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1. Institutional Context Statement

The faculty, students, staff and administration feel Woodbury University is an extraordinary place, full of possibilities that we have not yet realized. Much of the promise comes from a strong history that provides a definite institutional trajectory and a clear underlying set of values.

In 1884, entrepreneur and educational pioneer Mr. Francis Chute Woodbury founded a college in downtown Los Angeles. The mission of Woodbury Business College (as it was initially named) was to increase the economic capacity of the region by providing education in key areas of business. In 1931, the College created a division of professional arts to support an emergent economy centered on entertainment and design. In 1974 Woodbury College became Woodbury University and in 1984 added Architecture to its professional degrees. In 1987 Woodbury University moved to a 22.4-acre campus in Burbank where today it still retains its earliest commitment to growing the economic capacity of the Southern California region.

Woodbury University is unique among private institutions with regard to its diversity. U.S. News and World Reports ranks it the fifth most diverse Masters II institution in the western region. During the 2004-05 academic year, Woodbury University enrolled 39% white, non-Hispanic students; 36% Hispanic students; 12% Asian students; 7% international students; and 6% African-American students. The white, non-Hispanic students comprise diverse populations as well, including a large and growing number of Armenian students. The majority of Woodbury’s students come from families of limited economic means, and they are the first in their families to go to college.

In serving this group of students and in striving to fill a role in the economic history of Southern California, Woodbury’s faculty has been called upon to be innovative, dedicated, and socially responsible. Woodbury’s ambition is to provide intellectual and human capital to the region’s sectors of business, to offer opportunities to those who have the most to contribute but who have been traditionally marginalized, to provide students a world-class education, and to sustain a socially responsible community that examines and tries to preserve the important ecologies of our region’s nature, society, and culture.

Throughout its educational evolution, Woodbury has adhered to core principles that value ethical behavior, student empowerment, diversity, and rigorous professional education that is grounded in the liberal arts.

While Woodbury’s strength flows from its underlying historical purpose and the principles that have persisted, one change that Woodbury still contends with occurred in 1972, when for-profit Woodbury College became a not-for-profit institution. Many of the University’s weaknesses in the years following arose from not having fully embraced this change.

In March 2001 a WASC Special Visit focused on five areas of concern: Financial Viability; Assessment and Program Review; Planning; Faculty; and Technology. In each case, problems in those areas appear to have arisen from an imperfect transition from Woodbury’s past to its present. For instance, the University lacked an endowment that could help support operations and offer a measure of financial security. However, the University has advanced significantly from that phase by reaching the $10 million goal in its endowment and by bolstering the staff and operations in the Advancement area.

Another area of concern was the heavy reliance
on part-time faculty, which was a strength of the for-profit model and which then, as now, gives students access to real world experience. Perhaps the most pervasive concern, however, dealt with the institution’s difficulties in developing a culture of data collection, analysis, and forecasting to manage enrollment, develop budgets, review educational performance, and perform institutional and departmental planning at the strategic and operational levels.

While many of the specific problems have been addressed and while various units of the University can show great improvement, larger issues that led to these problems are just beginning to find effective solutions at the institutional level.

It is essential that we continue to develop these solutions to help us with emerging challenges. Woodbury has created programs such as Architecture and Interior Architecture whose success threatens to exceed the institution’s capacity; it seeks to reposition programs such as Business so that they maintain their long history of quality; and it looks to continue its record of producing students who achieve regional and national success. It will come as no surprise, then, that the community has identified themes in this Institutional Proposal that echo previous problems and look to create enduring mechanisms for continuous improvement.

2. Description of Outcomes

Our Institutional Self-Review has been a tremendous community learning experience. It has led us to a greater understanding of our shortcomings and our potential. We anticipate six important outcomes of our re-accreditation process that will help us become the University we have the potential to be:

A. A refined University vision and mission that reflects Woodbury’s emerging identity. The University’s current mission and core values reflect its trajectory in a broad sense, but changes in our enrollment, our faculty, our programs, and in the larger educational landscape require incorporation into our educational identity.

