

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 2

For Institutions Seeking Initial Accreditation

To: Stockton Christian Life Center

March 20 – 22, 2019

Team Roster

List Team Chair: Jonathan Parker, Professor of Education, California Baptist University

Assistant Chair: Cynthia Carter, Associate Provost, Fresno Pacific University (Retired)

Team Member: Linda Hawk, Vice President (VP) for Finance and Administrative Services,
California State University, San Marcos (Retired)

Team Member: Alice Knudsen, Director of Institutional Research, Planning, and Academic
Assessment, Mills College (Retired)

Team Member: Lee Kats, Vice Provost for Research and Strategic Initiatives, Pepperdine
University, Malibu, CA

WSCUC Staff Liaison: Maureen Maloney, VP, WSCUC

The team evaluated the institution under the WSCUC Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective judgment for consideration and action by the institution and by the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC). The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. Once an institution achieves either candidacy or initial accreditation, the team report and Commission Action Letter associated with the review that resulted in the granting of either candidacy or initial accreditation and the team reports and Commission Action Letters of any subsequent reviews will be made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

Table of Contents

SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 2	3
TEAM REPORT.....	3
SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT	3
A. Description of Institution and Visit	3
B. The Institution’s Seeking Accreditation Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review & Report ...	5
C: Response to Issues Raised in Past Commission Letters	5
SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC’S STANDARDS	5
Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives	5
Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions	8
Standard 3: Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability	10
Standard 4: Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement	18
SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
Findings: Reflections and Plans for Improvement	27
Commendations.....	30
Recommendations	30

*SEEKING ACCREDITATION VISIT 2
TEAM REPORT*

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Visit

The Christian Life College (CLC) mission is to equip learners for a life of commitment to Christ, biblical fidelity, educational excellence, and lasting service to the kingdom of God. The originating institution, Western Apostolic Bible College (WABC), was founded in 1953, and its history traces back to church basement Bible institute meetings hosted by the late Rev. Clyde J. Haney beginning in 1949. In 1954 and 1956 respectively, the college was first accepted and then endorsed by the United Pentecostal Church.

WABC began offering a four-year Bachelor of Arts (BA) degree in Bible and Theology in 1964 and changed its name to Christian Life College in 1980. Associate of Arts (AA) degrees were added to the curriculum in 1983. In 1994, approval was granted by the State of California's Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) to offer AA and BA degrees in two majors: Bible & Theology and Christian Music. From 1998 to 2006, the curriculum further expanded to include a Christian Education emphasis and then a Biblical Studies major, later revised to General Ministry. The central focus remains as evangelistic outreach, spiritual depth, personal holiness, and unreserved commitment to the Word of God.

CLC is located on a 20-acre campus located at 9025 West Lane in Stockton, CA. Of the seven large campus buildings, five are primarily used for the college; two are shared with other ministries. In addition, two identical on-site dormitories provide housing for up to 92 students each.

CLC submitted an application for eligibility to WSCUC in November 2015, with

eligibility granted for the period of December 8, 2015, until December 8, 2020. A subsequent application for accreditation was submitted in February 2016, and a Seeking Accreditation Visit 1 (SAV1) was tentatively scheduled for spring 2017, pending receipt of the Letter of Intent. WSCUC approved an institution request to move the SAV1 from spring 2017 to fall 2017.

CLC's 2017 SAV1 resulted in action to receive the SAV1 report, grant Candidacy for a period of five years, and schedule a SAV2 for spring 2019. The SAV1 report included seven commendations and 10 recommendations.

CLC offers both Associate of Arts and Bachelor of Arts degrees in five academic areas: Bible and Theology; Business Administration and Management; General Ministry; General Ministry with emphasis in Christian Media and Communication, Christian Music, and Missiology (Missions). While no degree programs have been added since the SAV1 visit, CLC added a leadership concentration/emphasis to the General Ministry degree.

Enrollment as of 2019 appears essentially stable, with 160 undergraduate student headcount, with 85 females and 75 males. By comparison, enrollment was reported at 157 in spring 2017, then rose slightly to 163 in fall 2017 with 91 females and 72 males.

The SAV2 site visit was conducted after team members reviewed CLC's institutional report and evidence files. Prior to the visit, initial report drafts were constructed to clarify lines of understanding and lines of questions to be explored. Additional evidence was requested and made available prior to and during the visit. CLC accommodated team members' requests for scheduling accommodations, which allowed interviews to be conducted with individuals and groups who could contribute to clarifying institutional practices as the site visit unfolded. Team members noted that institutional representatives appeared to be candid and forthcoming with responses to inquiry.

B. The Institution's Seeking Accreditation Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Review & Report

The institution provided well-organized, thoughtful, and serious responses to the recommendations in the Commission Action Letter, which generally appeared to accurately portray the institution's current status. It is evident CLC has taken intentional actions in response to SAV1 recommendations.

CLC is in an emergent stage of producing sufficient data to fully inform effective decision-making, supported by strong assessment buy-in across academic and administrative departments. There is currently no trend data and outcomes are disaggregated in only one demographic dimension without crosstabs, such as comparing race and ethnicity by gender. Similar to learning outcomes, retention and graduation data are not yet disaggregated for demographic specificity and do not include trends.

CLC's SAV2 report appears to have generated effective recommendations for continued institutional improvement, such as expanding diversity resources and practices, and the culture's enthusiastic response toward a growing capacity for data informed decision-making portends well for effective applications related to the college's growing body of evidence.

