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ACCREDITATION REVIEW

University of California at Santa Barbara

INTRODUCTION

The University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB) has realized a remarkable trajectory since the last accreditation visit. Research productivity, the excellence of the faculty, the quality of students, and many other aspects of the campus experience have improved dramatically. Excellence in research has been widely recognized through such achievements as entrance into AAU in 1995, the achievement of three Nobel Laureates, and impressively increasing research funding. The intensification of research efforts does not appear to have distracted faculty from their commitment to teaching. The qualifications of students have also risen during recent years: SAT scores have steadily increased in the last several years, at an average of about 15 points a year.

The Accreditation Team was specifically charged to look at three aspects: the Freshman Experience, Graduate Education, and Educational Effectiveness. The team divided into three sub-teams to consider these aspects, held team or sub-team meetings with many groups and individuals, discussed the findings together, and agreed on the recommendations which follow.

The Accreditation Team was unanimously impressed by both the quality of work at UCSB and the sense of well-being and enthusiasm on the campus. The pride and satisfaction of students, staff, faculty, and administration in the recent history of the University provide rich soil for the continued improvement for which UCSB clearly seems destined.
The campus is full of exciting initiatives and both the determination and the energy to make them happen. There are so many new and important goals—increased research, the new four-quarter initiative, strategic planning, emphasis on the undergraduate experience, and a capital campaign, to name the most important—that it would be far too easy to lose focus. Obviously, there are real dangers in such a many-headed agenda. Some areas could easily get the attention and resources at the expense of the others. It is imperative that the University focus on a few important issues and allocate financial and personnel resources accordingly; schedules for action must also be determined. The Accreditation Team felt some concern for new initiatives in undergraduate education, particularly the Freshman-Year Experience, unless clearly defined financial and personnel commitments underpin the planned improvements. The upper administration must make sure that the person in charge of each of these initiatives has both the authority and the resources to achieve the stated goals. The organizational structure and financial backing for each chosen initiative will be essential to success. Unless the resources and leadership are clearly and forcefully committed, it would be far too easy to slide on some of the initiatives deemed less urgent, for example, to emphasize growing research aspirations at the expense of the undergraduate initiatives which are essential to UCSB’s future.

Throughout our discussions we were aware that more attention must be paid to issues of diversity, both in terms of increasing diversity of faculty, staff, and students, and in terms of creating a more comfortable, hospitable environment for those from protected groups who are already on campus. Although not one of the three stated categories being observed, these issues surfaced in discussions throughout the visit.
The Team was also concerned about the ill-matched timing of the WASC accreditation visit and the development of the Strategic Plan, the first draft of which is completed. There has not yet been integration between the two efforts. As the draft of the Strategic Plan is discussed and finalized on campus, the findings of the WASC accreditation report must be incorporated. The overlapping schedules for the two efforts make that integration awkward, perhaps difficult. But it is necessary.

The Team was well aware that future budgetary pressures could impair the ability of the University to move ahead. A major lacuna in the visit was the lack of information on budgetary planning in the presentations of academic plans. The budget realities and the academic goals must be integrated as UCSB maps its future.

Finally, the Team was concerned that there may be major financial challenges ahead that could threaten the very impressive plans that are being developed. UCSB faces the future buoyed by the remarkable growth and development of the past. But the possibility of a less prosperous future for the State of California has not been taken into consideration. Certainly prioritization of goals will be important to the University should any unforeseen exigencies occur.

I. THE FRESHMAN-YEAR EXPERIENCE

A. An Overview

UCSB has undergone a radical transformation during the past few years experiencing a substantial increase in research awards to faculty and a notable rise in national recognition
of its research programs. At the same time, the UCSB undergraduate student body has become academically stronger through increasingly competitive admissions. For the next decade, UCSB faces the challenge of aligning the undergraduate experience to make the most of these transformations. The WASC accreditation visit comes at a time when it makes good sense to reexamine the place of undergraduates in the research mission of the University.

In identifying the Freshman-Year Experience as a focus for the Self-Study, UCSB has recognized that the first step in establishing a new set of expectations about undergraduate education must begin at the beginning for all students. UCSB has acknowledged that it is crucial to pay attention to the ways that the newest and youngest members of the UCSB community are welcomed and introduced to its core values and mission.¹

To benefit from and to participate fully in the research enterprise that engages the UCSB faculty, students need to develop abilities and attitudes that prepare them to work as partners with faculty in the discovery of knowledge. UCSB’s Freshman-Year Experience Self-Study report describes a list of objectives for the first year consistent with this goal of undergraduate education in a research university. The report also outlined initiatives in academic, personal and social development that, through cooperation and coordination across the College of Letters and Sciences, Student Affairs, and Residential Living offices,

¹ We acknowledge that the needs of the transfer student population, which were not addressed in the Self-Study report, require special attention. We trust that the goal of integrating new students into campus life applies to this group as well as to freshmen. We expect that initiatives for new students will be expanded to serve transfers as appropriate.
would bring to fruition an overarching vision for building a community of undergraduates who are a vital part of the campus intellectual and social life.

In the WASC Team’s meeting with the Freshman-Year Experience Committee to discuss the report, we were impressed by the collegiality among the various members of the group. Even more impressive was the sense that this group, by virtue of being constituted, had begun to make progress on the first of its main recommendations – “to develop a more coordinated approach to helping freshmen meet the goals we have planned for them.” (Self-Study, p. 47) We applaud UCSB for taking advantage of the accreditation process not only to assess its programs and services for freshmen but also to start implementing the recommendations.