B. Greater alignment between the University’s educational objectives and institutional planning.

In recent years Woodbury has new programs and increasing enrollment that have made planning a challenge. We want control of our growth within our educational identity. We want to develop our planning in a way that helps us realize our educational objectives.

C. More robust institutional inquiry, more pervasive assessment, and greater accountability. For Woodbury, ensuring quality as we sustain growth is crucial to meeting our Core Commitments to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness. We need to have greater ability to interpret information about our performance, and we need to make assessment a part of our culture.

D. Improved use of data for institutional inquiry and quality assurance. To build our capacity for institutional reflection and evaluation we need to build better systems of data gathering and analysis. We have much work to do to become an evidence-based institution, and this will be one of our most fundamental advances as a result of our reaccreditation process.

E. Improved ability to evaluate educational objectives. At Woodbury, refining our educational objectives is the first step to evaluating them. As we develop our educational objectives, we will make certain they are reflected at the level of the school, program, and course. We will establish a system of ongoing program review for all academic programs.

F. Improved faculty evaluation of student learning. Many of the University’s programs incorporate outcomes-based assessment, and many of the faculty are proficient in assessment techniques. To raise the skill level of the entire faculty, both full-time and part-time, we will use our new Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to spread assessment skills throughout the faculty, and we will require our faculty members to develop teaching portfolios to document their teaching effectiveness for contract renewal and promotion.

3. Constituency Involvement

Developing the Institutional Proposal has been an inclusive and evidence-based process, with
especially significant contributions by the faculty.

December 2004. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, who serves as the WASC Academic Liaison Officer, selects Barbara Bowley to chair the WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee (WRSC).

January 2005. Team from Woodbury attends WASC reaccreditation workshop at Cal Poly Pomona. The WRSC Chair informs the Woodbury University Faculty Association (WUFA) Senate and the Senior VPAA informs President Nielsen and the cabinet about the new accreditation environment.

The Senate plans how faculty will lead the reaccreditation effort. They ask the WRSC Chair to provide a progress report at each Senate meeting and seek advice from the Senate on key issues for reaccreditation.

February 2005. President Nielsen issues a memo to the University community that outlines the reaccreditation process and timeline. The memo calls on the community for “your support and your active help in this important project.”

The WRSC Chair and Senior VPAA choose steering committee members from a cross-section of the University: five members from faculty, one from Student Affairs staff, one from University Advancement staff, and one from the President’s cabinet. They are selected on the basis of their demonstrated commitment to the University, their complementary strengths, and their ability to work from an institution-wide perspective.

WRSC Chair leads a town hall meeting of faculty, staff, and administrators that introduces the community to the concept of the University as a learning institution based on a culture of assessment and continuous improvement. At the meeting the WRSC Chair administers a survey to seek ideas from the community on how to improve institutional quality. The responses collected there become one of the tools for the Institutional Self-Review.

WRSC begins regular weekly meetings. The committee studies the reaccreditation process and begins the Preliminary Self-Review exercise, evaluating key issues at Woodbury within the WASC Criteria for Review under the Four Standards. It reviews WASC reports from both 1998 and 2001 and identifies outstanding issues concerning data collection and assessment, program review, and institutional planning.

WRSC identifies an area for immediate attention: the need for better data to assess institutional capacity and student learning.

March 2005. After consultation with the Chair of WRSC the Senate approves the use of teaching portfolios as a means to assess instructional effectiveness and student learning.

The chairs of the academic programs convene and adopt a proposal from Arts & Sciences to establish five institution-wide educational outcomes based on Our Student’s Best Work: A Framework for Accountability Worthy of Our Mission. The Senate approves the proposal.

The WRSC Chair briefs the President’s Council on the emerging themes for reaccreditation and advises them of the critical need to increase the University’s capacity for data collection and analysis.