C: Response to Issues Raised in Past Commission Letters

The Commission's March 9, 2018, Commission Action Letter included ten major recommendations, which are noted below in SAV2 narrative findings by Standard and CFR.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL COMPLIANCE WITH WSCUC'S STANDARDS

Standard 1: Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

CFR 1.4: *Institutional Purpose. Consistent with its purposes and character, the institution demonstrates an appropriate response to the increasing diversity in society through its policies, its educational and co-curricular programs, its hiring and admissions criteria, and its administrative and organizational practices.*

Commission Recommendation: *Increase the size and diversity of the Board of Directors and Board of Trustees to better reflect student, faculty and staff demographics and expand the professional qualifications of the Board.*

CLC has a highly diverse student body that roughly approximates the ethnic diversity of the state of California. A statement on diversity can be found on the college website that is consistent with WSCUC's Equity and Inclusion Policy.

A primary concern during the SAV1 visit was the lack of diversity and limited range of expertise on the board of directors. Since the SAV1 visit the college has added two new board members. One is a female with a background in higher education, the other is an African-American male with a background in business. The team considered these additions to be a good first step in diversifying the board. Conversations with the president and board members confirmed that the institution is committed to further diversifying the board and continuing to increase the range of expertise among members.

Another concern was the fact that the gender and ethnic diversity of the faculty and staff was not as robust as the diversity within the student body. There was no formal plan with specific goals and timelines for increasing faculty and staff diversity. Faculty and staff recruiting primarily utilizes informal networks within the United Pentecostal Church International denomination. Several teaching assistants who are graduates of the college and also have part-time staff responsibilities are being supported by the institution as they pursue master's degrees. Upon completion of advanced degrees, they would become eligible for hire as faculty members. All but one of these has completed a master's degree and are now full-time faculty members.

CFR 1.5: Integrity and Transparency. *Even when supported by or affiliated with governmental, corporate, or religious organizations, the institution has education as its primary purpose and operates as an academic institution with appropriate autonomy.*

Commission Recommendation: *Revise CLC bylaws to accurately reflect actual college operations.*

Christian Life College's bylaws clearly define the relationship between the institution, the Christian Life Center, and the United Pentecostal Church International denomination. The institution's articles of incorporation state that it is an institution of learning governed by a board of directors and there is no reference to a subaltern relationship with the church or the denomination. The website makes the following statement regarding this relationship: "The College is established with the spiritual leadership and prayers and financial support of the Christian Life Center ("Church"), and by the approval of the Division of Education of the United Pentecostal Church ("DOE"). Nevertheless, as an institution, the College is owned and operated by an independent board of directors. As such, CLC provides a college education within an atmosphere that is consistent with the ideals and spiritual principles of the Church and the Articles of Faith of the United Pentecostal Church International. Faculty lives must reflect faithfulness to the Word of God and they sign a statement reflecting that fidelity. Approved faculty from other churches or denominations must agree to respect the nature of the College and its mission, while the College in turn respects their religious convictions."

The team followed a line of inquiry regarding the autonomy of the institution in response to emails asserting that the pastor of Christian Life Center exerted improper control over the hiring and termination of employees of the college and elements of the curriculum. No corroborating evidence was found to support those assertions.

Three statements within the bylaws raised some concern during the SAV1 visit. One statement referencing the chief executive officer indicated that the faculty senate is "accountable to the CEO," a breach of expected faculty independence in shared governance. Another

statement in the bylaws referred to a provost when there wasn't one. Third, the bylaws stated that the chief financial officer (CFO) is hired by and reports to the board. All three of these bylaws issues have been addressed and there is now congruence between the bylaws and the actual institutional operations.

Standard 2: Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

CFR 2.2: *Teaching and Learning—Clearly defined degrees re: admission requirements and levels of achievement for graduation: processes to ensure meaning, quality and integrity of degrees—Undergraduate degree requirements, including general education and core competencies.*

Commission Recommendation: *Develop a definition of student success and a process to measure and track this success to help inform the meaning of CLC's degrees and ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees.*

While CLC previously had a well-developed discipline specific curriculum, they did not clearly define the position, role, and evaluation processes for the core curriculum and general education (GE) requirements. CLC subsequently worked to define how each part of the curriculum contributes to the success of the student both in terms of knowledge development as well as career skills. To further enhance GE learning CLC developed a set of general education program learning outcomes (PLOs).

CLC reports that general education faculty work closely with discipline specific faculty to incorporate general education PLO assessment into annual program review processes. Core competencies are assessed in capstone projects for each discipline. It is not clear how AA students and BA students are expected to achieve different levels of understanding with regard to PLOs. CLC reported that they were still developing mechanisms for assessing core competencies. Specifically, it was reported that they were still discussing how to assess quantitative reasoning and critical thinking. It was clear in meeting with all programs that adjunct faculty are still not very involved in assessment planning or data collection.

CFR 2.6: *Graduates achieve state levels of attainments; SLOs embedded in faculty standards for assessing student work.*

Commission Recommendation: *Develop a definition of student success and a process to measure and track this success to help inform the meaning of CLC's degrees and ensure the quality and integrity of its degrees.*

Since the SAVI visit, CLC separated the Office of Assessment from the Office of Institutional Research. Faculty senate established institution wide standards of student success. Also, since the SAVI visit, the college wrote and published a student assessment handbook. The handbook lays out the purpose and plan for the types of assessment data faculty are responsible to collect.

