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Senior College Commission
Western Association of Schools and Colleges
985 Atlantic Avenue; Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501

Dear Commission members:

Woodbury University is looking forward to the WASC team visit in March. Since your 1998 review, we have made astonishing progress in a variety of different areas, which were of concern to the team. I took action, the consequences of which have brought positive results.

Since Woodbury has been and will continue to be dependent upon student tuition for much of the operating revenue, we hired a new leader for the enrollment management program. The results have been heart-warming. We have had a 37% increase in new students during the past two years. One of our goals was to increase our full-time traditional student body and that has been accomplished. We continue with a very strong enrollment picture for the future.

Obviously, one of the problems created when you have more students is that space becomes an issue. The Board of Trustees has made a commitment of more than $2.4 million to upgrade and build new facilities to accommodate the students and their very specific needs, particularly in the areas of design and architecture. Studio space for these programs is now being created. Additionally, a cafeteria building and new classroom space will be built within the next twelve months.

A development program has now been implemented at Woodbury. In the past we had a very small and understaffed Institutional Advancement office. We were reasonably successful with what resources we had. However, by allocating all of the appropriate staffing to this office the improvement has been significant. During the year 2000 we will have raised more than $2 million, which is more than four times the total raised in 1999. All of the signs for the future indicate that we now have a fundraising team and program that will result in finding the resources so that we can accomplish the central mission of the Institution.
A planned giving program has now been developed and we currently have twenty-two members with a potential of more than $7.5 million in gifts. The endowment program is now well under way and within the last forty-eight months we have moved from about $2 million to more than $7 million in this underpinning program.

Our alumni record base has more than tripled in the past twelve months. All of these are good signs and these accomplishments will give us again the tools to carry out the Institution’s goals.

The strength of Woodbury has been, is today and will be a high quality teaching faculty. We are making clear strides in defining and budgeting for the central core of our school. The University administration and the Trustees are committed to continuing our plans.

Technology throughout the campus has had major improvements since 1998, however, we are not keeping up with our written plans. The University will hire a new cabinet level administrator - a chief information officer to help us make decisions. Grants are being written and our operating budget has shown our commitment.

The entire strategic planning process has also been revitalized and is being fully implemented in all aspects of the school. Major progress has been made to integrate these goals into the operating budget as well as finding other resources in order to accomplish the stated objectives. All of these strategic issues have helped us focus clearly on evaluation and assessment of all of the programs within the University and there’s a whole new emphasis on making sure that we are accomplishing our strategic mission, as well as our core values.

Again, we are looking forward to your visit and we will be prepared to give you greater detail on all of the areas that were of concern.

Sincerely,

Kenneth R. Nielsen
President
I. ISSUES CITED IN THE COMMISSION LETTER OF JULY 6, 1998

On March 17-20, 1998, a WASC visiting team reviewed Woodbury University for reaccreditation. As a result of that visit and the review of the self-study, the Commission offered these observations and recommendations in their July 6, 1998 letter to President Kenneth R. Nielsen:

"The evaluation team found much about the institution to commend. The team found that the University is deeply concerned about its students; that it is dedicated to teaching and student development through the creation of an active learning environment; that it provides multiple alternatives to the traditional course format; that it is enthusiastic about faculty efforts to sustain curriculum innovation and improvement; that it is expanding the diversity of its student body; that it fosters respect of cultural differences; and that it is committed to progress in bringing technology to the faculty and providing opportunities to use technology effectively in the delivery of instruction."

The Commission acted to reaffirm the accreditation of the institution, but expressed considerable concern in five particular areas:

"Financial Viability: While it seems that the Woodbury University administration and its Board are committed to maintaining the institution's financial base, the Commission views three recent developments as cause for concern: the recent financial constraints that necessitated the reduction of budgetary expenditures by $1.3 million; the apparent lack of internal budgetary procedures and controls; and the continued reliance on tuition as a primary means of meeting financial obligations."

"Assessment: While there are vigorous and concentrated assessment activities underway on the campus, they are not universal, nor are they integrated. As reflected in the
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evaluation team's report, considerable work remains to be done in implementing assessment of student learning more effectively throughout the institution. The University is encouraged to expand its efforts to assess student learning, while bearing in mind that it is not the assessment activity itself that is important, but how the results of the assessments are applied toward improving student learning and teaching effectiveness. Assessment data can provide meaningful indicators of quality, providing the basis for program improvements and faculty development. The Commission encourages the University to build an infrastructure that will permit the examination of learning goals and provide University-wide coordination of assessment activities."

"Planning: The Commission was pleased that the University has developed some momentum in building upon its strategic plan. The commission believes that this is an important opportunity for the University to develop well-understood planning procedures at all levels. The Commission endorses the team's recommendation that the University develop an integrated planning process. As it moves toward this goal, the University should ensure the integration of technology into both academic programs and administrative services; it should set priorities and assign resources appropriately; it should assure widespread campus involvement in the planning process; and it should incorporate measurements to assess its progress in meeting the goal."

"Faculty: The Commission observed that the adequacy of the core faculty and the faculty workload – both issues that had been identified previously by the Commission – remain items of concern. Although the University has given these issues attention, the commission encourages it (1) to find an appropriate balance between core, full-time faculty and adjunct faculty; (2) to develop criteria for the allocation of faculty workload, being mindful of the various responsibilities it expects faculty to undertake; and (3) to continue the work it has begun in addressing appropriate compensation for faculty."

"Technology:" While the Commission's letter mentioned technology as one of the five areas to be addressed in this special visit, no
specific items were defined. However, the Team Report noted a number of issues, including the need for an integrated student information system, better training for faculty to integrate technology in the classroom, and more powerful and more specialized computing equipment, especially for the majors in design.

As a result of these concerns, and in addition to the reaffirmation of accreditation, the Commission acted to closely monitor the actions of the institution over the succeeding three years. These observations included a progress report delivered on March 1, 1999, the audited financial statements for that year and the next, and a Special Visit focusing on financial viability and planning, assessment, faculty and technology.

The progress report of 1999 was extremely well received. In a July 19, 1999 letter to the President, Erwin Seibel noted both the quality and substantive nature of the report. In addition, the letter commended the institution on the steps it had taken to improve the budgeting process and provide better control of the financial issues confronting the University.

