

**REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM
SPECIAL VISIT**

To Logos Evangelical Seminary

March 6-8, 2024

Team Roster

John Jackson, Team Chair
President, William Jessup University

Shih Yu “Franklyn” Wu, Team Assistant Chair
Professor, ALO, Dharma Realm Buddhist University

Sumaira Akhtar, Team Member
Effectiveness & Planning, ALO, Zaytuna College

Jennifer Hirashiki, Team Member
Academic Coordinator for Shared Governance and Undergraduate Initiatives, University of California, Los Angeles

Susan Opp
WSCUC Staff Liaison

The team evaluated the institution under the **2013** Handbook and Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation 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. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution, its Accreditation History, as Relevant, and the Visit	page 2
B. Description of the Team’s Review Process	page 4
C. Institution’s Special Visit Report: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence	page 4

SECTION II – TEAMS’S EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

Recommendation 1	page 5
Recommendation 2	page 7
Recommendation 3	page 9
Recommendation 4	page 12
Recommendation 5	page 13

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

Findings, Commendations & Recommendations	page 16
--	----------------

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution, Accreditation History, as relevant, and Visit

Logos Evangelical Seminary (Logos) was founded by the Evangelical Formosan Church (EFC) in 1989 and gained its authority from the EFC General Assembly. The governance structure includes a Board of Directors, nominated internally, and approved by the EFC General Assembly's Executive Board. The seminary's main campus is in El Monte, California, with a branch campus in Bensenville, Illinois. The foundational ethos of Logos Evangelical Seminary was encapsulated in the phrase: “Attempt great things for God. Rescue millions of souls.” In 2019, the mission statement was revised to reflect a renewed focus: “Forming missional servants for God’s kingdom; Transforming global churches for Christ.”

Logos operates as a non-profit, faith-based graduate-level institution with approximately 270 students and a faculty team comprising 12 full-time residents and one remote member. The seminary offers a range of degree programs, including Ph.D., D.Min., Th.M., M.Div., M.A.C.S., M.A.F.M., and M.A.I.C.S., all accredited by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada (ATS). Institutional accreditation was granted initially by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WSCUC) in 2012, following candidacy in 2010, and reaffirmed for eight years in 2018. In 2019, during the 30th-anniversary celebration, then President Lin presented the updated mission statement to various stakeholders, reaffirming its profound impact on Logos' future direction and educational goals. Following this, former President Lin urged faculty and staff to unite and work towards realizing this mission. Plans were set in motion to invest more physical and human resources into the development of online programs and student services, aligning with the revised mission. The newly appointed president, James Hwang (2021), has furthered the leadership in bringing Logos’ education programs towards this mission, enhancing impacts of theological education through graduates and flexible educational means.

The Covid-19 pandemic prompted Logos to pivot; using the emergency waiver for substantive change approval from the Department of Education and WSCUC, the seminary began to offer synchronous and asynchronous online courses, along with online co-curricular activities. This expansion to online offerings under the emergency approval widened the reach of Logos, attracting distance learning students from various parts of the world. The seminary seized this opportunity to present transformational education to churches globally. In line with the new mission statement, Logos aims to continue forming missional servants and transforming global churches through a variety of online education modalities. During this time, Logos' leadership made strategic decisions to adapt to the changing landscape, including revising the blueprint for phase three of campus renovation. This revision included plans to incorporate four additional multimedia classrooms to facilitate synchronous online class usage.

Logos' reaffirmation in 2018 came with a required Interim Report due in November 2020. The November 2020 Interim Report was required to address five issues: program review processes including assessment results and disaggregated data; direct and indirect indicators of student learning; faculty composition, size, and teaching load; sustainable finances; and adapting to changing environment of theological education.