The General Ministry program was in line for a program review and was first to establish and measure program learning outcomes under the guidance of the new assessment handbook. The assessment director worked with General Ministry faculty to develop rubrics for PLO assessment. The new General Ministry learning outcomes are still not specific enough to easily measure or assess. For example, new PLOs suggest that students will be able to apply or “practice key skills” yet those skills are not listed or described. Reports from the Bible and Theology and Business programs suggested that faculty in those areas are modeling their future program review and assessment of PLOs after what was done or has been planned in General Ministry. The general education faculty members have developed a plan for assessing PLOs in the next one to two years.

CFR 2.10: *Institution identifies and supports needs of students; tracks aggregated and disaggregated student achievement satisfaction and campus climate; demonstrates students' timely progress.*

Commission Recommendation: *Collect, disaggregate, and analyze student success data to demonstrate acceptable retention and graduation rates and inform decision-making about the allocation of student support resources.*

As mentioned previously, CLC reorganized and reformed an office of institutional research (IR). There has subsequently been renewed emphasis on data collection, data disaggregation, and a more focused dedication toward data-informed decision making.

New disaggregated data confirm that CLC is serving a diverse student body. Retention data are informative and suggest that the college will set targeted retention goals in a new strategic plan. Until then, the college used current retention data to create a new advising program and an advising handbook. It is not clear if additional resources were utilized to create these new advising resources.

While there has been significant progress toward more thorough and accurate data collection on student metrics, the office of institutional research has important work ahead. Since data collection is new, there is very little longitudinal data on which to establish trends and patterns. Further, more disaggregation of the data will provide valuable information for establishing even more support for students. For example, if retention rates change dramatically from one year to the next, further data mining could provide valuable input into causes of these sudden changes in rates. In addition, information from the new IR director makes it apparent that he will need further professional development in data disaggregation and guiding data-based decision making for the institution.

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

CRF 3.1: *The institution employs faculty and staff with substantial and continuing commitment to the institution. The faculty and staff are sufficient in number, professional qualification and diversity and to achieve the institution's educational objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs wherever and however delivered.*

Commission Recommendation: *Continue efforts to employ CLC faculty with the appropriate education and credentials to qualify them to achieve the institution's educational*

objectives, establish and oversee academic policies, and ensure the integrity and continuity of its academic and co-curricular programs.

Since the Seeking Accreditation Visit 1 (SAV1) in November 2017, Christian Life College (CLC) continues to employ faculty who are committed to fulfilling the mission of the institution. The college recruits and hires faculty based upon education, experience, expertise, and commitment to Christ and the mission of the college (CFRs 2.1, 3.3). According to the college faculty roster for 2018-2019, which includes teaching assistants, four hold the title of professor. They are the college president, vice president of finance, vice president of academic affairs, and the college's accreditation liaison officer (ALO; CFR 3.1. In addition to the four professors who have senior administrative duties and responsibilities as outlined in their job descriptions, CLC employs twenty-four assistant professors and six teaching assistants. Altogether, there are 34 faculty, including teaching assistants, and 24 or 71% of the total faculty are alumni of CLC (CFR 2.1). In 2017, CLC's board of directors directed the administration to implement a plan whereby all faculty members hold a graduate degree in the fields in which they plan to teach. The college, based on the 2018 faculty roster, has ten full time professors who possess a master's degree. One faculty member holds a terminal degree and three are currently enrolled in doctoral programs. For all faculty, excluding teaching assistants, 96% hold a master's degree in or higher in their discipline and 14% possess a terminal degree. CLC has invested in faculty obtaining advanced degrees in disciplines connected to the college's courses and degree programs. All courses offered at CLC have a faculty member as teacher of record that ensures a level of supervision for teaching assistants. Of the six teaching assistants, five are enrolled in master's degree programs as further evidence of the CLC's commitment to degree attainment by its faculty. The college anticipates enrollment growth into the future, particularly in its Business Administration program, and is exploring expanded offerings in general education. As a result,

the college developed and implemented guidelines to recruit and hire faculty possessing master's degrees or higher in disciplines aligned to curricular needs.

Christian Life College believes in diversity for the student body and faculty and since SAVI, has written a diversity hiring plan for faculty (CFR 1.4). The plan is multifaceted and lists five strategies that CLC defines as common practices governing diversity hiring initiatives that are consistent with the mission of the college. The composition of the faculty by race and ethnicity closely mirrors its student body with the faculty composition being 51% Caucasian, 23% Hispanic/Latino, 11% African American, 3% Native American, 3% Asian, 3% Pacific Island/Hawaiian and 6% identifying as being two or more. Conversely, the student population is 38% Caucasian, 37% Hispanic/Latino, 5% African American, 2% Native American, and 1% Asian. According to the report, 16% of the students self-reported two or more ethnicities (CFR 1.4). Since the SAVI, the faculty and student bodies are more diversified by ethnicity with increases in Hispanic/Latino for faculty. Asian, Pacific Island/Hawaiian and two or more ethnicities also increased for faculty and students. In terms of gender diversity, CLC's faculty is 34% female and 66% male; the student population is 48% male and 52% female. During the visit, it was noted by the president that he is committed to diversity in the college's hiring practices.