The WASC Team concurs with the group’s finding that “the principal goal of the freshman program is an academic one.” (Self-Study, p. 21) We also endorse as an important priority the need for new students to develop a sense of belonging within the UCSB community. (Self-Study, p. 47) In our conversations with students and faculty, we learned that very often, personal and social relationships grow naturally out of shared intellectual interests, especially when students pursue these interests in a small class taught by a faculty member such as an Honors Section or a Freshman Seminar. We recommend that UCSB create more opportunities for first-year students to build relationships with peers and with faculty around common intellectual interests, especially through small classes.
We recommend placing a high priority on encouraging activities that promote peer and faculty/student relationships for a number of reasons. First, the UCSB students and faculty currently involved in small classes report an excitement about learning and the opportunity to explore concepts in greater depth both in discussion and in writing assignments. From the longer perspective of enhancing the four-year undergraduate experience, when students get to know a member of the faculty with whom they share scholarly interests in their first year, they have a chance to build upon this relationship and pursue advanced study in the field through a major concentration, research, and/or departmental honors. Several of the students whom the Team met during the visit acknowledge small classes as a factor contributing to their success in finding a faculty mentor for research or departmental honors.

Small faculty-led classes are the best approach but they are not the only way to prepare students for full participation in the research university. The report described a range of other programs that can serve the same goal, and are described below. Given the size of the freshman class and the limitations on available faculty resources, we endorse the report's recommendations for expanding other existing small-group activities that bring together students and faculty, both curricular (e.g. writing classes) and extracurricular (e.g. residential programs), in addition to expanding the available number of small courses offered for freshmen.
In the sections that follow, the WASC Visiting Team raises questions to help focus attention on the conditions that will enable UCSB to achieve successful development and implementation of the Freshman-Year initiatives.

B. Curriculum, Residential Life and Academic Support

Preparing students for the learning that a research university can provide has three attributes on the academic side. Students must acquire knowledge at a satisfactory level and with real breadth. They must gain skills in writing, critical thinking, and numeracy. Finally, they must become engaged members of the university community. These academic attributes are supported by, and in turn support, the personal and social development that UCSB also wishes to incorporate into the first-year experience. The Self-Study has detailed goals to achieve each of these facets of the freshman experience. The Accreditation Team applauds these goals because together they are needed for students to begin to become members in the research community of UCSB.

In terms of the provision of knowledge and skills, UCSB already does a commendable job, as evidenced by student surveys and our discussions with students. The skills emphasized in the Self-Study, together with those developed through the general requirements, are needed to achieve the capabilities to develop and communicate knowledge of different types. As our discussion with the committee working on General Education requirements made clear, the writing requirement may require reformulation, and the committee’s ideas about how to do so make good sense.
Likewise, general education courses provide knowledge with the needed depth and breadth. Once again, student surveys and our discussion with students support this judgment. The commitment of faculty to undergraduate education and the enrichment that comes when faculty bring their scholarship into the classroom contribute to the high-quality education that UCSB undergraduates receive. Lecturers appropriately play a role in this education, particularly in certain disciplines, but the fact that permanent faculty have consistently amounted to three-quarters of the entire faculty surely adds to the quality of a UCSB education. To maintain the synergies between research and teaching that currently exist, it is important that UCSB maintain this proportion as it expands and innovates over the next decade.

Academic support units play a fundamental role in this process. Campus Learning Assistance Services (CLAS) will have about 7,000 visits this year, with freshmen making up the largest single group. The number of visits has been growing by about one-tenth annually. In our view, CLAS tutors are very successful in working with students, in part because they offer tutors strong training. The Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) likewise has been very successful in working with low-income and first-generation students; Program of Determined Students (PODS) in particular has demonstrated success in developing skills and knowledge needed by students. Other academic support functions are similarly successful.

There remain problems in UCSB’s capacity to provide the skills and knowledge needed by first-year students. The General Education Committee has identified problems
that often arise with general education curricula and is forming a strategy to solve them. Most importantly, they point to the problem of ensuring that general education courses are regularly assessed to ensure that they meet their general education goals. This is entirely appropriate.

Two other problems also have come to our attention. First, Teaching Assistants (TAs) are not always well trained to teach. There are notable exceptions, including those trained by CLAS and the Writing Program and in some departments, and many students reported superb interactions with TAs. But TAs we met themselves reported little training, and students concurred that their educational efforts were uneven.

Second, academic support seems underfunded. They are clearly limited in the services they can provide, at a time when the demand for these services has been growing rapidly. The Self-Study notes the disproportionate cuts received by staff units in the mid-1990s, and the need to reinstate some of these funds. We concur; even in the absence of growth in students, academic support units require added resources. Clearly this need is compounded by the projected growth in the number of students. In the absence of these investments, all UCSB freshmen would lose an important source of academic and social assistance, but the burden might fall most heavily on low-income, minority, and first-generation students.

In our view, the biggest problem that UCSB faces in the first year concerns engaging students in the university community. This engagement involves student enthusiasm,
motivation or, as the Self-Study puts it “excitement about learning” (p. 35). The Self-Study points to this problem when, discussing the results of student focus groups, it writes “Students in all groups cite the size of classes and lack of personal attention as the greatest impediments to motivation” (p. 36). The existence of this problem was widely confirmed by our meetings with students. We agree fully with the Self-Study’s concern over this issue.

