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I. LIST OF TOPICS OR CONCERNS ADDRESSED IN REPORT

The Commission areas of concern were:
A. Open Communication with WASC and the CDU Campus Community
B. Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management
C. Presidential and Board Leadership
D. Faculty Governance, Policies, and Development
E. Assessment of Student Learning, Student Success, and University Endeavors

The Commission summarized its findings in the July 7, 2009 letter as below.

Charles Drew University identified and listed the findings that made up the commission letter and grouped team report recommendations under the appropriate commission findings area (see Attachment A – WASC Action Letter - CDU Summary of Issues and Concerns).

Summary of Commission Topics or Concerns

At its meeting on June 17-19, 2009, the Commission considered the report of the Educational Effectiveness Review (EER) team that conducted the visit to Charles Drew University of Medicine and Science (CDU) on April 1-3, 2009.

The EER team focused both on the issues from the 2007 action letter and on CDU's work in addressing the themes in its institutional EER report (Campus-wide Approach to Student Outcomes; Faculty Needs; Funding and Resource Allocation; and Leadership). The team found that although CDU had "engaged" with the goal for the review cycle, it had "not progressed as far as it had hoped" regarding its four expected outcomes for the EER visit. In particular, the team noted that the institution's EER report is closely aligned with the initiatives delineated for the CPR review, instead of those for the EER review, and the University provided no explanation for these departures from the original Proposal.

The Commission endorsed the findings and recommendations of the team, and highlighted the following issues as needing urgent attention:

A. Open Communication with WASC and the CDU Campus Community. Foundational to the accrediting process is the open communication between the institution and the accrediting body. Criteria for Review (CFR) 1.9 requires honesty and open communication with the Accrediting Commission, seriousness and candor in the review process, and prompt informing of the Commission about any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution.

The Commission is deeply concerned about the report from the EER team that it was difficult to get information in support of the EER visit:

"The team had to repeatedly ask for documents providing the underlying evidence for assertions in the report. Moreover, the team found the report to understate or ignore significant challenges and difficulties faced by the University. When sufficient or necessary information is not readily available it brings into question the reliability of what has been asserted by the institution."

In its response to the team report, CDU notes that it did not intend to withhold from or delay information to WASC, but that "some document requests were either new to us or required reanalysis and reordering of information [due to the deteriorating economic climate]." As

reported by the team, however, the kinds of documents requested were not out of the ordinary and should have been provided or available to the team as a matter of standard preparation for the EER visit.

Furthermore, the team reported that the documentation, when and if it did arrive, often was confusing or not what was asked for, and that the institution’s EER report included gaps, erroneous, and understated information. Missing information included the vote of no-confidence in the president, the loss of special accreditation of an academic program (discussed further, below), the financial crisis (known in November 2008, but not included in the December 2008 report and not reported to WASC until February 2009), and the 50% tuition increase for 2009-2010. Erroneous information included the inaccurate claims that all students had been reassigned to new clinical sites after KDMC's status as a teaching organization was terminated, and that the new medical school had received state approval. An example of understated information was the reference to a 'negotiation' with the County of Los Angeles, which was actually a lawsuit against the County and a countersuit against CDU. These are deeply troubling findings and demonstrate noncompliance with Commission Standards. (CFRs 1.8, 1.9, 3.5, 3.9) It is the responsibility of CDU to forthrightly provide all information requested, accurately and without distortion, to the Commission.

Open and candid communication within the campus community is also essential for accreditation. The Commission is deeply concerned that "fear of retribution by administration was expressed [by students, faculty, and staff] and appeared to hamper their full participation in the EER meetings with the team." The team stated that the relationship between faculty and senior administration did not appear to have improved since the CPR, and may have gotten worse. Faculty, staff, and students reported that they did not perceive the administration as listening to them, with the exception of the deans of the two colleges. This is unacceptable for an academic institution and the University will need to demonstrate that there is an open, transparent and interactive environment for the appropriate exercise of governance and decision making at the institution. (CFRs 1.4, 3.8)

The team also learned on the visit that the external accreditation of one of the University’s programs was withdrawn, although WASC had not been notified of this. CDU was later able to obtain a voluntary withdrawal from the accrediting agency. It was not clear to the team what kind of notification had been given to the students and, as reflected in the Commission action, further information on this issue is expected. (CFRs 1.7, 1.8, 1.9)

During the meeting with the Commission Panel you acknowledged the earlier lack of transparency and indicated ways in which the leadership team was attempting to overcome that. These efforts have only recently been undertaken and their impact would need to be assessed by the next visiting team. Moreover, the Commission expressed concern that many of the same people who helped create or supported the climate that led to fear of retaliation are still in place. Thus, it may take more than meetings to change the internal culture of the campus.

At the present time, with regard to open communication with WASC, Charles Drew University does not meet key elements of Standards I and 3.

B. Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management. The financial sustainability of an institution is essential for its accreditation. (CFR 3.5) Financial issues have followed CDU from the beginning of its accreditation history. Now, faced with a multi-million dollar shortfall, layoffs, new debt, and uncertain times, CDU's financial position has deteriorated to the level of a financial crisis. This situation raises grave concerns about the sustainability of the institution in both the near and longer terms. In the Commission Panel discussion, you indicated that there will be a $7-8 million deficit in FY '09, that the deficit would be
covered by institutional reserves, and that CDU is still working to establish greater stability through tighter monthly budget control. While a plan is being developed for financial recovery, CDU will need to demonstrate that it can operate sustainably over an extended period of time. (CFRs 1.3, 3.5, 4.1, 4.2)

There is also deep concern about the planning that has led the institution into its current crisis. CDU has not responded to the recommendations from previous Comprehensive and Special Visits that the University prepare a fully developed, long-range strategic plan with supporting financial projections before embarking on expansions, and that it resolve the losses from the KDMC relationship before addressing other planning issues. It was not evident to the CPR team that the University had sufficient resources to support the expansion of several programs, including the addition of a School of Nursing, and it recommended in 2007 that "The University needs a fully developed long-range strategic plan with supporting financial projections and a facility master plan, before embarking on these expansions." Nevertheless, at the time of the EER visit, CDU was already in the midst of building a new $43 million Life Sciences Research and Nursing Education Building, using bond funding along with $7 million from NIH and $10 million from the State of California. At the same time, it had projected a $10 million shortfall in its $72 million budget, and had engaged in the first series of lay-offs.

The 2009 EER team, reporting on the 2008 update to the CDU Strategic Plan, commented that "despite a long period of development, staff expressed uncertainty about the priorities of the University relative to the strategic plan . . . " and that "especially given the current financial situation of the University, the EER team also questions whether the University has sufficient resources to enact the 2008 updated strategic plan." The team reports that the 2008 update to the strategic plan "eloquently" discusses the importance of the needs that CDU intends to address, sets tasks and timelines, but does not provide the financial costs of the various initiatives. (CFRs 3.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3)

Financial management is a concern for the Commission as well, as it learned from the EER report that audits and annual budgets are chronically late, that the University is out of compliance with federal control regulations, and that there are reports of inaccurate financial aid allocations. At the time of the visit, financial systems and financial management were inadequate and could not provide the information needed for the sophisticated planning of such a complex institution as CDU. Data about, and analysis of, student enrollment and retention rates were also incomplete, exposing another area of vulnerability in the University's planning. (CFRs 1.8, 2.5, 3.5, 4.1-4.4)

Since the visit, CDU reports that the primary implementation of a new financial system is complete and the various financial offices are "functioning in day-to-day business." It also notes that the unqualified financial audit for the last fiscal year has been sent to the WASC office since the visit. With regard to student attrition, CDU reports that it is combining better data, internal expertise, collaboration with external experts, and trend analysis with student focus groups and student participation in office reviews. Though these responses have not been verified or evaluated in terms of their effectiveness, they represent positive steps. Nonetheless, the longstanding nature of these issues requires a more consistent and comprehensive response, including greater financial transparency, clearer planning and priority setting for the allocation of resources.

At the present time, with regard to financial sustainability, planning, and management, Charles Drew University does not meet key elements of Standards 1, 3, and 4.

C. Presidential and Board Leadership. In 2007, the University's president was commended for opening lines of communication, initiating a strategic planning process, and taking initial steps to improve assessment, including the acquisition of a sophisticated data-management
software system. Two years later however, the EER team found that a "consistent and pervasive" fear of retribution by the administration was expressed by members of all campus constituencies, the leadership had adopted a change to the strategic plan that was not linked to costs of initiatives, and little use had been made of the sophisticated data-management system.

Exacerbating, if not leading these changes, was the self-reported need of the president to be completely in charge of every aspect of the institution during a time of crisis, "regardless of what others thought, because she was the most capable person to take charge." For example, she claimed in an interview with the team to be in charge of marketing, as well as the president's office. Interviews with the Board suggested that they accepted this new top-down leadership, trusted the president's ability and her optimistic projections of $7 million in private gifts and grants, even knowing that a substantially smaller sum of $1.4 million was brought in during the previous year (FY2008), and accepted her call for a business model to reign in programmatic costs. The team also found the reporting arrangements of the University leadership to be highly irregular and ineffective. The deans of the two colleges reported directly to the president, rather than to the academic dean. The academic dean also reported directly to the president and had no academic units reporting to him.

One month before the EER visit, the faculty passed a vote of no-confidence in the president. There is disagreement as to whether the institution reported this detail to the visiting team and CDU has begun to provide follow-up written documentation with significant information. What is more important, however, is that the University operates with clear and effective leadership at all levels. The University, at the present time, is failing to do so. (CFRs 1.3 and 3.8-3.11)

Since the visit, the president has resigned, CDU has appointed an internal interim president, and the Commission was informed during the Panel discussion that preparations are being made for a national search for a new president. The turnover of presidential leadership at CDU is a concern for the Commission. As it begins the search for a new president, it is critical for the University to engage in self-reflection to examine both its selection process and the underlying reasons for the historical instability of this key leadership position.

At the present time, with regard to Presidential and Board Leadership, Charles Drew University does not meet key elements of Standards 1 and 3.

D. Faculty Governance, Policies, and Development. The Standards of Accreditation place strong emphasis on faculty governance because it helps ensure academic quality and maintain the educational purposes and character of the institution. The Commission's concern for faculty governance at CDU surfaced in 1995 and was identified again in 2007; this time including the issue of faculty development.

