WASC Institutional Self-Review

WRSC Evaluation of WASC Institutional Self-Review Worksheet

Qualitative Data From Worksheet

**Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives.**

1.1 – Mission Statements

- The mission statement could potentially improve by incorporating unique character of Woodbury University (addresses general liberal arts and professional tract mission but not specializations of the university, eg design fields and business in urban center)

- There may be a contradiction between professional education and lifelong learning. The University’s mission is too vague. How does the strength and dynamic growth of the design school figure in the mission?

- Published mission statement is evident. Institution’s purposes not always subject to peer review.

- Catalog, Web page, Student hand book, Accreditation Reports

- Published Mission Statement defines WU's essential values in character. The appropriateness of the purpose(s) needs validation though.

- The institution has a published mission statement that clearly describes its purposes which fall within recognized academic areas and/or disciplines. Peer reviews within the framework of generally recognized academic disciplines or areas of practice need to occur on an ongoing basis.

- Published in the catalog and is on the web site.

1.2 – Educational Objectives

- The catalogue and strategic plan outline educational objectives but I am not aware of status (learning outcomes)

- As we progress into graduate education, “student focus” may not be as important as “scholarship” or “academic excellence”. Our policy of serving as many as possible may provide a disservice to good students. The good students do not appreciate the “no student left behind” policy; it means that many are not pushed ahead. The good students are pressing us to lift the bar and raise the stature of the school.

- The publication of objectives is not sufficient in and of itself; disparity and inconsistency exist.

- Catalog, Course Syllabi, Accreditation Reports
• The objectives need clear delineation and dissemination. The ed. objectives do exist at the school level (evidence catalog, Accreditation Reports, various other documents at the department lever, Strategic Plan).

• The institution needs published educational objectives that are consistent with its purposes.

• There are goals and broad statements available, but actual objectives are not easily found.

**1.3 – Leadership Accountability**

• Unaware of performance evaluation process at this level

• Leadership needs to exhibit excellence, be creative, nimble and innovative, and aware of the world outside, just like an entrepreneurial corporation. Leadership needs to appreciate the design school's strength and support its growth

• Lack of coordination/communication exists.

• Faculty contracts, Administrative contracts, Search policy criteria and Request for submittals. Note: one area needing attention would be the leadership and management of business office and decision making process for implementing fiscal issues

• The leadership system at all levels exists at the department level in academic areas. The leadership of staff

• The institution’s leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at some but not all levels. High performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability is generally lacking.

• In the academic area, we are served by department chairs who are awesome. The academic vice president has made an excellent start and the president serves the university extremely well.

**1.4 - Academic Freedom**

• I don't exactly know where they are, but assume there are published policies

• Although WU states its commitment to these tenets, lack of consistency exists in its implementation.

• These ratings are here not because I think issues of academic freedom are problematic but rather because I’m not sure where this is written in policy. I’ve never had to look it up. Places I would check: Faculty handbook, Faculty constitution, Personnel Committee Policy

• Faculty Handbook, Student Handbook. The commitment to academic freedom needs to be made more public through systematic dissemination at various points and at various levels, currently it is implicit.
• Faculty Handbook, Student Handbook and University policies exist related to academic freedom and related procedures.

• In faculty and student handbooks and staff policy and procedures manual.

1.5 - Diversity

• We talk about diversity and we recruit for diversity, and I believe we need to do more to raise consciousness about diversity issues, which includes cross cultural awareness, individual and institutional self-awareness plus establish more rituals (some of this is in the strategic plan, but not aware of progress).

• Although we are a school with a diverse student body, it sometimes appears that programs are run by individual schools or departments, not university-wide.

• Course work documentation both syllabi and student outcome (projects, research, exams, etc)

• The institution was rated very high nationally in diversity. The course offerings are also diverse. However, more black faculty (F/T) needs to be hired.

• The institution has diversity in its faculty and students and staff.

• Not so clear, but we seem to be doing it. The student body is diverse, the staff less so, the faculty even less so (though more diverse than many other institutions) and the board has little diversity at all.

1.6 - Autonomy

• No religious or political agendas – actually we need to see some stirring of political interests on this campus

• I have not seen nor experienced any history of interference.

• Concerns of separating board interests and agendas from academic programs.

• WU is not supported by or affiliated with political, corporate or religious organizations. It is autonomous in its academic policies.

• The institution has no history of interference in substantive decisions or educational functions by political, religious, corporate or other external bodies outside the institution’s own governance arrangements.

• The institution has little history of interference from outside the academy.

1.7 - Representation

• Information and procedures described in student handbook and catalogue. Grievance and sexual harassment procedures need clarification.

