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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to compare the founding of Fairbanks Baptist Bible College with a procedure I later developed from various sources (Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education [ACPE], “Regulations,” 2000; “Statutes,” 2000; Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges [AGBUC], 2000; Cedarholm, 1988; Fadel, 1971; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Halm and Hiatt, 1987; Ingram, 2003; Schindlbeck, 1969; Stark and Lattuca, 1997). The comparison shows that we omitted some important steps in establishing the college. Based on the previous sources, the results of the study, and Thornton’s (1966) procedure, I developed a recommended process describing the responsibilities of four successive groups: the founders, the Board, the president, and the college. I concluded with some implications for future study.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Horton and Friere (1990) described their “spoken book” on education and politics (pp. 3-4) by giving it the title We Make the Road by Walking (p. 6). Friere says, “Even though we need to have some outline, I am sure that we make the road by walking . . . . in order to start, it should be necessary to start” (p. 6). Horton adds this clarification:

I see this thing as just unfolding . . . . I don’t see any problem with that. I agree with Paulo; it’s a natural way of doing it. It’s what grows out of what you do. Everything comes out of the past and goes beyond. (Horton & Friere, 1990, p. 7)

In spite of its simplicity, Horton and Friere’s point is significant. If a person is going to accomplish something, the first thing they have to do is start, even though they may not have a specific procedure or goal in mind.

This philosophy characterized the founding of Fairbanks Baptist Bible College. We had no prior knowledge or experience in establishing a postsecondary educational institution (Loriot, personal communication, November 10, 2002). We just started, then responded to issues as they came up (Loriot, personal communication, October 26, 2001).

After we established the college, I asked, “Is there a widely accepted procedure for starting a college? If there is, how did our approach compare to it?” The objective of this thesis is to answer these two questions.

The Nature of the Study

This is a case study of an account of the founding of Fairbanks Baptist Bible College, using a process I developed from various sources as the criteria for analysis.
Background

Fairbanks Baptist Bible College (FBBC) is a small, church-related two-year college operating as a ministry under the authority of Hamilton Acres Baptist Church (HABC), which is located at 138 Farewell Avenue, Fairbanks, Alaska. The school was originally established in 1999 as Hamilton Acres Baptist Institute, but in 2001 it was granted exempt status by the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education (ACPE).¹

FBBC is not a junior college, therefore it cannot grant an associate’s degree (20 AAC 17.065). However, according to Title 20 of the Alaska Administrative Code (ACPE, “Regulations,” 2000), Chapter 17.065 (b) [5] (A) – (C), it may use the term “Bible College” in its institutional title, offer courses for credit, and grant a certificate to those students who complete a prescribed program of studies, as long as it meets the minimum specified requirements of Alaska Statute 14.48.060 (ACPE, “Statutes,” 2000).

The college’s mission is to help separatist fundamentalist independent Baptist churches in this region of the world fulfill Christ’s command for His followers to make disciples from all nations (Matthew 28:19 [New American Standard Bible, updated]). To accomplish this, the school offers two programs (Hamilton Acres Bible Institute [HABI], Catalog, 1999). The first is a two-year 72-hour Certificate in New Testament Ministry (CNTM) designed to train pastors and missionaries. It is modeled after the associate of applied science degree. The other is a one-year 24-hour Certificate in Personal Ministry (CPM) for members who want to minister within the local church.

¹ In this thesis, the information from state regulatory agencies is limited to the ACPE because this is the only institution with which we dealt. A survey of the agencies in other states and their requirements is a study in itself and is outside the scope of this thesis.
In 2003, FBBC graduated its first student from the CNTM program. Currently, the college has 11 non-program students and five CPM students, but no CNTM students.

Research Questions

Two major themes emerge in this paper: (a) whether there is a procedure for establishing a college; and (b) how our approach in starting Fairbanks Baptist Bible College compared to it. These are further broken down into several questions:

1. Has a widely accepted procedure for founding a college been developed?
2. What steps have other colleges followed in the process of establishment?
3. Can their approaches be reduced to some kind of procedure?
4. What steps did we take in establishing our college?
5. Did we follow the same basic process the others used, or are we unique?

An Overview of the Methodology

With Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan as a guide, I wrote an account of the founding of FBBC from the first three years of the college archives. Then, using Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) plan and Fadel’s (1971) model for determining the feasibility of establishing a college, I examined five accounts describing the beginnings of colleges (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969) in order to developed a process which would serve as the criteria for analyzing the narrative. After that, I corrected the procedure on the basis of the ACPE requirements (“Regulations,” 2000; “Statutes,” 2000) and the recommendations of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGBUC, 2000). The general process I developed was based on my review of these sources. Next, I asked some individuals to
code my narrative for this process. Finally, I analyzed the data to see how closely we
followed the process that I had developed from these sources.

The Benefits of This Study

First of all, this case study should provide FBBC with a first hand account of its
founding. Next, it should show us what we as founders may have missed in establishing
the college so that we can take steps to correct any shortcomings. Finally, it will provide
a recommended procedure for those who are planning to establish a college.

Definitions

This section defines terms which may not be familiar to the reader.

Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education (ACPE)

Established by the Alaska legislature under Chapter 14.48 of the Alaska Statutes
(ACPE, “Statutes,” 2000), the ACPE regulates all postsecondary educational institutions
operating within Alaska except the state universities, which the legislature controls, and
programs offered by institutions that are approved and accredited in other states.

Authorization to Operate as a Degree-Granting Institution

This is also known as authorization to operate or degree-granting status. Upon
meeting the ACPE requirements, an institution is authorized to grant the specified degree.
This privilege is reviewed periodically, and may be revoked (ACPE, “Statutes,” 2000).

Bible College

A Bible college prepares individuals for Christian ministry (Caughill, 2003). It
often includes a residential program because of its emphasis on cultivating a specific set
of character qualities in the graduate (p. 5). In a Bible College, every student majors in Bible, but may have a second major in a related field (p. 7; compare Brereton, 1996).

**Church-Related Junior College**

A church-related junior college is a two-year college sponsored and controlled by a denomination or church group (Fadel, 1971). Not all Bible colleges are church-related.

**Exempt Status**

Exempt status allows an institution to offer limited educational services, provided it meets the minimum requirements (ACPE, “Statutes,” 2000).

**Family Educational Rights Protection Act of 1974 as Amended (FERPA)**

Also known as the Buckley Amendment, this law protects a person’s right to privacy regarding his or her educational, medical, and legal records produced while they are a student at a postsecondary educational institution. It also allows them to review some of their records, and to appeal any possible inaccuracies (Rainsberger, 1998).

**Junior College**

This is the broad term for a two-year college that offers either a terminal associate’s degree or the first two years of a four-year degree (Good, 1959, p. 305).

**Separatist Fundamentalist Independent Baptist**

A Christian separatist refuses to follow anti-biblical culture and philosophy, and rejects religious compromise, heresy, and apostasy. McLachlan (1993) defines separation as “radical non-conformity to the . . . highly organized and carefully arranged system of thought and practice which stands in total opposition to God and His truth” (p. 122).
McIntire (1984) defines Christian fundamentalism as a movement comprised of those who believe they affirm the true Christian fundamentals as they are derived from a literal interpretation of the Bible. These basics include: (a) the inspiration, inerrancy, and authority of the Scriptures; (b) the deity of Christ; and (c) the substitutionary death, bodily resurrection, and future return of Christ to earth. Christian fundamentalists believe that it is necessary to defend these truths when they are called into question.

Baptist churches who are not tied to a denomination, convention, or organization are independent Baptists (Lewis & Demarest, 1996). They believe that: (a) the Bible is the sole authority for faith and practice; (b) everyone should enjoy religious liberty; (c) every true believer has direct access to God; (d) baptism and church membership are only for true believers; (e) there are only two biblical church offices (pastor and deacon); (f) the local church alone has authority over the non-sacramental ordinances of Baptism and the Lord’s Table; (g) the local church is autonomous; and (h) the church and state have separate spheres of authority because they have different functions (p. 255, vol. 3).

Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools (TRACS)
The Transnational Association of Christian Colleges and Schools is:
... an organization of Christian postsecondary institutions ... established ... to promote the ... development of postsecondary institutions through the accreditation process.

TRACS is recognized by the United States Department of Education (USDE) and the Council on Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA). (TRACS, “General Information,” 2002)
CHAPTER II
A COMPOSITE PROCESS FOR ESTABLISHING A COLLEGE

The Development of a Composite Process

In my review of the literature, I did not find any references to a generally accepted method for starting a college (compare Stark & Lattuca, 1997, p. 130), so I decided to develop my own process. Using Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan (see also p. 140; Stark & Lowther, 1988) and Fadel’s (1971) model for determining the feasibility of starting a private junior college, I summarized the founding of five colleges as described in three case studies (Fisher, 1983; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969) and two narratives (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998). Finally, I corrected this tentative process with current state regulations (ACPE, “Statutes,” 2000; “Regulations,” 2000) and recommendations from a collegiate agency (AGBUC, 2000; Ingram, 2003).

Curriculum Design

During the early 1980’s, postsecondary student enrollment and government funding in higher education declined significantly (Carper & Hunt, 1996; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Seymour, 1988). As a result, the focus shifted from planning for anticipated growth to developing college programs that would be more competitive (Richardson & Gardner, 1983; Scott, 1981; Seymour, 1988).

As part of this movement, Conrad and Pratt (1983) devised a model for curricular decision-making. It involved three sets of criteria: (a) contextual factors; (b) curricular factors; and (c) outcomes. Contextual factors are areas over which educators have little control. They include society, the institution, and student characteristics (p. 23). The
academic planner has more control over curricular factors (p. 24), which are broken down into *content* and *form*. The content of the program entails what the program will include (p. 24). It is shaped by society, the goals of the institution, the nature of the discipline, and the specific department’s outlook on the structure of knowledge. The form has to do with the sequence of courses and methods of instruction. It is influenced by views regarding the manner in which knowledge is acquired (p. 26). Finally, Conrad and Pratt mention outcomes (p. 28), and divide these into *educational outcomes* and *curricular outcomes*. The first one relates to how well the instructional process is operating, while the second one concerns the form that the curriculum takes after it is evaluated.

In a revision of Conrad and Pratt’s (1987) approach, Stark and Lowther (1988) developed an *academic plan* (p. 42). It included seven components: (a) what is to be learned; (b) the subject matter which is to act as a medium for conveying it; (c) the learners’ pre-instruction background; (d) the order of presentation; (e) the resources utilized in the learning process; (f) the evaluation of progress; and (g) a method for revising the content of steps one through five in view of the findings of step six (p. 42).

Stark and Lattuca (1997) expanded this process to include eight decisions. Stark, Briggs, and Rowland-Poplawski (2002) later divided them into three stages (p. 331; see also Stark & Lattuca, 1997, pp. 9-14; Table 11.1, p. 313). *Development* involves three decisions. First, the planners must determine the program’s purpose because it affects the rest of the curriculum (Stark & Lattuca, 1997, p. 10). The goal may be to impart factual content, a set of skills, or an attitude (1997, p. 10). Secondly, they must select a field of study that achieves the purpose. Any subject can be used to reach this aim, but some are
more closely related to the purpose than others (1997, p. 13). Lastly, curriculum planners must specify the sequence of courses that will maximize learning. The order may be chronological or thematic, or it may be determined by prerequisite courses (1997, p. 13).

During Implementation, the planners will determine the best way to accomplish the curriculum’s purpose as expressed in the basic content and sequence of courses. This phase also involves three steps. First, they must consider the learners’ characteristics in order to meet their needs, abilities, and goals (Stark & Lattuca, 1997, p. 13). Next, they must select the instructional processes. Too often, instructors lecture because it is easier, so college planners must ensure that teachers employ pedagogical methods which require active student participation (p. 13). Then, based on the purpose, content, and sequence of courses, they must determine the instructional resources that will be needed, including the texts, media, classrooms, labs, and availability of practical experiences. Any of these elements can either enhance or detract from the learning experience (p. 14).

The last step, Evaluation, includes two aspects: (a) evaluation; and (b) adjustment. Although they take place during the initial phase, they should also occur later on a regular basis. The object is to determine whether the curriculum is achieving institutional goals, meeting student needs, or adapting to cultural changes (Stark & Lattuca, 1997, p. 14).

The chronological nature of Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) process made it useful for my purpose, but their omission of some administrative steps necessitated further research.

**Factors Involved in a Feasibility Study**

Fadel’s (1971) summary of issues involved in founding private junior colleges (pp. 122-127) are listed below in the form of questions under his general headings.
First, Fadel (1971) addressed the issue of the college’s philosophy. (a) Is it well-organized and comprehensive, with specific objectives and goals? (b) Is it understood and accepted by all school personnel? (c) Does it govern everything else? (d) Have provisions been made for periodically evaluating progress toward meeting its goals?

Next, Fadel (1971) grouped several matters under a general heading. (a) Is the community willing to provide general support, money, and students? (b) Has the board retained legal counsel in order to ensure that it is complying fully with the law? (c) Has a program for providing services to students been established? (d) Has the college acquired a library which meets the requirements of the regional accrediting association, as well as the philosophy and curricular needs of the school? (e) Have qualified individuals who are both willing and able to serve been selected to function as a Board of Directors?

Fadel’s (1971) discussion on curriculum resembles Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan. (a) Does it carry out the goals and objectives of the school’s philosophy and reflect its core values? (b) Does it emphasize the institution’s distinctive qualities? (c) Can it be implemented? (d) Does it meet the community’s needs? (e) Has a policy been developed for periodic evaluation and adjustment?

In the next category, Fadel (1971) emphasizes the need for a student body which meets the school’s needs, and whose needs the school can meet. (a) Does the size of the student body match the college’s philosophy and goals? (b) Is enrollment sufficient to support the curriculum? (c) Are students selected in view of their general agreement with the school’s philosophy and mission? (d) Can student-related income meet most of the school’s financial needs? (e) Is there an effective student recruitment program in place?
Then Fadel (1971) addresses issues regarding the administrative staff and the faculty. (a) Does the CEO have the necessary experience and qualifications? (b) Does this person whole-heartedly endorse the school’s philosophy and goals? (c) Does [s]he have the ability to develop and advertise the school’s distinctive qualities? (d) Does the college have an organizational plan which carries out the board’s mandates? (e) Are instructors hired for their ability to teach rather than to do research? (f) Are they properly qualified, either with a master’s degree or exceptional experience? (g) Are they committed to the institution’s philosophy? (h) Do the full-time teachers carry a reasonable load (15 or 16 hours per week)? (i) Does the college pay well enough to attract good teachers and provide for advancement without overstepping its budget?

After that, Fadel (1971) discusses the importance of a sound financial program. (a) Does the institution have a professional accounting system that is appropriate to the college? (b) Is the budget closely controlled, especially in the first couple of years? (c) Is it based on the college’s lowest projected income and maximum predicted expenditures? (d) Will the combined student-related and non-student related income meet the expenses, especially those needed by the student body, faculty, and curriculum? (e) Is there a program for advertising the financial needs of the school? (f) Is the institution able to borrow the necessary funds? (g) Have qualified persons been appointed to raise funds?

In conclusion, Fadel (1971) emphasizes the need to secure adequate facilities and to ensure that the college does not duplicate existing programs in the area. (a) Does the school have facilities, whether temporary or permanent? (b) Will the size of the campus permit growth? (c) Is it located near such important services as fire and police protection,
as well as general utilities like water, sewer, telephone, and electricity? (d) Have the proper formulas been employed to determine whether sufficient space has been allocated for classrooms, offices, and dormitories? (e) Have all other schools in the area been researched in order to ensure that the college being established is providing a distinctive program? (f) Is the city in which it is to be located large enough to provide the number of students, staff, and services necessary to maintain the college?

In summarizing Fadel’s (1971) model, I divided his second and fifth categories into sub-points because they each cover several topics. This resulted in: (a) the college philosophy; (b) community support; (c) legal counsel; (d) a student services program; (e) the library; (f) the board of directors; (g) the curriculum; (h) student enrollment; (i) administrative staff; (j) organization; (k) faculty; (l) finances; and (m) facilities.

Fadel’s (1971) criteria go a step further than Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan by including some administrative issues in founding a college. However, he appears to arrange them according to relative importance rather than chronological order. As a result, I looked further in order to determine how both might fit together in a sequence.

Historical Accounts of the Founding of Other Colleges

Using Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan and Fadel’s (1971) criteria as guidelines, I analyzed narratives describing the founding of five colleges (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969). In the following discussion, I first summarized each account, then I combined them into a tentative process. The resulting process is based on the judgments I made about the approach taken in each narrative.
Fisher Junior College

Originally named Winter Hill College, Fisher Junior College enjoyed phenomenal success (Fisher, 1983). When it was started in Somerville, Massachusetts, in 1903, the school had 13 students (p. 30), but by 1919 it had four campuses, each averaging 275 day students and 200 evening students (pp. 30-31). The key elements in its success were: (a) the desire of the founders; (b) the selection of a college name; (c) an awareness of the advantages of a location; (d) the curriculum; (e) a passion to advertise the school; (f) a clear purpose; (g) a quality education; (h) flexibility; (i) monetary incentives; and (j) a decision to expand the college.

Stonehill College

Stonehill College is a church-related school founded in 1948 in North Easton, Massachusetts, which is about 20 miles south of Boston (Gribble, 1998). Gribble states that its establishment was delayed for some time because it did not receive full support from the church officials (p. 4).

Gribble’s (1998) description of its founding includes: (a) a vision; (b) a survey of adequate facilities; (c) the purchase of facilities; (d) a period of delay; (e) circumstances motivating the founders to action; (f) presentation of a rationale for support; (g) church approval; (h) a college name; (i) appointment of a president; (j) formal application for legal approval; (k) the influence of key individuals; (l) advertisement; (m) admission requirements; (n) enrollment; (o) organization; (p) fund-raising; (q) statement of purpose; (r) public inauguration; (s) financial stability; (t) accreditation; (u) growth of the campus; (v) curricular improvement; and (w) national publicity.
Christ College Irvine

Renamed Concordia University Irvine (Council for Advancement and Support of Education, 2006), this church-related liberal arts college (Lutheran Missouri Synod) is located in Irvine, California (Halm & Hiatt, 1987). The period of its founding lasted from 1955 to 1976 and was hindered by conflicts between groups in the synod (1987, p. 2).

Halm and Hiatt (1987) describe the events: (a) a vision based on the need; (b) the formation of a committee; (c) political pressure; (d) a feasibility study regarding location; (e) purchase of property; (f) debate concerning economic feasibility; (g) formation of a supervisory board; (h) appointment of an administrator; (i) lobbying efforts; (j) a period of conflict resulting from confusion about the nature of the college, financial concerns, outright opposition, interpersonal issues, lack of qualified leadership, and cultural differences between the Midwestern synod leadership and the West Coast administrator and governing board; (k) final approval from the synod; (l) the influence of leadership; (m) increased campus size; (n) an increase in the student body; and (o) accreditation.

Winston Churchill College

Schindlbeck (1969) describes the founding of Winston Churchill College, which was located in Pontiac, Illinois. His account covers the period of time from June 1964 through September 1966. The school closed in 1971 (Brown, 2005).

In his narrative, he deals with some basic questions about establishing a college. His account contains the following steps (Schindlbeck, 1969): (a) a feasibility study; (b) a vision based on need; (c) a location; (d) a Board of Regents; (e) meetings to inform the public; (f) agreement on the scope of Board control; (g) counsel from outside; (h) the
college name; (i) a fund-raising goal; (j) postponement; (k) a list of priorities for opening the school; (l) application for state approval; (m) application for Articles of Incorporation and tax exempt status; (n) an extensive fund-raising campaign; (o) expansion of the Board; (p) application for grants from corporations; and (q) commencement of classes.

