

REPORT OF THE WSCUC TEAM

For Reaffirmation of Accreditation

To Woodbury University

March 6 - 9, 2018

Team Roster

Patricia Potter, National University, Chair
Laurel McCabe, Sonoma State University, Assistant Chair
Kris Chase, St. Mary's College
Randall Lavender, Otis College of Art and Design
Lynnette Zelezny, Fresno State University
Richard Osborne, WSCUC Staff Liaison

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

- A. Description of the Institution and its Accreditation History
- B. Description of the Team's Review Process
- C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Quality of Supporting Evidence

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

- A. Component 1: Response to previous Commission actions
- B. Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators
- C. Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, quality and integrity of degrees
- D. Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation
- E. Component 5: Student Success: Student learning, retention, and graduation
- F. Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence
- G. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment
- H. Component 8: Institution-Specific Themes (optional)—none for Woodbury
- I. Component 9: Conclusion: Reflection and plans for improvement

SECTION III – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

APPENDICES

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 - 3. Student Complaints Review
 - 4. Transfer Credit Review
- B. Off-Campus Locations Review

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Accreditation History

Woodbury University is a private not-for-profit institution of 1,075 students and 70 full-time faculty in Burbank, California. The school was founded in downtown Los Angeles by Francis Woodbury in 1884 as Woodbury Business College, and in 1974 was renamed Woodbury University. In 1987 the institution moved to their current location on a historic 22.4-acre campus in the eastern San Fernando valley. In 1998 they opened a small satellite campus in San Diego.

The institution has traditionally served under-represented students in the Los Angeles area, with a mission “to transform students into innovative professionals who will contribute responsibly to the global community.” Woodbury's emphasis on small classes, professional accreditation of its degrees, practical skills, and applied internships have earned the institution recognition in national educational rankings. It is particularly known for its architecture programs, which are accredited by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) and the Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA).

Woodbury is focused on undergraduate education, with 85% (1,215 students in spring 2017) of its students pursuing a bachelor's degree and 15% (218 students in 2017) pursuing a master's. International students make up 21% of the entire student population. More than half of the undergraduates (56%) are transfer students. Ninety-one percent of its students are enrolled on the Burbank campus, with 9% enrolled in San Diego. Woodbury offers thirteen bachelor's degrees and six master's degrees in its Schools of Architecture; Business; and Media, Culture and Design. The College of Liberal Arts offers majors and cross-disciplinary General Education (GE) undergraduate courses.

The Woodbury student body is highly racially diverse, with 29% Hispanic enrollment, 31% Caucasian (many of whom are Armenian), 23.4% international students (mostly from Saudi Arabia), 8.5% Asian, 2.9% African-American, and .45% Native American. Woodbury is officially classified as a Title V, Hispanic Serving Institution, which enables it to receive federal aid and grants to renovate facilities and provide financial support to improve academic programs. A high percentage of Woodbury's students come from families with limited economic means and are first-generation college attendees. Seventy-one percent of Woodbury students receive financial assistance. The gender basis of the student body is approximately equal, with 48.5% female and 51.5 % male.

Woodbury maintains professional accreditation for many of its bachelor's and master's programs. In addition to two professional accreditations in architecture, it holds National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD) accreditation for its Fine Arts bachelor's degrees in Interior Architecture, Animation, Fashion Design, Filmmaking, Game Art and Design, and Graphic Design; and Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and Accreditation Council for Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP) accreditations for its Business Administration bachelor's degree.

B. Description of Team's Review Process

The team prepared for the October 2017 Off-site Review by reading the institution's 2017 self-study and examining the data and supporting materials provided by the institution. Because some important issues required additional evidence and explanation, the team developed nine lines of inquiry for the March 2018 accreditation visit and requested additional documents. The lines of inquiry addressed: 1) mission, 2) strategic planning, 3) financial stability and sustainability, 4) the meaning, quality, and integrity of the degree, 5) assessment, 6) student

learning and success, 7) faculty and staff diversity, 8) decision-making structures and processes, and 9) a culture of continuous learning and improvement.

The team found that certain parts of the institution's self-study and supporting materials lacked needed evidence, that the narrative didn't specifically address some of the Commission's recommendations, and information relevant to institutional decision-making and financial viability was insufficient. The team requested that the institution provide the following materials approximately two months prior to the accreditation visit: 1) consistent presentation of data, with numerals and percentages described; 2) updated organization charts; 3) updated strategic plan, including advancement, information technology, library resources, and diversity plans; 4) updated Board of Trustees information, with minutes of Board of Trustees and Finance committee meetings; 5) tables disaggregated by diversity and school of retention, time-to-graduation and graduation rates; 6) enrollment data and forecasts disaggregated by campus, diversity, and degree program, and a master facility plan; 7) a coherent narrative characterizing the meaning, quality and integrity of the degrees offered by the institution; 8) updated general education (GE) and core competencies assessments; 9) program learning outcomes linked to program review and outcomes assessment, with sample syllabi; 10) exemplars of assessment used to improve university functions; and 11) updated information on compliance with the requirement to publicly display achievement data. The institution was responsive in sending materials and in providing online links.

The team reviewed the institution's January 2018 response to the lines of inquiry, the new narrative on the meaning, quality and integrity of the degree, the new data and supporting materials, and the University's website, catalogs and other publications. In addition, the team reviewed updated documents for the overarching Strategic Plan, the Strategic Enrollment Plan,

and specific strategic operational plans for Finance, Advancement, Marketing and Infrastructure. The team monitored and read the contents of the confidential email account during the visit.

During the accreditation visit the team met in person with administrative personnel, staff, faculty, and students. Meetings included the president; eight members of the 21-member Board of Trustees; the Accreditation Liaison Officer; the WSCUC Steering Committee; the president's cabinet; vice presidents of Academic Affairs, Accounting and Finance, Advancement, Information Technology, Administrative Services and Human Relations; the associate vice presidents of Academic Affairs and of Admissions; four school and college deans; the Dean of Students; the University librarian; assistant registrar; institutional researcher and research analyst; full-time and adjunct faculty; staff; students; the head of the Faculty Senate; members of the Strategic Enrollment Plan committee; the marketing team; and members of the student services team. The team communicated by telephone with the outside auditor and two Board of Trustees members and via Zoom teleconferencing with one San Diego faculty member. One member of the evaluation team conducted a visit to the San Diego campus prior to the accreditation visit and met with all of the faculty and staff at that campus.

C. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor of the Report and Supporting Evidence

The institution organized the 2017 self-study into five sections: institutional purpose; response to WSCUC Commission letters; the meaning, quality and integrity of the degree (including graduation and retention rates, core competency assessment, and student success); faculty development; and financial viability and sustainability. Because the institution's accreditation team applied WSCUC's accrediting template only after the first draft was written, the resulting narrative was not organized around the Commission's recommendations, and thus

coherence with the recommendations, as well as a consistent use of data, and the institutional reflectiveness commonly found in self-studies, was not readily apparent. The narrative described an old, current and new Woodbury in sections throughout the report. This layered organization didn't always clearly link to WSCUC standards or components, or to Commission action recommendations.

As a result, the team found it challenging to find answers to some of WSCUC's basic lines of inquiry, to clearly see how the institution was using assessment to improve its culture of decision-making and learning, to discern how the institution had responded to certain of the Commission's action recommendations, and to understand how financial decisions were made in response to the enrollment crisis. It was for this reason the team drew up a lengthy list of lines of inquiry in preparation for the accreditation visit, and requested numerous data sheets and materials that could fill in the gaps of the report ahead of the visit.

The team's interviews with campus personnel during the visit did help make sense of some of the gaps and remaining questions from the report. However, data reporting continued to raise questions for the team. At times the report described raw numbers, and sometimes percentages, which made it difficult for the team to understand the limits and context of the data. Some parts of the self-study presented tabled data, yet the report didn't reflect on the implications of the data in decision-making, student learning, or curricular planning. For example, disaggregated retention and graduation data tables were not always labeled, readable, and could not be printed by the team. In another example, a central feature of the university's financial viability concerned declining enrollments, yet the data reporting emphasized headcount rather than Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) data. Using headcount would result in only rough

approximation of tuition income, though it is useful for monitoring advising and student support needs.

While the report accurately portrayed the condition of the institution and presented data on most core institutional measures, the report was less clear about how the data was thought about, nor how it informed decision-making. Inconsistent reporting of data on student success—sometimes retention, sometimes student ratings of satisfaction, sometimes job data or accreditation data—made it difficult for the evaluation team to compare and assess across programs. The Attrition and Retention Report stood out for its data analysis and careful reflection on the impacts on policies and curriculum, yet this report wasn't used to influence decision-making, nor was it highlighted in the self-study. The library assessment report stood out for its thoughtful use of data that was used to improve student services; it could provide a model for future assessments of student support services and co-curricular activities. (CFR 4.1)

The narrative often missed the opportunity to engage in deep institutional self-reflection that might lead to a greater understanding of effectiveness, systems of quality improvement, and student learning. As an example, in *Component 3, Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality, and Integrity of Degrees*, the narrative discussed assessment of core competencies but identified them as “WASC’s” rather than using the opportunity to self-reflect on their use. This section missed an opportunity to highlight Woodbury's distinguishing elements, such as its diversity, Title 5 status, high-impact practices, or discussion of outcomes. Interviews during the site visit were used to substantiate some of the points made in this aspect of the report. Special requests during the evaluation visit were made for disaggregated data to better understand potential disparities in indices for underrepresented minority students. (CFR 2.2, 2.10)

The Woodbury accreditation team clearly engaged the university community in preparing for the self-study; the report was written by its three-member accreditation team. The accreditation team acknowledged that the institution and the report were "not as data-driven" as they would like, that they did not yet have an institutional research director in place, and that institutional research was not a part of the accreditation committee's work. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

Component 1: Response to Previous Commission actions

Woodbury University is seeking reaffirmation of accreditation. Its last Reaffirmation Visit in March 1998 resulted in a Special Visit in March of 2001 that focused on financial viability; assessment and program review; planning; and faculty composition, compensation and workload.

In 2008 the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) team evaluated evidence of progress in these four areas. The Commission action letter of June 24, 2008 detailed five major areas for special attention for the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) visit in 2010. These included: 1) faculty workload, 2) financial capacity, 3) integrated planning efforts, 4) institutional research to support student learning, and 5) program review effectiveness.