• Lack of studio space, especially in the areas of architecture and design, continues to diminish the effectiveness of the learning environment for students. This makes it more difficult to fulfill stated Woodbury goals.
• Catalog, Registrar policies, Faculty Constitution, Academic Appeal committee policy

• The WU catalog, Student handbook. The office of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs maintain appropriate records to this effect. Records to this effect are available in the Registrar’s Office also.

• The institution has published or readily available policies on student grievances and complaints, refunds, etc. and has no history of adverse findings against it with respect to violation of these policies. **Records of student complaints are maintained for a six-year period?** The institution clearly defines and distinguishes between the different types of credits it offers and between degree and non-degree credit, and accurately identifies the type and meaning of the credit awarded in its transcripts.

• The student handbook and the catalog have the policies on student grievances and complaints. My past experience with this has shown student affairs to be thoughtful and thorough. Though I might personally disagree with some of their decisions, they follow the policies as they are written. I don’t know about the records they keep.

**1.8 – Organizational Integrity**

• I think the grievance procedures are still not clear nor the process understood by students. Additionally, I believe the faculty/staff need further training on sexual harassment guidelines.

• Enrollment Services Group has tried to streamline bureaucracy for students and Faculty and Staff Associations have tried to do the same.

• Rated poorly with high priority because of past performance of business office

• It is unclear how sound the procedures/processes in the Business Office are, given the lapses that have been reported in TIAF over the last 2 years. The recent appointment of an external consultant is a first clear action taken to address this issue.

• The institution has published or readily available grievance procedures for faculty, staff, and students. Its finances are regularly audited by external agencies.

• There are regular and thorough audits. There have recently been some difficulties in the business office with faculty salaries/deductions/etc.

**Synthesis/Reflections on Standard 1**

1. **Most Important Issues**

• Establish learning outcomes and measures. Diversity education-awareness/celebrations. Tweak policy/procedures on grievances/sexual harassment

• 1.3, 1.6, and 1.8
• More public dissemination of information in regards to academic freedom; Greater diversity, especially in faculty (black faculty?); Business procedures/processes to be scrutinized and audited by external agencies; A dedicated office of Institutional Research.

• The institution needs published educational objectives that are consistent with its purposes; The institution’s leadership creates and sustains a leadership system at some but not all levels. High performance, appropriate responsibility, and accountability is generally lacking.

• Defining and evaluating educational outcomes.

2. – Strengths for Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review

• I don’t really know the data gathering and systems or how it’s used. I am familiar with the recent success that was measured as a result of the new Academic Peer mentor program, as it was shared with the campus community (the rise in grades of students on academic probation). This is a strength.

• The work of the Enrollment Services Group

• Strong student life and student services that embrace diverse student life, Strong academic support services

• For Preparatory Review: Strategic Plan, clearly defined Mission Statement, departmental/school leadership; For Educational Effectiveness: Educational goals are clearly defined at the department/school level.

• For Preparatory Review: mission statement; For Educational Effectiveness: academic freedom policies, no outside interference

• Diversity of student body. Clear focus on mission.

3. – Improvements for Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review

• One thing is a better understanding of why students leave WU before graduating (eg better exit interviews and assessment)

• Regarding institutional purposes: need for greater coordination and communication from leadership team in converting theory into praxis. For WU to take a closer look at how it truthfully represents itself to our various constituencies.

• Overhaul business procedures in business office as they pertain to decisions regarding academic goals, Clarify stated goals and credentials for the selection of leadership positions, Review of written policy regarding the relationship between the board of trustees and their connection to other departments and schools with in the university.

• For Preparatory Review: Institutional Research Functions; For Educational Effectiveness: Institutional Research Functions, clear well defined procedures for the introduction/phasing out of majors programs
• For Preparatory Review: leadership; For Educational Effectiveness: educational objectives

• Defining and evaluating educational outcomes.
2.1 – Educational Programs

- I don’t know specifics

- A+D’s goals are well honed by the accreditation process (see 2.4) NAAB and FIDER provide intense scrutiny of their program content.

- Catalog, Course syllabi and work, Accreditation program evaluations both internal and peer reviewed comments. There is definitely concern regarding full time faculty. Finding the balance between practicing professionals and academics in the professional programs. Acquiring the appropriate number of recognized scholars in the arts and sciences.

- Difficult to assess on a regular and consistent basis. Right now, each school seem to proceed independently of each other.

- The program description in catalog. The accreditation reports for the School of Architecture and Design and Business provides clear statement. There is an over-reliance on the part-time faculty in all the programs.

- The content, length, and standards of the institution’s academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review. See the Course catalogue and class syllabi.