The audited financial statement, on the other hand, was not as well received. In a March 10, 2000 letter from Lily Owyang, the Commission's Interim Report Committee criticized the institution on its growing reliance on auxiliary revenues, a comment the institution finds perplexing in light of WASC's continual exhortation to become less reliant on tuition revenues. A more detailed response to the March letter may be found in Section III A below.

The Commission requested a special visit for March of 2001. This report prepares the team for this special visit.
II. REPORT PREPARATION

Woodbury University prepared this report by focusing on the five specific issues cited by WASC in its July 1998 letter. As a result, those most involved in the actual preparation of this report were the administrators most responsible for finances, assessment, planning, faculty and technology. In addition, the presidents of the Faculty Association and the Staff Association as well as the deans have reviewed this report.

Kenneth R. Nielsen, President
Zelda L. Gilbert, Vice President, Academic Affairs and Dean of the Faculty
Cindy Croft, Vice President, Finance and Administration
Heemanshu Bhagat, Vice President, Student Affairs
James C. Dean, Vice President, University Advancement
Don St. Clair, Vice President, Enrollment Management and University Marketing
E.B. Gendel, President, Woodbury University Faculty Association
Mauro Diaz, President, Woodbury University Staff Association

However, Woodbury University has been working with the WASC recommendations since they were issued in 1998. This work has involved the entire campus community: in writing the new strategic plan, in the assessment of technology needs, in program review, in new budgeting strategies, and in fund raising. This broad participation will be documented as we address each of these five issues.
III. *WOODBURY UNIVERSITY RESPONSES TO WASC RECOMMENDATIONS*

At the time of the March 1998 WASC visit, Woodbury University was just beginning to recover from the fiscal hardships engendered during the previous fall semester. New enrollment projections had been overstated, based on optimistic enrollment goals rather than conservative expectations. Retention was lower than expected because current students, anxious to finish before the University switched from the quarter to the semester system, had rushed to complete their degrees before the new academic year. As a result, enrollment dropped from 1,132 the previous fall to 1,049, while FTE dropped from 955 to 873. In addition, drains on the operating budget due to the implementation of several new programs had not yet been matched by the expected growth in revenues.

The steps taken to balance the budget included reassignments of some staff positions and the elimination of others. In addition, a proposed salary increase had to be delayed for six months and a number of other budgetary items reduced or eliminated. These actions, along with a student retention from fall to spring higher than anticipated allowed the institution to finish the 1997-1998 fiscal year with an operating surplus. In addition, in January 1998 Woodbury was able to fund a 4% raise for faculty and staff and implement the second stage of a new full-time faculty salary schedule.

Ultimately, Woodbury was able to derive significant benefit from the strains of 1997-1998, emerging stronger, better managed, and better focused, and with its revenue generating initiatives intact. Currently we are experiencing unprecedented growth in enrollment and in development revenues.

In this report, Woodbury University will demonstrate a solid fiscal base, significant institutional participation in advanced strategic planning, increased funding to areas of notable concern, and enthusiastic optimism about the future of the institution.

A. Financial Viability and Budget Controls

The Progress Report of 1999 noted that the new CFO, hired just before the 1998 visit, had instituted thoughtful and
conservative budgeting processes. In addition, hiring for new positions, raises for current employees, and some major capital expenditures are now scheduled after the fall enrollments are known to ensure adequate funding. The new team in the Admissions office has proved both extraordinarily capable and prescient as well, so there have been no unpleasant surprises.

In 1998, as in previous reports, WASC urged Woodbury University to develop less reliance on tuition revenues. Woodbury will always be tuition driven. Few institutions have endowments of such magnitude that they are not. However, the revitalized Development Office has created a new environment with expectations of success. With that new consciousness, they have raised considerable revenues that will help the institution achieve its aims. During the 2000 calendar year, the University raised more than $2,000,000 in donations and gifts. In addition, in the past, donations had come primarily from foundations rather than individuals, as is more common. This year, individuals contributed over $1.5 million, a third of that from the trustees. The most successful fundraising year ever in the institution's history could only claim $725,000.

Combined with President Nielsen's intent to increase the endowment until it is twice the operating budget and to retiring the bond debt, Woodbury University is focused on reduced reliance on tuition revenues.

The Visiting Team made a number of recommendations:

- Issue written policies on internal budget control structure and mechanisms.
- Develop a policy and procedures for immediate inventory and control of newly acquired equipment. Computers and other technology equipment should be secured to avoid loss.
- Document and implement budget calendar, and clear guidelines, policies, and procedures.
- Develop a process for capital budgeting
- Develop three to five year operating and capital budget plans that dovetail with the strategic plan and the mission statement
- Write clear and reasonable purchasing procedures and train appropriate staff and administrators

- Review the chart of accounts for adequacy and revise as needed

- Train staff on POISE, especially on the interfaces and downloading and uploading data to eliminate redundant data entry and better utilize existing staff.

And in its March 2000 letter, the Interim Report Committee urged that Woodbury:

- Continue to monitor the financial impact of the two new programs (AACEL and the San Diego architecture program) and evaluate how these relate to the overall University budget plan.

- Conduct a careful examination of the shrinking margin of New Assets evident in the review of the 1997 and 1998 budgets.

Woodbury University responds:

During the past three years Woodbury's budgeting process has been continually refined to ensure it is achievable, participatory, and supports the university's Strategic Plan. A budget calendar has been established, and guidelines, policies and procedures are clearly communicated to the vice presidents, department heads, and department chairs who are responsible for preparing detailed budgets. The quality, nature, and detail of budget information provided to the Board of Trustees has also been improved and met with great satisfaction.

Both the operating and capital budgets are outgrowths of the university’s Strategic Plan, which helps guide the prioritization of and resource allocation to Woodbury’s numerous funding needs.

Many more general ledger accounts and several additional departments have been created to provide department heads and chairs better information for budgeting and monitoring their expenditures. Additionally, beginning in the latter half of the 1997-98 fiscal year, department heads and chairs are provided detailed departmental revenue and expenditure reports on a weekly basis to
ensure the information used in their decision-making is as up-to-date as possible. These reports also are a valuable aid to the CFO in monitoring revenues and expenditures and adjusting spending as necessary.

