway Seminary does not provide incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments.  
  X YES □ NO  
  Comments: While not required to do so, GSSBC meets Title IV requirements. |
| Degree completion and cost | Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? Each Degree Section provides “standard” time frames E.g.: MDiv Catalog, page 31- but as shown in the narrative of the WSCUC Report, Gateway has a significant number of part-time students  
  X YES □ NO  
  Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree?  
  Catalog, pages 143-148  
  X YES □ NO  
  Comments: |
| Careers and employment | Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? Each Catalog Degree Section provides Vocational Roles E.g.: MDiv Catalog, page 32  
  X YES □ NO  
  Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable?  
  The Gateway alumni magazine X YES □ NO  
  Comments: |

**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 requirements 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:
Terry Ratcliff, Ed.D.
Date:  12/5/18
# 3- STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*§602-16(1)(ix) WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s student complaints policies, procedures, and records. (See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission’s Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Policy on student complaints | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints?  
Faculty Manual Section III-9E   Student Handbook, page 8  
X YES   NO  
Is the policy or procedure easily accessible?   X YES   NO  
If so, where?  
Student Handbook, page 8  
Comments: Verified that Policy on Grievances is included in the Student Handbook |
| Process(es)/procedure   | Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints?  
Student Handbook, page 8  
If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure?  
Comments: Verified that procedure is included in the Student Handbook  
Does the institution maintain records of student complaints?  
Appeals are handled in writing only; Records of emails and documents are kept in the VPAS’ office.  
X YES NO  
If so, where? |
| Records                 | Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time?   X YES NO  
If so, please describe briefly:  
Comments: Historical record of student complaints is maintained by the Office of the Vice President of Academic Services |

Review Completed By: Mark Stanton,  
PhD  
Date: November 29, 2018
4 – TRANSFER CREDIT REVIEW FORM
Under federal requirements*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting, transfer, and admissions practices accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Reviewed</th>
<th>Questions/Comments (Enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections of this table as appropriate.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Transfer Credit Policy(s) | Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for reviewing and receiving transfer credit? xYES □ NO  
Faculty Manual Sec. III-9C  
Catalog, pages 173-175 |
|                   | If so, is the policy publicly available?  x YES □ NO  
If so, where? Catalog, pages 173-175 |
|                   | 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? x YES □ NO  
Catalog, page 174 |
|                   | Comments:                                                                                         |

*§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.

See also WSCUC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: J. Aaron Christopher  
Date: November 29, 2018
APPENDIX B

OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2013 Standards)

Institution: Gateway Seminary of the Southern Baptist Convention
Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit
Name of reviewer/s: Terry Ratcliff, Ed.D.
Date/s of review: October 29, 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed\(^1\). One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address
San Francisco—Bay Area Campus
38891 Mission Blvd
Fremont, CA 94536

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 regional center or off-campus site by WSCUC)

The Fremont location was established in 2016 when Golden Gate/Gateway Seminary moved from Mill Valley to Ontario, in southern California. The campus serves local commuter students in the Bay Area. The site was donated by an area church, and the seminary utilized resources from the sale of the Mill Valley site to build a state-of-the-art educational facility. The new building has multiple smart classrooms, a library, a “green wall” video studio, ample administrative and faculty offices, break room, and ample space for growth.

Fall enrollment was reported at 85 students, generating 360 credit hours. There are 3 full-time faculty assigned to the Fremont locations. Additional courses are taught by adjuncts who have active ministry activity in the area.

Four degree programs (3 master’s, 1 doctorate) and five diplomas/certificate programs are offered. The WSCUC website does not list the doctorate as available at this campus.

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

During the visit, Dr. Ratcliff met with Dr. Rick Durst (site director), current students, staff members, full-time faculty, and adjuncts. All participants were highly satisfied with their experiences at the San Francisco—Bay Area campus.