WRSC extracts themes from their Self-Review exercise. On March 28, the Senate approves the draft themes for reaccreditation.


The President, Senior VPAA, and the members of WRSC attend the 2005 WASC Annual Meeting. WASC staff reviews the draft IP.

On April 19, WRSC appears before the Board of Trustees’ Academic and Student Affairs Committee. The Committee praises the efforts of WRSC and the entire community and gives its full support for the themes.

On April 19, WRSC also holds a town hall meeting for faculty, staff, and students. During the meeting, a strong consensus emerges that the themes adequately reflect the most important issues for moving the
University forward.

WRSC Chair joins the President’s Budget Advisory Committee to bring recommendations for building institutional capacity to the FY 2005-2006 budget. In a meeting of the WRSC Chair and the President, the President stresses the importance of being accountable to our students, their parents, and to all those we serve. He emphasizes that the WASC reaccreditation process is a way to move the University to even greater levels of quality and pledges his personal support to make sure there is institution-wide cooperation in helping WRSC carry out its responsibilities.

May 2005. WRSC asks standing campus committees and organizations for feedback on how the Themes and Actions relate to their charges and activities. Feedback is obtained from twelve committees, including student government leaders, alumni, deans, several faculty committees, and three presidential advisory committees. The exercise helps WRSC gain perspective on how the University’s organizational structure can best be used to implement the Proposal’s activities.

June 2005. The Chair of the Board’s Academic and Student Affairs Committee, who is also Vice-Chairman of the Board, presents the Board with the new framework for WASC reaccreditation and the themes of the Proposal. The Board enthusiastically endorses the presentation.

August/September 2005. WRSC circulates a new draft to the entire community for review. WRSC incorporates suggestions to produce its final draft.

4. Approach for the Preparatory Review

The Capacity and Preparatory Review will be staged according to the Four Standards. The most important issues for Woodbury will be the questions of making sure our resources effectively support our growth and increasing our capacity to measure our performance.

Sustaining Growth While Sustaining Core Resources

To support the growth we seek, we will need to determine how our core resources need to be developed and sustained. The Capacity and Preparatory Review will help us establish the baseline for finances, faculty and administrative staffing levels, part-time and full-time faculty salaries, and the library and information technology.

Using Data More Effectively

To guide the growth of the institution, we will use higher quality data to inform our planning and decision-making, and distribute that data throughout the University. Better data will allow the University to be more coherent in its planning and decision-making. Shared data will allow decision makers at all levels to communicate the basis for decisions. We will hire an Institutional Researcher to help us generate better data and to guide us in developing an Institutional Portfolio.

Creating a Climate of Continuous Improvement

To ensure quality as we grow, we will build performance assessment in all areas of the University and use the data to continuously improve. With a clearer institutional identity, our academic and non-academic departments can refine their missions and align them with performance objectives.

Woodbury has specific goals to achieve by the end of its Capacity and Preparatory Review:

A. A renewed mission and vision for the future that is embraced by the community.
B. Performance objectives for each unit of the University.
C. Greater capacity to collect, interpret, and communicate data to guide our decision-making and ensure quality.
D. A mechanism for ongoing analysis of the ability of our core resources to sustain planned growth.

5. Approach for the Educational Effectiveness Review

Woodbury University will employ WASC’s Special Themes approach for its Educational Effectiveness review. We were attracted to this approach because, as WASC (2003) notes, it is
“useful to institutions which are just beginning to establish their institution-wide systems of assessment related to teaching and learning.”

The process of Institutional Self-Review has shown us the scope of work needed to meet our Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness, and we feel this is best expressed through four themes. These themes reflect our desire to align our University more clearly around its educational mission, to focus on both teaching and learning, to develop the whole student for a successful future, and to build systems of evidence and accountability for our students’ learning.

As we develop our themes we anticipate the following outcomes:

A. A clear educational identity that establishes our main educational objectives across the University;
B. Alignment of the University’s educational objectives with educational outcomes at the institution level, the program level, and the course level;
C. More effective instruction; and
D. Even more successful students.