At the time of the EER visit, two faculty development initiatives had begun, both initiated by the faculty themselves. The division between the faculties of the two colleges had been ameliorated at the initiative of the faculty, to the extent that there was once again a single faculty governing body to which both faculties belonged. The faculty also had formed an ad hoc committee on Faculty Appointments and Promotions. Unfortunately, little of the faculty's work had been addressed by senior administration at the time of the EER visit.

Faculty workload policy, appropriate salary and benefits schedules, and the faculty contract process also had not yet been finalized by the time of the visit. The teaching load of 14-16 units per semester for College of Science and Health faculty members leaves little time for scholarly or creative activity. Faculty spoke of a request from the administration that they sign blank contracts to be filled in later, an egregious request,
regardless of the motive. The faculty refused, and progress on the contract process ended. The team also notes that "(w)ithout contracts and workload policies, faculty members are anxious about the stability of their positions and academic programs."

In addition, there was no evidence of an active peer review evaluation process,' and the team was unable to find mention of an Academic Freedom policy. Nor was there any sign of faculty voice in institutional governance and decision making. On the contrary, the financial crisis had led the president and the board to install a 'business model' to guide programmatic changes, apparently without considering academic criteria or consulting with the faculty through appropriate governance processes.

While the faculty is to be commended for the initiatives that it has taken in areas of faculty governance, policies, and development, the Commission finds that the institution is seriously and significantly out of compliance with nearly all of the expectations of the Commission regarding governance, faculty workload, professional development and decision making. Some of the actions reported by the team are professionally inappropriate and undermine the character of the University as a credible higher education institution. (CFRs 1.3, 1.4, 2.8, 3.1-3.4, 3.5, 3.8, 3.11, 4.1, 4.2)

CDU's written response to the team report and your presentation at the Panel meeting indicate that senior administration has held a town hall meeting and met with the Faculty Senate since the visit, in order to discuss, among other things, open financial data, faculty representation, data integrity, faculty workload policies, salaries, benefits, and contracts. These are positive first steps, but are not sufficient to alter the findings of the team.

At the present time, with regard to Faculty Governance, Policies, and Development, Charles Drew University does not meet the key elements of Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4.

E. Assessment of Student Learning, Student Success, and University Endeavors. The EER team reports that faculty has begun the process of assessment with the identification of University Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs); a primary goal of the EER report. The Commission is concerned, however, that assessment at CDU is not at the minimum level expected for reaffirmation of accreditation. The team reports that there is little evidence of collection, aggregation, and analysis of data in the service of academic decision making and planning. Beyond SLO's, the Commission expects institutions to have program- and course-level learning outcomes, and a system of regular program review. Quality assurance reviews are expected for co-curricular programs, administrative units and the governing board. (CFRs 1.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.11, 3.3, 3.7, 3.9, 4.4, 4.7)

The CDU written response to the team report notes that plans and efforts have been made since the visit with regard to assessment and program review, stating that CDU has completed external and internal reviews of the support offices during the past two years, and that it now plans to standardize those reviews. It also describes plans to more fully develop the system of evidence-based academic program review. Again, these are positive steps but do not respond fully to the gaps in academic assessment and program review that were noted by the team.

At the present time, with regard to Assessment of Student Learning, Student Success, and University Endeavors, Charles Drew University does not meet the key elements of Standards 2 and 4.

In sum, the Commission finds that Charles Drew University does not meet key elements of Standards 1, 2, 3, and 4.
To assist the University in developing evidence of compliance, the Commission identified the following list as illustrative of the changes that would be need to be in place at the time of the next visit:

1. A campus-wide climate of open and transparent communication.
2. A functioning system for managing and reporting financial and budgetary systems.
3. Evidence of campus-wide understanding and use of the database system.
4. Stable leadership in the presidential role and within the president's cabinet.
5. Board involvement in fiduciary responsibilities and strategic planning.
6. A complete and documented system of governance.
7. Well-developed and fully implemented systems for assessment and quality control.

II. INSTITUTIONAL CONTEXT

Charles Drew University (CDU) is a private, nonprofit, nonsectarian, minority-serving medical and health sciences institution. The University was conceived as a postgraduate medical school during 1963 planning discussions and was chartered in 1966 after the California governor’s McCone Commission cited poor health status and diminished access to healthcare as among the major factors fomenting the 1965 Watts Rebellion. The University’s mission 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, which continues to serve as the only academic health sciences center for the area’s 1.5 million residents, is the only designated minority-serving health-sciences university in a county of more than 10 million people, 70 percent of whom are from minority communities. Defined as a Minority Serving Institution by the U.S. Office of Civil Rights, the University’s College of Medicine is recognized by the Department of Education under subsection (a), Title III B Section 326, as a Historically Black Graduate Institution. The University is also a charter member of the Hispanic Serving Health Professions Schools, a national nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the health of Hispanic people through research initiatives, training opportunities, and academic development. CDU is the only higher education institution so dually designated in the United States. CDU is also accredited by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) and currently offers academic programs organized into three colleges: the College of Science and Health (COSH) and the College of Medicine (COM), and the School of Nursing. COSH offers programs, including undergraduate degree, master of public health degree, continuing education, and certificate of completion programs. COM is composed of the CDU/UCLA Medical Education, the Master of Science in Clinical Research, and the Continuing Medical Education Programs. On June 12, 2009, the California Board of Registered Nursing granted initial approval for the Entry Level of Master of Science in Nursing Program for the Charles Drew University School of Nursing. The Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) Commission granted its initial approval of the nursing program in March 2009.

The University was presented with a major challenge in September 2006 when the County of Los Angeles Department of Health Services lost its certification for the King/Drew Medical Center (now named Martin Luther King, Jr. Multi-Service Ambulatory Care Center or MLK) from the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS). This decertification eliminated the hospital’s capacity to receive federal re-imbursement for Medicare and Medicaid (Medi-Cal) patients. CDU’s funding and training capacity was seriously compromised by the county’s decision to terminate the hospital’s status as a teaching institution. On November 1, 2006, in absence of a safe and reliable teaching environment, the University voluntarily withdrew from Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education (ACGME) sponsorship effective July 1, 2007.
The University has become a dominant force in translational research, focusing on quickly converting research findings into the improved practice of medicine at the community level. In research dollars, CDU ranks in the top 10 percent of more than 3,400 institutions supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and is ranked in the top 50 private research universities, as rated by the Center for Measuring University Performance.\(^2\) The University’s presence and expertise is also felt internationally. A significant number of programs in the Global Health Institute aid international communities in establishing healthcare programs and systems.

In more than 37 years of enrolling students, the University has made significant contributions to the nation’s health care by graduating more than 550 physicians, 2,100 physician assistants, 2,500 physician specialists, and numerous other health professionals, almost all from diverse communities, the great majority of whom continue to work with underserved communities many years after graduation. CDU first received WASC accreditation in 1995.

III. STATEMENT ON REPORT PREPARATION

The interim report was prepared by Ronald A. Edelstein, EdD, Academic Liaison Officer for Charles Drew University. The report was based on the process and information described in the overview to the section responding to issues identified by WASC.

The work of the CDU WASC Leaders and Task Groups form the basis for the analysis and recommendations described in this report. Please see Attachment B for complete set of names.

The required documents were prepared by the following:

- Dr. Richard Baker – Dean of College of Medicine
- Dr. Daphne Calmes – Associate Dean for Medical Student Affairs
- Mr. Pierre Flood – Director of Financial Aid
- Mr. John Geraghty – Controller
- Ms. Yvette Lane – Associate Director of Student Administration
- Dr. Ron Lau, VP – Finance & Chief Financial Officer
- Mr. Richard Lindstrom – Director of Academic Infrastructure Development
- Dr. Gail-Orum Alexander – Dean of College of Science and Health
- Ms. Espie Pasigan – Sr. Executive Assistant of Academic Affairs
- Ms. Ligia Perez – Associate Director of Institutional Research Office
- Dr. Christopher Reid – Associate Dean of College of Science and Health
- Ms. Edna Yohannes – Office of the President Chief of Staff

The draft of the interim report was discussed and shared with the Executive Council including administrative (Vice Presidents and CFO) and academic leadership (Deans, Academic Senate Leadership). Dr. Charles Lindahl (CSU Associate Vice Chancellor Emeritus) reviewed the draft of the report. Dr. Keith Norris, Interim President reviewed the final report.

IV. RESPONSE TO ISSUES IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMISSION

Background
Organization of CDU Response to Issues Identified in the WASC Action Letter
The Charles Drew University (CDU) Administration and Academic Senate (in July 2009) formed an oversight plan and created work groups to ensure timely and tangible institutional responses to WASC recommendations and to ensure that these responses are embedded in CDU short-

and long-term planning. The purposes of the groups are to identify issues that need to be resolved; provide step-by-step activities needed to resolve the issues; identify responsible staff; provide dates and timelines by which tasks will be accomplished and monitor progress to ensure completion.

Four CDU task groups were formed: 1) Financial Stability, Planning and Management; 2) Organizational Arrangements; 3) Academic Standards and Processes (Self-Monitoring); and 4) Leadership. The task groups reflect major concern areas identified by WASC and by the CDU community. The WASC task groups were given broad assignments with some intentional overlap to obtain multiple perspectives (see Attachment C – CDU WASC Task Force Summary and Invite). Task groups reviewed the WASC reports, action letter, and committee charges and three of the groups made task and time charts for each area. One group prepared a matrix of assessment tools and guidelines. During our September 21, 2009 visit to WASC, a suggestion was made and incorporated to cross link the action letter with the committee timelines as appropriate.

A number of documents served as background for the preparation of CDU task groups and preparation of this report includes the WASC team report received June 15, 2009, the CDU response to the WASC team report, the WASC action letter, CDU summary of the action letter, the September 17, 2009 CDU report to WASC in preparation for CDU leadership visit to WASC on September 21, 2009, CDU task groups’ recommendations and timelines\(^3\) and CDU report of task groups and Executive Council members’ accountability.

The CDU-WASC task groups reported out to a meeting of campus leadership including administration, students, faculty, and academic senate on October 22, 2009 (see Attachment D – Summary of WASC Findings and Recommendations - presentation). A compilation of CDU task group recommendations and timelines was endorsed by the Interim President on December 4, 2009 and sent to the campus community following review by the Academic Senate and the CDU Chief Restructuring Officer\(^4\). All groups have been working continuously to implement recommendations.

The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO), Dr. Ronald Edelstein, then prepared a report describing key tasks and assignments for which an Executive Council member is either the accountable staff or supervisor (see Attachment E – AA Report to the CDU Community). In addition, the ALO made suggestions of other key tasks that flow from the committee assignment. The ALO met with each member of the Executive Council individually and the Academic Senate representatives to review and clarify the assignments.