As outlined in the faculty handbook, full-time and adjunct faculty members are actively involved in the college's governance, curriculum development and review, and the setting of academic standards through the faculty senate as a policy forming, representative body of the college's faculty (CFR 3.10). The overarching purpose of the faculty senate at CLC is to directly engage faculty in the college governance of academic policy to ensure they have final oversight and are the driving force of the college's academic curriculum and faculty development and assessment (CFRs 1.3, 3.10). As outlined in the faculty handbook (pages 23-25), the faculty

senate participates in college governance as a regulative, consultative, advisory, shared responsibility, and delegated authority as directed by the college president or an authorized designee (CFRs 1.3, 1.5, 2.4). The faculty senate is active in the college governance system through its responses to college committees and policy resolutions as documented in the faculty senate meeting minutes of October 16, 2018. During the site visit, it was noted in several sessions that faculty acknowledge academic freedom and have ownership of the curriculum (CFRs 1.3, 3.10).

CFR 3.3: *The institution maintains appropriate and sufficiently supported faculty and staff development activities designed to improve teaching, learning, and assessment of learning outcomes.*

Commission Recommendation: *Provide appropriate and sufficient professional development for faculty and engage faculty and staff in the broader higher education landscape to support them in their academic endeavors. (Refer as well to CFRs 2.1, 2.8, 2.9, and 4.7)*

To ensure that all faculty are engaged in assessment, program review, and faculty development, CLC appointed a Professional Development Committee, comprised of the faculty senate chair and two faculty members who are voted in by the faculty senate each year. According to CLC's Handbook on the formation, mission and function of college committees, updated on January 17, 2019, the Professional Development Committee is charged with fostering optimum professional growth and achievement by every faculty member (CFR 2.4). This committee also encourages the college to make provision for the faculty to attend professional meetings to enable them to keep current in their academic areas and encourages memberships in appropriate professional organizations. This was evidenced when the college sent 70% of its faculty to WSCUC hosted assessment workshops. Further evidence includes senior leadership support for CLC's accreditation liaison officer and assessment coordinator participation in WSCUC's Academic Resource Conference (ARC) and Assessment Leadership Academy (ALA). It was also expressed during the visit that the director of human resources is actively

involved the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM) and brings valuable compliance and culture knowledge and tools to the institution.

The college currently has a full-time assessment coordinator and, since the SAVI visit, added a part time director of institutional research. The assessment coordinator coaches and supports academic program assessment committees through the process of assessing student achievement of learning outcomes and developing program review reports. It is evident that CLC advanced its efforts in assessing student achievement and that program faculty members are reviewing data for enhancements in curricula and pedagogy. CLC leveraged the culture of assessment into student services and administrative units, which are also supported by the Office of Assessment. However, program review is still emerging at CLC and as of the site visit, no programs have gone through the complete review cycle. It is important that CLC maintain momentum in assessment and program review by making this process a high priority for the faculty and senior leadership.

CFR 3.4: *The institution is financially stable and has unqualified independent financial audits and resources sufficient to ensure long term viability. Resource planning and development include realistic budgeting, enrollment management, and diversification of revenue sources. Resource planning is integrated with all other institutional planning. Resources are aligned with educational purposes and objectives.*

Commission Recommendation: *Implement a plan to diversify revenue streams to support CLC as it grows and gains sophistication as a higher education institution.*

Christian Life College functioned without an operating deficit for three consecutive fiscal years ending July 31 for 2015, 2016, and 2017. The college received an unqualified opinion on its independent audits for all three years with no significant deficiencies or material weaknesses noted in their reports. From fiscal year ending July 31, 2017, compared to fiscal year ending July 31, 2016, the college's total net assets as reported on its statements of financial position increased by \$14,364 when compared year over year. This was primarily due to an increase in

property and equipment at cost of \$101,533 and a decrease in cash in bank of \$92,612 when compared for the same period year over year. Cash purchases were made by the college in kitchen and classroom equipment, furniture, library books and fixtures, and building improvements. In the statement of activities, unrestricted revenue and support decreased by \$41,680 in 2017 when compared to 2016, primarily due to the contributions not realized in 2017 (CFRs 4.6, 4.7).

CLC's primary sources of revenue are tuition, fees, and housing charges. For the fiscal year ending July 31, 2017, student tuition and fees represented \$527,885 or 47% and housing charges represented \$431,906 or 37% of net revenue. Contributions represented 8.5% or \$97,272 for the same period. In terms of operating costs, there is an intangible support of CLC in the form of a lease agreement with the Stockton Christian Life Center that was executed in 2015 for a period of twenty-five years at an annual rent payment of one dollar (\$1.00). The college's total estimated commitment for the lease period is \$2,654,880 according to the Notes to Financial Statements for the fiscal year ending July 31, 2017. The college acknowledges that the value of this lease is critical to its operations (CFR 1.5).

On the expenditure side, operating expenses increased by \$137,372 or 14% in 2017 compared to 2016. Significant increases were in salaries and housing allowance, accreditation, academics, and activities. These costs were one-time for consulting support, education expenses for faculty obtaining master's degrees, and improvement projects as noted above. These activities resulted in a change in unrestricted net assets from \$174,356 in 2016 to a deficit of (\$4,696) in 2017.

For fiscal year 2018, CLC projects an operating loss of \$65, 671 before interest and depreciation and at the time of the SAV2 report and site visit, did not have its audited financial statements for the year. However, the college expects to return to operating surpluses in fiscal

year 2019 due to contributions coming in above projections and not incurring one-time costs at the same level as fiscal years 2017 and 2018 (CFR 3.4).

