Californ...

VICE CHAIR
Sherwood G. Lingenfelter, Vice Chair
Dede Alpert
Public Member Sherwood G. Lingenfelter, Vice Chair



July 6, 2006

Lisa Beardsley Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and ALO Loma Linda University 11060 Anderson Street Loma Linda, CA 92350

Dear Dr. Beardsley:

At its June 30, 2006, meeting, a panel of the Proposal Review Committee considered the Loma Linda University Institutional Proposal for its next reaffirmation of accreditation review. Members of the panel asked me to express their appreciation for your participation in the telephone conference call, and for that of your colleagues Richard Hart, Chancellor and CEO; William Hughes, Director of Educational Support Services; Beverly Buckles, Professor, Department of Social Work and Social Ecology; and Robert Gardner, Director, Institutional Research Office. By your participation along with that of your colleagues it was evident to the panel that the proposal was the product of broad and interested engagement across many segments of the institution. Your collective responses to the panel's questions were helpful in assisting them to better understand the institution's context and its intentions for the upcoming comprehensive review.

As communicated to you during the phone call by the lead reader, the panel acted to approve the proposal. The panel wishes for me to convey that they regard this to be a well-organized and insightful proposal, describing in succinct terms how the institution will engage with and benefit from the subsequent stages of the review process. In particular, the members noted the clarity with which the proposal embraces the mission of a faith-based institution, drawing it forcefully into its evaluative and planning processes. The institution appears poised to address matters that are fundamental to the character of Loma Linda and its growing place in the world.

The panel was pleased to hear that the LLU planning team had already noted the absence of stated learning outcomes—and their related assessment practices-in several of the graduate programs that do not undergo external accreditation reviews. The panel affirms the steps already taken to address this issue and urges the institution to ensure that this goal remains central in subsequent planning, including setting plans to engage these programs in systematic program review.

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

James R. Appleton University of Redlands

Lisa Marie Beardsley

Mark Bookman University of Judaism

W. Bernard Bowler

Barbara Cambridge Carnagie Academy and N.C.T.E.

Jerry Dean Campbell University of Southern California

Kenyon S. Chan Occidental College

Aimee Dorr University of California, Los Angeles

Laurence Gould

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

Christina Maslach University of California, Berkeley

Tomás Morales California State Polytechnic University, Pomona

Thomas H. Robinson School's Commission Representative

Martha G. Romero Community and Junior Colleges Commission Representative

Eleanor Dantzler Siebert Mount St. Mary's College

Mary Kay Tetreault Portland State University

Laura Trombley Pitzer College

Sue Wesselkamper Chaminade University of Honolulu

STAFF Ralph A. Wolff Executive Director

Elizabeth Griego Associate Directo

Neil Hoffman Associate Director

Richard A. Winn

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

Lisa Beardsley July 6, 2006 Page 2

The panel was encouraged to hear of LLU's plans to extend the concept of wholeness beyond the life of individual students and into the global communities its graduates are preparing to serve. When aligned with LLU's participation with the new Carnegie classification of Community Engaged institutions, such strategies will certainly generate understandings that will be of great value to the rest of the region.

The Institutional 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.

We wish you well and look forward to working with you on this review cycle.

Sincerely

Richard Winn

Associate Director

Cc: Richard Hart, Chancellor and CEO

Proposal Review Committee

Ralph A. Wolff