The Interim President reinforced the importance of the WASC assignments by creating a weekly meeting (every Thursday at 10am) for CDU-WASC leadership (see Attachment F – Coordination of Compliance Broadcast 120409). The goal of the meeting is to identify progress, completed tasks, roadblocks, and alternate strategies as needed. The goal of the process is to infuse WASC standards as part of the regular business of the university. The WASC activities are our roadmap for the university. While accreditation is the key goal, all of the WASC activities serve the higher purpose of building a world-class university dedicated to our mission.

All CDU WASC-related correspondence, information, internal reports and materials may be found at [http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/wasc](http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/wasc) and [http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/Accreditation/wasc/WASCTaskForces](http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/Accreditation/wasc/WASCTaskForces)

---

\(^3\) See Gantt Charts or [http://www.cdrewu.edu/assets/pdfs/Task%20Groups%20Recommendations%20updated%20011310.pdf](http://www.cdrewu.edu/assets/pdfs/Task%20Groups%20Recommendations%20updated%20011310.pdf)

\(^4\) See broadcast email from the President re: Coordination of Compliance dated December 4, 2009.
Expert Assistance Obtained for WASC Identified Issues Related to University Restructure and Budget

CDU formally engaged (at the recommendation of one of our philanthropic partners) with the Executive Service Corps of Southern California (ESC). ESC is an organization that strengthens nonprofits through coaching, consulting and capacity-building by the use of experienced executives who volunteer their services. A distinguished group of retired executive leaders including Jerry Weissman, John M. Coleman, and Charles Lindahl (CSU Associate Vice Chancellor Emeritus), met with the university administrative and academic leadership on Tuesday, August 25, 2009. That meeting led to the draft of a formal project plan in two phases. The first phase includes assisting CDU to create a clear plan for addressing the operational structures, processes, and systems to ensure a high performing organization that is functioning far beyond the minimum expectations for full WASC accreditation. They will also support the VP for Finance in the financial restructuring process, including assisting management in the development of a financial reporting structure to provide timely and usable information for both management and faculty, as well as assist in advancing other key administrative functions. A more effective and efficient administrative infrastructure will be critical to actively support the faculty. Dr. Fred Samulon (ESC) is assisting the President’s Office in the development of a revised strategic plan (see section IV.B. Financial Sustainability, Planning and Management for a detailed description of the strategic plan). Dr. Edelstein is being advised by Dr. Charles Lindahl (CSU Associate Vice Chancellor Emeritus) of the Executive Service Corps on matters related to academic planning.

A. Open Communication with WASC and the CDU Campus Community

Background, Plans and Accomplishments

Charles Drew University has established a proactive communication strategy with regard to WASC and the CDU community.

The CDU Academic Liaison Officer (ALO), Dr. Ronald Edelstein, and WASC Liaison, Dr. Diane Harvey, communicated immediately after receipt of the July 7th action letter to 1) clarify and review CDU public response to the action letter; 2) place communications on CDU and WASC web pages (including at CDU a frequently asked questions page regarding probation status); 3) provide notification to other professional accreditation agencies.

Drs. Harvey and Edelstein continue ongoing communication regarding: 1) CDU’s major changes in personnel; 2) identifying issues and reporting format for the September 21, 2009 CDU leadership meeting with WASC President, Mr. Ralph Wolff and Dr. Harvey; 3) identifying budget changes that occurred after September 2009 visit; 4) discussing anticipated changes in the academic structure; and 5) setting-up conference calls for updates and revisit with CDU leadership in February and March 2010 at the initiation of CDU. Mr. Wolff and Dr. Harvey indicated after the September 21st meeting that communications has improved. A copy of the CDU interim president and ALO report (dated September 17, 2009) which was sent to WASC preceding the visit and was used as a discussion document at the meeting is attached (see Attachment G – CDU WASC Report 091709). Also attached is a copy of the CDU academic senate president’s (Dr. Eric Bing) summary of the CDU and WASC Leaderships’ September 21st meeting attached (see Attachment H – WASC September Leadership Visit Summary).

The September 17, 2009 report to WASC included an update on actions taken with regard to WASC communication and communication with the CDU campus community.

---

5 See http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/wasc/FAQ
1. The CDU community was informed of the probation status in an all-campus forum for faculty, staff and students on July 8, 2009, following the receipt of the commission action letter of July 7, 2009. Written notifications were posted by WASC and CDU on July 10, 2009. Posting on the campus website followed the WASC protocol. WASC was kept fully informed of the activities. Dr. Harvey and Mr. Wolff reviewed our “frequently asked questions” regarding probation prior to posting of the document.

2. The Accreditation Liaison Officer (ALO) participated in the orientation day held last August 11, 2009 (morning and evening sessions) of all new students of the College of Science and Health (COSH). Discussions included explaining the WASC probation statement, answering questions, reviewing university student learning objectives and describing methods for student participation in the WASC and University rebuilding process.

3. The classes of the medical school that were not on campus (at UCLA) were informed by the College of Medicine (COM) and the ALO personally met with the 3rd year, 4th year, and the incoming class to explain the probation status and the role of students in assisting the University.

4. We have kept WASC fully informed (through email and discussions with Dr. Harvey) of major developments and responses to WASC requests. These communications included CDU letters to professional accreditation and education bodies, notification regarding the hiring of our new CFO, Dr. Ron Lau, budget reports; and the WASC requested report on the Nuclear Medicine Technology program sent August 31, 2009.

5. The CDU president and leadership team have convened full university-wide meetings held July 8th and September 1st with faculty, students and staff to discuss campus plans, budgets, and the WASC reports. See below for discussion of follow-up meetings since September 2009.

6. A major change is the administrative culture is the inclusion of academic senate leadership in the Executive Council meetings of the president. The CDU administration and the academic senate executive committee now routinely meet regarding budget, academic, and governance issues.

7. In response to the WASC report, the academic senate and administration jointly formed an oversight plan to ensure timely and tangible institutional responses to WASC recommendations are imbedded in CDU short and long-term planning. Four task groups were formed and have been meeting regularly. The purposes of the committees are to: identify issues that need to be resolved; provide step-by-step activities needed to resolve the issue; identify responsible staff; provide dates and timelines by which the tasks will be accomplished; and monitor progress to ensure completion.

Communication at CDU and with Community Stakeholders since September 2009

The Interim President continues to have town hall meetings with the CDU campus community. The Board of Trustees enacted and implemented the change in its policy and procedures to allow for faculty and student representation on the board to improve communication and ensure inputs from faculty and students into policy and governance. The ALO attends the Charles Drew Student Government (CDSG) meetings on a biweekly basis, along with academic support office directors, to report on WASC-related activity and follow up on student issues. The CDSG conducts evaluations of administrative and academic units on campus and these unit directors also attend CDSG to have direct

---

6 See http://www.cdrewu.edu/page/1959
7 See http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/wasc/FAQ
8 See all email correspondence with Dr. Harvey (on file)
9 See CDU Letters to all professional accrediting agencies
10 See Broadcast Email from CDU President and Email Communications with WASC.
11 See CDU Report to WASC on NMT Program
12 WASC Task Force Summary and Members. See also http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/Accreditation/wasc/WASCTaskForces
dialogue on services. The president’s executive team, including the ALO, meets with the community advisory bodies (such as the Black Health Task Force) to provide and obtain assistance. A major initiative by the president and deans of the colleges was to form a new educational development series for community members (with longitudinal training including creation and presentation of a scholarly project). The plan is to create a community faculty series at the university. A significant benefit of this community engagement is providing another avenue for direct and reenergized participation by community members directly into the academic life of the university. Faculty, students, and administration also communicate information about the university when they are at the community sites for research training and service.

The Interim President has regular meetings (including a comprehensive review of the restructure plans for the University on February 2, 2010) (see Attachment I – University Forum 020210) with the campus community, students and staff groups, the local community, regional state and national groups. He instituted a change in his weekly cabinet meeting and includes representatives from the Academic Senate Executive Committee. The restructuring committee includes the Chair of the Academic Senate Budget and Finance Committee, the Dean of College of Science and Health, the Special Advisor to the President, and the Chief Restructuring Officer. CDU instituted using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2009 to measure student engagement and also the new student orientations include assessment of support services. Feedback is provided to the deans, directors and faculty. The Academic Senate and Student Government provide reports to the Board of Trustees. The CDU Academic Senate/WASC task group on leadership recently presented survey results on leadership styles preferred by faculty (see section IV.C. Presidential and Board Leadership section).

The campus communications have improved as evidenced by student government feedback (see Attachment J – Letter from CDSG President) and academic senate reports, and the number of people participating in governance-related activities (see Attachment K – Academic Senate Report to BOT). At the time of this report, no final decision have been made by the Board of Trustees on the presidential search but on Friday, February 19, 2010, the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Bart Williams, met with the faculty of the Academic Senate to discuss their input regarding selecting Dr. Keith Norris, currently Interim President, as the permanent president of CDU. The Academic Senate unanimously endorsed making Dr. Norris a permanent president. Mr. Williams is taking that information back to the board of trustees for next action. At the February 19, 2010 meeting with the Chairman of the Board and at the Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting held February 23, 2010, faculty expressed their appreciation that the Board of Trustees showed willingness to include the Academic Senate in the decision-making process. They believe that this open communication on the part of the board is a demonstration of transparency and shared decision-making.

The Next Steps: Tasks and Timelines Needed to Accomplish Communication Efforts

Faculty, staff and students understandably remain concerned due to the uncertain budget climate, the increased demands on all of the university to rebuild, probation status, across the board salary cuts, budget process, leadership changes, pace of change, and restructuring. These difficult issues require continuous communication. Therefore, the action steps outlined above continue as the following are being added:

1. The Charles Drew Student Government (CDSG) leadership group will make a presentation to the Executive Council of the Administration and Academic Senate Executive Committee oversight group in March 2010 and on a quarterly basis. In addition to CDSG participation in the Board of Trustees’ meetings and ALO’s participation in CDSG meetings, this will provide direct information to the task group. CDSG will be asked to update their evaluation of services.
2. The Associate Director of Institutional Research Office (IRO) has made reports to the various committees of the University and continues to participate in WASC task groups. The IRO summarized existing reports and institutional data reports requested by campus and by outside agencies. The work was well-received. The IRO will be asked to now participate periodically in the newly formed Council of Deans to help insure evidence-based decision making and responding to academic data requests.