The 2010 EER team report noted 1) that there were still “outstanding issues regarding workload, compensation, promotion and retention” of faculty, 2) commendations for the institution's actions to balance its budget in an economic downturn, and encouragement of efforts to increase the endowment, 3) that the institution was in the beginning stage of integrating data and institutional research with planning and decision-making, 4) a recommendation to strengthen institutional research, and 5) that progress toward assessing student learning was uneven among departments. Noting that Woodbury had made progress with assessing student

learning at the program level, the team recommended that the University needed “to establish clear guidelines regarding what constitutes a program review, a consistent schedule for when reviews are due and a transparent mechanism for providing programs with useful and constructive feedback.” The team also noted the need “to demonstrate how student learning is linked to resource allocation,” and work through Woodbury's senate and administrative structure “to further support a focus on student learning.” The team recommended that the University continue its focus on general education reform, with particular attention to program outcomes.

Following the Educational Effectiveness Review, the Commission Action letter of June 24, 2010 noted that "the economic turndown forced a delay in implementation of planned changes" in faculty workload and compensation and that the “remaining issues were at an earlier stage of implementation than the team hoped to find, especially since the Commission had extended the time between visits from 18 to 24 months to give WU more time to plan and implement a large number of new initiatives.” The Commission highlighted three areas for special attention: 1) student learning and program review, "developing clear guidelines for program reviews with a consistent schedule that provides for utilizing feedback for program improvement" and "resource allocation...tied to the results of program reviews;" 2) general education revision with "clearly outlined and measurable outcomes" and assessment; and 3) equitable and transparent policies on faculty compensation and workload. The Commission referred to the issue of faculty compensation and workload as “a trailing one at WU, going back at least a decade.” The Commission acted to reaffirm accreditation for the institution, to schedule the CPR and EER reviews, and requested an Interim Report due on March 1, 2013 related to the three issues.

In March, 2013 a panel of the Interim Report Committee convened to consider the Interim Report and evaluate the progress made. The panel expressed satisfaction with Woodbury's planning and guidelines for systematic program review and resource allocation, GE re-organization, and steps taken toward equitable faculty salary evaluation and workload. The Commission action letter of Dec. 20, 2013 requested a thorough report on the following areas in the fall 2017 Offsite Review and the spring 2018 Accreditation Visit:

1. Student learning and program review. The Commission asked for "careful monitoring" of "a sound plan" but an "overly aggressive and difficult to implement" schedule of program review. (CFR 2.4, 2.6, 2.7)
2. General education. The Commission expressed concern over the sustainability of assessment of the new GE curriculum. The Commission requested a full analysis of strengths and weaknesses of the GE program and its assessment. (CFR 2.4, 2.6)
3. Faculty compensation and workload. The Commission “found that WU is on the right track” for issues of “salary equity, work load, employees' performance standards, and evaluation, transparency, consistency and promotion policies for both full-time and adjunct faculty” and supported Woodbury’s “aim to continue its analysis of faculty workload to ensure equity for salaries, stipends, course release, and professional development.” (CFR 2.9, 3.2, 3.3)

Major Changes at the Institutional Level

Woodbury has experienced major changes since its last accreditation visit in 2010, most notably in its succession of presidents, significant decline in student enrollments since 2012 (including declines in international students), budgetary deficits, large faculty layoffs, loss of staff, and turnover in administrative management. (CFR 3.1) After its president of sixteen years

retired in June 2012, a new president took office in July 2012. He stepped down in February 2015, an interim president was named in March 2015, and Woodbury's 14th and current president, David Steele-Figueroa, was appointed in October 2015.

In 2012 the institution's enrollments began to fall significantly, with corresponding negative effects on the institution's financial status. From 2012 to 2018 the enrollment declined by approximately 34%, from 1,771 students in fall 2012 to 1,160 students in fall 2017. Attrition rates were markedly high in 2015, with school attrition levels between the end of the first year and end of the second year ranging from 55% to 89% for freshman and transfers combined. The new president's cost-cutting measures to address the budgetary shortfalls included a projected 25% reduction in faculty since 2015, staff layoffs, and three program closures or suspensions in 2017. High-level personnel in finance, instructional technology, admissions, institutional research, and advancement were laid off or left the institution. Currently many administrative personnel and managers are new to their positions, with some positions not planned to be filled, though a director of institutional research has been hired to begin in fall 2018. (CFR 4.7) The president's 2017 cutbacks included discontinuance of the bachelor's and master's programs in Leadership, and suspension of the master's of Media for Social Justice. (CFR 3.1, 3.4, 3.7)

The budget-driven cutbacks have led to a campus climate that shows hopefulness and optimism as well as uncertainty and vulnerability. The evaluation team saw staff, faculty and students who love the university and were hopeful that financial viability can be attained; as well as faculty and staff approaching burnout from the increased duties and responsibilities placed on them. (CFR 3.2)

Component 2: Compliance: Review under WSCUC Standards and compliance with federal requirements; Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Standard 1. Defining Institutional Purposes and Ensuring Educational Objectives

The university publishes in its catalog and posts online clear statements of mission, purpose, core values, diversity commitment, strategic principles, admissions information, academic and co-curricular program information, and hiring and administrative policies and procedures. (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.4) Woodbury's mission of transforming students into innovative professionals who contribute responsibly to the global community is a laudable one. The core mission is supported by the institution's focus on practical skills development, required internships, community partnerships, transdisciplinary general education courses, and interdisciplinary collaborations. Woodbury's four strategic principles—civic engagement, entrepreneurship, design thinking, and transdisciplinarity—are articulated, developed and assessed across programs, majors, and the GE curriculum, though implementation of assessment is uneven. Student learning objectives and learning outcomes in courses and programs are clearly stated in program descriptions and course syllabi. Retention and graduation rates for each program are posted online as markers of the institution's success in achieving its educational objectives. (CFR 1.1, 1.2, 1.6)

However, while Woodbury guarantees a 4-year graduation rate (excepting the bachelor's in Architecture which targets 5 years) in its promotional material to potential applicants, data show that only 19% of students graduate in 4 years, 45% in 6 years, and 48% in 8 years. (CFR 1.6) Tuition cost is clearly stated by program, and if applicants (excepting architecture) closely check detailed graduation data, a 6-year or 8-year time-to-graduation may be reasonably expected. Internship sites, job placements, and career opportunities for graduates are posted online. (CFR 1.2)

Woodbury enjoys a highly diverse student and staff community. Its faculty, like so many institutions of higher learning, is less so, and the university pledges through its Diversity policy to “address issues of diversity and inclusiveness because this is an essential part of an experience-centered education.” The team notes that Woodbury does not have an explicit and formal Diversity policy to guide faculty and staff hiring processes. (CFR 1.4)

Woodbury posts its institutional report and all Commission action letters on the university website. It has succeeded in including assessment some form of assessment in most courses, and has successfully implemented program reviews in all of its programs. Its program accreditations further specify standards for student learning outcomes and assessment. The institution has regularly received clean financial audits. The institution has provided necessary financial data to the evaluation team, and it has communicated openly and honestly with WSCUC regarding its practices and policies. (CFR 1.7, 1.8)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 1.

Standard 2. Achieving Educational Objectives Through Core Functions

Woodbury’s undergraduate and graduate degree requirements are clear and are accessible online and in the catalog, and are appropriate to the degree level. (CFR 2.1) Class syllabi, assessments, program reviews, and faculty committee review provide evidence that faculty set and assess the academic standards required for graduation, and are in full ownership of curriculum content. Woodbury's programs and curricula are informed by its strategic principles of civic engagement, entrepreneurship, design thinking, and transdisciplinarity, which act as guides to program content, practices, skill development, and assessment. A significant marker of

Woodbury is the value it places on creativity. Faculty have the opportunity and the expectation to think across disciplines in general education courses that integrate learning. (CFR 2.8)

Professional accreditation for many of its degrees have led to a Woodbury culture accustomed to setting clear course and program outcome standards and assessing students' progress toward meeting them, with support provided toward achievement. Milestone and capstone courses are well-used for assessing learning outcomes that vary across programs, and programs such as Fashion Design utilize community partnerships to give students practical real-world experience in developing outcome skills. Woodbury's GE courses offer a range of courses that cut across academic disciplines, along with high-impact practices. In particular, the Woodbury Integrated Student Experience (WISE), in particular, though small, exemplifies Woodbury's commitment to transformational high-impact practice-based experiences for students. The team encourages continued development of this educational model. (CFR 2.2, 2.4)

The university has worked for several years to incorporate and integrate the five core competencies of written and oral communication, information literacy, quantitative reasoning, and critical thinking into the general education curriculum, in addition to three additional competencies of knowledge, personal and social responsibility, and applied learning. This work is ongoing, and the team encourages the institution to develop GE assessments that are sustainable in the long-term. The assessment committee is working on simplifying the assessment process to make it workable and sustainable over time. (CFR 2.2)

Woodbury attracts students who by traditional standards are un- or under-prepared for college, and many students need extra attention or accommodations from faculty and staff. As of yet, however, systematic efforts to collect data on student satisfaction, characteristics influencing retention and graduation rates—including analyses disaggregating race, ethnicity, and

international and transfer status—and student support services efficacy have not been regularly undertaken, and when undertaken, they have not been specifically used to improve institutional functioning. (CFR 2.10, 4.1)

While Woodbury's student support services have been downsized during cost-cutting, the institution is planning assessments to provide data on how well they are meeting student needs. The library services assessment report in particular was outstanding, and was used to inform institutional decision-making to improve services to students through the acquisition of needed databases. The institution is in the process of implementing the integrated Starfish system to provide early notice to faculty and staff of students who need additional student support in academic advising, writing, and tutoring. Some suggestive data from the 2015 student satisfaction survey indicate that Woodbury student ratings are lower than national averages in specific areas such as campus climate, support services, academic advising, and instructional effectiveness, yet this was not discussed in the self-study. While the team noted that faculty and staff pride themselves on proactive on-going engagement and collaboration in a tight-knit environment of students, faculty and staff, the team recommends that Woodbury develop and continue its assessment of student support services to insure that student learning needs are being recognized and met, particularly with minority and international students. (CFR 2.10).