As our discussions with faculty, administrators, staff and students made abundantly clear, engagement has many dimensions. It involves interaction with faculty members, forming intellectual communities with other students, connecting with research, and gaining a sense of how to chart the path best for the student. These are all academic, but they also affect, and are affected by, students’ personal and social development. In agreement with the Self-Study’s statement that “Enhanced academic achievement is the primary goal of any institution of higher learning” (p. 24), we will focus here on the academic dimension of engagement.

Many first-year students are deeply engaged in their educations. Two groups in particular have organized relations they find profoundly stimulating: Creative Studies students and Honors students. The source of their connectedness became clear from their articulate discussion and strong advocacy of UCSB. They identify several sources of satisfaction. First they had direct interaction with faculty in small-group settings beginning from the first year. Second, they formed intellectual communities themselves; they valued and learned from one another in their courses. Third, they formed a social network. Having a common space like the Honors Lounge was critical for this. Creative Studies students
identified organized coffees where students got together. Fourth, they felt they had excellent advising, often informally through their connections with faculty members. Fifth, they were oriented towards research, and many third and fourth year students were actively and excitedly engaged in research working with faculty members and at times graduate students and other undergraduates. It was clear that this engagement was personal and social as well as academic. More could be done for these students, especially in Honors where faculty and students pointed to problems of underfunding and hence reliance on the voluntary activity of faculty members. The Self-Study recognizes the need to invest in Honors. But the success of these initiatives is notable; in the group of students we met, most said that they would not have come to UCSB had it not been for Honors or Creative Studies.

The problem is that these students form only one-tenth of UCSB’s undergraduates. The question is how the other nine-tenths can enjoy the same kind of engagement. We strongly feel—in agreement with everyone we talked to—that all UCSB students should gain these benefits, and that if they did, undergraduate education at UCSB, already very good, would improve markedly. It must be said that some first year courses are engaging. Many students pointed to the benefits of having faculty in even the largest classes who were accessible to them. Important innovations such as linking content courses with freshman writing courses, move in this direction. The freshman writing courses themselves are small enough to build intellectual community. TAs had similar effects for some students. Academic support services had clear, strong effects in involving students in small groups in which they connected to tutors and to other students; with better funding they no doubt could do more of this.
In agreement with those we talked to, we feel that these mechanisms, by themselves, are not sufficient to achieve the level of engagement needed and sought by UCSB students. The Self-Study and our conversations suggest several complementary means to achieve this end. The mechanism emphasized most strongly in the Self-Study and in our conversations was the general education freshman seminar. While the UCSB community needs to define the goals and structure of these seminars more explicitly, our conversations led us to conclude that these seminars would be small (about 18 students), interactive, probably writing-intensive and speaking-intensive, offered for four credits, and would investigate an important intellectual problem. They would all meet general education requirements. UCSB offers five of these seminars this year, and plans to offer 10 next year and 20 the following year, at which time it will assess the effectiveness of this program.

Such seminars have great potential to promote engagement for first-year students. A number of us on the WASC Team have worked with such seminars, and in our own institutions and nationally such seminars have demonstrably built intellectual communities between faculty and students and among students themselves. They also have strong, positive effects on retention and academic achievement. We know that there is great enthusiasm for such seminars among UCSB students, faculty and staff. Department chairs, in particular, made it clear that, resources permitting, they and their faculty would welcome this innovation. They could play an important part in improving intellectual engagement in the first year.
As academic leaders at UCSB well know, several questions must be answered before the role of these seminars at UCSB can be ascertained. Most importantly, do they work? A careful assessment, based both on student surveys and assessment of objective learning outcomes, will be required for this end. A clear documentation of the effectiveness of these seminars will be needed to establish their roles and to convince university leaders that they are worth the cost, which will be substantial. Second, the mechanism to generate a regular flow of these seminars must be established. We agree with faculty and administrators who note that, if these seminars become a permanent feature of the curriculum, they must be taught on load, and must not lead to the great growth of lecturers in other courses. One chair pointed out to us that faced with a choice between a large section service course and an 18-person seminar, he would have to schedule the service course, and we entirely understand this decision. Hence any mechanism must involve new resources for departments that add significant numbers of freshman seminars. Third, a decision must be made about whether they are four-credit courses or are one- to two-credit courses, similar to some of the first-year seminars currently offered.

Finally, the question must be answered about the role of these seminars in the UCSB first-year program. One model discussed by members of the First-Year Committee was the "mosaic," in which four-credit first-year seminars would be complemented by one-credit seminars, Interdisciplinary Studies 20 (INT 20), Program of Determined Students courses and so forth. These other options have had notable success over the past few years. In this model, every UCSB student could have some such engaging first-year program, but could choose the one most appropriate to him or her. In another model, UCSB would build up
first-year seminars over time, perhaps establishing enough for one-half of UCSB freshmen in five years. This is clearly a key question for the University to answer.

Engaging students in the freshman year must involve more than a single seminar, no matter how good it is. Advising that meets the needs of students is necessary. Staff we talked to mentioned that first-year students might have the greatest need for advising but be most resistant to it. This accords with the WASC Team's experience in our home institutions. We talked to students for whom first-year advising failed miserably and to others for whom it succeeded. First-year seminars can create the kind of informal advising that now benefits Honors students. We learned that the University has invested in adding advisors, which is laudable. Further advisors might be needed as the student body expands. But the University should investigate how to improve the delivery of advising services to first-year students.