3. The documentation regarding CDU on our website has been updated but must be reanalyzed for consistency. Web page management will be analyzed to allow for quicker turn around of changes in the content from the units.

4. The Restructuring Committee, Vice-President of Finance, and Interim President are scheduled to make a presentation of the 2009-10 budget revisions and the 2010-11 budget review process in a town-hall style meeting in March 2010. An evaluation instrument will be included in this meeting.

5. The leadership of academic senate and administration agreed on a July 2010 date for a full mock WASC review and debriefing to the campus.

B. Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management

Background, Plans and Accomplishments
The September 21, 2009 report to WASC included the updates below related to financial sustainability, planning and management as described in the WASC action letter and team report.

1. The university hired Dr. Ron Lau as the new CFO effective August 1, 2009. Dr. Lau brings extensive experience in university finance. In addition, Dr. Lau was previously CFO at CDU from 1999-2006 and oversaw the period of greatest financial growth and 6 straight unqualified audits, a first in the history of the institution. His knowledge of the institution will be critical in regaining a foothold on the financial management and the transition from a consultant led department to one of dedicated employees. Dr. Lau also brings experience as a WASC site visitor and a true understanding of university best practices. To assist Dr. Lau during this transition period of addressing numerous priority issues and rebuilding a department, we have engaged a specialized consulting firm, The McShane Group. (Principal contact is Mr. Jim Huitt; contract signed August 28, 2009.) The McShane Group is providing assistance to help us improve our situation in financial and administrative operations, financial reporting, cash flow, finance systems analysis, and bond covenant defaults.

2. A comprehensive assessment of all institutional policies and procedures is being undertaken with input from the Board of Trustees. This has led to numerous tangible outcomes, including but not limited to the Administrative Academic Assessment Handbook and Administrative Program Assessment Handbook.

3. Led by the Academic Senate executive committee, groups of faculty and administration (including representatives from the board of trustees, and community representatives) have been formed into WASC Task Force Groups to provide oversight of the WASC specific recommendations and to provide broad input into the overall campus restructure.

4. On August 14, 2009, the Board of Trustees approved an operational budget for the 2009-10 academic year that includes a conservative balanced budget. They also received a briefing from the new CFO, Dr. Ron Lau, on plans for a new fiscal approach.

13 Email announcement re: Dr. Ron Lau’s appointment as CDU CFO & VP-Finance
14 Academic Assessment Handbook
15 Administrative Program Review Policy and Handbook
16 WASC Task Forces (http://www.cdrewu.edu/about-cdu/Accreditation/wasc/WASCTaskForces)
17 Board Minutes, August 14, 2009
for the new academic year. See section IV.B. Financial Sustainability, Planning and Management.

5. The campus has re-engaged with traditional stakeholders including the campus community, governmental entities at the county, state and federal levels, private philanthropic organizations, community organizations, alumni, and friends of the university.

6. Accelerated negotiations by the president, board chair, and vice-president for operations with the Los Angeles County led to the settlement of the lawsuit between CDU and the Los Angeles County on September 1, 2009.18 This action paves the way for re-establishment of our longstanding partnership with LAC for health professions training, health care delivery, and research to address the health needs of the residents of South Los Angeles. Plans for the re-establishment of the former MLK Hospital to a full functioning facility are moving forward and CDU, with the support of our district LAC Supervisor, will once again be a partner in that effort.

7. The County of Los Angeles and the University of California system have had discussions of formal partnership to re-establish MLK hospital as a teaching hospital.19 Dr. Norris spoke on behalf of CDU in regards to health professional training as part of the planned Comprehensive Medical Center at the UC Board of Regents meeting on September 17, 2009.

8. CDU has formally engaged (at the recommendation of one of our philanthropic partners) with the Executive Service Corps of Southern California (ESC), as described earlier.

9. The Board of Trustees is now in the process of analyzing the Memorandum of Agreement20 of faculty and administration presented at the August 14, 2009 Board of Trustees’ meeting. The purpose of the memorandum was, in part, to initiate discussion of a faculty contract with the administration. Follow-up is discussed in section IV.D. Faculty Governance, Policies, and Development.

10. The university has successfully obtained additional federal funding for 2009-2010 to date amounting to approximately $3M from the President’s stimulus package.21 At the time of this writing, the $10 million state appropriation for the Research Life Sciences and Nursing Education building was approved by the California legislature and is in the governor’s office with anticipated assignment and allocation at the October 12, 2009 meeting of the State Public Works Board.22 These accomplishments will help to solidify the financial situation of the university. This approval is still pending.

11. A balanced budget has been approved;23 a new CFO was hired effective August 1, 2009; an independent financial review has been implemented; the academic senate and president’s executive team meet together regularly on budget planning and reductions; and we have engaged with the Executive Service Corps to review (with academic and administrative leadership) our alignment of strategic plan and budget with mission critical objectives. The budget revision, after September 2009, is described in section IV.B. Financial Sustainability, Planning and Management.

12. Program reviews of a variety of offices (information technology, contracts and grants, human resources, financial aid) are taking place as part of the WASC oversight committee work. Going forward, the review process will now include systematic self-review, often with external reviewers, with recommendations tied to the budget process for the given academic year. The results of program review as described in section IV.E. Assessment in Student Learning, Student Success and University Endeavors, will help shape the budget development process.

---

20 Memorandum of Agreement - draft
21 CDU NIH Report
22 See copy of a letter from CA Legislature to UC VP-Budget
23 Approved 2009-2010 CDU Budget
13. The Board of Trustees meeting held August 14, 2009, had special emphasis on budget and bond default related issues with Ms. Lisa Pattinson from Sovereign Bank. Those defaults relate to a net asset covenant and the discussion led to the plans to retain the McShane Group to provide assistance on financial reporting and management. The minutes and complete documentation of the August 14, 2009 Board of Trustees’ meeting\(^\text{24}\) described the above in complete detail.

14. We have completed a preliminary review of all organizational structures and reporting responsibilities, and an inventory and documentation of all personnel and their pay sources on campus as part of a re-organization of the financial and operational processes. This has led to the implementation of reorganized contracts and grants’ processes to streamline extramural pre- and post-award accounting, and to ensure compliance with the National Council University Research Administration (NCURA)\(^\text{25}\) best practices. This will further help align the process of linking budgets with the emerging recommendations from the review of the academic plan for the campus and alignment of academic resources.

Activity since the September 17, 2009 Report to WASC: Tasks and Timelines to Resolve the Budget Challenges

The Task Group I for Financial Stability, Planning, and Management is chaired by Mr. Nathaniel Clark (Chief Restructuring Officer and University Auditor) and this task group has developed a set of key activities and timelines based on WASC findings (see Attachment L – FSPM Tasks and Timelines). The Interim President’s latest report on February 2, 2010 to the University community and on February 12, 2010 to the Board of Trustees outlined the CDU budget and restructuring plan. The next key steps he presented are to: 1) become self sustaining with Expenses equaling Revenue by March 15, 2010; 2) implement the expense reduction plan by Feb 15, 2010; and 3) secure new revenues to balance the budget by March 1, 2010.

Dr. Norris also gave an update on Restructuring and University Spending as shown in the Figure 1 below:

He further indicated that we are now on target to implement the expense reduction plan by Feb 15, 2010; CDU is partially ($1.5) meeting the target to secure new revenues to balance by March 1, 2010; the Executive Service Corps (ESC) is providing support on operational

\(^{24}\) Board Minutes, August 14, 2009  
\(^{25}\) NCURA Confidential Report available at the Office of Grants Contract and Compliance
effectiveness; and the Interim President’s participation in White House Initiative on HBCU Medical Schools. The next steps for increasing resources include: New relations for training and health care delivery with the funding and anticipated reopening of MLK Hospital and settlement of the lawsuit with the County of Los Angeles; UC funding for telemedicine; potential new partnerships for the urgent care clinic that was closed on November 14, 2009 and a variety of development initiatives.

CDU has an operating total of $2.4 million deficit for the six months ending December 31, 2009. CDU sent WASC a report and an explanation from the CFO on December 22, 2009. CDU has approximately $2.5 million operating cash and equivalents, after spending approximately $2.4 million in the six months through December. CDU needs to reduce expenses immediately, in large amounts, in order to balance the current budget. The new Life Sciences Research and Nursing Education (LSRNE) building is projected for occupancy approximately March 2010. New Costs will include building operating costs, bank relations, bond administration, and debt service. New costs are projected at $300,000 per month.

**Finance Office Restructure**

The University realized in late 2008 that operations were consuming financial reserves at an alarming rate. In early 2009 the University began to implement a number of cost reductions in order move towards a balanced budget. CDU approved a balanced budget for FY2009-10, however, revenue streams fell and the infrastructure and systems necessary to implement the balanced budget were not effective.

The CFO joined CDU in August 2010. The following highlights the strategies and activities for the past six months. The CFO knew that we needed to reduce costs by a significant amount. The CFO needed to know our cash position. The CFO also needed to know what our operating deficit was on a weekly basis, both accrual and cash. The CFO immediately communicated to the administrators that we were freezing all non-essential expenditures. CFO personally approved every expenditure of $5,000 or more. We immediately put multiple reviews and controls on all employee actions.

Due to programming and other system-related problems, the reports that were available were not timely nor effective. We finally began to develop workable monthly reports in order to better understand our financial situation. We began to share the information with budget managers in order to provide them with tools to better manage their costs. We developed cash flow statements. We used the monthly reports to develop pro-forma scenarios and in the decision process for restructuring and additional expense reductions.

We opened the budget process, emphasizing faculty participation, including staff and the community. The Board became much more involved in financial oversight.

We have reduced the monthly operating deficit from ($500,000) in July by almost 80%. We have plans for additional cost reductions to be implemented in the coming weeks. We have plans to increase revenues. Conservatively, we have strategies to balance the budget using only existing revenues.

We have developed a five year budget projection with reasonable assumptions. We are actively engaged throughout the organization in budget management. We are slowly developing our systems with appropriate policies and procedures. We are training staff and faculty in fiscal management. We are improving the reporting of actual financial results, comparing them to budget. We are aligning our resources to our strategic plan. We are watching the short term and working with a long term horizon. We are in the process of

---

26 See Email re: Update on CDU sent December 22, 2009.
obtaining external assistance to improve our financial systems which will be critical to our moving forward effectively.

Since August 2009, the finance department has ended nine consultant positions. Finance has reduced one staff position and ended one temporary staff position. Select consultants have been converted to employee status. The annualized savings is approximately $1.2 million. Rebuilding the financial systems will take a tremendous amount of work and a year to complete. Since August 2010, the primary focus has been on the ledger system and financial integrity. The CFO will work on staff development, financial reporting, and customer service, concurrently during the next two years.

