



June 30, 2005

Gerardo Marin
Associate Provost
University of San Francisco
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080

Dear Gerardo:

At its June 24, 2005 meeting, the Proposal Review Committee considered the Institutional Proposal submitted by the University of San Francisco for its next Reaffirmation of Accreditation review. Members of the Panel appreciated your participation in the conference call along with those of your colleagues: James Wisner, Professor of Politics and Provost & Academic Vice President; Michael Bloch, Associate Professor of Psychology and Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences; Susan Prion, Assistant Professor of Nursing and Director of Institutional Assessment; Alan Ziajka, Director of Institutional Research; and Johnnie Johnson Hafernik, Professor and Chair of Communication Studies. The responses to the questions were extremely helpful in assisting the Panel to understand your institutional context and the approach you plan to take for your comprehensive accreditation review.

As noted in the conference call, the Panel acted to accept your Proposal. The Panel found the proposal thoughtful, clearly written and easily understood. It commends the University for its responsiveness to recommendations from its last accreditation review. The Panel was particularly impressed with the involvement of the campus community in the preliminary self-review under the WASC Standards, and how the results of the self review, the University's Vision, Mission and Values statement, and its strategic priorities informed the selection of outcomes for the current review cycle. It was apparent to the Panel that the University is seriously committed to building a culture of evidence. Panel members learned that student learning outcomes for most major programs are available online. Program reviews are systematically conducted for academic programs and the results of these reviews are considered by the campus leadership and the Assessment Steering Committee.

Although the Panel acted to accept University's Proposal, the following recommendations are provided as suggestions for improvement:

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
California State University, Fresno

VICE CHAIR
Sherwood G. Lingenfelter
Fuller Theological Seminary

Dede Alpert
Public Member

James R. Appleton
University of Redlands

Lisa Marie Beardsley
Loma Linda University

Mark Bookman
University of Judaism

Barbara Cambridge
*American Association for
Higher Education*

Jerry Dean Campbell
University of Southern California

Kenyon S. Chan
Occidental College

Carter Doran
*Community and Junior Colleges
Commission Representative*

Aimee Dorr
University of California, Los Angeles

Laurence Gould
Public Member

Marvalene Hughes
California State University, Stanislaus

Christina Maslach
University of California, Berkeley

Tomás Morales
*California State Polytechnic
University, Pomona*

Thomas H. Robinson
School's Commission Representative

Beverly P. Ryder
Edison International

Eleanor Dantzler Siebert
Mount St. Mary's College

Mary K. Tetreault
Portland State University

Rose Y. Tseng
University of Hawaii, Hilo

STAFF
Ralph A. Wolff
Executive Director

Stephanie R. Bangert
Associate Director

Elizabeth Griego
Associate Director

Gregory M. Scott
Associate Director

Richard A. Winn
Assistant Director

Robert R. Benedetti
Adjunct Associate Director

Lily S. Owyang
Adjunct Associate Director

Bill Gong
Finance & Operations Manager

1. Clarify in your Institutional Presentations what structures and processes are in place leading a "culture of evidence," e.g., how data is used in decision-making, and what improvements in Institutional Capacity and Educational Effectiveness have been made as a result.
2. Provide additional information on how the University's Vision, Mission and Values statement is linked to learning outcomes in the core curriculum, the major and the co-curriculum.
3. Continue efforts to have all academic programs develop learning outcomes, select assessment strategies and demonstrate that they are using the results of assessment to improve student learning.
4. Consider the development of an assessment strategy for service learning courses.

In its June meeting, the Commission reviewed comments from institutions on the timing between the Capacity and Educational Effectiveness Reviews. At the initiation of institutions and at the recommendation of Capacity Review teams over the past two years, the Commission has acted to extend for a majority of institutions the Educational Effectiveness Review from one year to 18-24 months following their Capacity Review. For institutions with Capacity and Preparatory Reviews in Spring 2008 (Proposals due October 15, 2005) and beyond, this timeframe is now normative. For institutions with recent Proposal reviews, you have the option to maintain your current timetable or consider rescheduling your Educational Effectiveness Review to take place 18-24 months after the Capacity Review in accordance with this recent Commission action. Please complete to the enclosed form on the timing of the Educational Effectiveness Review and return it to the WASC office no later than August 15, 2005.

Congratulations on the acceptance of your Proposal. Let me know if you have any questions or need clarifications.

Sincerely,



Cecilia Gray
Adjunct Associate Director

cc: Proposal Review Committee
Stephen A. Privett, S.J., President
Ralph A. Wolff