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The last WASC Accreditation visit was a Special Visit in March 21-23, 2001. It focused on five areas:

- Financial Viability
- Assessment
- Planning
- Faculty
- Technology

This document will describe Woodbury’s continuing efforts to address the visiting team’s recommendations.

### Financial Viability

1. Convene cabinet-level discussions on budgetary policies so that each manager will have a clear sense of role, responsibility, as the institution strives to maintain financial viability.

Woodbury has been working to improve the budget process. Improvements within the last three years include:

- The presidential budget committee meets on a regular basis to prioritize campus needs. Composed of faculty and staff, its members represent every department on campus, and assist the cabinet in prioritizing projects and capital expenses.

- An online report (due to come on at the end of December) will give each budget manager real-time access to their account activity and status.

- Overall institutional budget information and ratios are available in the Key Performance Indicators document. This spreadsheet is updated on a regular basis, and is extensively used in planning and cabinet discussions. A summarized version is also used in an online dashboard for Board of Trustee meetings.

### Assessment and Program Review

1. Develop a protocol for program review that includes expectation that there will be (a) both internal and external reviews, (b) data derived from assessment, and (c) use of results to improve programs.

2. Develop policy (process and procedure) for new program approval.

3. Provide training for faculty in the endeavor to develop and implement assessment plans.
Woodbury revised the academic program review policy in June 2007. This update clarified the APR process, and instituted a number of requirements that resolve the concerns raised in the 2001 Special Visit.

- **Internal / External Review**
  Many of our programs are already subject to external review through their disciplinary accreditation. Those not externally accredited are required to find an external evaluator during the review process.

- **Assessment**
  Programs are required to report on learning outcomes on a program-wide basis, and programs are required to document changes made as a result of assessment data. The institutional researcher is required to maintain datafiles for each program with retention, enrollment, and graduation indicators. Support for assessment is provided by the Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (IETL) and the Educational Planning Committee (EPC).

- **New Programs**
The EPC was recently formed to approve major programmatic changes, including new program approval. Its duties include:

  - review new academic programs, results of program review of existing programs, and educational policies
  - make recommendations on research into quality and efficacy of instructional programs, and research findings for implications to curriculum
  - coordinate with Institutional Researcher on collection and dissemination of data necessary for evaluation of curricula, and make appropriate recommendations
  - develop and review Master Academic Plan (MAP) in collaboration with academic units, including annual program reports

Proposals for new programs must include a number of attachments, including:

- **I. Department, School, Title of Major or Minor**
- **II. Rationale** *(Fit with current mission and strategic directions for school and University)*
- **III. Justification** *(Need for program, internal and external markets)*
- **IV. Implications**
  a. for Department and School
  b. for other Departments and Schools
- **V. Goals and Outcomes**
- **VI. Enrollment Projections**
- **VII. Resources** *(Indicate existing or new)*
  a. **Staff** *(What current staff will support this? What additional staff will need to be hired?)*
  b. **Library** *(Existing collection and plans to support with additional acquisitions)*
  c. **Facilities** *(What space will be used and how will that be accommodated within existing use or planned expansion?)*
- **VIII. Revenue/Expense Budget** *(Indicate any start-up costs)*
- **IX. Appendices**
  a. Major/Minor requirements and electives *(course names, numbers, units)*
  b. **Course Syllabi** *(with learning objectives)*
  c. **Schedule of projected course offerings**
d. Vita of key faculty and other participants

- Training in Assessment

The IETL is currently responsible for training faculty in program assessment. In Spring 2005, the IETL sought to improve the usefulness of faculty portfolios through a Faculty Learning Community (FLC) that comprised 14 faculty members. The members came from every discipline of the university and included chairs, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty. The FLC’s stated goal was to train faculty to move from paper to electronic portfolios. However, the subject for the FLC was effective teaching and its documentation. The FLC studied models of learning and assessment, including Mary Allen’s *Assessing Academic Programs in Higher Education*. There followed an FLC of 12 faculty members in fall 2005.