CDU Organizational Restructuring Update
The following organizational changes have taken place since the December 10, 2009 Board of Trustees meeting:

President’s Office: Direct reports to the President have been reduced. The following positions currently report to the President: a) Dean’s Council (Deans of COM, COSH, Nursing) b) Chief of Staff c) Chief Financial Officer d) Chief Restructuring Officer / University Auditor.

Academics: The President established a Deans’ Council to oversee and manage the University's resources and programs while he explores other organizational structures best suited for CDU's mission. The Deans’ Council is currently examining the cost-benefit of existing academic programs with an eye towards benefiting the university, the faculty and the students. Dr. Gloria McNeal, the founding Dean of the School of Nursing, was recruited and began her tenure at CDU on January 25, 2010.

Registrar / Student Services will be reorganized and consolidated to include: a) Student Financial Aid b) Enrollment and Admissions c) Accreditation d) Institutional Research e) Library Services and f) Saturday Science Academy.

Research: To improve service and to focus control and compliance activity, Research Administration has been segregated into three units: a) Integrity and Compliance (IRB / Vivarium) b) Research Administration and c) The Office of Sponsored Programs (formerly Office of Grants, Contracts and Compliance).

The Office of Sponsored Programs is closely working with the Finance and the Human Resources departments to assure that grants are adequately budgeted, controlled, and monitored to reduce compliance exposures or lost opportunities (e.g., under utilization of funder supplied resources).

Development: Under the leadership of the President, Development is being reorganized to broaden its focus and public/private reach to include: a) Alumni Affairs b) External Affairs c) Business Development and d) Institutional Grants Development and Management (e.g., Title III).

Department of Finance & Information Technology: The following restructuring changes have been made by management: a) The Information Technology function and responsibilities have been transferred to the Chief Financial Officer; b) A permanent Controller has been hired; c) The CFO has replaced costly Tatum, LLC (a Finance consulting firm) and ManageEase (a Human Resources/Payroll consulting firm) consultants with three permanent employees who have earned CPA certifications; and d) Finance department policies are being developed, documented and provided to the Board of Trustees’ sub-committee for review and approval.
Administration: The Chief Restructuring Officer / University Auditor with the assistance of Executive Services Corps (ESC) are working to fill the Human Resources Director position. Current plans include replacing ManageEase with permanent employees which will considerably reduce the university’s expenses.

We have been successful in convincing two prior employees to return as temporary employees to assist the university with the transition to permanent employee staffing. Their employee status determination (temporary to permanent) will be made by the HR Director once hired.

A new Employee Handbook and a Human Resource Department Procedure Manual have been developed and documented. Both the Handbook and the Procedure Manual will be reviewed by the Employee Concerns Committee and the Academic Senate Executive Committee and senior management.

CDU Restructuring – Expense Reduction
Substantiated reductions-in-force and monthly operations expense reductions total $348K. The Restructuring Committee believes that there are other operational expense reduction opportunities (e.g., management of purchased services, travel cost, etc.) that will improve future financial results.

Strategic Planning
The Executive Service Corps (ESC) assisted CDU in the development of a revised strategic plan that moves the current plan from a long-term aspiration model to a shorter range operational plan that ties critical core goals to budget with accountability measures. In short, the accelerated strategic plan focuses CDU, for the next 18 months, to the following goals with a March 2010 start date. Members of the strategic planning committee included the representatives from the board of trustees, executive council (deans and VPs), members of the academic senate, faculty, and WASC task group/oversight representatives. See Attachment M for complete list of participants.

1. Financial sustainability, planning and implementation
2. Meet or exceed all accreditation requirements
3. Implement effective and accountable management structures, processes, and staffing
4. Academic excellence, including an academic plan
## Proposed Goals and Objectives

(Goals in priority order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Sub-Objectives</th>
<th>Person Leading Work on the Objective</th>
<th>Resources Required to Achieve Objective</th>
<th>Time to Completion of Objective</th>
<th>Reference Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>Improve the 3 month cash flow</td>
<td>Identify and Implement $250,000 per month reduction by end of June by holding a series of budget meetings with key decision makers</td>
<td>Dr. Norris</td>
<td>CRO and All Executive members to follow up on their assignments</td>
<td>06/30/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bring researchers together by 1/20/10 to identify key options for faster spending to gain $100,000 in IDC revenues</td>
<td>Dr. Friedman</td>
<td>Meeting with PIs, cooperation from Human Resources and Finance</td>
<td>1/20/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete the items identified on 1/20/10 for faster research spending</td>
<td>Dr. Perkins</td>
<td>Meetings with faculty and PI, reports from Office of Sponsored Programs</td>
<td>03/15/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify other means to bring in $150,000 per month</td>
<td>Dr. Norris</td>
<td>Development staff, board members</td>
<td>5/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Find pro bono lawyers to represent CDU</td>
<td>Mr. Watkins</td>
<td>CDU marketing materials, contacting the lawyers</td>
<td>03/30/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Produce a balanced next year budget</td>
<td>Dr. Lau</td>
<td>President and EC member review</td>
<td>5/15/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Define the ongoing process for resource generation</td>
<td>Ms. Yohannes</td>
<td>Input from EC, director of Urban Health Institute, faculty and Board</td>
<td>6/30/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Sub-Objectives</td>
<td>Person Leading Work on the Objective</td>
<td>Resources Required to Achieve Objective</td>
<td>Time to Completion of Objective</td>
<td>Reference Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Live within next year’s balanced budget</td>
<td>Dr. Norris</td>
<td>Cooperation of Senior Management, monthly Financial Reports from Finance</td>
<td>7/1/11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet or Exceed All Accreditation Requirements</td>
<td>Implement WASC Plan Phase 1 – responding to the 5 top WASC concerns</td>
<td>Dr. Edelstein</td>
<td>All EC members follow up on assignments (20-25% of EC time)</td>
<td>6/30/10</td>
<td>Task group reports and supporting docs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interim Report</td>
<td>Dr. Edelstein</td>
<td>Information from EC members</td>
<td>2/28/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fully demonstrate WASC compliance</td>
<td>Dr. Edelstein</td>
<td>All WASC task groups</td>
<td>11/20/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify a Schedule for all Required Accreditations</td>
<td>Dr. Edelstein</td>
<td>All WASC task groups</td>
<td>2/2/10 07/31/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receive full WASC accreditation</td>
<td>Dr. Norris</td>
<td>Complete all tasks identified by the WASC Task Forces</td>
<td>07/01/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Sub-Objectives</td>
<td>Person Leading Work on the Objective</td>
<td>Resources Required to Achieve Objective</td>
<td>Time to Completion of Objective</td>
<td>Reference Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Effective and Accountable Management Structures, Processes, and Staffing</td>
<td>Select Permanent President</td>
<td>Mr. Williams</td>
<td>(The board chair met with faculty on 2/19) Meeting with Board members, teleconference with WASC</td>
<td>6/1/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilize Organization/ Complete the Essential Restructure</td>
<td>Mr. Clark</td>
<td>Cooperation and support of Board, President and Senior Management</td>
<td>3/30/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify all needed Policies, Procedures, and Job Descriptions</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Dr. Lau</td>
<td>HR (20 hrs.), ½ time temp for 3 months</td>
<td>7/1/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Dr. Orum</td>
<td>Drs. Wolf &amp; Shay</td>
<td>5/1/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Dr. Norris</td>
<td>Dr. Perkins, Melanie Rodriguez, Lee Irons</td>
<td>3/31/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Mr. Clark</td>
<td>HR Employment and Compliance reference Manuals</td>
<td>3/30/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a personnel review process</td>
<td>Mr. Clark</td>
<td>HR Director ($130K) and staff of two professionals and one admin assistant</td>
<td>7/15/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a process for rewarding merit</td>
<td>Mr. Clark</td>
<td>Budget for HR Director($130K) and staff of two professionals and one admin assistant</td>
<td>7/15/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out a baseline Communication survey of staff, faculty and students (soliciting input)</td>
<td>Mr. Clark</td>
<td>Hiring HR Director, cooperation of EC, Institutional Research Associate, Academic Senate</td>
<td>06/30/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strategy for improving internal communications</td>
<td>Mr. Clark</td>
<td>Hiring HR Director, cooperation of EC, Institutional Research Associate, Academic Senate</td>
<td>09/31/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Sub-Objectives</td>
<td>Person Leading Work on the Objective</td>
<td>Resources Required to Achieve Objective</td>
<td>Time to Completion of Objective</td>
<td>Reference Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create and disseminate to the board a letter defining expectations of a board member</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Williams</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>3/15/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit 4 new board members after doing an assessment of what skills are required</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Williams</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>6/30/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide 2 training sessions to board members on obligations and effectiveness of board members and boards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Williams</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>9/30/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build and charter a viable fund development committee of the board</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Williams</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>9/30/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Academic Programs</td>
<td>Generate an Academic Plan</td>
<td>Define University Objectives for Education, Scholarly Activity, and Service Excellence</td>
<td>Dr. Baker</td>
<td>1 hour per week meeting of all the deans</td>
<td>5/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define Program Offerings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Baker</td>
<td>1 hour per week meeting of all the deans, Resources within the Colleges</td>
<td>4/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define Outcomes to be Measured</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Baker</td>
<td>1 hour per week meeting of all the deans</td>
<td>4/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify Required Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Baker</td>
<td>1 hour per week meeting of all the deans</td>
<td>4/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify Partnership Opportunities with other organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Baker</td>
<td>1 hour per week meeting of all the deans</td>
<td>4/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a Companion Business Plan to Implement the Academic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. Baker</td>
<td>1 hour per week meeting of all the deans</td>
<td>6/1/10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Sub-Objectives</td>
<td>Person Leading Work on the Objective</td>
<td>Resources Required to Achieve Objective</td>
<td>Time to Completion of Objective</td>
<td>Reference Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish the first SON cohort</td>
<td>Admit 40 students Fall 2010 Hire Faculty and Personnel Develop SON Business Plan</td>
<td>Dr. McNeal</td>
<td>Physical Plant Human Resources IT Admissions Enrollment Financial Aid Financial Mgt Librarian Dean's Council Clinical Agencies $1.5M</td>
<td>08/20/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase enrollment to 120 students</td>
<td>Admit 2 cohorts each academic year Increase number of preceptorships Increase interdisciplinary collaborations Develop distance learning teaching strategies</td>
<td>Dr. McNeal</td>
<td>Physical Plant Human Resources IT Admissions Enrollment Financial Aid Financial Mgt Librarian Dean's Council Clinical Agencies $5.0M</td>
<td>08/20/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please see Attachment N for Strategic Plan as the working draft document. The plan is set for completion in March 2010

**Student Related Data and Planning**

The Institutional Research Office and the Student Administration Office have teamed to review the enrollment and retention data and provide it to deans and faculty.