Undergraduate research is a fundamental attribute of engagement in a research university. UCSB has a fine record of undergraduate research. From the faculty and students we spoke to, we learned that such research is conducted by a substantial minority of juniors and seniors (perhaps 20 percent in total) and that it is absolutely fundamental in their education. UCSB also contributes to funding such research, complemented by faculty research grants and other sources. Freshmen undertake little formal research, which typically is appropriate since such research presumes that students have mastered material beyond the scope of even well-prepared first-year students. But as the Self-Study and faculty engaged in undergraduate research agreed, the first year can begin the process of
engagement in the creation of knowledge. Freshman seminars are one important means. In one seminar described to us, students in fact engage in research with primary sources, working with the faculty member and other students. One-credit seminars have often featured faculty research with excellent results. Faculty also pointed to the use of research exercises in large lecture courses, including those in which the faculty member discusses his or her own research. Co-curricular activities such as inviting majors or prospective majors to seminar speakers can have the same effect. Such changes would both link students to the life of knowledge creation and likely lead to greater involvement in research as juniors, seniors, and graduate students.

In these ways, first-year students can become engaged in the activities of a research university. They begin the life of independent creators of knowledge, but do so in a social context of mentors and fellow workers involved in a community of scholarship. At the same time they gain the skills and knowledge needed to transform these beginnings into more active research. As we note below, other aspects of their first year activities, surrounding the residence halls and social life, could support this activity. In this way UCSB could effect a transition to the deepened connection to the University and to knowledge creation in the upper years of undergraduates’ education.

Each of these facets of engagement have been mentioned in the Self-Study and highlighted in our discussions. We could not be in greater agreement that these innovations could add a deep engagement to the skills and knowledge that first-year education already provides. However these changes will require investments. For example, if every incoming
student had one first-year seminar, 200 would have to be scheduled annually. Faculty would have to be added to even approach such a target. But the effects on quality, retention and academic accomplishment could be great. A clear commitment to this goal could help in the upcoming Capital Campaign, which would help defray the costs of these innovations. Most importantly for their quality-enhancing effects, we strongly encourage exploration of such programmatic changes.

C. Creating the Conditions for Faculty Participation

The long-term willingness of faculty to participate in the various dimensions of the Freshman-Year Experience is a crucial condition for its success. Our visit has made it clear that two very laudable features of life at UCSB provide a strong basis on which to build toward this long-term faculty participation.

The first is a faculty culture that gives a high priority to undergraduate teaching, including teaching freshmen. Time and again we were presented with evidence of this culture, either in practices, such as the departmentally-established rules for faculty teaching undergraduate classes, or in statements, such as those by several faculty who speak of teaching freshmen as something they genuinely value doing. They treated this not as necessity or duty, but rather as something genuinely important. We found this particularly impressive given the campus' rapid movement toward becoming a research university of international standing.
The second feature that makes us optimistic about the possibility for long-term faculty involvement in the Freshman-Year Experience initiative is the tradition of collaborative governance. There appears to be a great deal of dialogue and collaboration about policy and program development, among faculty and between faculty and administration. This bodes well for utilizing the creativity and expertise of the faculty to implement programs that benefit freshmen, and for minimizing the alienation and resistance that follows when people feel excluded from influencing events that affect them.

These two factors reduce our concerns, and the concerns expressed by some with whom we met, about the potential, or perhaps to an extent inherent, conflict between the Self-Study’s high priority to both exceptional graduate education and research and high quality undergraduate education and a distinctive Freshman Experience.

In this context, however, we do have concerns about how faculty will fit in to the Freshman initiative. If this initiative is to be successful over the long-haul, and not carried by the enthusiasm of early adopters, then it must be developed carefully.

Our conversations made it clear that UCSB is above all else a research campus where grant-getting and publication count more than successful teaching for tenure and promotion. While we recognize that, especially in the context of the campus’ teaching culture, there is an appeal to teaching small classes of increasingly bright new students, it is also the case that, without thoughtful planning and appropriate incentives and resources, this may suffer some of the limitations and frustrations we witness in the Honors Program.
Stated somewhat differently, it is not sufficient to, as someone stated, “Start with faculty who are interested and see what happens.”

It will be crucial to go beyond special funding and short-term rewards to build in an incentive structure that encourages work with freshmen, without introducing unmanageable burdens on department curricula. For example, it might be fruitful to experiment with credit banking, in which an individual acquires one or more credits for teaching a freshman class, to be saved and used for course reduction. Other kinds of incentives are possible, and may be more appropriate for UCSB, but the point is to take seriously the need to design them for the long term.

It also will be important to remove obstacles that are likely to reduce faculty participation. Individual faculty may be inclined to do something but find it too costly because needed institutional assistance is not in place. The goal of greater undergraduate involvement in research is a case in point. A number of faculty expressed a desire to involve undergraduates, including freshmen, in research, but also noted that it is difficult to locate students to participate. University leadership should strengthen the existing process to find students who want to join research projects, and make it more visible to the student body; many students are unaware that such a process exists.

It is also desirable for faculty to come together to learn from one another about their experiences in trying to meet the challenges of effectively teaching freshmen, either in seminars or large classes. This kind of sharing is recommended in the Self-Study, and it is
our guess that given the strong interest in teaching, many faculty would respond. For it to happen, however, the University will have to act as host and facilitator.

Finally concerning faculty, consideration should be given to learning, in a systematic manner, what happens to faculty who involve themselves in Freshman initiatives. This can be done through interviews, surveys, focus groups and other means. Taking the time to discover what works and what doesn’t, and the effects on the faculty’s relationship to their work and the campus, will provide information that can help with the implementation of programs, and signal that what happens to them is a central concern.