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. Woodbury's self-report substantiates that quality and rigor are ensured by student learning outcomes that are embedded in standards set by faculty to assess student work. Based on interviews with faculty program coordinators, program review is taken seriously at Woodbury, and a culture of continuous improvement is embraced. The team notes that standardization of student learning outcomes is inconsistent across disciplines. This suggests a decentralized program assessment structure in contrast with one that

is institutionally coordinated, which may be an aspirational goal for Woodbury in the future. The team encourages continued development and assessment of high-impact practices such as the Woodbury Integrated Student Experience program, and that the work on developing program review guidelines and a sustainable assessment cycle continue. (CFR 2.7)

Data is tracked and included in program reviews, however, it does not include information disaggregated data by race and ethnicity. This is relevant given that Woodbury is a federally designated Hispanic-Serving Institution. (CFR 2.7, 4.1). If a commitment to continuous improvement of teaching and learning is endorsed, disaggregated outcome measures are a next step in assessment and institutional reporting. (CFR 2.6,4.3).

The team recommends that the university reflect on the patterns contained in the time-to-graduation and retention data, particularly as it applies to African American and international students, to the College of Liberal Arts, and to factors that influence persistence and retention. The 4-year, 6-year, and 8-year graduation data do not support the 4-year graduation guarantee that Woodbury makes to potential applicants. (CFR 1.2, 2.10)

Related to this, the team recommends that Woodbury develop and continue its assessment of student support services and co-curricular activities to ensure that student learning needs for all students, including under-represented minority students, are being recognized and met. (CFR 2.11. 2.13)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 2.

Standard 3. Developing and Applying Resources and Organizational Structures to Ensure Quality and Sustainability

Woodbury has undergone substantial change in management and finances over the past few years. To assess the impact of these changes, the team reviewed the three most recent outside audits, three-year enrollment and budget forecasts, correspondence between Woodbury and its bondholder, and held frank conversations with the CFO, the outside auditor, and the Board. Declining enrollment (from a high of over 1,700 in FY13 to less than 1,200 in FY18) has created a financial challenge for this tuition-dependent institution. The institution has an engaged administration that is committed to working with faculty and staff transparently and realistically to address this challenge. (CFR 3.6, 3.7, 3.8).

Currently, Woodbury has a record of unqualified financial audits, and a board-designated reserve available to cover current deficits. (CFR 3.4) However, two important issues make it difficult for Woodbury to fully satisfy CFR 3.4. First, it has several consecutive years of actual and forecasted operating deficits. Second, it is currently out of compliance with one of the covenants of a bond. More specific information on this challenging financial situation is discussed in Component 7.

Regarding institutional decision-making, the team found substantial faculty involvement, with membership on important committees distributed across faculty and administration. (CFR 3.10) The university does not yet have a diversity policy for hiring staff and faculty, and the team recommends that one be developed. (CFR 3.1, 3.10)

The struggle with finances has created short-term pressure to reduce expenses. Faculty clearly are committed to the success of the institution and have been asked to step up with increased recruiting and administrative responsibilities. The team is concerned about the sustainability of the current faculty workload. Improved financial performance should result in

greater resources available for the faculty (CFR 3.1], decreasing current workload pressures and alleviating the team's concerns over workload sustainability issues. (CFR 3.2)

The team found significant information resource and information technology needs, which should be addressed when the financial situation stabilizes. (CFR 3.5).

Lastly, the team found that the Board of Trustees is appropriately engaged in governance and aware of the financial challenge. The team notes that the Board's bylaws lacked statements about conflicts of interest and about the process for regular and formal evaluation of the CEO, though informal evaluations have occurred (CFR 3.9).

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. The team recommends that the university continue to monitor faculty workload and compensation, particularly in the near-term as more is being asked of faculty and staff to step up to help the institution, generating concerns regarding burnout and sustainability. (CFR 3.2)

While the diversity of students and staff is notable at Woodbury, the team recommends the development of a diversity policy in hiring faculty and staff. (CFR 3.1, 3.10)

The team is concerned about resource allocation for services necessary to support academic offerings, particularly in information resources and information technology, and recommend that attention be given to these areas. (CFR 3.5)

The team recommends that the institution develop a policy and procedures for regular evaluation of the president of the university, as well as for conflicts of interest on the board. (CFR 3.9)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that given the current financial situation the institution provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate only partial compliance with Standard 3.

Standard 4. Creating an Organization Committed to Quality Assurance, Institutional Learning, and Improvement

The hiring of the new president, Dr. David Steele-Figueroa, in the fall of 2015 coincided with dramatic decreases in enrollments across the university. The new president has shown acumen in appointing effective new senior leadership, particularly the CFO, and in strategically analyzing the university's financial status and setting priorities to regain financial viability. Cutbacks, though difficult, pared expenses when needed and demonstrates the new president's short-term effective tactical planning. At the same time, attention to long-term strategic planning is needed.

The team finds that the faculty are clearly engaged in the assessment of teaching and learning, and are developing plans to make these processes less complex, easier to implement, and more sustainable. The new senior institutional research position should be helpful in assisting faculty with further reflection on, and use of, data. (CFR 4.1, 4.2)

While the university has made remarkable progress since the last visit in 2010 in conducting program reviews in all programs, quality varies widely. Some assessments reflect thoughtful questioning of content, curriculum, and student experiences, and use of the results to improve the overall experience. The Leadership Program Review is exemplary in its thoughtfulness and reflectiveness in feeding assessment results back into improving curriculum. The final closing-of-the-loop to take assessment outcomes back to curriculum content, policy, and outcomes is unevenly applied, and the team encourages continued thought and development on this important aspect. Faculty committees are in place to examine the sustainability of the program review assessment cycle, and to develop clear guidelines for the program review

process. The team recommends that the work on developing clear program review guidelines and a sustainable assessment cycle continues. (CFR 2.7)

The institution is at an emerging level of developing practices and processes for a culture of evidence and improvement. The team notes the absence of a director of institutional research, a position which can coordinate assessment, develop assessment tools, practices and procedures, train faculty, analyze data, and disseminate findings. The planned 2018 hire will greatly help in these areas. Investment of resources in a full-time institutional research director, and a supporting data analyst, to build accessible data dashboards is essential. (CFR 4.2, 4)

With some notable exceptions, such as the Strategic Enrollment Plan (SEP) committee's close monitoring of enrollment and financial data, and the library assessment's impact on resource allocation in the library, institutional research is not commonly being used in decision-making, for institutional reflection and planning, to establish priorities, and to align resources with future directions. Assessment of student satisfaction, student support services, co-curricular offerings, alumni and stakeholders is in the emerging phase. While data are clearly being collected, the thoughtful analysis and use of the data in setting institutional goals in alignment with budget are not yet apparent throughout the university. (CFR 4)

Plans are in place to develop data dashboards (i.e., Tableau) that will open access to faculty and staff to inform evidence-based decision making related to assessment and student success, such as retention and graduation, and to identify bottleneck courses. (CFR 2.7, 2.10, 4.1). This will dramatically improve the data-driven culture at Woodbury.

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. The team recommends that the work on developing clear program review guidelines and a sustainable assessment cycle continue, and that the institutional research senior position be filled. Data dashboards will increase real time

access to data for faculty and staff for program review, assessment of student learning outcomes disaggregated by race and ethnicity, retention and graduation rates disaggregated by race and ethnicity, assessment of student support services, and evidence-based decision making.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with Standard 4.

Credit Hour and Program Length Review.

The team reviewed Woodbury's self-study appendices, course syllabi, and program templates, and determined that the institution meets federal compliance for credit hours and degree definition policies. These are the proper length for undergraduate and graduate programs. (CFR 2.2)

Marketing and Recruitment Review.

Tuition and fees are clearly described on the university website, with a tuition calculator for undergraduates. Woodbury provides four guarantees to incoming students regarding a 4-year time-to-graduation (with the exception of Architecture), merit scholarship assistance, "transformational worldly experiences," and full-time employment or graduate study following graduation. The institution provides information on its website, by program, on the type of employment for which the graduate will be qualified, and lists businesses in which graduates have found employment. It includes a separate link to a page for employers seeking to find graduates for future employment. No incentive compensation is paid for success in enrolling students, nor are vendors managing online and media advertising paid any incentives for inquiries or enrollments generated. Because the 4-year graduation guarantee found on the institution's website is not supported by the institution's current graduation rate data, the team finds that the institution only partially meets this federal standard. The team recommends that

Woodbury immediately change the language on its website related to its 4-year graduation guarantee. (CFR 1)

Student Complaints Review.

Woodbury has a clear policy and procedures for addressing student complaints, and these are easily accessible. A formal appeals committee reviews requests for exceptions to academic policies, and a petition process described in the university catalog outlines procedures for grade changes. Students submit in writing their complaint against faculty to the Dean of Faculty, complaints against staff go to Human Resources, and Student Affairs handles student versus student complaints. Records of student complaints are kept in the office of the Associate Dean of Students, while the Student Conduct office keeps formal complaints. Tracking is done online via Conduct Coordinator software (this is currently being re-evaluated for possible migration to Maxient). (CFR 1.7)

Transfer Policy Review.

Woodbury's transfer credit policies and procedures are clear and visible to prospective and current students, and are described on the university website. (CFR 2.2)

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with federal requirements.

Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI).

In the team's review of Woodbury's Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI), it is evident that educational objectives drive the institution's mission. (CFR 2) Student learning outcomes and performance standards are described in the catalog, course syllabi, and program reviews, and assessments are implemented in capstone courses, culminating projects, milestone assessments, and portfolios, as well as assessments throughout the curriculum. Faculty

are often involved in course assessments, and program chairs and faculty discuss how to implement assessment findings into curricular improvements. (CFR 2.7) Internship supervisors assess students on professional criteria, and students engage in self-assessment of these criteria. Some course and program assessment findings are shared directly with students. Although inconsistent across programs, time and human resources are invested in assessment and continuous improvement. Graduation rates, assessment data, and achievement data are publicly available and visible on the institution's website.

The team's finding, which is subject to Commission review, is that the institution provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate compliance with education effectiveness indicators.

Component 3: Degree Programs: Meaning, Quality and Integrity of Degrees

In revising this narrative, the Woodbury accreditation group met with various stakeholders, including the Faculty Senate and the President's cabinet. The resulting narrative included enrollment data, forecasting, and anecdotal information on ideas, gaps in programs and support services, and ideas for new initiatives. It was still difficult for the WSCUC accreditation team to ascertain the unique characteristics of the Woodbury graduate from this narrative, and to determine the institution's next steps in strengthening resources related to these core characteristics. (CFR 2.2)

The 2017 Strategic Plan, on the other hand, provided a concise description of the unique characteristics of the Woodbury degree. They are: 1) transformation of first-generation college students, 2) experiential learning in innovative pedagogies, 3) a culture of student engagement and social responsibility, and 4) core values leading to student success.

