Reaffirmation of WASC Accreditation for California State University, Chico


"The team is here from what accrediting agency?"
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Executive Summary

Since our 1996 re-accreditation by the Senior College Commission of the Western Association for Schools and Colleges, WASC ¹ has created a new model of accreditation to meet the changing context for institutional accreditation. This paper highlights the dimensions of the new model and their implications for the CSU, Chico WASC re-accreditation efforts:

- The new WASC Review Process includes a) the Institutional Proposal, b) the Capacity and Preparatory Review, and c) the Educational Effectiveness Review. The new accreditation cycle is intended to be phased, evidence-based, integrated system of on-going review, rather than a single event. The system of review has a clear focus on effectiveness, both institutional and educational.

- In order to remain accredited, we must demonstrate that as an institution we fulfill the two Core Commitments of the Accrediting Commission, i.e. a Commitment to Institutional Capacity and a Commitment to Educational Effectiveness.

- On March 15, 2004, WASC’s Proposal Review Committee approved CSU, Chico’s Institutional Proposal. ² The Committee suggested special coverage of university’s assessment programs, campus climate for minority students, treatment of EER projects as scholarly research inquiries, and the performance measurement system. They expect “active leadership and broad involvement of the faculty.”

- On June 7, 2004, we were notified that the Capacity and Preparatory Review is scheduled for Fall 2006 / Spring 2007 and the Educational Effectiveness Review for Fall 2007 / Spring 2008.

- In the Institutional Proposal, we stated that the Capacity and Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews will be conducted within the framework of Chico’s vision and mission statements and its strategic plan. Accordingly, we will review in-depth selected aspects of the five strategic priorities identified in Chico’s Strategic Plan for the Future.

- More specifically, we proposed to use the Capacity and Preparatory Review to move toward the development of an electronic, web-based performance measurement system.

- Similarly, we proposed to use the Educational Effectiveness Review as a means to research three themes a) the nature of student engagement at a residential campus, b) the refinement of the academic program review, and c) the innovative use of technology in the delivery of effective General Education offerings.

- Our overall Institutional Presentation will be electronic and web-based, using pbViews and a CSUC “Today Decides Tomorrow” Institutional Portfolio.

- The Council of Institutional Effectiveness and Accountability will serve as the Steering Committee for the overall WASC reaccreditation effort.

¹ See WASC website at http://www.wascweb.org/
² (http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/vppra/wasc/instProposal.html)
What WASC Expects / Requires

Since our 1996 re-accreditation by the Senior College Commission of the Western Association for Schools and Colleges, WASC 3 has created a new model of accreditation to meet the changing context for institutional accreditation. WASC recognized that both institutions and the challenges of defining and evaluating quality have become significantly more complex and come under increasing scrutiny. Some of the changes that affect our ability to define and evaluate quality in the accreditation process include:

- A shift towards effectiveness and performance indicators beyond inputs and resources as the organizing basis for defining and evaluating quality;
- Higher expectations for the performance of graduates, leading to calls for increased attention to evidence of student learning;
- Concern over the rising costs of higher education … resulting in an emphasis of the need for greater efficiency and effectiveness in institutional performance.

(WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001, p. 2)

In a recent meeting, Ralph Wolff, Executive Director of WASC, noted the shift from assessment to learning by highlighting “What Was In” and “What Was Out.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What’s Out</th>
<th>What’s In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirming and Asserting</td>
<td>Commitment and Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More is More</td>
<td>Less is More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing More Assessment</td>
<td>Finding the “Good Catch” – Identifying Issues that need Attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting the Institution from Criticism</td>
<td>Presenting a Balanced View of the Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenting the “Ideal Institution.”</td>
<td>Using the WASC process to create a sustained learning-centered culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeing Accreditation as a Once-a-decade Burden</td>
<td>Seeing the Interplay of Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning as a Strategic Institutional Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 See WASC website at http://www.wascweb.org/
Accordingly, WASC now operates under a new set of principles, including:

- Greater emphasis is needed on evidence of educational effectiveness and student learning;
- The accreditation process needs to shift from an “in/out of compliance” stance on every issue to a recognition that many aspects of quality are best addressed on a continuing basis.
  (WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001, p. 3)

