



March 15, 2004

Arno J. Rethans
Vice Provost for Planning, Resource Allocation and Evaluation
California State University, Chico
400 West First Street
Chico, CA 95929-0234

Dear Arno:

At its March 2, 2004, meeting, a panel of the Proposal Review Committee considered the California State University, Chico revised Proposal for its reaffirmation of accreditation review. The Panel found the revised Proposal responsive to the issues identified in the November 24, 2003, letter that followed the review of the first Proposal. The Panel voted on behalf of the Proposal Review Committee to accept the revised Proposal for the review.

In the course of its review of the revised Proposal, Panel members asked me to bring two issues to your attention that have implications for the implementation of the review. We discussed these issues in our telephone call of March 10, 2004. The Panel was unclear as to the extent faculty would be involved in the review process. Your explanation of faculty-led committees and projects for the two reviews and description of faculty involvement at all levels was responsive to this inquiry. It was also helpful to know of the plans for committees to meet monthly with the Council for Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability to insure appropriate assistance, consultation, communication, and resources to support the various ongoing efforts. The success of the Proposal would seem to depend on active leadership and broad engagement of the faculty, with wide dissemination of results for further faculty discussion.

The second issue identified by the Panel is that of support to under-represented minorities and improvement of campus climate for all students, recommendations from the last Commission action letter. In our telephone conversation, you noted that length limitations for the Proposal prevented a discussion of the progress made by the Academic Senate's Educational Policy and Programs Committee sub-committee on Recruitment and Retention of Diverse Students, including the work of groups convened to address relevant issues for the curriculum, students, faculty, and community. This work is to be included in the Preparatory Review Report, along with work on the Irvine Diversity Scorecard data and evaluation, and analysis of data and activities planned by the Foundation for Excellence in the First Year.

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
James R. Appleton
University of Redlands

VICE CHAIR
Louanne Kennedy
*California State University,
Northridge*

Barbara Cambridge
*American Association for Higher
Education*

Kenyon S. Chan
Loyola Marymount University

Geoffrey M. Cox
Cardian University

Carmen Maldonado Decker
Fullerton College

Faith Gabelnick
Pacific University

Diane F. Halpern
Claremont McKenna College

Marvalene Hughes
*California State University,
Stanislaus*

Sherwood G. Lingenfelser
Fuller Theological Seminary

Hugo Morales
Public Member

Thomas H. Robinson
Poway Unified School District

Beverly P. Ryder
Public Member

Theodore J. Saenger
Public Member

John B. Simpson
*University of California,
Santa Cruz*

Rose Y. Tseng
University of Hawaii, Hilo

Steadman Upham
Claremont Graduate University

Larry N. Vanderhoef
University of California, Davis

John D. Welty
California State University, Fresno

W. Atom Yee
Santa Clara University

STAFF
Ralph A. Wolff
Executive Director

Martha Balshem
Associate Director

Stephanie R. Bangert
Associate Director

Elizabeth Griego
Associate Director

Gregory M. Scott
Associate Director

Robert R. Benedetti
Adjunct Associate Director

Fred H. Dorer
Adjunct Associate Director

Lily S. Owyang
Adjunct Associate Director

Thomas J. Gallagher
Finance & Operations Manager

Arno J. Rethans
March 15, 2004
Page 2

By notification of this letter the Proposal Review Committee accepts the revised Proposal and the timeline for the review, with the Preparatory Review to be conducted in spring 2006, and the Educational Effectiveness Review 12 months later, in spring 2007 (specific dates to be determined). 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 distributed to the team without attachments. The data tables and relevant attachments are to be updated and included as part of the Preparatory Review presentation. It is understood that minor adjustments in the activities undertaken as outlined in 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.

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

Sincerely,



Elizabeth Griego
Associate Director

cc: Paul J. Zingg, President
Proposal Review Committee Panel: Boo Riley and Paula Lutomirski
Ralph Wolff