The Interim Report panel found the report inadequate in addressing the five issues, and further Progress Reports were requested for submissions in November 2021 and in November 2022. In 2021, Logos applied for distance education approval for its M.A.C.S. program and was invited for resubmission; both the initial proposal and the resubmission in 2022 were not accepted by the Substantive Change Committee. In January 2024, the Substantive Change Committee declined to approve another resubmission from Logos to offer the M.A.C.S. program online. Despite the lack of approval by WSCUC to offer a degree program via distance education, Logos has been offering a full M.A.C.S. program and two-thirds of the M.Div. program online as well as hosting other programs that appear to be offered substantially online. The insufficiencies in the Interim Report and the two Progress

Reports, and the failure to comply with WSCUC Substantive Change requirements regarding distance education led to the current Special Visit.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The Special Visit Team initially convened remotely and did an extensive review of prior Commission actions, prior Team reports, and Institutional reports regarding substantive issues. The Team prepared for the on-site visit by assigning specific roles and writing responsibilities prior to the Campus Visit.

On March 5-8, 2024, the Team visited Logos' El Monte campus. The Team is grateful for the seminary's preparations and hospitality led by Dr. Jane Peng, the Chief Academic Officer & Accreditation Liaison. The Team met with faculty, staff, and students over the three-day visit and believes we had a full and substantial view of the seminary and its operations. We are confident in the substance of our report based on the extensive nature of our visit and materials reviewed.

C. Institution's Special Report: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

Logos' January 2024 Special Visit report summarized its history, including its major changes since the last WSCUC visit in 2018, where Logos was reaffirmed for eight years, and responded to the five issues addressed in the May 2023 CAL sectionally. The report provided helpful information for the team to begin to gauge if appropriate attention has been paid to the five issue areas.

While the team can clearly discern Logos' attempt at addressing the issues, substantive evidence is lacking to demonstrate the presented processes and progress. For example, a protocol on new program approval was drafted in November 2023 and attached in the report as a signpost for the institution's quality assurance process, but the seminary did not present good documentation in its submission that the online programs that Logos has been offering were reviewed and established using the new procedure or its equivalent predecessor. Also, although Logos indicates that it has a program review

process and states in the Special Visit report that two degree programs have gone through program review recently, the documentation of these program reviews consists of only 1) minutes of meetings during which faculty discussed the respective program review, and 2) the PowerPoint slides that were presented during those meetings, which does not include analyses of data, findings, nor action items. Logos did not provide written program review reports in its Special Review submission. Whether and how the seminary used the outcomes of these reviews or other data to make decisions was also not apparent in its Special Visit submission.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF ISSUES UNDER THE STANDARDS

Recommendation 1. Provide evidence that the institution has quality assurance processes, including academic program proposal, approval, and scheduling processes, that act to ensure the institution is offering programs in accordance with WSCUC policies, including substantive change policies. (CFRs 2.1 and 4.1)

In November 2023, a new program development guide titled “Guidelines for Proposing New Academic Programs” was drafted to help create a structured process for new programs to be reviewed. It aligns with Logos’ mission and operation, supporting the seminary’s intellectual leadership and ministerial currency. The guidelines detail the functioning of a Program Development & Approval Committee (PDAC) and outline the new program proposal and approval processes from the initial submission of a letter of intent to final reviews with a clear timeline. Stakeholders include faculty, alongside the administration, as an integral proponent in the approval process.

While the codified new academic program proposal and approval procedures look sound on paper, many questions remain. First of all, the guidelines are too minimal to inform implementation and good practices. It would be helpful if Logos could elaborate or provide more information about the processes with good quality documentation—such as letters, minutes, and planning documents—that proceeded through the procedures. Also, the new program approval process does not allude to external

standards such as the WSCUC Substantive Change Review process. Such allusions are by no means necessary for an institution's internal review process. However, given the seminary's several recent unsuccessful attempts in receiving Substantive Change approval for an online program leading up to the November 2023 adoption of this new program approval process, the team was curious to see if the internal body responsible for new program approval had knowledge of the requirements for Substantive Change to offer an online program and whether such consideration went into the planning and decision making of new academic program approval.