The transformative nature of the Woodbury experience was supported by faculty in interviews on-site, who noted that the university takes quiet, "more reticent" students and transforms them into effective, confident persons. Classroom pedagogies, practical skills development, internships, and collaborations with peers were cited as practices that support this transformation. Faculty agree that civic engagement in the form of internships and community partnerships is an important element of the Woodbury experience, and that high-impact practices such as the WISE program should be studied and developed more fully.

From interviews during the team's visit, it was clear that institutional data that substantiates the meaning, quality and integrity of the degree is not widely disseminated, transparent, nor accessible to support the efforts to define this component. The WISE program is often noted as an example of a high-impact practice related to the meaning, quality and integrity of the Woodbury degree, but while it is exemplary, it includes very few students (N=20) and is so new that it has no track-record of assessment to confirm success. Woodbury's reflections in the WSCUC Standards and Compliance review underscores that "[a] lack of data protocol for institutional databases and operational computing continues to hinder operations." Thus, lack of institutional data that is public and transparent significantly weakens Woodbury's meaning, quality and integrity of the degree related to its mission. Data dashboards are an urgent priority for program review and assessment to inform this component. (CFR 2.7, 2.10)

It was powerful to meet and interview the faculty who are responsible for the meaning, quality and integrity of the degree at Woodbury. Degrees, both undergraduate and graduate, are clearly defined as are levels of achievement to attain graduation. (CFR 2.2) Based on the team's review, Woodbury's programs and the curriculum are sound. However, had data been more

meaningfully applied to underscore Woodbury's pride points, the component on meaning, quality and integrity of the degree could have potentially been excellent.

Program review is systematically in place at Woodbury to ensure meaning, quality and integrity of degree at the undergraduate and graduate level. (CFR 2.2, 2.7). The faculty play a key role in the development of the curriculum and assessment of curricular effectiveness via student learning outcomes. The faculty have opportunities for professional development at Woodbury to redesign the curriculum and develop student learning outcomes that are important in program review. Woodbury is commended for its plan to “work on more purposeful assessments of the meaning of a Woodbury degree.”

Significantly, the narrative described faculty perceptions of missing support related to the meaning, quality and integrity of the Woodbury degree. This includes a lack of co-curricular activities that support Hispanic, Asian, and Middle Eastern international students; program goals that do not always take advantage of Woodbury's transdisciplinarity; and a weak second year experience. The revised narrative included statements from faculty that resources are needed to financially support low-income students, to augment student services to support international students' language needs, and that cultural competency needs to be addressed in the curriculum. (CFR 2.10, 2.11)

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. The team recommends that the institution continue to reflect on the core elements and characteristics that describe the Woodbury graduate at the bachelor's and master's levels. (CFR 2.2) The 2017 Strategic Plan may provide a solid foundation from which to move forward on this component.

The hiring of an institutional research director, as well as implementation of data dashboards, will advance this area, and move Woodbury forward to elevate and prioritize the use of institutional data to ensure the meaning, quality and integrity of the degree. (CFR 2.2, 4.2)

Component 4: Educational Quality: Student learning, core competencies, and standards of performance at graduation

Woodbury describes five core competencies in the bachelor's and master's degrees: oral communication, written communication, critical thinking, quantitative analysis, and information literacy. These are measured at the program level, with results aimed to improve student learning at the course and program level, though this level of influence was not always backed up by evidence. Program curriculum maps show levels of development of the four strategic principles across the curriculum. Additionally, the GE curriculum adds three additional core competencies to these—knowledge, personal and social responsibility, and applied learning—in an effort to integrate Woodbury's four strategic principles (civic engagement, entrepreneurship, design thinking, and transdisciplinarity). (CFR 2.2)

At the GE level, three of the strategic principles—civic engagement, design thinking, and transdisciplinarity—map onto three of the GE core competencies—oral communication, critical thinking, and information literacy, respectively. The quantitative reasoning core competency is primarily evaluated in a single course, Math 149 or 249.

Woodbury has revised its core competency assessments and is planning on assessing one core competency each year, beginning with critical thinking in 2017-18. The team did not find a summary report on this at the time of the visit, nor did it see a planned March 2018 summary report on core competency evaluation. A visual summary of assessed critical thinking criteria showed that each of the ten courses assessed used different criteria for evaluation, and that levels

of student proficiency ranged from poor to outstanding. Suggestions for curricular or student learning improvements were not included in this graphic report.

The team was able to evaluate assessment reports on oral communication, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning by the time of the visit. The 2015-16 information literacy assessments used rubrics to assess assignments in six courses in fall 2015 and in spring 2016, with a total of thirty-nine students assessed. Evaluation scores in evaluation, integration, and documentation were calculated, and for each program, averages were obtained, and specific areas of improvement described. The small sample size was noted in the report. Competency levels in information literacy were acceptable, with average of 2 on a 4-point scale, at a level of Typically Proficient.

The 2016-17 oral communications assessment reported results from using both a 1-3 and a 1-4 scoring rubric of three group oral presentations in five programs, for a total of fourteen presentations. The average score on the central message, the use of supporting materials, and audience engagement was evaluated as Poor, short of a Proficient score. The 2015-16 assessments duplicated these findings, in the same three categories. The assessment committee's feedback to programs briefly described general areas needing improvement. The team suggests that a more nuanced rubric will specify outcomes more clearly, so that the evaluations and the feedback can be detailed and be able to clearly inform suggestions to improve curriculum and student learning.

The quantitative reasoning assessment evaluated three students each in an upper-division Management and Architecture course. Five assessors rated their work on an exam, with one student receiving excellent evaluations, and two students receiving Poor to Fair evaluations. The report noted that six targeted courses for 2016-17 had not yet completed their assessments.

The GE committee is benchmarking initial assessments of three core competencies in the 2017-18 year: information literacy, oral communication, and written communication, and plans to add outcomes assessment at the Practiced and Developed level.

A review of program assessment plans showed that programs were ambitiously planning a 3-year assessment cycle in multiple courses and multiple assignments. For example, the Game Design program's assessment plan described three different aspects of the Knowledge core competency—initial levels at start of study, knowledge demonstrated at the end of the 2nd year and 3rd year, and a summative assessment at the end of the 4th year. These assessments primarily involved the use of evaluative rubrics in course assignments, and in the capstone course involved portfolio evaluation. The detailed nature of these assessments led the team to wonder about their sustainability over time, particularly given the institution's currently over-burdened faculty, as well as the current lack of adequate support in the area of institutional research.

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. In summary, the team notes that Woodbury is beginning efforts to systematically assess core competencies across the curriculum. In the 2015-17 years, the small numbers of students assessed demonstrated Poor to Fair or Typical Proficiency in the competency areas of oral communication, information literacy, and quantitative reasoning, while the 2017 assessments in critical thinking showed Poor to Outstanding student competencies. An evaluation of the criteria, methods and procedures for assessing core competencies across the curriculum and across programs is necessary before a real understanding is reached of how well Woodbury's students meet performance standards for core competencies at graduation. (CFR 2.2) The remarks in program review narratives on grade inflation support the conclusion that simply using grades to assess competency is not sufficient.

Component 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Graduation.

Woodbury's overall 6-year graduation rate is 46% for its 2009 entering cohort, which compares unfavorably with a national bachelor's 6-year graduation rate average of 59% for all 4-year institutions; and of 66% for private non-profit institutions (National Center for Education Statistics data). It compares favorably with the 32% average 6-year graduation rate for an institution with non-selective open admissions policies. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, graduation rates are highest at the most selective institutions, with 6-year graduation rates decreasing as selectivity decreases.

The institution organized its narratives of success around its strategic principles of civic engagement (job and internship placements and community partnerships), design thinking (program learning and outcomes), entrepreneurship (proactive leadership activities), and transdisciplinarity (innovative and cross-disciplinary courses). (CFR 2.7) With the exception of student satisfaction and graduate job placement surveys, and graduation and retention data, Woodbury lacked systematic quantitative data that supported its qualitative observations of student success.

The team examined the data on retention, graduation rates and time-to-graduation from fall 2005 to 2010, disaggregated by race and ethnicity. The time-to-graduation data for the 2007 cohort show that 19% of students graduate in 4 years, 45% in 6 years, and 48% in 8 years. This data was not meaningfully discussed in the self-study, though it was stated in the Attrition and Retention report included as an Appendix that Woodbury was underperforming in its 6-year graduation rates. As stated earlier, the team notes that this data contradicts Woodbury's publicly offered guarantee of graduation in 4 years.

The overall 6-year graduation rate for the 2009 cohort is **46%**, with white (64%), Asian (53%), biracial (50%), and international (47%) students graduating at higher rates. Hispanic

(38%), African American (38%) and Native Hawaiian / Pacific Islander (25%) students showed markedly lower 6-year graduation rates than the average. Over multiple cohort years, Asian and white students often had the highest 6-year graduation rates, with African American and Hispanic students showing variation—sometimes higher, sometimes lower.

Six-year graduation rates vary by school. Examining data from fall 2005 to fall 2010, the team found that the College of Business had the highest overall graduation rate at 55%, followed by Architecture (53%) and Media Culture & Design (50%), with Liberal Arts reporting the lowest rate (35%). White, Asian and Hispanic students showed the highest graduation rates overall, with African American and international students showing variation. Significant differences are noted in African American 6-year graduation rates at 41% in the College of Business, 42% in Media Culture Design, 42% in Liberal Arts, and 51% in Architecture. International students showed 6-year graduation rates at 44% in the College of Business, 46% in Media Culture Design, 25% in Liberal Arts, and 50% in Architecture. The team recommends that the university reflect on the patterns contained in this data, particularly as it applies to African American students and international students, and to the College of Liberal Arts.

Retention (also called persistence) rates show similar patterns. In the United States a 61% retention rate is the average. The data from 2012 to 2015 show that African American students had lower persistence relative to the norm in 2013 and 2015, while Hispanic students had lower persistence rates from 2012 to 2015. International students had lower persistence rates relative to the norm in every year from 2006 to 2012. As noted in a prior section, *attrition* rates in 2015 were markedly high. In 2015, 3-year School attrition rates were 89% in Architecture, 74% in Business, 75% in Media Culture & Design, and 55% in Liberal Arts, with 100% 3-year attrition in the San Diego Architecture program. While Architecture and Business have high attrition

rates, the majors of Communications, Psychology, Graphic Design, and Filmmaking were identified as also contributing to low retention rates. The 2017 report recommended that the institution increase support services for African American and international students, increase financial support, and provide additional academic support in first-year courses to stem attrition.