The process of projecting enrollment and tuition revenue has also been refined. Enrollment is projected conservatively and realistically to ensure there are no recurrences of the over-optimism of Fall 1997. In addition, enrollment projections are detailed — developed by semester for full- vs. part-time students for each program and/or major — thus further ensuring they are achievable. These realistic enrollment projections also allow the university to do a better job of budgeting expenditures in January for the upcoming fiscal year, making it unnecessary to "re-invent" the year's operating budget or to defer major expenditures until after actual fall enrollment figures are known.

Detailed budget worksheets that show budget and actual operating expenditures for the past two years plus the current year are provided to department heads and chairs for their use in proposing new operating and capital budget amounts for the following year. Spending guidelines are provided by the CFO, and vice presidents have the flexibility to re-allocate monies among the departments for which they are responsible. Department heads and chairs have the freedom to determine funding priorities within their departments within the context of the spending guidelines. Needs in excess of the spending guidelines are explained in writing and submitted to the President's Management Team (vice presidents) for consideration and prioritization.

Capital budgeting consists of two components: (1) the acquisition of computers, office furniture and equipment, library books, etc. and (2) the renovation/construction of facilities. From 1997 to 1999, capital expenditures fell almost exclusively into the first category. As with operating expenditures, budget preparation occurs at the departmental level. Through 1997-98, department heads and chairs had no visibility over capital expenditures for their departments from a budgeting or monitoring standpoint. Beginning in 1998-99, departments' capital expenditures are temporarily recorded in operating accounts, so that they appear on the weekly departmental expenditure reports mentioned
previously. They are then reclassified and capitalized at year-end as part of the closing process.

In 2000, Woodbury embarked on an aggressive renovation/construction program to accommodate the needs of its rapidly expanding student population. This necessitated a different approach to capital budgeting. While expenditures for computers, office furniture, etc. are still handled through the operating budget process, a separate budgeting process (including a detailed cash flow analysis) has been created for facility renovation and construction.

The financial impact of all programs, including AACEI and San Diego, is regularly monitored by the CFO. It is the expectation of the Board that both of these programs will be financially self-sufficient, and both programs have been successful in meeting that expectation. In 1998-99 the AACEI program netted $48,000; whereas the San Diego program had a modest $75,000 deficit, which was considered acceptable given that it was the first year of operations and there were numerous, one-time start-up costs. In 1999-2000, they netted $337,000 and $151,000, respectively. And in 2000-2001 they are projected to net $740,000 and $219,000.
B. Planning

The Visiting Team made a number of recommendations concerning planning. These included:

- Develop benchmarks for the most important of the action items identified in the Strategic Plan. Ensure that those items selected for benchmarking are generally perceived as the most pressing and important currently facing the institution.

- Assess the current workloads of staff and determine the need for additional positions, as well as adequate technical support and training.

- Perform a space utilization study to determine the most appropriate uses of existing space as well as the current and future space needs (amounts, adjacencies, and types) for the campus. This study should include consideration of increased study, research, archival, and electronic resources space in the Library.

- Within the next year develop a three to five year capital plan (repair and renovation of facilities, replacement of equipment, acquisition of appropriate technology and infrastructure, and building acquisitions) that can be used as a document to inform the budget process as well as fundraising. The plan should align with the mission statement and the strategic plan.

Woodbury University responds:

In preparing for the Interim Report of 1999, Woodbury University revisited its Strategic Plan, expanding, revising, and prioritizing its topics. This revised plan was submitted along with the Interim Report.

However, that revised plan had not benefited from widespread community participation nor had it tied planning to budgetary processes. In addition, built as it was on planning begun in 1996, the strategic focus was limited and already outdated. As a result, the institution began to plan anew in the spring of 1999. Eventually the process directly involved over 40% of the full-time members of the campus community in significant planning positions. These members included the president, the vice presidents and deans, 16 members of the faculty (3 librarians, 6 department chairs, 6 full-time teaching faculty, and one adjunct faculty member), 16 members of the staff, and four students (two current, two former students who were staff members).
Preparation began in May of 1999, with a cabinet level retreat to focus on the major issues of the institution, i.e. planning to plan. This group became the Strategic Planning Committee, with an ambitious calendar of activities scheduled to complete the process by the April 2000 meeting of the Board of Trustees. The final timeline is included on the next page.
STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETINGS
Year Zero

May, 1999  Planning to Plan
June 23, 1999  Identify institutional mandates
               Identify stakeholders
July 7, 1999  Review existing research
               Identify additional research needs
               Identify institutional core, values
July 21, 1999  Review additional research
               Review competition recap
               Begin SWOT Analysis
August 4, 1000  Complete SWOT analysis
                Review key strategic issues and reach consensus
August 18, 1999  Begin review of key strategic directions
September 1, 1999  Complete review of key strategic directions
                   Select Design Teams
                   Discuss Design Team objectives
September 15, 1999  Prepare mission statement
                    Prepare vision statement
                    Prepare competitive positioning statement
September 29, 1999  Review draft document for presentation to Board of Trustees
                    Plan October 17-18 Board activities.
October 13, 1999  Review Design Team progress
October 17-18  BOARD RETREAT:
                      Two day full-board retreat on strategic planning
December 1  Design Teams submit completed Action Plans, including
               estimated revenues and the financial resources required.