From the standpoint of the university, the project to create greater assessment of teaching and learning has been successful. The FLCs in particular established a knowledgeable core of faculty who serve as a resource for improving teaching assessment and who, through their work, model good assessment and influence the campus culture. The success can be seen in the way the Curriculum Committee now scrutinizes syllabi for learning outcomes, learning activities linked to the outcomes, and assessment. The FLC’s work also created a scholarly interest in pedagogy that is reflected in the faculty development awards that the faculty association has made, the sabbatical projects that the university has supported, and the papers and presentations that faculty members have made.

**Planning**

1. Refine the process of data gathering so that strategic planning will be based upon reliable information.

2. Identify the individual(s) who will be responsible for monitoring and sustaining the plan and informing the community about progress and change.

Over the past several years, we have established a set of Key Performance Indicators. Established by the cabinet in 2004-05, these indicators provide a high-level view of university operations in all major operational areas. Each cabinet member is responsible for updating their own area’s metrics, generating projections for the coming year, and providing actual counts for past ones. The Board, the president, and the senior staff have found this document extremely useful in tracking progress and in planning. It is now available online on our portal for any member of the community to view.

One of the priorities in the Strategic Plan of 2004 had been the hiring of an institutional researcher who would oversee an office that would both compile data that the university routinely collects and assure that the appropriate data was being collected. The position would help the university create and manage useful data tables that would allow various parts of the university to review the efficacy of their activities and make revisions that would improve them. The position was filled in Fall 2006.

As a result, more data is being collected and reported on in a centralized manner. A series of live online reports have been put online. In Spring 2007, faculty chairs and deans were trained in the use enrollment, cohort tracking, retention, graduation, and academic calendar reports. These reports are available to the entire campus community, making governance and management a more transparent process. Our portal (established in Fall 2007) is currently being used by a wide variety of areas on campus to share data and coordinate projects. Institutional data is being moved off of individual peoples’ computers, and into a centralized institutional repository managed by Institutional Research.
At present, new hires are approved well before the annual budget is prepared, and those positions are made part of the annual budget. For instance, two new positions for fall 2008 have been approved and are currently in the search process: an additional faculty in fashion design, who will serve as the chair, and an additional faculty member in architecture. Two animation searches are also underway, one to replace a full-time faculty member and one to fill a full-time regular position that had been a visiting position. Both hires have been undertaken in accordance with our strategic plan that supports special accreditation, in these cases NASAD and NAAB.

The Master Academic Plan will propose new hires for the next five years. This plan is supported by tentative recommendations coming out of the Compensation and Workload Committee.

**Faculty**

1. Begin the faculty recruitment process in the fall semester preceding the projected date of appointment.
2. Ensure that funds allocated for proposed faculty hires are included among items in the non-discretionary category of the Budget.

**Technology**


   1. Hire a Chief Information Officer
      - **Completed.**
   2. Convene an ad hoc committee to investigate how other universities are meeting their technology needs and goals
      - **Completed.** This is done on an ongoing basis by talking to other universities at conferences such as Educause and Sungard SCT.
   3. Conduct a campus-wide inventory of hardware and software
      - **Completed.** Academic and administrative inventories are maintained by the IT office.
   4. Conduct an in-house, campus-wide assessment of computing hardware, software, skills, skill levels, and training needs.
      - **Completed.** IT conducts its yearly planning efforts through a number of input mechanisms. In addition to the Technology Committee, the CIO gathers input through an online forum, survey forms, and anonymous comment boxes in the labs. IT meets with department heads on a yearly basis to assess each department’s needs and ensure that their needs are met. All documents are posted on the main Woodbury website for public comment and review.
   5. Develop an up-to-date map of the physical infrastructure for technology.
      - **Completed.** Network diagrams are maintained by our network administrators.
   6. Develop an information systems architecture plan.
      - **Completed.** This is part of our campus disaster recovery planning (DRP).
   7. Develop procedures for maintain assessments of computing hardware, software, skills, skill levels, training needs, and hardware/software inventory.
• **Completed.** The Presidential Technology Steering Committee gathers input from every area of campus for technology status and future directions. Inventories are regularly maintained for both hardware and software for licensing purposes.

8. Develop policies and procedures for meeting technology needs.
   • **Completed.** IT ensures that it meets campus technology means through the input and planning processes previously described. All policies and procedures are posted on the main Woodbury website.