The 2017 Attrition and Retention Report analyses show that students who are academically underprepared and who take remediation courses have a lower persistence and graduation rate than students who don't—the explanation being that these students do not re-enroll and thus do not graduate. Woodbury developed a first-year professional development course that developed academic and personal learning skills, and found that students who took this course tended to stay enrolled. (CFR 2.10, 2.11)

From interviews during the team's visit, it was clear that institutional data that describe disaggregated measures of student success are not widely disseminated, transparent, nor accessible, and that disaggregated data related to retention and graduation are not used by faculty and staff for data driven decision-making to improve student success. (CFR 2.10, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3) Especially concerning is that the team found that College deans were unaware of the disaggregated data of retention and graduation rates for underrepresented minority students versus non-underrepresented students. (CFR 1.2).

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. Systematically analyzing and thinking through the meaning of disaggregated measures of retention and graduation will allow Woodbury to meet its student learning goals in a more focused way, and to develop student support services that meet these students' needs. Faculty suggestions include co-curricular activities that support Hispanic, Asian, and Middle Eastern international students; strengthening Woodbury's second year experience; increasing financial resources to support low-income students; supporting

international students' English-as-a-second language needs; and increasing cultural competency awareness. [CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 2.14]

Component 6: Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program review, assessment, use of data and evidence

The evaluation team was impressed with Woodbury's record of completing program reviews in all of its programs in the period since the 2013 WSCUC Interim Report. The team reviewed evidence that the university engages meaningfully in processes of ongoing assessment at the course, school/program, and institutional level in alignment with student learning outcomes. Multi-year program assessment plans are now in place. Each assessment plan includes key milestones for the current assessment cycle, as well as capstone assessments of outcomes intrinsic to the degree. Further, a comprehensive set of curriculum maps (including program learning outcomes) detail four levels per program of student learning as it is intended to progress over four academic years.

In program review data, student samples were generally small, procedures and outcomes measured varied considerably, and recommendations for student learning improvement also varied. Next steps include larger sampling and thought given to outcome criteria compared across courses. Alignment of committee observations and evaluations with those collected from students about their experiences in courses, and from faculty members about student learning within their courses and programs, is also a next step. (CFR 2.3, 2.4)

Woodbury provided narratives from department chairs to describe changes made from assessment, and these narratives documented that faculty are invested in assessing and improving student learning. The chair of the Game Art and Design program, for example, provided a cogent analysis of "gut instinct assessment" of how the program developed from its pilot in 2012, how replacement courses were devised, and how the curriculum was re-sequenced to improve student

learning. Likewise, the chair of the Communications department offered insights into the different skill levels and learning needs of international students based on assessments of student learning, and offered curricular ideas for meeting these needs.

Programs provided varying levels of analysis of how they had improved student learning in response to assessment or program review, with the Leadership program providing an exemplary analysis. The Business program illustrates numerous issues arising in program assessment, assessment of core competencies, student learning outcomes, student support service assessments, and how assessment data is used to improve student learning. (CFR 4.3, 4.4) Six examples follow. 1) The Business report described focus group and survey data on advising difficulties, with a subsequent plan to offer mandatory faculty advising training in fall of 2017. 2) They commenced a study on grade inflation, with individual faculty members notified of their standing, with plans to reassess at a later date. 3) A 2013 assessment of low graduation rates associated with low entering GPA informed a 2014 plan to emphasize GPA over SAT scores for financial aid beginning in 2015. With declining enrollments this plan was put on hold in 2016, with offering of increased advising support to low-score incoming students on a trial basis in 2016-18. 4) Assessments indicated that students did not have the core competency quantitative skills, and efforts to refocus lower division Math classes and upper division Management classes on quantitative skills have not yet been assessed. 5) Written communication assessments showed that plagiarism was a concern, particularly for international students, resulting in a shift of focus to in-class writing. 6) Business was particularly clear that assessment had increased faculty workload, and devised strategies to make it more workable and sustainable.

Program reviews, while conducted in regular, ongoing cycles, are not yet consistent in structure and protocol with WSCUC guidelines. For example, while Architecture, Business, and

Media Culture & Design have robust accreditation procedures in place, WSCUC has disallowed in recent years specialized program accreditation *in lieu of* program reviews. (CFR 2.7)

The 2017 Attrition and Retention Report outlines overall graduation and first-year persistence rates, with analyses broken down by student demographics, student preparedness, second term GPA, financial status, Pell status, financial aid awarded, housing status, and peer group comparisons. The report drilled down to levels of potential impact, and offered recommendations based on the analyses. However, there was no evidence in the self-study that the report was used to support institutional planning decision-making, nor improve student learning or institutional functions, as it had the potential to do. (CFR 4.2, 4.3) Team conversations with support staff during the visit did indicate that some report recommendations were in line with support services being offered to students.

The team notes that the recommendations included in many of the program reviews often do not include calls for resource allocations—space, faculty lines, student support services, budget—as determined by its assessment results. This suggests that the link between program review and resource allocation is missing on a general level across the university, and that the goal of continuous improvement of student learning and support services is at a beginning stage at this institution. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3) In contrast, an example of a program review at Woodbury leading to resource allocation is the recent Library review, in which questions and recommendations about Library hours and available databases were noted, passed on to the Educational Policy Committee, and subsequently passed on to higher administrative personnel, with the result that specific database needs were addressed with budgetary allocations.

The institution is at the beginning level in assessing student support services, student satisfaction, and alumni satisfaction, and using these findings to improve institutional functions.

(CFR 4.1, 4.5) The team didn't see evidence that the 2015 student satisfaction survey, or the disaggregated retention and graduation data, were being thought about and discussed, with the results used to inform budget allocations or improve student learning or student services. (CFR 4.1, 4.3) For example, the student satisfaction survey indicates that the following areas are significantly lower in student satisfaction than national private 4-year colleges: campus life; recruitment and financial aid; academic advising; student centeredness; campus climate; instructional effectiveness; registration effectiveness; and service excellence. Woodbury students endorsed items in these areas at significantly lower levels than national averages; these findings indicate potential areas for future inquiry, analyses, decision-making, and alignment of resources. (CFR 4.3)

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. Woodbury engages in assessment with the aim to improve programs, courses, and student learning, and to increase student success. At the same time, as was stated by the accreditation review committee in the evaluation team's initial meeting, decisions across the university and in the student learning and success area have been made “less on the basis of data than we’d like.” (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3) Institutional research is not yet intrinsic to a Woodbury culture that values data-driven decision-making. The hiring of an institutional research director is essential to develop this component. The team also suggests that program review is enhanced by including external readers who offer professional disciplinary perspectives beyond that of specialized accreditation reviewers. (CFR 2.7)

J. Component 7: Sustainability: Financial viability, preparing for the changing higher education environment

As noted above, budget deficits have created a challenge for Woodbury to pursue its long-held mission of successfully educating a diverse student population. The institution has

confronted this challenge purposefully and inclusively, and has asked for both faculty and administration to step up with resource contributions.

Mission. Given the enrollment challenges, the team asked in several meetings about any changes to the mission in order to maintain enrollment. Without exception, the team was impressed with the knowledge of and dedication to the mission statement: "Woodbury University transforms students into innovative professionals....focusing on purposeful student engagement...". This feeling came across strongly from faculty, administration and students. (CFR 1.1) Students gave thoughtful and heartfelt testimonials during the visit to the way they were actively welcomed into a supportive environment and expressed confidence in the value of their education. The consensus is that the financial challenges have helped refocus the university on its core mission, rather than the opposite: it is a wake-up call to the institution to think again about what makes it unique. (CFR 1.1, 4.7) At the same time, the team notes the lack of attention, both in words and in the self-study, to Woodbury's status as a Hispanic-Serving Institution. (CFR 2.2)

Reflections and Plans for Improvement: Woodbury has shown a commitment to mission that is commendable, given the challenges it faces. The team suggests that the institution give more explicit thought to what it means to be an Hispanic-serving Institution, and highlight the programs and demographics that support this designation. (CFR 2.2, 4.6, 4.7)

Strategic Planning. Woodbury recently devoted significant amounts of time and resources to developing several related plans: an overarching Strategic Plan, a Strategic Enrollment Plan, and specific strategic operational plans for Finance, Advancement, Marketing and Infrastructure. Much of this work was not completed until the fall of 2017, and the team reviewed the available written materials for each plan. Woodbury's strategic enrollment plan

included detailed spreadsheets that link specific enrollment initiatives to potential revenue and expenses. The team also consulted with the cabinet, faculty and staff about the current progress in implementing the various aspects of the plans. In addition, one member of the team visited the San Diego campus and was able to see how that campus is integrated into the broader institution and that it embodies the goals of the strategic plan. [CFR 1.7, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 4.6, 4.7]

Given the short-run enrollment challenge, much of the implementation work has focused on the Strategic Enrollment Plan, and the team found that strategic planning for most constituencies meant this plan. In a very short span of time, Woodbury has developed extremely detailed linkages between enrollment goals, budget forecasts for revenue and expenses associated with achieving those goals, and the overall financial health of the university, as represented by various 3-year budget forecasts for different enrollment trends. For example, one enrollment goal is to increase international student success, through both admissions and retention. This involves spending on additional support staff and recruitment, among other costs, and has a goal of a specific number of additional students, and a specific amount of tuition revenue. Woodbury is to be commended for the way it has linked strategic goals with specific financial outcomes, and this work should help guide the university in how best to allocate resources to achieve financial sustainability. (CFR4.6) The campus community is heavily involved in both implementing and tracking the Strategic Enrollment Plan; for example, faculty are now participating in recruitment. (CFR 1.7, 4.6)

Planning in other areas is still at an emerging stage, since many of the documents were just completed. It is too early to see how implementation will progress, other than to note that resources have been allocated to particular areas. The Advancement Strategic Plan was developed by an outside consultant, and is quite aggressive for the staff resources available. The

campus does have an extensive Master Facility Plan completed in 2015 by an outside consultant. Clearly reflecting a different financial environment, it includes much higher enrollment projections than are currently applicable, and contains an excellent template for new strategic planning. (CFR 3.5)

While it is understandable that Woodbury has focused so heavily on the Strategic Enrollment Plan, the team is concerned that the university is still without a comprehensive longer-term strategic plan that integrates the individual plans, and reflects current strategic priorities. (CFR 4.6, 4.7) These priorities preferably should be developed through a community-wide conversation about what Woodbury should look like in the future, and also reflect a deeper sense of the university's place in the higher education community. For example, during conversations with multiple groups, the team heard that the long-term enrollment goal was 1,500 students and that there were no plans for online programs. The team was not able to find the rationale for those specific goals which would normally stem from a strategic plan for the institution. (CFR 4.7) While the team was impressed with the commitment to student success and mission at the San Diego campus, long-term goals for that campus were not readily apparent.