Theme #1: Institutional Identity

Woodbury University has come to comprise diverse educational programs, embracing architecture, design, the liberal arts as well as business. The University’s main stakeholders are aware of the evolution of the curriculum, but few have been able to reflect on what it means for the University’s future.

Hypothesis: By creating a rich and meaningful context in which all of Woodbury’s stakeholders can come together to create a vision for Woodbury’s future, we can build consensus around our mission and our educational objectives.

Action #1. Generate and share institutional information to help the community understand the University’s current trajectory and future possibilities.

To prepare the community for discussions about our institutional future, we need a context portfolio about our current institutional environment. We need to understand our student demographics, including the social and economic factors that impact their lives. We need information on the growth and development of our programs. We need information that places our students within the larger context of higher education. We need to examine future trends in learning and in society at large to get a clearer picture of how our students will live and learn after they leave Woodbury.

Action #2. Develop a common vision of Woodbury University’s institutional identity and educational objectives.

Woodbury University must define its educational priorities so that it can operate with greater effectiveness. On October 11, 2005, Woodbury will convene an “identity retreat” in which the community will begin to refine its understanding of the University’s driving forces and primary educational concerns. The identity retreat will take the context portfolio produced in #2.1 and from it find a renewed identity that can inform the mission and objectives of units throughout the University. The success of this activity will require participation from both campuses and the efforts of the faculty, students, staff, administration, the Board of Trustees, alumni and all other stakeholders.

Theme #2: Institutional Alignment

This theme plays a key role in the Capacity and Preparatory Review and will continue to be developed through the Educational Effectiveness Review. It requires that the University makes certain that the allocation of resources in all areas of the institution are based on planning that is in line with the educational identity, objectives, and mission of the University.

Hypothesis: Aligning the University’s policies and practices with its educational objectives will facilitate the development of performance indicators to create greater levels of accountability and move the institution toward a “culture of evidence.”

Action #1. Develop a Master Academic Plan to grow the University in conjunction with its educational identity and objectives.

Aided by a facilitator, the University will develop a plan that informs how and when and where we
want to grow our programs, our facilities, and our enrollments. We will have a master planning document that is informed by a community-wide agreement on educational objectives and the future course of the University.

**Action #2.** Review the goals of the existing strategic plan to determine how they align with the Master Academic Plan and then determine how the goals’ outcomes will be assessed.

With the development of a Master Academic Plan, we will be able to analyze our current strategic plan to determine how the two align. The resulting refined strategic plan will be reviewed to make certain how its goals should be assessed. This is one of the first steps we will make toward developing a culture of evidence that will permeate the institution.

**Action #3.** Evaluate the Current Master Facilities Plan for its alignment with the Master Academic Plan.

As at many rapidly evolving institutions, having enough resources and using them effectively is challenging. At Woodbury’s 22.5-acre campus, the development of facilities and support services has been affected by rapid growth. This has resulted in building several temporary structures to meet unanticipated growth and having under supported educational resources such as labs and libraries. The new Master Academic Plan will guide the revision of the current Campus Master Facilities Plan.

**Theme #3: Student Success**

Woodbury is justifiably proud of its exceptional focus on students, especially on educating the whole student for lifelong success. We want to build on that strength by refining our vision of the successful student and developing mechanisms to create even greater student success. With a refined vision of our institutional identity we will be able to establish our unique definition of student success within the Woodbury context and within the larger educational, professional, and global community. In defining success, we will take into account our students’ goals for themselves and what we need to provide them with to assure a successful future.

*Hypothesis: By establishing a model of what constitutes “student success” in the unique Woodbury environment and generating evidence that measures how well its educational processes produce student success, Woodbury will produce the most successful students possible.*

**Action #1.** Develop data to measure the success of our current students and use those measurements to improve our students’ opportunities for success.