The place of the chairs deserves special attention in relation to the Freshman-Year Experience. The chairs are leadership, management, and faculty all rolled into one. They also are a key to the successful implementation of almost anything. Chairs often find themselves in conflict over the different institutional goals they are asked to give priority, caught between the requests of campus leadership, with which they may or may not agree, and the expressed needs of their faculty, which they may or may not understand. This is true in general, and is likely to be even more true with the demands that are placed on them to deal with the new summer-quarter policy.

Campus leadership will need to be clear that the University is committed to the Freshman-Year Experience goals, while at the same time providing chairs with the capacity to respond in ways that make sense in their own units. Essential pieces of this will be providing chairs with information, consulting with them about issues such as incentives, and
providing adequate resources. Chairs will recognize before anyone else that the goals for the Freshman-Year Experience cannot be met without additional faculty and dollars, and it will be up to campus leadership to forecast those needs and try to meet them.

D. Challenges and Issues

The Self-Study emphasized coordination as an important strategy for successful implementation of the freshman initiative. We want to underscore that a clearly articulated vision of the whole, a distinct picture of how the parts fit together is as important to successful implementation as coordination. As described above, one staff member from the Freshman-Year Experience Committee called this overview a “mosaic.” If this metaphor is accurate, it should be well defined—all the “stones” or “tiles” need to fit into the mosaic and changes in any one of the pieces should be crafted with care for its effect on the others and on the whole.

The WASC Team noted three challenges presented by the mosaic approach. First, leadership. The proposed coordinating committee of senior administrators, supported by one staff member who serves as the freshman experience coordinator, offers a solution to the problem of coordination and will likely provide a good administrative structure, especially given the excellent working relationships among the various offices. We wonder if this structure also provides a good model of leadership in a period of development? The freshman-year initiative will require a substantial investment of financial, facilities, and human resources, and may need strong advocacy within the institution to obtain these resources—especially since faculty participation is currently motivated largely by good will.
Implementation will require an assessment of pilot projects, a design for the whole “mosaic” and its constituent parts, and a budget and strategic plan. How will the proposed committee handle these next stages in the process? Without endorsing another approach, the WASC Team raises questions about the structure of leadership to help focus attention on the conditions that will enable UCSB to achieve successful program development and implementation.

Second, communication. Once UCSB defines the mosaic, and its common agenda for freshmen and the constituent components, how is this vision articulated and by whom? To new students? To faculty? To deans and department chairs? To parents? For example, on the topic of undergraduate research, what is the appropriate set of expectations for first-year students about their involvement in research? Do these expectations differ for different groups of students, e.g., Counseling and Career Services (CCS) or Honors or Educational Opportunity Program (EOP)? How do students find out this information? What are the practical steps freshmen can take to prepare themselves to take full advantage of the benefits of being undergraduates at a research university? With a mosaic approach, all constituencies benefit from clear communication of the goals of the initiative as well as from easily accessible descriptions of the programs and opportunities. We recommend that a plan for publications and Web information be carefully developed in conjunction with the new initiative to ensure consistency among the messages delivered to students by all participating faculty, staff and peer undergraduate staff such as RAs and peer advisors.
Third, advising. For students to take advantage of new programs in the first year, consistent and accessible communication of information needs to be coupled with a robust system of advising. As noted above, the WASC Team was impressed by the existing structures that provide academic support for students in the form of Campus Learning Assistance Services tutorials and other such services. We also found that outreach advising in the residences, including off-campus dorms, offers many benefits. Nonetheless, as the Self-Study acknowledges, much more focused guidance will be required to match each student to the appropriate opportunity for creating a sense of community.

In our visit to the UCSB campus, we discovered three topics that were not identified in the Self-Study report that appeared to us to have the potential to affect successful reform on the scale presented by the Freshman-Year Experience initiative.

The first is the mandate to operate year-round. In several discussions, we learned that the UC system mandate to add the summer quarter has been accelerated and that implementation of this mandate has dominated planning discussions by the College deans and department chairs. When asked about the impact on the freshman-year initiative, responses were almost unanimously certain that there would be no negative consequences for launching the new programs from the addition of the summer quarter and incremental students. Indeed, there were assurances that the new funds that would be generated by the mandate would enable UCSB to mount the new undergraduate initiatives.
We continue to be concerned about ways that the four-quarter operation could interfere with implementation. How will the system of advising be stretched by the need for first-year students to do academic planning for summer quarters as well as the typical four-year pattern of enrollment? Are advisors trained to handle this new approach to academic planning? How will the infrastructure for academic support generally be supplemented? And more generally, could the demands of the four-quarter operation postpone the development of components of the first-year program?

The second issue is the continuing progress toward creating a diverse student and faculty at UCSB. UCSB's commitment toward this goal is unquestioned in light of the outreach efforts in recruiting students and the success in academic service infrastructure for undergraduates from underrepresented minority groups. Challenges in recruiting and sustaining a diverse faculty and graduate student population are more daunting.

The third is the role of the libraries. Perhaps because this review is theme-based, rather than standards-based, and because the connection to these initiatives is not as obvious, the library is not mentioned in the Self-Study. While understandable, this is an important omission. The campus needs to recognize that the library is integral to all three Self-Study themes. For the Freshman-Year Experience, the library can play an important educational function in such areas as information technology training, providing support for student research activities, and providing physical places for students to work together on group projects. Less directly, but of equal importance, the library can be valuable in attracting
faculty, thereby permitting the campus to select those who have a desirable balance of teaching and research priorities.