CLC recognizes the need to diversify its revenue streams as noted in the SAV1 team recommendations. It was predicted that the upward trend of net assets would level off or decrease as the college strategically invested in faculty and learning resources as documented in the 2nd revision of the Board Strategic Vision (BSV) released for 2017-18 college year. In 2017, the college set a goal of \$250,000 for its capital campaign and other projects and raised \$243,000 in one and five-year gifts. CLC hopes to increase this to \$300,000 by July 31, 2019. As a result, contributions would represent 13% of CLC's budgeted gross revenue by year-end for 2019. The college's president currently serves as the acting director of campaign development and is focused on developing donor relationships with the support of the director of alumni relations, leading the annual campaign program, and collaborating with the board and administration to craft strategies for a long-term capital campaign (CFR 4.7).

Since SAV1, CLC drafted a strategic enrollment plan that includes long term enrollment goal setting, integrated marketing and recruitment strategy development, and execution of retention and student support services (CFR 3.5). The college views retention, graduation, and alumni success to be priority goals aligned with the Board Strategic Vision and to ensure alignment of financial resources as it continues to diversify its revenue streams with contributions as well as Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and other grant funded opportunities. As of the SAV2 site visit, the strategic enrollment plan was still in draft form; CLC is encouraged to move the plan into full implementation before the fiscal year 2020 budget planning process.

CFR 3.9: *The institution has an independent governing board or similar authority that, consistent with its legal and fiduciary authority, exercises appropriate oversight over*

institutional integrity, policies, and ongoing operations, including hiring and evaluating the chief executive officer.

Commission Recommendation: *Enhance the independence of the Board of Trustees to a level appropriate to govern an institution of higher learning.*

A recommendation made in the SAV1 report was for CLC to revise its bylaws to reflect the actual college structure and operations. In 2018, the college conducted this review with an intentional focus on articulation of greater institutional independence at the board level (CFRs 1.5, 3.7). The bylaws retained language for the board of directors to consist of up to fifteen members and with at least three members of the United Pentecostal Church International (UPCI) who hold ministerial license with the Western District of the UPCI. Previously, the bylaws allowed for up to nine members in good standing of the Stockton Christian Life Center.

The board's primary role is to set the long-term vision of the institution. This is accomplished through the annual Board Strategic Vision that is a five-year plan identifying areas of expected achievement, growth, and sustainability. In addition, the board has fiduciary responsibility to oversee financial resources and is the final authority on educational matters (CFRs 3.6, 3.7, 4.6). It also grants all degrees awarded by CLC upon the recommendation of the faculty and president. The full board meets three times a year and every member is asked to serve on a subcommittee for a two-year term. However, board members have no term limits and may serve successive terms. The president/chief executive officer, chief academic officer, chief financial officer, and chief operating officer are non-voting members of the board and serve as providers of information to facilitate board actions and decisions (CFR 3.8). The president gives a verbal and written update to the full board at scheduled meetings and presents the annual state of the college report every January.

The board of directors is comprised of nine individuals who bring ecclesial, academic, and business sector experiences to their roles. The members' backgrounds include: practicing

attorney, university administrator, senior pastors affiliated with the United Pentecostal Church International, real estate development; civic engagement; and a business entrepreneur (CFR 3.7). This array of perspectives brings instructional, administrative, ministry, legal, civic engagement and capital development expertise to the college. Following the SAVI and subsequent WSCUC Commission Action Letter, CLC added two new directors in December 2018. One new member is an experienced college educator and administrator who brings expertise in student support services and has worked with diverse student populations. The second new member brings financial acumen and entrepreneurship to the college and works in the community assisting those in transition to find meaningful employment within the community. It was noted by the college president that the board has already gained much from the participation of these new additions to the group. The president also noted that CLC will continue to recruit members to further diversify the board in ethnicity, gender, and expertise.

In fall 2017, the board underwent a process of reflection and review through a self-evaluation that focused on fidelity to the core purposes of CLC, forward positioning at all levels for CLC's future success and providing effective oversight so academics, finances, and personnel are aligned to realize the mission and vision (CFR 1.7). Areas of distinction as tabulated on survey responses were diversity on the board and effective meeting processes. Conversely, areas that were identified as poor were succession planning, board role in risk management, and involvement in fundraising planning and execution. The board discussed the results of this self-evaluation, noting areas that needed attention, and acknowledged areas of strength upon which to build for the future.

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

CFR 4.1: *The institution employs a deliberate set of quality-assurance processes in both academic and non-academic areas, including new curriculum and program approval*

processes, periodic program review, assessment of student learning, and other forms of ongoing evaluation. These processes include: collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data; tracking learning results over time; using comparative data from external sources; and improving structures, services, processes, curricula, pedagogy, and learning results.

Commission Recommendations for CFRs 4.1, 4.3, and 4.4: *It is imperative for CLC to demonstrate sustained, evidence-based, and participatory self-reflection by: a) developing and implementing quality-assurance processes that include effective assessment tools and methods for direct and indirect assessment of student learning in relation to all Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILOs) and Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) and standards and benchmarks for student performance; and, b) using findings to improve curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology.*

CLC appears to have improved quality assurance processes subsequent to the SAVI report. First, it appointed a new assessment coordinator and provided quality professional development for this individual and a second individual through WSCUC's Assessment Leadership Academy. The assessment coordinator has since developed a set of assessment handbooks for administrative and student service units, academic programs and co-curricular programs. These handbooks are written clearly and concisely to offer effective guidance for assessment activities. In addition, the assessment coordinator conducted assessment training for all faculty in a 6-hour workshop during the second day of orientation and continues to assist with assessment activities across campus.

The assessment coordinator also set up a student learning assessment structure, which includes program learning outcomes (PLOs) for academic programs and initial considerations for co-curricular programs; an overall plan (O-plan) and an annual plan (A-Plan). In addition, all programs now have curricular maps aligning courses with PLOs. These maps indicate both curricular cohesion and coherence; all proficiency levels are represented in reasonable sequences. There are some gaps in Bible and Theology and General Ministry maps, where courses are listed that do not meet any program goals. The General Education program now has a

curriculum map consisting of WSCUC's required core competencies. There is also a process unfolding to assess institutional learning goals, known as the Mission and Vision (MV) or the Four Pillars. However, it is currently an unapproved draft plan. The plan calls for the aggregation of data from program assessments that are aligned with the Four Pillars and does not require additional assessment. For example, PLO1 from Bible and Theology, PLO 1 from General Ministry, PLO 2 from General Education, and PLO 3 from Business Administration all align with MV1: Commitment to Christ.

At the time of this review, only one program, General Ministry, had completed an element of the full assessment process. Rather than the entire 5-step cycle of assessment culminating in a complete program review, progress as of the SAV2 visit was limited to the completion of the O-plan, A-plan, and a group of capstone assignment assessments. Appropriate methodologies were used in the assessment process, including a valid scoring rubric, calibration of evaluators around interpretations and scoring, anonymity of artifacts to prevent evaluator bias, and production and analysis of data in a final report (Y-report). In addition, the program plans a second year of capstones assessment to track learning over time. Two areas of weakness were noted. First, the data analysis in the report was not sufficiently deep and meaningful. For example, while score distribution was reported, no student demographic disaggregation was available. The only disaggregation was gender or race/ethnicity associated with who had completed the assignment, rather than students' quality of learning. Recommendations included in the report are slated for wide dissemination during the college's annual summit in summer 2019.

The assessment of administrative and student service units and co-curricular programs was inconsistent and not centralized. The Co-Curriculum Committee disclosed that no

assessment had been done and no assessment plans existed. However, the Learning Resource Center (LRC), a student service unit, revealed that a very thorough system of assessment was taking place which included the assessment of tutoring through student exit surveys (Learning resource Center Reading and Writing Center Survey 2017-2018), tutor review of student sessions (course, student, consultant, area of support, and additional comments), assessment of Learning Resource Center (LRC) presentations, and the use of assessment services disaggregated by demographics. The LRC has also been closing the assessment loop; for example, they discovered that more Hispanic students were utilizing the LRC and so employed bilingual tutors to serve this student group. In response to student concerns about the time lag for obtaining help editing papers due to LRC hours of operation, an online paper submission process was initiated for juniors and seniors. Freshmen and sophomore students, on the other hand, are required to engage in personalized, face-to-face sessions for this support.

CLC regularly administers student surveys, including a most recent (2018) climate survey. Results indicated that 77% of the General Ministry student respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the courses in the program. These results were incorporated into the General Ministry annual assessment report.

For benchmark institutions to be considered comparable, institutions are required to have three features in common with CLC: size, scope, and mission. It was not clear what benchmarks other than retention and graduation rates CLC plans to consider. Comparable graduation rate data provided were from various time spans, such as 2009 to 2013, 2010 to 2014, 2011 to 2015. Benchmark retention data were presented in a few cases. A comparison document did not include CLC's retention or graduation rates; as presented, the data were of limited use

particularly with regard to decision-making and subsequent action plans. CLC is encouraged to collect, analyze, and consistently apply comparison data.

Finally, the existence of a Curriculum Committee is noted; however, the committee function appears to be currently limited to individual course approvals. There was no indication that the committee had experience reviewing and approving programs, and the members of the committee appeared unclear about what criteria would be used for that purpose. For example, reviewing curricular maps would fall under a more comprehensive review function along with determinations about curriculum cohesion and coherence.

While CLC established procedures for curriculum and program approval, developed and utilized the course evaluation form, and articulated and posted PLOs for all programs, as well as institutional learning outcomes (ILOs) in the form of MV or Pillars, and has taken steps to improve its assessment and data-gathering function, learning has been assessed by only one program in a limited annual report, which precludes the institution from implementing widespread improvements in student learning or curricular development based on assessment data. In addition, while data integration and dissemination plans are reported by the IR director, IR functionality is still in its infancy with little data being generated and used for decision-making, and the college has yet to establish benchmarks with comparison institutions.

CFR 4.2: *The institution has institutional research capacity consistent with its purposes and characteristics. Data are disseminated internally and externally in a timely manner, and analyzed, interpreted, and incorporated in institutional review, planning, and decision making. Periodic reviews are conducted to ensure the effectiveness of the institutional research function and the suitability and usefulness of the data generated.*

Commission Recommendation: *Build institutional research (IR) capacity by developing and implementing clear IR expectations that include the generation and presentation of useful and accurate data to help guide CLC in its planning and improvement efforts.*

CLC separated assessment and IR functions and devoted resources to growing its institutional research capacity. The new Office of Institutional Research (OIR) developed an Annual Plan for 2018-19 with specific data objectives, and also created an IR calendar listing related assessment tools, implementation dates, and associated collaborative offices. However, there is little information on actual data collected or how the data have been or will be used in institutional decision-making. In addition, there is heavy reliance on surveys (approximately 7 student surveys), which may result in survey fatigue and a consequent decline in response rates.

