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Process Overview:

Over the past year and a half, the WASC CPR committee assembled a number of working documents intended to provide evidence for the four essays. Composed of academic representatives from each school, representatives from academic affairs, registrar's office, institutional research, and IT, we attempted to create a body of evidence demonstrating the university's capacity.

We began by iterating through each of the criteria and questions. Building off of the committee's experiences, we assigned a rating, wrote a narrative description and “next steps” section, and collected documents as evidence.

We then conducted a survey to gather input from faculty and staff. We received over a hundred responses, getting input from two thirds of full-time faculty, a third of staff members, and 15% of the adjuncts who had taught in the previous three years. The architecture full-time faculty conducted a focus group instead of participating in the survey. Next, we gathered input from students and recent alumni through a series of surveys and focus groups.

After coding the results, the CPR committee went back and revised our initial assessment of each criteria. We coded each criteria as either initial, emerging, developed, or highly developed, approaching the ratings from a process improvement standpoint.

After completing our assessments, and compiling them into a single package on the CPR website, the process was turned over to David Rosen to write the essays.

Documentation Descriptions:

The following material is available on the WASC CPR website.
Committee Summary

- **Framework Rubric**
  This two-page document was created by the committee as a high-level overview of each standard, showing where Woodbury lies on each group of criteria from a self improvement standpoint.

- **Classification & suggested further actions**
  This 38 page document lists each criteria for review, a narrative description of how Woodbury meet the criteria, evidence for meeting the criteria, and tasks for moving to the next stage.

**Committee Schedule**

- **CPR Committee Project Plan**
  This Excel document shows the committee project plan.

**Woodbury Community Input**

- **Summary Rating by Criteria**
  This five-page document provides a high-level view of how Woodbury meets each criteria from a self improvement standpoint.

- **Summary of all community ratings & comments, shown alongside committee ratings and suggested further actions.**
  This 16 page document provides a high-level viewpoint of the input from staff, faculty, students, and alumni. It synthesizes the qualitative and quantitative data to provide a readable summary.

- **Faculty & Staff Input**
  - **Ratings, Comments, Architecture Full-time Faculty Focus Group Results, Survey Form**
    These documents are the final report for the faculty and staff survey. They include quantitative and qualitative results, as well as the survey form and the focus group results.

- **Alumni Input**
  - **Response Rates, Ratings, Comments, Business-school specific responses, Survey Form**
    These results are from the summer alumni survey. They include qualitative and quantitative results, the survey form, and the questions specifically directed at business graduates.

- **Student Input**
  - **Traditional & Weekend College Student Ratings and Comments, Survey Form, Student Leadership Focus Group Results**
    These describe the information gathered from the student body. It includes results from surveys conducted in both the weekend and traditional programs, as well as a focus group conducted at a student leadership meeting.