During the visit, the stakeholders did not show strong familiarity with the new program approval process nor the Substantive Change requirements. The team found evidence that more than half of Logos' degree programs have been operating in a way such that students can complete more than 50% of the program remotely. Setting aside for the moment the lack of WSCUC Substantive Change approvals, these online programs did not go through the new program approval process or its preceding equivalent. From the team's interviews, including the one with degree program directors, the online programs were more a result of converting in-person courses to be taught online than deliberate instructional design aimed at the online learning experience. In other words, the team characterizes these programs' transition to be more by default than by design. Further, because the team did not find strong evidence of consistent and sustained evidence-driven quality-assurance practices at Logos, even if learning is effective in these online programs, Logos would be hard pressed to demonstrate such effectiveness.

Therefore, while Logos has exhibited sincerity towards quality assurance by drafting the "Guidelines for Proposing New Academic Programs" in 2023, it needs to incorporate considerations for WSCUC Substantive Change requirements into the approval process and adopt better documentations to show that new programs have gone through careful planning and design, even if they are existing in-person programs converting to the online modality (CFR 2.1 and 4.1).

Recommendation 2. Demonstrate that evidence of direct measures of graduate-level student learning is intentionally gathered, evaluated, and considered by program faculty and used during program reviews, and that all program reviews follow a consistent academic program review process resulting in documented continuous planning and improvement. (CFRs 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 4.3, and 4.4)

The Logos faculty engage in ongoing discussions and reviews of their programs with a continued effort to increase formality and structure. The sample program reviews submitted in the interim report were from 2021 and 2022. Per the published schedule, no review was planned in 2023, and the next scheduled reviews are in 2024 for the Th.M. and Ph.D. programs, which appear to be in very early stages of discussion. The evidence provided included the program review policy and schedule, updated M.A.C.S. learning outcomes, M.A.C.S. and M.A.I.C.S. program review meeting presentation slides, and meeting minutes for the M.A.C.S. and M.A.F.M. reviews. For all Logos programs, a capstone exists in the form of a project (M.A.C.S., M.A.I.C.S., and M.Div.), thesis (Th.M., D.Min., and Ph.D.), or practicum (M.A.F.M.), which provides a primary source of summative assessment measures for the faculty's program learning outcome reviews. Other forms of measures used in the program reviews were some papers from courses, personal student reflections, interviews with students, or mentor evaluations, which include both direct and indirect measures. The indirect measures were used for learning outcomes that were relatively more intangible attributes and dispositions of the student.

Logos has a two-page documented policy and procedure for program reviews, accompanied by a schedule from 2017 through 2026 (CFR 4.1). It outlines six phases: self-assessment, external and internal reviewer meeting and report, program review committee discussion, recommendation discussion, executive summary report delivered to faculty for group decisions, and strategic plan update. While the procedure is strong, the evidence submitted with the interim report did not align to each of these phases. The review team encourages Logos to adopt the outlined procedure in full to strengthen and build a consistent and comprehensive system of program review and learning outcomes assessments. At the time of the review, the Th.M. and Ph.D. program reviews were focusing on

narratives written by thesis reviewers, rather than formal rubrics used in other program reviews that facilitate comparisons of data by years. Logos may also consider streamlining the data entry and storage of the rubrics in Populi.

Additionally, the team suggests that the policy expands to include minimum expectations on qualitative and quantitative data for examination. For example, both of the M.A.C.S. and M.A.I.C.S. reviews included an examination of enrollment, retention, and graduation data by attributes like year, gender, age, and part/full-time. As noted on the following pages, Logos should consider whether any of the disaggregated student groups are relevant for the learning outcomes assessment, such as age, part/full-time, or ministry experience, or whether the inclusion of datasets from other offices (e.g. student survey data or student participation in select activities) may be informative. Then, the faculty can draw deeper insights on why some students perform differently than others.

