



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

July 20, 2015

Dr. Mary Cullinan
President
Eastern Washington University
Showalter 214
Cheney, WA 99004

Dear President Cullinan: ^{Mary-}

On behalf of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities, I am pleased to report that the accreditation of Eastern Washington University has been reaffirmed on the basis of the Spring 2015 Year Seven *Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability* Evaluation.

In reaffirming accreditation, the Commission requests that the University submit an Ad Hoc Report in Fall 2015 to address Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2015 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report. Moreover, the Commission requests that the University expand its Spring 2016 Year One Mission and Core Themes Self-Evaluation Report to address Recommendation 2 of the Spring 2015 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report. In addition, the Commission requests that the University submit an Ad Hoc Report in Fall 2016 to address Recommendations 3 and 4 of the Spring 2015 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report. A copy of the Recommendations is enclosed for your reference.

In making these requests, the Commission finds that Recommendations 2, 3, and 4 of the Spring 2015 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report are areas where Eastern Washington 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 2015 Year Seven 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 Eastern Washington University take appropriate action to ensure that Recommendation 1 of the Spring 2015 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report is addressed and resolved in the prescribed two-year period.

Further, the Commission has issued a *Notice of Concern* (formerly known as a *Warning*) for Recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the Spring 2015 Year Seven Peer-Evaluation Report. Given the longstanding reputable stature of the University, the Commission's expectations for a foundational infrastructure of assessment and the use of the results of assessment in a meaningful evaluation of mission fulfillment were not met.


President Mary Cullinan
July 20, 2015
Page Two

The Commission commends Eastern Washington University for its commitment to student success. Examples of initiatives in this area include the PLUS program, the learning commons, and the Office of Community Engagement's programs for students—especially community service. The institution's retention and completion rates are noteworthy, especially in light of the number of first-generation students and those who are Pell eligible. Further, the Commission finds noteworthy the University's robust, inclusive and transparent budgeting process. Lastly, the Commission commends the University's Division of Information Technology for its comprehensive strategic planning process and the resulting investments in technology which provide faculty the opportunity to explore and incorporate innovative technology into the learning experience.

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

Best wishes for a rewarding 2015-2016 academic year.

Sincerely,


Sandra E. Elman
President

SEE:rb

Enclosures: Recommendations
 Commission Policy, *Commission Action Regarding Institutional Compliance Within Specified Period*

cc: ✓ Dr. Colin Ormsby, Vice Provost for Academic Planning, Graduate Programs, Grants and Institutional Research
 Ms. Jo Ann Kauffman, Board Chair
 Mr. Gene Sharratt, Executive Director, Washington Student Achievement Council

Year Seven *Mission Fulfillment and Sustainability* Evaluation
Spring 2015
Eastern Washington University
Recommendations

1. The evaluation committee recommends that Eastern Washington University seek formal approval of its mission statement by its governing board (Standard 1.A.1).
2. The evaluation committee recommends that Eastern Washington University clarify core themes so that they individually manifest essential elements of its mission and collectively encompass its mission (Standard 1.B.1).
3. The evaluation committee recommends that the institution engage in regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective, and evidence-based assessment of its accomplishments, and that it documents through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes (Standards 4.A.3 and 5.A.1).
4. The evaluation committee recommends that Eastern Washington University's core theme assessments and results of assessments of programs and services are: a) based on meaningful institutionally identified indicators of achievement; b) used for improvement by forming planning, decision making, and allocation of resources and capacity; and c) made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner (Standard 4.B.1).

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.

1997
2002