Maranatha Baptist Bible College

Maranatha Baptist Bible College (MBBC), located in Watertown, Wisconsin, was established on July 1, 1968. It is not church-related. It is a member of the North Central Accrediting Association and is accredited by The Higher Learning Commission (MBBC, Catalog, 2005). Even though this account is not from a scholarly periodical, it is included because: (a) it is the founder’s personal narrative; (b) the account relates details many of the other articles omit; (c) it only took four months to establish the college; and (d) both Maranatha and Fairbanks Baptist Bible College are Bible colleges in the strictest sense.

In his account of its establishment, “What God Hath Wrought” — *A History of the Founding of Maranatha Baptist Bible College*, Cedarholm (1988) describes the elements involved in founding the college: (a) a vision; (b) a feasibility study regarding facilities; (c) appointment of a president; (d) community support; (e) expert advice; (f) opposition; (g) the purchase of a facility; (h) the college name; (i) a motto; (j) a college hymn; (k) the faculty; (l) students; (m) equipment; (n) a library; and (o) a public dedication.

*A Tentative Sequence for Establishing a College*

After reviewing the foregoing literature, I made some judgments about the steps they took and came up with the following procedure for establishing a college. It is not prescriptive, and as it turned out, even this order of events was tentative.
1. Develop a vision.
2. Form a steering committee.
3. Conduct a feasibility study.
4. Arise from lethargy.
5. Gain moral support.
6. Purchase property.
7. Select a Board.
8. Determine Board control.
10. Name the college.
11. Appoint a president.
12. Face obstacles.
13. Enlist influential individuals.
14. Gain unofficial approval.
15. Counter opposition.
16. Develop a curriculum.
17. Set admission requirements.
18. State the institutional purpose.
19. Advertise.
20. Gain state approval.
21. Get instructional resources.
22. Organize the college.
23. Raise the necessary funds.
24. Enroll students.
25. Obtain a faculty.
26. Hire qualified leadership.
27. Achieve financial stability.
28. Expand the Board.
29. Acquire equipment.
30. Increase the campus size.
31. Increase the student body.
32. Hold a public inauguration.
33. Seek accreditation.
34. Build the library.
35. Consider factors in location.
36. Re-evaluate the curriculum.
37. Strive for academic excellence.

State Regulations, Agency Recommendations, and Common Sense

I immediately noticed that: (a) some events seemed out of order; (b) others had only occurred once, so I did not know whether they should be included; (c) some events either duplicated or were closely related to others; and (d) some conflicted with current standards and guidelines. I made what I considered to be the necessary adjustments based on Stark and Lattuca (1997), Fadel (1971), the ACPE regulations ( "Regulations," 2000; "Statutes," 2000), and some AGBUC recommendations (2000; see also Ingram, 2003).
I subsumed Step 4 under Step 12 because the founders’ lethargy was a hindrance (Gribble, 1998). I also changed Step 5 to *gain community support* in order to distinguish it from seeking financial support. Otherwise, I left Steps 1–5 as they were.

Only Boards can authorize major purchases (AGBUC, 2000, p. 7), so Step 6 must occur after Step 7. However, it must happen before Step 20, because adequate space for instruction is a state requirement (ACPE, “Regulations,” 2000; “Statutes,” 2000; see also Schindlbeck, 1969). So I placed the purchase of property as soon after Step 7 as I could, yet after Step 9 because the Board might want to take that action early in its agenda.

I included Step 8 as a sub-point of Step 7, because it followed immediately after that step. Furthermore, I combined Steps 12 and 15 and then renamed the resulting step *respond to obstacles* because they were essentially synonymous.

According to Stark and Lattuca (1997), Step 18 should occur prior to Step 16, but because the Board formulates the institutional purpose (AGBUC, 2000, p. 6; Ingram, 2003, p. 3), it should be placed someplace after Step 7. It seemed that the Board would want to conduct research prior to making any decisions (Fadel, 1971; Stark & Lattuca, 1997), including this one (Fadel, 1971, p. 123), so I inserted Step 18 between getting expert advice (Step 9) and purchasing the property (previously Step 6).

applying for state approval. Prior to approval, a college must also obtain a faculty (Step 25), equipment (Step 29), and a library (Step 34 [ACPE, "Statutes," 2000]). Cedarholm (1988) mentions all these steps together in his account, so I put them in Step 21, and placed it before Step 20. I also reworded Step 20 to say make formal application for state approval so that it would not appear as though state approval were automatic.

It seems that raising the necessary funds (Step 23) should occur prior to Step 6 and Step 10. However, even though the Board is responsible for authorizing loans and raising support (AGBUC, 2000), it does not have to have the capital in hand. It can secure a loan to meet these needs, but not raise the finances to pay for them until the institution is ready to apply for state approval.

Steps 19 through 29 (excluding Steps 26 and 28) take place simultaneously in the school’s progress toward inauguration (Step 32). In the original account (Halm & Hiatt, 1987), Step 26 dealt with the qualification of the college president, so I incorporated it into Step 10. I also included Step 28 under Step 7 as a sub-point coordinate with Step 8.

I made Steps 30 and 31 post-inaugural, because Fisher (1983), Gribble (1998) and Halm & Hiatt (1987) all put them after the opening day of school.

The location of Step 35 near the end does not appear to be feasible. In his account, Fisher (1983) is summarizing the factors that determined the location of the campuses. He also mentions them at the beginning (Fisher, 1983, p. 29). After noting this, I realized that most of the founders looked for an appropriate location prior to purchasing the land (Step 6), even before they had gained community support (Step 5). So I created another step just after Step 3, and named it locate appropriate facilities.
In effect, Steps 30, 31, 33, 36, and 37 occur simultaneously, but I arranged them in an order that reflects the goal of accreditation. I placed Step 37 first, followed by Steps 36, 31, and 30. Step 33 remains last as the goal of this process.

The Composite Process for Establishing a College

This version of the composite process will serve as the criteria for evaluating our approach. I have changed the numbers to capital letters to match the designations for the categories. After the analysis is completed, I will restate it as a recommended process.

While developing this process, I could see the steps falling into groups. I have incorporated these divisions into the list. In some ways, they parallel Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan. However, Stark and Lattuca’s approach emphasizes curricular development, while this one looks at the administrative steps used to establish a college.

Research

In Steps A through E, the founders looked for a suitable environment.

A. Develop a Vision

In nearly every scenario, the process began with a vision. The number of people who shared this vision varied in each case. It could be a group of people (Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969), a few individuals (Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998, p. 1), or one person (Cedarholm, 1988).

The circumstances that gave rise to the founders’ vision also differed. In one case, an entrepreneurial mind-set led two brothers to start their own school (Fisher, 1983). Most of the founders, however, saw a student population that was not being adequately served (Cedarholm, 1988; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969). Even though other
colleges already existed in the area, they were either over-crowded (1969) or were not close enough to the student population (1988; 1987). For some, starting a college nearby would save students money because they could live at home (1969).

Drawing new members into the church was given as a rationale for establishing Christ College Irvine (Halm & Hiatt, 1987). Cedarholm (1988), on the other hand, started Maranatha Baptist Bible College solely to train Christian workers.

B. Form a Steering Committee

In two narratives, the founders set up a steering committee, either officially or unofficially (Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969). The group’s functions included: (a) trying to gain support from the public in general (1969) or from the religious community (1987); and (b) determining the best way to finance the college (1969).

C. Conduct a Feasibility Study

Two accounts mention feasibility studies, though neither was conducted in direct connection with the establishment of the college (Gribble, 1998; Schindlbeck, 1969). However, both were conducted in the area in which the college was started, and one even acted as a catalyst in getting the process moving again after a period of inactivity (1998).

The variables considered in these studies included: (a) the number of similar colleges already in the area (Gribble, 1998); (b) whether standing facilities were available (1998); and (c) the degree of financial support available (1998; Schindlbeck, 1969).

D. Locate Appropriate Facilities

Locating facilities was closely tied to a feasibility study. However, it received a great deal of emphasis in the narratives, so I have given it separate treatment here. In
most of the accounts (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998, p. 2; Schindlbeck, 1969), a location became known within a short time. In one case, however, more than 80 sites were researched (Halm & Hiatt, 1987).

The authors mention several criteria for determining the location of the college. The availability of existing facilities appears to have been a major criterion (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998, p. 2; Schindlbeck, 1969). Two accounts (Fisher, 1983; Halm & Hiatt, 1987) do not mention whether existing buildings were used, but in three of the narratives, the founders purchased campuses previously used for educational purposes (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998, p. 2; Schindlbeck, 1969).

Geographical location was also important. An ideal site was: (a) near the student population (Fisher, 1983; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969); (b) urban (1983), or at least close to and centrally located between urban centers (1969); (c) accessible by major transportation routes (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983); (d) attractive to students in terms of providing local employment (1983), religious and medical services (1983), and short-term lodging for their relatives (1983); and (e) near an area which had a number of influential individuals who were interested in founding a college (1969).

\(E. \text{ Gain Community Support}\)

At this point, most of the founders sought to gain moral (Cedarholm, 1988) or political support (Halm & Hiatt, 1987). However, they targeted different groups and used a variety of methods to accomplish this.

The founders of Christ College Irvine used political methods to achieve their aims within the synod convention (Halm & Hiatt, 1987). They applied pressure on the synod
leaders by continually reminding them of the measures the convention had passed and presenting arguments in favor of establishing the college. Eventually, they gained the leaders’ support for the undertaking (1987).

Others looked for support from their own peers (Cedarholm, 1988; Schindlbeck, 1969) or talked to influential individuals (1969). Cedarholm (1988) enlisted the support of others through an announcement in a church service, contact with an influential individual, and a luncheon for local pastors. At the luncheon, he described the available facilities and presented pictures of them. The key founder of Winston Churchill College gained support when he met with influential individuals (Schindlbeck, 1969) who later disseminated information about the college in meetings for the general public (p. 176).

Organization

In Steps F through K, the founders appointed leadership and determined the direction the college would take.

F. Select a Board

In both narratives in which the initial selection of members is mentioned (Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969), it was carried out by a higher authority. In one case, it was the ruling religious body (1987); in the other it was those who held the charter to the college (1969). After that, the Board was self-governing and self-perpetuating (1969).

As part of its actions, the Board of Winston Churchill College (Schindlbeck, 1969): (a) decided who would serve, though it is not clear if this refers to individuals or to general qualifications; (b) determined the number of members; (c) clarified the Board’s responsibilities; (d) established Board control by defining the boundaries of the region.
from which members would be chosen, as well as the proportion of members elected from different parts of the region (1969, p. 174); and (e) appointed more members later.

G. Get Expert Advice

In two of the accounts, the founders requested advice from experts (Cedarholm, 1988; Schindlbeck, 1969). Before taking any action, Cedarholm (1988) sought advice from an educator. He was advised to (a) gain a following, (b) obtain a faculty, (c) acquire a facility, and (d) raise some finances.

When the founders of Winston Churchill College encountered obstacles, some of them asked another college president for advice (Schindlbeck, 1969). He tried to dissuade them from continuing. However, others enlisted the help of a highly respected individual who turned the situation around, and was even successful in bringing back some of the former supporters (p. 178). Later on, they asked two Attorneys-at-Law to help them draw up the documents for Articles of Incorporation and tax exempt status (p. 173).

H. State the Institutional Purpose

Three authors include a statement of purpose (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998, p. 8). One sought to instill a philosophy of life (1998), while the other two were vocational in nature (1988; 1983). In two cases, the founders also invented a motto or slogan in order to keep the school focused on its goal or to promote its distinctiveness (1988; 1983). Cedarholm (1988) composed a school song based on the motto.

I. Purchase Property

J. *Name the College*

Four of the narratives mention the naming of the college (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998, p. 6; Schindlbeck, 1969). They emphasize the reason for selecting the name: (a) some were geographical (1983; 1988); (b) others were inspirational (1988); and (c) some were intended to honor well-known individuals (1969).

Stonehill College (Gribble, 1998, p. 6) was a combined name acknowledging the people who provided the facilities and the community in which it was located. Winter Hill College’s location near a well-known landmark was a key factor in its original name (Fisher, 1983). Cedarholm (1988) chose a name which would remind everyone of the college ideals. Finally, the founders of Winston Churchill College wanted to honor the British statesman and his principles (Schindlbeck, 1969).

K. *Appoint a President*

The Board is responsible for selecting a president (Gribble, 1998, p. 6; Halm & Hiatt, 1987) who is able to establish the direction that the college will take and to give it a distinctive character (1987, p. 7). This individual must: (a) be knowledgeable in academic issues (1987, p. 5); (b) be able to hold their own in the politics surrounding their position (1987, p. 5); (c) be responsible for establishing educational goals and objectives for the college (1987, p. 7); (d) delegate duties to others (1998, p. 6); and (e) display unflagging determination to see that the college is established (1987).

*Local Commitment*

In Steps L through N, the colleges sought to increase their chances for survival by gaining commitment from the community and/or religious authorities.
L. **Respond to Obstacles**

Facing challenges is common in establishing colleges (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998, p. 5; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969). The accounts discuss three facets of obstacles: (a) their nature; (b) the length of the conflicts; and (c) the founders’ response.

The hurdles the founders had to overcome took various forms: (a) lack of finances (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998, p. 5; Halm & Hiatt, 1987); (b) the possibility of a dwindling student population (1987); (c) confusion about the college’s mission (1987); (d) outright opposition (1988; 1987); (e) interpersonal conflicts (1987, p. 6); (f) poorly-equipped leadership (1987, pp. 5-6); (g) cultural differences between groups (1987, pp. 5-6); (h) lack of personnel (1998, p. 5); (i) lack of time and money (1988); (j) lack of motivation (1998, p. 5); and (k) a general lack of preparation (Schindlbeck, 1969).

In the founding of Maranatha, Cedarholm (1988) ignored the opposition and proceeded with his plans. The founders of Winston Churchill College postponed its opening for one year in order to take care of some deficiencies (Schindlbeck, 1969). In the other accounts, the periods of delay were much longer, amounting to nine years in one case (Halm & Hiatt, 1987) and thirteen in another (Gribble, 1998, p. 5).

The responses also varied. At Christ College Irvine, the founders continuously presented their arguments to the authorities in order to persuade them to act (Halm & Hiatt, 1987). They reminded them of the measures that had already been taken and the benefits of finishing the project. At Winston Churchill College, the Board drew up a list of priorities to complete before opening the school (Schindlbeck, 1969). The founders of Stonehill College were spurred into action when they were faced with the possibility that
another college might be started in that same area (Gribble, 1998, p. 5). In the end, they also presented arguments to the authorities as to why their property should be the site of a new college (p. 6).

M. Enlist the Aid of Influential Individuals

This strategy deserves special mention because it took place at different times. Schindlbeck (1969) mentioned that key individuals helped promote the college when it was first conceived (pp. 172-174) and after it encountered problems (pp. 177-178).

N. Gain Unofficial Approval

Apparently, this step applies only to church-related colleges (Gribble, 1998, p. 6; Halm & Hiatt, 1987), rather than to independent schools (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Schindlbeck, 1969). This seems logical because the church leaders’ approval would be necessary for the founders to continue with their course of action.

Legal Endorsement

The steps leading up to state approval to grant a degree (Steps O – T) involved amassing resources and structuring the organization to meet mandated standards.

O. Develop a Curriculum

Only Fisher (1983) mentions the curriculum. He explains the basic thrust of the programs (p. 29) and says that the subjects were oriented toward fulfilling their purpose (p. 31). He lists several facts regarding the instructional processes used in the college: (a) they emphasized the development of student skills; (b) classes were offered both during the day and in the evening in order to accommodate all students; (c) students were
allowed to enroll at any time during the year; and (d) students were permitted to progress at their own pace, based on their financial situation, level of interest, and competency. As a result, some students could complete their programs in less time.

P. Raise Funds to Achieve Financial Stability

Finances were an important issue. Gribble (1998) attributes many of Stonehill’s problems to “[its] hasty and poorly financed foundation” (p. 9). The founders did not receive permission from the church authorities to raise funds (p. 7), so they had to borrow a large sum of money in order to establish the college (p. 9). It took them six years to pay it off (p. 9), and they were not able to make any real progress until they did.

Cedarholm (1988) was able to negotiate a deal in which he only had to come up with a down payment. The deal also included a good rate of interest and a desirable length on the mortgage. Later, however, he raised the question of where the college would get its operating funds. Fisher (1983) does not mention the need for money, but gives details about the founders’ method for charging the students (p. 30). It is interesting that they offered discounts in order to get the students either to attend day classes or to commit themselves to longer terms for evening classes (p. 31).

Winston Churchill College raised money in three steps (Schindlbeck, 1969). First, the board set an amount to raise. It included the cost for renovating the facility, a down payment on a dormitory, salaries for administrative staff, and money for other capital expenses (pp. 171-172). Next, two local businessmen raised money through an extensive advertisement campaign involving lectures and press releases (pp. 172-173). Finally, the board applied for grants from large corporations (p. 172).
Q. Acquire Instructional Resources

Only Cedarholm (1988) mentions instructional resources. Experienced instructors applied, having apparently heard about the new school by word of mouth. The previous owners had taken many of the classroom supplies and equipment, but then returned them. The school also received surplus goods from local businesses and manufacturers. Finally, the faculty and students, and even the students’ parents, helped with some basic services.

The first acquisition to the library was a Bible donated by the founder (Cedarholm, 1988). The faculty also agreed to put their libraries on loan to the school. Books came from other sources as well. They were donated by local residents, missionaries, pastors, and even young people. Discarded volumes were gathered from public libraries, colleges, and seminaries. A number of publishing houses also contributed to the library.

R. Organize the College

Due to the size of Stonehill College and its lack of funds (Gribble, 1998, p. 7), its organization was very informal, with each administrator serving in several capacities.

S. Set Admission Requirements

Gribble (1998) notes that admission requirements were not stringent the first year. On the other hand, the founders of Winston Churchill College had to give the minimum requirements for entrance when they applied for state approval (Schindlbeck, 1969).

T. Make Formal Application for State Approval

The next step was to apply for state approval to grant a degree (Gribble, 1998, p. 6; Schindlbeck, 1969; see also Halm & Hiatt, 1987, p. 5) in order to ensure that the students would receive a quality education and a valid degree (Cedarholm, 1988).
Schindlbeck (1969) lists the following information that had to be included on the application: (a) the name of the school and its location; (b) the type of institution; (c) the minimum requirements for entrance; (d) the character, scope, and intent of the courses; (e) the fees charged and the conditions for their payment; (f) the criteria for hiring the faculty, as well as what would be required of them; (g) the degrees that the school would award; and (h) the estimated value of the college’s holdings. Upon approval, the board of Winston Churchill College employed Attorneys-at-Law to help them apply for Articles of Incorporation and tax exempt status (Schindlbeck, 1969, p. 173).

Inauguration

In Steps U through W, the colleges concentrated on recruiting students and raising more finances, which culminated in a memorable celebration of the school’s opening.

U. Advertise


V. Enroll Students

Two accounts (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998) mention the initial recruitment of students. Enrollments were large in both cases. Although 250 men applied at Stonehill,
only 134 actually attended during the first semester (1998, p. 8). At Maranatha, two hundred eleven students came for the first term (1988).

The first year’s entrance requirements were not stringent at Stonehill College (Gribble, 1998), but Schindlbeck (1969) states that Winston Churchill College had to specify its entrance requirements prior to state approval. Cedarholm (1988) mentions that many students who were already at other schools wanted to transfer to the new one. This forced him to make sure that the school could offer the courses these students needed.