Meeting minutes sufficiently illustrate a variety of topics discussed among faculty when using data from the program review, ranging from student support to curriculum design to recruitment. To better align with the program review procedure, the team suggests that the faculty adequately documents the key decisions it reaches and separates these decisions from the brainstorming of ideas. It is also good practice to close the loop with its strategic plan updates and other initiatives. To ensure each phase is complete, the program review committee should consider specifying the specific deliverables of each phase. Moreover, Logos should consider aligning the program review process to the existing program approval process. Specifically, the “evaluation plan” from the program proposal (containing an exit plan, evaluation metrics, evaluation frequency, and growth plans) should be examined to ensure the program continues to align with its original (or latest) expectations, since much of the faculty’s recommendations from the program review are related to these same topics. Likewise, the existing program approval process could be modified to reflect the existing requirement that an approved program is subsequently reviewed every five years.

Logos is gaining benefit from program review discussions and a combination of quantitative and qualitative data. The institutional research office, which is continuing to expand its expertise and capacity, may have potential to advance in its value by providing a centralized support system for all quality assurance processes.

Recommendation 3. *Having gathered and disaggregated data regarding student learning, retention, and graduation to examine differences among student populations (for example, student population attributes that may include race/ethnicity, gender, online/on ground, location, etc.), provide evidence for how the disaggregated data are being used to inform decisions designed to result in improvements in student success. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4)*

Since Logos' reaffirmation review in 2017, the collection and use of disaggregated data has been a continued area of attention by WSCUC, as noted in subsequent progress reports in 2021 and 2022 and the most recent special visit in 2024. Although Logos made incremental progress in this area, it continues to need a holistic approach to data collection, analysis, utilization, and assessment to transition from varied activities to more meaningful strategies (CFR 4.4). The disaggregated data collected thus far has demonstrated potential value, and continued and deeper use will enable Logos to genuinely observe trends and derive benefit for its educational mission. However, Logos' did not exhibit signs that it has fostered an institutional culture on consistent use of qualitative and quantitative evidence to support deliberation and decision-making on important programmatic issues. See below for the points raised by the Commission over the years regarding disaggregated data.

- March 2018: Continue to develop what is now a middle-stage assessment plan into a robust and sustainable program review process that assesses courses, programs, and delivery modes, using appropriately disaggregated data. (CFRs 2.7, 4.3, and 4.4)

- March 2021: Disaggregate data regarding student learning, retention and graduation to examine differences among student populations (including demographics, location, modality, and other appropriate variables), providing evidence for how the disaggregated data inform practice.
- August 2022: [An updated progress report that addresses] consideration of disaggregated student success data indicating progress in self-reflection and development of action plans to address areas of inequitable student outcomes.
- May 2023: Having gathered disaggregated data regarding student learning, retention, and graduation to examine differences among student populations (for example, student population attributes that may include race/ethnicity, gender, online/on ground, location, etc.), provide evidence for how the disaggregated data are being used to inform decisions designed to result in improvements in student success. (CFRs 4.1, 4.2, and 4.4)

In the progress report provided by Logos, it was evident that the primary sub-demographic groups, especially post-Covid, were on-site and online students that were further disaggregated by program and campus, with some longitudinal comparisons by time period and occasional breakout groups by age. Recent discussions on campus led to an urgent discovery that online students required more student support with different adaptations for critical programs, such as orientation and faculty office hours. An annual survey (apparently one of many as described by the Online students interviewed), as shared by the Dean of Students, also prompted students to identify themselves as an on-site or online student, as well as their program. However, while disaggregated data is potentially available, the survey results remained aggregated.

The Team recommends Logos make further use of the survey data and prepare reports on disaggregated student groups, using the same sub-demographic groups reported in enrollment or graduation data (CFR 4.1). Logos may also consider adding other questions in the survey to further disaggregate students, such as their time zone or country or another behavioral attribute like their

attendance in a particular activity (CFR 4.2). For example, in a general seminary-wide survey, Logos can ask students how often they participate in student care groups and look for correlations in other survey questions on part-time versus full-time enrollment, general satisfaction ratings, etc.

