March 3, 2010

Dianne Harrison
President
California State University, Monterey Bay
100 Campus Center
Seaside, CA 93955-8001

Dear President Harrison:

At its meeting on February 17-19, 2010, the Commission considered the report of the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) team that conducted the visit to California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) on September 16-18, 2009. The Commission also reviewed the Capacity and Preparatory report submitted by CSUMB prior to the visit and your response to the team report, dated November 20, 2009. The Commission appreciated the opportunity to discuss the visit with you and your colleagues: Kathy Cruz-Uribe, Provost; and Mary Boyce, AVP for Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness and ALO. Your observations were very helpful.

California State University, Monterey Bay’s Institutional Proposal outlined a hybrid approach with a “planning focus” for the Capacity and Preparatory Review. The planning focus was designed to connect strategic and academic plans with divisional plans, and to demonstrate a connection between planning, priorities, and university budgeting. CSUMB expected outcomes from the CPR in the areas of integrated planning and budgeting; retention analysis; and development of academic space.

The Commission commended the commitment of the CSUMB community to the vision of the university; the open communication and relationship building across departments and units; the conservative and thoughtful allocation of resources in support of continued capacity building during these challenging times; and the institution’s awareness that it is in the midst of transitioning from a new, small institution to a larger, more mature university.

In accepting the team report, the Commission endorsed the findings, commendations, and recommendations of the visiting team and highlighted several areas, building on the team report, for continued attention:

**Strengthening Feedback Loops.** CSUMB has developed an appropriate evidence-based model that will help it determine how well it is achieving its educational purposes and learning objectives. Application of this model requires collecting, analyzing, and synthesizing data, and strengthening the feedback loops that will result in continuous improvement. The team report indicates that there is increased interest from faculty and staff in data collection and use, but in practice, the collection and use of data are inconsistent across the university. Efforts are underway to develop stronger skills for faculty and chairs in data gathering and analysis and should be sustained. As the next step, the university will need to demonstrate that it is using outcomes data to improve programs and student learning over the short and long term. This should be a central focus of the Educational Effectiveness Review. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 4.4, 4.6, 4.7, 4.8)
Improvement of Retention and Graduation Rates. Among degree-seeking, first-time full-time freshman, CSUMB has ranked last or near last in retention among the California State University campuses. In addition, there has been a five-year trend of increasing attrition for freshmen. Results from the university’s retention data analysis countered commonly held assumptions about the academic standing or ethnicity of non-returning students. As the university continues to study these issues, the Commission expects that improvement of retention and graduation rates will continue as a high priority and be addressed again at the time of the Educational Effectiveness Review. Improvement of results and setting appropriate goals need to be sustained as a high priority. (CFRs 2.3, 2.10, 4.3, 4.5, 4.6)

The Commission acted to:

1. Receive the Capacity and Preparatory Review report and continue the accreditation of California State University, Monterey Bay

2. Proceed with the scheduled Educational Effectiveness Review visit in spring 2011. The Institutional Report will be due 12 weeks prior to the scheduled visit.

3. Request that the institution incorporate its response to the issues raised in this action letter into its Educational Effectiveness Review report. You may include this analysis in an appendix to your Educational Effectiveness report or incorporate it into the report.

In accordance with Commission policy, copies of this letter will be sent to Chancellor Charles Reed and the chair of the CSU Board of Trustees in one week. The Commission expects that the team report and this action letter will be widely disseminated throughout the institution to promote further engagement and improvement, and to support the institution’s response to the specific issues identified in them.

Please contact me if you have any questions about this letter or the action of the Commission.

Sincerely,

Ralph A. Wolff
President and Executive Director

RW/dh

cc: Sherwood Lingenfelter, Commission Chair
    Mary Boyce, ALO
    Herbert L. Carter, Chair of CSU Board of Trustees
    Charles Reed, Chancellor
    Members of the CPR team
    Diane Harvey, WASC Associate Director