Reflections and Plans for Improvement: The financial situation and enrollment challenge have galvanized the campus to work on enrollment in a thoughtful and strategic way. Until that situation is resolved, it will be difficult to focus on longer-term strategies, but the work still needs to be done. The individual plans for enrollment, advancement, facilities, infrastructure and marketing need to come together, with specific timeframes and goals. Woodbury needs to be able to describe the university it would like to be. (CFR 4.7)

Diversity. The team met with a wide range of campus constituencies and noted the very evident diversity of the faculty, administration and student body, across most dimensions of

diversity. (CFR 3.1) Institutional data, however, don't fully capture this, as there are gaps in historical data, particularly for faculty and staff. Current faculty demographics do not appear to match those of the student body in race, ethnicity, or gender. As a university focused on professional education, Woodbury does face a challenge in matching faculty, who often come from fields that lack diversity, and a student population that reflects Woodbury's mission. The team did not find evidence that this issue has explicitly been addressed. [CFR 3.1]

Woodbury has achieved existing diversity without a formal policy guiding hiring and promotion that reflects the mission of the university. (CFR 1.4, 3.1) Diversity considerations did not guide recent reductions in faculty and staff, which were driven more by voluntary separations in response to incentives and to non-renewal of evaluation faculty contracts across all schools.

Reflections and Plans for Improvement: Information about diversity is another instance where Woodbury lacks data to drive decision-making. The team recommends that the institution adopt a diversity policy that insures its faculty and staff reflect both the university's mission and best practices in higher education. Work on a complete database of faculty and staff demographics will be part of this effort.

Financial Viability. The evaluation team was provided with financial plans for the next three years, as well as audited financials for the past three years. The financial plans reflected a variety of possible enrollment scenarios, stemming from the newly developed and detailed Strategic Enrollment Plan. The Strategic Enrollment Plan is currently being implemented, with the goal of erasing the operating deficits of the prior three years. (CFR3.4) These cumulative operating deficits equal approximately \$8 million. Woodbury has been able to withstand this financial stress by drawing down its Board-designated quasi-endowment, which stood at approximately \$18 million at the time of the visit. Forecasted budgets continue to show expected

deficits until FY21, assuming an increase in enrollment in response to implementation of the Strategic Enrollment Plan. The forecasted budget is in surplus by FY21 for moderate to optimistic increases in enrollment. The worst case scenario, which assumes flat enrollment, would result in additional cumulative deficits of about \$8 million. Conversations with the Board, and individually with the Board Finance Committee Chair, confirmed that the Board is very aware of the financial situation, and concerned about the draw on board-directed endowment funds. The Board is also very supportive of the need to draw down the funds to insure the short- and long-term success of the university. Given the importance of increasing revenues through increased enrollment, the team encourages the Board to increase its knowledge of how enrollment gains are occurring due to implementation of the Strategic Enrollment Plan. [CFR 1.7, 3.4, 3.5, 3.9, 4.6]

Woodbury has continued to receive unqualified audits, has sufficient cash to withstand a few more years of operating deficits, and has reduced deficits through reductions in expenses and extensive enrollment planning. (CFR1.7 and 3.4) The evaluation team, however, is concerned that the as yet unproven Strategic Enrollment Plan, along with the need to stabilize faculty and staff resources, leave the institution less financially stable than required by CFR 3.4. In addition, the FY17 audited financial statements, along with a conference call with the audit firm of Moss-Adams, LLP, showed that the institution is currently out of compliance with the debt service bond covenant for its outstanding \$26 million bond. The lender has agreed to waive the covenants for FY18 (confirmed by the auditor, the CFO, and a letter from the lender), but Woodbury has no guarantee that this waiver will be renewed. The CFO expects that it will be renewed, as the institution has a long relationship with the lender. Of course, further deterioration in the financial situation could change this position.

Reflections and Plans for Improvement: Woodbury's careful and conservative stewardship of financial resources has enabled it so far to weather the financial challenge of declining enrollment. Looking forward, it is essential that the institution use its Strategic Enrollment Plan, supported by its Strategic Advancement Plan, to increase revenues through increased enrollment, so that it returns to consistently surplus budgets along with a replenishment and then growth in its endowment. (CFR 3.4)

Decision-making. Woodbury has undergone a massive change in leadership over the past three years, with the current president being chosen through a Board-dominated process and charged with turning the institution around. There has been a significant decrease in the number of faculty and staff, leaving those who remain to confront major enrollment challenges. Thus, it is not surprising that decision-making structures and processes are still in flux. The team had frank conversations with the president, the provost, the cabinet, and the Board, as well as meetings with faculty and staff. What impressed the team is the degree of commitment by all parties to the university, and the desire to not just support, but be positively involved in decision-making.

The new president has been quite open with information, and faculty have been kept apprised of developments. The elected head of the Faculty Senate serves as dean of the faculty, sits on the president's cabinet, and clearly is an active contributor to important educational decisions. Individual faculty members are involved through a normal committee structure that did not change with the administration. Given the small size of the university, informal processes are also important. Individual schools are in charge of their curricula, subject to committee approval. (CFR 3.10) A restructuring of the faculty pay structure was led by the faculty.

The most apparent weakness in decision-making processes at Woodbury is the lack of a robust data set that tracks the information crucial to making good decisions about educational effectiveness and resource allocation, and that can be easily accessed by all interested parties, including the Board. This weakness stems from two directions: the relatively small amount of resources devoted to information technology and to institutional research. Currently, institutional research is being led by a part-time staff member. This means that much data gathering and analysis to support the Strategic Enrollment Plan, for example, has been done on an *ad hoc* basis by other administrators. (CFR 3.10, 4.1 4.2) The team encourages Woodbury to find the resources, even within the current financial situation, to fund strategic investment in both information technology and institutional research. [CFR 3.7, 3.10]

Reflections and Plans for Improvement. Decision-making at Woodbury has responded proactively to the enrollment and financial challenges, showing a high level of commitment, communication, and involvement. Decision-making could be substantially improved with access to good data about the institution, as well as informational technology and institutional research departments that are staffed and funded at the appropriate level. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6, 4.10)

Component 9: Conclusion: Reflection and plans for improvement

Woodbury has shown a commitment to its educational mission that is commendable given the current challenges it faces. The team was impressed by the warm welcome and the *esprit de corps* that was visible in faculty, students and staff during the evaluation visit.

The evaluation team's final reflections and plans for improvement are discussed below and arranged according to WSCUC Standards.

Standard 1. Because the 4-year graduation guarantee found on the institution's website is not supported by the institution's current graduation rate data, the team finds that the institution

only partially meets the federal standard regarding Marketing and Recruitment. The team recommends that Woodbury immediately change the language on its website related to its 4-year graduation guarantee. (CFR 1)

Standard 2. Woodbury's self-study substantiates that academic programs are designed by faculty, include learning outcomes essential to the degree, and that faculty are actively engaged in assessing student learning across the institution. Program review is ongoing, with faculty continuing to work on developing clear program review guidelines and a sustainable assessment cycle. Standardization of student learning outcomes is inconsistent across disciplines, which suggests a decentralized program assessment structure versus one that is institutionally coordinated. This may be an aspirational goal for Woodbury in the future, which the hiring of an institutional research director will assist. The team suggests that Woodbury consider adopting the best practice of including external readers in the program self-study process, who offer a disciplinary perspective beyond what might be supplied by specialized accreditation reviewers. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 2.7, 3.7, 3.10)

Evaluations of how well Woodbury is meeting its core competency requirements are in the beginning stages. The team recommends that the institution evaluate the core competency assessment cycles, criteria, and procedures so that these are comprehensive across programs, include a healthy amount of student data, are sustainable to faculty over time, and that follow up on whether curricular and student learning improvements are undertaken.

While data are tracked and included in program reviews, Woodbury does not include information disaggregated data by race and ethnicity, which is particularly relevant given that Woodbury is a federally designated Hispanic-Serving Institution. (CFR 2.7, 4.1). If a commitment to continuous improvement of teaching and learning is endorsed, disaggregated

outcome measures are a next step in assessment and institutional reporting. (CFR 2.6, 4.3).

Along this line, the team suggests that the institution give more explicit thought to what it means to be a Hispanic-serving Institution, and highlight the programs and demographics that support this designation. (CFR 2.2, 4.6, 4.7)

The team recommends that the university reflect on the patterns contained in the time-to-graduation and retention data, particularly as it applies to African American and international students, to the College of Liberal Arts, and to factors that influence persistence and retention. The team notes that 4-year, 6-year, and 8-year graduation data contradict the 4-year graduation guarantee that Woodbury makes to potential applicants.

Systematically analyzing and thinking through the meaning of disaggregated measures of retention and graduation will allow Woodbury to meet its student learning goals in a more focused way, and to develop student support services that meet all students' needs. Related to this, the team recommends that Woodbury develop and continue its assessment of student support services and co-curricular activities to ensure that student learning needs for all students, including under-represented minority students, are being recognized and met. Faculty suggestions in these areas include developing co-curricular activities that support Hispanic, Asian, and Middle Eastern international students; strengthening Woodbury's second year experience; increasing financial resources to support low-income students; supporting international students' English-as-a-second language needs; and increasing cultural competency awareness. (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 2.14)

Finally, the team recommends that the institution continue to reflect on the core elements and characteristics that describe the Woodbury graduate at the bachelor's and master's levels. The

2017 Strategic Plan may provide a solid foundation from which to move forward on WSCUC
Component 3, The meaning, quality and integrity of the degree.