W. Hold a Public Inauguration

Four narratives refer to the beginning of classes (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998, p. 8; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969), but only two of them mention that the college had set aside a specific day to celebrate it (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998). Cedarholm (1988) says that about 1,500 people attended the dedication of Maranatha.

Growth

Some of the schools gained notoriety because they strove to meet a higher standard. Steps X through BB illustrate what they did to avoid stagnation and closure.

X. Strive for Academic Excellence

Gribble (1998) lists periodicals recognizing the college for its excellence (p. 9). The educational quality of Fisher College contributed to its rapid growth (Fisher, 1983).

Y. Evaluate the Curriculum

Stonehill College’s effort to provide a high quality program (Gribble, 1998, p. 9) seems to imply that they had an on-going policy for evaluating the curriculum.
Z. **Increase the Student Body**

Two authors mention increased enrollment (Fisher, 1983; Halm & Hiatt, 1987).

**AA. Increase the Campus Size**

Some accounts described the later growth of the college in terms of facilities (Gribble, 1998) and branch campuses (Fisher, 1983).

**BB. Seek Accreditation**

Two schools achieved accreditation (Gribble, 1998, p. 9; Halm & Hiatt, 1987). Maranatha (MBBC, *Catalog*, 2005, p. 8) and Fisher College (Fisher, 1983, p. 146) also received accreditation later. Schindlbeck (1969) does not mention it in his account, possibly because he wrote it too soon after the founding of the college.

Comparison with a Procedure for Establishing a College

Thornton's\(^2\) (1966) procedure for establishing community colleges is similar to the composite process. It is described below, then compared to the composite process.

*A Procedure for Establishing a Community College*

Thornton (1966) uses two phases: (a) “securing legal authorization” (pp. 102-107); and (b) “establishing the authorized community junior college” (pp. 107-115).

*Obtaining Legal Authorization*

Before discussing this phase, Thornton (1966) mentions that someone must develop a vision prior to establishing a college (p. 103). Then he gives the six steps

---

\(^2\) I discovered this material after developing the composite process, so it was not included in the analysis of my narrative. However, it was so significant that I had to insert it for comparison. I also incorporated it in the process described in CHAPTER V.
that lead up to state approval: (a) conduct preliminary studies; (b) deal with opposition; (c) gain professional and community support; (d) apply for state approval; (e) secure commitment through a local election, and (f) appoint a board.

Establishing the Community College

Thornton (1966) then explains the steps for organizing the college: (a) develop an agenda; (b) select a site; (c) assess the curricular needs of the college; (d) hire faculty; (e) procure equipment; (f) inform prospective students; and (g) provide in-service training for the new faculty.

A Comparison with the Composite Process

Although Thornton's (1966) procedure has many parallels with the composite process, there are some minor differences: (a) he separated the hiring of faculty and procuring of equipment into two steps; (b) he omitted two other steps—naming the college and setting admission requirements; (c) he recommended having a faculty orientation just prior to the opening term; and (d) he ended his process with this last step.

There is another major difference—Thornton's (1966) view of state authorization conflicts with that of the composite process. Apparently, he wrote at a time when the states were still drafting legislation for postsecondary educational institutions (p. 90), so his comments tended to be speculative. In fact, he conceded that the pattern surfacing at that time was "general" and "basic" (p. 106).

The two approaches differ on this issue in two ways. First of all, Thornton (1966) had the founders apply for authorization to operate before they developed the curriculum and organized the college (pp. 106-107). In the composite process, applying for degree-
granting status can only take place after the state’s organizational, fiscal, and curricular requirements are met. Secondly, Thornton makes the state responsible for determining whether the college is feasible (p. 106). Fadel (1971) places this responsibility on the founders, while the ACPE does not require either the candidate institution or the state agency to conduct a feasibility study (“Regulations,” 2000; “Statutes,” 2000).

Summary of the Literature Review

Stark and Lattuca (1997) described eight aspects of program development that occur in three chronological stages (Stark, Briggs, & Rowland-Poplawski, 2002), but their plan emphasized the curriculum rather than the administrative steps. Fadel (1971), on the other hand, dealt with the administrative issues, but he listed them in terms of their relative importance rather than chronologically. So I combined the two models and then analyzed five accounts of the establishment of colleges (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969) in order to develop a sequence of events. Using the ACPE requirements (“Regulations,” 2000; “Statutes,” 2000) and the recommendations of the AGBUC (2000; Ingram, 2003), I revised the list of events and came up with what I called a composite process.

After that, I compared the results with Thornton’s (1966) procedure and found only a few differences. However, I discovered his material too late in the research to include it as part of the analysis of my narrative. In CHAPTER III, I will describe how I wrote the narrative about the founding of Fairbanks Baptist Bible College, then I will explain the method we used for analyzing our approach.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I will explain the nature of the study, how I wrote the account of the founding of our school, and the method used to analyze the narrative.

The Nature of the Study

This is a case study utilizing documentary analysis (Berg, 2001; Duffy, 1999; Silverman, 2000). The objective is to compare the approach we used in founding the college with the composite process I developed in CHAPTER II.

The Method Used in Research

My methodology involved: (a) writing a narrative of the founding of the college; (b) conducting a content analysis; and (c) comparing the results to the composite process.

Composing the Narrative

I wrote the narrative from material I found in the college archives, so I had to start by determining what material to use. After that, I had to decide how to write the account.

Identifying the Documents

I surveyed the college archives and selected the material I wanted to use.

Material omitted. I omitted everything that did not take place between June 1998 and January 2002. I also left out course assignments, routine procedures, accounts of interpersonal conflicts, and everything that is protected by FERPA (Rainsberger, 1998).

I omitted some material due to the nature of the situation. For instance, the other administrators often did not respond to my memos or emails in writing. Instead, they
would discuss the issues with me at church services or administrative meetings. However, my memos and emails almost always allude to these conversations. So, for the most part, going through the archives was like listening to one side of a telephone conversation in which I repeat nearly everything that is being said on the other end of the line.

*Material included.* Most of the material I used came from my own files, but I also included some from the files of Jim Haning, the first Dean of the institute and the college. I organized it into four categories: (a) administrative; (b) public; (c) developmental; and (d) legal. Each group also breaks down into several subsets.

1. *Administrative.* This material was generated for administrative purposes.

1.1 *Planning materials.* I included papers concerning problems in starting an institute, the nature of higher education, a suggested timetable for establishment, issues regarding a mission statement, information on creating a mission statement, a comparison of associate of arts programs from various institutions, potential institute programs, publications from other institutes and colleges, forms for the institute, and registration announcements.

1.2 *Calendars and schedules.* This group includes schedules, master calendars, and academic calendars for both the students and the faculty.

1.3 *Agendas.* I also looked at various agendas, including a church business meeting agenda and an administrative agenda covering every event for an entire year.

1.4 *Forms.* The forms I used include a policy manual, an instructors’ handbook, operational forms, the church budget, forms for determining the appropriateness of a textbook, textbook lists, textbook order invoices, and course introductions.
1.5 **Revisions.** I included lists of catalog revisions and copies of revised catalogs, as well as revisions in the policy manual and guidelines for instructors.

1.6 **Meeting notes.** I also looked at administrative meeting notes.

1.7 **Administrative communication.** This includes correspondence and email with administrative personnel and other individuals in the institute or college.

2. **Public.** This material encompasses everything used to inform the church or general public regarding the college.

2.1 **Public communication.** I consulted catalogs, announcements, church bulletins, half-page bulletin inserts, a brochure describing the institute or college, a proposed publication for the college (*The Voice*), speeches, and academic dean’s reports given at the annual institute and college convocations.

2.2 **Public functions.** This group of material includes a suggested convocation service and notes from an Evening of Prayer service.

3. **Developmental.** These items were produced in order to improve the school.

3.1 **Personal files.** My personal notes and research included the results of an enrollment survey conducted in the Institute’s first term of operation, a condensation of Bloom’s taxonomy, and quarter sheets of scrap paper with notes scribbled on them.

3.2 **Papers presented to the faculty.** I compiled this material for professional development. Most of it came from my University of Alaska Fairbanks (UAF) courses.

4. **Legal.** The final group concerns the college’s status with the state.

4.1 **Standards.** This category includes federal and state statutes, a simplified version of the state statutes for the college administration, standards for learning resource
programs, regulatory agency policy statements, information on the transferability of credits from an accredited college, and accreditation association handbooks.

4.2 **Official correspondence and consultation.** This material includes official written correspondence, as well as notes I took during phone conversations.

4.3 **Agendas.** I looked at an agenda for application for authorization to operate, one for obtaining it, and a list of tasks we needed to complete after we knew our status.

4.4 **Proposals.** In this final category, I placed guidelines for submitting a proposal to the ACPE, an impact statement relating to degree-granting status, a list of options concerning our status, a formal proposal to the ACPE, and a second version of that proposal couched in popular language for the church congregation.

*Writing the Narrative*

My wife and I moved to Alaska in June of 1998 and the church endorsed the college as one of its ministries in January of 2002, so I limited the narrative to this time period. When I first started writing, I went through the material and recorded significant events in chronological order. However, starting with the documents generated in the fall of 2001, I divided the material into *events* and *issues*. My goal was to make the account easier to analyze, and I believe it showed that I was already evaluating the process to some degree. On the other hand, I did not go back and reconfigure the previous material.

Furthermore, I began recording observations about the process. This shaped the content of the account and kept me on track. When I finished, I not only had a sequential record of the founding of the school, but part of it was also arranged in a format that I felt would be easier to analyze. CHAPTER IV contains the narrative.
**Analyzing the Narrative**

In order to compare our approach with the one developed in CHAPTER II, I had some individuals code the narrative. Then I organized the data and compared our findings with the composite process.

*A Basic Description of Content Analysis*

Silverman (2000) defines *content or documentary analysis* as a form of textual analysis in which "researchers establish a set of categories and then count the number of instances that fall into each category" (p. 826; see also Holsti, 1969; Krippendorf, 1980, p.7; Silverman, 2001). The objective is to reveal a document's theme or outline (Berg, 2001, pp. 240-241; Duffy, 1999, p. 111-112).

Berg (2001) describes two approaches to content analysis (pp. 245-246). In the deductive approach, the text is coded for predetermined categories. In the inductive method, the researcher lets the author reveal the categories or theme through his or her own use of terms (2001; see also Silverman, 2001, p. 124). Because my own account was being coded, I chose the first approach in order to retain as much objectivity as possible.

*The Elements of the Content Analysis*

Content analysis entails four basic elements.

*Data collection units.* The data collection units could include any grammatical unit from a word to a complete sentence. However, similarly categorized adjacent data collection units were to be combined in order to reduce the work during the analysis.

*Recording units.* Data collection units embodying a category's concept (a *theme*) were to be recorded (Ryan & Bernard, 2000; Holsti, 1969; Krippendorf, 1980).
Categories. The 28 steps of the composite process comprised the categories. I assigned each step a capital letter, designating the last two as “AA” and “BB.”

Context units. If the coders could not categorize a unit, they were to consult the definitions in *The Code Book*. If this did not help, they were to look at the context until they could determine the category (Holsti, 1969; Krippendorf, 1980). Units that they still could not categorize were to be put in a category marked “Other.”

The Process of the Content Analysis

The content analysis involved: (a) gathering the data; and (b) analyzing it.

Gathering the data. This step required: (a) preparing some forms (Krippendorf, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002); (b) training the coders (Krippendorf, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002); and (c) coding the narrative.

1. Preparing the forms. First, I prepared *The Data Book* (Neuendorf, 2002), which had two kinds of blank tables. The first table, named *Regular Data Sheets*, was used to record clearly categorizable units. (See Table 1.) It had 608 rows of 31 columns. The second table, called *Special Data Sheets*, was to be used when the coders felt that a unit could either fit several categories or not fit any of the categories (Krippendorf, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002). Each row had three columns. (See Table 2.) Then I created *The Code Book*. It contained coding instructions and the category definitions (Neuendorf, 2002).

2. Training the coders. After the coders read through *The Code Book*, we practiced the method on a text describing the founding of a college (Krippendorf, 1980; Neuendorf, 2002, p. 146). Then, when the coders were ready, I gave each of them a copy of *The Narrative* to scan.
Table 1. *Regular Data Sheet*

*Regular Data Sheet*

| RU# | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T | U | V | W | X | Y | Z | AA | BB | α |
| 1   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 10  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 11  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 12  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 13  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 14  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 15  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 16  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 17  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 18  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

Name ____________________________ Date __________________

Data Sheet Number ______  The Narrative Page Number ______
Table 2. Special Data Sheet

Special Data Sheet
Name ________________________ Date __________________ Data Sheet Number ____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RU#</th>
<th>More Than One Category</th>
<th>New Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Coding the narrative. I instructed the coders to scan the account for data collection units (Holsti, 1969) and mark each one by drawing an unbroken line under it. If the unit continued to the next line or page, I told them to put an arrow at the right-hand margin of the leading line and one at the left-hand margin of the next line. When uncoded text separated parts of the same recording unit, I directed them to mark it with a dashed underline. However, they did not need arrows if the dashed text continued to the next line or page, because the dashed lines already indicated continuation.

Next, I told them to go to the Regular Data Sheets in The Data Book, take the number in the first column of the next unused row (designated RU# for “Recording Unit Number”), and write it over the underlined unit in the text for later reference. Then I had them circle this number in the Regular Data Sheet in order to avoid using it again. When the unit was an action or decision, rather than discussion (The Code Book defined these terms), I instructed them to put a check mark (✓) in the second column of the Regular Data Sheet. I had them record this data so that it would be available in case I later saw that discussion bore some sort of relationship to actions and decisions.
The next 28 columns corresponded to the steps in the composite process. If a unit could be clearly categorized, I told the coders to put an “X” in the appropriate column. If it appeared to fit more than one category or did not seem to fit any category (Neuendorf, 2002), I directed them to put an “X” in the last column. This column was headed by the first letter of the Greek alphabet (“α”), which stands for “Other.” This was to indicate that they had recorded the unit in the Special Data Sheets.

If the coders went to the Special Data Sheets, I had them enter the recording unit number in the first column. If it fit more than one category, they were to write the capital letters of those categories in the second column, separating them by a semi-colon (;). If it did not fit a category, I requested that they enter a new category name for it in the third column. If two or more recording units shared a designation, I asked the coders to link them together by adding a new letter, such as “CC,” “DD,” etc., in parentheses. Finally, I instructed them not to go back and look for any mistakes when they were finished coding. Instead, they were to return The Data Book and The Narrative to me immediately.

Analyzing the data. This step involved: (a) organizing the data; and (b) comparing our approach to the composite process. Originally, I had planned to use the procedure described below, but when I started to look at the data, I adopted a different approach.

1. Organizing the data. My plan was to create a “Master List.” (See Table 3, which contains examples.) Only units marked as actions or decisions in the Regular Data Sheets were to be recorded. I planned to assign each unit a Master List Number (ML#) in the first column. This would be followed by two columns for each coder. As I received each coder’s set of books, I would identify them with a lowercase letter and enter it above
their group of columns. In each coder’s first column (RU#), I would enter their recording unit number. In the second one, I would show how they categorized the unit.

Table 3. *A Master List from the Regular Data Sheets—With Examples*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML #</th>
<th>RU#</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>RU#</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>RU#</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An ML# could represent several rows, so I planned to assign the next one only when all the classifications for a unit had been entered. Each different categorization of a unit would be included under the same ML number, but entered on separate rows. An “em” dash (—) in the ML# column would indicate that they referred to the same unit.

2. *Comparing our approach with the composite process.* Once I had organized the data in the Master List, I planned to use it to evaluate the coders’ data. First, I would compare our approach with the composite process to see which steps we did or did not use, then I would determine the sequence of steps we used. Finally, I would evaluate the effects of our approach.

**Summary of the Methodology**

Using Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan as a basic guide, I composed a narrative of the founding of the college from its archives. CHAPTER IV contains this account. Next, I developed a 28-step method I called “The Composite Process.” It was based on my review of Stark and Lattuca’s (1997) academic plan, Fadel’s (1971) model
for determining the feasibility of establishing a two-year college, narratives describing the process of founding five colleges (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1988; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969), the requirements of the ACPE ("Regulations," 2000; "Statutes," 2000), and the guidelines of the AGBUC (2000; Ingram, 2003). This process had six phases: (a) research; (b) organization; (c) local commitment; (d) legal endorsement; (e) inauguration; and (f) growth.

The steps of the composite process are not intended to reflect what takes place in the founding of every college. Instead, their purpose was to serve as categories in the analysis of my narrative. After I had collected the data, I planned to determine the results. Then I would compare our approach to the composite process. As it turned out, I took a slightly different approach to organizing the data. CHAPTER V will discuss the results. First, however, I will describe the establishment of Fairbanks Baptist Bible College in CHAPTER IV.
CHAPTER IV

FOUNDING FAIRBANKS BAPTIST BIBLE COLLEGE

This history of the founding of Fairbanks Baptist Bible College is a chronology of events between the initial planning for Hamilton Acres Bible Institute in June of 1998 and its final recognition as a college in January of 2002.³

A Brief Description of the Major Participants

Hugh Hamilton

Hugh Hamilton graduated from Tennessee Temple Bible College in Chattanooga, Tennessee. After pastoring several churches in southern and southwestern states, he and his wife, "Aunt Sue," moved their family to Alaska in order to have a fresh start after their middle son Jonathan died of childhood leukemia (Hamilton, "An Autobiography," 1998, pp. 26-27). Hugh pastored Hamilton Acres Baptist Church from 1968 to 1998,⁴ when he stepped down from being senior pastor and became pastor emeritus (pp. 22, 27).

Marshall Hamilton


³ In the original version of this narrative, I included many subheadings which I have edited out in order to shorten it and give it a smoother style. I did not realize at the time that they may have affected the coders' perception of the data.

⁴ There is no connection between the names. The church had already been named for the subdivision in which it is located long before the Hamiltons moved to Alaska.
Bruce Hamilton


Jim Haning

In 1989, Jim Haning obtained his Bachelor of Science in Missions and Bible from Pillsbury Baptist Bible College in Owatonna, Minnesota (FBBC, Catalog, 2001), and became the assistant pastor at Hamilton Acres Baptist Church. In 1996, he received his Master of Ministry degree from Northland Baptist Bible College, in Dunbar, Wisconsin, and in 1998 was pursuing the Doctor of Sacred Ministry degree from that same school (2001). He was also the principal of Hamilton Acres Baptist School, which the church had started in 1970 (Hamilton, “An Autobiography,” 1998, p. 42).

Russ Posey

Russ Posey received his Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from New Mexico State University in 1980. He founded Siberian Missions in 1992 and had been the principal of Hamilton Acres Baptist School during the 1992 – 1993 academic year. In 1998, he was in the Master of Ministry program at Northland Baptist Bible College (FBBC, Catalog, 2001).

Joe McCulley

Joe McCulley had been stationed at Eielson Air Force Base near North Pole, Alaska, and had attended Hamilton Acres Baptist Church. He graduated with a Bachelor
of Science degree from Liberty University, Lynchburg, Virginia, in 1995, then received his Master of Divinity degree from Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary in Lansdale, Pennsylvania, in 1999. In 2000 he returned to Fairbanks to start the church he currently pastors, Pioneer Baptist Church, which is located near Eielson Air Force Base.

*Cliff Loriot*

In 1977, I graduated from Southland Bible Institute in Wolfpit, Kentucky, with a Christian Worker's Diploma. In 1987, I received a Bachelor of Theology from Piedmont Bible College in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, and in 1997 I obtained my Master of Divinity degree from Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary. After corresponding with the pastors at Hamilton Acres for a year, my wife and I moved to Alaska in June of 1998 to help start an evening Bible Institute. I went to work in the UAF electrical shop in October of 1998. This later proved to be beneficial when I started pursuing my master's degree.

