



July 29, 2014

Dr. Thomas W. Krise President Pacific Lutheran University 12180 Park Avenue S. Tacoma, WA 98447-0003

Dear President Krise:

On behalf of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to inform you that at its June 25-26, 2014, meeting, the Board of Commissioners accepted the University's Spring 2014 Year Three *Resources and Capacity* Report which was expanded to address Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2011 Year One *Mission and Core Themes* Peer-Evaluation Report. In regard to Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2011 Year One *Mission and Core Themes* Peer-Evaluation Report, the Commission determined that its expectations have been met.

In accepting the report, the Commission requests that the University address Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2014 Year Three *Resources and Capacity* Peer-Evaluation Report in an Ad Hoc Report without a visit in Spring 2015 and address Recommendations 2 and 3 of the Spring 2014 Year Three *Resources and Capacity* Peer-Evaluation Report in the Spring 2017 Year Seven *Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability* Self-Evaluation Report. A copy of the Recommendations is enclosed for your reference.

In making these requests, the Commission finds that Recommendations 2 and 3 of the Spring 2014 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report are areas where Pacific Lutheran University is substantially in compliance with Commission criteria for accreditation, but in need of improvement. However, the Commission determined that Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2014 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report does not meet the Commission's criteria for accreditation. According to U.S. Department of Education Regulation 34 CFR 602.20 and Commission Policy, Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period (enclosed), the Commission requires that Pacific Lutheran University take appropriate action to ensure that Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2014 Year Three Resources and Capacity Peer-Evaluation Report is addressed and resolved within the prescribed two-year period.

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

Enclosures: Recommendations; Commission Policy

cc: Dr. David Veazey, Director of University Assessment, Accreditation and Research

## Year Three Resources and Capacity Evaluation Spring 2014 Pacific Lutheran University Recommendations

- 1. Though the evaluation committee's discussions with Pacific Lutheran University personnel found evidence of respect for academic freedom and intellectual property, the evaluators recommend that explicit policy statements regarding these issues be included in the institution's key documents such as the faculty handbook and human resources materials. The committee also recommends that the University publish its credit hour policy and identify the means by which it monitors the policy for compliance (Standard 2.A.24, 2.A.27 and NWCCU "Credit Hour Policy" statement dated November 2012).
- 2. While the committee found that some academic departments made initial efforts to identify student learning outcomes for its majors and general education program, the committee recommends that this process be comprehensively implemented and that assessment of student learning outcomes become a high priority in institutional planning for mission fulfillment (Standard 2.C.1, 2.C.2, 2.C.3).
- 3. The committee recommends that the University develop and implement policies that clearly articulate institution-wide responsibilities, expectations and standards related to Continuing Education Units (Standard 2.C.16, 2.C.17 and 2.C.18).

## Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period Policy

If the Commission determines that an institution it accredits is not in compliance with a Commission standard for accreditation or an eligibility requirement, the Commission will immediately initiate adverse action against the institution or require the institution to take appropriate action to bring itself into compliance within a time period that shall not exceed: (1) twelve months, if the longest program offered by the institution is less than one year in length; (2) eighteen months, if the longest program offered by the institution is at least one year, but less than two years, in length; or (3) two years, if the longest program offered by the institution is at least two years in length.

The Commission may extend the period for compliance noted above should it reasonably expect that, based upon the institution's progress toward meeting the Commission's standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement, the institution will come into full compliance within a reasonable timeframe. Should an institution deem that as a result of mitigating circumstances it is not able to comply with the standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement within the specified period of time, the institution may submit a written request to the Commission for additional time to come into compliance with the standard for accreditation or eligibility requirement. The request is to be submitted prior to the time limit for corrective action set forth by the Commission, provide a detailed explanation of the reasons why the institution cannot comply with the standard for accreditation within the designated time period, and demonstrate that the institution is making good progress in meeting the standard for accreditation. Following a review of the request, the Commission will make a determination as to whether the institution has based its request on valid reasons. If the Commission determines that the institution has substantiated good cause for not complying within the specified time period and is making good progress to come into compliance, the Commission will extend the period for achieving compliance and stipulate requirements for continuing oversight of the institution's accreditation during the extension.