WRSC will form a Task Force on Student Success that will first determine what information the University currently collects about students that may be brought to bear on assessing their curricular and co-curricular success. The group will evaluate mechanisms to compare our students’ skills and knowledge upon entry, at mid-course, and at graduation, including nationally normed instruments that are used to evaluate the academic skills of students, both formatively and summatively. It will also examine methods for assessing alumni success. They will consider ways to compare our students with their peers nationally in both curricular and co-curricular dimensions. The task force will report on their findings to WRSC for consideration by the wider community.

**Action #2.** Develop alumni tracking systems to help us define student success in terms of lifelong impact.

The alumni of Woodbury University can provide a vast amount of information about how successfully we are educating our students. This is especially important for an institution that educates large numbers of students who come from underrepresented categories or who are the first in their families to attend college. Tracking graduates’ placement and continued education will offer one measure. Surveying employers as well as surveying and interviewing our alumni will help us determine if we have inculcated the habits and skills that help determine success. Understanding our successful alumni can help us shape our institution at all levels and “future engineer” successful students.

**Action #3.** Develop and implement holistic model of student success that takes into account research on best practices as well as what is most meaningful within the Woodbury culture.

Woodbury does not define success singularly.
We are open to defining success in many ways, and as we create greater capacity for assessing the development of our students and the lifelong success of our alumni, we will be able to have richer and richer concepts of the successful student and better mechanisms for producing such students. We plan to develop indicators of success based on educational research and with respect to the cultural, economic, and demographic parameters of our students and alumni.

We want to use the results of our inquiries into our students’ success to help inform our own notions of lifelong success. For several years, members of the Woodbury community have worked on a concept of student success that takes into account both personal and professional mastery. This model builds not only on Woodbury’s student-centeredness, but also on its special approach to professional education grounded in the liberal arts. We believe we can develop a special approach to holistic education, which intertwines curricular and co-curricular dimensions of success in a unique way. To create our unique model we will research the field of holistic student development and apply it to our vision of educating the whole student.

We will pilot a short curriculum in personal and professional mastery and develop assessment outcomes for this group as we track their journey on a longitudinal basis. Depending on the results of our assessment, we will see if this innovative model is meeting our goals for generating successful students who demonstrate personal and professional mastery, and we will consider its implications for the curriculum.

Theme #4: Instructional Effectiveness

The faculty’s dedication to educating Woodbury’s students is a point of institutional pride. To demonstrate the effectiveness of our instruction, a more robust, institution-wide culture of educational assessment needs to be developed.

Hypothesis: If we coordinate educational objectives across programs, conduct regular program reviews that are evidence-based, and increase the faculty’s understanding of assessment and the types of instruction that are most effective in the unique Woodbury environment, the result will be greater instructional effectiveness.

Action #1. Perform comprehensive, assessment-driven program review that develops departmental learning objectives that are in alignment with institution-wide learning objectives.

As the Deans align the mission of their schools around the University mission and educational objectives, each program will establish objectives that are aligned to the schools and incorporate University-wide learning objectives. To assist the program heads in this task, we will offer a workshop in evidence-driven, on-going formative program reviews that culminate in a periodic summative review. In addition, we will ask the program heads to compare methods of program assessment and to review the report of the Task Force on Student Success to identify best practices. To support our plan for institution-wide program review, program chairs will use the robust data collection that we will engineer in preparation for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. Chairs who have completed their review will serve as mentors for those undergoing review.

Action #2. Develop the ability of faculty to evaluate instruction based on common measures and with regard to the institution’s educational objectives and desired learning outcomes.

Our review of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (EEI’s) shows that a wide variety of good assessment mechanisms exist on campus, including capstone courses, internship supervisor evaluations, alumni interviews, professional reviews, and mid-course and capstone portfolio reviews. Our EEI review also revealed a lack of institution-wide assessment of learning. Most of the better program assessments take place within a context of disciplinary accreditation rubrics that do not make contact with institutional learning objectives.

