



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Draft 2*  
*January 6, 2003*

*Colleagues:*

**Welcome back!** I hope you had a nice break and that you started the New Year off full of enthusiasm and energy. Thank you very much for submitting changes and suggestions for this, our second, draft of Chico's Institutional Proposal. I hope that I have incorporated your ideas as you intended them. If not, let us review at our next meeting scheduled for **Thursday, January 16** at our regular time and place.

In this revision:

- We noted the changes in sections 1-4 in **blue** for convenient review.
- We have added contents for sections 5-9.
- We have put reference-to-WASC-standard boxes in the right margin.
- We have put some question boxes in the right margin. We need help on these.

At our last meeting we set as a goal to have a presentable Institutional Proposal by the end of January 2003 so we could begin to make presentations to the audiences outlined in Section 3 of the draft proposal. Towards that end I propose that we **meet every Thursday this month** starting on January 16, 2003. (Recall that I am attending a WASC seminar on how to put the Institutional Proposal together on January 9, 2003).

Please review this draft in some detail. As we begin to outline the specifics for the Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review we are beginning to commit the campus and the individual divisions to some significant efforts. As we agreed earlier to use the WASC reaccreditation process as a tool to accomplish campus and divisional goals, it is important that we set up the review processes to accomplish those goals.



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Draft 3*  
*March 13, 2003*

*Colleagues:*

This is our attempt at a new version of our Institutional Proposal following exposure to the “best practice model” of UC Berkeley. I hope to get sufficient direction at our March 13, 2003 meeting so that Jenny and I can put together a “presentable version” during Spring break.

In this revision:

- We have dropped item # 6 on Senior Leadership under **Our Future** in Section 1: Institutional Context.
- We have revised Section 2 substantially. We put the global outcomes we had in Draft 2 in the general introductory paragraph and have tried to list more specific outcomes that foreshadow our suggested research questions for the Educational Effectiveness Review.
- We have made no changes in Section 3: Engagement of the Campus Community.
- We have dramatically revised Section 4 by focusing only on the “staging” aspects and not introduce the strategic plan priorities in this section.
- We have changed the introduction to Section 5, the Preparatory Review, and we have added a concluding section. We may want to discuss whether we want to list the items or merely indicate that we are already a long way toward completing the data for this review.
- We have completely redone Section 6: The Educational Effectiveness Review.
- Sections 7-8-9 remain the same.

Please review this draft in some detail. As we outline these specifics for the Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review we are de facto committing the campus and your individual divisions to some significant efforts.



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Draft 4*  
*March 24, 2003*

*Colleagues:*

This is draft # 4 in which we incorporate our discussion of the March 13, 2003 meeting. We have focused primarily on revising Section 6 of The Educational Effectiveness Review. The intent is that once we agree on the content of this draft that a presentation would be made to Cabinet, followed by a presentation to the Executive Committee before we share with the other audiences mentioned in Section 3 Engagement of the Campus Community.

In this revision:

- We corrected the typos you identified.
- We substantially changed Section 5, The Preparatory Review. We took out all the detailed references to existing policies, procedures and websites. We will save them for the real thing!
- Section 6 was also substantially changed again. We deleted the Workload Study (Section 2.1 in Draft 3) and put it under priority # 5 as a performance indicator project. We similarly deleted the study of Development. Next, we reintroduced Technology as a subject for study under the EE Review: a) it was subject of much commentary in the previous team visit report and hence needs to be addressed and b) we believe we have a story to tell. .
- We pose a question for section 1.3 in section 6. Do we want to subsume Assessment under Academic Program Review or treat as a separate topic for study?
- We suggest specific areas to be included in the development of campus-defined performance measures. Do we want to add others? Delete some of the currently proposed?
- Sections 7-8-9 remain the same.

Please review this draft in some detail. As we outline these specifics for the Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review we are de facto committing the campus and your individual divisions to some significant efforts.



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Draft # 5*  
*April 4, 2003*

*Colleagues:*

CSU, Chico is preparing for reaffirmation of accreditation by WASC, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. In order to remain accredited we have to demonstrate that CSU, Chico fulfills the two Core Commitments of the Senior School Commission. The two Core Commitments are a Commitment to Institutional Capacity and a Commitment to Educational Effectiveness.

Demonstration of these Core Commitments occurs through a staged and sequential accreditation review process that results in an Institutional Presentation comprised of:

- The Institutional Proposal (Chico: due 10-15-2003)
- The Preparatory Review (Chico: due Spring 2006)
- The Educational Effectiveness Review (Chico: due Spring 2007)

The Institutional Proposal is the first element of the Institutional Presentation and the first stage in the accreditation review cycle. Its purpose is to guide the entire accreditation review process. Once approved, it provides Chico and the Commission with a foundation for carrying out the accreditation process within a written and approved framework.