Further clarity and consistency on Logos' official definitions of an on-site and online student is also recommended (CFR 4.2). Many of the on-site students occasionally attend classes online, which may create the potential for another disaggregated student group. Such students have unique experiences after experiencing both modalities and could offer Logos additional perspectives as they improve remote teaching and learning practices. Moreover, Logos has an opportunity to further disaggregate students by attributes often highlighted during critical discussions such as regions, whether the student is employed or not, and part-time versus full-time (CFR 4.4). The 2017-2023 M.A.C.S. Retention Rate charts, for example, disaggregated students by on-site/online and male/female only, and perhaps further insights could be derived from other combinations of disaggregation.

Lastly, the supporting documentation provided by Logos as evidence that disaggregated data is being used was inadequate. The two sets of meeting minutes provided for the Online Education Committee (2021-2023) and President's Council (October 2023) did not clearly demonstrate that portions of meetings were dedicated to an intentional analysis or reflection of disaggregated data. Rather, the minutes demonstrated that more attention was given to remote learning student support. While the allocation of more financial resources and additional staff was discussed in multiple meetings, it is recommended that Logos uses a healthy balance of anecdotal feedback and official datasets to support key management decisions, while also retaining evidence of the existence of best practices (whether for subsequent employees or regulatory compliance) (CFRs 1.4, 1.8). Logos should habitually discuss such data in committee and council meetings, including faculty members, and then subsequently make the data accessible through existing IR capacities to those who need it for decisions.

Recommendation 4. Clearly demonstrate the intentional connection of planned enrollment growth/enrollment targets to budget planning, providing evidence of both current enrollment and budget connections, as well as those planned for the next three years. (CFR 3.4)

Logos has consistently been urged to develop synergies between their strategic plans, their enrollment targets, and their budget planning. While the enrollment of Logos is small, it has remained stable over the past several years. At present, tuition income remains a very small portion of Logos' total revenue. Contributions income for FY23 and FY22 were in the range of 70 and 65% of total income respectively. Logos has believed that the addition of online programs will be a key to future enrollment growth; thus far this growth has not occurred nor has WSCUC approved any programs to be offered online. For Logos to meet its enrollment targets of 5% annual growth, its strategies will need to be refined and appropriate resources dedicated to support growth before and as it occurs.

Currently, the lack of staffing and systems infrastructure to support consistent enrollment growth is apparent. On the other hand, advancement strategies appear to be successful, but there are concerns about sustainability year to year. The achievements of the advancement efforts are notable and the long-term prospects of foundation and private giving are to be commended.

Early evaluation of Logos' financial reports indicates that advancement strategies (as noted above) have been effective and suggest a strong affinity from the seminary constituency to its mission. Contribution revenue has been \$6.1m, \$4.4m, and \$7.4m in FY's 21, 22, and 23 respectively. This revenue is notable, but challenging to predict annually. Tuition revenue is generally considered a more stable indicator of growth over time. However, the very slow rate of tuition growth and the challenges of the Covid-19 era have been lasting for Logos as well as for other institutions. Tuition income has been \$960k, \$940k, and \$1.1m for FY21, 22, and 23 respectively. Other income has also been variable; \$500k, \$687k, and \$1.6m in FY21, 22, and FY23.

While Logos has been able to sustain Net Operating Income in each of the most recent 3 years—\$1.8m, \$947k, \$5.5m in FY21, FY22, FY23—the majority of the positive results have come from

advancement/donation activity. The seminary appears to be grappling with enrollment challenges through the Covid-19 era and while it has expressed a desire and intention to move to a substantive online platform, the move to online has not yet been approved for any degrees and the adoption of the online platform appears to be uneven to date. Should the seminary not receive approval to operate its programs online, the impact of the loss of enrollment could be substantial. We urge the seminary to provide alternative plans for enrollment growth should it not be able to expand its online modality.