At this point the timeline was revised. By the end of December, the Design Teams in most areas
had completed their action plans. Review and suggested revisions were also completed for
most. Public "Town Hall" meetings were scheduled.
STRATEGIC PLANNING MEETINGS (continued)

January 20, 2000
Town Hall Meetings:
  Human Resources
  Governance & Administration

January 25, 2000
Town Hall Meetings:
  Development
  Identity

January 26, 2000
  Discuss Technology revised action items
  Discuss “Vision Statement”

January 27, 2000
Town Hall Meetings:
  Enrollment
  Programs & Curriculum

February 1, 2000
Town Hall Meetings:
  Student Affairs
  Technology

February 3, 2000
Town Hall Meetings:
  Program Research
  Facilities

February 9, 2000
  Discuss detailed action plans for Human Resources, Governance
  & Administration, Development & Alumni, Identity, Program
  Research & Development

February 16, 2000
  Discuss detailed action plans for Student Affairs, Facilities,
  Programs & Curriculum, Enrollment & Enrollment Services,
  Technology

March 1, 2000
  Discuss “strategy for success” and “competitive positioning
  statement”
  Discuss projected revenue for 2000-2004
  Revisit “mission statement”

March 8 and 9, 2000
  Retreat to prioritize action items

March 22, 2000
  Discuss phasing of action items

March 29, 2000
  Begin final assembly of strategic planning package

April 11, 2000
  Forward strategic planning package to Trustees for review and
  approval
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE
Kenneth R. Nielsen, President
Zelda L. Gilbert, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Cindy Croft, Vice President, Finance and Administration
Heemanshu Bhagat, Vice President, Student Affairs
Don St. Clair, Vice President, Enrollment Management and University Marketing
Mary Collins, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Richard King, Dean of Business and Management, Chairman
Emeritus of the Board of Trustees
Lou Naidorf, Dean of Architecture and Design, Campus Architect
Leo O'Hara, Dean, Weekend and Evening College
Seta Javor, Executive Assistant to the President

DESIGN TEAMS

Development & Alumni
Ken Nielsen, President
Tip Geisbush, Development Office
Seta Javor, Executive Assistant to the president
Richard King, Dean of Business and Management, Chairman
Emeritus of the Board of Trustees
Erick Serrato, Student
Scot Weiner, Associate Dean, Student Affairs

Enrollment & Enrollment Services
Don St. Clair, Vice President, Enrollment Management and University Marketing
Heemanshu Bhagat, Vice President, Student Affairs
Paul Decker, Director, AAcel
Peter DiSabatino, Professor of Architecture, President of the Faculty Association
Greg Dotson, Student Accounts Manager
Katy Gent, Admissions, San Diego Campus
Jan Leath, Registrar
Cleo Williams, Director, Financial Aid

Facilities
Lou Naidorf, Campus Architect, Dean of Architecture and Design
Barbara Bowley, Director, Library Services
Phyllis Cremer, Assistant Dean, Academic Affairs
Cindy Croft, Vice President, Finance and Administration
Michelle Mahoney, Director, Student Activities
Ken Nielsen, President
Jerry Tracy, Plant Superintendent
Governance & Administration
Zelda Gilbert, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Cindy Croft, Vice President, Finance and Administration
Geraldine Forbes, Assistant Dean of Architecture and Design
Cleo Williams, Director, Financial Aid
Phil Pack, Professor of Biology

Human Resources
Cindy Croft, Vice President, Finance and Administration
Paul Decker, Director, AACEL
Karen Kaigler-Walker, Professor of Marketing
Brad Monsma, Associate Professor of English
Rachelle Prince, Director, Human Resources

Identity
Richard King, Dean of Business and Management, Chairman Emeritus of the Board of Trustees
Jocelyn Chong, Assistant Director of Student Activities and Multicultural Affairs
Karen Kaigler-Walker, Professor of Marketing
Bill Keeney, Professor of Graphic Design
Lou Naidorf, Dean of Architecture and Design, Campus Architect
Ken Nielsen, President
Linda Pollari, Assistant Professor, Interior Architecture
Don St. Clair, Vice President, Enrollment Management and University Marketing

Program Research & Development
Leo O'Hara, Dean, Weekend and Evening College
Barbara Bowley, Director, Library Services
Mary Collins, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Cindy Croft, Vice President, Finance and Administration
Satinder Dhumal, Professor of Business & Management
Sue Vessella, Associate Professor of Graphic Design

Programs & Curriculum
Zelda Gilbert, Vice President, Academic Affairs
Martí Pike, Associate Professor and Librarian
Mary Collins, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Norman Millar, Associate Professor of Architecture
Leo O'Hara, Dean, Weekend and Evening College
Carolee Toon, Professor of Graphic Design
Kay Mount, Adjunct Faculty in Marketing

Student Affairs
Heemanshu Bhagat, Vice President, Student Affairs
Scot Weiner, Associate Dean, Student Affairs
Phyllis Cremer, Assistant Dean, Academic Affairs
Jessi Leech, President, Student Government Association
Ann-Louise Lockhart, Admissions Counselor
Roxanne Rafii, Assistant Dean, Weekend and Evening College
Technology
Mary Collins, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Mauro Diaz, Admission Counselor
Sue Perham Hung, Director, Management Information Systems
Xiaoyang Liu, Assistant Professor and Librarian
Aida Artenian, Management Information Systems
Joe Windolph, Management Information Systems

The Design Teams were the heart of the strategic planning process. It was their job to take the basic framework of the Strategic Plan and to identify the strategic issues, set strategic goals, and propose action items to achieve each goal. They then determined the measurable outcomes of each action item, assigned responsibility for it, and estimated the resources and costs of each. Finally, they each prioritized their own items. The Strategic Planning Committee, all of whom chaired various design teams, then reviewed all the items and their priorities and arrived at a final, prioritized list. These may all be found in the accompanying Documents.

The Strategic Plan has significantly influenced the funding priorities and activities for the 2000-2001 fiscal year. Among the most important are the following:

- Included in the budget are responses to issues involving increased staffing in technology, human resources, plant management, and the business office.
- Based on recommendations from the plan, a consulting firm has been hired to review staff positions, responsibilities, and levels of classification, with an aim of developing a better salary/classification system.
- Two new faculty positions were included as well as funding for open positions that had been left unfilled. Next year's budget will include funding for four or five additional new faculty positions in line with recommendations from the Academic Planning Committee.
- The Faculty Development Committee received funding and the library acquisitions budget received a modest increase. Details may be found in the section on faculty.
- A comprehensive marketing plan has been written and is being implemented.
- Optimum enrollment levels for programs have been set
- The facilities needs assessment has been completed and a ten year facility plan written and published. (A copy of the facility plan will be available in the Team Room.)
- The budget now also includes routine raises for staff and adjunct faculty set at better than cost-of-living while the faculty salary schedule receives an annual cost of living adjustment.