The September 17, 2009 report to WASC included an update on student information collection and dissemination.

The Institutional Research Office continues to participate, prepare and submit surveys to meet contractual agreement with state, federal, and other external agencies such as IPEDS, WASC, College Board, etc. The office provides updated information about the university to researchers when preparing grant proposals. The IRO has been involved in preparing draft policies for the academic program review, and administrative program reviews, and assessment surveys to establish benchmarks for program review process. The office prepared and administered a survey for all CDU students during the summer of 2009 term using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) questions. Survey responses include over fifty percent (50%) student participation that provides a benchmark of CDU students’ perception and comments of their academic experience at CDU during the 2008/09 period. Additional assessments have been developed, data collected and analyzed in support of specific programs to establish benchmarks/baselines. The annual student orientation surveys started this academic year (August 2009) provide trends on students’ experiences and assist CDU to improve services. The office closely collaborated with faculty in developing academic program assessment handbook. During the preparation of program review documents, the IRO researched many other university documents, and requested permission from universities nationwide to use some of those documents to prepare CDU policies and handbooks for program reviews.

The IRO’s reports on student attrition, retention, and success will be accurate, automated, and provide insight into those issues for a proactive intervention and decision-making. These reports can be accomplished by the operational use of code tables in the student information system for cohorts and retention values, and the access to the NSCH services. The Institutional Research Office (IRO) has been working in collaboration with the Students Services and the Financial Aid Offices to identify processes to follow up student retention issues. The Student Services Office established a procedure to document in the student information systems the non-attendance of students scheduled for continuing enrollment from one term to the following. This process contributes to identify and document attrition rates and tracks student-identified explanations for withdrawal. In addition, the Institutional Research and the Student Services Offices have recommended instituting the process of reporting mid-term grades into the student information systems to profile students at risk. The Office of Financial Aid will complete requirements to be a certified member in the National Student Clearance House (NSCH) by spring of 2010. CDU’s participation in the NSC will allow the university to update key stakeholders of CDU student enrollment status, to track the movement of previously CDU enrolled student into other higher education institutions, and to measure their success rates.

The Institutional Research Office (IRO) continues to participate, prepare and submit surveys to meet contractual agreement with state, federal, and other external agencies such as IPEDS winter collection, and data sets for WASC interim report (see Attachment O – Data Deliverables and Index). The office updates the university profile with current data about the university in the IRO website. The IRO continues to participate in WASC Task committees, Academic Affairs meetings, assist program directors in developing and analysis of surveys,
collaborate with COM and COSH in updating faculty and students data, provide CDU institutional data for grant submission (COSH (MSEIP), COM (California Endowment), Research Offices (MBRS, WOC), Title III and Title V annual reports), prepare data analysis reports to deans (CDU MD program alumni in the Medical Board of California (MBC), Medical Education applicant and matriculants trend, enrollment and retention); provide data required for accreditation reports (e.g. in Physician Assistant), and continue the data integrity process with the Registrar’s Office for data accuracy.

The new initiative of the Institutional Research Office (IRO) for AY09-10 is the acquisition and implementation of the program assessment management software, WeaveOnline. The IRO has set up the software for CDU implementation (entity tree, user profile, roles and access), uploaded assessment materials to the software document repository, entered the student learning outcomes for each academic program, developed training material, and is in the process of providing hands-on demonstrations, and individual training sessions with primary focus on the academic program directors for the spring term. The IRO developed and administers a survey to benchmark program assessment at CDU prior to training to capture level of opinion on program assessment and assist program directors in evaluating their program assessment stage as of the spring of 2010.

**Student Administration, Registrar’s Office, Financial Aid Office and Counseling**

The WASC team report advised that the university needs to study systematically the nature of the problems with the financial aid office and the registrar’s office. CDU-WASC Task Group I (Financial Stability, Planning and Management) reviewed these issues as did the university restructure committee.

**Background and Activity to Date**

Ms. Tracie Matthews (Director of Financial Aid, California State University, Channel Islands) provided an external review of current financial aid policies and procedures in May 8, 2009. Ms. Matthews met with the Registrar’s Office, Academic Affairs, Information Systems, Institutional Research, and Finance to assess the relationship between offices and the financial aid. From that assessment, Ms. Matthews revised the Office of Financial Aid Policies and Procedures Manual. We engaged with The Kenaly Complement (Consultant) to provide temporary help in financial aid pending decisions on staffing organization.

On September 28 – 29, 2009, Ms. Matthews was invited back on to make an assessment and recommendations of staffing and organization of the financial aid and student administrative services office. Her report is on file and shared with the Council of Deans. The Office of Student Administration and Financial Aid made an action plan based on the recommendations in the external review report. The Council of Deans met in January 2010 after reviewing the report and recommended reactivating the search for an Executive Director of Student Administrative Services. That position was approved by University administration on February 3, 2010 and a search is underway.

The new Dean of School of Nursing, Dr. Gloria McNeal, is also evaluating the current services and staffing of the Offices of Student Administration and Financial Aid. The new dean joined CDU on January 25, 2010. She will give us a fresh perspective as the newest customer of these offices. Following the new dean’s assessment, the Council of Deans will implement a revised staffing plan in sync with the hiring of the executive director.

CDU will also consider The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) proposal for Student Administration Assessment Consultation. We

---

28 See AACRAO Proposal
delayed going forward with this assessment until the report by Ms. Matthews was completed and reviewed.

The student information system, PowerCampus, provides CDU an integrated database for all student information, ensuring consistency and data integrity. The following projects have been completed and reported in the September 17, 2009 report to WASC.

a. Launch of the Self-Service Portal, MyCDU, for online registration, billing, financial aid, and unofficial transcript access. MyCDU provides transparency by offering students and faculty real-time internet access to student data. MyCDU was launched for new and continuing student in Fall 2009. For the first time CDU held online registration.

b. The Registrar’s Office reconciled paper and electronic student files for all new and continuing students. Significant effort has been spent restoring the integrity of continuing student records and assuring the accuracy of new student records.

c. Staff development — In July 2009, the Office of Student Administration hosted a series of cross-training sessions with key staff members from SunGard, Information Systems, and Student Accounts.

The following accomplishments have been completed:

a. Lender evaluation list – June 2009 Office of Financial Aid developed an electronic lender evaluation list that allows students to compare several different lender options in a side by side comparison of lender benefits for Stafford/Plus/Grad-Plus and Alternative loans.

b. Scholarship Web page – in October 2009 the Office of Financial Aid researched and developed an external scholarship web page to assist student to find and apply for addition funding possibilities to help meet the expenses that federal and institutional aid is unable to cover.

c. Data Integration – in February 2010 the Office of Financial Aid along with the Office of Information Systems completed the data interface between PowerCampus and PowerFAIDS. This new interface will eliminate the duplication of data entry and reduce data entry errors and allow the seamless flow of information between the Office of the Registrar and the Office of Financial Aid and further eliminate incorrect financial aid awards.

d. Disbursement Processing – February 2010 the Office of Financial Aid along with the Office of Information Systems completed the set up of the disbursement module which will all for a seamless flow of data from the PowerFAIDS disbursement and the student account. This will also eliminate duplication of data entry and reduce data entry errors and eliminate incorrect financial aid disbursements.

e. National Student Clearinghouse (NSC) – March 2010 the Office of Financial Aid along with the office of Information Systems will complete testing and be a certified participant. NSC will allow the university to update key stakeholders of student enrollment status. In addition the university will be better able to track student movement and success rates.

f. The Office of Student Administration created a Semester Retention Report for Spring 2010. This report identifies and documents attrition rates and tracks student-identified explanations for withdrawal. This data was updated in the Student Information System (PowerCampus) and forwarded to the Office of Financial Aid, Finance, Institutional Research, and the College of Science and Health.

g. Faculty submitted Fall 2009 grades online via MyCDU. The Office of Student Administration provided faculty with training documents as well as individualized training session to learn how to navigate the system.

h. Historical academic records, both paper and electronic, were updated.

Counseling
The Dean of the College of Science and Health contributed to a plan for comprehensive student counseling including securing funding through a grant from the Department of Education to hire a retention coordinator. The plan includes evaluating students prior to admission through the Accuplacer Diagnostic Assessment tests, while supporting the
students through the services of the retention coordinator who will be responsible for assisting students with academic and non-academic resources to promote retention. In addition, the retention coordinator will be responsible for providing reports regarding student retention. Prior to the retention coordinator, student retention reports have been prepared by the Registrar’s Office.

Next Steps: Tasks for June 2010 Completion
1. Draft a Recruitment Policy that clearly articulates specific roles and responsibilities so that administration, staff, and faculty are fully aware of the range and scope of Office of Student Administration responsibilities. Distribute draft to key stakeholders for feedback and consensus.
2. Review the California Articulation Policies and Procedures Handbook and previous CDU articulation agreements and create an Action Plan to update all University Articulation Agreements
3. Implement the Cash Management, Online Inquiry and Online Application features of MyCDU (PowerCampus Self-Service Portal)
4. Define and document the core services of the Registrar’s Office by drafting a Policy Manual that provides a uniform code for office operation and behavior. Distribute draft to key stakeholders for feedback and consensus
5. Review and edit FERPA Policy, and submit to key stakeholders for consensus and educate Students, Faculty, and Staff on CDU FERPA Policy
6. Draft of Student Handbook submitted to key stakeholder for feedback and consensus

C. Presidential and Board Leadership

Background Related to Issues of Presidential and Board Leadership in the WASC Action Letter
Dr. James Appleton, President Emeritus at the University of Redlands, agreed to serve as a WASC Consultant and met with the Board of Trustees on December 10, 2009. This visit responded to WASC recommendations that a meeting be held with the governing board of CDU, WASC staff, and a WASC board consultant during one of the board’s regularly scheduled meetings to discuss presidential and board leadership issues and the Board’s role in responding to the probation action.