- Far too few full-time graduate faculty (I believe we have only one), or indeed full time faculty of all kinds.

2.2 – Degree Requirements

- Title V is addressing supplemental learning to help with under-preparedness. Also, ESL proficiency is an issue that needs to be addressed.

- In many cases, course syllabi are lacking in depth in some departments and schools. Although attempts have been made, more consistency is needed.

- These requirements are clearly enunciated in the catalog and are consistently enforced. These are also reflected in course syllabi, although variations exist.

- Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major.

- Levels of achievement for undergraduate and graduate students are not generally assessed except in one capstone course.

◊ – Baccalaureate

- I am assuming WU are up to par on this one, but it’s not my area.

- While still ensuring quality material is delivered, we need to clarify the goals of A+S classes, such as physics, taken only by design students. We need to resolve the
conflicts between the needs of A+S students in majors such as psychology, and design students taking the same classes for GE. At present these classes are often restricted. There should be adequate classes for both. Literacy, critical thinking and numerical skills are a constant challenge, but are improving gradually thanks to workshops and the Learning Center. Need a greater variety of GE classes in order to provide a genuine university-level education.

- School of Arts and Sciences continues its attempts at integration throughout the curriculum.

- Curriculum requirements provide balanced general education requirements. Consistent discussion occurs between arts and sciences and the professional program leading to applicable interdisciplinary course work and course work that is relevant to professional programs. Work toward providing course work from different professional programs that could be taken as general education requirements.

- The G/E and Majors provide an integral curriculum that prepares students for work, civic responsibility and a fulfilling life(?) The school of Business is currently piloting a curriculum along the lines of Personal, Professional Development that addresses the issues of meaning, purpose, fulfillment in life. The wide array of courses offered in these areas are broad-based and offer opportunities for requisite competencies. Evidence: Courses as described in the catalog and support syllabi.

- The institution has a program of General Education that is integrated throughout the curriculum, including at the upper division level together with significant study in depth in a given area of knowledge (described in terms of a major). The program consists of a minimum of 45 semester credit hours (or the equivalent)?

- The general education program is very good. Thoughtful, innovative, providing both breadth and depth. However, there are still too many GE requirements met by major courses.

◊ - Graduate

- Appears to be so. Out of my area.

- Although templates exist for curricular design, not all faculty members oblige.

- Can't speak on this criteria for review

- Course catalog and syllabi. All faculty teaching in the MB are doctorally/professionally qualified. (For example, 90% credit hours in the MBA are taught by doctorally qualified faculty. At least 5 full-time teach in the MBA program. Bachelors degree from an accredited institution is a requirement for admission to the MBA program. )

- The institution employs at least one full-time faculty member for each graduate degree program offered.

- One full-time person does not a graduate faculty make. (Are there more and I’ve missed them?)

2.3 – Programs/Policy
• Most appears to be on par, eg SOAR, but again, this aspect is out of my area. I do see need for improvement in the collaboration between academic and co-curricular programming that has greater potential for out-of-classroom student learning within (eg faculty, Student Affairs and student leaders identifying campus wide programs).

• Students’ ability to conduct critical research needs constant emphasis. More attention should be paid to students’ ability to gather and critically evaluate information.

• Faculty members would benefit in seeing what exists beyond the textbook!

• This is probably well done through out the university but without detailed analysis I feel that it may need our attention. The priority is high since it is the main objective of the institution.

• The syllabi for undergraduate and graduate courses

• The use of information and learning resources beyond textbooks is evidenced in syllabi throughout the undergraduate and graduate curriculum.

• I don’t know. I haven’t seen a breadth of syllabi, though in the past at least some graduate courses have used a single, introductory textbook as a resource. I’m sure this has stopped by now.

2.4 – Learning Effectiveness

• In general, yes, but as an administrative staff person, I’m not so involved in this.

• See 2.1 The A+D professional accreditation process, coupled with self-assessment, provides a forum for this exchange. The architecture faculty annual retreat generates a spirited discussion of program content, although we might consider splitting into focus groups, going into greater depth, and reporting back to a larger group.

• Not always the case.

• There is evidence that is done with in each individual department as experienced through syllabi, faculty meetings, accreditation reports (FIDER, NAAB) and professional advisory boards. However more attention needs to be paid to dispersing this information across departmental and schools boundaries.

• Through Curriculum Committee, Senate, and WUFA.

• The institution’s expectations for learning and student attainment need to be better shared among its members (including faculty, students, staff, and where appropriate, external stakeholders). The faculty’s responsibility is done through the Curriculum Committee, Faculty Senate, and WUFA.

• The faculty own the curricula.

