



RECEIVED
PRESIDENT/PROVOST OFFICE

AUG 19 2011

Western Washington University

August 16, 2011

8060 165th Avenue N.E., Suite 100
Redmond, WA 98052-3981
425 558 4224
Fax: 425 376 0596
www.nwccu.org

Dr. Bruce Shepard
President
Western Washington University
516 High Street, MS 9033
Bellingham, WA 98225-9033

Dear President Shepard: *Bruce*

On behalf of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to report that the accreditation of Western Washington University has been reaffirmed on the basis of the Spring 2011 Year One Evaluation. Congratulations on receiving this continued recognition.

In reaffirming accreditation, the Commission requests that the University address Recommendations 1 and 2 of the Spring 2011 Year One Peer-Evaluation Report in its updated response to Standard One as part of its Spring 2013 Year Three Self-Evaluation Report. The Commission reminds the University that it is also to address Recommendation 1 of the Fall 2010 Focused Interim Evaluation Report in an addendum to its Spring 2013 Year Three Self-Evaluation Report. (Copies of the Commission's February 10, 2011, letter and Recommendation 1 are enclosed for your reference.)

In taking this action, the Commission finds that Recommendations 1 and 2 of the Spring 2011 Year One Peer-Evaluation Report are areas where Western Washington University is substantially in compliance with Commission criteria for accreditation, but in need of improvement.

If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes for a rewarding academic year.

Sincerely,

Sandra E. Elman
President

SEE:rb

Enclosure: Recommendations (2010 and 2011); Commission letter

cc: ✓ Dr. Steven L. VanderStaay, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education, Director of Academic Assessment
Mr. Dennis Madsen, Chair, Board of Trustees
Mr. Don Bennett, Interim Executive Director, Washington Higher Education Coordinating Board

**Year One Peer-Evaluation Report
Spring 2011
Western Washington University
Recommendations**

1. As the institution begins its revisions for the next report, the evaluation panel recommends that the University clarify the relationship between the core theme indicators and mission fulfillment. In particular, the connection between the indicators that inform mission fulfillment and the rest of the core theme indicators is unclear (Standard I.A.2, I.B.2).
2. As program assessment capacity is systematized and developed, the institution is encouraged to incorporate more evidence of student learning outcomes data throughout the educational experience and within academic programs into the evaluation of both core themes and mission fulfillment (Standard I.B.2).