



July 7, 2006

Diana Demetrulias
Vice President for Assessment and Quality Assurance
California State University, Stanislaus
801 West Monte Vista Avenue
Turlock, California 95382

Dear Diana:

At its June 30, 2006, meeting, a panel of the Proposal Review Committee considered the California State University, Stanislaus Institutional Proposal 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 Ham Shirvani, President; Scott Davis, Assistant Professor of English; Gary Novak, Acting Dean and Professor of Psychology; and Steve Stryker, Professor of English. Your collective participation made it evident to the panel that the proposal was the product of broad and interested engagement across many segments of the institution. Your responses to the panel's questions were helpful in assisting them to better understand the institution's context and its intentions for the upcoming comprehensive review.

As communicated to you by telephone on June 30, 2006, the panel acted to accept the proposal in its present form and to commend the institution and its team for submitting an exemplary institutional proposal. The panel found both the narrative and the supporting appendices to be well organized, conceptually rich, and indicative of the institution's deep commitment to student and institutional learning.

Panel members were particularly impressed with the institution's notion of Inquiry Circles as an organizational overlay that optimizes existing structures while supporting boundary-crossing investigations of campus-wide issues. It was evident to the panel that these groups had already engaged in significant work prompting fruitful conversations among stakeholders. The panel affirms what the institution has identified as the early task of the Circles in narrowing the extensive list of potential questions down to a few issues worthy of depth exploration.

After examining the proposal and conversing with you and your colleagues, the panel made a number of critical observations. It is evident that 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
John D. Welty, Chair
California State University, Fresno

VICE CHAIR
Sherwood G. Lingenfelter, Vice Chair
Fuller Theological Seminary

Dede Alpert
Public Member

James R. Appleton
University of Redlands

Lisa Marie Beardsley
Loma Linda University

Mark Bookman
University of Judaism

W. Bernard Bowler
Public Member

Barbara Cambridge
Carnegie Academy and N.C.T.E.

Jerry Dean Campbell
University of Southern California

Kenyon S. Chan
Occidental College

Aimee Dorr
University of California, Los Angeles

Laurence Gould
Public Member

James E. Lyons, Sr.
*California State University,
Dominguez Hills*

Christina Maslach
University of California, Berkeley

Tomás Morales
*California State Polytechnic
University, Pomona*

Thomas H. Robinson
School's Commission Representative

Martha G. Romero
*Community and Junior Colleges
Commission Representative*

Eleanor Dantzer Siebert
Mount St. Mary's College

Mary Kay Tetreault
Portland State University

Laura Trombley
Pitzer College

Sue Wesselkamper
Chaminade University of Honolulu

STAFF
Ralph A. Wolff
Executive Director

Elizabeth Griego
Associate Director

Neil Hoffman
Associate Director

Richard A. Winn
Associate Director

Barbara Wright
Associate Director

Christie Jones
*Assistant Director for Research
and Substantive Change*

Lee West
*Assistant Director for
Commission Support*

Robert R. Benedetti
Adjunct Associate Director

Richard C. Giardina
Adjunct Associate Director

Bill Gong
Finance & Operations Manager

Diana Demetrulias
July 7, 2006
Page 2

University is investing considerable energy and resources into this review for its own sake rather than to satisfy an extrinsic WASC requirement. There is an inclusive sense of ownership over the process that is manifest by the level of faculty and staff participation as well as by the degree to which stakeholder groups are empowered to "drive" the process and publish their findings. Early planning has envisioned ways to sustain and institutionalize key aspects of the review process long after final Commission action. The Circles of Inquiry are structured with a high degree of conceptual understanding as "learning communities" and are already functioning as such. Even in the face of State budget cutbacks, CSU Stanislaus appears to be using the review process to focus resources and find efficiencies in order to continue to provide a rich learning environment for its students, faculty, and staff. The proposal shows every evidence of having captured a glimpse of an active, forward-leaning institution with a number of promising quality processes embedded in the culture. In observing these strengths, and in accepting the proposal, the panel commends this evident commitment to obtaining value from the review process.

The Institutional 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.

We wish you well and look forward to working with you on this review cycle.

Sincerely,



Richard Winn
Associate Director

Cc: Ham Shirvani, President
Proposal Review Committee
Ralph A. Wolff