2.5 – Active Engagement

• Appears to be strength, especially in studio courses, but often wonder how much this is done (other than grades) across the curriculum?
I encourage students to write detailed comments on the evaluation forms.

The “traditional” model of pedagogy is still employed in many disciplines. More regular feedback is necessary.

One area of this criteria needing more attention is the insurance of appropriate and ongoing feedback. This is determined through constant struggling in my own department as well as anecdotal concerns expressed by students in student advisory board meetings.

Most classes are conducted in a interactive process that actively engages the students in the learning process. The evaluation process is evidenced from the syllabi.

This can always be done better until a measurement for attainment is agreed to.

My knowledge of this is limited. I know that my department chair is constantly challenging us and our students to achieve high expectations.

2.6 – Demonstration of Attainment

Assume this is up to par, but out of my area

The architecture curriculum is tightly structured around the demands of a professional education and the general education requirements of the university.

Not consistent throughout the disciplines.

A stronger and more systematic technique needs development for the assessment of alumni after graduation as well as employer’s concerns. Develop stronger program for students interested in graduate programs.

Syllabi, review of student work by industry experts, student excellence.

Need to quantify and measure levels of attainment.

Often we don’t know. Follow-up can be difficult. Are departments meeting with alums to assess their success and their opinions on the fit between their skills and the marketplace?

2.7 – Program Review

Don’t know

We need an alumni database so we can check our numbers on professional license exam passing rates and graduate school placement. External professional accreditation boards and final design reviews that include practicing professionals provide real-world evaluation of the A+D programs. Faculty teach in clusters and teams to give each other continuous assessment. Guest critics from other schools, and our faculty that sit on review panels at other schools, provide external benchmarking of our standards.

Needs to be done consistently across the disciplines – university-wide.
• A stronger and more systematic technique needs development for the assessment of alumni after graduation as well as employer’s concerns. Develop stronger program for students interested in graduate programs. Speaking from anecdotal information for IA, placement is fairly strong but need more reinforcement through out curriculum the importance of professional certification.

• For Business Program, the assessment of learning outcomes are satisfactory by ACBSP Standards.

• The institution needs to incorporate its assessment of educational objectives results with respect to student achievement, including program completion, license examination, and placement rates results.

• I don’t know. Arts & Sciences is starting program review again. One was done 8 years ago that was pretty thorough. At that time, other department reviews were sometimes uneven. However, outside accreditors have created a climate in which review occurs more often.

2.8 – Scholarship, etc.

• Don’t understand WU’s policy re: scholarship, publishing, etc. Annual student conference highlighting exemplary student work is excellent – many faculty members acknowledged for outside recognition.

• In order to attract qualified faculty, more funding is needed for faculty development. The University should provide help with finding grants and grant writing, and provide course release and research assistants for faculty research and book writing. There should be an awards program for teaching excellence and service. A+D hosts faculty colloquia, a grant-funded outside lecture series, faculty gallery exhibits, book talks and signings. The A+D faculty are actively working on developing new classes, incorporating new technology, and developing a graduate program.

• It seems as if support of faculty for professional development is improving through faculty advancement fund. However more funds could be allocated in departmental budgets.

• Faculty Scholarship, Student Scholarship Conference, creative projects, new majors/courses etc. ample evidence at various school level, faculty awards, student awards.

• This category is a mixed bag of items: 1) The institution actively values and promotes scholarship – how to measure??; 2)curricular and instructional innovations – how to measure??; and 3) creative activity – how to measure?? as well as their dissemination – don’t see how this relates to the above

• Faculty are supported in creativity and innovation in courses and curricula (for example, the new "Journeys" courses from the history faculty). Support for scholarship has improved slightly (faculty development grants, etc.) but more improvement is needed.

2.9 - Linkage
• Appears to be on par – out of my area.

• Are we getting better? More emphasis on the scholarship of teaching and learning would be a help.

• Faculty promotion policies, course syllabi

• Faculty promotion policies, sabbaticals

• I don’t know.

2.10 – Student Assessment

• I am not familiar with how the (course) evaluation process is shared with faculty members, accountability and performance evaluation? I believe we need to understand more about students’ needs and satisfaction

• Advising is an important component of the learning process

• This is where we need to travel!

• Feel this hasn’t been addressed significantly to date. Student feedback of program occurs only at the end of the semester which leads to little ability to change based on student input during the semester. Course evaluations don’t necessarily get the students to evaluate course work rather than faculty.

• These policies are stated in the catalog and individual course syllabi. Although grades are reported major-wise by Registrar’s Office, no rigorous analysis is done to access their reasonableness

• The institution’s policy on grading and student evaluation is clearly stated, and provides opportunity for appeal as needed; and periodic analyses of grades and evaluation procedures are conducted to assess the rigor and impact of these policies.