\(^1\) See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</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 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, 3.4, 4.6)</td>
<td>The site is highly aligned with the mission of the institution. All constituents feel supported by the staff, faculty, and administration in Ontario. The offsite is planned and organized to efficiently interact with the other campuses and administration in Ontario.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution.</strong> 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>The Fremont site is very much a part of the institution as a whole. Gateway signage clearly connects the facility with the institution. Since many students who had attended in Mill Valley are finishing their programs in Fremont, there is a strong connection at Gateway students. No attempts to connect the Fremont students to those at other campuses was observed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Learning Site.</strong> 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 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)</td>
<td>The building is a modern, state-of-the-art facility. Classrooms are well lit, well furnished, and equipped with appropriate technology. Faculty offices are easily accessible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services. CPR:</strong> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <strong>EER:</strong> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)</td>
<td>The library is exceptionally well equipped for a facility and student population of this size. Students report that access to other materials is easy. Faculty are available for advising in their offices. As indicated in the recommendations, student support services at all locations need review and adjustment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are 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, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)</td>
<td>Full-time faculty are very involved in all academic activities of the institution, and very connected with their colleagues at all campuses. They participate fully in curriculum development and program review.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Delivery.</strong> 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) [Also submit credit hour report.]</td>
<td>Curriculum development and evaluation are handled at all off-campus sites in the same ways they are managed in Ontario. In addition to program managers (located at other sites), the site supervisor assists adjuncts in course preparation. All courses utilize a core syllabus, which maintains consistency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Graduation.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>Data on retention is collected at the program and site levels. Further analysis and action plans are recommended at all sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning. CPR:</strong> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <strong>EER:</strong> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)</td>
<td>Off-site programs are included in the program review process for the institution. Team recommendations for improvement of program review for the institution include programs and courses offered at the various campuses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</strong> How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <strong>EER:</strong> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)</td>
<td>Review of institutional effectiveness includes the off-site campuses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OFF-CAMPUS LOCATIONS REVIEW – TEAM REPORT APPENDIX (2013 Standards)

Institution: Gateway Seminary of the Southern Baptist Convention
Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit
Name of reviewer/s: John McVay
Date/s of review: 11/5/2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

    Gateway Seminary Pacific Northwest Campus (GSPNC)
    3200 NE 109th Avenue
    Vancouver, WA 98682-7749

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 regional center or off-campus site by WSCUC)

    MDiv (Masters)
    MTS (Masters)
    Bible Teaching Certificate (Non-degree)
    Diploma in Theology (Non-degree)
    Church Planting Certificate (Non-degree)
    Mission Studies Certificate (Non-degree)

    [Note: the GSPNC website also lists DMin and DTH (the Diploma in Theology)]

For the 2018-2019 academic year, GSPNC has an enrollment of 51 students, 38 of whom will spend time on the Vancouver campus. Nearly all students are part-time, with most engaged in ministry.

GSPNC, the third regional campus of the institution (then Golden Gate Seminary), began in 1980 as a partnership with the Northwest Baptist Convention.

GSPNC is designated as an additional location by WSCUC.

---

2 See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.
3. Nature of the Review (material examined and persons/committees interviewed)

The reviewer visited GSPNC on Monday, Nov. 5, 2018. Students were present on campus and classes were being conducted. Interviews were conducted with:

- Dr. Mark Bradley, Director, GSPNC, and Associate Professor of Leadership Formation, a "trustee-elected" faculty member
- A lunch interview with both Dr. Bradley and Dr. Michael Kuykendall, Professor of New Testament Studies and also a "trustee-elected" faculty member
- Ashley Seuell, Regional Campus Librarian, and another library staff member
- Randy Adams, PhD, Adjunct Professor and Executive Director of the Northwest Baptist Convention (who, with a PhD in homiletics from Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, regularly teaches preaching course at GSPNC)
- Sonya Fitzpatrick, administrative assistant to the president, who also regularly aids students with registration-linked matters and provides advice with regard to their academic programs
- Several students on site (including one student also interviewed as part of the student interviews conducted from the main campus)

In addition, the reviewer participated in a tour of the facilities, spent time examining the onsite library collection, visited two classes that were being conducted (E1412-31: The Educational Ministry of the Church, with eleven students taught by adjunct professor Dr. Tim Walter, and P1401-31 Preaching, taught by adjunct professor and Executive Director of the Southern Baptist Pacific Northwest Convention Dr. Randy Adams).

