



December 18, 2007

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

Dear President Harrison:

At its December 12, 2007, meeting a panel of the Proposal Review Committee considered the Institutional Proposal from California State University, Monterey Bay, for its next reaffirmation of accreditation review. Members of the panel asked me to express their appreciation for your participation in the telephone conference call, and for that of your colleagues Kathy Cruz-Uribe, Provost; Mary Boyce, Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness; and Swarup Wood, Associate Professor. Your collective responses to panel questions and comments were helpful in assisting them to understand your institutional context and the approach of your proposal for the comprehensive review.

In acting to accept the proposal and the timeline for review, the panel commended the University for presenting a well-written proposal that clearly identifies the University's strengths and the significant challenges it faces. Specifically, the panel found the forthright analysis to be an important initiation of an evaluation process that may be critical to the University's future as an institution. The panel also noted the strength of the institution's resolve to address these issues and commended the new administration for its leadership at this point in CSUMB's development. Noting evidence of engagement with major stakeholder groups in the evolution of the institutional proposal, the panel wished to underscore the importance of continuing to engage all constituencies across the campus throughout the review process.

The panel asked that I extend their special commendation for the program review manual, which they found to be an exemplary piece of work.

In the interest of focusing the institution's subsequent research and analysis and to make the work of the review teams more effective, the panel offered the following guidance. More explicit alignment of the outcomes from the capacity section's analyses with the educational effectiveness research projects will provide clarity and inform campus review teams' work throughout the

985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100
Alameda, CA 94501
PHONE: 510.748.9001
FAX: 510.748.9797
E-MAIL: wascsr@wascsenior.org
INTERNET: www.wascweb.org

CHAIR
Sherwood Lingenfelter
Fuller Theological Seminary

VICE CHAIR
Horace Mitchell
California State University, Bakersfield

Mark Bookman
American Jewish University

W. Bernard Bowler
Public Member

Jerry Dean Campbell
Claremont School of Theology

Anna DiStefano
Fielding Graduate University

James Donahue
Graduate Theological Union

Jackie Donath
California State University, Sacramento

Aimée Dorr
University of California, Los Angeles

John Eshelman
Seattle University

John Fitzpatrick
Schools Commission Representative

Laurence Gould
Public Member

Brice Harris
*Community and Junior Colleges
Commission Representative*

Linda Johnsrud
University of Hawaii

Roberts Jones
Public Member

Christina Maslach
University of California, Berkeley

Leroy Morishita
San Francisco State University

William Plater
*Indiana University -
Purdue University, Indianapolis*

Sheldon Schuster
Keck Graduate Institute

Eleanor Dantzer Siebert
Mount St. Mary's College

Carmen Sigler
San Jose State University

Larry Vanderhoef
University of California, Davis

Mary (Sue) Wesselkamper
Chaminade University of Honolulu

Michael Whyte
Asia Pacific University

Paul Zingg
California State University, Chico

STAFF
Ralph A. Wolff
President and Executive Director

Therese A. Cannon
Executive Associate Director

Richard A. Winn
Associate Director

Barbara Wright
Associate Director

Michelle Behr
Assistant Director

Ingrid Walker
Assistant Director

Shana Antoine
Finance & Operations Manager

second half of your review process. For example, the outcomes from the capacity section's focus on retention analysis (topic two) critically support the educational effectiveness section's analysis of the value of the academic model (theme two). Drawing this connection directly will help campus members focus on these relationships and will inform related concerns, such as inquiry into the reasons students leave CSUMB and the subsequent fiscal implications of CSUMB's retention rates. Similarly, the panel thought the academic space theme (capacity) had a critical consequence for educational effectiveness that might be addressed in that report.

The panel was well aware that the University faces a period of significant self-reflection and that modifying its vision of itself may be part of this process as it addresses resolving the campus vision with its role within the CSU system. It expressed its hope that this evaluation process will foster candid analysis and consideration of these issues within the University.

The proposal now becomes the framework for the accreditation review process and represents a plan of action and commitment by the institution. The proposal will be shared with the visiting teams for both the Capacity and Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review, and with the Commission following each review. It is understood that adjustments in the activities undertaken under the proposal will be made as implementation occurs. Major changes to the proposal, such as in the direction or focus of institutional activities for the accreditation review process, are to be approved in advance by Commission staff. The timeline for the review will remain with the Capacity and Preparatory Review in spring 2010 and the Educational Effectiveness Review in fall 2011. As you prepare for your Capacity and Preparatory Review, please plan to attend the upcoming CPR workshop held during the WASC Academic Resource Conference (ARC) in April.

We wish you well and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,



Ingrid Walker
Assistant Director

Cc: Mary Boyce, Associate Vice President for Academic Planning and Institutional Effectiveness, ALO
Proposal Review Committee