Dr. Appleton reviewed all of the WASC commission findings, prior WASC reports, and in particular, all of the commission letter findings with regard to presidential and Board leadership. Dr. Appleton provided in an open session an overview of the purpose of the visit and WASC expectations of universities. In closed session with the board and deans, Dr. Appleton detailed responsibilities of boards and discussed specific issues related to board functions. The CDU Board of Trustees began work on their goals, objectives, task and timelines. The Executive Service Corps (ESC) is now working with the board to continue board development. At the request of the university, Mr. Jerry Weissman (ESC) had a conference call with Dr. Appleton to review expectations and assessment of the board. Mr. Weissman and the ESC developed presented a proposal for board development and presented it at the February 12, 2010 meeting of the Board of Trustees. This development includes assessment of the academic plan, creation of a board operational plan and evaluation system, fund raising, assessment of board strengths, creation of a board recruitment matrix, and inventory of institutional needs (including operations, academic and community) matched to board member commitments.
The Board of Trustees has amended its bylaws\textsuperscript{29} and implemented the process to allow for faculty and student representations on the Board of Trustees. ESC is working with the Office of the President to revise the CDU strategic plan, per WASC recommendations, with a deadline of March 31, 2010 completion of the plan. The committee representing all campus constituencies has met, completed a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) assessment, priority review, and drafted revised objectives for a strategic plan with operational focus (see section IV.B. Financial Sustainability, Planning and Management for a detailed description of the strategic plan).

**Presidential Leadership Issues**

Keith Norris, MD is Interim President. Dr. Norris began a leadership and financial restructure of the university. Dr. Norris appointed Mr. Nathaniel Clark, University Auditor, as the Chief Restructuring Officer leading the university restructure committee. The goals of the committee were to review the administrative and academic structure of the university, make recommendations and monitor implementation. The restructure committee reviewed administrative and academic structure of the university. Per WASC commission letter finding, the committee reviewed the academic structure and its reporting relationships and created a new academic structure, the Council of Deans. The Council is made of the deans of the three colleges (Medicine, Science and Health and the new School of Nursing) and academic affairs. The Office of Academic Affairs serves as the support unit for the Council of Deans. The recommendation to appoint a provost remains under consideration but in view of budget constraints, the leadership concluded that the Council provides stronger management structure at this time.

The Board of Trustees has not yet announced intentions regarding the presidential search. However, one of the objectives of the revised strategic plan is for the Board of Trustees to energize and finalize the search process. At the time of the interim report, no final decision has been made by the Board of Trustees on the presidential search but on Friday, February 19, 2010, the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Bart Williams, met with the faculty of the Academic Senate to discuss their input regarding selecting Dr. Keith Norris, currently Interim President, as the permanent president of CDU. The Academic Senate unanimously endorsed making Dr. Norris a permanent president. Mr. Williams is taking that information back to the board of trustees for next action. At the February 19, 2010 meeting with the Chairman of the Board and at the Academic Senate Executive Committee meeting held February 23, 2010, faculty expressed their appreciation that the Board of Trustees showed willingness to include the Academic Senate in the decision-making process. They believe that this open communication on the part of the board is a demonstration of transparency and shared decision-making.

The CDU/WASC Task Group IV on Leadership chaired by the Academic Senate President, Dr. Eric Bing, reviewed and developed a tasks and timelines (see Attachment P – Leadership Tasks and Timelines) matched to WASC recommendations and developed the following tasks matched to WASC concerns.

1. Ensure continuity of faculty leadership: a) training new academic senate leaders, and b) faculty evaluation of the Academic Senate. This task is in process.
2. Restore trust. Measure leadership using a tool for 360 degree review of team leaders, develop policies and procedures for each department, review of policies for the institution, and develop an outline of policy and procedures. This task is now in process by the Office of the President and the Chief restructuring Officer.
3. Link the strategic plan to the 2010-11 budget and data management system. This task is assigned to the data-driven strategic plan and budget committee.

\textsuperscript{29} BOT Amended By-Laws
4. Create a new leadership model. Drs. Keith Norris (Interim President) and Dr. Eric Bing (Academic Senate President) outlined three (3) models of leadership and solicited stakeholder input on the models.

5. Data-driven decisions. This was announced by Dr. Norris on February 2, 2010 to include data sources and evidence in policy and procedure implementation.

6. Board Training (need to understand academic models/ responsibilities). This was assigned to the Executive Service Corps who presented to the Board of Trustees on February 12, 2010.

7. Appropriate reporting structure. A thorough review of the new reporting structure is expected by July 31, 2010 from the university restructuring committee, chaired by Mr. N. Clark.

8. Clarify what type of leaders CDU needs. This was completed and presented to the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees. See leadership survey below.

9. Roles and responsibilities. All faculty and staff should be able to match roles and responsibilities to CDU mission and objectives. These will be assessed as part of academic and administrative review process.

Leadership Survey
The WASC Leadership task group conducted an online survey of leadership style preferences at Charles Drew University to faculty, staff and students on November 19, 2009 to assess the CDU community’s preference for different leadership styles and their related characteristics. Based on their responses, the CDU community prefers a mix of transformational, democratic and people-oriented leadership style where the leader inspires his or her team with a shared vision of the future, invites other members to contribute to the decision-making process, and organizes, supports and develops the people in the team.

The least favorable style is autocratic leadership where a leader exerts high levels of power over his or her employees or team members and where people within the team are given few opportunities for making suggestions. The final report was presented at the Academic Senate full faculty meeting on February 9, 2010.

Data Table – 2009-2010 CDU Leadership Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in order the top 3 leadership characteristics that you believe would be most beneficial to the University at this time.</th>
<th>Median Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inspirational and shares vision</td>
<td>40.00607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves others in decisions</td>
<td>36.90137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegates responsibility</td>
<td>14.82853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitors and communicates success</td>
<td>13.1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energetic</td>
<td>11.72686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team work focus</td>
<td>11.72686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly visible and communicative</td>
<td>11.38088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes, supports and develops team</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentivizes team</td>
<td>7.241275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets the job done</td>
<td>6.898331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develops others skills</td>
<td>6.552352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Procedures</td>
<td>4.482549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exert Power</td>
<td>3.447648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meets needs of team</td>
<td>2.069803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short term horizon</td>
<td>1.034901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answer Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Median Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Next Steps and Timeline for Major Tasks Still Needing Completion

1. Decision on presidential search – At the time of this report, no final decision has been made by the Board of Trustees on the presidential search but on Friday, February 19, 2010, the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Bart Williams, met with the faculty of the Academic Senate to discuss their input regarding selecting Dr. Keith Norris, currently Interim President, the permanent president of CDU. The Academic Senate unanimously endorsed making Dr. Norris a permanent president. Mr. Williams is taking that information back to the board of trustees for next action.

2. Budget revisions based on project deficit – The budget revisions will be completed in March by the CFO and Interim President.

3. Detailed description of the new administrative and academic structure – This will be completed in March by the Interim President.

4. Development of Board of Trustees' goals, objectives and self-assessment plan – This will be completed by the Board Chair working with the Executive Service Corps in August 2010.

D. Faculty Governance, Policies, and Development

The September 17, 2009 report to WASC identified the following actions taken:

1. The Board of Trustees has amended its bylaws to have faculty representation as well as student representation. The Board of Trustees' Academic Affairs Subcommittee is reviewing the faculty memorandum of agreement document. The Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and the President are attending each others' meetings and participating jointly on budget planning.

2. Faculty Development — The Dean of the College of Medicine invested resources to hire a faculty development director who comes with an extensive background in health sciences and faculty development and has conducted workshops, boot camps (extended workshops with learning outcomes and learning communities for both colleges). We also have held an array of external faculty development workshops conducted by experts for faculty of both colleges.

3. Governance and policy and procedure issues: The ad hoc committee on faculty appointments and promotions (which included the deans of the colleges, the dean of Academic Affairs, and participation by a member of the Board of Trustees) made excellent suggestions, many of which have been implemented. One of the recommendations was that each college needed to specifically tailor recommendations to the needs of their own faculty but acting under an “umbrella” of university guidelines. The dean and the associate dean of the College of Medicine, acting on recommendations, reorganized the office of faculty affairs, established subcommittees, established a new appointments and promotions process and a point calibration system
for peer review. This new system is up and rolling and is used for all new appointments, promotions and recalibrations of existing faculty. This process is shared with the College of Science and Health who have sent representatives, including the dean, to the College of Medicine meetings. The College of Science and Health is creating their own system but is using the ad hoc committee recommendations as a guide. The deans and other senior administrators participated in all aspects of this process.

Actions taken since the September 17, 2009 report to WASC
Task Group II of Organizational Arrangements (OA), chaired by the Dean of the College of Science and Health, Dr. Gail Orum-Alexander, created a detailed matrix of 72 issues covering faculty workload and contracts, use of data systems, and program assessment and review (see Attachment Q - OA Tasks and Timelines). The task group identified leadership issues related to governance policy and referred these to the leadership committee in discussion in the Executive Council.

Current actions include the following:
1. The Academic Senate completed its revision of the senate constitution and bylaws and is now holding elections. The Board of Trustees completed review of the constitution and approved the changes.
2. As described earlier, the Board of Trustees implemented its bylaws change and faculty and student representatives now are participating members of the board.
3. The interim president (as part of administrative restructuring and in response to WASC concerns of the academic reporting structure) formed the Council of Deans (described earlier) to unify academic planning, reporting, decision making, and standardize a framework for academic governance across colleges in collaboration with the Academic Senate committee on education. The new Dean of the School of Nursing, Dr. Gloria McNeal joined CDU officially on January 25, 2010.30

The first item reviewed by the new Council of Deans (at the request of the Board of Trustees) was the Academic Senate’s memorandum of agreement (MOA) regarding faculty rights. This document which is a precursor to the faculty contract process has been delayed by administration (Board of Trustees and Administration) causing much concern among the faculty. The Deans’ Council recognized the delay and expedited a companion document addressing the faculty rights and responsibilities. This document will be sent to the Board of Trustees and then back to the Academic Senate for review and adoption. While delay is regretted, the two documents should provide a solid foundation for the contract process which the Academic Senate has completed for administration review pending MOA approval.

4. All university-wide policy and procedures are undergoing audit and review under the direction of the Chief Restructuring Officer. The WASC compliance audit checklist was used as a cross check on CDU policy and procedures’ inventory. Executive Council members have been given policy review assignments.
5. The academic and administrative review policy and procedures handbook are described in section IV.E. Assessment of Student Learning, Student Success, and University Endeavors, of this report.
6. The University Catalog has been the subject of intensive review by the colleges and may be found at http://www.cdrewu.edu/assets/pdfs/CDUCatalog20092011online.pdf.