Materials examined include:

- GSPNC web page, part of the wider GSSBC web site
- GSPNC library use statistics
- The GSSBC Self Study Report (and especially p. 11, which contains a brief description of GSPNC)
- GSPNC budget figures as reflected in the GSSBC 2018-2019 Expense and Revenue Budgets
- Dr. Mark Bradley’s Fall 2016 syllabus for P 1111-91 Foundations for Ministry (online)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lines of Inquiry</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 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, 3.4, 4.6)</td>
<td>The site is highly aligned with the mission of the institution. All constituents feel supported by the staff, faculty, and administration in Ontario. The offsite is planned and organized to efficiently interact with the other campuses and administration in Ontario.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connection to the Institution</strong>. 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>Faculty and students both see themselves as integrally connected to the GSSBC home campus. This ethos is especially strengthened by the close participation of the “trustee-elected” faculty, including the director, in governance and evaluation processes through participation in regular meetings and in the annual faculty retreat.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of the Learning Site</strong>. 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 1.7, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.4)</td>
<td>GSPNC occupies a full, purpose-built wing of the Northwest Baptist Convention headquarters building and is able to use additional facilities in the complex as well. Dedicated space includes four classrooms, a student lounge (inclusive of kitchen facilities), a faculty office, a director’s office (with a spacious anteroom for the administrative assistant to the director, and a student waiting area), a library facility comprised of a number of rooms/spaces, and a computer lab. The facility gives the impression of being well-maintained and managed and of contributing positively to learning and to student contact with faculty and staff. The site is directed by Dr. Mark Bradley, who coordinates all functions on the campus including recruiting and mentoring adjunct professors.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services</strong>. CPR: What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? EER: What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.5)</td>
<td>Students report a sense of family and that they enjoy close attention to their needs on the part of director, faculty, and staff. Advising and counseling are available through the work of the administrative assistant to the director and through close, personal attention from the director. It was evident that faculty and staff know each student’s situation and work individually to meet their needs. The library houses 16,000 volumes on site and offers good access to online databases, to books mailed to students from other GSSBC libraries, and inter-library loan services. In addition, a cooperative agreement exists allowing students full access, inclusive of borrowing privileges, at the Western Seminary (Portland Campus), Multnomah University, and George Fox University libraries. Library staff regularly provide research guidance and coaching on writing. Students were effusive in their praise of library staff and services. While every indication suggests that academic programs are being delivered effectively, GSSBC academic data is not aggregated by campus, making</td>
<td>No campus-specific follow up is required. However, the general recommendation for improvement in data gathering and interpretation will provide needed, campus-specific data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
it difficult to speak specifically of GSPNC programs and students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Faculty.</strong> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are 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, 3.1-3.3, 4.3)</th>
<th>The two “trustee-elected faculty” (TTF) members carry a significant element of the teaching load, ably supported by a range of adjunct professors, most of whom are regular, long-term partners. TTF faculty participate regularly in GSSBC governance committees, program evaluation, and the annual faculty retreat (where significant elements of program review and assessment are conducted).</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum and Delivery.</strong> 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) [Also submit credit hour report.]</td>
<td>GSSBC and GSPNC take pride in being part of a system that delivers the same curriculum at all sites and online. All courses are developed centrally through syllabi templates. Each syllabus is reviewed by the campus director and the appropriate department chair to ensure that it follows the template. Courses and programs are evaluated and synchronized through centralized processes.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retention and Graduation.</strong> 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)</td>
<td>While every indication exists that retention and graduation rates are on par with other GSSBC campuses, GSSBC academic data is not aggregated by campus, making it difficult to validate that this is so. No campus-specific follow up is required. However, the general recommendation for improvement in data gathering and interpretation affirms the need for campus-specific data.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Learning.</strong> CPR: How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? EER: What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.3, 4.4)</td>
<td>All assessment strategies used on the central GSSBC campus are employed at GSPNC including course/teacher evaluations, signature assignments, TFE evaluations, etc. Again, there is a deficit in being unable to differentiate GSPNC data. No campus-specific follow up is required. However, the general recommendation for improvement in data gathering and interpretation affirms the need for campus-specific data.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</strong> How are the institution’s quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? EER: What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.1-4.7)</td>
<td>GSSBC processes to ensure quality education are crafted with multiple sites in mind and, per interviews with students, faculty and administrators, are executed fully with regard to each site, including GSPNC.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Distance Education Review-Team Report Appendix

Institution: Gateway Seminary of The Southern Baptist Convention
Type of Visit: Accreditation Visit
Name of reviewer/s: Terry Ratcliff
Date/s of review: Nov 27-30, 2018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all comprehensive visits to institutions that offer distance education programs and for other visits as applicable. Teams can use the institutional report to begin their investigation, then, use the visit to confirm claims and further surface possible concerns. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report. (If the institution offers only online courses, the team may use this form for reference but need not submit it as the team report is expected to cover distance education in depth in the body of the report.)