The college hired a new institutional research (IR) director with advanced skills to serve quality assurance processes by providing disaggregated trend data on graduation and retention rates and enrollment data, along with other forms of evidence. For example, the IR director administered a student 'academic and social culture and climate' survey, which was reported to have generated useful results, although specifics were not provided. The survey was created by the IR director without the benefit of training in survey construction, administration, or analysis. Therefore, best practices, reliability, and validity are called into question.

The IR director has been learning new software (SONIS and IZENDA) with plans to improve data collection and reporting, such as integrating the database by linking data via student identification numbers (IDs). Most of these plans have reportedly been deferred to demands of preparing for the SAV2 visit. In general, the IR director would benefit greatly from extensive professional development in data analysis and interpretation, survey design and administration, and statistical analyses such as cluster analysis to identify an appropriate set of comparison institutions to generate more robust analysis and interpretation of data and to facilitate data-informed decision-making across the campus.

The institution also needs to prioritize the development and utilization of a more sophisticated information management system leveraging advanced and sustainable technology resources; move with a sense of urgency toward SONIS and IZENDA staff training, implementation, and report generation; and professionalize and centralize survey creation, implementation, and analysis. The employment of various data collection and analysis tools will strengthen the quality of information coming out of the IR office. At this juncture, there is not much information regarding the actual use of these tools or the results that have flowed from them, so it remains to be seen how well the office will utilize the tools at its disposal.

IR's role supporting the assessment program in collecting, analyzing, and disseminating the data generated is well-imagined, and if done correctly, will result in IR's important and useful partnerships with departments, programs, and service units. The General Ministry program's annual report data is the singular example to date of that potential. While the example demonstrates a start, it bears refinement as stated under CFR 4.1 above.

A plan for IR office effectiveness self-assessment was not available. This is particularly important as there was limited data or process implementation available at the time of the visit to judge IR functionality.

CFR 4.3: *Leadership at all levels, including faculty, staff, and administration, is committed to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. Assessment of teaching, learning, and the campus environment – in support of academic and co-curricular objectives – is undertaken, used for improvement, and incorporated into institutional planning processes.*

The fact that CLC committed resources to establish the Office of Assessment (OA) and the Office of Institutional Research (OIR) is evidence of its commitment to improvement based on the results of inquiry, evidence, and evaluation. This commitment and the engagement of the

college in the implementation of assessment plans, the collection and analysis of relevant data, and application of the data toward improvement created an emerging culture of evidence and improvement. CLC has not yet completed a 5-step cycle of closing the loop for at least one program and that process remains incomplete. However, an annual summit is in place for the dissemination of recommendations for improvement and the creation of action plans.

CFR 4.4: *The institution, with significant faculty involvement, engages in ongoing inquiry into the processes of teaching and learning, and the conditions and practices that ensure that the standards of performance established by the institution are being achieved. The faculty and other educators take responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness of teaching and learning processes and uses the results for improvement of student learning and success. The findings from such inquiries are applied to the design and improvement of curricula, pedagogy, and assessment methodology.*

Full-time and adjunct program faculty members are asked to set standards of performance and establish assessment plans to measure student learning and to utilize direct or indirect evidence that demonstrates student success. Faculty members also are asked to partner with student services and administrative units to consider the data and subsequent conclusions.

Each program has a dedicated Assessment Committee, which is responsible for designing and implementing an Overall Plan (O-Plan) and an Annual Plan (A-Plan) for assessment. Programs are at various stages of constructing and implementing these plans. Once the assessments are carried out, a report is drawn up that contains data and analysis and recommendations for improvement and is shared with the program faculty. Program faculty review the report and recommendations, and a final draft is put on the agenda for the annual summit, during which these recommendations are disseminated and action plans drawn up. CLC plans to assess each goal at every proficiency levels, that is, many of the assessments in the O-Plan are formative in nature which will give the program important data as to the progress of

students through the curriculum. In addition, as would be expected, capstone portfolios are relied upon heavily for summative assessments.

One program, General Ministry, completed a capstone assessment. The program's plan is well laid out and the evaluative rubrics are generally sound, though the criteria for the 'Nature and Mission' goal was not measurably articulated. The measure is currently listed as "demonstrates an understanding of" but does not indicate what would be observed to make that determination. As more assessment rubrics are finalized for implementation, the college is encouraged to refine goals for observable measurement.

Another facet of the General Ministry capstone assessment described by the acting department chair was his working one on one with each capstone course student to be sure that they understood the capstone assignment prompts used in the assessment. This seems to have provided the scaffolding necessary for a valid assessment.

Teaching effectiveness is assessed through peer review, grade distributions, and student course evaluations, all of which are appropriate and useful measures. The results of the peer review are used to discover innovations, which are then shared with other faculty to improve pedagogy. In addition, each program chair monitors individual faculty performance to ensure that faculty members receive support when necessary. Course evaluations appear to cover the important aspects of a course, including asking students if course outcomes are clear, and appear to provide meaningful data that will help faculty improve practices where necessary.

OIR collects and aggregates data to generate grade distribution reports. In addition to being used to help evaluate teaching effectiveness, these are currently used as indirect measures of student success. While grade distributions are a good way to determine the consistency of

faculty grading practices, the generalities provided by grades are less meaningful than more detailed information provided by learning outcomes data.

The Academic Advising program at the college is a good example of a program designed to support student success. The Early Warning System provides programs with a comprehensive report showing aggregate data on at-risk behavior, such as excessive absenteeism or failing multiple assignments. The sample report provided covered about 42% of the students and 50% of the courses. This important information could be used for improvements that would directly impact student experiences. Expanding this resource to cover all students and all courses would make it an even stronger tool.