Perhaps the most dramatic changes have occurred in the Advancement Office and the Admission Office. Driven by the Strategic Plan, the University has created a fully staffed Development office, including a Vice President for Advancement, a Major Gifts Officer, and a Director, Alumni Relations. The results have been spectacular as noted above in the section on University finances. A new vice president for enrollment management, hired two years ago, has turned that office around completely. In the fall of 1997, enrollment stood at 1049 with an FTE of 873. Since then, enrollments have leaped 28% to 1342 students and 1128 FTE.

Major strategic issues in progress include our management information system, advising, additional growth in the full-time faculty, and faculty and staff development. The Strategic Plan is driving several significant grant proposals, including a TRIO grant proposal to provide improvements in advising, tutoring, and retention to the most at-risk students, and a Title V grant proposal aimed at federal funding for a major change in student information systems, advising, faculty development, and basic skills education. Because of the strategic plan, we were expecting such growth, although not as quickly as it arrived. Thanks to the foresight of a ten-year facility plan, the visiting team will find construction sites all over the campus to help deal with the influx of students.

The Plan also focuses on long-term issues, specifically the continued reliance on tuition revenues. Woodbury University will always be tuition driven. Most institutions are. However, one of its major development goals is to “…continue to add endowment earnings to endowment principal until such time that the endowment reaches at least twice the amount of the annual operating budget.”
The Visiting Team recommended that Woodbury:

- Provide deans and department chairs, as well as selected members of the Student Services staff, training in developing unit plans for the short and intermediate range.

- Use the Cabinet or the strategic Planning Committee to monitor the integration of the unit plans with the Strategic Plan.

Woodbury University responds: All the academic deans and many of the department chairs and department heads served on the Strategic Plan design teams. In extending this methodology, deans have worked with the department chairs to plan strategically and in particular, to set goals for student outcomes and for enrollment. The outcome goals have been incorporated into the departmental program reviews. The enrollment goals, developed in conjunction with the deans, the chairs, and the Vice President, Enrollment Management, are providing guidance to the enrollment plans for the coming years. These goals include preferences, if any, for freshmen or transfer students, need for increased computing resources, and implications for facilities.
C. The Faculty

The 1998 Team Report included a number of recommendations regarding faculty. The primary considerations involved the number of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty utilization and remuneration, faculty workload, and faculty development.

WASC has repeatedly commented on Woodbury University’s extensive use of adjunct faculty. In trying to discern exactly what WASC wants, Woodbury has found itself in the unenviable position of trying to hit a constantly moving target. For example, in an effort to set our own standards, the 1998 Self-Study noted the following:

Since the 1991 WASC visit, the student body has increased in size by 11% while the number of teaching faculty (not chairs, deans or librarians) has increased by over 50%. ... In its strategic plan, Woodbury University has set the ratio of courses taught by full-time faculty to adjunct faculty at 20:60 or a minimum percentage of 25%. In the fall of 1996, the University exceeded that goal with a percentage of 26.7%... In the fall of 1997 the percentage fell to 24.1% in spite of the addition of a new teaching position in business. The decrease in the percentage was due to a decrease in teaching load, from 12 courses per year (16 hours per week) to 8 courses per year (12 hours per week).

The 1998 team did not find this increase sufficient and responded with the following recommendations:

- Develop a core full-time faculty with a criteria based formula for allocation of faculty time to the various responsibilities they bear.

- Review the published criteria for hiring faculty at specific ranks to identify criteria that will fit the University’s vision of themselves as an institution specializing in professional programs.

- Identify the characteristics of paramount importance in selection of adjunct faculty.

Woodbury University responds:

Woodbury University will always rely on the expertise of adjunct faculty who are professionals in the fields in which the university awards degrees. In following the team’s recommendations and arriving at its own goals for full-time faculty, the institution has attempted to answer four questions:
Guiding Questions

1. In light of the mission of the institution, when are the students best served by full-time faculty and when by adjunct faculty?
2. How many faculty are necessary to provide the appropriate expertise and support in particular departments and disciplines?
3. How many faculty do students need in order to serve as advisors?
4. How many faculty are required to meet the obligations of faculty governance?

Guideline #1

At least two full-time faculty should be available in every professional major in order to provide the best foundation education possible in the students’ first two years.

Guideline #2

Most upper division classes in the professional majors are best taught by practicing professionals who serve as adjunct faculty.

Professional education builds on a foundation of basic principles and theories. From this base, students learn more direct applications and further their professional skills. The general education core also develops a foundation that leads students to develop as independent learners in contexts different from their majors. The ultimate intent is “…to prepare graduates who are articulate, ethical and innovative life-long learners.” (Mission Statement)

Those faculty teaching the basic principles and theories should be our best teachers – by definition our full-time faculty. If this is not accomplished, students will not have the foundation they need for more advanced learning. Faculty teaching direct applications and professional skills are most likely adjunct faculty who are working professionals. They bring real world experience into the classroom and best prepare students for their careers.

Faculty teaching in the general education core should be our best teaching faculty. Period. These professional educators are responsible for not only the foundation years but the upper division classes as well. The appropriate and fitting search for
professionals who can teach as adjunct faculty doesn’t hold for the “itinerant scholar” in English or political science, except where there are too few courses for a full-time load.

**Guideline #3**

Whenever possible and where a sufficiently robust teaching load exists, general education and liberal arts courses should be taught by full-time faculty.

Our reliance on these itinerant scholars teaching part time in the liberal arts should be significantly diminished. They are rarely practicing professionals in their fields – it is difficult to “practice” history or philosophy without a full-time academic position. Some are graduate students, supplementing their teaching assistantships with employment at Woodbury. When a full-time load is not available in a discipline, then these teaching positions should be filled by individuals with the appropriate academic qualifications – i.e. a terminal degree in hand or close to completion.

**Guideline #4**

Woodbury University should hire the faculty best suited to teach in its various programs.

