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I. NATURE OF THE INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT AND MAJOR CHANGES SINCE THE LAST WASC VISIT

A. BACKGROUND, CONTEXT, HISTORY, AND MISSION

A.1 Mission
The mission of the Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science (Charles Drew University or CDU) is “to conduct education, research, and clinical services in the context of community engagement to train health professionals who promote wellness, provide care with excellence and compassion, and transform the health of underserved communities.” CDU carries out its mission through educating and training the next generation of health professionals in a unique environment with a blend of pedagogy, research, community outreach, and service that prepares students and graduates to address health disparities and the multiple needs of medically underserved populations. CDU provides students with a unique local clinical training experience as it is set in a culturally and socioeconomically diverse community. The University Student Learning Outcomes, which are aligned with the University’s mission, follow:

- Excellence in Clinical Service. Students demonstrate excellence in their chosen field of study.
- Academic and Social Research. Students evaluate, use, and/or conduct research.
- Compassion and Cultural Sensitivity. Students demonstrate compassion and cultural sensitivity, with a special commitment to serving diverse and underserved populations.
- Professionalism. Students demonstrate responsible, empathetic, and ethical professional behavior.

Program- and course-level learning outcomes are linked to the University Student Learning Outcomes.

A.2 Brief Accreditation History and Context
Charles Drew University was first accredited by WASC in 1995, following a process that began in 1986. In 2000, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Commission deferred reaffirmation of accreditation and scheduled a special visit for 2002. This visit led to reaffirmation and the scheduling of the Capacity and Preparatory Review (CPR) visit in spring 2007. The outcome of that visit resulted in the WASC Commission continuing CDU’s accreditation and proceeding with the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) visit in spring 2009. Following the 2009 visit, the WASC Commission placed CDU on probation, requesting an interim report in March 2010 and scheduling a special visit for February 2011.

A.3 History
CDU is a private, nonprofit, nonsectarian, minority-serving medical and health sciences institution located in Los Angeles, California. CDU was founded in 1966 after the McConé Commission cited poor health status and diminished access to quality education, health care, employment, and safety as key factors in sparking the 1965 civil unrest in the local community. The needs of the community remain as great now as they were 45 years ago. CDU is the only designated minority-serving health sciences university in a county with a population of more than 10 million residents, 70 percent of whom are from minority communities. The University serves as the only academic health sciences center for the area’s 1.5 million residents.

CDU has earned the designation as a minority-serving institution by the U.S. Office of Civil Rights, and its College of Medicine (COM) is recognized by the Department of Education (DOE) as a Historically Black Graduate Institution (HBGI as designated by Title III B). The University is a charter member of the Hispanic Serving Health Professions Schools, a national nonprofit dedicated to improving the health of Hispanic people through research initiatives, training opportunities, and academic development.

The University has made a significant contribution to the diversity of the nation’s healthcare workforce by graduating more than 400 physicians, 2,000 physician assistants, 2,500 physician specialists, and numerous other health professionals for over 35 years. More than 80 percent of these graduates are ethnic minorities, and more than 70 percent continue to work in underserved communities ten years or more following graduation. Many former fellows and faculty have become national leaders in education, government services, research institutions, and clinical enterprises.
A.4 Educational Programs
Charles Drew University provides programs from pipeline (precollege) programs to graduate training programs. Academic programs are organized into three colleges or schools: the College of Science and Health (COSH), the College of Medicine (COM), and the Mervyn M. Dymally School of Nursing (SON). Pipeline programs include the Saturday Science Academy and the Short-Term Education Program for Underrepresented Persons (STEP-UP).

COSH offers undergraduate degrees for community health, alcohol, and drug studies; diagnostic medical sonography; health information technology; nuclear medicine technology; pharmacy technology; physician assistant; pre-healing arts; and radiography. COSH also offers a Master of Public Health Degree. The college’s certificate programs are in clinical coding specialist; post-baccalaureate physician assistant; post-baccalaureate pre-med; alcohol and drug studies; nuclear medicine; and pharmacy tech. The college also offers continuing education. COM is offered jointly with the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Medical Education program where students are enrolled in the first two years of basic science training at UCLA followed by two years of clinical training with CDU faculty. The Master of Science in Clinical Research and continuing medical education programs are also offered. SON offers a Master of Science in Nursing with two tracks: Entry Level Master of Science in Nursing (ELMSN) and Family Nurse Practitioner (FNP) track. See chart on details on enrollment and status of programs.²

The closure of King/Drew Medical Center (Martin Luther King, Jr. Multi-Service Ambulatory Care Center or MLK-MACC) for residency training impacted programs at CDU. In September 2006, the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services lost its certification for the MLK-MACC by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS). On November 1, 2006, the University voluntarily withdrew from Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) sponsorship effective July 1, 2007 because of a lack of a safe and reliable teaching environment on hospital grounds. CDU sued the County of Los Angeles on April 24, 2007, related to the loss of the hospital accreditation and, in turn, the loss of CDU’s residency programs. The lawsuit was resolved on September 2009, and the relationship with the County of Los Angeles improved markedly with the development of new training partnerships. The closure of the inpatient facilities at MLK-MACC has stimulated and strengthened new and existing partnerships with community clinics, local affiliated hospitals, and community-based organizations.³

An important milestone since the last site visit is the establishment of a school of nursing. On June 12, 2009, the California Board of Registered Nursing granted initial approval for the Master of Science in Nursing Program. The WASC Commission granted its initial approval of the nursing program in March 2009. Seventeen students are in the first nursing program class, which began August 2010.

Students and Faculty
There are currently 324 students enrolled in CDU degree programs (120 in COM, 187 in COSH, 17 in SON). Reflective of the CDU mission, the student body is highly diverse. The student demographic breakdown is 21.3 percent Asian, 38.6 percent Black, 21.3 percent Hispanic, 9.0 percent White, and 9.9 percent Other.

There are 91 full- and part-time compensated faculty members (totaling 75.2 FTEs) and 111 non-compensated faculty. Fifty-two percent of our faculty (primarily clinical, community, and research faculty) receive no remuneration for their service to the University. This includes faculty who are community health leaders involved in student learning, participatory research, and other activities advancing the University’s mission. The faculty are highly diverse in ethnic composition: 23 percent Asian, 47 percent Black, 7 percent Hispanic, 22 percent White, and 1 percent Other. A strength of CDU is that faculty diversity closely parallels student diversity.
A.5 Education and Research Physical Resources
The main campus is on approximately 11 acres of land within the unincorporated area of Willowbrook in South Los Angeles. Currently, the university campus is composed of three permanent two-story buildings and several smaller facilities, including some temporary buildings. The W.M. Keck Foundation building houses COSH program offices, the Student Education and Services Center (SESC), and nine classrooms. The W. Montague Cobb Medical Education building houses university administrative offices, the Health Sciences Library, Learning Resource Center, Clinical Simulation Center, and COM administrative offices. The new $50 million state-of-the-art Life Sciences Research and Nursing Education (LSRNE) building is a 63,922-square-foot, two-story building that houses the SON administrative offices, a clinical simulation center, three classrooms, a learning resource center, and research facilities. There are three learning centers across campus; two state-of-the-art clinical science simulation/education technology centers; and numerous resources and facilities supporting biomedical, clinical, and translational research for faculty and students. For more information on physical resources, refer to facilities master plan (see Appendix Q).

A.6 Research Environment Linked to Education and the Community
Infrastructure that supports CDU research is especially significant to the new graduate focus for enhancing scholarly activity for both students and teaching faculty. The CDU research enterprise, including its basic science activities, has undergone significant expansion. According to the Center for Measuring University Performance, CDU ranked #49 among the Top American Private Research Universities in research funding in 2009. The University currently receives more than $20 million in NIH funding annually and another $12 million from other sources to conduct basic and clinical research, primarily focused on health disparities issues. The LSI supports new research discoveries through the work of teams focused on reengineering clinical research into structured systems for improving patient outcomes. The clinical and translational research activities are funded partly through Accelerating eXcellence In Science (AXIS), a National Center Research Resources (NCRR) research infrastructure grant award—an NIH Clinical and Translational Science Institute (CTSI) -like funding mechanism. Two other major research infrastructure programs include the Center to Eliminate Cancer Health Disparities in partnership with Jonsson Comprehensive Cancer Center at UCLA and the Research Centers in Minority Institutions (RCMI) Translational Research Network (RTRN). To sustain this level of success and continue to stimulate quality and scholarly education, transformation of the University’s research infrastructure was completed. Research infrastructure is now coordinated within the Life Sciences Institute (LSI) and includes institutional funds and grants aligned with the requirements of clinical and translational research. The LSI is well positioned to play a significant role in the future of systems biology and medical research at CDU.

A.7 Research Clinical Sites
Charles Drew University engages in clinical research primarily through patient recruitment via approximately 25 community and outpatient clinics. Participant recruitment occurs from outpatient settings, such as the MLK ambulatory clinics, the Hubert Humphrey Clinic (120,000 patient visits per year), and the To Help Everyone Clinic (T.H.E. Clinic), which receives approximately 20,000 patient visits per year, or through direct recruitment from within the community. CDU has worked closely with the Southside Coalition of Community Health Centers, which serves the South Los Angeles community and represents 19 clinic sites. In 2007 alone, the Southside Coalition members collectively cared for more than 95,000 patients and provided more than 382,000 patient visits. The UCLA health system (more than one million clinical visits and 80,000 inpatient visits per year) also provides sites for clinical trial recruitment. Investigators continue to have access to these and other smaller sites that have been part of the core clinical research-distributed network at CDU. Clinical research operations also provide a rich resource for CDU students completing a thesis or project or community service requirements.
B. MAJOR CHANGES SINCE THE LAST WASC VISIT

Major changes at CDU since the EER visit include the: (1) appointment of a new chair of the board of trustees and new board membership and the creation of a board of councilors, (2) completion of the 2010 financial audit demonstrating an improved financial condition, (3) establishment of a provost model for academic decision making and accountability, (4) reconfiguration of academic degree programs, (5) board of trustees review and approval of key documents, including the strategic plan (see Appendix O), academic plan (See Appendix O), financial sustainability business plan (See Appendix P), facility master plan (see Appendix Q), Memorandum of Agreement on faculty rights and responsibilities, and statement on shared governance, (6) voluntary withdrawal of accreditation for the physician assistant program, and (7) start of the new School of Nursing in the new Life Sciences Nursing Research Education Building. These major changes are described in detail in Section III, Response to Issues Identified by the Commission and the Last Visiting Team. The organizational charts (see Appendix F) reflect and highlight key personnel changes at the University since the last site visit.

Three significant changes that span the five WASC issues are briefly highlighted below.

**Board of Trustees:** Change of the membership of the board of trustees took place on September 10, 2010, with the bylaws and legal structure of CDU remaining unchanged. The new board had its first meeting in November 2010, and subsequently demonstrated fiduciary responsibility by securing $5 million in new foundation support for the University. For more information on finance, see subsection III.C.

The board includes a new chair and vice-chair. The newly elected chair of the board of trustees, Dr. M. Roy Wilson, is chancellor emeritus at the University of Colorado Denver and a renowned ophthalmologist, researcher, and academic leader. Dr. Wilson served CDU for 15 years as a faculty member, department chair, and dean of COM. Dr. Wilson has assumed responsibility for the office of the president with delegated authority by the board of trustees. Dr. Wilson is not using the title of president, however, because he is not a candidate for president, and use of the title could cause confusion among presidential search candidates. The search process and status is described in subsection III. D.1.2.

Dr. Cornelius Hopper, vice president of health affairs, emeritus, University of California System, was named vice chair of the board of trustees. Dr. Hopper chaired the 2005 steering committee on the future of King/Drew Medical Center. On October 13, 2010, the board of trustees announced the formation of a presidential search committee, chaired by Dr. Hopper. The president’s job description and committee membership were formulated after extensive discussions with representatives of the search firm, Spencer Stuart; campus representatives at all levels; external partners; and friends of the University.

In addition to the reconfiguration of the board of trustees, a special advisory group called the board of councilors was announced in September 2010. The chair of the board of councilors is Los Angeles County Supervisor Mark Ridley-Thomas. The naming of Supervisor Ridley-Thomas is significant given the central role of Los Angeles county government in health care and the leadership role of the supervisor in rebuilding the MLK hospital, demonstrating a positive change in the relations between CDU and the County of Los Angeles.