Even before our Institutional Proposal Review had been completed, the institution began to address this need. At the annual faculty workshop in August, Dr. L. Dee Fink helped faculty understand the importance of course design and assessment that fosters “significant learning.” In January, Dr. Mary Allen will present a faculty workshop on assessment techniques. Woodbury’s Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will follow up with ongoing
workshops on assessment. By reviewing syllabi for evidence of outcomes-based assessment, the IETL will track how well the faculty are developing assessment skills.

**Action #3. Explore the effectiveness of various modes of instruction in producing significant learning.**

Woodbury University has rich and diverse ways of delivering instruction to its students, including studio work, student portfolios, and collaborative courses. We want to build on this strength by investigating how our various models can be used across the curriculum to produce deeper and more significant learning. WRSC will establish an Instructional Effectiveness Task Force to investigate how modes of instruction impact learning on campus. WRSC will disseminate the results of that investigation to help the community produce more innovative instruction and deeper learning. Departments will use this information to link learning objectives with optimal modes of instruction.

**Action #4. Provide faculty with the tools to assess instructional effectiveness.**

Preliminary analysis has suggested that electronic teaching portfolios can provide faculty with a means to grade, assess, and track student progress and at the same time serve as a tool to reflect on, demonstrate, and improve instructional effectiveness. Woodbury’s Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning will develop faculty learning communities to train faculty how to use e-portfolios for continuous improvement of teaching.

**6. Workplan and Milestones.**

**Timeline**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2007</td>
<td>Completion of Institutional Self-Study for Capacity and Preparatory Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2008</td>
<td>Capacity and Preparatory Review Site Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>Completion of Institutional Self-Study for Educational Effectiveness Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2009</td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness Site Visit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WRSC will remain responsible for overseeing the reaccreditation effort. WRSC will identify or establish committees to undertake the tasks associated with reaccreditation. These groups will report to WRSC, who will assure that the work conforms to the standards for reaccreditation.

WRSC will assure that the information that emerges from the identity retreat and subsequent activities result in a community document that reflects Woodbury’s renewed mission, values, vision, and educational objectives. This document will be distributed throughout the University and published widely. It will be first used to guide WRSC, with the aid of an external consultant, to develop a Master Academic Plan. The Master Academic Plan will be submitted for approval to the administration and the Board of Trustees.

WRSC will then task the Strategic Planning Committee to review the Strategic Plan for its alignment with the University’s revised mission and educational objectives. With a new Master Academic plan we will set the stage for our Capacity and Preparatory Review. We will be able to examine with greater precision how well our core resources support our educational objectives. A major component of this will see the President’s Space Planning Advisory Committee undertaking revision of the Campus Master Facilities Plan in light of the Master Academic Plan.

In order to help the community identify, collect, and analyze data, a special Capacity and Preparatory Review Committee will work with the Institutional Researcher. Reporting to WRSC, the CPR Committee will comprise stakeholders from all key academic and non-academic areas of the University. This committee will be charged with examining how well our core resources support the University. Ultimately the committee will help produce the Institutional Portfolio for reaccreditation.

To begin the assessment efforts required for the Educational Effectiveness Review, Deans will collaborate on the development of common program review processes and standards and assure the alignment of those standards with the University’s educational objectives. The new
coordinator of General Education will work with program chairs to develop a plan for infusing institution-wide general educational outcomes throughout the curriculum based on the Key Educational Outcomes adopted by the University. Guided by the work of the Deans and the efforts of WRSC, chairs will work with program faculty to develop specific student learning outcomes and translate these into course-level student learning outcomes.

Task forces focusing on the two themes of Student Success and Educational Effectiveness will be developed by WRSC and first given the responsibility of identifying the types of data needed to assess student success and to aid the faculty in their assessment of instructional effectiveness. This information will be brought to the Capacity and Preparatory Review Committee to assist them in their role of developing the data capacity of the University.

Please see Appendix A for a detailed workplan and timeline.