WASC’s new standards and underlying values emphasize the creation of a culture of learning. Such a culture of learning is learner-centered, knowledge-centered, assessment-centered, and ‘community of practice’-centered. Wolff wants to “bust the mind set” underlying the “What’s Out” practices. He compares it to students asking a professor what the minimum requirements are for passing a course. We want to shift away from compliance to accountability. Away from statements like “We have the best programs in…” Away from the notion that 400 pages of reporting anecdotes is better than 100 pages of real evidence. Away from lists and lists of ad-hoc assessment activities to a culture of evidence based on integrated systems. Away from an unwillingness to discuss shortcomings to taking the stance of a learner and being open to dialogue and deep learning. Away from a posture of “We have no problems” to building commitment to continuous improvement. The end game is not “Are you above or below the line,” but rather the end game is “Is learning built into the strategic thinking of the institution?” We are asked to demonstrate on the basis of data, evidence, and information that as an institution we are addressing problems and that we have intentional designs of quality assurance. (See WASC, Evidence Guide, January 2002).

The WASC Review Process

The persistent message of the WASC’s 80th Annual Meeting, April 2004, on the nature of the WASC Review Process was:

- Each university has a unique story to tell – where it has been, where it is now, and where it chooses to be in the future;
- Evidence of the unique story is to be presented throughout the phased review;
- This evidence must include demonstrations of student and organizational learning;
- WASC expects deep conversations and reflection on issues identified as important campuswide;
- The reaccreditation process is to be a campus-wide undertaking that results in continuous improvement of the institutional performance.
The WASC Review Process includes:

- Institutional Proposal
- The Capacity and Preparatory Review
- The Educational Effectiveness Review

The Commission has identified the following outcomes as important for the accreditation review process to serve institutions:

- The development of and more effective use of indicators of institutional performance and educational effectiveness to support institutional planning and decision making;
- Greater clarity about the institution’s educational objectives and criteria for defining and evaluating those objectives;
- Improvement of the institution’s capacity for self review and of its systems of quality assurance;
- A deeper understanding of student learning, the development of more varied and effective methods of assessing learning, and the use of the results of this process to improve programs and institutional practices on a continuing basis; and
- Systematic engagement of the faculty with issues of assessing and improving teaching and learning processes within the institution, and with aligning support systems for faculty more effectively towards this end.

(WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001, p.36)
The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR)

WASC announced that the name of the “Preparatory Review” has been changed to the “Capacity and Preparatory Review” in order to clarify the process.

The Core Commitment to Institutional Capacity:

“The institution functions with clear purposes, high levels of institutional integrity, fiscal stability, and organizational structures to fulfill its purposes.” (WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001, p. 5)

To WASC:

? Capacity is an institutional attribute that emerges from alignment of resources, organizational structures and values around educational objectives;
? Capacity for sustaining student and organizational learning is intentional, holistic, and aligned with institutional purposes;
? Capacity is to be used for improvement and transformation within institutional context.

Organizational structures to fulfill their purposes:

? Structures/systems are in place to assess programs;
? Results from program assessment is used to improve programs and institutional practices;
? Decisions are made by people through structures/systems using indicators of institutional performance and educational effectiveness;
? Allocation of resources is aligned with the vision, mission, and educational objectives of the institution and its programs (the team will look at how things are aligned to shape learning outcomes).

WASC envisions a CPR that:

? Gets the institution to think differently about capacity: integrated, data-driven.
? Shifts from “affirm and asset” to an evidence-based review of capacity.
? Builds a Standing Portfolio base for longer term review of effectiveness.

WASC advances five principles of Good Evidence:

1. Relevant
2. Verifiable
3. Representative
4. Cumulative
5. Actionable.
The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)

The Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness:

"The institution evidences clear and appropriate educational objectives and design at the institutional and program levels. The institution employs processes of review, including the collection and use of data, that assure the delivery of programs and learner accomplishments at a level of performance appropriate for the degree or certificate."

(WASC Handbook for Accreditation 2001, p. 5-6)

The Educational Effectiveness Review is designed to demonstrate that CSU, Chico fulfills the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness. Its primary purpose is to invite sustained engagement by the institution on the extent to which the institution fulfills its educational objectives. Through a process of inquiry and engagement, the Educational Effectiveness Review is also designed to enable the Commission to make a judgment about the extent that the institution fulfills its Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness.

