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.
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 CFRs 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