



July 2, 2007

J. Michael Bishop
Chancellor
University of California, San Francisco
513 Parnassus Avenue, Box 0402
San Francisco, CA 94143-0402



Dear Chancellor Bishop:

During its meeting on June 27, 2007, a panel of the Proposal Review Committee (PRC) considered the Institutional Proposal submitted by the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) for its reaffirmation of accreditation review. The panel would like to thank your colleagues who participated in the call: Eugene Washington, Executive Vice Chancellor; Sally Marshall, Vice Provost of Academic Affairs; Dorrie Fontaine, Associate Dean, School of Nursing; and Helen Loeser, Associate Dean of Curricular Affairs, School of Medicine. Their collective comments proved most helpful. As indicated during the conference call following the panel's deliberations, the panel acted to accept the proposal.

The panel expressed their appreciation for a well-prepared document that promises a very productive self-study in the months ahead. In particular, the panel regarded the three themes as appropriate to the institution and expressive of significant integrity. There is evidence that the extensive work UCSF has done to achieve standing with each of its programmatic accreditors has served the institution well and will give each school an advantage as they collaborate on the WASC self-study. The student achievement data, as required by programmatic accreditors, will be especially useful indicators in the institution's continuing pursuit of improvement.

The panel also noted with appreciation the diversity goals that envision moving beyond achieving a diverse student population to encouraging a climate that will support minority advancement into faculty and administrative roles as well. Such commitments confirm the panel's perception that UCSF does not rest content with having achieved high performance in conventional output measures, but continually seeks to develop a pervasive culture of excellence.

The following comments on behalf of the panel are intended to provide perspectives that will be useful as you undertake the next steps in the review process. They do not require a response at this time but may be reflected in the manner in which UCSF conducts its review and reports its findings.

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
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. Wolf
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

J. Michael Bishop
July 2, 2007
Page 2

The New Standards. Since UCSF conducted its prior reaffirmation under the previous WASC Standards and visit process, this review cycle represents some significant shifts for the institution. It should be clear to a visiting team that the Standards have served as an organizing framework for both phases of the review. While it is not necessary for the review to address each of the 42 CFRs, it should be clear how the selected themes demonstrate the institution's response to the two core commitments that the CPRs define.

Timelines and Integration. The Work Plan and Milestones provided in the proposal reveal an ambitious and highly aligned series of inquiries and reflections. The panel advises that the institution clarify which aspects of the work plan pertain specifically to the CPR and which to the EER, and that linkages between the CPR findings and the EER inquiries become even more explicit. There should be a clear sense of continuity between the two phases of the review process, with an emphasis on the "preparatory" aspects of the CPR that will enrich the findings under the EER.

Linkage with Strategic Plan. While the interplay between the WASC review and the new UCSF Strategic Plan was not a central component of the proposal, given that its formal release post-dated the submission of the proposal, the panel anticipates that there can be significant synergy between these two parallel endeavors. It is likely that the learnings arising from the WASC self-study may inform and even shape key elements of the strategic plan. Since this interaction can more fully embed the WASC values into the institutional culture, the panel advises that opportunities for this exchange be sought and formalized.

The timeline for review will remain with the Capacity and Preparatory Review, spring 2009 and the Educational Effectiveness Review in fall 2010 (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.

Congratulations on this significant achievement. We hope that your proposal will be useful in putting your institution on the path to an even more productive and successful self-review. Please accept my readiness to assist in this process as needed.

Sincerely,



Richard Winn
Associate Director

Cc: Joseph I. Castro, Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Academic Affairs
Proposal Review Committee