Specific purposes of the Educational Effectiveness Review include:

- To review the design and results of institutional efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of educational programs;
- To examine institutional practices for evaluating student learning and to develop and share good practices in using educational results to improve the process of teaching and learning;
- To examine the alignment of institutional resources with activities designed to achieve the institution’s educational objectives; and
- To promote sustained engagement with selected issues of Educational Effectiveness consistent with Commission Standards. These will have already been identified by the institution and approved through the Proposal Review Process. The institution is encouraged to select issues of importance to itself in this process, so the Review will be of maximum local utility.

As part of its Educational Effectiveness Review, CSU, Chico is expected to engage the issue of Educational Effectiveness in depth. The campus is expected to move well beyond description of activities to analysis of evidence, reflection on how well our quality processes are working, and ways that those processes have led to further improvement on campus.
WASC intends for Educational Effectiveness to mean a system of quality assurance for student and organizational learning that demonstrates:

- leadership focus
- educational objectives and outcomes at all levels
- educational infrastructure
- faculty responsibility
- culture of inquiry and evidence
- assessment of student learning
- reflection and action plans on results of assessment
- program review
- consistent attainment of learning results.

The process of the EER is designed to have the institution explore such questions as

- Given what you are doing, how well are you evaluating it and how well do you reflect upon that evaluation?
- As an institution you have selected some areas of distinction (focus), “are you doggin’ them?” Is there sustained engagement in the foci?
- How does the institution share its best practices? Internally and externally?
What CSU, Chico Promised


Expected Outcomes for the Review Process

In its Institutional Proposal, CSU, Chico outlined the following expected outcomes for the WASC Review Process:

California State University, Chico views the WASC re-accreditation process as an aid in further promoting the development of a “culture of learning.” It intends to accomplish this by deepening campus engagement with issues of educational effectiveness and student learning and in further institutionalizing a “culture of evidence” in which performance indicators inform and drive institutional improvement and decision making.

More specifically, the campus expects the review process to:

- Deepen campus conversations about the nature of student engagement at a residential institution such as CSU, Chico; including academic and social engagement, first-year experience, substance abuse education and prevention, and diversity.
- Re-orient the Academic Program Review Process towards a system of review that reinforces the values and principles of CSU, Chico, the CSU, and our accreditation agencies.
- Enhance assessment of General Education within the frameworks of the CSU, Chico General Education Policy and the CSU Accountability Process.
- Explore alternative approaches to the wise use of academic technology in fostering scholarship in general and student learning in particular.
- Strengthen our performance measurement systems and promote their use in decision making at all levels of the institution.
- Stimulate progress in becoming a better learning organization by recognizing, sharing and transferring best practices.

Staging of Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews

In the Institutional Proposal, CSU, Chico outlined the following:

The Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews will be conducted within the framework of Chico’s vision and mission statements and its strategic plan. Accordingly, we will review in-depth selected aspects of the five strategic priorities identified in Chico’s *Strategic Plan for the Future*.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR)

In the Institutional Proposal, CSU, Chico outlined the following tasks for the CPR:

Since the Commission’s 1996 letter, significant work has been conducted to assemble relevant information to demonstrate CSU, Chico’s long-standing commitment to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness. As described in our 2000 Fourth-Year Report, “campus administrators are experimenting with the Balanced Scorecard Framework … as the cornerstone of a new strategic management system for accomplishing its vision and mission and for addressing accountability and responsiveness issues.”\(^5\) We propose to use the Preparatory Review as a vehicle to formalize the results of these experimental efforts and move towards the development of an electronic, web-based performance measurement system.

More specifically, we plan to:

- Review / reaffirm the critical success factors for each of the strategic priorities in the *Strategic Plan*.
- Build on the foundation provided by the CSU Accountability Process by augmenting system-defined accountability performance indicators with campus-defined performance indicators that address our unique goals and priorities.
- Assemble workgroups to identify and/or further refine campus-defined performance indicators and develop reporting strategies for each of the content areas within the strategic priorities.
- Develop the infrastructure to use PB*Views* as the reporting system for the performance measurement system.

The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)

Following an iterative series of discussions by campus stakeholders and decision makers, CSU, Chico outlined the following themes for the research programs to be undertaking under the EER:

“The vision, mission, and strategic priorities of CSU, Chico served as the framework for the selection of the following areas of emphasis to be examined in the course of this Educational Effectiveness Review:

- The Nature of Student Engagement at a Residential Campus.
- The Refinement of the Academic Program Review.
- The Innovative Use of Technology in the Delivery of Effective General Education Offerings.”