Hamilton Acres Baptist Institute (June 1998 – August 2001)

*Initial Planning (June – December 1998)*

When my wife and I moved to Fairbanks, we understood that the church wanted to start an evening Bible Institute offering non-credit courses solely for the benefit of its church members. Once we arrived, however, the pastors told me that they wanted to train pastors and missionaries for vocational Christian ministry.

From June to December of 1998, Jim Haning and I met on a regular basis to discuss several foundational issues regarding the Institute, conduct research into what other schools had done, and make some basic decisions. We kept Bruce and Marshall informed of our discussions and consulted them for their approval.
Issues to Consider in Establishing an Institute

In August 1998, I presented some issues we needed to consider in a paper entitled “Problems Encountered in Establishing an Institute.” The most important thing we had to do was determine our purpose, because it would affect the length of the program, the curriculum, the size of the library, and our future plans.

Then we had to decide if we should grant any certificates or diplomas. We agreed that doing so would give students an incentive to persevere, but it also meant that we would have to offer courses from the very beginning that could be credited toward them. Otherwise, we could offer anything we wanted. We also discussed whether an associate’s degree or a bachelor’s degree constituted minimum preparation for Christian ministry.

We had to make sure our programs did not hurt the students’ future schooling by duplicating too many courses in programs offered by other schools, but we also needed to offer enough courses to help students for whom this was the only degree. Furthermore, we had to balance the length of our program with a reasonable course load per term.

We also needed to figure out how to acquire a quality library.

Later on, we looked at information on Christian higher education, including its definition, historical perspective, relationship to the government, accreditation, and future projections, which included non-traditional options (Gangel, 1981).

During our meetings, we also talked about typical course loads, including the number of pages students should be required to read, the length of assigned papers, the number of tests administered per course, how long the tests should be, and requirements for auditors.
Decisions

To answer most of these questions, we drew from our experiences as students. We decided to go with trimesters rather than semesters. If I remember correctly, Bruce asked us to do this. We also decided that all our courses would be two hours, and that we would offer them in a block format. We settled on 55 minutes for the length of a class session and agreed that the students should have a 10-minute break between sessions. In order to determine the best class times, we conducted a survey of the church members in which we described the Institute’s purpose, its programs, the courses’ “for credit status,” our attendance policy, the trimester’s beginning and ending dates, and the cost per hour. As a result, we settled on Tuesday evenings from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. and on Saturday mornings from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

We agreed on a 2-letter, 3-digit system for course numbering. The two letters indicated the department. The first number represented the course level, the second told whether the course was offered in an even year or an odd one, and the final digit stood for the trimester in which the course was offered.

We talked about the need to be able to use classrooms with tables and erasable marker boards.

We discussed what we needed to know from each student at registration and how we would order textbooks. We talked about whether students would pay the Institute or the church, whether this would apply to textbooks as well as tuition and fees, and what the policy would be for installments and late payment. Finally, we decided it would be a good idea to come up with a school logo that embodied our mission.
Operation as an Institute (January 1999 – August 2001)

Our initial planning resulted in an introductory trimester during which we made further plans for full-fledged operation. The Institute was installed in the fall of 1999 and operated until the fall of 2001. During our first year, we pursued what we thought would be our normal course, but something happened at the end of that year to change our direction, and throughout the next year we worked to adapt to the situation.

Preparation for Installation (January – August 1999)

Between January and August of 1999, Jim and I prepared for the installation of the Institute. We conducted a pilot trimester, developed policies, advertised, and held a registration, faculty orientation, student orientation, and Installation Service.

An introductory trimester (January – March 1999). We decided to have an introductory trimester in the spring of 1999 so we could see what kinds of problems we would encounter when we opened in the fall (HABI, Catalog, 1999). It began January 5th and ended March 26th. We initially offered two courses which could be audited or taken for credit. Jim taught Bibliology on Tuesday evenings from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. I was going to teach Hermeneutics on Saturday mornings from 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., but I wound up teaching on Thursday evenings instead. Before we started, we also added Marriage and the Family, which Marshall taught on Monday evenings. Students did not need to be admitted. They only needed to register for a class, but we limited registration to church members. In my Academic Dean’s Report, given on September 4, 1999, I noted that we had 12 students, which we thought was excellent.
Planning meetings (January – August 1999). During our trial trimester, Jim and I met every other Sunday afternoon to discuss the Institute policies and to make intensive preparations for its full-fledged operation. Our target date was the fall of 1999, and our primary goals were to develop a program, a catalog, and a brochure. We also made plans for: (a) the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship’s annual meeting; (b) our first registration; (c) the faculty and student orientations; and (d) our installation as an Institute.

In our meetings, we established an agenda we wanted to meet by March 2000, and we assigned a date to achieve each item. We met the agenda by asking questions about each issue, applying them as we researched each item, consulting catalogs from other schools, and working the issues out on paper. The questions were:
(a) Does this item fit the Institute’s purpose? (b) Is it necessary for carrying out its purpose? (c) Is there any unnecessary duplication with other items? (d) What are the advantages and disadvantages of this item? (e) Do we have the needed resources and authority? (f) Is there a better way to do it? (g) Will this draw students?

After some discussion, we revised the order of the items on the agenda and added a few more. The final form included the following actions:
1. Construct a clear, concise, yet comprehensive statement of purpose.
2. Determine the number, length, content, and organization of the programs.
3. Determine the library’s content and location. We would ask the faculty to recommend books that will be required texts in their courses, books that the instructor recommends the students acquire, and books or materials that must be available for the student to complete course requirements, whether for collateral reading or for research.
4. Compile a catalog to include the Institute’s purpose, philosophy of operation, faculty, facilities, programs, schedules, courses and their numbers, doctrinal statement, academic issues, and financial issues. It is to be distributed to interested church members.

5. Spell out the organization of the Institute in a manual, with the responsibilities of such positions as Dean, Academic Dean, and Institute Chaplain.

6. Prepare a teachers’ handbook that includes standards for teachers, as well as guidelines for preparing courses, determining course load, and grading.

7. Prepare registration packets with course descriptions, a course schedule, a class registration form, and a textbook order form.

8. Present the Institute at the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship.

9. Prepare a student handbook explaining the dress code and demerit system.

10. Make copies of class notes for each student that registers.


12. Create a brochure which would include the address and phone number of the Institute and deliver it in bulk to churches.

13. Get certification from the Evangelical Training Association (ETA). This organization provides material for churches to use in training teachers, Sunday school superintendents, and interested laypersons in various levels of biblical and practical studies. Each student is granted a certificate when they complete the curriculum.

14. Design a certificate or diploma for use in our graduations.

Jim had other things to do, so I did most of the research. First, I checked into one Bible college faculty’s credentials. Eighteen and a half percent had doctorates, sixty-three
percent only had master’s degrees, and eighteen and a half percent only had a bachelor’s degree. This was encouraging, since over half of our faculty had their master’s degrees.

In stating the Institute’s purpose, I started by defining *intention*, *purpose*, *end*, *goal*, *objective*, and *aim*. Then I clarified their relationship to each other. We settled on *purpose*, *objective*, and *aim* as the terms we wanted to use. Having done that, I compiled a list of statements from five Bible colleges and reduced each one to its corresponding purpose, objectives, and aims. Finally, I prepared a “Statement of Purpose” in which I spelled out each aspect of our institutional goals.

Then I approached the issue from a different angle by asking what pastors or missionaries should be able to do. I decided that they must be able to: (a) interpret and apply biblical truths; (b) recall biblical content and teaching; (c) communicate the message of the Bible; (d) biblically conduct missionary work or administrate a local church; and (e) defend biblical truth. After that, I consulted five catalogs describing associate’s degrees in Bible or ministry. Focusing on three of them, I looked at courses that were: (a) common to all three; (b) common to any two; and (c) offered by only one. All of this helped us determine the purpose of our programs and which courses to offer.

In the end, we agreed to offer three programs: (a) An 80-hour *Associate in New Testament Ministry (ANTM)* for pastors and missionaries; (b) a 36-hour *Certificate in Local Church Ministry (CLCM)* for Sunday school teachers; and (c) a 24-hour *Certificate in Personal Ministry (CPM)* for those who wanted to enhance their personal life and ministry. Courses could also be taken on a non-program basis. The programs were designed so that a student could transfer to the next level without losing any credits. I
drew up a master schedule in order to make sure there were no conflicts, then laid out different scenarios in which the programs could be completed.

In order to compile a catalog, I looked at the tables of contents from eight Bible colleges. I noted the general categories in each one and compared the sub-categories under each general category. Then I drew up a skeleton table of contents with enough room between each entry to make comments relevant to our own situation. Jim and I went through the outline, clarifying the terminology and content of each section. When we were done, I specified the font and paragraph formatting for each heading level.

We also drew up a teacher’s handbook and entitled it *Guidelines for Instructors*. It dealt with course load, assignments, and grading. In determining a proper course load, I looked at the assignments I had to complete when I was in Bible institute and college. First, I developed multipliers to convert the three- and four-hour course loads to the equivalent of a two-hour load. Next, I divided the courses into levels and grouped the assignments within each level by type. When I compared the amount of material assigned to each group and level, I found them to be remarkably consistent. Using this process, I developed a currency system in which 25 pages provided a reference point for other kinds of assignments. We felt that this was the number of pages a student could read in an hour.

In this system: (a) one page of basic hand-in work equaled 25 pages of reading; (b) one page of a full term paper with footnotes, references, etc., equaled 50 pages of reading; (c) a 10-minute oral report was worth 50 pages; (d) one-page of an objective exam was worth 40 pages; and (e) one-page of an essay test equaled 75 pages. Jim and I later revised it to make one page of a major paper equal to 75 pages of reading and one
I also found that the course loads within each level were consistent and later used this to determine course loads. For example, freshman course loads ranged between 1,200 and 1,300 pages, sophomore assignments fell between 1,200 and 1,400 pages, juniors were assigned homework that was the equivalent of between 1,100 and 1,300 pages, while seniors, interestingly enough, were only assigned between 800 and 1,000 pages.

As for the brochure, we did not produce one until February 1, 2000. It gave the school's history, purpose, doctrinal position, faculty credentials, accreditation status, programs, costs, and application procedure. It was an executive-size (8½ x 14) tri-fold that included a cut-away portion which could be used to request more information.

*The Fundamental Baptist Fellowship Meeting (July 1999).* The Northwest Chapter of the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship meets annually, and it was our church's turn to sponsor it. Jim proposed that we present the Institute at the meeting, since a large number of pastors, missionaries, and other Christian workers would be there. We talked to Bruce about it and he gave us permission.

The meeting took place in the third week of July. During one of the services, we briefly explained the basics of the Institute, then we presented Drs. James Singleton and Jerry Tetreau of IBC with their own special edition copy of our catalog. At the end of the service, we provided the other attendees with regular copies.

*Registration.* We also planned our first registration. We set the date for Thursday, August 5th, from 7:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. We drew up a procedure, complete with a layout...
of tables, chairs, stackable trays, and files. One of our instructors was appointed as the Registrar, and Jim served as the Business Manager.

*Faculty orientation.* We had our first instructor orientation on Sunday afternoon, August 17th. Each administrator discussed their area of expertise. We went over the *Guidelines for Instructors,* the faculty calendar, the grade book, course forms, final grade forms, the textbook data order form, library policies, the student mailboxes, the Institute bulletin board, Christian service ministries and reports, and guidelines for student papers.

*Student orientation.* We held a student orientation on Sunday afternoon, August 22nd. We covered the same basic information as in the faculty orientation, with each faculty and staff member discussing their specific area of responsibility.

*Installation (September 4, 1999).* We debated about what to call this, so I looked up the definitions of *installation, commissioning, inauguration, ordination, authorization, christening, dedication, investiture,* and *commencement.* We settled on *installation.*

We decided to hold the service at the beginning of the fall trimester. It just so happened that Dr. Les Ollila, the president of Northland Baptist Bible College, and Dr. Tim Jordan, the president of Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, would be in Fairbanks during that time, so we thought it would be good to involve them in it.

The installation service took place on Saturday evening, September 4, 1999 (HABI, *Catalog,* 1999). Jim explained the purpose and programs of the Institute, and I reported on its status and progress. Dr. Ollila preached the message. The members of the church stood in a vote to recognize the Institute as one of its ministries. Bruce appointed Jim as Dean of the Institute, then Jim appointed Marshall as the Chaplain and me as the
Academic Dean. At the end of the service, Jim presented Drs. Ollila and Jordan with special edition copies of the catalog, and Marshall closed the service with a prayer of dedication (Hamilton, 1999). Afterward, someone took a group picture of the major participants.

The 1999 – 2000 Academic Year

During the first year, we revised our catalog to incorporate some policy changes. We also made plans to have a special lecturer come up from the lower 48 states during the winter, but as the events unfolded we decided to have someone else come up during the summer instead. This one decision led to a real turning point in our college.

Policy changes. During the year, Jim and I made several decisions. First of all, we agreed that he would be the acting business manager and I would be responsible for registration. In October, we decided that no instructor would teach more than one course per term, and that a married instructor would not be asked to teach when their spouse was teaching. In April of 2000, we talked about who would teach the next year’s courses, and in May of that same year we determined that instructors could audit courses free.

We agreed that we should require students to apply for admission so that we could control who attended classes. We planned to have a meeting on Sunday evening, April 2, 2000, for church members who were interested in applying for the Institute, but then rescheduled it for April 19th. At the meeting, we informed the students that they would have to apply for admission if they wanted to take classes in the fall, then we explained the enrollment procedure. Twenty-two people took application packets. We took down their names and later added eight others who we thought might be worth contacting.
I drew up a master schedule based on a two-year rotation of courses, and from that I created a schedule of classes to add as the first group of students needed them. This also prevented them from taking courses before they took the pre-requisites. In October of 1999, and again in April of 2000, I proposed that we expand the CLCM to include either church music or church education. Then, in March of 2000 I suggested that we add a missionary aviation to our ANTM. Neither proposal was pursued.

At the church’s Annual Strategy Session on March 1, 2000, the members voted to give the Institute a $1,000 gift. Eventually, this would become a permanent part of the church budget and, with the exception of one year, would steadily increase.

During the planning phase, Marshall had asked about accreditation. Bruce suggested that we schedule a luncheon with Dr. Singleton in order to get his advice about this while he was in Fairbanks for the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship meeting. He also recommended that we do this with Drs. Ollila and Jordan when they came in the fall. We later tried to establish a credit transfer relationship with Maranatha Baptist Bible College in Watertown, Wisconsin, and International Baptist College in Tempe, Arizona. I obtained some information on criteria for credit transfer, as well as the address for TRACS, and passed them along to Jim. Sometime around May 29, 2000, Jim and I also talked about getting endorsements from Drs. James Singleton and Jerry Tetreau of IBC, from Drs. Sam Horn and Les Ollila of Northland Baptist Bible College, and from Detroit Baptist Theological Seminary, but we never acted on this.

By mid-March of 2000, we had revised the student handbook, catalog, and some of the forms. We made 38 major revisions to the catalog alone. The revised edition of the
catalog included a full-color picture of Pastor Hugh and Aunt Sue standing in the new chapel that had been dedicated in memory of their son Jonathan. The chapel is located at Camp Challenge, which is owned by the church. Bruce presented a special edition to them on April 23, 2000, the thirty-first anniversary of their coming to Alaska.

From 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. on Saturday, May 13, 2000, we held an orientation in which we familiarized the staff and faculty with the changes. Marshall, Jim, Bruce, and I spoke on various issues. Afterward, we all enjoyed a potluck meal together.

*Summer session 2000.* After the Fundamental Baptist Fellowship, Bruce talked with Dr. Singleton about holding a modular course on church administration or church planting during the winter of 2001. They decided that January 8 – 14, 2001, was the earliest they could have it (Haning, handwritten note regarding Dr. Singleton’s proposed course outline). We later revised the dates to January 6 – 13, 2001. We also decided to include the times that Pastor Bruce’s Timothy Club met, as well as the hours that students helped establish the church at Eielson. During the fall of 1999, however, Dr. Singleton developed cancer, and by late December he had to withdraw his commitment.

In a memo dated September 3, 1999, I notified Jim that he was slated to teach Baptist History in the spring. He responded that he would like to have Dr. David Burggraff teach the course in a summer session. Dr. Burggraff, a professor at Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, had taught the course as part of Jim’s master’s program. In October, we discussed what progress was being made. On January 10, 2000, Jim faxed Dr. Burggraff, thanking him for considering his request, and by January 16, 2000, he had been able to get a commitment from Dr. Burggraff.
In a memo sent January 16th, I asked Jim about some related issues: (a) What texts did Dr. Burggraaff want to use, and would he provide us with a course introduction? (b) Do we need to get any resources for our library? (c) Could we get the assignments ahead of time? (d) Can we do the grading? (e) Is it alright for us to allow the students time to complete the written assignments afterward? (f) Can he tell us what he plans to cover in each session so that we can advertise, especially for the regular church services? Dr. Burggraaff sent us the assignments and a list of resources to get for the library. They were equivalent to a seminary level course, so I asked if he could shorten the list and reduce the assignments to fall within the school’s guidelines for course loads.

We had also planned to use regular church services for some of the lectures so that non-students could benefit. By February 13th we had set the dates for July 9 – 16, 2000, and had scheduled registration for April 14, 2000. Seven people registered. The sessions were excellent and appeared to hold the interest of all who attended. Naturally, this prompted Jim to propose that we have Dr. Burggraaff come back the next summer.

Jim had also suggested that we ask Dr. Burggraaff’s advice regarding the Institute, so we met on Sunday afternoon, July 9, 2000, in the Hamilton Acres Baptist School Learning Center. His main suggestion was that we seek college-level degree-granting status from the state of Alaska. For one thing, this would allow veterans to use their benefits to pay for their schooling. He thought it would be good to contact Alaska Bible College in Glenallen in order to find out what was involved. He also suggested that we get in touch with Maranatha Baptist Bible College to see if they would make us a satellite of their school.
He emphasized that we definitely should not call ourselves an “institute,” because it would be considered little more than a glorified Sunday school. Instead, we should have the word “college” in our name. Our name should also have a regional orientation, rather than be tied to the church. “Fairbanks Baptist College” sounded good to him.

In seeking degree-granting status, he said we would have to justify our program with a mission statement. He added that it was up to the state to confer degree-granting status. The Department of Education in Washington, DC, also had minimum standards that had to be met. He suggested applying to the American Association of Christian Colleges and Seminaries, of which he was vice-president, as well as contacting the Association of Christian Schools.

He advised us to establish a governing board, with people from various walks of life—the pastor and deacons, businessmen, other pastors, and personnel from other colleges. He also proposed that we teach our courses in modules, perhaps four per year. Then he recommended that we get legal counsel and mentioned the Christian Legal Association (CLA). We brought up the fact that we did not have enough qualified teachers, particularly in the area of science and math. He responded by saying that our students could take the courses through the university and apply them to our program.

Dr. Burggraff also strongly advised us to show the ACPE that we were serious about doing what was right by enrolling in a Master of Education degree. He felt this would make them more willing to award us degree-granting status. Meeting with him was a turning point in the history of the college. That night, I went on the internet and downloaded the ACPE regulations from the Alaska Legal Resource Center (2000).
On the following Sunday afternoon, July 23, 2000, Jim and I met with Bruce and Marshall to discuss Dr. Burggraff's advice and to make some recommendations about the direction we should take. We discussed: (a) degree-granting status; (b) accreditation; and (c) our name. The last topic took up most of the discussion.