Next Steps, Tasks and Timelines for Completion of Key Items
1. The Interim President has completed review of the Council of Deans’ report on faculty rights and responsibilities. The document will be submitted to the Board of Trustees and Academic Senate for review and final approval is expected by all bodies at the end of March 2010.

30 See http://www.cdrewu.edu/news/2010/NewDeanNursing
2. The university-wide policy and procedure review will be completed by June 2010 under the leadership of the Mr. Nathaniel Clark, Chief Restructuring Officer & University Auditor. Task Group II for Organizational Arrangements chaired by Dr. Gail Orum-Alexander, Dean of College of Science and Health, identified academic policy and procedures and timelines for the colleges and Council of Deans to review. All policy and procedures will be in place for the 2010-11 academic year.

3. The revised strategic plan calls for the creation of an academic plan by the Council of Deans. We have asked Dr. Charles Lindahl (ESC) to assist the Council of Deans in this process in March and April 2010.

E. Assessment of Student Learning, Student Success, and University Endeavors

Academic Standards and Processes

The September 17, 2009 report to WASC described the following activities:

1. Program Directors have prepared the SLO/curriculum/assessment tools alignment matrix.
2. The Dean of College of Science and Health (COSH) held a curriculum retreat on August 13, 2009 to review the 2009-2010 assessment plans. The dean is centralizing collection of initial assessment tools for the 2009-2010 academic year using the template developed by faculty and the Institutional Research Office.
3. The Associate Dean of the College of Medicine (COM) has completed a similar process for the CDU-UCLA medical education program working with the CDU Education Policy and Curriculum Committee and the UCLA Medical Education Committee.

A faculty committee and administration produced an academic review policy and procedure handbook (see Attachment R – Academic Program Review Handbook) and an administrative review policy and procedure handbook (see Attachment S – Administrative Program Assessment Handbook) in August 200931. The policy and procedures and handbooks for academic and administrative review were based on assessment of best practices at other universities, and the WASC best practices guide32, and a workshop by Dr. Angela Albright (Associate Dean of the College of Health and Human Services, CDU – Dominguez Hills). CDU-WASC Task Group III (Academic Standards and Processes) reviewed the handbooks and made a series of proposals for implementation of the review process including a compilation of a “tool kit” for implementation. The committee further recommended that a workshop on assessment take place concurrent with implementation. The task group emphasized that academic program directors benefited from previous workshops and suggested that administrative and academic support offices were in need of similar workshops. Dr. Mary Allen, an expert on academic program review, held three (3) workshops at the CDU campus on October 29 – 30, 200933. The first two workshops were directed at program administration and attended by 58 staff (most administrative offices sent multiple participants). The following day, all of the academic program directors and deans met with Dr. Allen to review progress to date on academic assessment and establish system to fully develop program review and tie it to university review process and schedule. The policy and procedure handbooks were further reviewed and refined by the Academic Senate and sent to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate for its approval on November 11, 2009. Program Directors were using the academic review forms as a working draft even prior to official adoption. Therefore, all programs were able to use a standardized system to refine objectives, and collect data from the first semester. The next step for

31 See Administrative and Academic Program Review Handbooks
32 See WASC Resource Guide for “Good Practices” in Academic Program Review
33 See Dr. Mary Allen’s Workshop Announcement
academic review is to conduct self assessment and have preliminary data analysis available to their deans for budget review in March and April 2010.

CDU WASC Task Group II for Organizational Arrangements has set a schedule for key tasks for academic and administrative review in the 2009-10 academic year. The schedule for academic review was tied to the academic calendar and the administrative reviews. We have identified November 2010, December 2010, and January 2011 as dates for interim external program reviews. The Offices of Dean of College of Science and Health and College of Medicine also provided dates of accreditation review for professional programs. The Dean of the College of Science and Health indicates that the schedule for program review and preliminary assessment of fall academic learning outcomes is complete. The College of Medicine Associate Dean of Student Affairs has set a schedule for review of medical student rotations that have occurred to date. Task Group III for Academic Standards and Processes will convene in March 2010 and ask program directors to present data and their preliminary analysis for academic review.

The governing board (CDU Board of Trustees) at its meeting on February 12, 2010 established guidelines for determining Board effectiveness using the services of the Executive Service Corps (described in the introduction to this report). Dates for the review have not been set at the time of submission of this report.

Plan to Complete Academic and Administrative Review
The Deans and Vice Presidents (Executive Council of the President) each identified the administrative units that will undergo self assessment and external review. Many offices have previously completed recent external reviews and are using that information to organize objectives, benchmarks, and self-assessment. Although many of our administrative programs undergo external review and are now engaged in restructure, using a standardized administrative review process is new for many offices and delay has occurred. In order to keep on schedule, the WASC task group oversight committee compiled a list of administrative offices and is asking each Executive Council member and/or Unit Director to make a formal presentation of objectives and benchmarks in March 2010. The February 11th CDU-WASC Leadership meeting was devoted to the analysis of policy review and administrative review updates. In April 2009, the ALO and Institutional Research Associate will meet with each administrative unit to provide assistance and review objectives, benchmarks, and self-assessment.

V. IDENTIFICATION OF OTHER CHANGES AND ISSUES CURRENTLY FACING THE INSTITUTION

Changes at the University and Issues
The preceding report documents major changes at Charles Drew University and issues facing the University. Listed below is a summary of the major issues and changes discussed in this interim report.
1. The budget challenges at CDU remain a critical concern and the university is implementing a budget reduction plan and resource development plan. The interim president, Dr. Keith Norris, implemented the University restructure plan described below. The current year working budget and the draft 2010-11 budget reflect those changes. The current year working budget will be brought into balance by April 1, 2010.
2. The university has implemented a university restructure plan. Interim President, Dr. Keith Norris appointed a university restructuring committee that includes Academic Senate representatives. The committee recommendations have been outlined in this report. Key changes include: a) the President’s Office; b) Academics; c) Research; d) Development; e) Department of Finance
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and Information Systems; f) Administration as detailed in section IV.B. Financial Sustainability, Planning, and Management). The new Council of Deans was created in response to WASC concerns about stronger administration of Academic Affairs. The recommendation to appoint a provost remains under consideration but in view of budget constraints, the leadership concluded that the Council provides stronger management of Academic Affairs without the substantial additional costs of higher level administration.

3. The CDU Urgent Care Clinic was closed on November 14, 2009 as part of budget reductions and university restructuring. CDU’s Urgent Care Clinic, located in the Kenneth Hahn Plaza, 11722 South Wilmington Avenue, was designed to meet many of the needs of South Los Angeles’ patient population including the uninsured, and underinsured. University leadership is working with local community clinics and health care organizations to reopen the site as a community health center. Negotiations have been initiated with several health provider organizations and funding agencies. CDU would not own and operate this center but would benefit as a partner for practice and educational training for all of the colleges.

4. Recent appointments include: a) Keith Norris, MD – Interim President; b) Ron Lau, EdD - Chief Financial Officer; c) Gloria McNeal, PhD - Dean of School of Nursing; d) Nathaniel Clark, CIA – Chief Restructuring Officer and University Auditor; and e) Darlene Parker-Kelly, MSLS – Director of Library and Learning Resource Center.

5. The Board of Trustees met with Dr. James Appleton at the recommendation of WASC. The Executive Service Corps is continuing restructure and development activity in follow up to the visit. A new board member, Mr. James Lott (see Attachment T – James Lott Bio), was appointed at the February 12, 2010 Board of Trustees meeting. Faculty and student representatives are now serving members of the board.

6. A university wide oversight committee created a plan for addressing the WASC concerns and is now implementing the plan. A university committee of Academic Senate and Administration meets weekly to monitor progress.

7. A revised strategic plan draft has been developed and the final plan will be completed in March 2010 for adoption by the Interim President and Board of Trustees.

8. Policy and procedures for academic and administrative program reviews were completed, approved and are being implemented. First semester outcomes are under analysis and academic and administrative self review is taking place. Curriculum and faculty development related to this process have occurred. The results of program reviews will help shape the budget development process.

9. A conference call with WASC Liaison, Dr. Diane Harvey, and CDU WASC Leadership was completed on February 25, 2010 and a CDU leadership visit to WASC is planned for March 2010. Both of these communications were initiated by Charles Drew University.

10. The final approval of the faculty Memorandum of Agreement is overdue. But it has been reviewed and a companion document “faculty rights and responsibilities” was drafted by the Council of Deans for Board of Trustees and Academic Senate approval in March 2010.

11. Completion of the new Life Science Research and Nursing Education building and parking facility are on time and set to open in March 2010. The School of Nursing is finalizing plans to open in the Fall of 2010.

12. The colleges continue to develop new partnerships for education and clinical training.

VI. CONCLUDING STATEMENT

The entire CDU campus is aware of the urgency of the issues brought forth in the WASC action letter and CDU task groups’ review and action plans. The campus has been consistent in embracing the recommendations not only as needed for accreditation but as a road map and foundation for a sustainable outcomes-based university.

Since the July 2009 WASC action letter and September 2009 CDU leadership visit with WASC, much work has occurred as documented by our task group reports. However, Preparation for the report reinforces what our oversight group, Academic Senate, Board of Trustees and faculty
already know: the pace of work must be accelerated and sustained. This interim report and recent reports to our campus community attest to the comprehensive nature of changes taking place at CDU. The Academic Senate commented that this review process has provided an opportunity to expand campus communication, trust, and sharing with administration on campus. We have reached beyond our campus for support and found it from local partners, philanthropic organizations, and government and university entities. We recognize that not all of the work can be done at once and we have set priorities accordingly. The process underscores the need for vigilance.

VII. Required Documents for all Interim Reports

1. Current Catalog(s)—CD-ROM or link to web-based catalog will suffice (see http://www.cdrewu.edu/assets/pdfs/CDUCatalog20092011online.pdf
2. Summary Data Form (see Attachment U)
3. Complete set of Required Data Exhibits to Support Interim Reports (see Attachment V)
4. Most recent audited financial statements by an independent certified public accountant or, if a public institution, by the appropriate state agency; management letters, if any (see Attachment W)
5. Organization charts or tables, both administrative and academic, highlighting any major changes since the last visit (see Attachment X)

VIII. Additional Financial Documents

1. Financial statements for the current fiscal year including Budgeted and Actual Year-to-Date and Budgeted and Actual Last Year Totals (see Attachment Y)
2. Projected budgets for the upcoming three fiscal years, including the key assumptions for each set of projections (see Attachment Z)