We recommend that efforts be made to include library leadership in planning processes, and to plan for, on a consistent basis, the particular long-term contributions the library can make.

II. GRADUATE EDUCATION

During the last decade, UCSB has emerged as one of the country's elite public research universities. Its improved standing follows from the accomplishments of its faculty, the quality of its graduate students and graduate programs, and a significant growth in total research funding. These successes create an especially strong foundation upon which to expand and improve graduate education during the next decade.

UCSB has been well served by the leadership of the Graduate Council and the Graduate Dean during this time. Such leadership, coupled with the active support of the central administration, has allowed the campus to embrace growth in graduate programs as a key strategy to move to the next level of academic excellence and achievement. The plan to increase the number of matriculated graduate students from 11 percent to 15 percent of total enrollment is sound and should be pursued.

There is true excitement among faculty and students about the potential to expand graduate education at UCSB. Moreover, there is a high level of collegiality
across the University that finds its source in the vision and administrative style of the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor. Faculty are willing, indeed, eager to work across disciplinary boundaries, and graduate students come to UCSB in increasing numbers to take advantage of interdisciplinary programs. It is rare to find such esprit among so diverse a group of scholars.

This energy and spirit provide the campus with a truly unusual opportunity to develop interdisciplinary programs and explore new modes of collaborative scholarship. UCSB does not appear to have the usual barriers to interdisciplinary teaching and research that are often found at research universities. The faculty and students are willing to embrace interdisciplinary scholarship, the administration and deans are supportive, and no significant financial obstacles appear to impede the flow of students and faculty between programs. This circumstance no doubt finds its roots in the historical development of the campus, but it is also directly related to the current abundance of financial resources. Care should be taken now by the central administration to institutionalize practices to sustain interdisciplinary collaborations within and between schools so such practices do not disappear if funding declines.

Many notable interdisciplinary efforts are under way at UCSB. Some, especially in the sciences and engineering, are established, successful, and well-funded. Others, like the program in Media, Arts and Technology, are in the early stages of growth and will require nurturing and support if they are to succeed. There are also many ideas for new interdisciplinary collaborations that are in the developmental stage. While funding
is excellent on a university-wide level, it is clear that there are not sufficient financial resources to follow every interdisciplinary idea. Consequently, the campus needs to prioritize its efforts in interdisciplinary teaching and research to ensure the success of the highest quality programs.

Graduate students are the lifeblood of UCSB’s graduate programs. Recruiting and retaining the most able and talented graduate students are inextricably linked to the University’s academic improvement. The availability of financial support for graduate students is thus a limiting factor to the growth of graduate programs. Graduate programs should not grow in the absence of new financial resources. State funding of graduate students is generous, but the subsidy does not cover the true cost of education. Funds for research stipends, tuition awards (both resident and non-resident), new and expanded facilities and instrumentation, as well as library and computing resources are a must if the quality of graduate students is to be maintained as enrollments grow. Similarly, graduate students are in need of affordable housing options, a need the University is planning to address in the next two years. Finally, UCSB must continue to focus on diversifying the graduate student population. All of these efforts require revenue. Consequently, other sources of funding (gifts, grants, fellowships) must be found and directed to graduate programs to maintain high academic quality in the face of increasing enrollments.

A majority of graduate student support derives from workload funding for teaching assistants (TAs). Teaching by graduate students is an important part of
graduate training, and it serves the institution well by bringing developing scholars, scientists, and artists into the classroom. Because so much financial support for graduate students is tied to TA work, however, there is a potential for abuse, especially in the humanities and social sciences where large numbers of undergraduates are taught. Excessive teaching by graduate students disrupts learning, interferes with research productivity, and slows progress to degree. Excessive teaching by graduate students should be avoided, as should the growth of graduate enrollments for the purpose of meeting undergraduate teaching needs.

Because a sizable portion of financial aid for graduate students comes in the form of teaching assistantships, a danger exists that graduate students will become overly involved in staffing the University’s program of undergraduate instruction. This particular worry assumes even greater importance when the enrollment projections for the University are examined. In the coming years, UCSB will be serving many more undergraduate students. Unless the growth of ladder and adjunct faculty keep pace with increasing enrollments, graduate students will be called upon to provide an even greater proportion of instruction, especially at lower division levels. To be sure, teaching by graduate students is a necessary and important part of graduate education. Too much teaching by graduate students, however, erodes the quality of the graduate experience and slows time to degree.

The self-study document asserts that “the principal way UCSB prepares its graduate students for a career in teaching is through its preparation of them in their roles
as teaching assistants.” Various programs provide substantial training possibilities: departmental programs, the Lead TA program, Interdisciplinary Studies 505, the Teaching Assistant Development Program (TADP) and its videotaping and consultation opportunities, instructional grants to TAs, and the new, very promising Certificate in College and University Teaching. Supported by an active Office of Instructional Consultation, these efforts are noteworthy and productive, but they do not seem to be required or mandated sufficiently to ensure that all TAs participate to meet UCSB’s goal of producing educators. The concerns regarding lack of consistency of TA training across departments, inadequacy of mentoring, questionable rigor of departmental TA training courses, and lack of ongoing teacher-effectiveness training are mirrored in the graduate student comments about their TA preparation. Many of those whom we met claim inadequate preparation for their responsibilities.