We proposed the name “Fairbanks Baptist Bible College.” Bruce asked us to give a rationale for each term. We explained that “Fairbanks” would be more widely known geographically than “Hamilton Acres.” We would want to include “Baptist” because it was important to distinguish ourselves from other Christian groups. The word “Bible” indicated that we were training people for Christian ministry, and would show that we were not a Christian liberal arts college offering a wider variety of programs. Finally, it was important that we call ourselves a “College” as opposed to being an “Institute,” since this would make our credits more readily transferable. Even after that, Bruce did not appear to be completely convinced. He may have thought that people would confuse the school with Bible Baptist Church, which is also located in Fairbanks. Nevertheless, we maintained that every term was necessary, and when we stated that Dr. Burggraff had in essence suggested the title, he agreed to it.

The 2000 – 2001 Academic Year

During the second year, we implemented our new admission policy, encountered some new issues, and applied for degree-granting status. I also enrolled at UAF.

Furthering my education. Jim and I agreed that one of us should get a Master of Education degree. However, he already had his hands full. He was principal of the day school, was working on a Doctor of Ministry degree, and still had young children at
home. We also knew that his degrees were not from regionally-accredited schools, so we figured it would be difficult for him to get into UAF's graduate program. After some discussion, we decided that I should get the degree. Furthermore, as an employee of the university, I could take courses tuition-free.

In the fall of 2000, I enrolled at UAF as a non-degree student so that I could start taking courses while pursuing the application process. I encountered two obstacles in my application. First, my undergraduate degree was not from a regionally-accredited school. However, the university accepted my master's degree in lieu of it because the seminary was accredited by the North Central Association. Secondly, I did not have any experience in the field of education. Apparently they changed their minds about this after I showed them our Catalog and the material I had drawn up in establishing the school. I was accepted into the program in the spring of 2001.

The Master of Education program at UAF requires three hours in cross-cultural education (UAF, Catalog, 2002), but I wound up taking nine hours, including Education and Socioeconomic Change, Small Schools Curriculum Design, and Educational Administration in Cultural Perspective. These courses, along with the cross-cultural experiences I had while I was growing up, were a significant factor in the development of our curriculum after we became a college.

Because I was academic dean at the Institute, the School of Education thought I was applying for the educational administration program offered in Anchorage (UAA), rather than the one in curriculum and instruction at Fairbanks. However, the program at UAA prepared K–12 principals and superintendents, whereas I was interested in higher
education. The program at Fairbanks was also more versatile. As it was, I still wound up taking over half of my courses in educational administration because of the way the classes were scheduled. However, this proved to be of some benefit when I became the dean of the college later.

*Implementing a new admission policy.* By May of 2000, only six students had applied under our new policy. Fall registration took place on Sunday, July 30, 2000. Seven people registered. A few more registered for the winter. This discouraged us, so in November we conducted a survey of people who had taken application packets, including those who had enrolled and those who had not. The survey was a questionnaire that I used as an assignment in my Introduction to Applied Social Science Research course at UAF. The results showed that people did not have time to take classes. Those who had not enrolled also said they would be more likely to do so if the school was accredited. However, applications increased notably when we offered Introduction to Christian Music, advertised it as being a help to choir members, and provided a financial incentive.

*Facing new issues.* Several new issues came up during that year, but we only made decisions on a few of them, since we had to focus on our status with the state.

In June, we were faced with a challenge when a young man from out of town enrolled and needed a place to live. We let him stay in a room in the church and made one of the windows into a fire exit. He cleaned the church as payment for his room.

During November of 2000, our library also became an issue. Originally, it was located in a storage closet across from the school office, but the church and day school also kept unused furniture, file cabinets, and boxes of Sunday school material in there.
This made it difficult to get to the books. So we decided to move the library downstairs to one of the larger Sunday school rooms, where it has been ever since. After that, we were able to have someone arrange the books and start cataloguing them.

We also fine-tuned our policy on grades during November of that year.

As we were conducting the November registration for the winter term, Jim proposed either going to a semester system or adding more hours to our class sessions in order to make them equivalent to a semester. I agreed, but felt we should do it when we applied for our new status. By January 1, 2001, we were seriously considering going to semesters, but this meant that our program would exceed the American Association of Community Colleges' limit for an associate's degree (AACC, "Associate of Arts," 1984). It also forced us to decide between the associate of arts degree, which requires 30 hours of general studies (AACC, 1984), and the associate of applied science, which only requires 15 hours (AACC, "Associate of Applied Science," 1986). We later adopted the associate of applied science model (AACC, 1986) because we could use our existing courses to meet the general education requirements in an interdisciplinary manner.

Pursuing authorization to operate. Beginning in July of 2000, we started to look into the issue of authorization to operate. The situation became critical when we realized that we were not in compliance with state law and needed to act immediately.

1. Conducting initial research. The day after our meeting with Dr. Burggraff on July 16, 2000, I drew up an impact statement with regard to degree-granting status. By September 27th, I had downloaded the ACPE’s entire regulations and had obtained a copy of the Association of College and Research Libraries’ requirements (ACRL, 1994).
On October 1, 2000, I drafted a research proposal for my Introduction to Research class. It was entitled, "Fairbanks Baptist Bible College: Determining our Options with Regard to Authorization to Operate as a Postsecondary Institution." It suggested four steps: (a) obtain and interpret an official copy of the ACPE material; (b) determine our level of compliance; (c) determine each option available to us and the level of difficulty in achieving it; and (d) present the findings to the institute administration for their consideration. I presented it to the class on December 3rd.


This is a condensed, edited, and even re-arranged version of the Regulations of the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education, 20 AAC 17. Its purpose is to provide a clearer restatement of those statutes, one which is more relevant to our situation. Comments appear in 10 pt. font. (p. 1)

On January 3, 2001, I made a list of the tasks that had to be completed in order to apply for authorization to operate. It had several columns: (a) one for the task; (b) one for the primary actor; and (c) one for the secondary actors[s]. There were also columns for due dates and cost, but I left them empty. By January 13th, I had re-arranged this list into three phases: (a) preliminary investigation of the material; (b) preparation of the program and policies; and (c) presentation of the plan to the faculty. This time the date columns were filled in. The first task was to be finished by February 28, 2001, and the last was to be done by June 1, 2002. It was not long, however, before our plans changed.
On February 5th, I ordered three sets of literature. First, I sent for copies of the American Association of Community Colleges’ policies on *The Associate of Arts Degree* (AACC, 1984) and *The Associate of Applied Science Degree* (AACC, 1986). They came shortly after February 13th. I also ordered two booklets from the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO). These were the *Academic Record and Transcript Guide* (AACRAO, 1996) and *Retention of Records* (AACRAO, 2000). Finally, I sent for two copies of the *Accreditation Handbook* of the Northwest Association of Schools and Colleges (NASC, 1999). The letter was returned to me unopened. After finding a more recent address under the Commission on Colleges, I sent for them again on February 24th, and received them shortly after February 27th.

In the meantime, I also contacted a lawyer. He urged me to be very candid with the ACPE. He specifically advised me to let them know that we were serious about providing a quality educational program. The commission deals with all kinds of schools, he stated, and their main concern was whether or not we were trying to rob the state of financial aid. Above all, we must convince them that we are operating in good faith.

2. *Contacting the ACPE.* Joe McCulley and his family returned to Fairbanks in the summer of 2000. The church hired him as an assistant pastor in order to provide him with an income while he started the church near Eielson. By September 27th, the issue of his involvement in the Institute had come up. Bruce wanted him to help with the pursuit for college status, so we gave him the task of looking into the legal matters. Apparently, he had contacted the state and had received a packet from the ACPE by priority mail. It was postmarked February 20, 2001.
On February 23, 2001, we held a faculty meeting in which we presented an agenda for seeking degree-granting status. We explained that Jim, Joe, and I would be doing the primary investigation into authorization to operate. We would research legal, administrative, financial, and academic matters. We also stated our options: (a) close the Institute; (b) offer non-credit classes at cost; (c) become an extension of an existing college, such as Maranatha Baptist Bible College; or (d) go for degree-granting status. The church leadership and institute administration would make the final decision.

We then described what the end product would look like and established some goals. On April 15th, we would give the faculty more materials, then we would discuss the whole situation at a meeting on May 1st. On May 15th, they would vote on whether to pursue degree-granting status.

On March 31st, I wrote to Dr. Jerry Tetreau at IBC, asking if we could become an extension of that college, and if so, what would be required of us. I never heard from him.

3. Realizing that we were not in compliance. During the spring, Joe became more involved in his church-planting activities, so I was asked to take over the legal matters regarding our status with the state. Then the ACPE called the church just prior to April 1st and asked us to send them a brochure describing our programs. Realizing that we were not in compliance with the ACPE, and not knowing what their reaction would be, we were faced with either confessing our mistake or adjusting our literature to reflect what we thought they wanted to see. In an email attachment to Jim, I proposed . . .

. . . that we (a) provide a statement to the students to the effect that we cannot presently grant an associate’s degree or courses for credit; (b) send a slightly
revised copy of our present catalog to the ACPE with a letter of explanation to the effect that we were in error, but ignorantly; (c) provide them eventually with a revised program that would exempt us from seeking authorization to operate; and (d) apply for exemption and then throw ourselves at their mercy. (Loriot, personal communication, April 1, 2001)

The next day Jim asked if we could meet just prior to the Wednesday evening service to discuss the issue. In our meeting, we decided that I should contact Jo Anne Hayden, the Program Coordinator for the ACPE, to see what we must do. I called her that week, and she responded that we may be closer to authorization to operate than we think. She reassured me that we would be okay for the time being if we:

1. Send out the disclaimer letter to the students.
2. Refrain from advertising, marketing, or promoting the school for now.
3. Avoid recruiting any new students until our status is determined.
4. Maintain a reasonably constant dialogue with the ACPE . . . by sending them documents, applications [for exemption or authorization], and asking them questions . . . . One of the important things is for us to get into the system as wanting to comply. (Loriot, personal communication, April 6, 2001)

At Ms. Hayden’s request, I sent her a four-page letter on April 6th. I gave a short history of the Institute, told her what we were doing to comply with her instructions, and explained how we would revise our catalog and policies to qualify for degree-granting status. Then I asked some questions about our status.
By April 15, 2001, I had written to Dr. John Brock, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Maranatha Baptist Bible College, asking him about operating under their status as an accredited college. On May 2nd, he responded that this arrangement would be very difficult, and included a list of criteria that Maranatha had established for transfer of credit from other institutions.

Meanwhile, Ms. Hayden wrote back on April 27th. “Our suggestion . . . ,” she said, “would be that the Institute make immediate Application for Exemption” (personal communication).

4. Determining our options. Jim and I met that week to discuss her letter and talk about our options. Bruce and Marshall may have been there, but I have no record of it. The ACPE allowed exempt status for religious organizations, so I presented this scenario:

The following characteristics represent the restrictions and benefits I believe we will face under Exemption Scenario #6:

1. Limit instruction to that which is sponsored by and conducted solely for the membership.


3. Offering and providing postsecondary education solely in the form of religious training to persons who hold or seek to learn the particular religious faith or belief of that religious organization.

4. Include a conspicuous statement on marketing, admission, and enrollment materials advising that the instruction is exempt from State of Alaska authorization requirements.
5. Some funding, though more limited than if authorized.

6. As always, transfer of credit is still at the discretion of the receiving institution.

7. Instruction not available to other than members only.

8. Graduates not being trained to make a living outside of the religious organization, i.e., non-vocational training only.

9. Training only to prepare students for leadership positions on a volunteer basis to perpetuate your own church.

10. Exemption status provides a temporary time frame in which to pursue authorization.

11. Use of the terms ‘Bible College’ in the name of the institution may be permitted [?]. (Loriot, “Exemption Scenario #6,” 2001)

As a result, we drew up a list of 11 questions to ask Ms. Hayden, and I typed them up in order to have them ready when I called her. The questions were:

1. Does she have an email address by which we could correspond more quickly?

2. Under exempt status, would we have to eliminate our vocational courses?

3. Would it be better for us to apply for exemption first, then work toward degree-granting status?

4. What is the definition of a “religious organization” under 20 AAC 17.015(a)(6)? Is it a local church, a denomination, or could it be a loose association of like-minded churches? 20 AAC 17.015(a)(6) requires that our graduates ‘not make a living outside our religious organization.’ In other
words, could we train men to minister in other independent Baptist churches?
Would it be out of the question for us to train someone to establish and then pastor another independent Baptist church?

5. Can we qualify for exempt status if we retain these vocational courses and use the term ‘Bible College’ in our institutional title under 20 AAC 17.065.

6. Would this be a good time to change our name?

7. If we qualify under 20 AAC 17.065, could we state that we are exempt from authorization to operate, then specify that we are a two-year Bible College training men to be pastors and missionaries?

8. If we file for exemption, what credential would we offer—a ‘certificate,’ a ‘program,’ or a ‘curriculum’?

9. Would the CPM, CLCM, and CNTM be separate programs under exempt status?

10. If we pursue authorization to operate, can we continue to offer our vocational courses while we are under review?

11. Authorization to operate requires us to have one full-time supervisor and two full-time department heads, one for general education and the other for the major. (a) Can the supervisory role be distributed among the instructors, so that only two individuals need to be full-time? (b) What is the definition of ‘full-time?’ (c) Can the department heads also serve as employees of the church, dividing their time with other roles? (d) Are the requirements for department heads any more stringent than those laid out for the faculty?

(Loriot, “Questions: Clarification,” May 6, 2001)
According to a letter from Ms. Hayden on June 6, 2001, I had called her on Monday, May 7th. I wrote down her responses as we talked (appearing in quotes below), but I do not have answers to all of the questions, so I may have skipped some.

She gave me her email address, but there is nothing written after question #’s 2 or 3. As for question #4, I have no clear definition of a religious organization here, but she stated that “making a living” meant getting paid for what they did. She added that the individual could “strengthen or maintain the current [church], [or] expand [it].” She also said that it would not be out of the question to train someone to establish and then pastor another independent Baptist church. As for question #5, she directed me to page 48 of the ACPE Regulations (2000), subsection (b)(5)(B) of 20 AAC 17.065, which implied that we would be “exempt from a specific aspect,” as she called it. Taken together, these sections indicate that for . . .

. . . INSTITUTIONAL AND COURSE NAMES . . .

(b) A postsecondary educational institution may not use the term . . . ‘college’ . . . in its name unless it meets the following minimum standards, respectively: . . .

(5) a school or branch of a school, otherwise exempt from regulation by the commission under law, and substantially owned, operated, or supported by a church or religious organization and exempt from taxation under 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3) as a religious organization, may use the term ‘college’ or ‘university’ with terms describing its religious focus, such as ‘Bible College’ or ‘Theological University,’ if that school or branch of a school meets the following:
A) its programs are designed for, aimed at, and attended by persons who hold or seek to learn the . . . beliefs of that church or religious organization;

(B) its programs are intended to prepare its students to become ministers of, to enter into some other vocation closely related to, or to conduct their lives in accordance with the particular faith or beliefs of that church or religious organization; and

(C) its advertisements, solicitations, and representations to students or prospective students are clearly limited to these purposes, and do not advertise or represent the provision of general education programs or of their programs as being substantially similar or equivalent to those institutions meeting the requirements of 20 AAC 17.010 – 20 AAC 17.030 and 20 AAC 17.205 – 20 AAC 17.250. (ACPE, “Regulations,” 2000, p. 48)

As we understood it, subsection (5) implied that we could use the term “Bible College” in our name, if we met the conditions under (A) and (C). Subsection (B) appeared to allow us to train pastors and missionaries, provided we fulfilled those same qualifications. Apparently, I did not ask question #6, since her answer to question #5 would have taken care of it. Furthermore, there is no written response beside it. As for question #7, she replied that if we limited the nature of our instruction to vocational courses, as opposed to a liberal arts program, we could declare our exempt status and then specify that we are a two-year Bible College training men to be pastors and missionaries. Her basis for this must have been 20 AAC 17.065 (b)(5)(B). She also stated
that we would be offering certificates (question #8), and that each program would be separate (question #9). She said that she needed to check into question #10.

In response to my question about full-time personnel (#11), she agreed that the supervisor’s responsibilities could be divided between the two department heads. She pointed out that the regulations (ACPE, 2000) only stated the need for a supervisor who is responsible for the institution without specifying full-time status (p. 53). However, she noted that the department heads had to be full-time (p. 68). As far as the department heads being church staff members, she replied that the issue was commitment level, not a specific number of hours devoted to either position. Finally, she said that she would check into the question of whether department heads had to meet certain requirements.

After discussing Jo Anne’s responses, Jim and I decided that even though we were still unsure about whether we could prepare pastors and missionaries for vocational ministry, our library was the only thing keeping us from pursuing degree-granting status.

During the summer of 2001, we looked at several options. (a) If we could set up a cooperative agreement with the University of Alaska Fairbanks’ Rasmuson Library and the North Star Borough Noel Wein Library, we could go for authorization to operate. (b) If we could establish a relationship with an out-of-state accredited college such as IBC, we could offer a degree and not have to worry about authorization. (c) If we applied for exempt status, we would be approved. This was the option I continued to research.

At the end of May, I emailed Paul McCarthy at the Rasmuson Library and Greg Hill at Noel Wein Library. I described our situation and asked if we could set up a cooperative agreement with either of them. Both men responded immediately. Greg Hill
asked if I would allow him some time to look into the matter (personal communication, date unknown). Paul McCarthy explained that the two libraries already had a reciprocal agreement. He also mentioned that UAF did not have many holdings in theology, so they were not prepared to support such a curriculum (personal communication, June 6, 2001).

Sometime between May 31st and July 6th, I called Greg Hill and talked with him about the agreement. I also let him know that I had been corresponding with Paul McCarthy. In an email to him on July 6th, I asked if he had been able to get with Mr. McCarthy about the agreement. Then, on July 11th, I received an email from Rheba Dupras at the Rasmuson Library, explaining that the library department heads had discussed our request and that they did not want to “enter into an agreement that would imply or obligate [them] to a commitment to support another institution’s curriculum” (personal communication). She did mention that the agreement between Rasmuson and Noel Wein gives limited privileges to any borough resident who has obtained a card from the university, borough, or school district libraries (Dupras; compare McCarthy, personal communication, July 19, 2001). Two days later, Greg Hill wrote back and expressed the same opinion. He emphasized that their mission is to help individuals rather than institutions (personal communication, July 13, 2001).

At the same time, Jim and Bruce were still interested in setting up a relationship with IBC, but as of July 19th they had not heard anything. On July 24th, Jim emailed me to the effect that Bruce wanted us to look into the possibility of becoming a satellite of IBC. Later that day, I talked with him on the phone. He explained that he meant that we should pursue exempt status first, then work toward establishing a relationship with IBC.
On August 23rd, Jim wrote to me, saying that Bruce wanted us to send all of our updated literature for the college to Dr. Tetreau at IBC. Apparently, he was also having difficulty getting a response because he wrote, “I am attempting to extract information from Tetreau regarding the feasibility of becoming an extension of IBC” (personal communication). That Sunday I gave Jim our latest catalog, but I expressed doubts about how easy it would be to make such an arrangement. I reiterated Dr. Brock’s opinion that pursuing authorization to operate was easier than getting another college to sponsor us.