Trustees and councilors are nationally recognized individuals. They are affiliated with governmental agencies, leading healthcare organizations, or academic partners in the Los Angeles region, committed to the long-term sustainability of CDU. Organizations include: the California Endowment (TCE), Catholic Healthcare West (CHW), Cedars-Sinai Medical Center (CSMC), Kaiser Permanente (KP), UCLA, and the University of Southern California.

For further information on presidential and board leadership, see the report in subsection III D.1.

**Voluntary Withdrawal of the Physician Assistant Program Accreditation:** On March 12, 2010, the CDU physician assistant program received a notice of adverse action from the Accreditation Review Commission on Education for the Physician Assistant (ARC-PA) following a January 4 to 5, 2010 site.
The action required a response within 30 days. A letter from CDU requesting voluntary withdrawal from ARC-PA accreditation was submitted. On March 22, 2010, ARC-PA responded and accepted the request, indicating that although we are voluntarily withdrawing from accreditation, students currently enrolled in the program are eligible to sit for the Physician Assistant National Certifying Examination (PANCE).

**Opening of the School of Nursing:** The Mervyn M. Dymally School of Nursing began its first class cohort of 17 students in August 2010. It offers the Entry Level Master of Science in Nursing (ELMSN) track, which is designed for non-nurses holding baccalaureate degrees in another field who are interested in completing course requirements leading to a graduate degree in nursing. Graduates of the program are eligible to sit for the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses and the Clinical Nurse Leader (CNL) certification examination. The second cohort for the ELMSN track is scheduled to begin January 2011 with an anticipated size of 40 students.

The Family Nurse Practitioner (FNP) track in the Master of Science in Nursing Program is scheduled to begin in January 2011 with an anticipated student body of 60. The FNP track prepares advanced practice nurses to manage the care of individuals and families across the life span. It is designed for nurses holding baccalaureate degrees who are interested in completing course requirements leading to a graduate degree in nursing. Graduates of this program are eligible to sit for the FNP national certification examinations through the American Nurses Credentialing Center (ANCC) or the American Academy of Nurse Practitioners (AANP).
II. STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

A. TASK GROUPS AND OTHER CDU CONTRIBUTORS

The extensive and collaborative work of the CDU-WASC committees and task groups form the basis of this Special Visit Report. This report was reviewed, discussed, and shared with the senior management, including administrative (vice presidents and chief financial officer), academic leadership (provost, deans, academic senate leadership), and board of trustees. Dr. M. Roy Wilson (chair of the board) reviewed the report, and Dr. Ronald A. Edelstein (ALO) finalized the report [CFRs 1.8, 3.8, 3.10, 3.11].

There were five task groups and over 35 individual faculty, students, staff, and management contributors.16

B. ORGANIZATION OF CDU RESPONSE TO ISSUES IDENTIFIED IN THE WASC ACTION LETTER

Following the EER in July 2009, CDU administration and the academic senate formed an oversight task force to lead the preparation of the 2011 Special Visit. The task force created a plan and established WASC task groups to ensure timely and tangible institutional responses to WASC recommendations, including short- and long-term planning goals. Task group efforts included: indentifying issues that needed resolution; providing step-by-step activities required for resolution of the issues; and identifying responsible staff with recommendations for accountabilities, timelines, accomplishments, and progress and completion.

The task groups were each focused on the major concern areas identified by WASC, as well as specific related issues identified by the CDU community and from communication on campus. A fifth task group, focusing on communication, was added in 2010 as it became clear to each of the task groups that issues surrounding communication merited special attention. The five task groups16 formed were:

1. Communications with WASC and CDU Community
2. Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management
3. Presidential and Board Leadership
4. Faculty Governance, Policies, and Development
5. Student Learning, Student Success, and University Endeavors

The WASC task groups were given broad assignments with some intentional overlap to obtain multiple perspectives.17 In this report, we refer to the task groups by the main area of WASC concern that they were addressing. Internally, the names used by these task groups differed from the WASC concerns (e.g., “organizational arrangements” instead of “faculty governance, policies, and development”). Task groups reviewed the WASC reports, action letter, and committee charges. One task group reviewed all communication media. Three of the groups made task and time charts for each specific area, and one task group framed its work in terms of a matrix of assessment tools and guidelines.

A number of documents served as background for the preparation of the CDU task groups, and these included the WASC EER team report received June 15, 2009; the CDU response to the WASC EER team report, the WASC EER action letter, the CDU summary of the EER action letter, the September 17, 2009 CDU report to WASC prior to a CDU leadership visit to WASC on September 21, 2009, the CDU task groups’ own recommendations and timelines, the CDU report of task groups, the executive council members’ accountability document, the interim report, and WASC Interim Report Committee action letter.

In October 2009, the CDU-WASC task groups communicated their results to a campus forum, which included students, faculty, administration, and the academic senate.18 A compilation of CDU task group recommendations and timelines was endorsed by the then-interim president on December 4, 2009 and sent to the campus community following review by the academic senate and the CDU chief restructuring officer. The ALO met with each member of the executive council individually and with academic senate representatives to review and clarify the assignments. Key tasks and assignments for which each executive council member was accountable were established by the ALO.19 Reports have been reviewed by all participants, including administration, and feedback was gathered to validate statements, evidences,
and conclusions. CDU submitted an interim report to WASC on March 1, 2010, and a conference call was held on May 5, 2010. Based on the interim review report, CDU developed a regularly updated dashboard for monitoring progress and implementation of recommendations as well as for reporting to the board of trustees. All CDU-WASC-related correspondence, information, internal reports, and materials are on file in the Office of the ALO and are available in the Team Document Room.

Overall, CDU worked to apply the needed actions to meet all WASC standards. Evidence and analysis are presented to support these conclusions. In an effort to assess the impact of the changes, verify the adherence to WASC standards, and document compliance, faculty groups were created and have developed five reports. Specifically, the academic senate and administration of the University formed a series of task groups in August 2009 to create a new structure for self-review and to implement recommended actions that address the issues noted in the Commission letter of July 2009. As mentioned before, the task groups were named paralleling the WASC issues of (1) open communication with WASC-CDU community, (2) financial sustainability, planning, and management, (3) presidential and board leadership, (4) faculty governance, policies, and development, and (5) assessment of student learning and student success and university endeavors.

C. HOW THE REPORTS WERE WRITTEN

All task group participants were given the WASC Special Visit instructions and a suggested format for completing each report. In addition, each task group was handed a charge statement by the academic senate and administration, the Commission letter, a CDU-prepared summary of the Commission letter, and the WASC and team recommendations to begin the process. The task groups met continuously, and the ALO provided additional information requested by faculty or suggested by WASC or consultants. Task groups were in charge of the contents of the reports. Administration worked closely with faculty throughout.

Responses to the issues identified by the Commission and the last visiting team were prepared by the task groups and administration. The groups wrote detailed reports that included major actions, process evidence, impact evidence, and conclusions. Each WASC concern noted in the WASC letter was addressed. The reports in this section highlight the key major changes since the site visit. For consistency, each report follows an outline composed of: summary of key concerns and issues, actions to address key concerns and issues, analysis of effectiveness and impact of change, and recommendations and plans for continuous improvement. More comprehensive reports are in the Appendices I, J, K, L, and M.

During the preparation for the Special Visit, CDU obtained expert assistance from a number of sources. The Executive Service Corps of Southern California (ESC) was retained because of its service to nonprofits through coaching, consulting, and capacity building by the use of experienced executives from higher education and related fields. The ESC team was composed of Jerry Weissman, John M. Coleman, Charles Lindahl, and Fred Samulon, who met with university administrative and academic leadership starting August 2009, to commence a formal project plan in two phases described below.

The first phase assisted CDU to crafting a clear plan for addressing the operational structures, processes, and systems needed to ensure that the University would develop into a high-performing organization beyond the minimum expectations for full WASC accreditation. One major outcome involved the financial restructuring process, including managing the financial reporting process for providing timely and accurate information for management and faculty. The second phase of the project entailed advice on matters related to academic planning, including the development of a revised strategic plan. A revised strategic plan was completed and has been reviewed by the board of trustees (see subsection III.C, Report on Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management for a detailed description). A mock site visit with ESC was held on August 25, 2010, followed by an internal mock review held on September 29, 2010.

In the fall 2010, CDU retained the services of Stephanie Bangert, executive director at Samuel Merritt University, an experienced WASC evaluator and former WASC associate director, to assist in an
evaluation of documentation and readiness for the anticipated Special Visit. A two-day working session with CDU-WASC leadership was held on November 2 to 3, 2010.\textsuperscript{22}

The written feedback from the ESC and the Bangert consultations has been useful in strengthening and improving systems, processes, activities, as well as in strategic planning and response to concerns of the WASC Commission. The conversations and collaborative dialogue resulting from the consultations have clarified and unified understanding among the task groups of the WASC accreditation process.
III. RESPONSE TO ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMISSION AND THE LAST VISITING TEAM

A. OVERVIEW
Over the past 17 months, CDU has worked as a unified community to align strategy, structures, personnel, processes, resources, and outcome measures to its mission. This intense work began shortly after the WASC Team Visit when the University underwent major self-reflection at the highest level, the board of trustees. This self-reflection initiated a series of events, which in a very short time led to major changes in leadership and faculty governance structure, and in turn, the educational process. The task groups and their reports parallel the five WASC concerns: (1) open communication with WASC-CDU community, (2) financial sustainability, planning, and management, (3) presidential and board leadership, (4) faculty governance, policies, and development, and (5) assessment of student learning and student success and university endeavors. These reports are presented below.

B. REPORT ON OPEN COMMUNICATION WITH WASC-CDU COMMUNITY

B.1 Task Group Report

B.1.1 Summary of Key Concerns and Issues
Key issues of concern were noted with respect to communication with WASC and with the CDU community. The concerns with communication with WASC include maintaining honest and open communication between CDU and WASC, open and honest communication about the review and accreditation process, and promptly informing WASC of new issues as they arise. Key issues regarding open communication within the CDU campus community included fear of retribution from administration; poor communication between faculty, staff, and students; and ensuring an open, transparent, and interactive environment for appropriate exercise of governance and decision making.

To address the issue regarding transparency and open communication with WASC officials and the CDU campus community, a WASC communications strategy was implemented by the ALO and CDU administration [CFRs 1.7, 1.9]. At the direction of the former interim president, Dr. Keith Norris, a Communications Task Group was created to address issues of communication and community engagement. A summary of action and impact highlights is described below.

B.1.2 Actions to Address Key Concerns and Issues
Communication with WASC: WASC and CDU developed a strategy to provide open communication institution-wide and put in place systems where the University could receive real-time feedback on critical issues. Furthermore, CDU has opened communication institution-wide and established systems where the university community could receive real-time feedback on critical WASC issues. CDU implemented this communication strategy as previously described in the CDU-WASC report dated July 7, 2009. Evidence of open communications as assessed by CDU was presented to WASC in a letter dated September 17, 2009 [CFR 1.9].

A second recent example of open communication between CDU and WASC included consulting with WASC to review the process for changing board membership and adding an advisory committee (board of councilors) to the board of trustees. The past CDU board chair had telephone communication with the then-interim president and ALO (who met in person) at the WASC office to discuss the plans and provide continuous updates on CDU’s progress. The new board chair, vice-chair, and ALO have had regular contact with WASC, including an in-person site visit, which took place on December 7, 2010 [CFR 1.9].

A dashboard of compliance activity was created by CDU and shared with WASC (by the ALO, then-interim president, and previous board chair) to provide a timeline of activity and evidence of change. This
chart is posted in large format in CDU meeting rooms and used in updates with the board of trustees on WASC-related communications. During the meeting at WASC office, the interim president and the ALO also were prepared to inform WASC of the planned changes in board leadership and membership (as discussed in subsection I.B), and as such, the final plans were approved by WASC prior to announcements the following day to the CDU campus and community. The impact of the leadership changes on the long-term sustainability of the institution was evident. Following the change in leadership, the new board chair called WASC to confirm actions, as well as to give an analysis of the new membership and direction of the board of trustees [CFRs 1.9, 3.9].