Thus, expansion of the TA Orientation programs and ongoing training would be an important investment. As UCSB’s TA population grows, this will become even more critical not only to the preparation of graduate students for their future roles but also for the success of the undergraduate program. Many institutional-department combined TA programs at peer institutions are currently 3-5 days in length with ongoing training throughout the year. TAPD can provide models and resources that come from a substantial TA development literature. UCSB departments such as Psychology and Physics, who have developed strong TA preparation programs, appear to be eager to share their approaches.
International TAs (ITAs) need special attention and a training program that will meet their particular needs. Since this population is likely to increase, better and more extensive preparation will be required. Many aspects related to the socialization of ITAs beyond English proficiency should be addressed if ITAs are to adapt quickly to US undergraduate students and facilitate their learning.

The ten-year report on departmental TA training activities provides important information but may be too infrequent an assessment tool for strengthening TA preparation programs. Moreover, many institutions report that until questions about TA preparation become part of regularized departmental program reviews, TA preparation programs are seen as options rather than serious departmental responsibilities.

The intent to develop departmental “professional seminars” that are credit bearing is promising. In terms of these courses, because of its interdisciplinarity, UCSB may be able to cluster disciplines and develop innovative approaches that could become national models for others. These seminars are useful to those who aspire to faculty positions as well as to those intending to pursue careers in business, industry, government and nonprofit organizations. Representatives from those sectors maintain that employees must be able to explain concepts and information to superiors and subordinates and motivate others to learn—competencies acquired during the teaching assistantship experience when it is combined with reflective analysis.
Graduate students requested more assistance from faculty members. Although generally pleased with their research experiences, they reported inadequate mentoring, especially among the underrepresented minorities with whom we talked. They cite lack of collegiality in some cases, and many seem concerned about the potential after-effects of unionization in terms of further changes in relationships with faculty. The graduate students are very pleased that unionization has produced appropriate workload levels and made much more transparent the expectations for holding a teaching assistantship, but they are distressed that they now can only receive confirmation of appointments one quarter at a time. Obviously, this new chapter in TA unionization and its effects on UCSB graduate education has yet to be written and assessed.

Adopting a forward-looking position, UCSB recognizes that preparing graduate students primarily for limited or nonexistent faculty positions at research-extensive universities is inadequate. The opportunities that the institution has established through partnerships with entities outside the campus community place UCSB in a unique position to offer graduate students multiple and rich possibilities to explore careers that exist outside the academy and require doctoral training. Since less than 17% of the students have held internships, efforts to establish more opportunities should be pursued. The GPMPC Certificate and others like it provide better preparation for a variety of career options.

In addition, UCSB should develop more extensive partnerships with surrounding institutions of higher education so that students can explore faculty lives in teaching-
intensive colleges and universities. As planned, additional career advising and
counseling, better interaction with successful graduate alumni, and greater visibility for
potential employers outside of academia will be helpful. If these initiatives are to
succeed, someone must provide systematic and sustained implementation of the various
activities, including assessment of impact.

As the data suggest, however, the most important sources of career advice and
counseling are faculty. Efforts should be undertaken in various forms to enable the
faculty to know exactly where graduates from a department or interdisciplinary program
are seeking and obtaining employment. Whenever possible, faculty should be
encouraged to visit the working places of their graduates—not only for fundraising
purposes but to enable the faculty member to be a better advisor to graduate students
aspiring to a variety of careers and to foster partnerships between the institution and
other segments of society that require employees with deep, analytical skills. In turn,
PhDs working in arenas other than academia ought to be invited to share their career
successes with graduate students in multiple forums within the University community.
In addition, departmental program reviews could focus more clearly on how departments
are preparing their students for multiple career options, so that departments will value
and confront this question. National projects such as the Woodrow Wilson Foundation’s
"Humanities at Work" and "The Responsive Doctorate" may assist efforts in this area.

Close faculty-student interaction is the sine qua non of graduate education,
especially doctoral education. The campus should be faithful to this principle as
graduate programs increase in size. Similarly, faculty teaching at the graduate level should be recognized and rewarded in a manner that is consistent with the prioritization of graduate education by the campus. Care should be taken to avoid having graduate programs taught primarily as overloads (that is, when a significant portion of the program is taught via reading and conference or independent study formats). At the same time, such reading and conference or independent study formats have their place in the research university, but not as substitutes for regularly scheduled seminars and courses. Finally, service on graduate committees is vital to high quality graduate education. Such service should be rewarded in the normal faculty evaluation processes of the University.

III. EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

WASC has increasingly emphasized institutional effectiveness, student learning outcomes, and more generally a “culture of evidence” in its accreditation standards. In its Self-Study document, UCSB focused upon “educational effectiveness” as one of the three areas receiving special attention. Consequently, the Self-Study document, its appendixes, the materials assembled in the Team Room, and the accreditation website devote substantial space to the display of information reflecting indicators of campus and program quality and goal attainment. Moreover, the UCSB staff that coordinated our visit were quite responsive to our requests for structuring the meetings and discussions with faculty, students, and staff in a way that allowed ample time for us to explore this particular theme.
In the materials on record and conversations alike, we found convincing evidence that UCSB is a self-reflective institution that takes its educational responsibilities seriously. Indeed, the faculty culture seems unusually attentive to undergraduate students, compared to the majority of research universities with which we are acquainted. The administrative officers we met are well informed about faculty and student concerns and are perceived by the general University community to be responsive.