• Policies on grading are clear. Periodic analyses of grades and evaluation procedures? We used to do this by distributing grade distributions to deans and department chairs. Are we still doing this?

2.11 – Co-Curricular

• Stated again, would like to see increased collaboration between faculty and staff involved with co-curricular programs to further integrate academic and personal development. Student leadership programs are an example of a strength, but attract a small percentage of students.

• Architecture Department helps students with internship programs, job placement, and graduate school application.

• Attempts have been made but linkages are not always easy to recognize.
• There seems to be co-curricular programs for the professional programs but it could be re-assessed for arts and sciences. More strategic coordination between the co-curricular activities and academic course work could be strengthened.

• Very little is done by way of co-curricular activities except by student fraternities and Sororities.

• The institution inconsistently (not across the boards) develops and implements co-curricular programs that are integrated with its academic goals and programs, and supports student professional and personal development.

• I believe that student affairs runs a very good co-curricular program. Career services, counseling, student organizations, etc. all provide students with opportunities for personal and professional development. Are they integrated into the academic curriculum as well as we’d like? I don’t know.

2.12 – Requirements Information

• I don’t exactly know how, but design students may need better preparation for the intensity of the program. I don’t know where to address the issue of “studio culture” regarding health practices (eg sleep), but somewhere this may need to be addressed.

• Model is inconsistent. The establishment of the Office of Academic Advising will help.

• Advising for programs is consistent and thorough

• The published information in various forms provides this information. The university is undertaking web-redesign

• Need to eliminate paper copies that by their very nature are out of date and inaccurate.

• For the most part these materials are accurate and complete. I, personally, struggle with the academic calendar on IQ web, but maybe it’s only me. For example, the last time I looked, I couldn’t find the date for commencement. Last week I called three offices and asked when summer school began. May 9th was the answer. But that’s only right for the accelerated programs. For this one, the IQ web calendar was the best source of information.

2.13 – Support Services

• My perception we’re pretty good with this?

• We need on-line or telephone registration like other universities. Some students, especially those on the San Diego campus, perceive these services as hostile and difficult to navigate.

• With the integration of the adult programs into the mainstream, continued customer needs to be consistent.
• Except for some minor glitches these student support services work well. At times these departments feel understaffed.

• It is hard to assess whether Student Support Services meet the needs in the absence of a system of systematic tracking.

• Support services need to be evaluated by each service listed. Some are doing a better job than others. But first, the needs must be understood and agreed to.

• These have gotten steadily better each year. More hours in the labs, more resources in the library, better software support in financial aid and advising, etc.

2.14 - Transfer Students

• We need to carefully evaluate the qualifications of transfer students particularly in digital media and, if necessary, require additional classes.

• Always room for improvement in developing better transfer student programs – strength of one of Title V grants in addressing this issue.

• Specific to my department, articulations agreements are clear.

• Various articulation agreements.

• Articulation agreements exist and can be put in place for new schools.

• Yes, we are transfer friendly. On-line articulation agreements with some of the nearest community colleges are especially helpful.

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Two

1. – Most Important Issues

• Assessment of student learning, satisfaction and achievement.

• Systematic alumni evaluation; Systematic assessment procedures for both assessing student work as well as assessing teaching performance. Assessment procedures as they are appropriate to diversity of student outcomes; Communication on these issues across departments and schools.

• More full-time faculty; Better pay for part-time faculty; Assessment of the adequacy of Student Support Services.

• The content, length, and standards of the institution’s academic programs conform to recognized disciplinary or professional standards and are subject to peer review. Competencies required for graduation are reflected in course syllabi for both General Education and the major.

• Number and qualifications of faculty.

2. – Strengths for Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review

• I would assume the quality of our academic programs.
• The work of the School of Arts and Sciences toward the integration of General Education across the curriculum.

• Student support services; Academic advising

• Scholarship and creative activity, Articulation Agreements for transfer students

• Prep review: The institution’s policy on grading and student evaluation; Ed Effectiveness review: Articulation Agreements for transfer students

• Support for innovation

3. – Areas for Improvement

• Need for assessment of learning outcomes

• Learning outcomes – university, departmental, and individual courses: what it takes to create better learning-centered environments.

• Alumni follow up; Assessment and evaluation standards

• Systematic assessment of student learning (2.6 & 2.7); F/T & P/T ration and P/T salary

• Prep review: Define scholarship measurements (see 2.8); Ed Effectiveness review: Need to quantify and measure levels of attainment.