Meanwhile, Jo Anne Hayden and I corresponded with regard to the advantages, disadvantages, and regulations concerning each status. On May 19th, I emailed her to ask when the ACPE held its meetings and how far in advance we would have to submit our application. In a letter dated June 6th, she replied that we could apply for exempt status at any time and that the staff could make an administrative ruling on it, but an application for authorization had to be submitted to the Committee 60 days before the quarterly meeting in which it would be considered (personal communication).

We were also confused about whether or not an exempt institution could grant a degree, and this generated a flood of correspondence (Hayden, personal communication, June 6, 2001; Loriot, personal communication, June 22, 2001; June 30, 2001; Hayden, personal communication, July 6, 2001; Haning, personal communication, August 20, 2001; Loriot, personal communication, August 21, 2001). Ultimately, we decided that an exempt institution could not grant a degree, even if it was of a clearly religious nature.

Sometime around June 7th or 8th, I asked one of my graduate advisors about the qualifications for a department head, since this would have some bearing on whether we
could apply for authorization to operate. She said that a general education department head should at least have a master’s degree, but that it could be in any field, while a major department head must have a master’s degree in the field of the major. She added that we could probably combine everything under one major since we were a small school.

On the morning of June 11th, I called Dr. John Brock at Maranatha Baptist Bible College and asked him about setting up a credit transfer relationship with them. We also talked about the “trimester-based semester” that Jim and I had discussed, and he had no problems with it. He suggested, though, that we establish an articulated agreement with UAF so that our students could get their math and science courses, since at that time we did not have instructors for those classes. He also emphasized that the students need to be convinced that they are getting a quality education for the cost, especially in terms of transferability of credits. He explained that it was a credibility issue.

On the other hand, he advised me to go ahead and apply for authorization. He said we needed to show the students that we were serious about giving them a good education.

I later sent Jo Anne a lengthy email. In it I asked about whether we needed to get legal counsel, the liabilities of exempt status, the similarity between the requirements for exempt status and degree-granting status, and whether we could provide a vocational ministerial education. In this email, I said that . . .

I understood from our last phone conversation that the ACPE will permit the term ‘religious organization’ to include other Separatist Fundamentalist Independent Baptist churches, both established and to-be-established in church-planting missions, as representing a loosely associated movement of autonomous local
churches [a quasi-denomination], for which I am grateful.” (Loriot, personal communication, June 22, 2001)

We felt that the ACPE had made an important concession to us when she did not object to or correct this statement. I also told her that we were trying to establish a cooperative agreement with some libraries in the area. She later responded that our options sounded good (Hayden, personal communication, July 6, 2001).

On June 25th, we were still pondering whether we should just go for authorization since the requirements were practically the same as for exempt status. So I emailed Ms. Hayden again, asking for more clarifications. On June 30th, I also emailed Jim with some practical arguments for seeking degree-granting status. I reasoned that we could get students to enroll by promising them a degree and the financial aid to get it, and that we could only do that if we had authorization to grant a degree. Once again, I appealed to Dr. Brock’s advice, but this time I added that applying for authorization at the time was better than applying for exempt status, then applying for degree-granting status later.

On July 6th, Jo Anne wrote that: (a) transfer of credit and financial aid were factors in choosing which status to pursue; (b) it was not necessary to get legal counsel for either; (c) the commission could give us permission to use the term “college” in our title; (d) there were minimum requirements for both exempt and degree-granting status; and (e) if we were exempted by the commission, enjoyed tax exempt status, enrolled only members of our particular faith, prepared ministers only for our faith, and advertised the fact that our instruction was clearly limited by those conditions, we could call ourselves a “Bible College,” even if we did not offer a degree (Hayden, personal communication).
I called Jo Anne back on July 16th. She said that the commission was looking for tax exempt status and evidence that our program was clearly religious, but that anything else would be helpful. She also said that she would try to expedite our application.

5. Applying for exempt status. Jim sent our application for exemption by certified mail on July 29, 2001, and the ACPE received it on August 2nd. We included a proposal that described our program and a copy of our catalog, since that was a requirement for application. The proposal offered an Associate of Applied Science in New Testament Ministry, because we still thought we could offer a degree as an exempt institution.

Summer session 2001. After it became apparent that Dr. Singleton could not teach in January of 2001, Jim said he wanted to have Dr. Burggraff teach Christian Ethics that summer, especially since the 2000 summer session had gone so well. But by mid-April, Dr. Burggraff was having difficulty fitting it into his schedule, so Jim emailed me to say that he and Dr. Burggraff were considering it for the next year (personal communication, May 14, 2001). I responded by saying that it was beginning to look impractical to have out-of-state lecturers teach our courses. Jim and I then decided to team-teach the course, but because of some changes in Jim’s plans, I wound up teaching it myself. With regard to special summer lectures, I later took the position that: (a) we had capable instructors; (b) we could save ourselves the expense of bringing in an outside speaker if we used our own teachers; and (c) summer was not a good time for courses in Alaska anyway.

Fairbanks Baptist Bible College (September 2001 – January 2002)

Both the ACPE and the church approved the college during the 2001 – 2002 academic year. This change also brought new issues with which we had to deal.
Events

Several events took place between July 2001 and January 2002 which led to our being granted exempt status by the ACPE and receiving recognition from the church.

A New Status

Working with the ACPE during the summer took a large percentage of my time. It kept me from getting ready for registration for the coming trimester. I also had to ask my professor at UAF to give me an extension for the course I was taking.

Delays. By the second week of August, we had still not heard back from the ACPE. This concerned us because we could not enroll any new students until we knew our status. So I emailed Jo Anne. I told her that we could wait on the questions of whether we could use the term “Bible College” in our title and whether or not we could grant a degree, but that we needed to know about our status. I also asked her if the delay was due either to the need for clarification, or to an omission in the proposal.

Exempt status. On Monday, August 20th, Jim emailed me with the news that Jo Anne had called to say that we had been granted exempt status and that we could use the term “Bible College,” but that she was still consulting legal counsel regarding our right to grant a degree. She also confirmed that we could offer a certificate (personal communication). I wrote her the next day to thank her for everything she had done and to let her know that we would settle for granting certificates for now. I told her that the question regarding degrees could wait until we applied for authorization.

Later that evening, I wrote Jim back, telling him I would print the applications, catalogs, and $50.00 coupons so that we could give them to the prospective students at
the Wednesday evening service. After that, I would print out the registration material and give it to them the following Sunday. On Tuesday morning I emailed Jo Anne Hayden to thank her again for her help and to say that we were only going to offer the two certificate programs, unless we heard from her otherwise.

On September 5th, Jim asked me for Jo Anne’s phone number so that he could call to determine if our degree-granting status had changed and to ask her to send written documentation concerning our exempt status (Haning, personal communication, 2001). She wrote back on the 13th, confirming our exempt status, but informing us that exempt institutions do not qualify for degree-granting status (Hayden, personal communication, September 13, 2001). She added that we could file a written request for reconsideration of this in accordance with 20 AAC 17.018.

In a letter dated September 23rd, I thanked Jo Anne again and told her we would not be appealing the Committee’s decision. I let her know I would revise the proposal to reflect our non-degree-granting exempt status and send her a copy. The revised proposal and catalog were ready by October 14th, so I sent them to her. She acknowledged receipt of the items in a letter sent on November 2nd (Hayden, personal communication, 2001).

An agenda. I drew up an agenda subtitled, “An Agenda for the Academic Year 2001 – 2002.” The introductory paragraph states that “the following items need to be taken care of during the 2001 – 2002 Academic year. They will finalize and solidify our exempt status and in turn prepare us for authorization to operate” (Loriot, August 21, 2001). It included 17 tasks:

1. Have the church leadership sign the pledge of commitment.
2. Present the proposal to the faculty for their approval or editing.

3. Present the proposal to the church for approval and commitment.

4. Revise the policy manual concerning organizational issues, job descriptions, full-time positions, procedures, and academic freedom vis-à-vis our doctrinal statement.

5. Obtain an embossed seal of the college logo.

6. Purchase libraries.

7. Finish revising the Catalog and Student Handbook to reflect the new status.

8. Recruit the new church member and his wife as instructors.

9. Get faculty pictures for the catalog.

10. Discuss future programs such as aviation, music, and education.

11. Develop a records retention policy.

12. Move the computer records to the facility.

13. Obtain a “clean” copy of FERPA, to be kept in the office for student perusal.

14. Evaluate charges for tuition and fees.

15. Develop guidelines for Room & Board.

16. Develop a policy for refunding application fees prior to enrollment.

17. Develop housing prospects.

An Administrative Meeting

On September 27, 2001, we discussed these issues at an administrative meeting.

Problems with scheduling. Because the other administrators were full-time pastors, it was often difficult to schedule meetings. Jim was finally able to arrange a meeting with Bruce and Marshall for September 27th.
A preliminary phone call. Earlier that day, Jim called Dr. Tetreau about a credit transfer relationship (Haning, personal note, September 27, 2001). He recommended that we eventually go for accreditation. He suggested that we would have better success with credit transfer in the interim if: (a) we made sure that our class periods met the Carnegie semester unit standard of 12½ clock hours for an academic hour; (b) our curriculum reflected the course requirements; (c) we only used teachers that have a master’s degree or multiple years of experience in their field; and (d) we have set forms for our course syllabi, guidelines for grade evaluation and assignments, and so forth (Haning).

The agenda. We used my agenda, “Concerns Regarding College Status,” as a guide to discuss several issues and make some decisions.

1. Exempt status with the ACPE. We started by discussing various issues relating to exempt status. First, we talked about how we were going to provide housing for single students. It was suggested that we develop a program in which church members could host students, but we recognized that there would have to be strict guidelines. We decided to survey the church members to see if anyone was interested and qualified. It was also suggested that we ask one of the men in our church if he would let our students stay in a set of apartments he owned. These students would have to be at least 20 years old.

Then we discussed the need for faculty and church approval of the proposal for exempt status. We agreed that getting church approval could be handled at the annual church business meeting, which had been moved from March to January, but there was some confusion about what I meant by “faculty approval.” This misunderstanding led to delays in the process. After communicating with Jim about it over the next couple of
months, he came to understand that I did not mean that the faculty had final approval, just
that they needed to buy into the proposal before we presented it to the church.

2. Convocation. The 2001-2002 Catalog originally scheduled our Convocation
Service for August 26th, so we decided to set it for Sunday evening, October 7th. At that
time, Jim and I would inform the church of the college’s status.

3. Class schedules. After that, we covered issues regarding the classes, such as:
(a) when Bible conferences would take place, which was important to know since we had
to allow for them in our schedule; (b) the fact that some of the instructors needed to catch
up on missed class sessions (Loriot, personal correspondence, September 24, 2001); and
(c) who was going to teach the Missions and Christian Ethics courses. The question about
the missions class did not get resolved. Russ was heavily involved in the mission work in
Siberia at that time, so if he taught it, he would have to schedule classes around his trips.

As for Christian Ethics, I stated in my notes that I preferred not to have summer
sessions. However, Jim and I agreed to teach the Ethics class during the summer, with
him handling eight sessions and me taking twelve. This may have been based on whether
or not he could get Dr. Burggraff to come, since Jim wrote himself a note to contact
Burggraff immediately. Afterward, I suggested we use a man who had just joined our
church to help teach the class, but I was told that he needed time get settled in.

4. Student issues. We briefly discussed matters regarding the students, such as
mailboxes, forms, breaks, and an orientation. We decided that a get-together after church
some evening would be the best time for the orientation session. Bruce also asked us to
notify him before we rejected any applications.
5. **Administrative meetings.** I brought up the issue of having regular faculty and administrative meetings. The idea of regular faculty meetings was tabled as unnecessary. It was suggested that we combine a faculty meeting with either a weekend retreat or a social gathering. The pastors agreed that administrative meetings were alright, as long as they only involved Jim and myself, and then they only needed to take place on a quarterly basis. However, I found that even scheduling meetings with Jim presented a challenge.

6. **Finances.** We discussed raising our tuition and fees, paying our personnel, and advertising. I also brought up the matter of increasing the size of our library. With regard to the financial questions, we decided to wait on these until our enrollment was up.

7. **Personnel.** Jim had mentioned that he might be leaving to pastor a church. My copy of the agenda mentions briefly, “a. Jim leaving — position replacement.” Then I wrote “→ [Joe],” meaning that we probably considered making Joe McCulley the Dean.

   We also talked about asking one of our instructors to teach a course in the spring on education in the church. Then we discussed whether to approach a couple who had just joined the church (HABC, *Hamilton Acres Herald*, n. d.) about teaching math and science, since they were qualified to teach these two courses. We decided to wait on both these issues. In the second case in particular, the pastors wanted to give the couple time to settle in, since they had just moved up from the lower 48.

8. **The ACPE and authorization to operate.** We concluded by returning to the discussion about our status with the ACPE. I mentioned that I was going to write Jo Anne Hayden a letter telling her that we were settling for exempt status and that we were not going to appeal their decisions. Then I said I would thank her for being patient with us.
We also talked about imprinting our college logo on the three-ring class syllabus binders, as well as getting it made into a seal. Then we discussed revising our catalog and policy manual to reflect our status with the state. After that, I indicated that I would draw up a retention of records policy to be included in our policy manual.

I closed by mentioning that we needed a 30,000 volume library and two full-time personnel in order to meet the qualifications for degree-granting status. Someone asked whether the ACPE would accept books on CD-ROM. That question was not resolved, nor did we discuss the issue of full-time department heads.

9. Accreditation. After we finished covering the agenda, Jim mentioned his conversation with Dr. Tetreau, and it was suggested again that we pursue accreditation.

Post-meeting agenda. On September 27th and October 1st, I outlined an agenda entitled “Administrative Action Agenda for 2001–2002.” It detailed the decisions we had made, indicated who was responsible for executing them, and specified when each task was to be done. I put asterisks beside the items which had a high priority. When I looked at it later, however, I noticed that less than one-third of the tasks had been completed.

I also attached a personal memo to this agenda concerning an application form for faculty and staff. It implied that we should define the obligations and privileges of the faculty and staff, as well as the extent of their academic freedom in view of our beliefs.

Administrative Review of the Proposal

By October 7th I had revised the ACPE proposal. On October 14th I gave Jim a copy so that he, Bruce, and Marshall could give their input on it. I asked them to initial it after they had looked at it. I later told Jim that I hoped they would approve it quickly so
that we could get it to the faculty before January. By Wednesday, October 31st, they had finished and had suggested several revisions, which I incorporated into the final edition.

Convocation

We held our annual Convocation during the October 7th Sunday evening service. After Marshall led the congregation in some hymns, Bruce opened with prayer and we took up an offering. We then asked the students if they would like to say anything about the benefits they had received by taking classes. A number of them stood and made some positive remarks. Next, Jim and I presented our reports. He read and explained the mission statement of the college and talked about the recent events leading up to its present status. After that, I gave the details of the college’s programs, its current statistics, and our future plans for degree-granting status and accreditation.

When we were done, Marshall gave a short challenge to the church and college and Bruce announced that the proposal would be up for approval by the congregation at the church’s annual business meeting in January. Then he closed the meeting with prayer.

Acquisition of a Librarian

In early November, we appointed a part-time librarian. She was excited about her responsibilities and worked hard to catalogue our books. We budgeted money for her to obtain supplies and to get some reference books describing how to set up a library.

Issues

A New Term System

In 2001, we introduced our new “trimester-based semester system,” but we found that this resulted in an increase in the work load for both the students and the instructors.
New Courses

Earlier, I had set up what I called a “Course Offering Start Up.” It added courses to the schedule as the first wave of students progressed through the program, beginning with the fall of 1999 and ending with the spring of 2005. In the fall of 2001, we had a student who could graduate within two years, so we had to introduce some higher level courses in order to ensure that he could finish. I also added a course on Alaska Native History and Culture to the missions emphasis program (FBBC, Catalog, 2001).

New Enrollment

We were able to begin most classes as scheduled, but could not take applications until the ACPE informed us of our status. However, we had 12 students enroll when they were finally able to apply. At the end of the academic year, we made another effort to recruit more students for the next year. We made a list of students who attended Hamilton Acres Bible Institute, eliminated the names of those who were currently enrolled in Fairbanks Baptist Bible College, and then approached the rest on an individual basis.

Class Sessions

Some instructors had to delay starting their classes, but they were able to make it up. One asked if his class could be moved to Saturday. I was concerned as to whether the students would receive the same amount of classroom time. Jim assured me they would, and said that the change would be made in the spring (personal communication, October 31, 2001). One of the students later told me it was more costly for him to make an extra trip into town for a Saturday class than it was to take one after work on a weekday.
Publication Revisions

We decided to include faculty pictures in the next catalog revision. The catalog was already on computer, so using a digital camera to take the pictures made it easier to incorporate them into it. We also revised the brochure to reflect our new status.

Records

Up to this point, I had kept all the school records and files on my home computer. Knowing that these could be lost or erased, we decided to keep a copy somewhere else. Russ set me up with a program that copied CD’s and I copied everything onto a CD in late December. Jim also had a college seal made for use with official documents.

Grades

At one point I could not handle everything, so I asked Jim to figure the grades. While he was calculating the cumulative grade point averages, he discovered that I had been figuring them incorrectly. After he showed me how to do it, I went back through all of the Institute and College records and corrected the students’ GPA’s.

The Calendar

By late September it became apparent that the college had scheduling conflicts with the church and day school. By January of 2002, Bruce had devised a plan to take care of this. He gave a blank copy of the 2002 calendar to each ministry head, asked them to fill in all the events for their ministry, then said he would publish a comprehensive calendar for the whole church. It was a good idea, but it brought to light the number of conflicts that existed between church and college events. It also showed that the church calendar was based on the solar year, while the college used the academic year. This
made it difficult to publicize college events which took place in the following solar year, since the church calendar did not go that far. I asked Bruce if he could extend the master calendar another six months to include the rest of the college’s academic year, but he didn’t think it would be fair to ask the other ministry leaders to plan that far in advance.

Instructors

Getting instructors became more difficult as we got into the higher level courses. Several had thought they could teach during this year, but now had other commitments. However, I felt that a college obligated us to offer the courses we had advertised.

During the fall, a new couple joined our church. They were qualified to teach math and science (new courses in our curriculum), so we considered asking them to teach. Jim later informed me that they had been approved. For the time being, however, we needed someone to teach a missions course and a class on church education in the spring trimester. As it turned out, I had to teach both. I had not planned on doing this, and I felt it would put me under more of a load than I could handle.

A Monetary Incentive

Beginning in the spring trimester of 2001, we had started offering a fifty dollar coupon toward the price of the Introduction to Music textbook as an incentive to get students to take the class. We believed the ACPE regulations allowed us to do this. In planning for the 2002 Spring semester, we decided to offer it as a certificate which was good toward tuition and fees, including the application fee, but not toward textbooks.
Final Acceptance

A Faculty Meeting

Faculty meetings were as difficult to schedule as administrative meetings. Though we needed to meet as early as October 5, 2001, we were not able to meet until January 13, 2002. On December 29, 2001, I sent a memo to the faculty and staff announcing that we were going to meet to discuss their approval of the proposal to the ACPE. We also gave a copy of the proposal to them at this time. The memo instructed everyone to read through the proposal beforehand and write in any questions or suggestions they had.

On the back of the memo, I explained the basic thrust of exempt status, the process of approval up to the present, and what it meant to be a college. In fact, the memo stated that the faculty are the college. It said that the faculty and staff are a college’s most important asset and that this was why we were asking for their approval. Their input into this decision was crucial. They needed to approve the proposal before it could be presented to the church for final endorsement at the annual business meeting in January.

During the Sunday morning service announcements on January 13, 2002, Jim reminded the faculty and staff to bring their copy of the proposal. We met at Marshall’s house after the evening service and everyone brought a dessert to share. Spouses were invited to come. While eating our dessert, we went through the proposal line by line to see if anyone had any comments. Only a few people had any questions or comments.