Recommendation 5. *Provide evidence that any academic program in which 50% or more of the program is or will be offered online (i.e., using distance education) has: a) gone through rigorous internal planning and approvals processes; b) involved program faculty in the design and development of online curriculum, program learning outcomes, and mechanisms of assessment; and c) obtained WSCUC substantive change approval in accordance with WSCUC substantive change policies and procedures. (CFR 1.8)*

It is evident that there is a strong push for offering online programs at Logos, demonstrated through meeting minutes, institutional goals, the submission of the M.A.C.S. program for distance education, and the fact that the majority of the student population take all of their courses online. The website shows reference to programs being available online and online student enrollments increasing despite the programs not being approved by WSCUC for distance education. In the team's meetings with seminary and academic leadership, it is clear that the latter know there is a need to have approval for their programs to be offered online. However, there seems to be a lack of clarity around the process and necessity of maintaining compliance with WSCUC. The team has grappled with whether there is a lack of understanding about the role of its theological accreditation (Association of Theological Seminaries-AT) as compared to regional accreditation, but we do not find that potential source of confusion to be an overriding factor.

In Fall 2023, Logos created a program approval manual (Guidelines for Proposing New Academic Programs) that provides some brief guidelines to proposing new programs. While this is a helpful start to shaping the process and providing guidance, there seems to be a need for further development and follow through in this area. While the manual seems as if it is intended to encompass all new programs, it is without any differentiation for the various types of changes (distance education, new program, etc.). In meeting with academic leadership, there seemed to be some discussion around the feedback they received for previous substantive change denials, but the main takeaway was to think of the online and in-person programs as separate entities, requiring different student services and logistical needs. In various meetings, it became evident that there is no defined process to review curriculum to be taught online. While there were some references to checklists and annual faculty review conversations, this process was not mentioned in other meetings, with comments stating that there is no review process for in-person courses that are being converted to online courses.

Additionally, while there is evidence of discussions around online education taking place via meeting minutes, with updates and action items, it was admitted that the university's culture is very oral-centric. Based on the minutes provided, most conversations centered around online course-level needs and updates, technology tools and requirements, and other general updates. These meetings did not show conversations centered around programmatic plans, substantive change requirements, or the specifics around any feedback provided from previous substantive change distance education request non-approvals. Additionally, there are consistent areas of feedback from the three submissions of the M.A.C.S substantive change that show no evidence of being addressed and no creation of systematic ways to work towards providing the appropriate evidence. In general, by solidifying this new program and substantive process and making sure the process is further developed according to guidance of all three accrediting entities (ASA, ATS and WSCUC), it may help to provide a consistent framework for all who are a part of the program development process, which can be used as a guide for not only those

developing new courses, but also those who oversee the development of new programs. These processes and collection practices could be beneficial in helping develop institutional narratives.

There is a mention of faculty involvement in the design and development of online courses, as seen in the online education discussions in faculty meetings (Attachment V); however, as mentioned above, there does not seem to be a consistent and transparent process for the development and review of online curriculum. On the flip side, there is evidence of multiple components that could be integrated and systematized in order to formalize a general practice. First, there is a plan to develop a faculty online teaching group to plan for online courses. Second, there is an existing e-course (DL101) that provides a basic overview of online pedagogy and requested checklists and documents (Online Teaching Policies and Procedures, Online Course Blueprint Template) that can be used for course review. It is not clear how many faculty have taken the e-course, completed the documents, or have received ongoing training focused on the successful transfer of pedagogical skills from on-ground to online courses and development. In the meeting with the online education committee, it was stated that the review of online instruction is typically done in a one-to-one manner between the academic dean and the faculty member during their annual review.