Woodbury University should strive to hire faculty with the best professional and academic credentials that fit the mission of the institution. Full-time faculty should have the credentials appropriate for their discipline. In higher education, the standard union card is a terminal degree: MFA, M. Arch, Ph.D., Ed.D., etc. In the academic majors and the general education core, these terminal degrees represent an appropriate level of academic achievement.

The same may not hold for all the professional majors. In these disciplines, professional credentials are essential, often more so than traditional academic credentials. This especially holds true for the adjunct faculty, whose professional skills and knowledge of the latest professional practices are our primary justification for hiring so many of them.
Woodbury University is deeply committed to increasing the number of full-time faculty, using the guidelines described above. Along with some simple mathematical analyses, we conclude that Woodbury needs to create between 11 and 15 new full-time faculty positions. This would bring the complete total of faculty from the previous 36 to 51. Towards that goal, the institution intends to add two full-time faculty positions each year. Driven by this priority, the institution added two faculty positions this year. Next year’s budget will include funding for four or five additional new faculty positions.

The Visiting Team and the Commission noted issues involving faculty workload. Woodbury University faculty carry a significant load. Full-time faculty may be assigned up to four lecture courses a term. In addition, they may be required to serve on two or even three Faculty Association committees as well as other ad hoc committees, all while advising 20-40 students.

While heavier than the somewhat more common three-course load, the teaching requirements at Woodbury are not out of line with national norms for teaching institutions. The faculty completed a survey on the amount of time they spent in various activities, including course preparation and delivery, evaluation of student work, advising, meeting with students, committee work, etc. The hours per class were very close to national norms. In another analysis, the number of hours per week spent in instruction nationally were 10.2 in 1996. At Woodbury this past fall, full-time faculty (including chairs and others with various course reductions) spent an average of 10.8 hours in the classroom. Still other national norms looked at faculty load in terms of average student contact hour. Because the average class size at Woodbury remains smaller than national averages for similar institutions, our average student contact hours are less than the national average. A universal course load reduction is not currently part of the Strategic Plan.

However, the other elements of the load are being addressed. Many faculty would prefer not to do advising nor to serve on more than one Faculty Association committee. With
the creation of new faculty positions, the faculty governance load will be spread more widely. In addition, new initiatives towards advising can lift that burden from all teaching faculty except those who chose it and who are then compensated for that choice.

The visiting team recommended that Woodbury:

- Improve adjunct faculty pay scales to a level at least comparable to neighboring institutions competing for the services of the same persons.

Woodbury responds as follows:

At the time of the 1998 visit, the basic adjunct pay for a three-unit lecture course was $1,808. A survey of adjunct faculty salaries at nearby institutions was completed and a new salary schedule proposed. Among other things, the proposed changes would alter how the institution recognizes past experience and would raise the basic pay to $2,500. The estimated price tag for this new salary schedule was about $500,000. The Strategic Plan recognizes both the need to raise adjunct salaries and the impact on the institution’s resources. Therefore, the Plan includes a recommendation to review the adjunct pay schedule with an eye to gradual implementation. In the meantime, the institution began to routinely raise adjunct salaries by 3 1/2% to 4% each year. In January of 2001, the basic pay for a three-unit lecture had risen 13% to $2,044.

Adjunct faculty have always had the opportunity to become voting members of the Faculty Association after several years of employment. Last year the time requirements for that membership were removed so that all members of the adjunct faculty may immediately become members of the Association each term in which they teach.

A new edition of the Adjunct Faculty Handbook was published this past fall and distributed during a special Adjunct Faculty Workshop focused on adjunct faculty needs. The separate workshop proved to be so successful that it will become an annual event.

The visiting team recommended that Woodbury:

- Develop a plan and specific strategies for improving the ethnic diversity of the full-time faculty.
Woodbury University responds:

Woodbury is an affirmative action employer, within the constraints of constantly changing law. Since the last team visit, the number of full-time faculty positions has increased from 36 to 39 (one library position is currently open and funded). The percentage of minority members of the faculty has also increased, from 12% to 18%. Strategically driven plans to further increase the size of the full-time faculty provide additional opportunities to increase diversity.

The visiting team recommended that Woodbury:

- Provide faculty and staff with adequate technology tools and developmental programs in how to use technology more effectively.

Woodbury University responds: The Strategic Plan includes proposals for faculty and staff development in the uses of technology. Faculty want to learn technology both for administrative uses and for improved pedagogy. Staff want and need significant training in technology for job enrichment and to keep up with rapid changes in technology. The institution is attacking these twin needs, and others, through a proposal for Title V funding.

This past summer, Woodbury University received its first ever funding from the Federal government in the form of a $37,000 Title V planning grant. This seed money has enabled the institution to engage in widespread institutional assessment resulting in a proposal for additional funding to address these issues of development, training, and technology. Based on the Strategic Plan and bolstered by surveys and campus wide meetings with faculty, staff, and students, the institution will be asking for funds to completely revamp its student information system and the rest of the management information system, including new software, new hardware, staff training modules, and full-time on-campus staff technical support. A specific component of the grant request is for faculty development in the use of technology in the classroom. Another component develops, pilots, and implements a new advising system that reduces faculty workload by making advising a choice rather than a requirement. Additional components will be discussed
in the section on technology. Since the grant proposal is due at the same time as the WASC visit, a finished copy will be available for review in the team room.

The visiting team recommended that Woodbury:

- Reconsider the statement of the University's position with regard to faculty research and scholarly activity to project a more positive image of the University and to encourage, rather than demoralize those faculty who are interested and engaged in scholarly activity.