Communication with CDU Community: The campus strategies designed to transform communications dynamics included: (1) posted all WASC-related correspondence and communications on the CDU website [CFR 1.7], (2) developed a CDU-WASC leadership committee (deans, academic senate, faculty, and administration) that meets weekly [CFR 1.7], (3) convened meetings of the ALO and other academic officers with student government, (4) facilitated student recruitment to serve on WASC planning committees [CFRs 1.7, 1.9], (5) created a task group to develop a university-wide communications strategic plan, [CFRs 1.5, 1.7], (6) produced a weekly newsletter updated by the board chair [CFRs 1.9, 3.9], which is communicated to the campus community, (7) developed, administered, and completed analyses of a campus-wide communications survey and a campus “climate” survey [CFRs 1.4, 1.7, 1.8], (8) established a university-wide emergency response plan called Everbridge [CFRs 1.5, 1.7, 1.8], (9) conducted university-wide mock reviews and site visits [CFR 1.8], (10) developed a dashboard of compliance activity to provide a timeline of completed tasks and evidence of change [CFR 3.5], (11) developed a draft university-wide communications strategic plan to be vetted and adopted by faculty, board of trustees, students, and staff [CFR 1.7], and (12) planned a series of community colloquia to address community engagement issues. The draft university-wide communications strategic plan is based on best practices following a review of selected communications strategic plans at several regional and national universities [CFR1.8]. Add tionally, administration, faculty, students, and staff continued to participate in weekly and/or monthly faculty, student, and staff governance-related meetings [CFRs 1.4, 1.5, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9].

As noted, there were numerous actions taken to improve communication with the CDU community. Listed below are actions that most positively impacted communication as a whole.

1. The administration has established a system for open communication and transparency, via monthly all-employee forums where members of CDU senior management have made clear and concise presentations on the financial status of the University and change in CDU board leadership and other pertinent issues [CFRs 1.8, 1.9]. This is evidenced through the calendar of monthly employee forums, over the past 17 months.36

2. CDU administration, with input from faculty, established a deans’ council, which meets weekly to discuss academic program issues including faculty appointments and promotions, academic program review, strategic planning, and fiscal activities. The deans’ council holds a forum every Thursday for faculty campus-wide to discuss academic issues and policy [CFRs 1.4, 1.8, 3.8]. This is evidenced through the calendar of weekly deans’ council meetings and weekly deans’ council meetings with CDU faculty, which includes sign-in sheets reflecting attendance at these meetings as well as the agendas for these meetings (on file in the provost’s office).

3. The interim president, Dr. Keith Norris, established an open-door policy whereby any student, faculty, staff, senior management, or community stakeholder could arrange to meet with him at any time to discuss any relevant concerns and/or issues [CFRs 1.4, 1.7]. This is evidenced by the calendar of the open-door meetings Dr. Norris held with community stakeholders and/or faculty and students on file in the Office of the President.

4. Through the work of the academic senate and the committee on clinical and community programs, the community concerns committee, numerous issues have been raised, openly discussed, and resolved, including issues concerning: faculty governance, faculty representation on the board of trustees, faculty contracts and job descriptions, program reviews, WASC task group status reports, appointment of a new CDU president, board of trustee engagement, financial sustainability of the University, em-
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employee and community representation on the board of trustees, and the need for a university-wide communications strategic plan [CFRs 1.4, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 3.3, 3.8, 3.9, 3.11]. Monthly minutes of meetings of the academic senate, community concerns committee, and the committee on clinical and community programs are available, showing productive communication and collaboration.

5. A university organizational chart delineating senior management positions, reporting relationships, and decision-making processes was developed and shared with the CDU community and the Black Health Task Force. CDU administration appointed a CDU faculty representative to attend these weekly meetings [CFR 3.8], shown on the current organizational chart (see Appendix F).

6. CDU completed two surveys related to communications. In August 2010, the first, “CDU Communications Survey,” asked the campus community about preferred modes of communication and topics that should be addressed. Many of the suggestions have been enacted. The second survey, the “Campus Climate Survey,” conducted November through December 2010, specifically asked CDU faculty and staff to assess changes in their perceptions regarding issues of leadership and fear of retaliation. They were asked to compare the present climate with that of 2009 and to give feedback on these issues. Results indicated that most faculty and staff perceive a better campus climate and that fear of retaliation is no longer an issue. The survey was conducted anonymously so answers were not linked with personal identifiers.

B.1.3 Analysis of Effectiveness and Impact of Change

Communication with WASC: As a result of the communication actions and policy changes, CDU began a practice of proactively seeking consultation from the WASC liaison, Dr. Harvey, to strengthen understanding of best and sustainable practices. The improved communication with WASC has brought the CDU community together and created momentum to achieving WASC standards, which included self-assessment through two mock WASC site visits. These mock visits served to engage the CDU community in critical issues affecting the institution and created an atmosphere conducive to collective conversation, research, deliberation, and reflection that has enabled the University to chart a course of improvement since the EER. These expert consultation visits are described in subsection II.C, How the Reports Were Written.

Communication with CDU Community: The CDU-WASC task group process itself is evidence of open communication; faculty, administrators, and students came together to discuss and implement actions that addressed every aspect of the Commission’s findings and they reported these findings to the CDU community. Evidence of effective communication includes “report-outs” by: the faculty governance, policies, and development task groups resulting in changes in policy, as well as report-outs from the assessment of the Student Learning, Student Success, and University Endeavors Task Group resulting in a formal system for academic review and elevation of the task group to a university committee. A third improvement to communication resulted after the ESC mock site visit, which led to the establishment of a student affairs committee within the academic senate.

Charles Drew University has made great effort to maintain open, honest, and bidirectional communication throughout the University. Several examples of improved communication can be seen in the results of student government feedback, academic senate reports, and the increased number of people participating in governance-related activities The academic senate’s community concerns committee (which is now the committee on clinical and community programs) and more recently the newly established ad hoc communications committee have reviewed the WASC findings and CDU’s responses. These committees concluded that there has been substantial improvement relating to open and honest communications, including greater transparency in university governance, university operations, and ongoing communication with WASC and community stakeholders.

The “internal culture” of the University, especially as it relates to bidirectional communications has changed, as manifested in greater engagement within the community. The committee on clinical and community programs and the ad hoc communications committee concluded that there is greater open and honest communications and transparency at all levels of the CDU administration; there is also greater collegiality between students, faculty, and staff. Furthermore, fear of retribution by CDU administration has
diminished. Concerns regarding university governance, finances, and program reviews, for example, were formally presented to the academic senate legislative council for review and resolution. Notably, the number of concerns brought to the academic senate legislative council has decreased as communications and decision-making systems have become more effective [CFRs 1.4, 3.8].

Since September 2010, with the seating of the new chair and members of the board, there has been candid, open and honest, transparent communication regarding the current state of the University. Communications have also included briefings regarding plans to ensure that the University is financially sustainable and details regarding anticipated enhancement of shared governance between staff, faculty, and students [CFRs 1.4, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9]. The new chair of the board, Dr. M. Roy Wilson, has facilitated an all-employee forum to discuss the new board transition, answering questions concerning the sustainability of the University and preparation for the pending WASC site visit. Dr. Ron Lau has reinforced these efforts by convening a series of campus forums regarding the University’s financial sustainability, as an open forum for faculty, students, staff, and community stakeholders for asking questions.

CDU will continue to monitor preferred communication modes by conducting regular campus-wide communication surveys that gather feedback from students, faculty, and staff. In the spirit of a true educational environment, CDU has learned that communication effectiveness with on-campus and off-campus constituencies alike depends on clearly articulating communication goals, objectives, and measurable outcomes.

**B.1.4 Recommendations and Plans for Continuous Improvement**

CDU intends to implement new communications strategies that have been developed by the communications committee. Recommendations described below respond to the findings of campus-wide climate and other communication-related surveys and address issues concerning institutional culture, effectiveness, and operational integrity.

1. Continue proactive communication with WASC and facilitate multiple-stakeholder participation in WASC-sponsored education forums.
2. Administer campus-wide communications and campus climate surveys to faculty, staff, and students to gauge the quality of campus-wide communications. Survey results will be analyzed and disseminated via the university website and e-mail.
3. Continue to solicit input and make informed revisions to the draft university-wide communications strategic plan. The draft document will be presented to the board of trustees for review and approval following a vetting process with the academic senate.
4. Enroll all faculty, students, and staff to sign up on the Everbridge emergency response system and conduct emergency management drills on campus to determine the efficacy of the new system and to assess how well the campus community responds to a mock university-wide disaster drill.
5. Procure programmatic and financial support from administration to conduct the community engagement colloquial series for enhancing involvement of community stakeholders.
6. Monitor implementation and prioritize resolution of issues relating to university operations, policy, programs, finances, or governance.
C. REPORT ON FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY, PLANNING, AND MANAGEMENT

C.1 Task Group Report

C.1.1 Summary of Key Concerns and Issues
The WASC Commission letter indicated serious concerns regarding: (1) the short- and long-term financial sustainability of the institution, (2) budget controls, (3) financial management systems, (4) reporting and planning, (5) availability of resources for academic program expansion, (6) data related to student enrollment and attrition, and (7) processes for addressing student attrition. CDU has taken a number of actions to address each of these concerns, as described below.

C.1.2 Actions to Address Key Concerns and Issues

Sustainability: To support its near-term financial position, CDU employed various measures to lower operating costs and obtain additional funding. Over the past two years, the University restructured and reduced expenses by approximately $10 million [CFRs 1.8, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3] through reductions in force, lowering of salary levels, and other measures. These actions more appropriately aligned the institution’s costs with revenues, resulted in achieving break-even performance during the first half of calendar year 2010, and provided the basis for a balanced budget for FY 2011 (see Appendix P).

The board of trustees recently secured additional funding to further enhance CDU’s financial position. In November 2010, $10 million in Proposition 1D funding was received and applied to debt principal associated with the LSRNE building.\[41\] [CFR 3.5] resulting in a $25,000 reduction in monthly debt service payments. CDU also obtained a $2 million grant from The California Endowment (TCE) to support the transitional costs related to the appointment of the chair, consulting fees, and other ancillary costs [CFR 1.8] associated with initiatives related to assessment of core business functions, provision of management support, and strategic planning [CFR 3.5]. An additional $3 million grant from TCE was acquired with two equal installments to support debt service payments, with $1.5 million received in December 2010 and the remaining $1.5 million anticipated in June 2011 [CFR 3.5]. The $5 million TCE commitment enables the University to release funds that may be used to support academic undertakings, strengthen administrative infrastructure, and build reserves [CFR 3.5].\[42\] These additional revenues result in a projected budget surplus of approximately $1.0 million for FY 2011 (see Appendix P).

To ensure the appropriate use of its resources, a rigorous approach for testing the viability of academic programs has been instituted. In fall 2010, academic programs were assessed by evaluation criteria developed by the deans’ council,\[43\] using data from the ad hoc academic senate program review committee, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, and the Office of Finance. Programs were subsequently prioritized according to alignment with university academic priorities, academic performance, financial viability, and market demand.\[44, 45\] As a result of the review process, seven academic programs were identified for closure, suspension, or “teach out” over the next two years, with resources reallocated to strengthen remaining programs.\[46\]

The University has entered a 20-year affiliation with UCLA’s School of Nursing and is in the second year of a 10-year agreement with the University of California Regents ensuring UC’s ongoing support for the institution. The School of Nursing (SON) entered into a 10-year financial agreement for training family nurse practitioners with St. Jude’s College of the Philippines. A tuition-based model for increasing operating revenues, focusing on enrollment growth for the SON and COSH without a concomitant increase in costs has been adopted. Future academic program development will occur under the auspices of the university academic program review committee, with related budgetary analysis by the CFO as part of the committee’s deliberations.

Planning: Financial leadership developed the Financial Sustainability Business Plan – Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2015-16 (see Appendix P) [CFRs 4.1, 3.5] including five-year unrestricted revenue and expense projections and key financial ratios. The Office of the President coordinated a faculty-led, accelerated, university-wide strategic planning process [CFR 4.1] that aims to align key objectives with
initiatives organized by the framework set by the academic and business plans (see Strategic Plan) [CFR 4.2]. The strategic plan is monitored by the president’s chief of staff and reviewed at senior management meetings. A board-level strategic planning subcommittee was created to ensure participation in plan development. The draft strategic, business, and academic plans were reviewed by KDG Architects, the firm selected to update the CDU campus facility master plan. KDG assessed the alignment of space allocations with university objectives (see Appendix Q). Future planning related to academic programs will be driven by the University’s academic program review process as well as with the major institutional plans approved by the board.