For further details on the review process and its components, please visit the CSUC WASC website at <http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/vppra/wasc/>

Please review this draft institutional proposal in some detail. When we outline the specifics for the Preparatory Review and the Educational Effectiveness Review we are de facto committing the campus and its units to some significant efforts. As we would like for these efforts to benefit the entire institution, we would like your ideas, comments, suggestions on how we can best demonstrate our commitment to educational effectiveness and present evidence that we have the capacity to deliver on that commitment.

*In particular, we need your help in selecting the limited number of institutional engagement issues to be addressed in the Educational Effectiveness Review.*



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Draft # 6*  
*June, 2003*

*Colleagues:*

Here is our first attempt at a final version of the CSU, Chico Institutional Proposal. We have tried to incorporate the substance of our discussions at our last meeting of May 22, 2003. More specifically, we have tried to “blend” our earlier list of potential EER topics in the following way:

- *The Nature of Student Engagement* ...subsumes the earlier topics 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.6 and 6.1.7.
- *Re-Orienting the Academic Review Process* “blends” topics 6.1.3 and 6.1.4.
- *Innovative Use of Technology* .. combines our earlier topic 6.1.5 with strategic priority 6.2.
- *Develop University Performance Measurement* ... recasts our earlier 6.3.1.

Please review this draft and let us know if you think we are on the right track. Once we reached some agreement on the rewrite, we will begin to work on the project management schedules.

*JR and AR*



**CSU, Chico**  
**Institutional Proposal**  
**Draft # 7A**  
July, 2003

*Colleagues:*

Here is our second attempt at a final version of the CSU, Chico Institutional Proposal. We have tried to incorporate the substance of the various suggestions (proposed changes are underlined) made in response to our first attempt at a final version. More specifically, we have

- Modified the section on *The Nature of Student Engagement* ....
- Significantly refocused the section on *Refining Academic Program Review* to reflect and address EPPC's concerns about Academic Quality under Conditions of Reduced Resources. We are positioning Academic Program Review as the vehicle for addressing and maintaining academic quality in general rather than focus on the "reduced resources" condition. We also address assessment in GE in the manner suggested by Martha Balshem in her June 24, 2003 letter.
- EPPC's concern about quality is also reflected in the rewrite of the introduction to the *Innovative Use of Technology* section. The framing of this section also borrows from William F. Massy's *Honoring the Trust: Quality and Cost Containment in Higher Education* (especially Chapter 5) and the recent article in *Change* (July/August 2003) entitled "Improving Quality and Reducing Cost: Designs for Effective Learning."

Please review this draft and let us know if you think we correctly interpreted your suggestions. Once we reached some agreement on this rewrite, we need to begin to work on the project management schedules.

You will note that we have labeled this rewrite, **Draft 7A**. We have also prepared a version **7B** that we will send to you as well. We would like to discuss the selection of 7A versus 7B at our next meeting.



**CSU, Chico**  
**Institutional Proposal**  
**Draft # 7B**  
July, 2003

*Colleagues:*

This is version **7 B** which is exactly the same as version 7A with **one major change**. Given that some members expressed concern about the number of projects under EER, we propose the alternative of subsuming the *Development of the University Performance Measurement System* under the Preparatory Review. Should we want to do this, we think it may be justified using page 42 and 43 of the WASC Handbook which include the following statements:

- **Under Possible Models for Preparatory Review Report** (page 43) it notes “Consistent with the approved Institutional Proposal, possible alternative models might include; 1) Exhibits organized in terms of the institution’s strategic planning priorities, with cross references to Commission Standards.”
- In preparing the Institutional Presentation as a whole, institutions should be mindful of several important priorities relevant to all four Accreditation Standards. These include ..... “Indicators and metrics of achievement, and/or specific bodies of evidence that can help the institution to determine the degree to which objectives are being achieved;” .....

Please review this draft and let us discuss the desirability of 7A versus 7B at our next meeting. Once we reached some agreement on this rewrite, we need to begin to work on the project management schedules and begin to identify individuals who will spearhead/participate in the proposed studies/activities.



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Draft # 8*  
*August, 2003*

*Colleagues:*

CSU, Chico has been preparing for reaffirmation of accreditation by WASC, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. In order to remain accredited we have to demonstrate that CSU, Chico fulfills the two Core Commitments of the Senior School Commission. The two Core Commitments are a Commitment to Institutional Capacity and a Commitment to Educational Effectiveness.

Demonstration of these Core Commitments occurs through a staged and sequential accreditation review process that results in an Institutional Presentation comprised of:

- The Institutional Proposal (Chico: due 10-15-2003)
- The Preparatory Review (Chico: due Spring 2006)
- The Educational Effectiveness Review (Chico: due Spring 2007)

The Institutional Proposal is the first element of the Institutional Presentation and the first stage in the accreditation review cycle. Its purpose is to guide the entire accreditation review process. Once approved, it provides Chico and the Commission with a foundation for carrying out the accreditation process within a written and approved framework.