The enrollment data that the seminary provides show that part-time online California student enrollment has been growing each term. In Spring 2023, 57 students (throughout all programs) enrolled as part-time online California-based students. In Fall 2023 this increased to 76 total enrollments, and as of Spring 2024, there were 88 part-time online enrollments. In that same time period, the part-time onsite California enrollments decreased by almost half. The part-time online Illinois student enrollments are almost double the enrollments for the Illinois-based on-site student enrollments. In terms of students by program, as of Spring 2024, 36 of 60 students are enrolled as online students in the M.A.C.S. program. The M.Div., M.A.F.M., and M.A.I.C.S. programs also have the majority of students enrolled as online students. In the past two academic years, online students have been the majority of enrolled students, with the exception of Spring 2023 at 49%. These enrollment numbers were from the

disaggregated enrollment data provided as evidence. However, over the duration of the special visit, there were concerns regarding the consistency of this data and enrollment numbers and categorization of students.

Logos does not have approval for any of these programs to be offered as online programs, and most recently in January 2024, the substantive change committee declined the application for the M.A.C.S. to be offered via distance education (for the third time). The rest of the degrees have yet to submit a substantive change for distance education for online approval. The degrees of these students enrolled in these programs are unapproved to be offered in an online modality (CFR 1.8).

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The central concern of the Special Visit is to verify whether Logos Evangelical Seminary has continued to offer its degree programs in the online modality beyond the expiration of the COVID-19 emergency waiver exempting institutions from obtaining WSCUC Substantive Change approval. After reviewing the seminary's website, institutional report and its attachments (including its enrollment data) and conducting interviews on campus, the team observes that not only the seminary's degree programs currently provide the option for students to complete more than 50% of their respective program online, the majority of students are in fact attending classes and completing their degrees online. Further, at the time of the visit, LES presents some of its degree programs on its website as online programs. LES has submitted an application for Substantive Change for only one of its seven degree programs and thus far unable to obtain approval after the initial submission and two resubmissions. In this regard, LES is out of compliance with WSCUC Criterion for Review 1.8.

The other issues that prompted the Special Visit—the seminary's new program approval process; its quality-assurance systems and practices, and its financial planning as related to enrollment growth—are not readily separable from LES's need to obtain WSCUC Substantive Change approvals to offer its

degree programs in the online modality. Concrete improvements in these areas are not only beneficial for the seminary in of themselves, but are likely to aid LES in its efforts to gain Substantive Change approvals and also improve the quality of learning in its online programs. Improving its quality assurance systems and practices and fostering an institutional culture that uses qualitative and quantitative evidence in deliberations and decision-making will not only help LES inherently in improving the quality of learning and student services, the better documentation practices implied in such an improvement will also help to demonstrate the effectiveness of LES's educational activities to its stakeholders and external bodies such as WSCUC. The financial planning that depends on growth of online enrollment can only be realized if LES becomes compliant through obtaining Substantive Change approvals.

Commendations

The Team wishes to commend the seminary for:

- 1) *The organizational clarity of mission and alignment of the seminary as evidenced in multiple meetings with faculty and staff and their vision and dedication.*
- 2) *The financial and data operations' migration to cloud-based software and upgrading of technology across campus operations.*
- 3) *Demonstrated strength and consistency in fundraising.*

Recommendations

The Team recommends that the seminary:

- 1) *Judiciously cease offering and promoting any program where 50% or more of the program is offered or may be taken online (synchronously and/or asynchronously) and has not been approved by WSCUC (CFR 1.8).*

- 2) *Expand institutional expertise in A) accreditation standards and program development protocols and B) WSCUC Substantive Change requirements for Online Programs (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 4.1).*
- 3) *Create consistent and comprehensive systems for regular program review and learning outcomes assessment processes that gather and utilize student learning outcomes data across the campus community (CFRs 2.6, 2.7).*
- 4) *Establish sustained evidence-based and participatory quality assurance processes and decision-making processes for the President's Council, academic activities, student services, and collaborative activities related to strategic planning and teaching and learning activities (CFRs 4.3, 4.4, 4.6).*
- 5) *Develop a holistic approach to data collection, analysis, utilization, and assessment through integrated and consistent systems of data input and access across the campus community (CFR 4.2).*