Management: CDU has revamped its financial review and control processes, increasing investment of time and resources to ensure a higher level of fiscal discipline. Financial data is now systematically and consistently reviewed by the board of trustees and senior management and acted upon where appropriate. The finance committee of the board meets four times per year or more to discuss the budget, investments, and other financial matters. The CFO provides budget reports and analysis to the senior management team for evaluation and resolution. Expenditure reports are distributed to department heads on a monthly basis to inform adjustments in spending patterns and types of expenses [CFRs 1.3, 4.3]. The CFO issues a quarterly consultant/purchased service report for management’s review, reconciliation, and follow-up [CFRs 1.3, 4.3]. Budget and vendor reports serve as a principal internal control for financial management and are consistently monitored by the Office of Finance and the board finance committee [CFRs 3.5, 4.4].

Responding to a WASC concern, the Office of Finance has undergone a reorganization, resulting in more stable leadership. Consultants and temporary staff have been replaced with a CFO, controller, assistant controller, and supporting staff (see Appendix F) [CFR 3.5]. The office has updated its policies and procedures for review by the board finance committee; the board of trustees has approved those policies, and implementation has begun [CFR 1.3]. A formal budget process was instituted, including the establishment of a new reporting system with distribution of monthly financial reports using the Great Plains software system. The Office of Finance also developed a fixed-asset tracking system and an improved approach for research expenditures transactions.

Similarly, the Office of Student Administration was restructured into a more comprehensive Office of Enrollment Management Services. The purpose was to strengthen the recruitment and retention of students to support programmatic and financial sustainability. The new office is responsible for clear delineation and effective administration of financial aid, admissions, registration, and counseling. Positions supporting these functions have been newly created or upgraded through the recruitment of experienced, highly qualified personnel (see Appendix F), including hiring of a director of admissions, a director of institutional effectiveness and assessment, a registrar, and a retention coordinator.

These individuals provide the oversight, direction, management reporting, and planning necessary for improved admissions, enrollment, financial aid, and retention. For example, the retention coordinator, working with the deans’ council, director of admissions, and director of institutional effectiveness, has performed a qualitative and quantitative analysis of trends in attrition. Based on these results, a student retention framework has been designed for early identification of attrition risk and timely remedial action [CFRs 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3].

As part of an institution wide effort to facilitate student success, the Dean of COSH secured a grant from the Department of Education and hired a retention coordinator, who is responsible for assisting students and implementing strategies to improve student retention rates. In addition, the coordinator is charged with leading a working group to address student attrition (comprised of the retention coordinator, the director of institutional effectiveness, and representatives from the deans’ council) and providing the deans’ council and the provost with student retention/attrition management and control reports. As a result of the analysis performed by the working group, a comprehensive program to improve identification and support of students at risk for attrition has now begun.
Students who are potentially at risk for attrition will be identified at time of admission based upon specified pre admission characteristics. These students will be provided with increased surveillance of academic performance, workshops, and formal courses designed to increase student success. At risk students will also be identified during the semester based upon evaluation of student performance at weeks four and ten of the semester. All students who are identified to be at risk during the semester will have their progress reviewed by a standing promotions committee, whose charge includes working with program directors, faculty, and learning skills personnel to develop a plan for remediation and to monitor the effectiveness of remediation interventions and student support programs.

Data from the Office of Enrollment Management Services was used to calculate retention rates, graduation rates, and academic program market demand profiles (number of applications, admissions, and enrollment). Institution wide and college level rates were generated as well as rates associated with subgroups (e.g. race/ethnicity) and specific academic programs. These data were used to inform institutional academic program review, program array determination and program improvement efforts. Use of these data has been formally incorporated in these respective processes.

Quantitative and qualitative analyses have been performed to identify and characterize specific reasons for student attrition over the last three academic years. Quantitative analysis indicates that the most frequent reasons for lack of student retention are financial issues (36%), personal (non-academic) issues (20%), academic issues (18%) and lack of fit/lack of interest in CDU(18%). Interviews of students who dropped out, program directors, and faculty provided further information related to reasons for attrition.

Policies, procedures and processes related to data acquisition, input, output, and data management are currently under review by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The review is scheduled for completion in January 2011. The results will inform the long-term solutions needed to effectively manage student enrollment and retention. The Office of Enrollment Management Services will implement the recommended student enrollment and retention program [CFRs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3].

C.1.3 Analysis of Effectiveness and Impact of Change
As a result of its review, the Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management Task Group concluded that the University has successfully executed several key initiatives to ensure sustainability. Financial performance and management have improved, resulting in a projected surplus for the institution; reduction of university debt; completion of the 2009 annual financial audit [CFR 4.2]; and completion of the 2010 annual financial audit. Senior leadership has taken a more active approach to budget management and revenue enhancement to ensure continued fiscal discipline. CDU’s planning processes are more thoughtfully considered, aligned, and implemented than in the past. Strategic initiatives are incorporated into the business plan and reflected in the projected use of facility resources and space. Management data and financial information were collected and used to inform academic program review and redirect resources to high-priority programs [CFR 4.1]. The institution has addressed infrastructure and data management shortcomings related to attracting and retaining students as described above. Importantly, faculty and management accountability, continuous assessment, and quality assurance are recognized and accepted as critical standards for institutional success [CFR 1.3, 1.8, 2.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4].

C.1.4 Recommendations and Plans for Continuous Improvement
The actions described above represent significant progress. CDU is engaged in or plans to initiate other key activities to ensure financial and programmatic sustainability, including:

1. Enlisting in-kind support from partners. Board of trustees and board of councilors will assist with identifying and filling short-term needs in core functional areas.
2. Renewing its efforts to increase fund-raising, including a more fully developed alumni association and implementation of an employee contribution program [CFR 1.3].
3. Drafting preliminary plans for a master’s-level physician assistant program (contingent upon WASC accreditation and alignment with the new ARC-PA accreditation standards) as part of the strategic planning process.
4. Developing growth plans for remaining academic programs that align with projected available resources⁵² [CFRs 1.3, 1.8, 3.5, 4.1].
5. Improving financial reporting for core units and the overall institution, including creation of actual-to-budget variance reports.
D. REPORT ON PRESIDENTIAL AND BOARD LEADERSHIP

D.1 Task Group Report

D.1.1 Summary of Key Concerns and Issues
The WASC Commission letter indicated concerns about the stability of leadership at Charles Drew University and its ability to make sound, evidence-based decisions in a timely and transparent manner. Based on self-reflection and analysis, actions have been taken by CDU, including: (1) transition from the previous administration, (2) reorganized membership of the board of trustees and creation of the board of councilors, (4) new presidential leadership, (5) clarified academic decision making, (6) increased transparency and accountability, (7) formalized shared governance, and (8) focused strategic planning.

D.1.2 Actions to Address Key Concerns and Issues
Timeline of Major Actions/Changes:
After the WASC EER visit, the team report (April 2009), and Commission letter (July 2009), the University entered into a period of reflection followed by action. The board of trustees accepted the resignation of the CDU president, Dr. Susan Kelly, in May 2009. The board of trustees voted Keith Norris, M.D., to serve as interim president. As noted in the introduction, a board of trustees with new membership was announced in September 2010, as well as the establishment of a special advisory group called the board of councilors. The board of trustees also announced the formation of a presidential search committee. Refer to subsection III.C.1.2, Report on Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management, Actions to Address Key Concerns and Issues for actions by taken by the board in fall 2010.

Transition from Previous Administration:
In May 2009, Dr. Keith Norris assumed the role of interim president with specific charges related to concerns expressed by faculty, community, external stakeholders, and the WASC site team. Dr. Norris was tasked to oversee changes to bring about an internal shift in the culture and processes of the University. Initiatives included: setting an institutional vision and instilling an institutional culture focused on accountability and educational excellence that respects the CDU mission and founding principles, reducing deficit spending and ascertaining the true (short-term and long-term) financial state of the University (including the fiscal impact of the new LSRNE), establishing highly functioning operations, rebuilding community trust, and transforming CDU governance at the highest levels.

The interim president and board chair created avenues for open communication and improved leadership, which was discussed above in subsection III.B [CFRs 1.9, 3.8, 3.9]. Another important step, in response to faculty and student requests for representation, was a change in the board bylaws to include a student and faculty trustee [CFRs 1.7, 3.11]. A proactive relationship with external stakeholders and WASC officials to evaluate institutional progress was established, including the board review and approval of strategic, academic, business, and facility plans [CFRs 1.3, 1.7, 1.8, 1.9, 3.5, 3.8, 3.9].

Since 2009, the administration worked closely with the academic senate finance committee to reduce the annual core-operating budget for 2009-10. Under the interim president’s leadership, CDU began the process of strategic planning, which reengaged the academic senate and community. The planning process required an emphasis on accountability, excellence with compassion, a tuition-based model for achieving self-sustainability, and a refocus on health professional graduate programs.

Reorganized Membership of the Board of Trustees and Creation of Board of Councilors:
Members of the former board of trustees, on reflection, realized that they had made serious mistakes in oversight and decision making, including in regard to attracting and retaining an effective chief executive officer. The board decided to change its membership, focus on reviewing the administrative structure, and obtain external expertise to assist in the presidential search and selection process. New trustees were selected based on the experiences and resources that each new board member could bring to enhance CDU, including experience serving on other, similar boards [CFRs 3.8, 3.9]. The board of trustees, including a new chair and vice-chair, seeks to enhance accountability of leadership and the level and
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intensity of oversight across campus [CFR 1.3]. The newly elected chair of the board, M. Roy Wilson, M.D., is a nationally renowned health professional academic leader who served as a department chair and dean of the College of Medicine (COM) at CDU for a number of years in the 1980s and 1990s.

New Presidential Leadership:
As highlighted in subsection I.B, Major Changes Since the Last WASC Visit, the interim president began to implement a wide variety of new policies and procedures designed to make CDU a compliant and sustainable institution for the long term. At the direction of the reorganized board, CDU initiated a presidential search in October 2010, and Dr. Norris returned to his previous role as EVP of Research.55 Dr. M. Roy Wilson, chair of the board of trustees, is assuming responsibility for the office of the president per delegation of authority by the board of trustee [CFR 3.10] until such time as a new president is installed. See subsection I.B., Major Changes Since the Last WASC Visit for details.

Being mindful that CDU would benefit greatly from assistance in the search for solid candidates for president, CDU enlisted outside expertise to help determine what qualities the CDU community requires in a president and to assist in attracting the best candidates. To this end, CDU is working closely with the internationally renowned academic search firm Spencer Stuart. The criteria for a new president was informed by a series of interviews that included a diverse group of students, administrative officials, faculty, community members, and stakeholder/partner health organization leaders.11 These criteria are also based on a survey conducted by the leadership task group that asked campus and community members what qualities and leadership styles they valued most in a CDU president.56 The presidential search committee includes members of the board of trustees, faculty, staff, community, and students, to find the best possible candidate for the position. A job description for a new president, and membership for the selection committee, was formulated after extensive discussions with representatives of the search firm Spencer Stuart11 and campus representatives at all levels, external partners, and friends of the University. In September, the board of trustees retained the executive search firm, Spencer Stuart, to work with its appointed search committee to conduct a national search for the next president. Spencer Stuart spent two days on campus conducting interviews with faculty, staff, community members, and board members to better understand the context and what is needed in CDU’s next leader. Following these meetings Spencer Stuart worked with the search committee to draft a position specification that was subsequently approved by the board of trustees. The search firm is currently conducting market outreach and assessment to identify qualified and interested prospects for the role of president.

The committee will review prospect profiles provided by Spencer Stuart in January 2011 and select candidates to be further vetted and interviewed by the search committee. Once the search committee has met with and identified its finalists, they will provide their recommendations to the full board. The board will then make the final decision. The targeted timeframe for completion of this search is March 2011. Market response to this position has been very positive.

Clarified Academic Decision Making:
In February 2010, CDU created the Office of the Provost57 to reaffirm a commitment to academia, establish an administrative focus on academic freedom and accountability, and standardize and consolidate policies and procedures across the colleges and school. Faculty governance has been updated to reflect the current status of the University, including a new academic senate constitution and bylaws58 as well as updated workload, grievance, and appointments and promotions policies [CFR 3.8, 3.11].

A deans’ council, created in February 2010, meets regularly to ensure effective communications across the leadership of the colleges. The council consists of the deans of each of the colleges and schools. The council and each dean, respectively, report to the provost. Clear divisions of responsibility between the deans and the provost have been delineated with regard to a number of academic policies, particularly around the areas of program review and budget development based on the results of those reviews. This creates a consistent academic decision-making structure and an administrative home for institution-wide academic processes. The deans’ council works closely with the academic senate to develop faculty policies and processes, recently creating and implementing a salary scale and contracts for all benefits-eligible faculty.
The former academic affairs dean is now the associate provost and oversees institutional accreditations and institutional research/effectiveness, working closely with the provost, deans, faculty, and students. Creation of the provost's office improves campus decision making by providing a university-level academic administrator to make decisions, rather than planning and developing policies in each college independently, as had previously been the case. An example of this is the university appointments and promotions process for faculty. Decisions regarding junior faculty remain with the dean of each college. Appointments and promotions at the associate level and above will undergo faculty review by the campus peer review committee of the academic senate. The provost has final signature authority on associate professor actions, and the board of trustees has final signature authority on full and emeritus professor actions.

The new academic organization has increased transparency on campus as faculty, staff, and students have a better understanding of how academic decisions are being made. Moreover, faculty and administration are now committed to a culture of analytical self-reflection. Many of the actions last year reflect a more analytical approach. Program prioritization and realignment decisions, for example, were based on program review results and analysis of cost versus revenue for each program. The evidence used to make decisions was presented to the interim president and the board, with feedback solicited from faculty. Meetings continue on a regular basis, with the provost and deans' council providing a weekly forum for faculty to meet and ask questions about academic and faculty issues. Faculty are now included in discussions at the highest levels on campus, as representatives from the academic senate participate in senior management meetings, and a faculty and student representative now sits on the board of trustees.  

Increased Transparency and Accountability:  
Since the time of the 2009 visit, CDU has improved the performance and accountability of leadership on campus as well as increased transparency and consistency of the decision-making process. The most definitive action was the change in presidential and CFO leadership, as previously noted. Additionally, human resources and finance, which had been largely outsourced under the previous administration, have been restructured as internal offices. The finance office was reorganized under the leadership of Dr. Ron Lau, who was previously VP of finance for CDU from 1999-2007 [CFR 3.10]. The human resources office was completely reorganized, with a new director, Dr. Toni C. ELBoushi. In addition to these restructured offices, a clear organizational structure was created and disseminated on campus, and institutional policies and procedures were updated. Each academic and administrative department is also developing its own organizational chart and job descriptions (see Appendix F). Moreover, a policy repository was created on the campus intranet, and as policies and procedures are revised and updated, they are stored in the repository. Not only does this provide instant access to these documents for all campus constituents, but it also helps to identify the gaps in current policy and has helped to clarify the roles (ownership, advisory, decision making, etc.) of different groups with regard to individual policies.

Faculty and administration have been working together to increase communication among all constituencies of the campus community. The interim president/EVP held a number of smaller, informal group lunch meetings with faculty, staff, and/or students. Faculty forums and CDU-WASC task groups now meet biweekly to discuss faculty issues. WASC task groups have also presented regular updates to both the academic senate and senior management. The recently formed deans' council implemented a Thursday forum to address specific academic and faculty issues with faculty directly. Topics discussed include: faculty workload, proposed program cuts and closures, faculty contracts, and the appointments and promotions process.

Formalized Shared Governance:  
The deployment of WASC task groups served as a model for a shared governance approach. Since the 2009 WASC visit, administration and faculty have come together to address the concerns raised by WASC in a systematic, data-driven way [CFRs 1.3, 3.8, 3.11]. Since those groups began their work, a number of multilevel processes have been implemented on campus, including a budget review process that starts with the academic and strategic plans and incorporates faculty and unit input in prioritizing the items to fund (see Appendix P). The deans’ council and faculty have developed a salary scale, contracts, and proposals for
university workload standards. One important result has been that all benefits-eligible faculty (greater than half-time compensation) are now under contract. A board of trustees committee is reviewing shared governance practices on campus as stipulated in the board bylaws. A statement of shared governance was recently adopted by faculty and administration and approved by the board of trustees.\footnote{The statement of shared governance was adopted in July 2021.}

Faculty have taken a larger role in university governance. With less fear of retribution, faculty have been more active on campus. Since the time of the last WASC visit, the academic senate has approved a new constitution and bylaws, worked with administration to develop a Memorandum of Agreement\footnote{The Memorandum of Agreement was adopted in June 2021.} around faculty rights and responsibilities, and implemented a contract for all benefits-eligible faculty. The increase in faculty participation contributed directly to increased productivity in resolution of faculty governance issues. The new academic senate constitution and bylaws better reflect the size of the faculty, and a better framework for faculty business has been established for improvement and action.

**Focused Strategic Planning:**

The strategic plan is closely tied to financial realities, and new initiatives are being planned in the context of costs and resources (see Appendix M). The newly reorganized membership of the board of trustees has a renewed emphasis on strategic planning and has revised and updated the strategic plan developed over the last year to better reflect current need and financial status. Moreover, the academic and business plans for CDU are integrated with each other and are tied to both the university mission and the budget. The budget planning process relies on the goals of the University’s academic, business, and strategic plans for funding prioritization decisions.

**D.1.3 Analysis of Effectiveness and Impact of Change**

Change in board leadership led to an immediate increase in involvement in fiduciary responsibilities and strategic planning. As noted, the board of trustees has secured $5 million in new foundation support for the University. The board of trustees procured a $2 million grant [CFR 3.5] to offset the transitional expenses of the board chair and vice chair, hiring of a chief operating officer (COO), consultant (EGG Management Consultants, Inc.) fees, and other ancillary costs [CFR 1.8]. CDU completed negotiations with Sovereign Bank (the mortgage company for the LSRNE building) to modify the loan covenants. The University was successful in obtaining a lower rate; the board has secured a $3 million commitment of external support for the University to use to make loan or fee payments.

The period of self-reflection has triggered transformation throughout the University. Most of the major changes that CDU implemented were discussed above in subsection I.B, including the restructuring of the financial and budgetary systems, database system, leadership, fiduciary responsibilities, and strategic planning. Another important implementation was the creation of the deans’ council and the creation of the Office of the Provost (for more details, see subsection III.D.1.2) [CFRs 1.3, 3.8, 3.9].

The changes in senior leadership at CDU are transforming the institution. The emphasis now is on sustainability and evidence-based decision making, rather than top-down pronouncements and inaction. The activity of the newly reorganized board of trustees gives members of senior management the support they need to move forward with many of the major changes that have been proposed over the last few years but never previously had the traction to move forward. Over the last three months, with the backing and encouragement of the board of trustees, senior management has been able to implement new facility, business, and academic plans that had only been concepts previously. Further, there is a renewed focus on policy and process, and the gaps in CDU’s operations structures are being filled, as evidenced by the development of a campus policy repository on the CDU intranet and the review of policies and procedures at all levels, including those regarding finance, operations, and faculty.

Other than the reorganization of administration, there have been two major catalysts for change at CDU: the addition of the School of Nursing and the increased activity of the academic senate. The addition of a third college to CDU forced changes in administration and administrative decision making. With three colleges, the University needed to move to a “one university” business model for academic planning and process, rather than the previous either/or “two independent colleges” model employed by COSH and COM individually.
Initially, the role of academic oversight was fulfilled by the deans’ council, but the lack of clarity around decision-making hierarchy and leadership of the council made it clear that this could not be a permanent solution. Instead, the University moved to a provost model, which supplies independent university-level oversight of each college and provides a place to bring each college in alignment with the others. Even in the short time that the Office of the Provost has been in existence, it has facilitated important changes on campus, such as the implementation of a university-wide process for faculty appointments and promotions.

The other major catalyst has been the increased involvement of the faculty in university governance and the academic senate. Faculty have been instrumental in helping to understand not only what policies and processes were working (and not working) but also where the gaps in our policies and procedures are and what roles various campus groups have with respect to individual policies. Previously, the roles of ownership (developmental/revision authority), discussion (advisory authority), and decision making (final signatory authority) were somewhat unclear. Even the involved parties were often unsure who was allowed to review and who was allowed to make the final decision on a number of issues. The increased involvement of the faculty, and their insistence on transparency and accountability, has driven the process of policy clarification and development on campus. With regard to a culture of shared governance and transparency, CDU has also fostered changes. Although many small changes have taken place, together they have resulted in a more open and communicative campus. Relative to the 2009 WASC visit, over 90 percent of respondents to a recent campus climate survey described the climate as more secure, with significantly less fear of retribution, and more open communication.

D.2 Recommendations and Plans for Continuous Improvement

Although CDU has brought about a number of changes that make the University’s leadership more stable and transparent, further action will help sustain these initiatives in the long term and strengthen the University as a whole. The task group recommends that CDU leadership continue to pursue the following endeavors:

1. Hire a permanent president with a contract of significant length to allow for stability. Realistic goals and performance indicators, together with accountability steps, should be agreed upon by the new president and the board and incorporated into contracts and routine performance evaluations.
2. Develop departmental “information packages” for each administrative and academic unit that include: vision/mission statement, organizational chart, job titles and descriptions for administrators and staff, key roles, and goals and objectives for the unit. Publish these packages on the unit’s website.
3. Continue to work with faculty and other stakeholders to clarify ownership, advisory, and decision-making roles around various aspects of university business through communication and policy implementation. Develop a summary/abstract for each policy that spells out these roles.
4. Continue to improve transparency of process by utilizing the University’s web resources efficiently. Make the university website more intuitive and user-friendly and provide access to information that is useful to all stakeholders.
5. Regularly revisit academic, business, and strategic plans and update them when goals are achieved or revised. Incorporate these revisions into budget planning and management.
E. REPORT ON FACULTY GOVERNANCE, POLICIES, AND DEVELOPMENT

E.1 Task Group Report

E.1.1 Summary of Key Concerns and Issues

The WASC Commission letter findings indicated concerns regarding the level of faculty participation in institutional governance and decision making, as well as concerns regarding whether the senior administration had adequately addressed a series of university-wide initiatives on faculty appointments and promotions. WASC pointed attention to inconsistent use of terminology and the apparent lack of formal policy in such areas as academic freedom, faculty hiring, peer review, workload, contracts, and faculty development. CDU has systematically addressed these concerns and resolved long-standing challenges, as described below within the categories of faculty governance, policies and procedures, and faculty development.

E.1.2 Actions to Address Key Concerns and Issues

Faculty Governance:
The governance and decision making at Charles Drew University is now clear and effective. CDU now has clear lines of decision-making authority (see Appendix F) and a fully documented system of faculty governance with uniform standards for faculty rights and responsibilities, contracts and workload, peer review, and development. The creation of the deans’ council and the Office of the Provost in February 2010 marked critical turning points in the revitalization of faculty administrative and governance systems. The deans, provost, and academic senate leadership worked with administration and faculty across campus to establish university-wide faculty standards, streamline academic reporting, and maximize the effectiveness of decision making and accountability.

Many of the changes related to faculty governance were precipitated by the adoption of a “one university” vision, which effectively integrates and coordinates activities of the three academic units through the provost’s office. To achieve the vision, it was necessary to formalize faculty governance, standardize policies, and expand faculty development. For example, these changes are reflected in uniform appointment and promotions process, faculty contracts and workload, hiring policies, and faculty development programs.

To facilitate shared governance, a proactive engagement strategy was adopted, including weekly meetings with the campus community to discuss and receive recommendations regarding major decisions. Faculty and students now have representation on the board of trustees and academic senate representation in executive council meetings. The reconfigured academic senate completed its first term, and elections for the second term of officers and legislators were held in summer 2010. The academic senate legislative council includes elected representatives from COM, COSH, and SON, as well as the chairs of the COM Faculty Executive Board (FEB) and COSH Faculty Association (FA). Faculty governance body elections were also conducted for the FEB and FA, and their standing committees were reactivated.

Based on the reviews of the CDU-WASC task groups, the academic senate revised its bylaws and refocused its committee priorities to address specific areas of concern [CFRs 3.3, 3.11]. A notable outcome was the central role of academic freedom in the faculty Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), jointly authorized by faculty and administration. To ensure transparency on faculty rights and responsibilities, a copy of the signed MOA is prominently displayed on the academic senate and other CDU websites.

To provide faculty with stability in the terms of their appointments and with incentives for professional advancement, an academic senate ad hoc committee met with the deans’ council to draft workload and contract templates. The final faculty contract and job duty templates were distributed to faculty in August 2010 and were completed over a three-week period for the top-priority subset of compensated benefits-eligible faculty. The process by which the deans and faculty arrived at the contract agreement is a strong example of shared governance in decision making at CDU.
Policies and Procedures:
Emphasis on shared governance, academic freedom, and peer review is the cornerstone of an academic culture that can deliver quality student outcomes. In addition to rebuilding this foundation over the past 17 months, CDU has focused its academic infrastructure efforts on implementing university-wide policies and procedures for faculty. The tangible manifestations of the revitalized system includes revised board bylaws, an adopted academic leadership model (provost); an approved MOA on faculty rights and responsibilities; an approved agreement on shared governance; a revised designated authority document; complete and revised organizational charts (see Appendix F), with accompanying job descriptions; a revised academic senate constitution; and revised policies and procedures for university, student, faculty, and research affairs.

CDU has defined uniform standards for appointments and promotions (A&P) across the University and has established a university-wide peer review committee under the auspices of the academic senate. Faculty agreed on the need for consistent university-wide due process, and the committee is responsible for reviewing appointments or advancements at the ranks of associate, full, and emeritus professor. The first meetings of the academic senate A&P committee were held this past November and December. Active dossier review of faculty candidates commenced in December 2010.

The lack of a hiring policy for faculty has been addressed. Under new faculty hiring guidelines, prospective faculty members must be preapproved for appointment eligibility by the dean and department chair of the relevant school, and all compensated faculty positions must entail an open and competitive search. During the hiring process, all faculty candidates, irrespective of whether they are due to receive compensation, must undergo background checks and complete conflict of interest disclosures.

In addition to focusing on faculty affairs policies and procedures, CDU has systematically reevaluated institutional policies and procedures in all other areas of university affairs and updated or developed new policies to facilitate proper institutional functions and controls. CDU materials were compared with policies of other institutions in terms of clarity and organization and were assessed as to their continuing appropriateness for the current needs of CDU students, faculty, and staff. A secure web repository for posting these materials is under construction and will enable all university stakeholders with CDU e-mail privileges to use their account names and passwords to access the online application and search by keyword to quickly retrieve a PDF copy of a specific policy.

Faculty Development:
Faculty development programs have been reinvigorated to further promote faculty stability and academic advancement. Participants in Academic Boot Camp (ABC) have included research and teaching faculty members from all three colleges; administrators; program directors; deans of COM, COSH, and SON; and all of the COM associate deans and clerkship directors. Each ABC graduate completed a course portfolio based on rubrics for each element. Participants in ABCs and the faculty learning communities have presented their evidence-based scholarship of teaching and learning work at regional and national conferences in posters and panels. There are several current ongoing scholarly research projects to identify best practices in health professional education in areas such as simulation technology, metacognition, learning technologies, and leadership.

**E.1.3 Analysis of the Effectiveness and Impact of Change**
Faculty governance and due process, academic affairs policy and support structures, and administrative decision making are progressively aligning. Through close collaboration of the academic senate and administration, the decision-making process is much more inclusive and efficient. Therefore, the campus has been able to resolve long-standing challenges in developing faculty contracts and workload terms and to act expeditiously to address resource allocation issues. The terms of revised program arrays have been settled, and personnel gaps such as new directors for institutional effectiveness, student admissions, and the PA program have been filled.
The extent and intensity of faculty engagement in a wide array of administrative committees, councils, and faculty forums demonstrates the effectiveness of collaborative efforts by faculty, administrators, and other CDU stakeholders to reinvigorate shared governance. Faculty members lead and comprise the majority of representatives to the various WASC task groups—which were originally proposed by the academic senate—and full-faculty forums sponsored by the deans’ council have invited and led to lively dialogue on topics ranging from the formation of the Office of the Provost to the academic infrastructure needs of the University.

The tangible impacts of renewed shared governance between the academic senate and administration are most evident in: (1) adoption of an MOA between faculty and administration [CFRs 3.1, 3.3], (2) signed faculty contracts for all benefits-eligible faculty, (3) prioritization of academic programs [CFRs 3.5, 3.8, 3.11, 4.1], (4) adoption of an academic plan [CFR 4.2], (5) creation of job descriptions and filling of academic leadership positions [CFRs 1.3, 1.4, 1.8, 3.8], and (6) effective use of data systems in support of evidence-based administrative decision making [CFRs 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.4].

The establishment of a uniform policy and process for peer review, as well as for faculty hiring, contracts, workload, and development, is transforming CDU’s culture. For the first time since CDU’s inception, there is a university-wide A&P committee and an established uniform policy and process for academic peer review. Another first for the University is the creation of standardized faculty contracts with salary scales benchmarked by a national faculty compensation survey (from the AAMC). Faculty and administration can now apply consistent terminology and standards in evaluating the contributions and confirming the status of faculty across the various colleges of the campus. Faculty recruitment and retention efforts can now be aligned with the institutional needs and goals clearly articulated in the academic plan for the University and companion document for CDU today (see Appendix O).

The implementation of standardized faculty contracts and workload terms is especially significant. In addition to providing stability for current faculty, these precedents have the potential to improve recruitment and retention efforts by making the employment process transparent for prospective and continuing faculty alike. The concept of a maximum approvable salary with compensation thresholds increasing by academic rank also provides incentives for faculty to expand their efforts to secure promotions on a timely basis and to acquire sponsored research funding. The use of sponsored research funding to increase faculty salary caps is critical for CDU as a private nonprofit institution that does not have faculty tenure or a guaranteed revenue stream that would enable institutional base salaries.

The primary objective of the overall policy consolidation project is to increase the transparency and accessibility of current policies for all university stakeholders. The online inventory, which serves as the official repository of the master copy of policies and procedures documents, dramatically increases the efficiency of both the authors and users of official documents. Eliminating uncertainty regarding policy document location, official status, and gaps has enabled faculty and administration to expedite collaborative efforts on revising and reauthorizing legacy policy, drafting new policy for review and approval, and reconciling policy across different operational levels. With easy access to relevant reliable data, the quality of collaboration between faculty and management for academic planning and program administration has greatly improved. These changes are critical to building and sustaining an evidence-based approach to educational and administrative decision making [CFRs 2.12, 2.9, 2.13, 3.7].

The expanded faculty development programs have stimulated a campus-wide culture of evidence-based academic excellence. Building a common understanding and approach to the fundamentals of course design among faculty members made the mapping of program and student learning objectives to CDU and WASC standards clear and efficient. Similarly, improved financial reporting and a shared foundation for mapping of administrative unit objectives have increased our ability to effectively use data to support evidence-based decision making.
E.1.4 Recommendations and Plans for Continuous Improvement

Finalizing the changes implemented over the past 17 months will ensure that the University can sustain compliance with WASC standards for faculty affairs by developing a culture of evidence-based decision making and maintaining the academic infrastructure necessary to support quality student outcomes. CDU focused on rebuilding shared governance, academic freedom, and peer review as the cornerstones of a faculty culture that can deliver quality education outcomes. Each of the primary components of academic infrastructure was assessed, and its relevant policies and procedures were systematically updated.

The task group recommends extending participation in shared governance through the appropriate use of technology for effective collaboration among geographically dispersed faculty. Contracts with minimum workload agreements for part-time and non-compensated faculty should be developed. Targeted initiatives must emphasize enforcement of uniform application of policies and procedures, sustain the culture of evidence-based decision making, progressively align faculty resources with teaching/education needs, and fully incorporate research and clinical faculty into curriculum development and delivery.

With established avenues for more effective shared governance, CDU will accelerate the process of fully implementing and ensuring compliance with new and revised policies and procedures. Academic programs and personnel will be maintained on regular review cycles, and administrative program and personnel reviews will be completed full cycle. Next steps over the coming months also include fully disseminating policies and procedures to all university stakeholders, developing rubrics to assess success in aligning decision making with the academic plan, and evaluating the effectiveness of policies and procedures in meeting institutional goals.
F. REPORT ON ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING, STUDENT SUCCESS, AND UNIVERSITY ENDEAVORS

F.1 Task Group Report
This report is divided into two subsections: F.1 addresses student learning and student success, and F.2 discusses university endeavors.

F.1.1 Summary of Key Concerns and Issues
WASC Commission letter findings indicated that assessment at CDU was not at the minimum level expected for reaffirmation of accreditation: (1) CDU needed to have program- and course-level learning outcomes, (2) there was little evidence of collection, aggregation, and analysis of data in academic decision making, and (3) CDU needed a system of regular program review and quality assurance reviews for cocurricular programs, administrative units, and the governing board. CDU has taken a number of actions to address these concerns as described below within the categories of student learning outcomes and academic program review.

F.1.2 Actions to Address Key Concerns and Issues
Student Learning Outcomes: CDU has a fully implemented system for development and evaluation of learning outcomes. In addition to developing student learning outcomes, CDU academic programs have collected data and used data for positive changes in courses and programs. CDU faculty and program directors revised and modified their course and program student learning objectives (CSLOs and PSLOs) and aligned the CSLOs to their respective PSLOs and the University Student Learning Outcomes (USLOs). Programs with concurrent accreditation applied their respective national standards in the development of their PSLOs. The PSLOs were presented in an interim self-study report to the WASC Task Force for review and feedback. The list of PSLOs was reasonable, well organized, and focused on the students’ required competencies/skills for their respective disciplines and degrees.

CDU faculty used Bloom’s (revised 2001) taxonomy action words in modifying their CSLOs and PSLOs to make them measurable. PSLO statements describe how students can demonstrate the various learning, skills, and competencies achieved during matriculation and by graduation. Faculty members have rubrics for assessing students’ performance in term papers and presentations, and samples of student work at varying levels are kept in each program’s resource files. Samples of an MPH writing rubric and samples of student term papers, presentations, and thesis and capstone projects are on file.

Faculty and program directors mapped the CSLOs of their respective curricula to the updated PSLOs and USLOs indicating the increasing level of sophistication for each course with respect to each PSLO and USLO. Each college/school has guidelines for the annual assessment of SLOs based on the CDU program review guidelines, which includes a multiyear assessment plan for PSLOs. At the start of the academic year, faculty and program directors determine which PSLOs and USLOs they are planning to assess in the upcoming academic year, the measures they will use, and the performance indicator/benchmark/criteria for success to achieve the stated SLO. At the end of the academic year, faculty and program directors analyze the results of the assessments, compare them to the chosen performance indicators/benchmarks, and plan actions for improvements for the next academic year if the results do not meet the benchmark.

PSLOs are readily available within the CDU catalog, programs’ websites, programs’ recruitment brochures, and program-specific student handbooks. Graduate-level students self-assess achievement of their PSLOs at the end of each semester and upon graduation, through an exit survey. For example, the College of Medicine uses a comprehensive graduation survey, which is benchmarked to peer institutions. In addition, all syllabi are required to include not only their PSLOs but also going forward will include the USLOs.

Academic Program Review: CDU has a university-wide committee responsible for academic program review. CDU has implemented a system of regular academic program review and assessment across all colleges and schools [CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 3.9]. CDU programs use the academic program review guidelines,
which were approved by the academic senate to prepare the annual program self-reviews and assessments [CFRs 3.9, 3.11], and a multiyear schedule for academic program review is being used [CFR 1.2].

CDU faculty and program directors complete self-studies, which cover achievement of program goals, assessment of findings compared to benchmarking criteria, action plans to address any gaps found from the results of the analysis, and plans for the next cycle of assessment studies. Program self-studies are used by the deans’ council to make recommendations for annual budgets. For example, the 2010-2011 budgets include resource allocation for retention efforts and recruitment of a new director of the physician assistant program. In 2010, CDU programs were reviewed internally by their respective college educational policy committees and had qualified external reviewers evaluate the PSLOs, assessment plans, evidence, benchmarking, results, and assessment impact. The MPH program, general education, radiography, and nursing program have external review reports on file. Program directors and college deans used feedback to address highlighted issues and responded to the deans’ council with updates on these issues.

CDU students are respected partners in the program review process and are included in their program committee meetings. In addition, graduate students in both COM and COSH have presented poster sessions at CDU, demonstrating their knowledge, competencies/skills, and achievement of student learning outcomes. Graduate students also self-assess achievement of their program’s student learning outcomes and the university SLOs.

Opportunities for cocurricular education at CDU include involvement with student organizations, workshops, poster sessions, lecture series/seminars, internships/practicum, and interactions with faculty and others students in cultural events. Learning objectives for cocurricular activities are derived from the college and university PSLOs [CFRs 2.11, 4.6].

F.1.3 Analysis of the Effectiveness and Impact of Change

Student Learning Outcomes: The standardization of CDU’s annual assessment of SLOs across CDU has increased faculty, student, and staff awareness of the importance of a culture of evidence in all aspects of assessment because of its impact on improving student success. The variety of SLOs and approaches to assessment developed by CDU faculty reflects the rich array of the academic fields at CDU. This exercise proved to be a transformative experience for the faculty, involving them in the process of defining what they expect of students and how they measure whether students are achieving these expectations, as well as altering the courses, curriculum, and/or teaching methods in response to the assessment results. Faculty members are now able to develop teaching and learning strategies to meet program expectations for PSLOs and USLOs. In addition, students now are told and reminded of program and university learning objectives. The majority of CDU’s academic programs use an online survey of current students and alumni to assess awareness and achievement of PSLOs and USLOs.

Assessment practices within all academic programs were reviewed, and their impacts on student learning achievements were analyzed. Resources were redirected to address academic needs in identified programs. The deans now rely heavily on the results of program evaluation to make decisions in allocating resources (see Appendix O). The campus also invoked an evidence-based approach to strengthen various programs. The most notable result is that programs have designed processes to improve student engagement in assessment of PSLOs and USLOs.

The approved program review guidelines facilitated and clarified what is expected from program faculty, program directors, college educational policy committees, and deans to document the student success of the achievement of their PSLOs. Courses, curricula, and evaluation methods were revised based on assessment of course learning outcomes. CDU has collected, aggregated, and analyzed student data for academic decision making. An example of actions taken in response to achieving student success is the following: Fifty percent of MPH students scored 80 percent or above, instead of the anticipated 80 percent of the class, when they were assessed on the program SLO of “identify community health problems and ethnic/racial health disparities using epidemiological, biostatistical, and community monitoring methods.” In response to this, the course instructor will now spend an additional class session giving a more in-depth
description of methods used in identifying community health issues. A question on the quality of the additional lecture will be added to the course evaluation, and student performance exam data will be analyzed to see if the benchmark was accomplished.

In a second example, the family medicine course determined that students should have an experience that includes exposure to a diverse group of ages (SLO/competency: patient care to a diverse group of patients). When faculty analyzed the patient log data, they found that there were not enough patients under the age of 21. As a result, the faculty added two community pediatricians as part of the rotation, and student exposure to this age group increased dramatically.

**Academic Program Review:**
The program review process has resulted in several major changes in the university structure. The development of the deans’ council and the Office of the Provost as well as the university academic program review committee was essential to providing the necessary infrastructure and oversight for the academic review process. In addition, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment now reports to the deans’ council and provost to ensure optimal assistance in academic planning and resource allocation for each college/school.

The analysis of data resulted in informed decision making regarding program activity. For example, there were seven program closed resulting from program review. The data is also used at the course level. In an example of how the program review process impacted decision making for the MPH program, 43 percent of the MPH students noted concern with regard to conflicts with Monday classes and holidays, which result in fewer days to review course material. The MPH classes were changed to Tuesday for the 2010-2011 academic year.

**F.1.4 Recommendations and Plans for Continuous Improvement**
1. CDU will complete the cycle of formal institutional academic program review process for 2010-2011.
2. The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment will assist program directors and deans to engage faculty in the continuous improvement of student data benchmarking.

**F.2 Administrative Review Summary (University Endeavors)**

**F.2.1 Summary of Key Concerns and Issues**
CDU needs quality assurance reviews for administrative units.

**F.2.2 Actions to Address Key Concerns and Issues**
CDU has expanded its use of assessment beyond the academic arena to include administrative areas. Policies and procedures for the review of administrative offices were adopted on October 10, 2009, paralleling the process for academic review [CFRs 1.3, 3.8]. During this same time period, the interim president organized an administrative restructuring committee led by the acting vice president of administration and chief restructuring and risk officer [CFRs 3.8, 3.9, 3.11].

Self-reviews were used by the restructuring committee to make recommendations for the university budget. As part of the self-review process, policies and procedures for each administrative office were also reviewed. Additional deliverables resulting from administrative units review include a new organizational structure for the University approved by the board of trustees, and job descriptions for senior management were rewritten and approved. All programs completed a common template for assessment and a standard format for self-review. In addition, the administrative programs have been mapped using WeaveOnline for alignment to the university mission. Due to the velocity of change at the University, not all programs have been through a complete cycle of internal and external review using the standardized form.

The challenge at CDU was to implement a systematic administrative review process during a time of great change. The organizational chart outlines the major administrative and academic units at the University, and the changes that have occurred over the past two years. A key element of the process was Interim
President Norris’ creation of a university restructuring committee led by the acting vice president of administration/chief restructuring officer in October 2009. A multistage process for standardized administrative review was implemented in January 2010.

As part of the uniform process, external reviews were conducted using data gathered through the internal review process. Many administrative offices and programs used external review information to organize objectives, benchmarks, and changes in their programs to produce quality work. ECG assisted the University in assessing results of the standardized administrative review process and is in the process of making recommendations for improvement. Development of a multiyear comprehensive review cycle for an administrative reorganization has begun.

F.2.3 Analysis of the Effectiveness and Impact of Change

Impact of Administrative Review: The major university administrative offices and the administrative offices of the deans created goals, objectives, and benchmarks. Offices have assessed 2009-2010 goals and objectives and have implemented corrective actions as appropriate. Many offices have undergone external reviews. Findings from external consultations have resulted in numerous actions. For example, Executive Service Corps of Southern California (ESC) assisted in the review of the human resources office in 2010. The impact of the review was to eliminate external consulting resources and instead hire a qualified internal staff responsible for designing a new internal office to optimize effectiveness.

Other examples of changes made based on external consultations include:

1. The provost office has reconfigured reporting lines and job responsibilities for university student administrative offices (Registrar, financial aid, admissions).
2. The Office of Sponsored Programs was reorganized based on recommendations from NCURA and on-site consultation with Dr. James Perkins to implement those recommendations, resulting in revamped processes for handling personnel action forms, pre- and post-award management, and financial issues related to grants management (coordination of research office and finance office, regulatory compliance issues, etc.).
3. The library and learning resources division implemented recommendations on staffing and holdings from external review and conducted a rereview in December 2010.
4. The president’s office reorganized the division of development and communications based on recommendations by Janet Levine, an external development specialist working closely with the board of trustees advancement committee.
5. The finance office reorganized based on recommendations from the new CFO, ESC, and Pricewaterhouse Coopers.

Self-reviews were used by the restructuring committee to make recommendations for the 2010-11 budgets. As part of the self-review process, policies and procedures for each administrative office also were reviewed. Additional deliverables resulting from program review include a new organizational structure for the University approved by the board of trustees, rewritten and approved job descriptions for senior management, and revised policies and procedures.

F.2.4 Recommendations and Plans for Continuous Improvement

Recognizing the need to establish a common administrative review process, as noted earlier, the new chair of the board engaged ECG Management Consultants, Inc., to conduct an external review of the administrative and operational framework at CDU. ECG’s scope of work entails a 3-month detailed assessment that has examined: (1) administrative and programmatic performance and infrastructure, (2) financial performance, (3) management organization, (4) business functions, and (5) reporting and processes.

In November 2010, ECG completed a number of actions related to its assessment, including:

1. Collecting and analyzing business function and programmatic information such as:
   - Organizational charts.
• Descriptions of core business functions and processes.
• Position descriptions for individuals in key business operations roles.
• Inventory of business systems.
• Descriptions of key educational and research programs and attendant financial plans/budgets.
• Samples of monthly financial and other management reports.
• Copies of annual reports, previous reviews/analyses, and other pertinent documents.

2. Conducting interviews with key internal and external stakeholders regarding the scope and effectiveness of, as well as potential improvements to, business operations and functions.

During December 2010 and January 2011, ECG will conduct following activities: (1) evaluate the reporting tools and processes used to manage CDU and to communicate with external entities and stakeholders, (2) assess business processes and systems, and (3) prepare a data book to include performance benchmarks of peer institutions for review by the board of trustees and other stakeholders. The data book will be presented to the board at its February 2011 meeting providing current status of the University with key accomplishments and remaining challenges, as well as immediate and long-term recommendations to enhance business functions and organizational framework.

CDU has established processes for academic program and administrative reviews, which have established a culture of evidence and assessment of student learning, student success, and university operations [CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 3.9]. The review process of academic and cocurricular programs, administrative units, and the governing board has led to improved communication between faculty and academic administration. The complete administrative reorganization and the first cycle of external review of the organization as a whole have been scheduled.
IV. IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER CHANGES OR ISSUES CURRENTLY FACING THE INSTITUTION

All significant issues or changes likely to occur at CDU have been addressed in the preceding section.
V. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

Charles Drew University has a long, successful history of educating students who are leaders in the care of minority, underserved, and disadvantaged populations. The University has a record of graduates, faculty, and administrators who have earned national leadership positions including a surgeon general, university president/dean/chancellor, academic healthcare executive, American Medical Association vice president, and others. Numerous CDU faculty members serve in prestigious national academies and academic societies. These success stories are due in part to a unified commitment to the CDU mission, the community, and the passion for the CDU “family.” Students, faculty, and staff select CDU for its focus, diversity, and outcomes tied to mission.

The Drew Medical Education program’s innovative work on preparing students to care for the underserved has become a model (“the prime program”) adopted by the University of California. The CDU/UCLA Medical Education program is now recognized as a top UC medical education program in terms of diversity of its student body. CDU research faculty receive competitive grant funding in greater proportion to our size, and that ranks us high in research support for private universities. CDU faculty and student research work is concentrated on solving high-impact healthcare problems of minority and disadvantaged populations. CDU is a federally funded national center for translating basic science and clinical research into community health (from the scientific bench, to the hospital bedside, and then to prevention and public health of the community). Most faculty have advanced training and hold degrees at the doctorate level. The students of the College of Science and Health (COSH) Masters of Public Health and College of Medicine (COM) work with research faculty and team with partner institutions. Students complete capstone or thesis research projects involving the community, making important contributions to correcting health disparity. These projects are of high quality and often are externally reviewed and presented at local and regional conferences or submitted for publication. The new graduate program in the School of Nursing (SON) has similar requirements of students in order to produce nurse leaders who are engaged in scholarship.

CDU Vision: The vision as set forth in the academic plan builds upon our accomplishments to date, setting a trajectory over the next two years on strengthening and expanding our graduate health professional degree programs. We will also focus on strengthening and expanding enrollment in our baccalaureate-level pre-health professional programs as a pipeline to our graduate offerings. Additionally, our associate degree health professional programs will be transitioned into bachelor degree programs. When all transitions and additions are completed, we anticipate an academic array of seven advanced degree programs and four baccalaureate-level programs. The business plan and strategic plan now provide consistent benchmarks and projections for achievement of the graduate-focused model.

Achieving Institutional Goals: The significant and wide-ranging changes that have taken place at CDU in response to the WASC Commission findings have led to the realignment of academic programs and a new focus on graduate health professional programs. Significant changes in organizational structure and leadership have been required, and many have been accomplished as described in this report. Analysis of each program alignment to institutional mission, financial sustainability, post-graduate market attainment, linkages to other programs, and contribution to the educational goals of the University have led to greater self-reflection and improvement. Faculty participation has increased dramatically, resulting in greater engagement with institutional strategy and success, as well as in better, informed decisions. New, formal processes of review have led to necessary reductions in program offerings. The institutionalization of these changes in organizational leadership, fiscal responsibility, communication, and data-driven decision making were critical to aligning institutional culture around academic integrity in order to achieve the goals of the University.