Members of the Council for Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability, serving as the WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee, have developed the attached institutional proposal following the process highlighted in Section 3 of the document. Before submitting it to WASC we would like one more campus review before finalization. Please review draft # 8 and share with us your ideas, comments and suggestions for improvement.



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Draft # 9*  
*August 28, 2003*

*Colleagues:*

CSU, Chico has been preparing for reaffirmation of accreditation by WASC, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. In order to remain accredited we have to demonstrate that CSU, Chico fulfills the two Core Commitments of the Senior School Commission. The two Core Commitments are a Commitment to Institutional Capacity and a Commitment to Educational Effectiveness.

Demonstration of these Core Commitments occurs through a staged and sequential accreditation review process that results in an Institutional Presentation comprised of:

- The Institutional Proposal (Chico: due 10-15-2003)
- The Preparatory Review (Chico: due Fall 2005, with visit in Spring 2006)
- The Educational Effectiveness Review (Chico: due Fall 2006, with visit in Spring 2007)

The Institutional Proposal is the first element of the Institutional Presentation and the first stage in the accreditation review cycle. Its purpose is to guide the entire accreditation review process. Once approved, it provides Chico and the Commission with a foundation for carrying out the accreditation process within a written and approved framework.

Members of the Council for Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability, serving as the WASC Reaccreditation Steering Committee, have developed the attached institutional proposal following the process highlighted in Section 3 of the document. Before submitting it to WASC we would like one more campus review before finalization. Please review draft # 9 and share with us your ideas, comments and suggestions for improvement.



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Revision # 1*  
*January 30, 2004*

*Colleagues:*

Attached please find our first attempt at a revision of the CSU, Chico Institutional Proposal along the lines requested by the WASC Proposal Review Committee in their November 24, 2003 letter to us.

While the Committee noted that “It is clear that significant thought and work have already been expended and the campus is well engaged in the review”, it has asked us to incorporate “some of the information relayed in the telephone calls” into the Proposal so as to “inform persons who will not have been privy to the telephone call of some of the information that was discussed.” .

More specifically, the Committee asked us to:

- Include more information on what we are doing to organize ourselves, including “information on structures or groups that will be responsible for studying which key issues, and the proposed process for reflection and coming to conclusions on topics.” (See pages 6 and 7)
- Include a “paragraph on how the institution intends to address or how it has addressed the Commission issues identified in the June 27, 1996 letter to President Esteban.” (See pages 1, 2, and 3)
- Have more information on the “number of reflective essays” as part of the Preparatory Review. (See page 7)
- More information on the “newly developed administrative guidelines for program review.” (See pages 6 and 9)
- Share information on our “self-description as a learning organization.” (This one is being explored by various committee; some have labeled the development of learning histories as per MIT Field Manual as a luxury we cannot afford; we seem reluctant to commit.)
- See more on “how the Preparatory Review will reflect on University challenges to maintain quality in an era of reduces resources.” (Part of strategic priority # 5-related (financial) performance measures)
- Update the institutional context “with information on how the president will be involved with and supportive of the review process.” (Pres. Zingg is reviewing this version this week, see page 12).



*CSU, Chico*  
*Institutional Proposal*  
*Revision # 2*  
*February 8, 2004*

*Colleagues:*

Attached please find a second version of our revision of the CSU, Chico Institutional Proposal along the lines discussed at our Thursday meeting. (February 5, 2004).

In this second version, we have:

- Revised [Section 1](#) (Institutional Context) to more clearly identify “how the institution intends to address or how it has addressed the Commission issues identified in the June 27, 1996 letter to President Esteban.” We identify in more detail the progress on the topics of strategic planning, strategic budgeting and the use of technology. (Ms Greigo, item #4) President Zingg is editing the revision of the “Our Future” section to incorporate his recent message “*Working Together*” to the campus. This should help set up the proposed studies in PR and EER. I am to meet with him early this coming week to review.
- Returned to the earlier version of [Section 3](#) and added the piece on organizational structure for implementation (Moved back from the revised section 4 as per Ms Griego, item # 2). Also labeled ATEC as an advisory group as per your suggestion.
- Revised [Section 4](#) (Staging of PR and EER) to include time lines (Ms. Griego item # 3). We have modeled the revised presentation after the BYU-Hawaii example she had sent us earlier.
- Revised / Reorganized [Section 5](#) (Preparatory Review) to more specifically identify what we “intend to focus on in the Preparatory Review” (Ms. Griego, item # 1). We also identify likely topics for the reflective essays as per our discussion.

As always, changes from the previous version are highlighted in [blue](#). For your convenience we have left in the previous text with “strike-throughs.” Let us know your reactions so we can finish this task as soon as possible and resubmit the proposal to WASC for its review. As we discussed, if this version still does not address the Committee’s wishes I will propose a campus visit of our staff-liaison and/or the chair or a member of our PRC to consult with us.