7. Effectiveness of Data Gathering and Analysis Systems

As Peter Ewell indicates in his 2004 report for WASC, an institution must have evidence to collect before it can become a learning organization.

In response to the 2001 WASC visit, Woodbury hired a CIO in January 2002 who developed a Student Information System (SIS) that since fall 2004 has increased the standardization of comprehensive student enrollment data collection. This data serves as one of the bases for the University’s reports and KPI’s. The creation of an Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in spring 2005 has also facilitated an increasing understanding of assessment techniques. The hiring of the University’s first director of writing in fall 2005 has brought to the campus training and experience in qualitative assessment.

The Institutional Self-Review process also led to improvements in the standardization of data gathering and analysis, including the analysis of financial data and student population characteristics. In the area of learning outcomes assessment, data gathering in some academic programs is comprehensive and data are used recursively to improve practice.

While the University’s capacity to gather and analyze data has grown and while pockets of good data collection and analysis exist, the University knows that it requires substantially greater capacity in gathering, deploying, and evaluating data. The work ahead must result in a robust infrastructure that can provide data and a culture that will nurture ongoing assessment. That the University places such a high priority on these goals is reflected in its commitment to hiring an institutional researcher and in its purchase of e-portfolio software for both students and faculty. We will continue to develop our data gathering and analysis with the establishment of an institutional portfolio and institutional assessment software, as well as promote and support community education in the culture of evidence.

Portfolio of Evidence

Throughout the Institutional Self-Review, the Capacity and Preparatory Review, and the Educational Effectiveness Review, Woodbury’s reaccreditation website will communicate information about our reaccreditation to the community and will ensure accountability to the public. The website can be found at http://web3.woodbury.edu/library/accred/accred.html. Some of the information already found on the website will provide information for the development of the Institutional Portfolio.

8. Proposal Data Tables.

See attached. Please note that data on upper division and lower division headcount were not tracked at Woodbury until the implementation of a Student Information System in AY 2004-2005.
### Headcount Enrollment by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Headcount Enrollment</th>
<th>Lower Division Headcount</th>
<th>Upper Division Headcount</th>
<th>Graduate Headcount</th>
<th>Non-Degree Headcount</th>
<th>Total FTE Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>203 (15%)</td>
<td>14 (1%)</td>
<td>1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>213 (15%)</td>
<td>12 (1%)</td>
<td>1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>177 (13%)</td>
<td>9 (1%)</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>177 (13%)</td>
<td>5 (0%)</td>
<td>1075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>561 (39%)</td>
<td>708 (49%)</td>
<td>176 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (0%)</td>
<td>1235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Headcount Enrollment by Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Headcount Enrollment</th>
<th>Full-Time</th>
<th>Part-Time</th>
<th>On-Campus Location</th>
<th>Off-Campus Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>890 (66.3%)</td>
<td>452 (33.7%)</td>
<td>1205 (89.8%)</td>
<td>137 (10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1404</td>
<td>876 (62.4%)</td>
<td>528 (37.6%)</td>
<td>1248 (88.9%)</td>
<td>156 (11.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>890 (65.4%)</td>
<td>470 (34.6%)</td>
<td>1178 (86.6%)</td>
<td>182 (13.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1374</td>
<td>925 (67.3%)</td>
<td>449 (32.7%)</td>
<td>1175 (85.5%)</td>
<td>199 (14.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>1130 (78.2%)</td>
<td>315 (21.8%)</td>
<td>1266 (87.6%)</td>
<td>179 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Degrees and Certificates Granted by Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Degrees Granted</th>
<th>Bachelor Degrees</th>
<th>Graduate Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>169 (78.2 %)</td>
<td>47 (21.7 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>184 (70.2 %)</td>
<td>78 (29.8 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>211 (70.8 %)</td>
<td>87 (29.2 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>232 (74.8 %)</td>
<td>78 (25.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>232 (74.1 %)</td>
<td>81 (25.9 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>