1. Programs and courses reviewed (please list)
   
   E111391  Principles and Approaches to Bible Teaching
   E272891  Contemporary Trends & Critical Issues in Youth Ministry
   I111291  Cultural Anthropology

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)

   Gateway Seminary was first approved by WSCUC to offer fully online programs in 2012. During Fall 2018 the following approved programs are offered fully online:

   Master of Divinity (MDiv)
   Master of Theological Studies (MTS)
   Master of Arts in Educational Leadership (MAEL)
   Master of Arts in Intercultural Studies (MAIS)
   Diploma in Theology
   Diploma in Educational Leadership

   GSSBC made major commitments to online learning with the hiring of a full-time Director of Online Education in January 2016. The director provides ongoing training in online pedagogy and provides instructional design assistance to faculty designing new courses. Instructional design assistance is also provided to faculty updating existing course. Conversion to a new learning platform (Canvas) was initiated in 2017 and is complete. The new platform has enabled

---

3 See Distance Education Review Guide to determine whether programs are subject to this process. In general only programs that are more than 50% online require review and reporting.
GSSBC to provide a standard course shell and a variety of new features that promote best practices in online learning.

In Fall 2018, 183 students are enrolled as fully online students. On-ground students can also enroll in online courses. Many on-ground students took advantage of online courses to accelerate degree completion during the transition from Mill Valley to Ontario.

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

Team members were granted access to a large number of current courses. Three courses were reviewed in detail as “guest.” In addition, members of the team met with the Director of Online Education and two faculty members. The director and faculty described a strong online program, with well designed faculty training and support.
<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>Distance learning is organized in the same way as the regional campuses, with strong administrative support.</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>Distance education students receive the same support as students at the regional campuses. Student communication to online students is integrated into the communication system for all students. Strengthening support services across the institution will benefit online students in integration into the life and culture of the institution.</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 among students? Is the technology adequately supported? Are there back-ups?</td>
<td>Conversion/Implementation of Canvas has enabled the institution to provide a strong infrastructure for online learning. Asynchronous learning is well developed. GS technology support is available, as well as 24/7 support from Canvas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Support Services:</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Faculty provide academic advising to all online students in a comparable fashion to advising to on-ground students. Remote access to librarians and digital library services provide the level of support necessary for online students. Strengthening support services across the institution will benefit online students. More detailed satisfaction, retention, and completion data on online students is needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty.</strong> 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?</td>
<td>Both full-time and adjuncts teach online courses. Current faculty were invited to teach online in addition to on-ground if they were interested. New faculty are hired with the skills and expertise to teach in both formats. The Director of Online Education and staff provide onboarding and ongoing training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
focused on online pedagogy. Since full-time faculty teach in the online format, online delivery is considered in the institutional curriculum development and program review processes.

**Curriculum and Delivery.** 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.)

Online curriculum development is part of the institutional curriculum development process. Full-time faculty with online experience are involved in the development process. Online courses and programs go through the same approval processes as on-ground courses. Because all GSSBC courses utilize a common core syllabus, all content and learning outcomes of online courses are comparable to on-ground courses.

**Retention and Graduation.** 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?

As indicted in the team report, further detail is needed in the review and analysis of retention and degree completion across the institution. Comparisons of student success at the regional campuses and online need improvement.

**Student Learning.** 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?

Online courses and programs are included in the institutional program review process. More detailed assessment of student learning in online formats vs. on-ground are needed.

**Contracts with Vendors.** 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*?

The team did not review the contractual agreement with Canvas.

**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?

Online programs and courses are included in institutional effectiveness data. As indicated in the team report, institutional research capabilities of the institution need improvement.