



July 5, 2007

Rev. Paul L. Locatelli, S.J.  
President  
Santa Clara University  
500 El Camino Real  
Santa Clara, CA 95053-0015

Dear President Locatelli:

During its meeting on June 27, 2007, a panel of the Proposal Review Committee (PRC) considered the Institutional Proposal submitted by Santa Clara University for its reaffirmation of accreditation review. The panel would like to thank you and your colleagues for participating on the call. Your collective comments proved most helpful. As indicated via email, the panel acted to accept the proposal.

The panel appreciated the opportunity to talk about the proposal and the work that lies ahead as the University prepare for its Capacity and Preparatory Review. The information provided about progress in assessment of student learning across the university, the update on your institutional research capacity, and plans for collection and use of evidence were all helpful to the panel in understanding the context for the proposal.

The panel found Santa Clara's proposal was a fine model of how the WASC proposal process should work and asked that I pass on to you their affirmation of several aspects of your proposal. The panel could see that the process undertaken in preparing the proposal was thorough and involved a broad range of campus constituencies. The themes chosen for the review are clearly aligned with the University's mission and current priorities. Research questions and tables of evidence were well framed, presented and organized and set forth an excellent plan for proceeding with the review. The self-review under the Standards and accompanying analysis of your capacity for the review were thorough and candid, reflecting strengths as well as areas that may need attention as you proceed.

The panel could see that there is strong support for the themes that will be addressed during the review and was impressed with the level of commitment and energy that has gone into the proposal's development. You have selected important themes and the work that will be undertaken will serve the University for years to come. It is encouraging to note that these themes represent areas the University would be addressing even without the WASC process. This

985 Atlantic Avenue, Suite 100  
Alameda, CA 94501  
PHONE: 510.748.9001  
FAX: 510.748.9797  
E-MAIL: [wascsr@wascsenior.org](mailto:wascsr@wascsenior.org)  
INTERNET: [www.wascweb.org](http://www.wascweb.org)

CHAIR  
John D. Welty  
*California State University, Fresno*

VICE CHAIR  
Laura Trombley  
*Pitzer College*

Dede Alpert  
*Public Member*

Mark Bookman  
*University of Judaism*

W. Bernard Bowler  
*Public Member*

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

Jerry Dean Campbell  
*Claremont School of Theology*

Anna DiStefano  
*Fielding Graduate University*

James Donahue  
*Graduate Theological Union*

Aimée Dorr  
*University of California, Los Angeles*

John Eshelman  
*Seattle University*

John Fitzpatrick  
*Schools Commission Representative*

Laurence Gould  
*Public Member*

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

Christina Maslach  
*University of California, Berkeley*

Horace Mitchell  
*California State University,  
Bakersfield*

Tomás Morales  
*California State Polytechnic  
University, Pomona*

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

Eleanor Dantzer Siebert  
*Mount St. Mary's College*

Sue Wesselkamper  
*Chaminade University of Honolulu*

Michael Whyte  
*Azusa Pacific University*

STAFF  
Ralph A. Wolff  
*President and Executive Director*

Therese A. Cannon  
*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*

Paul L. Locatelli  
July 5, 2007  
Page 2

impression was reinforced by the fact that some research areas identified in the proposal are already current foci of faculty work.

The panel appreciated discussion on the status of the University's assessment program, including next steps to ensure the quality of student learning outcomes in all programs and the use of program review and annual assessment reports. The panel applauds the University's characterization of assessment as needing to be faculty-driven, useful and manageable.

The panel did have some concerns about the range and extent of the work that the University plans to undertake and advises careful pacing and strong support for the faculty and staff, so that it can be sustained over the next five years. In this regard, the panel encourages the University to select key research questions for full research and development in the CPR and EER reports that will be submitted to WASC twelve weeks prior to each visit. The panel's initial concerns about this matter were alleviated by the phone discussion of the proposal as an iterative process in which the research questions will be refined and focused over time. This process will require careful selection and analysis of the evidence that will be included in the reports.

The panel noted that, as expected, some of the CFRs were not addressed in the themes selected. The panel suggests that the University prepare a matrix or evidence map showing where evidence concerning each CFR can be accessed. This matrix can be included in your data portfolio to accompany the CPR report.

The timeline for review will remain with the Capacity and Preparatory Review, fall 2009 and the Educational Effectiveness Review in spring 2011 (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 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. As you prepare for your Capacity and Preparatory Review, please plan to attend the upcoming CPR workshops held during the WASC Annual Meeting in April.

Again, congratulations on the fine work that has been done on the proposal. I look forward to seeing the review progress and, as always, am happy to support your efforts in any way that I can.

Sincerely,



Therese A. Cannon  
Executive Associate Director

Cc: Diane Jonte-Pace, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Students, Professor of Religious Studies  
Proposal Review Committee

**RECEIVED**

JUL 09 2007

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY  
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE