AGENDA

I. Welcome and Call to Order (Dr. Rajavashisth)

II. COM Governance Elections (Dr. Rajavashisth)
   a. Recognition of Outgoing Representatives
   b. Installation of New FEB and AS Representatives

III. WASC Update (Dr. Edelstein)
   a. Commission Meeting
   b. Status Options and Notification

IV. COM Dean Report (Dr. Baker)
   a. Faculty Contract Renewals
   b. Prefix Appointment Renewals
   c. Strategic and Academic Plans

V. Standing Committee Reports
   a. Student Admissions and Promotions (Dr. Calmes)
   b. Educational Policy and Curriculum (Dr. Calmes)
   c. Faculty Appointments and Promotions (Dr. Findlay)

VI. COM Associate Dean Reports
   a. Student Affairs (Dr. Calmes)
   b. Faculty Affairs (Dr. Wolf)

VII. Academic Senate Reports (Dr. Bazargan)
   a. Workload Policy
   b. Grievance Procedures
   c. Research Committee Survey
2011 Elections

44 ballots cast (26% of 171 eligible voters)

Incoming

Research Faculty Representatives

Shahrzad Bazargan, PhD (61%)   2011 – 2013
Sheba George, PhD (75%)    2011 – 2013

Clinical/Educator Faculty Representatives

David Hindman, PhD (82%)     2011 – 2013
Stanley Hsia, MD (75%)     2011 – 2013

COM Department Chair Representative

Kenneth Lewis, MD     (60%)    2011 – 2013

AS Legislative Council Reps (2 year terms)

Cynthia Davis, MPH (89%)    2011 – 2013
Satyesh Sinha, PhD (57%)    2011 – 2013

AS Legislative Council Rep (1 year term) *

Paul Robinson, PhD (100%)   2011 – 2012

* To replace Mohsen Bazargan, now AS President.
## Sanctions and Other Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>2001 Handbook</th>
<th>Indicators: CPR</th>
<th>Indicators: EER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impose a Formal Notice of Concern</strong></td>
<td>&quot;... in danger of being found in non-compliance with one or more Standards if current trends continue&quot; OR &quot;an institution on sanction has made substantial progress in addressing the issues that gave rise to the sanction but the issues have not been fully addressed.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Troubling trends in enrollments, retention, graduation, financial resources or management, or governance&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[not a sanction and not public]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Inadequate short- or long-term strategic planning, budget projections, or responses to capital campaigns&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Instability or vacancies in critical leadership roles&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Inadequate participation of key campus constituencies in WASC review process&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Inadequate infrastructure to support assessment of student learning&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue a Warning</strong></td>
<td>&quot;... fails to meet one or more of the Standards&quot;</td>
<td>Evidence in the team report, supported by cited CFRs, that the institution fails to demonstrate the Core Commitment to Capacity</td>
<td>Evidence in the team report, supported by cited CFRs, that the institution fails to demonstrate the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sanction/public]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Indications that the institution has resources and/or insights to solve the non-compliance issues in due time</td>
<td>Indications that institution has resources and/or insights to solve the non-compliance issues in due time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impose Probation</strong></td>
<td>&quot;... serious issues of non-compliance with one or more Commission Standards&quot;</td>
<td>Clear evidence in the team report, supported by several CFRs, that the institution fails significantly short of meeting the Standards relating to Capacity</td>
<td>Evidence that the institution has not addressed at sufficient levels the issues identified in the CPR action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sanction/public]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that previous sanctions have not led to full-scale endeavors to address inadequacies—through lack of financial resources, institutional will, and/or understanding</td>
<td>Clear evidence in the team report, supported by several CFRs, that the institution fails to meet the Standards relating to Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence in the team report, supported by cited CFRs, that the institution falls to demonstrate the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>Evidence, supported by institutional history, of slow or poorly sustained responses to prior Commission actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence in the team report, supported by cited CFRs, that the institution fails to demonstrate the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness</td>
<td>Evidence, supported by institutional history, of slow or poorly sustained responses to prior Commission actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue an Order to Show Cause</strong></td>
<td>&quot;... when placed on Warning or Probation ... has failed to make sufficient progress to come into compliance&quot;</td>
<td>History of continuing and significant non-compliance with multiple Standards along with a record of inadequate responses to previous Commission requirements</td>
<td>Evidence in the team report, supported by cited CFRs, that the institution fails to demonstrate the Core Commitment to Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[sanction/public]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Significant inadequacies of resources, leadership, governance, systems, processes, policies or planning that will shortly lead to an unsustainable institution, which cannot serve its students and other stakeholders</td>
<td>Evidence in the team report, supported by cited CFRs, that the institution falls to meet the Standards relating to Educational Effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission can identify clear, decisive, urgent-yet-achievable steps that an institution can take in a short time to demonstrate why accreditation should not be terminated</td>
<td>Evidence, supported by institutional history, of slow or poorly sustained responses to prior Commission actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminate Accreditation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing and serious failure to meet the Core Commitments and the Standards, even following very specific previous Commission actions</td>
<td>Evidence, supported by institutional history, of slow or poorly sustained responses to prior Commission actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[public]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Serious lack of compliance with Standard One related to institutional integrity</td>
<td>Evidence, supported by institutional history, of slow or poorly sustained responses to prior Commission actions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FACTORS TO CONSIDER WHEN RECOMMENDING A SANCTION OR NOTICE OF CONCERN

The following factors may be considered by teams that are evaluating whether or not to impose a sanction or are trying to decide which action or sanction is most appropriate under the circumstances. The team should consider the evidence that supports its findings about the factors.

1. The depth of the institution's understanding of the nature and magnitude of the changes it faces, and its acceptance of responsibility for addressing those changes.
2. Concrete and achievable plans to address the challenges, including realistic timelines and milestones.
3. The institution's capacity to implement change and take actions that will fully address the challenges.
4. The ability of the institution's leadership (CEO and governing board) to build institutional support for plans to address the challenges and monitor progress in the implementation of plans.
5. The institution's record of addressing previous challenges in a meaningful and effective way (including previous concerns identified by the Commission).
6. The institution's record of integrity in its internal dealings and in its relationship with WASC.
2011 Prefix Faculty Renewal Appointments

The date of the auto-expiration of Prefix series faculty was extended from June 30 to December 31, 2011. The deadline for submitting the four elements of the dossier needed to renew a faculty appointment in the Prefix series is November 16, 2011. In addition to submitting a current CV and a brief statement from your department Chair in support of renewing your appointment, see the following templates and/or guidelines for the other two elements.

Guidelines – Self Statement  
Template – Faculty Activity Plan/Report  
Guidelines – Faculty Activity Plan/Report

Appointments and Promotions

2009 Maintaining Faculty Appointments  
Other Appointments and Promotions

2011 Faculty Contracts

Compensated faculty must renew or initiate contracts for the new fiscal year, effective July 1, 2011. The elements of a complete contract package include a: (1) faculty employment contract cover page, which states your maximum approvable salary; (2) faculty workload description, which shows the expected distribution of your scholarly and service activities; (3) faculty activity plan/report, according to the standard college format; and (4) personnel action form (PAF), which states the terms of your compensated workload.

In addition to securing a new PAF for FY2011, see the following templates and/or guidelines for the first three elements.

Faculty Employment Contract  
Faculty Workload Description  
Template – Faculty Activity Plan/Report  
Guidelines – Faculty Activity Plan/Report
Medical Student Affairs

Admission Committee Update:

Class of 2015
24 students have received acceptances into the Class of 2015. The final class roster will be available in July 2011. Matriculants will start the Pre-matriculation/Orientation week on July 18, 2011 at CDU.

Second Look-Recruitment Weekend at CDU/Medical Student Mixer-April 15, 2011.
15 accepted students for the Class of 2015 attended a mixer with medical students from each of the classes. This is an annual event that we have as part of the recruitment weekend activities in conjunction with the DGSOM at UCLA. Prospective students spend Friday afternoon at the CDU campus and attend a Saturday event at the UCLA campus.

Upcoming Medical Student Events and Activities:

5. White Coat Ceremonies for Incoming Class of 2015:
   CDU Welcome/White Coat Ceremony July 22/2011
   UCLA White Coat Ceremony August 5, 2011
6. August 8th, 2011 First day of class for freshman class of 2015

Special Events:

Spring Into Health-A Health, fitness and Family Fun Festival, April 23, 2011.
Yelba Castellon and the Class of 2012 spearheaded the development of a community health festival at the Martin Luther King Jr. Recreation Center on Western Avenue in SPA 6. Yelba facilitated a collaborative effort between the Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks, the North Area Neighborhood Development Council and CDU. Student volunteers from the Saturday Science Academy II, College of Science and Health, Nursing, Admissions, Facilities and the Library all contributed to the successful event. Gordon Lee and the California Foundation for Stronger Communities generously provided the funding through their donation to the Medical School Community Outreach Program at CDU.
K30@UCLA
Graduate Training Program in Translational Investigation

NOW ACCEPTING APPLICATIONS UNTIL JULY 20, 2011
Details online at www.k30.ucla.edu

Applicants should hold professional degrees in Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing, or other clinical disciplines. PhD scientists who are highly committed to clinical investigation will also be considered. Applicants must also be U.S. citizens, noncitizen nationals or lawfully admitted permanent residents of the U.S.

The UCLA Graduate Training Program in Clinical and Translational Investigation (K30 Program) was developed to provide clinicians with the necessary training to become successful patient-oriented investigators who can bridge molecular medicine and clinical research.

The K30 program is a multidisciplinary effort at the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA to provide educational opportunities in clinical research for house staff (residents and fellows) and faculty. The K30 program offers various options available for advanced training in clinical research. Options vary from isolated workshops (Track I) to a formally structured certificate program (Track II) and a Master's Degree in Clinical Research (Track III).

Track I does not grant any certificate. The seminars related to Clinical Research Development are open to interested fellows and faculty, and can be taken as individual entities. Applications are accepted all year.

Track II consists of a structured two-year part-time program that leads to a certificate awarded by the David Geffen School of Medicine.

Track III is a Master of Science in Clinical Research degree program offered by the Department of Biomathematics in the School of Medicine. The length of time to complete the MSCR degree, including the requirement of a research thesis, attracts those with career aspirations in academic medicine.

The goals of these educational opportunities are to enable fellows and faculty to:

- Design and conduct clinical research (clinical trials and observational studies) and to successfully compete for funding (e.g. NIH K23 or RO1's in Clinical Research)
- Analyze the data and interpret the results of their research
- Present their research at scientific meetings and in the medical literature
- Critique and interpret the research of others

For further information, please visit our website: www.k30.ucla.edu
K30 Track II Program Coordinator
Phone: 310-825-6312
Email: K30@ucla.edu
2011-12 Committee Pool Form

The College of Medicine Faculty Executive Board has six standing committees. Please indicate below which of the committees you would be willing to serve on. Also indicate in the section below the areas of COM and the University which you would be willing to serve. (Please return to FEB Vice Chair Paul Robinson (paulrobinson@cdrewu.edu).

Standing Committees:

- Faculty Appointments and Promotions
- Educational Policy and Curriculum
- Medical Student Admissions
- Faculty Concerns and Grievance
- Medical Student Promotions
- Nominating and Elections

I am interested in serving the College of Medicine in the following other areas:

______________________   ______________________

I am interested in serving the Academic Senate in the following areas:

______________________   ______________________

I am interested in serving as a Medical Student Advisory or Research Mentor

Yes ____  No ____

I wish to attend an upcoming Academic Boot Camp

Yes ____  No ____

I wish to participate in an upcoming Faculty Learning Community

Yes ____  No ____

Name: ________________________________
Daytime Phone: ________________________  Evening Phone: _____________________
Email: _______________________________

Committee Pool Form 06-28-11
Grievance Procedure and Timeline, Rev. 1/7/2011

Based on current Grievance Procedures of COM, COSH, and AS and the timeline agreed upon by the leaders of these committees on 1/4/11.

KEY:

1. This flowchart is intended to represent the basic process and timeline for both College-level and University-level (via Academic Senate) faculty grievances. It is the right of the grievant to file a grievance claim with either the College to which he/she belongs or with the Academic Senate. For the purposes of this document, "Committee" refers to either the AS- or College-level committee.

2. Before beginning the formal grievance process, individual faculty members must attempt to take steps to mitigate the dispute. Documentation of these steps will be included in the submission of a grievance to any committee.

3. In some cases, the Grievance Committee may find that although the case is appropriate for their review, no hearing of the facts is necessary, or that the committee believes other avenues should be pursued (such as mediation), rather than convening a hearing and all that entails.

4. The committee receiving the grievance claim will then screen the grievance for appropriateness ac

5. If the claim is not appropriate for the committee receiving the grievance, that committee will forward the claim to the appropriate body, whether that be another grievance committee on campus, or an outside body, including regulatory agencies.

6. In cases heard by the College Grievance committee, appeals shall be forwarded to the Dean of that College. In cases heard by the Academic Senate committee, appeals shall be forwarded to the Provost. The appeals process of the grievance committee conducting the hearing shall apply. In cases where the grievant feels that a college grievance committee has not followed due process, a due process appeal may be made to the Academic Senate Grievance committee.