Standard 3. Woodbury's careful and conservative stewardship of financial resources has enabled it so far to weather the financial challenge of declining enrollment. Looking forward, it is essential that the institution use its Strategic Enrollment Plan, supported by its Strategic Advancement Plan, to increase revenues through increased enrollment, so that it returns to consistently surplus budgets along with a replenishment and then growth in its endowment. (CFR 3.4)

Separate but related to this issue, the team recommends that the university continue to monitor faculty workload and compensation. This is particularly essential in the near-term as more is being asked of faculty and staff to step up to help the institution, which generates concerns regarding burnout and sustainability. (CFR 3.2)

While the diversity of students and staff is notable at Woodbury, information about diversity is an instance where Woodbury lacks data to drive decision-making. The institution needs a diversity policy that insures that its faculty and staff reflect both the university's mission and best practices in higher education. Work on creating a complete database of faculty and staff demographics will be a part of this effort. (CFR 3.1, 3.10)

The team is concerned about resource allocation for services necessary to support academic offerings, particularly in institutional research and information technology, and recommends that attention be given to these areas. (CFR 3.5)

Finally, the team recommends that the institution develop a policy and procedures for regular evaluation of the president of the university, as well as for conflicts of interest on the board. (CFR 3.9)

Standard 4. Woodbury engages in assessment with the aim to improve programs, courses, and student learning, and to increase student success. At the same time, as was stated by the accreditation review committee in the evaluation team's initial onsite meeting, decisions across the university and in the student learning and success area have been made “less on the basis of data than we’d like.” (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3) Institutional research is not yet intrinsic to the Woodbury culture. The hiring of an institutional research director and the development of data dashboards are needed in this area. Data dashboards will increase real-time access to data for faculty and staff for program review, assessment of student learning outcomes disaggregated by race and ethnicity, retention and graduation rates disaggregated by race and ethnicity, and evidence-based decision making.

The financial situation and enrollment challenge have galvanized the campus to work on enrollment in a thoughtful and strategic way. Until that situation is resolved, it will be difficult to focus on longer-term strategies, but the work still needs to be done. The individual plans for enrollment, advancement, facilities, infrastructure and marketing need to come together, with specific timeframes and goals. Woodbury needs to be able to describe the university it would like to be. (CFR 4.7)

Decision-making at Woodbury has responded proactively to the enrollment and financial challenges, showing a high level of commitment, communication, and involvement. Decision-making could be substantially improved with access to good data about the institution, as well as informational technology and institutional research departments that are staffed and funded at the appropriate level. (CFR 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.6, 4.10)

SECTION III – COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Commendations. The team commends the institution for the following accomplishments and practices:

1. The team commends the highly qualified, hard-working, and dedicated mission-driven faculty and staff.

The evaluating team observed a high degree of campus support for pitching in to help where needed in a time of financial vulnerability. The dedication and spirit shown by the university community was inspiring to the team. (CFR 1.1, 4.7)

2. The team commends the ways in which Woodbury creatively engages students in curricular and co-curricular high-impact practices such as internships, work experiences, capstone courses, community partnerships, the Woodbury Integrated Student Experience program, student services, and the library. (CFR 2.5)

The team reviewed information on programs involving study away, internship placements, civic engagement, leadership, transdisciplinary course collaborations, community partnerships, undergraduate research, and surveys including alumni job placements and library use.

3. The team commends the Board of Trustees' and administration's careful and conservative stewardship of financial resources, which has enabled Woodbury to navigate difficult financial times, as well as the institution's historical trend of unqualified financial audits.

This commendation reflects review of the audited financial statement for the past three years, and conversations with the outside audit firm as well as the president, CFO, and Board of Trustees. (CFR 3.4, 3.6, 4.7)

4. The team commends the development and application of the Strategic Enrollment Plan, directed by the Enrollment Management committee, that enjoys wide buy-in and stakeholder

investment for an improved future, and budget planning which reflects multiple realistic scenarios tied to the Strategic Enrollment Plan. (CFR 3.5)

This commendation is supported by review of the Strategic Enrollment Plan, supplemented by the spreadsheet analysis provided by the provost that links the plan goals to budget results. It also reflects conversations with multiple groups on campus who are deeply involved and committed to the plan.

5. The team commends the university's progress in conducting program reviews, and marks especially the 2017 Attrition and Retention Report as an excellent example of the potential of using institutional research to inform university-wide decision-making. (CFR 2.3, 2.7)

Woodbury's program review cycles involve all academic programs as well as support services such as the Library, Counseling Services, Health Services, and the Writing Program. The 2017 Attrition and Retention Report outlines overall graduation and first-year persistence rates, with analyses broken down by student demographics, student preparedness, second term GPA, financial status, Pell status, financial aid awarded, housing status, and peer group comparison, with recommendations for university improvements offered. (CFR 4.1)

6. The team commends Woodbury's progress in developing a sustainable cycle of assessments in GE core competencies, in specifying the learning outcomes, and in beginning to conduct outcomes assessments. (CFR 2.2)

While this work is in the beginning stages, the faculty have clearly engaged time and energy in analyzing how essential skills in core competencies are taught, learned, and assessed in different courses across the curriculum.

Recommendations. The team recommends the following action plans for the university:

1. The team recommends that Woodbury initiate the development of a comprehensive longer-term strategic plan that integrates operating plans such as enrollment, advancement, and marketing, with resource allocation based on strategic priorities. This unifies stakeholders in the future vision of Woodbury.

This recommendation reflects the absence of a strategic plan that outlines a vision of Woodbury in the future, and which integrates the individual plans. (CFR 4.6, 4.7)

2. The team recommends that the university develop and implement a diversity plan that is aligned with Woodbury's core mission to serve diverse students, and underscores the university's commitment to diversity as a strength and value. The diversity plan, under the university's comprehensive strategic plan, will guide:

a) Recruitment of diverse students, including international students across multiple countries, that will deepen the overall learning experience of all Woodbury students in a community that embraces diversity and global appreciation. The team recommends that Woodbury prioritize enhanced student support services to improve student success, retention and graduation rates, particularly for underrepresented students and international students, who are graduating at markedly lower rates.

b) The diversity plan will also guide the recruitment, hiring, retention, and promotion of talented diverse faculty, staff and administrators, that reflect Woodbury's diverse student body.

This recommendation reflects the lack of a formal diversity plan to guide hiring of faculty and staff. It also reflects the lack of emphasis on Woodbury's classification as a Hispanic-serving institution. (CFR 1.4, 3.1)

3. The team recommends that the university strengthen the use of data to inform decision-making across the university. Even within the current financial environment, the team

recommends that Woodbury consider strategic investments in information technology and institutional research, with the goal of sharing data more widely to engage stakeholders in data-driven decision-making, including the Board of Trustees.

This recommendation reflects program review and assessment practices and processes across the university; of gaps in the ways that assessment data are used to inform university-wide planning and decision-making processes, particularly with disaggregated retention and graduation data; of WSCUC's *Component 3, The quality, meaning and integrity of the degree*; and of the need to align institutional priorities and decision-making with institutional data. It also reflects the incomplete nature of Woodbury's demographic data. (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 3.5, 4.2, CFR 4.4)

4. The team recommends that Woodbury expand the culture of assessment and data-driven institutional decision-making through continued assessment efforts that include student support services, co-curricular programming, GE, and core competencies. The team recommends that Woodbury continue the process of developing procedures and guidelines of program review that meet WSCUC standards. (CFR 2.2, 2.3, 2.4)

This recommendation is based on evaluation of program reviews, core competencies assessments, student services assessments and reviews, survey data, and narratives describing the assessment and review processes.

5. The team recommends that Woodbury continue the analysis of faculty workload to ensure equity in salary, stipends, course release, and professional development, and to ensure that faculty workload is sustainable.

This recommendation reflects the increase in faculty time spent on recruitment within the Strategic Enrollment Plan, and the need to consider the long-term impact of this on effective use

of faculty resources. Recent reductions in faculty numbers and increases in teaching workload have been strategic responses to financial pressures, and have not arisen from a long-term strategic analysis of workload. (CFR 3.1, 3.2, 3.5)

6. The team recommends that Woodbury bring the Board of Trustees bylaws into compliance with the November 2017 WSCUC Policy on Independent Governing Boards.

This recommendation arises from a review of the Board bylaws and comparison with the WSCUC Policy on Independent Governing Boards and Implementation Guide. (CFR 3.9)

APPENDICES

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 - 3. Student Complaints Review
 - 4. Transfer Credit Review
- B. Off-Campus Locations Review

APPENDICES

- A. Federal Compliance Forms
 - 1. Credit Hour and Program Length
 - 2. Marketing and Recruitment Review
 - 3. Student Complaints Review
 - 4. Transfer Credit Review
- B. Off-Campus Locations Review

CREDIT HOUR AND PROGRAM LENGTH REVIEW FORM

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the Comments sections as appropriate.)
Policy on credit hour	Is this policy easily accessible? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Where is the policy located? Website/ Academic Policies and Course Catalog
	Comments:
Process(es)/ periodic review of credit hour	Does the institution have a procedure for periodic review of credit hour assignments to ensure that they are accurate and reliable (for example, through program review, new course approval process, periodic audits)? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Does the institution adhere to this procedure? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Program review, however, inconsistent practices, timelines, methodologies and standards.
Schedule of on-ground courses showing when they meet	Does this schedule show that on-ground courses meet for the prescribed number of hours? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for online and hybrid courses <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 1
	What kind of courses (online or hybrid or both)? Online
	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate
	What discipline(s)? Anthropology 300
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample syllabi or equivalent for other kinds of courses that do not meet for the prescribed hours (e.g., internships, labs, clinical, independent study, accelerated) <i>Please review at least 1 - 2 from each degree level.</i>	How many syllabi were reviewed? 2
	What kinds of courses? Senior capstone, Senior Thesis, Internship
	What degree level(s)? Undergraduate and Graduate
	What discipline(s)? Psychology, Business, Architecture
	Does this material show that students are doing the equivalent amount of work to the prescribed hours to warrant the credit awarded? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Sample program information (catalog, website, or other program materials)	How many programs were reviewed? 3
	What kinds of programs were reviewed? Psychology, Architecture, Business
	What degree level(s) Undergraduate and Graduate
	What discipline(s) Psychology, Architecture and Business
	Does this material show that the programs offered at the institution are of a generally acceptable length? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments: Solid curriculum and credit hours in Woodbury programs

Review Completed By: Lynnette Zelezny
Date: March 2018

MARKETING AND RECRUITMENT REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's recruiting and admissions practices.

Material Reviewed	Questions and Comments: Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this table as appropriate.
**Federal regulations	<p>Does the institution follow federal regulations on recruiting students? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments:</p>
Degree completion and cost	<p>Does the institution provide information about the typical length of time to degree? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the overall cost of the degree? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Comments: Because the 4-year graduation guarantee found on the institution's website is not supported by the institution's current graduation rate data, the team finds that the institution only partially meets this federal standard. The team recommends that Woodbury immediately change the language on its website related to its 4-year graduation guarantee. (CFR 1)</p>
Careers and employment	<p>Does the institution provide information about the kinds of jobs for which its graduates are qualified, as applicable? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p> <p>Does the institution provide information about the employment of its graduates, as applicable? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>
	<p>Comments:</p>

*§602.16(a)(1)(vii)

**Section 487 (a)(20) of the Higher Education Act (HEA) prohibits Title IV eligible institutions from providing incentive compensation to employees or third party entities for their success in securing student enrollments. Incentive compensation includes commissions, bonus payments, merit salary adjustments, and promotion decisions based solely on success in enrolling students. These regulations do not apply to the recruitment of international students residing in foreign countries who are not eligible to receive Federal financial aid.