• Assessment of educational attainment of students.
Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Sustainability

3.1 – Sufficient Personnel

- I don’t know how to assess this
- 1) Low pay and lack of resources (see 2.8) discourage leaders in the field from applying. See attached for comparative data. 2) Adjunct pay is appalling in relation to competing institutions, and makes it very difficult to hire qualified faculty. Fee for 3-unit seminar: WU, $2,200-2,400; Art Center, $4,000; Otis, $4,000; SCI-Arc, $4,500; UCLA, $8,000.
- WU could use a Project Manager and a Director of Institutional Research.
- Most departments in all areas seem understaffed
- Source of Information – Business Office, Human Resource Office
- The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations and to support its academic programs, consistent with its institutional and educational objectives. Evidence: number and types of open and desired personnel reqs.
- We are still light in terms of support staff for faculty. Three secretaries and a student worker are not enough. The people we have are good, but they sometimes get overwhelmed.

3.2 – Sufficient Faculty

- There is always the question of integrating the adjunct faculty more into the community.
- Need a greater variety of GE classes in order to provide a genuine university-level education. Need more sections of GE classes, they can be hard to get in to. See 3.1
- Need more full-time faculty.
- Most departments and schools need additional full time faculty
- The existing F/T faculty is appropriately qualified. There is however, an over-reliance P/T faculty.
- The institution has an instructional staffing plan that includes a sufficient number of fulltime faculty with appropriate background by discipline and degree levels – in most departments. Some could use more fulltime.
- We have a terrific faculty, but there are not enough of them. There are not enough areas covered, not enough faculty to serve as advisors in some of the bigger majors (like Fashion Design and interior Architecture) although there has been substantial improvement.
3.3 – Personnel/Alignment

- Don’t know the process for faculty
- See 2.8
- Staff evaluations are very irregular.
- Personnel committee works well in implementing a balanced review of existing faculty. Workload is high. 4/4 load requirements seem out of line with comparable institutions
- Faculty promotion/contract renewal guidelines as stated in the Faculty Handbook
- Not done well with adjuncts.
- Faculty and staff recruitment practices seem fine. Workload, especially in some areas where faculty are doing three or even four preparations at a time, are too much. Chairs are required to teach too much. Measures of teaching effectiveness are not routinely addressed outside of design majors. Student evaluation forms still need lots of work.

3.4 – Faculty Development

- Don’t know about faculty
- The faculty development budget and resources available to faculty for research, such as TA’s and course release, are not comparable with other institutions. This lack discourages qualified faculty from applying.
- IETL is a good indication of movement in this direction.
- Departmental and school budget should include larger funding for faculty development.
- Sponsoring faculty to conference/workshop; Faculty development grants.
- Evidence: Budget for faculty development, training, seminars...
- With support from the two Title V grants, faculty development opportunities improved in the last three years.

3.5 – Resource Alignment

- Being addressed in strategic plan and with Board of Directors
- Space, space, space! Budget, budget, budget!
- Though there appears to be fiscal resources necessary to effectively run academic programs, the distribution and faculty involvement in how these resources are distributed needs reworking. There is an increasing need to address the physical resources of the university especially as it pertains to adequate class space, diverse type of class space, and faculty offices
• Check with Business Office. For the most part yes

• Need more reserves, more endowment, more fund raising and to stop living hand to mouth.

• Mixed. Routine audits – yes. These are thorough. Plans for managing the deficit – yes. Does the distribution of money always reflect the educational aims of the institution? Not sure.

3.6 – Information Resources

• There is a shortage of studio, computer lab and workshop space to support the current A+D programs, let alone anticipate growth. The library facilities at San Diego must expand to support the graduate program. Libraries at both campuses should include A+D project archives and material libraries

• Additional resources are necessary.

• Information resources though limited as actual holdings are made up for in electronic resources and other services for acquiring the necessary resources from outside sources

• MOL, BOL, San Diego Campus

• Need more labs and smart classrooms.

• The resources seem adequate to support undergraduate students. Faculty seeking scholarly resources will often need to go elsewhere. Image collection? I don’t know. Off-campus access was sometimes problematic as some important databases were accessible only through on-campus servers (Lexis-nexis, Psych Abstracts, etc.) is this still true?

3.7 – I.T. Resources

• Work in progress

• Computer lab space is inadequate for growing A+D programs. We need a digital fabrication laboratory to keep A+D programs up to date with current technology.

• Trying but . . . not all members of the WU community are availing themselves of the opportunities.

• Like other departments this area of the university feels understaffed. At times there is a disconnect between the prioritizing of academic needs.

• Check with IT Department/Steve Dyer

• Need more resources.