The Nature of Student Engagement at a Residential Campus

CSU, Chico sees its unique residential situation as an opportunity to create an intensive, high quality learning environment both in and outside the classroom. The underlying belief is that such learning environments foster improved student learning. CSU, Chico chooses to use the EER as a means of systematically validating these beliefs.

The Refinement of the Academic Program Review

Program review processes play a key role in the improvement of undergraduate education at CSU, Chico. Such reviews have the potential to systematize a program’s approach to academic quality and educational excellence. They provide a framework for quality management in our program offerings and other educational activities. Accordingly, we propose to refine our Five-Year Program Review processes as part of the EER.

The Innovative Use of Technology in the Delivery of Effective General Education Offerings

The Report on the Comprehensive Site Visit of CSU, Chico noted that “information and technology are keys to CSU, Chico’s future and the Learning-Centered Campus” and included an appendix entitled “Role of Information Technology at CSU, Chico in 2006.” Both the report and the appendix foreshadowed many of the issues Chico has faced since the visit. Of particular interest here is the question: “What Implications Does This New Information Infrastructure Have For General Education Reform and Vice Versa?” The projected state of funding for the CSU in general and CSU, Chico in particular and concomitant concerns about educational quality has increased the urgency and relevance of that question. We propose to explore academic technology as a means for leveraging

---

6 For details see: http://www.csuchico.edu/vpaa/vppra/wasc/instProposal.html
faculty and student efforts, especially in the area of general education where the need for greater efficacy with fewer resources is most critical.

**WASC Responses to CSUC Promises**

Correspondence from WASC to CSU, Chico includes the following instructions, comments, questions and / or suggestions that should be incorporated in our management of the CPR and EER projects:

**June 24, 2003**

- “… Several reviewers wished for more detail with regard to any improvement in the University’s climate for minority students.”
- “… the University’s assessment programs appeared to need considerable development; in particular, the reviewers did not see evidence of the use of assessment data in actual program planning.” (The reviewers here are the reviewers of the March 2000 report.)
- “… becoming a learning-centered campus, will have been a campus strategic goal for about six years by the time of the Preparatory Review, … it makes good sense for you to conduct an ‘audit’ of assessment activities as part of that review.”
- “For the Educational Effectiveness Review, related to this, you might wish to demonstrate your capacity for assessment by presenting several ‘case studies’ of assessment initiatives that show your established mechanisms for translating assessment information into actual programmatic change. For this demonstration, you may wish to include not only long-established assessment initiatives, but also new initiatives for which the need was identified in your assessment audit for the Preparatory Review.”
- “With regard to your fourth strategic priority … I see a strong opportunity to continue your engagement with the issue of minority enrollment and your campus climate for minority students. The 2000 reviewers saw progress in this area, but saw your challenges as continuing. For the Preparatory Review, of course, you will present a broad, multi-issue description of your efforts to serve your target population. For the Educational Effectiveness, however, you might consider doing an in-depth presentation on this particular issue.”

**November 24, 2003**

- “The University has selected three integral and challenging themes to explore in the Educational Effectiveness Review. The Committee encourages the University to pursue these themes as scholarly research inquiries, including the framing of questions and the examination and evaluation of student learning results and outcomes where appropriate.” (p. 3). *(The notion has been repeatedly offered that we view the projects as on-going research programs).*
“The Committee was particularly impressed with the plans for a performance measurement system around the strategic plan of the University and how that might be incorporated into the review process.”

The Committee was intrigued by your self description as a learning organization, and wondered if you could say more about what that means to you conceptually.

The Committee would like to see more of how the Preparatory Review will reflect on University challenges to maintain quality in an era of reduced resources.

March 15, 2004

“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 notion of faculty engagement has been a recurring theme in many of the WASC materials. Indeed, each standard and criterion for review has associated with it so-called Questions for Institutional Engagement.

The second issue identified by the Panel is that of support to under-represented minorities and improvement of campus climate for all students, given the recommendations from the last Commission action letter.
How CSU, Chico Will Deliver on Its Promises

The Capacity and Preparatory and Educational Effectiveness Reviews will be conducted within the framework of Chico’s vision and mission statements and its strategic plan. Exhibits will be organized in terms of our strategic priorities, with cross-reference to Commission Standards.

The Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR)

The project management schedule for the Capacity and Preparatory Review is as follows:

Fall 2004
- “Evidence” Teams will review WASC CFRs (Criteria for Review) and determine existence (or lack) of supportive evidence
- Develop pbViews infrastructure – this is the software that will be used to manage and present data for the performance measurement system as part of the CSUC electronic institutional portfolio

Spring 2005
- “Performance Indicators” Teams will refine/develop measures to be used to provide evidence for the Capacity and Preparatory Review
- Develop cycle for data collection on all measures
- Input measures that already exist and data into pbViews

Summer 2005
- Input newly developed measures and data into pbViews
- Develop Briefing Books and Report via pbViews organized by the CSUC Strategic Priorities
- Determine areas for reflective essays

Fall 2005
- Refine performance measures
- Write reflective essays

Spring 2006
- Write integrative essay
- Write CPR Report
- Share draft CPR Report with campus

Summer 2006
- Revise CPR Report as needed
- Prepare electronic version of CPR component

Fall 2006
- Finalize CPR Report
- Share Final CPR Report with campus
- Submit CPR Report to WASC

Spring 2007
- Host WASC Review CPR Review Team
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The Educational Effectiveness Review (EER)

Following an iterative series of discussions by campus stakeholders and decision makers, CSU, Chico outlined three themes for the research programs to be undertaken under the EER. The WASC Proposal Review Committee noted: “The University has selected three integral and challenging themes to explore in the Educational Effectiveness Review.” CSU, Chico has operationalized the pursuance of these three themes in the following ways:

**The Nature of Student Engagement at a Residential Campus**

- Examine the factors that promote learning and success for first-year freshmen students and participate in the “Foundations of Excellence in the First Year of College” project.
- Embed diversity in our assessment of educational effectiveness in terms of student learning, student preparation and student success.
- Assess the efficacy of Chico’s comprehensive alcohol drug education program that utilizes various prevention strategies to combat high-risk substance abuse.
- Analyze and act upon data on Chico’s student and institutional performance in the NSSE benchmark areas of academic challenge, active and collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching educational experiences and supportive campus environment.

**The Refinement of the Academic Program Review**

- Develop a New Framework for Academic Program Review. The elements of this new framework will align under the strategic priorities of the university, the ten principles of *Cornerstones*, the principles of the CSU Accountability Process, and the “core commitments” to institutional capacity and educational effectiveness that are embodied in the new WASC accreditation standards. The new review process is intended to refocus programs toward becoming more systematic and intentional about gathering data about the right things – performance and effectiveness—and on using the resulting information to continuously improve what the program does. The first-year milestone of this project, involving three degree programs (American Studies, Sociology and Mathematics) as test units for the new program review guidelines, has been successfully reached. The continuing “plan-do-assess-revise” analysis of efforts in this area will demonstrate our increasing capacity for assessment, diversity and quality improvement.
- Enhance Assessment in General Education. The General Education program is the foundation of undergraduate education at CSU, Chico. As such General Education was a special topic in the Report on the Comprehensive Site Visit of CSU, Chico, March 25-28, 1996 as well as in the March 2, 2000 Chico Fourth-Year Report entitled “Progress Toward Reaffirmation in the New Century.” Following exhortations in these reports, we will demonstrate our established mechanisms for translating GE
assessment information into actual program change as part of the Educational Effectiveness Review. We will conduct an audit of current GE assessment activities, identify “best” and “lesser” practices, and develop studies to improve the “lesser” practices. We propose to present several case studies of GE assessment initiatives that show our commitment to a culture of evidence and a culture of learning. We will include not only long-established assessment initiatives, but also some of the newer initiatives resulting from the audit.

The Innovative Use of Technology in the Delivery of Effective General Education Offerings

- Review existing approaches and techniques (including CSU, Chico’s Learning Productivity Projects) that allow effective student learning and strong student engagement in large-enrollment venues.
- Experiment with the use of academic technology to achieve student learning, student engagement and cost savings in a limited and representative number of larger demand General Education courses.

EER Project Management

The Proposal Review Committee encouraged us “to pursue these themes as scholarly research inquiries, including the framing of questions and the examination and evaluation of student learning results and outcomes where appropriate.” Indeed, WASC, in general, repeatedly advanced the notion that EER projects be viewed as on-going research programs. Accordingly, each of the eight projects subsumed under the three themes is to be developed as a research program that includes:

- the formulation of research questions,
- the operationalization of research variables,
- the collection of data on the research variables,
- the analysis of the data collected,
- a discussion of the study results for action implications,
- the distribution of study results, and
- the design and implementation of action plans.

