

December 2, 2002

Lynda Goff Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education University of California, Santa Cruz 1156 High Street Santa Cruz, CA 95064

Dear Lynda:

Thank you for submitting the revised Institutional Proposal for University of California, Santa Cruz in September 2002. I am pleased to report that your Proposal has been reviewed and accepted. The Proposal Review Committee readers commend you for a proposal that evidences a scholarly approach to the accreditation process.

The Proposal Review Committee readers find much to commend in this revised Proposal. They find that your plans for the Preparatory Review are now well tied to the goals of your Educational Effectiveness review and that your operational definition of Institutional Capacity clearly includes the capacity to achieve the institutional learning you propose to accomplish for that later review. The readers counsel that in your Preparatory Review presentation, you continue to point ahead, and to highlight your efforts to build capacity for the Educational Effectiveness review. The readers would also like to commend you for focusing your proposal on significant institutional issues and challenges, and for asking the difficult "how" questions. They also find your goals and intentions on page 3 to be well stated.

The readers note that your proposed plan for the accreditation review is broad and ambitious. This is a source of both commendation and concern. The institution has little data to date, and some plans for data collection appear vague. The readers caution that the groundwork you will need to lay is considerable, and anticipate that you may narrow the scope of your work as you go. You pose complex questions about your small learning communities model and about engagement between faculty and students. In relation to these questions, the readers note the NSSE data reporting low contact between faculty and first-year students; the removal of some advising functions from faculty; and your continued failure to address the question of new faculty orientation, a concern continued from your last comprehensive review. We

CHAIR James R. Appleton

Vice Chair Louanne Kennedy California State University, Northridge

Barbara Cambridge American Association for Higher Education

Kenyon S. Chan Loyola Marymount University

Geoffrey M. Cox

Carmen Maldonado Decker

Faith Gabelnick Pacific University

Diane F. Halpern Claremont McKenna College

Marvalene Hughes California State University, Stanislans

Sherwood G. Lingenfelter Fuller Theological Seminary

Hugo Morales Public Member

Thomas H. Robinson Paway Unified School District

Beverly P. Ryder

Theodore J. Saenger Public Member

John B. Simpson University of Califoria, Santa Cruz

Rose Y. Tseng University of Hawaii, Hilo

Steadman Upham Claremoni Graduate University

Larry N. Vanderhoef University of California, Davis

John D. Welty California State University, Fresno

W. Atom Yee Sama Clava University

Ralph A. Wolff
Executive Director

Martha Balshem Associate Director

Stephanie R. Bangert Associate Director

Elizabeth Griego Associate Director

Gregory M. Scott

Robert R. Benedetti Adjunct Associate Director

Fred H. Dorer Adjunct Associate Director

Lily S. Owyang Adjunct Associate Director

Thomas J. Gallagher Finance & Operations Manager Lynda Goff December 2, 2002 Page 2

anticipate that the team that will visit your campus will raise these matters.

Despite these concerns, the Proposal Review Committee readers find your Proposal to be a sufficient basis for the conduct of the institutional review, and congratulate you on passing this accreditation milestone. They expect that you will give careful consideration to the comments and suggestions set forth in this letter.

Please do not hesitate to call on me if I can be of any assistance. I look forward to working with you as you move through the accreditation process.

Sincerely,

Martha Balshem, PhD

Martha Balaham

Associate Director

Cc:

Amy Driscoll

Richard Curry