The Annual Church Business Meeting

Beginning in 2002, Bruce changed the annual church business meeting from March 1st to mid-January, then he renamed it the “Strategy Session” (HABC, “Strategy
Session," January 16, 2002). Early in December of 2001, Jim informed me that it would take place on January 16th. He later asked me to present the proposal to the church at the meeting (Haning, personal communication, January 16, 2002).

We started the meeting with a hymn and a prayer, followed by a short musical presentation. Then Marshall gave a spiritual challenge and we took up an offering. After reading the minutes from the previous year’s business meetings, the college was the first item of business. I explained the proposal under exempt status, which took about five minutes. After that, Jim called for a vote from the church. The proposal was approved.

The annual budget was the next issue on the agenda (HABC, “Strategy Session,” January 16, 2002). As part of it, the church voted to upgrade the college’s monetary status from a “friend of the ministry” to being a full-fledged ministry. In the former relationship, the church took up an occasional offering for the school. Being a ministry would make it a regular item on the budget. Upon a recommendation from the budget committee, the church allocated a maximum of $1,500 to the school for 2002.

The church also appointed some new deacons, dealt with a constitutional change, confirmed Russ’ appointment as Church Treasurer, and dissolved the budget committee (HABC, “Strategy Session,” January 16, 2002). The meeting was dismissed with prayer.

On Sunday, January 20th, the pastor, deacons, and college administration signed a copy of the proposal in the congregation’s presence (FBBC, “Proposal,” revised October 7, 2001). After that, the college seal was impressed on it. Fairbanks Baptist Bible College had now officially been established by Hamilton Acres Baptist Church and accepted by the Alaska Commission on Postsecondary Education.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

I began this thesis by asking: "Is there a widely accepted process for establishing a college? If so, did we follow it when we founded Fairbanks Baptist Bible College?" I answered the first question in CHAPTER II by formulating a composite process from a number of sources. I explained in CHAPTER III how I wrote an account of the founding of our college. This is contained in CHAPTER IV. Then I showed how coders would use the steps of the composite process to conduct a content analysis of the narrative in order to gather data so that I could compare our approach with the composite process.

In this chapter, I will answer the second question by discussing the results of the content analysis and making recommendations based on the discussion. After that, I will present a revised version of the composite process which I have called "A Recommended Process for Establishing a College." In conclusion, I will propose some possibilities for further study.

The Content Analysis

In this section, I will discuss the organization of the data, give the results, and then discuss the results as they relate to the founding of Fairbanks Baptist Bible College.

Data

We had only one training session, and only two of the three coders were able to attend it. When these two were confident that they could code the narrative, all three of them scanned it for data that fit the 28 steps of the composite process. I had originally intended to create a Master List of the data simultaneously from each coder's Regular
Data Sheets, but I found this too difficult, so I abandoned it two-thirds of the way through the process because I knew I would have to do it with the Special Data Sheets also. So I created a new format for the Master List on my computer, and entered the data into it as I went through each Data Book and Narrative individually. (See Table 4.)

Table 4. Revised Master List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line #</th>
<th>a</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>c</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>SDSA</td>
<td>SDSN</td>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>SDSA</td>
<td>SDSN</td>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>SDSA</td>
<td>SDSN</td>
<td>RDS</td>
<td>SDSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I had inserted line numbers into the margin of The Narrative for the coders to use if they had a question. I used these line numbers as the reference point, rather than the coders’ recording unit numbers, in the first column of this revised Master List. Each coder still had a set of columns, but each column within the set contained different data than the original ones. The first column, labeled RDS for “Regular Data Sheet,” was for units from the Regular Data Sheets. The second column (SDSA for “Special Data Sheet Ambiguous”) contained units from the second column of the Special Data Sheets. The data in this second column took on great significance when I analyzed the coders’ results later on. I put units from the third column of the Special Data Sheets in the third column of the revised Master List and named it SDSN (for “Special Data Sheet New”).

Next, I examined each coder’s Data Book individually. As I did so, I went to the column corresponding to the source of the data and shaded in the cells that related to the
lines the coder had marked as a recording unit. I put their recording unit number in the first highlighted cell and inserted a check mark (✓) if they had indicated that it was an action or decision. Then I typed in the letter designation of the category or categories into which they had placed it. If a recording unit began on the same line that the previous one ended, I put a forward slash mark (/) before it. This was the procedure for units in the RDS column. When I typed in the data in the SDSA column, I separated the letters with a semi-colon (;). As I entered the information in the SDSN column, I included the coder's designation for the new category. After I completed this table, I could see at a glance how each coder categorized a portion of text and could compare it with the others' results.

Then I drew horizontal red lines in the left-hand margin before and after each section of text that at least one coder had flagged as an action or decision. If more than one person coded it, I only included the common lines of text because the text on either side did not differ from it. This meant I was not counting lines, but sections of text. I gave each block of text a Master List Number (ML#). Later, I found sections which were not actions or decisions and deleted them. I also discovered that I had missed some sections. I gave them a new number by appending a lower-case letter to the previous ML#, and then I added them to the list. Ultimately, I came up with 139 blocks of text.

Results

In order to show the sequence of steps we used, I created a table from the revised Master List and labeled it “Sequence of Steps.” (See Table 5). It had six columns. The first column gives the ML#'s. The second one (“3”) contains the events all three coders classified as occurring at the same time. I highlighted these rows. The third column (“2”)
gives the units on which two coders agreed, and the fourth column ("1") lists units on which none of the coders agreed. The boldface letters indicate corroborating data.

Table 5. *The Sequence of Steps in Founding Fairbanks Baptist Bible College*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML#</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>SDSA</th>
<th>Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A – Develop a vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-/B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O – Develop a curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O – Develop a curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-/H/H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H – State the institutional purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O – Develop a curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H – State the institutional purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O – Develop a curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>-/U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U – Advertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>U/-U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>-/R/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R – Organize the college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>W/-W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/R; U; W</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>R/R/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>-/BB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/G; BB/-</td>
<td>BB – Seek accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46a</td>
<td>M/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/G; BB/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>-/Q/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td>-/Q/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V – Enroll students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>-/V/V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/S/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/S/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L/S/Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V/S/Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O/S/Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U/S/Z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-/D/-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CC — Turning point*
Table 5. *Continued.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ML#</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>SDSA</th>
<th>Step</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>-/Q/Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q – Acquire instructional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q – Acquire instructional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>O/-/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O – Develop curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71a</td>
<td>-/X;BB/X;BB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BB – Seek accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>L/Q/-</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T – Make formal application for state approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>-/Z/Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z – Increase the size of the student body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>-/R/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>-/Z/Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Z – Increase the size of the student body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>T/-/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>-/W/W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W – Hold a public inauguration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>N/W/-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Q/Q/-</td>
<td>-/-Q;R</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Q – Acquire instructional resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N – Gain unofficial approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>P/-/P</td>
<td>-/N/-</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P – Raise funds to achieve financial stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-/S/S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S – Set admission requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>O/-/O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O – Develop a curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P – Raise funds to achieve financial stability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifth column shows the sections of text from the SDSA column of the revised Master List. I used italics to differentiate them from the clearly coded units. Once again, I only included units that were marked as actions or decisions. The last column gives the capital letter designation and the description of the category that the section of text represents. These were added after I analyzed the sequence, so they only represent the categories that are selected in the other columns.

In columns two through five, I separated each coder’s categorization or group of categorizations with a forward slash mark (/). The order is Coder A, Coder B, and Coder
C. If a coder did not record that section of text, their position contains a dash (-). In the SDSA column, a semi-colon (;) separates the coder’s options from each other, and boldface type indicates the SDSA option or options I chose for the analysis.

I felt that adding the SDSA units was permissible because some of the options the coders selected closely corresponded to some clearly categorized units. In deciding which SDSA option to use in the analysis, I adhered to the following principles:

1. When an SDSA option corresponded to another coder’s clear categorization of the same unit, I selected that option by formatting it in boldface type.

2. When a coder listed the same two or three SDSA options in series, I selected the one that matched another coder’s category for that unit by identifying it with boldface type. For some reason, a coder’s SDSA options for a given unit never matched two clear, but disagreeing selections for the same unit. For example, if Coder A categorized an SDSA unit as either R or U, it never happened that Coder B clearly chose Category R and Coder C clearly opted for Category U, or vice versa.

3. When a coder’s SDSA options did not match any other coders’ choice, I indicated this by putting all of that coder’s SDSA options in boldface type.

In deciding which units to include in the final description, I started with the units on which all of the coders agreed the same event had taken place at the same time. Then I added units in which two coders agreed the same event was taking place at that time and which the third coder had included in their SDSA column. These were often adjacent to units on which the coders all agreed dealt with the same category. I combined them with the similarly categorized units to make one event, and shaded them in as major events.
Where two coders agreed on a unit, I gave that event a sort of secondary status by including it in the sequence, but did not shade it in as a major event. Furthermore, even though they may have been included as an SDSA unit or clearly categorized by only one coder, units which were adjacent to similarly coded units were included in the sequence as part of the unit to which they were adjacent. On the other hand, if at least two coders did not agree that a unit should be put into the same category, or it was not adjacent to one on which another coder agreed, I did not include it in the sequence.

When I factored in the SDSA units, they revealed events that the Master List had not. At times, they seemed to add to the certainty that an event was taking place. At other times, there were clusters of units in which I could see events transitioning from one category to another. Some series of events were so significant that I included them in the final sequence, especially ML#'s 58 through 67. (See Table 5.) In this series, the coders could not agree among themselves. They were “all over the map,” so to speak. So I looked up the portion of text in question in the original Master List. It corresponded to the time when Dr. Burggraff, from Calvary Baptist Theological Seminary, advised us to apply for authorization to operate. Apparently, the coders had unconsciously agreed that something unusual was taking place. The various categories do not point to any one activity, and the focused activity which characterized each step in the rest of the process is lacking here. It is like being in the jungle when a flock of birds suddenly take flight from somewhere in the distance. You know that some unseen presence has disturbed them. Using one coder’s designation, I labeled it “Category CC (Turning Point).”
Discussion

Table 5 is the basis for specifying which steps we did or did not use, determining the sequence of steps we followed, and comparing them with the composite process.

The Steps Used

Table 5 indicates that we used the following steps from the composite process. However, they are not in the order in which we used them. According to the results, we:
(a) developed a vision; (b) stated the institutional purpose; (c) gained unofficial approval; (d) developed a curriculum; (e) raised funds to achieve financial stability; (f) acquired instructional resources; (g) organized the college; (h) set the admission requirements; (i) made formal application for state approval; (j) advertised the college; (k) enrolled students; (l) held a public inauguration; (m) strove for academic excellence; (n) increased the size of the student body; and (o) sought accreditation.

The Steps Omitted

From Table 5, I was also able to determine the steps that the coders said we did not use: (a) form a steering committee; (b) conduct a feasibility study; (c) locate some appropriate facilities; (d) gain community support; (e) select a board; (f) obtain expert advice; (g) purchase property; (h) name the college; (i) appoint a president; (j) respond to obstacles; (k) enlist the aid of some influential individuals; (l) evaluate the curriculum; or (m) increase the campus size.

It is true that we did not conduct a feasibility study, select a board, purchase property, or increase the campus size. The last two steps were unnecessary because we already had facilities available and because the time period covered by the narrative did
not necessitate enlarging our campus. It appears that not conducting a feasibility study or selecting a board were the most important omissions we made in the process.

However, the rest of the data seems to be incorrect. If we include column "1" of Table 5, then at least one of the three coders noted that we formed a steering committee, located appropriate facilities, named the college, responded to obstacles, enlisted the aid of influential individuals, and evaluated the curriculum. I would agree. And as I recall the events, we also gained community support, obtained expert advice, and appointed a dean (the president). Most likely, these do not appear because the narrative does not accurately portray what took place. Many times we discussed an issue, made a decision, and acted on it, but the account only indicates that we discussed it. This may be because the report was based strictly on the written records, rather than on my full recollection of events.

*The Sequence Followed*

From Table 5 we can see that Fairbanks Baptist Bible College was established in two cycles separated by a crisis. The summary below demonstrates that the first cycle took place when Hamilton Acres Baptist Institute was organized, and the second one began after Dr. Burggraff’s visit. The numbers in parentheses indicate the ML#. The first clause in each paragraph specifies an event that all the coders agreed occurred at that time. I included 30 and 135 as full events because two coders agreed upon them and the third coder corroborated them in the SDSA column. Later clauses in each paragraph point to events on which two coders agreed. I included event 71a because two coders used the same two categories for it in their SDSA column but divided it into two steps.

*The first cycle.* We began with a vision (1).
Then we worked on developing a curriculum (6). During this time, we started putting together our statement of institutional purpose (7).

We continued to develop our curriculum (8).

We eventually formulated our statement of purpose (22).

We continued to revise our curriculum (23), then we advertised the college (27).

Next, we organized the college (29).

After that, we held a public inauguration (30). We resumed the organization of the college (37). We set admission requirements (40), and revised the curriculum again (43).

Then we raised funds to achieve financial stability (45). We also began looking into accreditation (46), and enrolled some students (57).

*The crisis.* At this time, we experienced a crisis. The coders seemed to agree that we did not clearly pursue any specific activity during this time (58-67).

*The second cycle.* We began the second cycle by acquiring instructional resources (69). After further developing our curriculum (71), we strove for academic excellence (71a) and looked at the issue of accreditation again (71a).

We made formal application for state approval (97). As a result, we increased the student body size (105) and held another public inauguration (133).

Finally, we gained unofficial approval (136) and raised more funds to achieve financial stability (138).

*Comparison of the Two Sequences*

Comparing our approach with the composite process hinges on seven steps that must occur in a specific relationship with each other and the other steps. These steps are:
1. Develop a vision.

2. Select a Board.

3. State the institutional purpose.

4. Gain unofficial approval. (This is for church-related colleges.)

5. Make formal application for state approval.

6. Hold a public inauguration.

7. Seek accreditation.

It appears that we used the following sequence in establishing the college:

1. We developed a vision.

2. We did not select a Board.

3. We stated the institutional purpose.

4. We held a public inauguration.

5. We looked into accreditation. (However, we did not actually pursue it.)

6. We formally applied for state approval.

7. We gained unofficial approval.

Comparing the two approaches reveals that we adhered to the order of the first three steps, with the exception of omitting the second one, but that we really mixed up the sequence when we employed the rest of the major steps.

I also believe that some of the other steps should occur before these major steps take place. For example, before applying for state approval, the college must: (a) locate appropriate facilities; (b) select a Board; (c) state its institutional purpose; (d) name the college; (e) appoint a president or CEO; (f) develop a curriculum; (g) raise funds to
achieve financial stability; (h) organize the college; and (i) set admission requirements (ACPE, “Statutes,” 2000). Furthermore, before a school can hold a public inauguration, it should enroll students. Finally, it is wise for the college to strive for academic excellence prior to seeking accreditation. It appears that our only violation of any of these steps was in holding a public inauguration before we required students to formally enroll.

Conversely, some of the major steps are pre-requisite to some of the minor ones. For example, before a school is allowed to advertise and enroll students, the state must determine its status. The data shows that we advertised the school and enrolled students before we made formal application to the state.

We also repeated certain steps, but this did not mean the process was flawed. In some cases, such as when we revised the curriculum, restructured the organization, or acquired instructional resources, repetition may show that the process is being carried out properly. Holding another inauguration was also normal because it indicated the change from being an institute to being a college. In other cases, repetition signals a problem. For instance, having to repeat the overall process showed that we had omitted something.

Recommendations

This study has provided many lessons that may be helpful in founding a college. The list of principles presented below is not exhaustive, nor is it representative of every case in which a college is established.

Get Formal Training in Educational Leadership

Getting a formal education in preparation for the task of founding a college is better than learning how to do it by experience. Personal experience is important, but
learning from the experiences of others in a controlled educational environment is less painful. We took a lot of wrong turns because we did not know what we were doing. Like Fadel (1971), I would strongly recommend that those who intend to start a college get a doctorate in education prior to establishing a college (p. 112).

Approach the Task with Diligence and Determination

Establishing a postsecondary educational institution requires determination and diligence at every stage—from conducting a feasibility study to meeting the requirements for accreditation. Therefore, formal educational preparation needs to be complemented by a willingness to work hard, especially in researching the issues. Humanly speaking, the one thing that saved us from complete disaster was our determination to find answers.

Familiarize Yourself with the Regulations

In addition to formal educational preparation, an extensive knowledge of state regulations regarding postsecondary educational institutions is absolutely necessary. When we found out that the ACPE regulations existed, we became concerned because we realized we were in violation by having already been in operation for a couple of years. On the other hand, we were also apprehensive about the ACPE’s role in determining the content of our courses, but our fears were alleviated when we took the time to read the fine print in the state regulations. We learned that cooperating with civil authorities in starting a church-related college did not require compromising our religious beliefs.

Develop a Broad Base of Support

Laying a solid foundation is important for developing a stable organization. We focused our efforts on developing a curriculum and organizing the college rather than on
conducting a feasibility study or appointing a board. This is like building a superstructure without having an adequate foundation. A feasibility study may have given us a better idea of the available resources, and having a board may have provided us with a broader base of moral and financial support. It appears that these omissions inhibited our growth.

*Constantly Improve Institutional Quality*

There is always a better way to do anything. Educators should be looking for ways to facilitate learning through an improved curriculum and organization. Fortunately for us, the content analysis indicated that we were doing this consistently.

*A Recommended Process for Establishing a College*

The approach described below is based on the composite process, as well as the results of the analysis. Before presenting it, I will review the sources on which it is based.

*A Review of Sources for the Recommended Process*

Stark and Lattuca (1997) provide the basic elements for developing a curriculum, which includes anything from one course to an entire educational institution (see pp. 113, 124, & 130). Their plan corresponds chronologically to the recommended process, but they focus on the curricular aspects rather than organizational issues. Fadel (1971) listed criteria to be considered in establishing a college, but he seemed to present them in their order of priority rather than chronological order. The five accounts also contributed to the procedure recommended in this section (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969). I corrected the process to meet current standards, using the ACPE requirements (“Regulations,” 2000; “Statutes,” 2000; “Regulations,” 2005; “Statutes,” 2005) and the guidelines of the AGBUC (2000; Ingram, 2003). Then I added
Thornton's (1966) procedure for establishing a community college because it included many important features and confirmed many aspects of the process.

The Recommended Process

This procedure is based on judgments I made about the literature cited above. It is not meant to be a standard procedure, but is provided as a guideline for those who intend to start a college. I will refer to each one briefly except where is added new information.

The theme of this process is the translation of the founders’ vision into a concrete reality that meets the need they perceived as existing. It is accomplished in four stages during which different groups or individuals bear the responsibility for making the vision happen. Each stage culminates with the former entity appointing a new one to take the vision to the next level. This does not mean, however, that the former group is no longer involved. More than likely they are still participants, but they have taken on a role in which they continue to work with the new group. The cooperation is cumulative.

The four entities are: (a) the founders; (b) the Board; (c) the president; and (d) the college as a whole. In the first stage, the founders typically work alone. In the second phase, many of them serve on the Board. When the president is appointed in the third stage, they work closely with that individual as Board members. In the last phase, the original founders, many of whom may still be Board members, continue to work with the administration and faculty of the college to fully accomplish their objective.

The Role of the Founders

The founders seek to persuade others to catch their vision of making an education available to a needy student population. To do this, they must: (a) develop an agenda for
the subsequent groups to enact; (b) prove to the community that the project is feasible; and (c) appoint a board that will provide a solid foundation for the college.