The past 17 months has initiated important institutional work to address WASC standards and concerns. CDU has focused on best practices to gain understanding of methods of improvement and ways to develop effective action plans. The faculty and administrative task groups produced achievable short-term and long-range recommendations, which have either been completed or integrated into the fiber of our institutional
processes for continuous improvement. The new members of the board of trustees have the requisite expertise for governing a health professional university, including university executive leadership, healthcare systems, government, finance, and strategic planning at regional and national levels. They are already deeply engaged in review and interconnection of academic plans, business plans, facility plans, and strategic planning. The chair of the board works on campus and is an active hands-on leader. He has assumed responsibility for the Office of the President with delegated authority by the board of trustees. The search for a president is underway with full university participation and is on schedule.

The collection and organization of evidence for purposes of academic and administrative review, including evidence requirements of the WASC accreditation process, has significantly strengthened the capability of CDU for self-assessment, change, and improvement. Members of the board are fully briefed on WASC standards, and they govern CDU with a focus to ensure compliance. The chair and vice chair interact with WASC frequently, including an in-person visit on December 7, 2010 to review the financial status of CDU, presidential search, role of Dr. Wilson as board chair with chief executive/presidential authority, and update on this Special Visit Report. The president’s cabinet is stable, with a mix of senior leaders with extensive experience at CDU and new leaders with a wealth of best practice experience from other institutions. A provost office is in place, and the effects of the deans’ council and alliance with shared academic governance are demonstrated by the execution of tough decisions based on evidence that may not be popular based on institutional history and/or culture. The deans’ council reviewed all academic programs along with reports from the academic program review committee. The results led to many changes, including program closures, redirected resources, reorganization of enrollment services, and institutional effectiveness and assessment divisions. The deans’ council directed funds to support library resources, educational technology infrastructure, and enhancement of simulation centers.

The need to expand the student base for program viability is an issue being addressed by the provost and deans with an enrollment management plan. The small size of our student body allows us to communicate with students directly and provide the hands-on mentoring and attention that are important hallmarks of clinical and health sciences education. We will continue this emphasis on student-centered learning as programs grow. We are reviewing all of our institutional student data to analyze, test, and fully implement the capability of our academic information systems.

The administrative units of CDU are now aligned with the student-centered focus of the strategic plan. The chair and the board of trustees have completed the first stage of a “top to bottom” external review of all offices, which will be supplemented by ongoing external review. A parallel process has engaged each administrative office to review objectives, policies and procedures, staffing, and position descriptions.

The issues and recommendations raised by the Commission have positively impacted Charles Drew University by providing both a roadmap and a renewed energy for building a sustainable learning organization. In addition, preparation of the Special Visit Report has served to catalyze necessary implementation of evidenced-based decisions. Immediately following the last WASC visit, CDU began reflecting on the core mission and rebuilding around its values as a health professional university dedicated to educating students for a new era of healthcare reform. The new board chair, trustees, and councilors have brought much-needed resources to the campus in a short period of time, and they provided positive closure on many long-standing issues related to our new research and nursing building and its associated bonds and bond covenants. The accomplishments of the new board of trustees have already reinvigorated the campus.

Institutional reflection has included dialogue with WASC, students, faculty, staff, and community partners. One of our foundation partners provided support for senior consultants (Executive Service Corps), who assisted the administration in many ways, including conducting a self-review, performing strategic planning, and advising senior CDU administrative leaders. The entire campus community has come together to reflect on and rebuild CDU based on the tasks identified by the WASC Commission with a fervor not seen in many years on our campus. The task groups, which included the academic senate, other faculty, administration, and community representation, have all embraced the efforts to rebuild CDU. The
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University, with its focus on WASC standards over the past 17 months, has been very successful in inculcating a culture of continuing performance improvement needed for student excellence and institutional growth in the coming years. We are now in substantial compliance with all of the WASC standards, and we will continue to improve as an institution to consistently be nationally recognized as a premier learning university.

In Summary: Responding to the findings from the WASC Commission offered CDU a critical opportunity to undergo systematic reflection, analysis, and action. The University has reevaluated its organizational values, culture, structure, and processes, and CDU has initiated evidenced-based changes necessary to achieve its goals of being a compliant, sustainable, and quality university. These transformations will enable CDU to achieve its abiding mission of educating students to become health professional leaders who are uniquely prepared and will serve with excellence and compassion in improving the health of underserved communities.

“Excellence in performance transcends artificial barriers created by man.” – Dr. Charles R. Drew
VI. REFERENCES

NOTE:
All references noted in the CDU Special Visit Report are available on the flash drive distributed with the report and/or available in the Team Document Room for reference during the visit.

1. CDU Catalog 2009-2011 [http://www.cdrewu.edu/assets/pdfs/CDUCatalog20092011online.pdf]
2. Program Array Table on Flash Drive
3. List of Clinical Affiliations in Team Document Room
5. Research Summary Table on Flash Drive
6. Memorandum of Agreement - Signed 060810 on Flash Drive
7. CDU Statement on Shared Governance on Flash Drive
8. CDU Request to Withdraw Accreditation for PA Program 031810 on Flash Drive
9. Broadcast Email re: Future of CDU 091010 and Letter from M Ridley-thomas on Flash Drive
10. Broadcast Email re: President's Search Committee Members 101310 on Flash Drive
11. CDU President - Position and Candidate Specification on Flash Drive
12. Board of Trustees and Board of Councilors Announcement on Flash Drive
13. ARC-PA Notice of Adverse Action on Flash Drive
14. ARC-PA Acknowledgment of CDU Withdrawal Request 032210 on Flash Drive
15. ARC-PA Letter re- NCCPA Policy on Flash Drive
16. Task Groups and Other CDU Contributors on Flash Drive
17. CDU WASC Task Group Summary and Invite on Flash Drive
18. Summary of WASC Findings and Recommendations - Presentation on Flash Drive
19. AA Report to the CDU Community 011310 on Flash Drive
20. Broadcast Email re- Coordination of WASC Compliance 120409 on Flash Drive
21. Mock Site Visit Schedule 082510 on Flash Drive
22. Stephanie Bangert Visit Schedule 110210 on Flash Drive
23. CDU WASC Report 091709 on Flash Drive
24. FAQs regarding WASC Actions on CDU on Flash Drive
25. Dashboard in Team Document Room
26. CDU Communications Strategic Plan on Flash Drive
27. Community Concerns Committee Meeting Minutes in Team Document Room
28. Committee on Clinical and Community Programs Meeting Minutes in Team Document Room
29. Committee on Clinical and Community Programs Meeting Sign-in Sheets in Team Document Room
30. Community Concerns Committee Meeting Sign-in Sheets in Team Document Room
31. Ad Hoc Committee on Colloquia Series and University Communications Sign-in Sheets and Agendas in Team Document Room
32. College of Medicine Faculty Executive Board Meeting Schedule and Agendas in Team Document Room
33. College of Medicine Full Faculty Meeting Schedule and Agendas in Team Document Room
34. Employee Committee Council Meeting Sign-in Sheets regard WASC Training in Team Document Room
35. Communication with CDU Alumni Relations Matrix in Team Document Room
36. Office of the President All Employee University Forums 2008-2010 in Team Document Room
37. Communication Improvement Survey and Results on Flash Drive
38. CDU Campus Climate Survey and Results in Team Document Room
39. Letters from Charles Drew Student Government (CDSG) on Flash Drive
40. Academic Senate Report to the BOT 021210 in Team Document Room
41. Prop 1D Transfer in Team Document Room
42. California Endowment Support in Team Document Room
43. CDU Academic Program Review Guidelines on Flash Drive
44. Academic Program Review Process Flowchart on Flash Drive
45. Program Closure Criteria and Results on Flash Drive
46. Broadcast Email re- CDU Program Closure and Suspension 081110 on Flash Drive
47. Finance Committee Agenda and Meeting Minutes in Team Document Room
48. Budget Control in Team Document Room
49. Vendor & Consultant Report in Team Document Room
50. Strategic Plan.
51. Letter to WASC Regarding Future of PA Program in Team Document Room
52. Unrestricted Revenue & Expenses in Team Document Room
53. Board of Trustees - Bylaws on Flash Drive
54. List of Board and Councilors on Flash Drive
55. Broadcast: Dr. Norris Resumed his Position as Executive Vice President in Team Document Room
56. Survey on Desired Leadership Qualities and Style in Team Document Room
57. Broadcast Email re: Organizational Chart - Announcement of Dr. Baker as Provost 081110 on Flash Drive
58. Constitution and Bylaws of the Academic Senate - updated October 2009 on Flash Drive
59. Appointments and Promotions Process in Team Document Room
60. Delegation of Authority on Flash Drive
61. Faculty Hiring Guidelines on Flash Drive
62. Policy Consolidation Project on Flash Drive
63. Programs’ Self-study Reports in Team Document Room
64. WeaveOnline Reports in Team Document Room
65. CDU Programs Student Learning Outcomes on Flash Drive
66. Curriculum Maps for All Programs in Team Document Room
67. Sample Syllabus for MPH 522, Spring 2011 in Team Document Room
68. CDU Academic Program Review Schedule 2010-2015 on Flash Drive
69. Reports from External Reviewers in Team Document Room
70. Program Review Committee Report to Deans on Flash Drive
71. Minutes of MPH Program committee meetings in Team Document Room
72. April 2009 Posters, Pictures, Flyer in Team Document Room
73. COM Medical Students Poster Session in Team Document Room
74. Administrative Program Review policy and Handbook 111609 - APPROVED by the Academic Senate on Flash Drive.
75. Communication Task Group Meeting Minutes and Sign-in Sheets in Team Document Room
76. Broadcast Email re: CFO Appointment Ron Lau on Flash Drive
77. NMT Program Report to WASC 083109 on in Team Document Room
78. WASC September Leadership Visit Summary 092109 on Flash Drive
80. NSSE Feedback in Team Document Room
81. University Forum 020210 on Flash Drive
82. Qualitative Analysis of Climate Survey in Team Document Room
83. Letter of Acceptance on Flash Drive
84. Enrollment & Tuition on Flash Drive
85. Employee Training on Flash Drive
86. Management Agenda in Team Document Room
87. Budget Process on Flash Drive
88. CDU Survey on Desired Leadership Qualities and Style in Team Document Room
89. FC-FEB History on Flash Drive
90. AAMC National Compensation Survey on Flash Drive
91. Faculty Contract - Template on Flash Drive
92. Faculty Job Description - Template on Flash Drive
93. COSH PA Simulations on Flash Drive
94. Consolidated Grievance Flow Chart on Flash Drive
95. Dr. Mary Allen’s Workshop Announcement in Team Document Room
96. COSH EAPC New Course Form in Team Document Room
97. COSH EAPC Annual Assessment Guidelines on Flash Drive
98. Sample of Students’ Work in Team Document Room
99. MPH Generic Student Self-Evaluation Survey in Team Document Room
100. Agenda for the External Program Reviewer's Visit in Team Document Room
101. External Review of Current Administration in Team Document Room
VII. REQUIRED DOCUMENTS AND LIST OF HARD COPY MATERIALS TO BE AVAILABLE IN THE TEAM DOCUMENT ROOM, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

- Appendix A - Current Catalog (http://www.cdrewu.edu/assets/pdfs/CDUCatalog20092011online.pdf)
- Appendix B - Completed Set of Required Data Exhibits
- Appendix C - Most Recent Annual Report to the Commission
- Appendix D - Budget for Current Year
- Appendix E - Most Recent Financial Statement and Audit by an Independent Professional Agency or, if a Public Institution, by the Appropriate State Agency, and Management Letters, if Any
- Appendix F - Organizational Charts
- Appendix G - Institutional Summary Data
- Appendix H - Compliance Audit Checklist
VIII. Other Major Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix I -</td>
<td>Report on Open Communication with WASC and CDU Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix J -</td>
<td>Report on Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix K -</td>
<td>Report on Presidential and Board Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix L -</td>
<td>Report on Faculty Governance, Policies, and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix M -</td>
<td>Report on Assessment of Student Learning and Student Success and University Endeavors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix N -</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix O -</td>
<td>Academic Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix P -</td>
<td>Financial Sustainability Business Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix Q -</td>
<td>Facilities Master Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>