Unfortunately, CLC was not prepared to reveal the application of assessment results for program improvements in any academic program. In addition, the college was not prepared to provide an example of a completed program review. The General Ministry program completed an annual summative assessment; however, the college made the decision to do a second round of annual assessments for the purpose of providing trend data prior to moving forward with the program review.

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings: Reflections and Plans for Improvement

CLC is highly engaged in the initial accreditation process and there is a strong level of commitment to WSCUC values and Standards and to improvement as an institution of higher education. Over the last year, the college took intentional steps to develop and implement policies and practices as recommended in the SAV1 team report. CLC acknowledges that the

self-study has had a significant impact on the college and has resulted in making the college a better institution for the students as well as all constituents connected to the campus.

Following the SAV1, team report, and Commission Action Letter, CLC recognized the need for improvement in the areas of assessment and institutional research. While a culture of assessment is emerging and developing at all levels of the institution, steps have been taken which include distinguishing the functions of institutional research and assessment through the creation of two departments. There is now an Office of Institutional Research and an Office of Assessment that were established in May 2018. This allowed the Office of Assessment (OA) to utilize a full-time employee who attended WSCUC's Assessment Leadership Academy to apply tools learned through the creation of an assessment handbook toward future implementation of program reviews. CLC recognizes the value of assessment and its importance in institutionalizing those processes in its continuous improvement journey.

The Office of Institutional Research, now renamed and refocused, has a sole purpose of disseminating accurate and meaningful data to the college. In fall 2018, a more qualified employee with subject matter expertise in data analysis, development, modeling, and reporting was hired. CLC also enhanced its student information system as a primary source of data through more sophisticated collection and analysis. The college is committed to supporting and enhancing ongoing assessment across the institution by strengthening both offices with strategic resource allocations that will promote assessment as an institutional priority.

In December 2018, CLC added two new directors to its board in order to expand diversity and expertise needed for appropriate governance. These two new members bring knowledge and experience in student support services, student affairs, and financial acumen. The board will need to adapt and adjust with the college's evolution as an institution of higher learning.

In addition to strengthening the board with new directors, CLC employs faculty who are also strongly committed to the mission and vision. CLC's faculty members are hired based upon their education, experience, expertise, and commitment to Christ. Their commitment is evident in that the current full-time faculty members have been teaching at CLC for an average of 10 years or more. This is noteworthy since the faculty senate voted in September 2018 to replace previously adopted institutional learning outcomes to reflect how academic, co-curricular, and administrative units were functioning in reality.

CLC acknowledges that assessment, institutional research, board diversity, and revenue diversification continue to develop, although significant progress has already been made. Looking to the future, CLC is exploring options for offering its current degree programs online and participating in Title IV federal student financial aid programs. The college anticipates student population growth and is mindful of the need to ensure its academic programs and student support functions will be able to accommodate future growth.

Even though CLC is an autonomous institution, it benefits from relationships with several religious organizations, namely the United Pentecostal Church International and the Christian Life Center. While the college recognizes the value of its long established and symbiotic ties to these organizations, CLC continues to evaluate these relationships and whether the future direction of these entities is aligned with the mission and vision of the college, particularly in the areas of marketing and facility usage.

Standard 1

The team finds that Christian Life College meets this Standard at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation. Only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

Standard 2

The team finds that Christian Life College meets this Standard at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation. Only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

Standard 3

The team finds that Christian Life College meets this Standard at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation. Only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

Standard 4

The team finds that Christian Life College meets this Standard at a level sufficient for Initial Accreditation. Only the Commission is authorized to make the final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards.

Again, only the Commission is authorized to make a final determination as to whether or not an institution is in compliance with the Standards

Commendations

The team commends the college for:

- 1) Expanding board membership, increasing its diversity in terms of gender, ethnicity, and expertise, and for its commitment and plans to add more members in the future.
- 2) Aligning the college's by-laws with institutional practices.
- 3) Support by executive leadership and participation and engagement by faculty and staff in professional development opportunities such as the Academic Resource Conference (ARC), the American Library Association (ALA), and the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM).
- 4) Significantly improving understanding of assessment and examples of sound assessment methodologies. A culture of assessment is emerging across the institution.

Recommendations

The team's recommendations are:

- 1) Codify all practices and processes in sustainable and accessible ways in order to ensure consistency in implementation (CFR 1.7).

- 2) Demonstrate that resource allocation decisions are informed by accurate and relevant qualitative and quantitative evidence as well as by strategic plan initiatives (CFR 3.4, 4.1, 4.6).
- 3) Implement co-curricular assessment, including outcomes disaggregation by multiple demographics, with results applied toward program improvement (CFR 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.10, 2.11, 2.13).
- 4) Complete assessment of student learning across all academic programs, including deep and rich analysis of student learning data, disaggregated by multiple demographics, with results applied toward program improvement (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.10)
- 5) Finalize and implement the strategic enrollment plan (CFR 3.4).
- 6) Improve institutional research capacity through further professional development to generate more robust analysis and interpretation of data and facilitate data-informed decision-making across the campus (CFR 4.2).
- 7) Develop and utilize a more sophisticated information management system leveraging advanced and sustainable technology resources. Move with a sense of urgency toward SONIS and IZENDA staff training, implementation, and report generation.

Professionalize and centralize survey creation, implementation, and analysis (CFR 1.7).