• Greatly improved! There are still delays in implementation of online grade submission and degree audit.
3.8 – Clear Processes

- I don’t believe I have seen an actual organizational chart or understand clearly decision making processes (who decides what?)

- Communication, communication, communication!

- Decision making process in the university is clear though not necessarily sufficient to support decisions making by the entire community. Clearer boundaries need to be in place between Board of Trustees and University when making decisions that affect our objectives as a university

- Organizational Chart, probably exists, is not a public document though. Should be made widely available.

- No org chart published.

- In my experience. The faculty senate is a huge improvement. The whole reorganization seems to be working well.

3.9 – Governing Board

- As far as I know

- Because of its membership composition, the Board of Trustees is perceived as being slanted towards the interests of the business school at the expense of A+D.

- One does not always have access to up-to-date information as the communication process is not always working.

- Key word being appropriate – policy needs to clarify the role of independent governing board and their relationship to making decisions. It seems as if the decisions are based on their desire to change the objectives and focus of the university’s objectives as opposed to the overseeing of fiduciary and legal issues

- Source: Board of Trustees

- There is an active Board of Trustees

- First, on the whole, the board has done a really good job in their role as trustees. However, they must cease their interference in the activities of the School of Business. Their sense that the School of Business will benefit from their help or that the Dean of Business is somehow available to help them with projects of their own must be clarified before we can hire another dean.

3.10 – Chief Executive

- Appears to be working

- Too many VP’s for an institution of this size.

- The leadership at some levels needs improvement.
• The president serves the university well.

3.11 – Faculty Leadership

• Don’t know the exact process – I assume it’s working
• Not always for the adjunct faculty to do this.
• Both senate and supporting committees serve as affective tools for the academic leadership. The separate departments insure the academic quality of their programs
• Personnel Committee, Curriculum Committee
• Given the limitations in number and the burdens of workload, the faculty do a very good job in taking responsibility for academic leadership.

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Three

1. – Most Important Issues

• Fiscal strength, physical needs (housing, technology)
• 3.2– sufficient number of full time faculty; 3.5 – Fiscal and physical resources; 3.9 APPROPRIATE oversight by the board
• Financial Stability/Business Office Practices; Faculty Development Support; Organization Chart
• personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications; Fiscal and physical resources

2. – Strengths for Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review

• Stable role of trustees. President and cabinet
• Academic leadership
• Faculty Evaluation Process; Faculty’s exercise of academic leadership
• Prep review: Board of Trustees; Ed Effectiveness review: The institution employs personnel sufficient in number and professional qualifications to maintain its operations

3. – Improvements for Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review

• Need for Office of Institutional Research
• Need for Project Manager and Director of Institutional Research. Fiscal and physical resources.
• I pulled this out of the overall description of the standard because as each indicator was reviewed, this was the part that became the most difficult to support. The
decision making process at the university faces many disconnects as it works its way up or down the hierarchical structure of the institution.

- Organization Chart and clear communication of authority, responsibility matrix; App. Independent; Audit of Business Practices

- Prep review: Organization Chart; Ed Effectiveness review: Better use of limited budget to meet most pressing educational needs

- The Board of Trustees needs to stay out of the academic operations of the institution.
Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Learning and Improvement

4.1 – Institutional Reflection

- Not sure what the standard is – there was one large community meeting about a year ago when campus wide constituencies were involved in the strategic planning process which seemed to bring about some changes in decision making (eg budgeting process)

- See 4.2

- Although we meet to discuss the strategic plan and our future direction(s), in reality, this plan is not always easy to decipher.

- The strategic planning process probably works as best as any. The re-evaluation process might be an area to look at

- Strategic Planning, Strategic Plan

- Need an understandable and coherent plan for assessing the attainment of educational objectives.

- ??? I’m unclear here. We have finished rewriting the strategic plan. Is it impacting the operations of the institution? I don’t know.

4.2 – Process/Alignment

- Facilities master plan must be aligned with the academic master plan! Although the 1998 response said the 10-year facility master plan was complete, it was NOT Implemented. Unlike at other universities, at WU there does not appear to be a facilities planning and development process, with sufficient support from the University administration, linked with the academic master planning process. As a result, programs such as Architecture and Animation are encouraged to expand their number of FTE students, but no space is planned for them. This process takes time; space must be planned five years ahead. Facilities planning requires an experienced and professional staff. There is also a need for short term fixes to deal with immediate space needs

- Cf. The planning involved in the budgeting process.

- Hard to support with evidence.

- This is the intent of the strategic plan but tighter department linkages are needed.

- I don’t know.

4.3 – Informed Processes

- The university has not had a central office to collect, assess, and disseminate data since we last had an Office of Institutional Research.