Woodbury University responds:

Woodbury has thoroughly revised how it views faculty development. The administration and the Board recognize that the best faculty are constantly engaged in professional development, whether that development takes the form of engagement in a design or business project or in scholarly activities. In support of that recognition, the institution has acted to increase funding for faculty travel and spread that funding equitably throughout all three schools. In addition, a Faculty Development Committee was created last year and modestly funded this year to provide additional support for faculty scholarship and development on a competitive basis. The Committee will be meeting this spring to review proposals and award those funds for the first time. The proposal form can be found at the institution's web site at: http://woodbury.iserver.net/people/association/fdc/ Index.htm. The number of sabbaticals awarded and funded has increased substantially: last year the Faculty Personnel Committee approved three proposals for sabbaticals. All three have been funded - two this year and one next year. This past fall, the Committee recommended one sabbatical for next year, and it has already been approved. This means that in the two academic years since the last WASC visit, Woodbury has funded sabbaticals for more than 10% of its full-time faculty. Finally, a faculty initiated Research Group has begun to meet once a month to discuss on-going scholarly projects. It is extremely interdisciplinary (the last meeting included a teacher of physics, several psychologists, and a member of the business faculty who specializes in management of cultural institutions) and is a welcomed addition to the institution.
In its recommendations for funding for next year, the Academic Planning Committee looked at proposed increases in travel money and at increases in funding for the Faculty Development Committee, but placed both of these low on its list of priorities. Funding will therefore remain at its present level.
D. Assessment

In its 1998 self-study, Woodbury University recognized the significant deficits in planned assessment. Program reviews had not been conducted since the late 1980s, the institutional research position had been eliminated in the budget restructuring of 1997, and no overall assessment plan existed. The visiting team noted these and other deficits and made several recommendations:

- It is imperative that someone on campus becomes familiar with the assessment of student learning outcomes.

- Conduct a program review of the MBA Program, with specific emphasis on the standards of academic performance required of the students.

Woodbury University responds:

At the time of the 1998 WASC visit, a schedule for program review had been adopted. Six majors were to complete their review that year. The results were remarkably unsuccessful. One program got halfway done; the rest were not able to progress even that far. In the clarity of hindsight, the reasons for these poor starts are evident: the schedule was too ambitious for what were essentially first-time program reviewers, there was little in the way of funding, training, or institutional support for the review process, and the department chairs had to work their way through a widespread mind-set that wanted to look at institutional inputs rather than student outcomes.

In response, in the fall of 1998 a day long Academic Retreat was conducted whose focus was how to do program review. The materials from that retreat may be found in the Documents accompanying this report. Department chairs, deans, and selected staff and administrators participated. At the end of the second year, progress had definitely been made. Chairs were aided by the workshop, by extended timelines and by modest financial support.

This past year has been even more successful. The decision to review the design departments prior to application for NASAD accreditation served as an additional incentive. As a result, the department chairs have done a commendable job in...
completing their program reviews. The following reviews are done and will be available in the team room for review:

MBA
General Education Core
Accounting
Business & Management
Computer Information Systems
Fashion Design
Graphic Design
History & Politics
Interior Architecture
Marketing / Fashion Marketing
Psychology
Weekend and Evening Programs

Scheduled for next year:

Architecture
Animation

The results have been satisfactory. The Arts and Sciences faculty have begun an ambitious program of long-term portfolio review to track accomplishment of goals. Chairs now come to the Curriculum Committee with proposals driven by what they have learned about their programs and about student outcomes. The MBA chair, unsatisfied with his program’s results the first year, revised and reviewed his program again.

While the team made no specific recommendation regarding the position of institutional researcher, it noted in its report that: The position of Director of institutional Research . . . is arguably the most important at the University for providing data on which the assessment effort depends so heavily. The Strategic Plan reviewed the need for an institutional researcher and recommends the replacement of that position during the second phase.

The Visiting Team recommended that:

- The University needs an assessment policy and implementation plan.

Woodbury University responds:
An assessment policy and implementation plan based on the Strategic Plan, on program
review, and on institutional practices have been developed. It is included in the Documents accompanying this report.

During the last six months, the institution has engaged in the following assessment activities:

1. Ongoing portfolio review as part of the General Education Program Review.
2. Survey of Students, including questions about need for remediation, hours worked, why they might have missed class, etc. A copy may be found in the Documents accompanying this report.
3. Analysis of the 1994 first-time, full-time freshmen cohort with particular emphasis on the needs for remediation, GPA, retention, and graduation rates.
4. A Survey of Faculty that looked at professional development activities, issues of teaching to diverse students, interest in training in technology, and whether they were first generation students.
5. A Survey of Staff that looked at a variety of staff issues, including familiarity with the Strategic Plan.
6. A Survey of Recent Alumni that looked at employment rates, satisfaction with education, and familiarity with technology.
7. An advising task force that has studied the advising process at Woodbury and made recommendations for improvements that have already been noted in this document. The group's report may be found in the accompanying Documents.

In addition to these in-house assessments, the institution will be hosting two consultants in January: Dr. Jack Maxwell, who will review our MIS and SIS systems and make recommendations; and Dr. Adelaide Adamson, who will be reviewing the work of the advising task force and providing an outside evaluation of our process and our plans. Finally, Woodbury hosted a visit from Mr. Tom Ferriera, a consultant from NASAD, who reviewed and evaluated the design programs in light of a possible application for NASAD accreditation. His written report was not available at the time of this writing but will be available in the team room.
The Visiting Team noted the following:

- The campus should enhance its planning and assessment activities in its co-curricular program. The interest expressed by student and academic services' professionals in expanding the assessment of both the programming needs and the study skills of its students should be financially supported and administratively encouraged. Program planning should be based on survey outcomes.

Woodbury University responds: Student Affairs has routinely assessed the success of its various programs and adjusted them accordingly. In line with past practice, the institution is gearing up for its regular Spring Semester student survey. We will be repeating the College Student Survey, as that data and its comparative national norms have been very helpful in previous years. We will also be attaching more specialized questions on issues of campus services. That survey should have just been completed at the time of this team’s visit.

Another regular assessment by the Student Affairs Office enabled us to track changes in preferences for student housing. As a result, several different opportunities have been made available to students this past year.

The Learning Center continually tracks the amount of student use (for example, 189 different undergraduate students last semester), the subjects and classes requested, preferred hours, and the use of tutor time. Based on these assessments, we have been able to increase student use significantly since the last team visit. At that time the half-time Center director had been laid off. Student use was minimal, with few tutors available, even when the director was on site. Now the center is staffed with a full-time director with expertise in composition and literature, a half-time assistant who focuses on mathematics and physics, and several professional tutors. Student tutors supplement this professional staff.