Review Completed By: Patricia Potter

Date: 5/3/18

STUDENT COMPLAINTS REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulation*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution's student complaints policies, procedures, and records.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Policy on student complaints	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for student complaints? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	If so, Is the policy or procedure easily accessible? Where? It is easily accessible in the catalog and on the university website.
	Comments: A formal appeals committee reviews requests for exceptions to academic policies, and a petition process described in the university catalog outlines procedures for grade changes. Records of student complaints are kept in the office of the Associate Dean of Students, while the Student Conduct office keeps formal complaints.
Process(es)/ procedure	Does the institution have a procedure for addressing student complaints? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: Students submit in writing their complaint against faculty to the Dean of Faculty, complaints against staff go to Human Resources, and Student Affairs handles student versus student complaints.
	If so, does the institution adhere to this procedure? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:
Records	Does the institution maintain records of student complaints? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? Records of student complaints are kept in the office of the Associate Dean of Students, while the Student Conduct office keeps formal complaints.
	Does the institution have an effective way of tracking and monitoring student complaints over time? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, please describe briefly: Tracking is done online via Conduct Coordinator software (this is currently being re-evaluated for possible migration to Maxient).
	Comments:

*§602-16(1)(1)(ix)

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission's Complaints and Third Party Comment Policy.

Review Completed By: Laurel McCabe

Date: 3/9/18

TRANSFER CREDIT POLICY REVIEW FORM

Under federal regulations*, WSCUC is required to demonstrate that it monitors the institution’s recruiting and admissions practices accordingly.

Material Reviewed	Questions/Comments (Please enter findings and recommendations in the comment section of this column as appropriate.)
Transfer Credit Policy(s)	Does the institution have a policy or formal procedure for receiving transfer credit? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Is the policy publically available? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO If so, where? University website.
	Does the policy(s) include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education? x YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
	Comments:

*§602.24(e): Transfer of credit policies. The accrediting agency must confirm, as part of its review for renewal of accreditation, that the institution has transfer of credit policies that--

- (1) Are publicly disclosed in accordance with 668.43(a)(11); and
- (2) Include a statement of the criteria established by the institution regarding the transfer of credit earned at another institution of higher education.

See also WASC Senior College and University Commission’s Transfer of Credit Policy.

Review Completed By: Randall Lavender
Date: 3/9/18

Team Report Appendix
OFF-CAMPUS SITE

Institution: Woodbury University
Kind of Visit: Reaccreditation
Date: February 22, 1018

A completed copy of this form should be appended to the team report for all visits in which off-campus sites were reviewed¹. One form should be used for each site visited. Teams are not required to include a narrative about this matter in the team report but may include recommendations, as appropriate, in the Findings and Recommendations section of the team report.

1. Site Name and Address

Woodbury University, School of Architecture, 2212 Main Street, San Diego, CA 92113

2. Background Information (number of programs offered at this site; degree levels; FTE of faculty and enrollment; brief history at this site; designation as a regional center or off-campus site by WASC)

The San Diego facility began as an innovative public/private partnership between Mesa Community College and Woodbury. The programs were initially housed at the Naval Training Center.

Located in the Barrio Logan neighborhood of San Diego, the teaching and learning space is a faculty-designed building (formerly a marine hardware store) that provides space for “studio culture and hands-on, craft -based design: It is open to students 24/7. This facility is designated by WSCUC as an additional location.

The San Diego Library at Woodbury University is an exclusive library focused on architecture, landscape architecture, and real estate development. The 1,300 square foot space houses a growing collection of 7,400 books and 31 current magazine and journal subscriptions.

Five programs are offered at this location and include: one bachelor’s degree in Architecture (BArch) and four (4) master’s degrees -- Master of Architecture (M Arch), Master of Science in Architecture in Real Estate Development (MS Arch RED) Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA) and Master of Interior Architecture, (MIS).

There are six full-time faculty members.

Current enrollment totals 76 students (the highest enrolling year was 2008 when the site had 130 students).

3. Nature of the Review (material examined, and persons/committees interviewed)

Woodbury self-study and appendices, the San Diego program brochures, course syllabus, and report on library support. The following individuals were interviewed:

Catherine M. Herbst, Chair, School of Architecture, San Diego and Assistant Professor
Susan McFetridge, Assistant to the Chair

¹ See Protocol for Review of Off-Campus Sites to determine whether and how many sites will be visited.

Stan Bertheaud, Professor
 Jose Parral, Assistant Professor
 Hector Perez, Assistant Professor
 Sandra Burllem, Administrative Assistant
 Brenda Hernandez, Library Staff
 Janet Asuncion, Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions Counselor

Attending from Burbank were:
 Ingalll Wahlroos-Ritter, Dean School of Architecture
 Marty Tippens, Accreditation Liaison Officer, Chair, Mathematics Dept.

Observations and Findings

Lines of Inquiry	Observations and Findings	Follow-up Required (identify the issues)
<p><i>Fit with Mission.</i> How does the institution conceive of this and other off-campus sites relative to its mission, operations, and administrative structure? How is the site planned and operationalized? (CFRs 1.2, 3.1, 3.5, 4.1)</p>	<p>The San Diego appears to be fully aligned with the Burbank campus. Site planning and operations are overseen by a Chair who is fully engaged with faculty and administrative colleagues at the main campus.</p>	<p>Is there discussion or planning occurring that would impact the San Diego campus? SD faculty reported that ramifications from the recent leadership changes had settled down. However, they also expressed a “more tenuous” feeling about the long-term future of the campus.</p>
<p><i>Connection to the Institution.</i> How visible and deep is the presence of the institution at the off-campus site? In what ways does the institution integrate off-campus students into the life and culture of the institution? (CFRs 1.2, 2.10)</p>	<p>San Diego faculty are fully integrated into the Burbank School of Architecture. This is primarily the outcome of the accrediting requirements of National Architectural Accrediting Board (NABB), which does not allow the disaggregation of data for off-site programs.</p>	<p>Confirm that the Burbank faculty agree that the two programs are fully integrated.</p>
<p><i>Quality of the Learning Site.</i> How does the physical environment foster learning and faculty-student contact? What kind of oversight ensures that the off-campus site is well managed? (CFRs 1.8, 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 3.5)</p>	<p>Impressive learning site with an open floor plan and the studio/craft work spaces required by the profession. faculty are present and know the students in every program. Student have access to their work spaces 24/7. High energy space.</p>	<p>None</p>

<p><i>Student Support Services. CPR:</i> What is the site's capacity for providing advising, counseling, library, computing services and other appropriate student services? Or how are these otherwise provided? <i>EER:</i> What do data show about the effectiveness of these services? (CFRs 2.11-2.13, 3.6, 3.7)</p>	<p>An impressive array of student services except for IT/Computing services.</p> <p>Academic advisors are on site. Student also have access to a part-time therapeutic counselor who is on campus two days a week.</p> <p>There is a Writing Center.</p> <p>The library has its own budget and a professional teaching librarian. The data show that the SD campus “circulates the most of all call number ranges at Woodbury University, including circulating slightly more than the architecture collection at the main campus.”</p>	<p>The computer and IT services distributed to the San Diego campus do not appear to be adequate.</p> <p>There are bandwidth issues. In addition, architectural printing and plotting devices - essential to the academic programs- are non-functional and must be conducted offsite. These functions are being conducted off site.</p> <p>Follow-up on the level and quality of IT/computer services on the main campus will be important. These services were described by the SD group as the “Achilles of the entity...using dated equipment and approaches.”</p>
<p><i>Faculty.</i> Who teaches the courses, e.g., full-time, part-time, adjunct? In what ways does the institution ensure that off-campus faculty are involved in the academic oversight of the programs at this site? How do these faculty members participate in curriculum development and assessment of student learning? (CFRs 2.4, 3.1-3.4, 4.6)</p>	<p>Most courses are taught by full-time faculty. The San Diego faculty teach in Burbank and Burbank faculty teach in San Diego. SD faculty chair curriculum committees and participate fully in the faculty culture of the main campus.</p>	<p>Ensure that faculty engagement also means that Burbank faculty travel to San Diego to engage with their colleagues.</p>
<p><i>Curriculum and Delivery.</i> Who designs the programs and courses at this site? How are they approved and evaluated? Are the programs and courses comparable in content, outcomes and quality to those on the main campus? (CFR 2.1-2.3, 4.6)</p>	<p>All programs in the architecture schools are developed to meet the 36 learning outcomes prescribed by NAAB. SD faculty are full participants in the curriculum development process. Programs and courses are comparable.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><i>Retention and Graduation.</i> What data on retention and graduation are collected on students enrolled at this off-campus site? What do these data show? What disparities are evident? Are rates comparable to programs at the main campus? If any concerns exist, how are these being addressed? (CFRs 2.6, 2.10)</p>	<p>Due to NAAB, the data on retention and graduation is not reported separately for SD. However, the Chair and faculty provided the following information about SD students: 77% of the BArch students complete in 6 years; 87% complete in 8 years and all currently enrolled undergraduates will graduate in May.</p>	<p>WSCUC seeks disaggregated data. IR functions at Woodbury will need to begin to provide “official” data for the SD campus.</p>
<p><i>Student Learning. CPR:</i> How does the institution assess student learning at off-campus sites? Is this process comparable to that used on the main campus? <i>EER:</i> What are the results of student learning assessment? How do these compare with learning results from the main campus? (CFRs 2.6, 4.6, 4.7)</p>	<p>Student learning is assessed exactly as it is on the main campus and in accordance with the NAAB standards on consistency.</p>	<p>See comment in Retention and Graduation above.</p>

<p><i>Quality Assurance Processes: CPR:</i> How are the institution's quality assurance processes designed or modified to cover off-campus sites? <i>EER:</i> What evidence is provided that off-campus programs and courses are educationally effective? (CFRs 4.4-4.8)</p>	<p>Same processes that are used on the main campus.</p>	<p>See comment above.</p>
--	---	---------------------------