- I don’t think any data or analysis is used in the planning process
• No systematic IR function

• More gathering and analyzing of quantitative and qualitative data is needed including consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.

• We work without an office of institutional research. Each area puts together what it can, but we have yet to develop a culture of assessment.

4.4 – Quality Assurance

• Don’t what current process is

• Greater need for ongoing assessment.

• There seems to be a better process for instituting new programs but the follow up of effectiveness and the reporting of that effectiveness needs to be developed

• Various departmental Accreditation Reports

• More gathering and analyzing of quantitative and qualitative data is needed including consideration of evidence of educational effectiveness, including student learning.

• QA processes need to be defines and assessments of effectiveness, tracking results over time, and using the results of these assessments to revise and improve structures, and processes, curricula, and pedagogy.

• Unclear to me. When we put in a new curriculum or even a new course, do we already have built-in plans for assessment of success?

4.5 – Institutional Research

• We need coordinated institutional research

• Do not have an Office of Institutional Research but certainly do need one!

• Haven’t seen any data like this

• IR as a central function is missing

• IR function missing.

• What institutional research? We do IPEDS, but is this data disseminated?

4.6 – Assessment Results

• We need coordinated institutional research

• See 2.1, 2.4, 2.7. Need an alumni database to provide accurate performance assessment metrics such as grad school acceptance, professional exam passing rates, graduate salaries 15 years out, awards, etc. Consider a post-full professor faculty review.
• WU not doing this well.
• IR as a central function is missing
• IR function missing.
• Same problems with a lack of high levels of assessment.

4.7 – Ongoing Inquiry of Teaching/Learning

• Assume, not my area
• See 2.1, 2.4, 2.7
• The Institute for Excellence in Teaching and Learning is, in theory, an attempt at jump starting this movement.
• Independent departments may meet this criteria but haven't seen sufficient evidence for the whole university
• Department Minutes, Curriculum Committee Minutes
• ??
• Clearly visible in design programs, not so visible in others.

4.8 - Stakeholders

• See 2.7. In addition to the current involvement, extensive professional input is planned for the architecture graduate program.
• Outside review of some capstone course projects is the only example I can recollect.
• Greater alumni involvement is recommended
• Alumni and employers need to be involved in the assessment of the effectiveness of the educational programs.
• I don’t know.

Synthesis/Reflections on Standard Four

1. – Most Important Issues

• Process and stakeholders in evaluating educational effectiveness
• 4.3 – planning process informed by data; 4.5 – institution research as a tool for quality assurance of programs; Leadership commitment to research
• IR Function; Establishment of culture evidence that drives the planning process
• Educational objectives plan; Strategic plan
• Lack of a culture of assessment

2. **Strengths for Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review**

• Committed, able professionals on staff and faculty

• Strategic Plan

• Generally speaking the strength in this indicator can be found at individual program levels. There is an effort to collect and analyze research to improve quality with in separate programs. There is a great level of expertise in this area that might not be realizing its potential at a more institutional wide level.

• Faculty Involvement/Responsibility in teaching/learning process (undergraduate or graduate); Strategic Plan

• Prep Review: none; Ed effectiveness: none

3. **Improvements for Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Review**

• Developing a system for implementing coordination of institutional research

• Research, discussion, constituent involvement in the shaping of WU’s assessment, implementation; what it means, how it is beneficial, how and where to get started.

• At an institutional level the type of data collected provides an understanding predominantly of financial repercussions, (i.e. class size, attrition, etc.) However a greater focus might be on research and analysis of student outcomes and ways of improving student outcomes.

• IR Function; Review of IR  in terms of mission critical items/processes

• Prep Review: IR Function; Ed effectiveness: QA processes

• Need to make institutional research a regular feature of our decision-making.
Summative Questions

1. **Who Participated in Self-Review?**
   - Steering Committee
   - Faculty/administration from different departments/areas/functions
   - WU WASC team members completed the worksheet on their own.

2. **Areas of Concern**
   - Measuring learning outcomes (other than grades). Incorporating data into decision making
   - Faculty (F/T, P/T Ratio) and faculty compensation and Load (esp. faculty teaching graduate level); Review of processes in the Business Office and Less reliance on the tuition driven budget; IR Function; Organization Chart

3. **Topics for Further Exploration**
   - Importance of co-curricular learning integrated into educational objectives and extended collaboration of faculty and staff (eg student affairs) in facilitating development of “whole student”
   - Strengths – Faculty investment in teaching and learning processes; Areas for Improvement Opportunities for Growth: IR Function, F/T, P/T Ratio/ Salary, Alumni Relations, Co-curricular activities

4. **Next Steps**
   - Reflect, process, develop themes for review