Once implemented, action plans will be subjected to the same research cycle to establish that improvement, if any, was accomplished.
## A Sample Project Management Schedule for the First-Year Experience (FYE) Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Report to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Fall 2004  | ✏ Complete Learning History for 2003-2004 FYE Committee Activities and Accomplishments  
            | ✏ Develop framing questions that will guide multi-phased, multi-year program of inquiry  
            | ✏ Plan question(s) / phase(s) / action(s) to be researched in Spring 2005 semester; develop research plans for Spring 2005 semester | ✏ FYE Website (when appropriate)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CIE&A (monthly)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ pbViews (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CSUC IP (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ WASC Website  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ Campus Newsletter |
| Spring 2005| ✏ Execute research action plan(s) for Spring 2005  
            | ✏ Report progress at regular intervals                                           | ✏ FYE Website (when appropriate)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CIE&A (monthly)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ pbViews (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CSUC IP (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ WASC Website  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ Campus Newsletter |
| Summer 2005| ✏ Complete Learning History for 2004-2005 FYE Committee Activities and Accomplishments  
            | ✏ Plan question(s) / phase(s) / action(s) to be researched in AY 2005-06 based on 2004-05 data / results and learning history; develop research plans for issue(s) selected. | ✏ FYE Website (when appropriate)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CIE&A (monthly)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ pbViews (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CSUC IP (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ WASC Website  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ Campus Newsletter |
| Fall 2005  | ✏ Execute research action plan(s) for Fall 2005  
            | ✏ Report progress at regular intervals                                           | ✏ FYE Website (when appropriate)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CIE&A (monthly)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ pbViews (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CSUC IP (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ WASC Website  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ Campus Newsletter |
| Spring 2006| ✏ Execute research action plan(s) for Spring 2006  
            | ✏ Report progress at regular intervals                                           | ✏ FYE Website (when appropriate)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CIE&A (monthly)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ pbViews (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ CSUC IP (semester)  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ WASC Website  
            |                                                                                         | ✏ Campus Newsletter |

*Overview of the CSUC WASC Review Process: August 2004*
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2006</strong></td>
<td>Complete Learning History for 2005-2006 FYE Committee Activities and Accomplishments</td>
<td>FYE Website (when appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan question(s) / phase(s) / action (s) to be researched in AY 2006-07 based on 2005-06 data / results and learning history; develop research plans for issue(s) selected.</td>
<td>CIE&amp;A (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pbViews (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUC IP (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2006</strong></td>
<td>Execute research action plan(s) for Fall 2006</td>
<td>FYE Website (when appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report progress at regular intervals</td>
<td>CIE&amp;A (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pbViews (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUC IP (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2007</strong></td>
<td>Execute research action plan(s) for Spring 2007</td>
<td>FYE Website (when appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report progress at regular intervals</td>
<td>CIE&amp;A (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Learning History for 2006-2007 FYE Committee Activities and Accomplishments</td>
<td>pbViews (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUC IP (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer 2007</strong></td>
<td>Complete Learning History for 2003-2007 FYE Committee Activities and Accomplishments</td>
<td>FYE Website (when appropriate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complete Final Report on FYE project for inclusion in Educational Effectiveness Report</td>
<td>CIE&amp;A (monthly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pbViews (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUC IP (semester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2007</strong></td>
<td>Submit Educational Effectiveness Review Report</td>
<td>WASC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campus Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WASC Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spring 2008</strong></td>
<td>Educational Effectiveness Review Team Visit</td>
<td>WASC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentation of the CSUC Institutional Portfolio

The accreditation review process is to result in an Institutional Presentation that is comprised of a Proposal, a Capacity and Preparatory Review, and an Educational Effectiveness Review. WASC has stipulated specific guidelines for the preparation of each of these documents. (See: WASC Handbook of Accreditation pp. 39, 42, and 46).

In as much as Chico’s CPR and EER are organized around its vision, mission, and strategic plan, the presentation of our Institutional Portfolio organizes narratives and exhibits in terms of our five strategic priorities with cross references to Commission Standards. The narratives will employ hyper-links to exhibits and major documents to guide the reader through the evidentiary basis for Chico’s commitment to Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness. The overall presentation will be electronic and web-based using pbViews and the CSUC “Today Decides Tomorrow” Institutional Portfolio.