A victim of its own success, the Center has run out of space and will be moving to larger accommodations next fall. In addition, the institution has submitted a TRIO Grant application to provide additional tutoring and academic support to 150 of its most at-risk students. In its assessment activities, it has found that these students, defined as low-income and first-
generation, are the most likely to find themselves in academic and/or financial trouble and subsequently drop out. The facilities for these TRIO students will be directly adjacent to the new Learning Center.

We have also just completed a combined in-house and external review of advising. The results are driving the advising changes discussed under the section on the Title V grant and faculty load.
E. Technology

The Visiting Team noted:

- There is an urgent need to provide an integrated student information system and automation to a number of administrative areas and functions, which are currently done manually.

- Provide additional resources to provide training for faculty and staff involved with the integration of information technology into the curriculum and administrative procedures of the University.

Woodbury University responds:

the need for an integrated student information system is widely recognized on campus as one of our most pressing problems. As a result, the Title V grant proposal focuses almost exclusively on funding and supporting a new SIS system. If we are funded, the new Chief Information Officer (a position created by the Strategic Plan and budgeted for this year) will coordinate the grant funds and the five-year implementation of this wide-ranging and most welcome change.

Specific components of the grant proposal will allow things like:

- Computerized graduation checks (currently done by hand)
- Computerized check of course prerequisites from the advisor's desk (currently done by hand)
- On-line registration
- On-line grade check
- Computerized financial aid packaging (currently done by hand)
- Computerized updating of student contact information so that faculty and advisors can find students under Early Alert or other similar circumstances.

Additional grant components address the need for improvement in Basic Skills education as well as better prepared peer tutors for more advanced courses. Also included are requests for funds for faculty development in the use of technology in the classroom and for staff development as noted above. Funding through Title V will not fix every technological
problem on campus but would go a long way towards addressing the most critical issues.

The visiting team made the following recommendation:
- There is a need to provide both more powerful and more specialized computing equipment to certain academic programs, especially in the School of Design.

Woodbury University responds: The institution constantly expands and upgrades the computing equipment available to students. Since the team visit of 1998, the institution has continued to upgrade the two PC labs and the Macintosh lab in the Miller building twice a year. In addition, satellite computing labs in the architecture complex have been expanded and improved, and a full-time staff person hired to oversee those labs and offer longer hours. The Fashion Design students have finally acquired their own computer lab, available just to them, and serving their computer design needs.

Unprecedented growth in the Animation major (from 10 in 1997 to 71 in 2000) has put a strain on the limited computing resources available to those students. With its original focus on drawing and painting rather than computer animation, we were unprepared for the need for more extensive computer facilities. The new chair of that department has defined those needs and then submitted a grant proposal that should help alleviate the strain. The announcement of that funding should precede this Special Visit.
IV. STRATEGY FOR SUCCESS

From its founding in 1884, Woodbury University has had as its core mission the providing of a quality, professional education that effectively prepares students for careers. Over the course of its 116-year history, this mission has been enhanced to include an emphasis on a liberal studies-based educational core as integral to the development of life-long learners, and the nurturing of the ethical development and leadership skills of its students.

Woodbury's approach to fulfilling its mission is guided by several core values that include academic rigor, diversity, and being student-centered. Further, there are several qualities that students consistently cite when asked why they chose Woodbury, including its small size, the personal attention they receive, and their exposure to skilled professionals who are practitioners in their fields.

Commitment to its mission and core values and respect for the qualitative attributes that students perceive as Woodbury's strengths are at the center of what makes Woodbury an exceptional educational institution today. They will continue to energize the University and define its direction for the twenty-first century.

Woodbury's strategy for success in the initial decade of the new century repositions the University around its core values, with a key emphasis on delivering top quality programs and services. The University's goal is to be "the best" at every aspect of what it does, from recruitment to career preparation to co-curricular education to support services. Achieving this goal will require Woodbury to engage in the intense and exhilarating work of organizational transformation. Many of the University's strategic directions will be aimed at identifying and rapidly institutionalizing ways to enhance its "student centered-ness."

Academics are at the "heart" of Woodbury's mission, and the University's drive for academic excellence will be the chief consideration in all aspects of planning, decision-making, and operations during the next ten years.

Woodbury presently finds itself in the enviable position of operating in an expanding marketplace while offering career-oriented education particularly suited to the demands of employers in the twenty-first century. Demographic projections indicate the
expanding demand for higher education will continue through the initial decade of the century.

To take full advantage of this opportunity, Woodbury will strategically — rather than opportunistically — focus its resources on thoughtfully developed programs and curricula delivered at purposefully selected locations. Traditional day undergraduate programs at the Burbank and San Diego campuses will anchor Woodbury’s operations, but strategically selected non-traditional programs, graduate programs, and satellite sites will also be supported. The University will continue to focus upon Southern California as its primary market.

To increase its market outreach, Woodbury will develop a multi-tiered identity, or “brand image.” The identity will begin with an institutional image rooted in the University’s core values. Under the umbrella of this institutional image, each school (Architecture & Design, Arts & Sciences, and Business & Management) will develop its own unique brand, consistent with the institutional image, but emphasizing its special characteristics and strengths.

Identifying ways to accommodate growing enrollments, including increased demands for on-campus housing, will be a fundamental challenge during the next ten years and will be accomplished through a combination of creative scheduling and expanded facilities. Although there is still a long-range interest in acquiring neighboring properties in Burbank, the short-term focus will be on maximizing the potential of the present site. In San Diego, Woodbury will seek a permanent site adequate to fully accommodate the projected scope of the programs there.

Funding the strategic goals of the University will require even more careful attention to building and nurturing increasing numbers of stakeholders in Woodbury’s mission and encouraging their financial support. During the first decade of this century there will be a clear commitment to continuing to increase the University’s endowment. Additionally, Woodbury will develop multi-year budgets that are an outgrowth of strategic planning priorities and effectively match needs to appropriate funding courses. Although other revenue-generating opportunities will be aggressively pursued, Woodbury will remain a tuition-driven educational institution.
In summary, in the next ten years Woodbury will focus on its Burbank and San Diego campuses, develop a clear institutional identity, shift to planning that is strategically-driven, and strengthen its internal structure. The implementation of this Strategic Plan will reposition Woodbury University to become a recognized leader for professional education in the twenty-first century.