*Develop a vision.* Someone has to realize that people’s educational needs are not being met and must be convinced that they can meet the need (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969; Thornton, 1966). Thornton (1966) adds that the need may be for training not offered by existing schools (p. 104) or for a city to take pride in having its own school (p. 104). A vision provides the reason for founding the school and governs its philosophy, decisions, and curriculum. It may give the founders the hope they need to achieve the goal and the endurance to face obstacles.

Carper and Hunt (1996) state that “a lack of vision is . . . [a] . . . critical problem” (p. 571). They go on to say that “the ‘vision problem’ is particularly crucial for religious institutions . . . [Their best hope is to] tenaciously maintain their faith commitments and offer a distinctive educational program” (p. 572).

*Form a steering committee.* First, the founders should develop a broad agenda for passing the vision on to individuals who will organize the college (Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969). In this capacity, they act as a steering committee. They also conduct a feasibility study, secure facilities for the college, elicit community support, and select a board. They may even look for ways to finance the school (Schindlbeck, 1969).

*Conduct a feasibility study.* Next, the founders determine whether establishing the college is wise (Fadel, 1971; Gribble, 1998; Schindlbeck, 1969; Thornton, 1966). If they believe it is feasible, it is my opinion that this strengthens their vision and provides them with information they can use in persuading the community to support the project.
Secure appropriate facilities. Thornton (1966) mentions that a precursory look at facilities may take place early in the process (p. 109). In the historical accounts I studied, this appeared to be the normal course (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969). Regardless of whether the location is temporary or permanent, securing a place to meet is likely to reinforce the founders' hope, as well as to provide them with something to offer prospective students.

Gain community support. The founders need to persuade the community that a college is needed (Cedarholm, 1988; Fadel, 1971; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969; Thornton, 1966). They are not looking for financial help, but moral or political support, and they may need the aid of influential individuals in responding to obstacles.

1. Respond to obstacles. Thornton (1966) calls this opposition, and he includes disputes over the location of the college under this heading (p. 105). However, the founders will face problems involving more than personal opposition (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969), so I used the term obstacles instead. The founders will use both this step and the next one throughout the process.

2. Enlist the aid of influential individuals. When they are trying to gain the community's support (Thornton, 1966, p. 105; Schindlbeck, 1969), or when they meet with obstacles later (1969), it is helpful if the founders can enlist "a competent authority" (Thornton, 1966, p. 106) or gain the support of local educational authorities (p. 105).

Appoint a board. The final independent act of the founders is to select a board. In many cases, they will serve on the board, so they will continue to function as leaders in the college (Fadel, 1971; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Schindlbeck, 1969; Thornton, 1966).
The Role of the Board

The Board translates the founders’ vision into a governing body that has the power and authority to enact it (Ingram, 2003). They are responsible for ensuring the college’s financial stability, appointing the president (Thornton, 1966, p. 109), and providing a permanent place for the college to meet. Ultimately, their actions shape the philosophy of the school, influence its curriculum, and mold its organizational structure.

Get expert advice. The Board’s first act should be to get expert legal, financial, and academic advice regarding the founding of a college (Cedarholm, 1988; Fadel, 1971; Schindlbeck, 1969; Thornton, 1966). Thornton (1966) suggests that the founders may gain the support of local professionals by seeking advice from them (p. 105). Board members should also research their own responsibilities, as well as the qualifications and duties of the president (Ingram, 2003). This step may be used at any stage of the process.

Articulate the institutional purpose. The Board should then draw up a mission statement with objectives, goals, and aims (AGBUC, 2000; Cedarholm, 1988; Fadel, 1971; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Ingram, 2003; Stark & Lattuca, 1997; Thornton, 1966). This is very important because it will govern: (a) the manner in which finances are secured; (b) the selection of a president; (c) the property purchased; (d) the curriculum; (e) the faculty; (f) the instructional resources; and (g) the organization of the school.

Determine the general content of the program[s]. Based on the school’s purpose (Stark & Lattuca, 1997, p. 13), the Board needs to determine the fields of study offered.

Name the college. The founders or the Board, rather than the president, should name the new college (Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998, p. 6; Schindlbeck, 1969; but see also
Cedarholm, 1988), and it should be undertaken with great care. The name may reflect the college’s purpose (Cedarholm, 1988) or its geographical location (Fisher, 1983).

**Raise funds to achieve financial stability.** The Board also secures the funds for:
(a) paying the president, staff, and faculty; (b) purchasing, maintaining, and expanding the property; and (c) purchasing and maintaining instructional resources, including the library (Cedarholm, 1988; Fadel, 1971; Gribble, 1998; Ingram, 2003; Schindlbeck, 1969).

**Appoint a president.** Once the Board has established the nature of the school and knows what to look for in an administrator, they are responsible for hiring a president who is in agreement with the mission of the college (Fadel, 1971; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987). From this point on, the president is expected to execute the vision of the founders and the Board as it is embodied in the mission statement (1987).

**The Role of the President**

The president is responsible for establishing and executing methods to achieve the vision (Gribble, 1998, p. 6; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Thornton, 1966), albeit in consultation with the Board members regarding every major decision (AGBUC, 2000).

**Draft a plan.** The president should start by determining everything that must take place before the college can open (Thornton, 1966), then he or she must establish a list of priorities in accomplishing them.

1. **Become familiar with the necessary requirements.** Before it formally applies for approval, the college must enact policies which conform to state requirements. This will increase the likelihood of approval on the first visit or review (ACPE, “Regulations,” 2000, 17.020[f]; see also TRACS, “Eligibility Requirements,” 2002). Not only will
subsequent visits be costly in terms of time and money, but the ACPE is also authorized to levy fines of $1,000 per day for each violation ("Statutes," 2000, 14.48.190). These are misdemeanors and may bring up to six months in jail ("Statutes," 2000, 14.48.200).

2. Develop an agenda. Thornton (1966) lists items the president should include on this agenda, and he says that the subsequent steps should be structured around the first one. These include: (a) the date classes begin; (b) where to hold them; (c) a survey of the educational needs of the community; (d) a curriculum; (e) a catalog; (f) faculty; (g) staff; (h) advertising; (i) instructional resources; (j) orientation for the faculty; and (k) the date for student registration (p. 109). Completing each task brings the vision closer to reality.

Purchase property. Tentative sites will most likely have been surveyed during the feasibility study (Thornton, 1966, pp. 109-110), but eventually the president must make more permanent arrangements (Cedarholm, 1988; Fadel, 1971; Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987; Thornton, 1966). In Thornton’s process, the board makes this decision based on the recommendation of the president (pp. 109-110; see also AGBUC, 2000).

Obtain official commitment. In the composite process, I labeled this step gain unofficial approval and relegated it to church-related colleges (Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987). However, Thornton (1966) includes a step called “local election” in which the community votes on whether the college should be established (p. 107).

The two events differ primarily in that commitment to the church-related school may involve the leadership, congregation, or convention (Gribble, 1998; Halm & Hiatt, 1987), while the general populace is asked to support a community college (Thornton, 1966). However, both focus on financial commitment—the one by budgetary allocations
or contributions (1998; 1987) and the other through increased taxes (1966). Apparently, this support increases the likelihood that the founding of the college will be successful.

Establish policies. Next, the president should develop the curriculum and organize the college. Curriculum development, organization, and the formation of a catalog should occur simultaneously. This culminates in the publication of a catalog that can be used to apply for degree-granting status, advertise the college, and train the staff and faculty.

As I see it, the curriculum, organization, institutional purpose, and students’ needs are related. The organizational structure must accomplish the institutional purpose by serving the curriculum and meeting the students’ needs, though the institutional purpose defines the type of student whose needs the college will meet (Fadel, 1971). On the other hand, the curriculum should further the school’s purpose and meet the students’ needs.

1. Develop a curriculum. Developing a curriculum entails three aspects (Fadel, 1971; Schindlbeck, 1969; Stark & Lattuca, 1997): (a) determining the specific features of each program; (b) setting admission requirements; and (c) acquiring instructional resources. Thornton (1966) calls this a survey of needs and says that the president must conduct a great deal of research in order to complete it (p. 110). Indeed, this is one area in which the president should strive for excellence (Fadel, 1971; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998) because it contributes to the school’s growth more than anything else (1983).

1.1 Determine the specific features of each program. A program must achieve two goals: (a) accomplish the mission of the school (Stark & Lattuca, 1997); and (b) meet the students’ needs (Fisher, 1983; Stark & Lattuca, 1997). These are used to determine the various aspects of the curriculum, which are then included in the catalog.
1.1.1 *Sequence of courses.* The courses in each program must be organized so that they maximize student learning (Stark & Lattuca, 1997; Thornton, 1966).

1.1.2 *Learner characteristics.* The college should determine the students' needs, abilities, and goals so that the other aspects of the program will maximize their learning (Stark & Lattuca, 1997; Thornton, 1966). Once again, the kind of student that enrolls in the college should be determined by the institutional purpose (Fadel, 1971).

1.1.3 *Instructional processes.* The president should see that the faculty employs teaching methods that match the courses and students' abilities (Stark & Lattuca, 1997). Job postings must require that instructors be able to use a variety of approaches, and the person who hires faculty must also be familiar with various teaching methods (p. 320).

1.1.4 *Instructional resources.* After the president selects the courses, their sequence, and the methods by which they will be taught, he or she needs to decide what resources have to be available in order to ensure that the students will get the most from their educational experience (Cedarholm, 1988; Stark & Lattuca, 1997).

1.2 *Set admission requirements.* Next, the president should combine the purpose of the institution with the characteristics of each program in order to establish criteria for admission (Gribble, 1998; Schindlbeck, 1969). These must be included in the catalog.

2. *Organize the college.* Like the college's curricular aspects, certain features of the organizational system have to be included in the catalog (ACPE, "Standards," 2000). Therefore, the president will need to create them before publishing the catalog.

2.1 *Prepare a detailed organizational chart.* Thornton (1966) suggests drawing up a chart detailing the organizational structure (p. 112). It must reflect the institution's
purpose (Fadel, 1971), facilitate the curriculum, meet the students’ needs, and include administrative personnel, guidance counselors, and faculty (1966). This should be drawn up before hiring any personnel—possibly even before procuring any equipment.

2.2 Hire administrative staff. The president then needs to hire staff (Thornton, 1966) to aid in administrative duties (AGBUC, 2000, p. 12), assist the instructors in their tasks, and help the students with relevant educational and personal needs (Fadel, 1971).

2.3 Develop a student services program. Thornton (1966) mentions the need to hire counselors (p. 112), but he does not define their responsibilities. Perhaps these are part of Fadel’s (1971) student services, and include such people as a Dean of Students or guidance counselors. The president also needs to prepare student forms (1966).

2.4 Acquire instructional resources. The president will need to obtain all of the instructional resources that will facilitate the learning process (Cedarholm, 1988; Fadel, 1971; Stark & Lattuca, 1997; Thornton, 1966).

2.4.1 Hire faculty. Qualified instructors are probably the most important asset of an educational institution (Thornton, 1996, p. 133), so the president must be very careful in selecting them (Fadel, 1971). It is best for a two-year college to hire teachers who are able to teach a wide variety of subjects, rather than those who are researchers (1971).

2.4.2 Assemble a library. The ACPE (“Regulations,” 2000) requires the library to meet the ACRL’s (1994) minimum standards, based on the curriculum and degree (Fadel, 1971). Formerly, the ACRL (1994) specified a minimum number of volumes for each size and level of institution. They recently revised the standards to say that a school’s library should be comparable to those held by peer institutions (ACRL, 2004).
2.4.3 *Obtain necessary equipment.* Thornton (1966) recommends that the president prepare a list of needed equipment and supplies based on priority: (a) items needed right away; (b) items that are not needed immediately, but which need to be acquired by a certain time; and (c) those items which can be put off until later (p. 113).

*Publish a catalog.* The ACPE ("Standards," 2000) requires the institution to publish a brochure or catalog, and specifies its contents (17.075[1-20]). Thornton (1966) has masterfully described the importance and character of a college catalog, so I have quoted his statement in its entirety:

The catalog will serve the entire district as one of the basic sources of information about the college. For this reason it should be prepared carefully, illustrated attractively, printed in quantity, and distributed widely. It is false economy and penurious public relations to prepare an inadequate number of official catalogs. It is especially important in the first year of the college to provide an impression of permanence and substance to all the patrons, and a well-prepared catalog can contribute measurably to this impression. It should present the history, the purposes, the regulations, and the educational offerings of the college in the clearest and most dignified fashion possible. (p. 112)

*Apply for state approval.* With a sufficient quantity of first-rate catalogs, the president is ready to apply for state approval and, if accepted, to advertise the college. Thornton (1966) puts application for state approval (pp. 106-107) prior to curriculum development and organization (pp. 110-113), but he admits that he formulated his process before state legislation had been refined (p. 90). Prior to applying for authorization,
today’s college president must demonstrate in writing how the state requirements will be met. The catalog is concrete evidence of this. In addition to this, it should be noted that the ACPE (“Regulations,” 2000) requires an application fee and bonding when an institution applies for authorization (20 AAC 17.020[c]).

Because of our view that a separation must exist between religious organizations and civil government, separatist fundamentalist independent Baptists have generally been suspicious of civil establishments when it comes to religious matters. For instance, we are concerned that state agencies such as the ACPE will dictate what we can teach in a Bible college. The commission has stated, however, that “review of the content of education programs and curricula of a religious nature will not involve the merits of the religious teachings” (ACPE, “Regulations,” 2000, 20 AAC 17.020[h]; see also “Regulations,” 2005). Perhaps this policy and similar policies in other states will increase the trend toward cooperation with state commissions and accrediting agencies.

*Prepare for the commencement of classes.* If the college has been authorized to grant a degree, it is ready to take the final steps toward achieving the founders’ vision. However, the school’s new status does not guarantee its success, so everyone must work with renewed vigor. The fact that the college has been approved ought to encourage the personnel and provide them with greater momentum. It may also improve the school’s image in the community, which can make the rest of the task easier. With the assistance of the Board, staff, and faculty, the president now needs to gather a student body (Fadel, 1971), prepare the instructors to work within the college policies (Thornton, 1966), and plan for the school’s opening ceremony.
1. **Advertise.** The president must have a recruitment plan (Fadel, 1971). Various methods may be used for advertising the new school (Cedarholm, 1988; Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998; Schindlbeck, 1969), but Thornton (1966) recommends that colleges focus on high schools (p. 113). Timing, however, is the critical factor. Premature advertising to enroll students is both unlawful (ACPE, “Regulations,” 2005) and unproductive. When it is conducted before the tasks of developing a curriculum, organizing the college, printing a catalog, and obtaining authorization are completed, advertising will create unnecessary work for the personnel, as well as distract them from those important duties.

2. **Enroll students.** Fadel (1971) says that student tuition should provide the majority of the college’s income (see also Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998), so the college should set a minimum enrollment goal. Thornton (1966) adds that the president must specify a time period in which the students may register (p. 109).

3. **Provide in-service training for the new faculty.** In addition to allowing the new faculty time to prepare for their classes, Thornton (1966) strongly recommends familiarizing them with the academic and administrative policies of the new college.

4. **Hold a public dedication ceremony.** The literature seems to indicate that setting aside a day to formally recognize the opening of the school is limited to religious colleges (Cedarholm, 1988; Gribble, 1998). If this is true, the explanation may be that the founders are expressing their gratitude to God for allowing them to bring the vision into reality. I know that this was the case in the founding of both Maranatha Baptist Bible College (Cedarholm, 1988) and Fairbanks Baptist Bible College.
The Role of the College

The vision has been realized, but the task is not over. The Board, president, staff, and faculty still have to focus on some important tasks, such as: (a) constantly improving the college’s curriculum and organization; (b) looking for new and greater sources of revenue; (c) expanding the size of the college; and (d) achieving accreditation—a process which in itself involves periodic review (NASC, 1999).

*Strive for excellence.* To accomplish the institutional mission, the college must make minor changes to constantly improve its curriculum and organizational structure.

1. **Evaluate the curriculum.** The college must periodically evaluate and adjust the curriculum to ensure it promotes the institutional purpose (Stark & Lattuca, 1997, p. 14). This includes professional development and the purchase of more learning resources.

2. **Improve the organizational aspects.** Based on my experiences, administrators will find better and easier ways to operate a college as they encounter new challenges.

*Increase the sources and quantity of revenue.* This will be necessary when it comes to enlarging the campus and meeting the students’ needs (Fadel, 1971).

*Recruit more students.* The president must have a plan for enrolling more students (Fadel, 1971) and may have to hire someone to handle this duty (Bryant, 1982). A good recruiting program: (a) involves all college personnel to some degree (p. 33); (b) stresses the distinctive features of the college (p. 36); and (c) targets specific audiences (pp. 36-37). Bryant mentions that older students are an important population to consider (p. 37).

*Increase the size of the campus.* The size of the campus and the size of the student body should always be in a state of tension (Fisher, 1983; Gribble, 1998). In other words,
the Board and administration should always try to keep the size of the campus larger than the student body, but they should also be trying to use it to its full potential.

*Seek accreditation.* Separatist fundamentalist independent Baptists have differing opinions on this issue. Accreditation is often equated with government funding and the conditions that come with it, but its real concern is with the quality of education (NASC, 1999, p. 28). Furthermore, the primary purpose of accreditation is to benefit the students in the transfer of their credits, though accreditation may help the institution by drawing more students. An institution may also become accredited by an agency such as TRACS, which holds firmly to a distinctively Christian philosophy of education ("Eligibility Requirements," 2002, p. 4). Most importantly, the founders, Board, and administration should all agree on this issue, and a relevant statement should be included in the bylaws.

Where both regional accreditation and national accreditation are available, I prefer regional accreditation because it is generally accepted by all schools, regardless of their status. However, both forms are acceptable to the Department of Education and can be held at the same time by the same institution. This is probably the best situation.

A college may operate for years before it is ready for accreditation. TRACS ("Eligibility Requirements," 2002) requires the school to be authorized by the state (p. 2) and graduate one class before applying (p. 6), so it could be up to four years before some colleges are ready. The most important thing is that the institution be extremely diligent in preparing for accreditation so that it is ready at the first visit (2002). To ensure this, the founders, Board, and administration should familiarize themselves with and conform to accreditation requirements from the very beginning of the college’s existence.
Implications for Future Study

It appears to me that the results of this research can be applied to further studies regarding the college and the recommended process that was developed in this thesis.

*Fairbanks Baptist Bible College*

Application of this study could benefit the college in a couple of ways. First, the narrative could be revised using the recommended process. It could serve as the outline, the criteria for including material, and the basis for explaining why certain steps were or were not included. This may give depth to the narrative, draw in more of the context, and provide a more concise and useful account of the founding of the college. In revising the account, I would recommend transforming discussion into action where this is relevant.

However, a more worthwhile project would be to implement the recommended process in order to make up for the deficiencies in the founding of the college. Then a study could be conducted in 10 or 15 years to determine the effect our initial approach had on the college, whether we implemented the recommended process, and how such an implementation might have affected the college. The research project could be performed in conjunction with an implementation of the recommended process, or it could be done separately. In any case, it would not be part of the evaluations which should take place on a regular basis, but would be an analysis of the state of the college at that time with reference to its implementation or non-implementation of the recommended process.

*The Recommended Process*

The recommended process, as developed in this thesis, may prove to be more useful if the information from the various sections of the paper were combined into one
statement. A more extensive literature review would also make it more. Applying it to other narratives describing the founding of a college and making additions or adjustments where the evidence seems to warrant it would seem to accomplish this goal as well.
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