Since the education of students is central to the mission of institutions of higher education, “educational effectiveness” and “institutional effectiveness” are often used synonymously. However, the UCSB Self-Study for the most part maintains its focus on educational effectiveness and the academic experiences of freshmen and graduate students. During our visit, we concentrated on the institutional mechanisms for maintaining academic and educational effectiveness at three levels of performance:

1. The individual faculty member
   - Extensive review of faculty performance every 2-3 years
   - Instructional development activities and support structures

2. The department level
   - Academic program review process

3. The University or institution level
   - The Input-Process-Output (IPO) Model
   - Survey research and data collection
   - Strategic planning

Level 1 — Faculty Effectiveness

At the first level of quality assurance, activity focuses on the individual faculty member. There is at UCSB an elaborate system of faculty assessment that documents
faculty accomplishments in teaching, research and creative work, professional activity and recognition, and University or public service. This faculty assessment is linked to decisions about merit pay and steps within rank, and takes place every 2-3 years (depending on rank) for each ladder faculty member—including post-tenure faculty. Moreover, there is an instructional evaluation and development program that uses a collage of teaching consultants, workshops, grants, technology, student ratings, and knowledge about good pedagogy to assist faculty to improve the classroom experience for students.

Faculty teaching is evaluated by students at the end of each course each quarter.Individual instructors and individual departments can vary the survey items and teaching dimensions which are assessed, but two items are common everywhere – the overall rating of the instructor and the overall rating of the course (on a 5-point response scale). The student responses are collected anonymously, scanned and summarized centrally, and reported to instructors and departments. Faculty submit these evaluations as part of personnel reviews, and departments use them in aggregate form in program review. The teaching evaluation process is thus fairly standard, and has been carried out over time and with enough consistency and participation that it has proven useful to the campus.

Other departmental practices for evaluating faculty classroom performance vary. While research achievement is given priority over teaching, the great majority of the faculty and chairs that we met take their teaching seriously and describe departmental climates and practices that encourage co-teaching and even collegial classroom visits at the point of preparation for promotion and merit review. In addition, we were told that campus support
for instructional services and development is considerable, with a budget of about $800,000 including $300,000 in grant funds to promote instructional innovation and use of instructional technology. The campus investment in instruction appears to be working, with the percentage of students rating faculty instruction as “excellent” increasing from 37% in 1991 to 42% in 1998.

Despite the ongoing instructional development and assessment of faculty teaching performance, however, teaching could be strengthened. For example, more faculty and departments could be encouraged to have peers or instructional support staff review their teaching. We know of departments at our own institutions that have analyzed course syllabi and student transcripts (supplemented by faculty comment) to determine whether prerequisite courses adequately prepare students for more advanced study. This type of assessment would not need to be overly burdensome but would help promote dialogue about teaching and help mitigate the widely held faculty perception that undergraduate teaching is generally less valued. Even after UCSB increases its graduate population from 11% to 15% over the next ten years, there will still be about 17,000 undergraduate students and 3,000 graduates. To attract the kind of high caliber undergraduates consonant with the academic quality of the graduate programs and faculty, there must be sustained interest in undergraduate teaching and pedagogical innovation to match curricular sophistication.

Level 2 - Department Effectiveness

By emphasizing institutional effectiveness in its accreditation standards, WASC does not identify any specific set of outcomes, but rather emphasizes the process by which
institutions ensure progress toward their own self-defined goals, and create a “culture of evidence.” A key component of the “culture of evidence” is a feedback loop, which provides faculty and decision-makers with relevant data and empowers them to act on the data to improve and achieve their goals. More than anything else that we observed during our visit, the Program Reviews at UCSB create such a culture of evidence.

A number of well-known scholars in higher education (see e.g., Barak and Mets, 1995; Banta, 1996) maintain that the most effective form of institutional assessment and improvement is program review. The Program Review Process at UCSB is both comprehensive, and well integrated into the fabric of campus life. Indeed, we believe this is the best example at UCSB of an internalized process of self-examination and continuous improvement—its thoroughness is matched by few other universities.

Departmental reviews occur every seven to eight years, and given the scope of the effort and the almost three-years they take to complete (including administrative feedback and action steps), reviews probably could not occur more often, and may indeed occur slightly less frequently with no loss of effectiveness. The departmental self-study has two basic components: (1) a comprehensive set of quantitative data including enrollments, degrees awarded, student placements, department finances, faculty profiles, and even student surveys administered as part of the review; and (2) a departmental self-assessment which addresses a wide-ranging set of questions about undergraduate and graduate education, faculty productivity and research interests, infrastructure, resources, and goals. It is significant that at the start of each set of Self-Study questions (e.g., about faculty or
undergraduate education), there is a brief but clear statement of campus goals that reminds departments and external reviewers of the context. Questions flow from these goals and encourage alignment of departmental and University objectives. The structure of the Self-Study requires units to become introspective and articulate their own vision based on personal experience and also to attempt to quantify and benchmark their activities against comparable departments nationally.

Review of departmental materials by faculty committees and academic administrators is extensive, and we marvel that the process proceeds as well as it does given the number of internal committees that play a role in the review. The Executive Vice Chancellor appoints a standing Program Review Panel (PRP) of ten faculty members reflecting a cross-section of disciplinary areas. This committee, has primary responsibility for shepherding the Self-Study through the review process and writing a final report.

An external review committee of three distinguished scholars are invited to review departmental materials and visit campus. This review is folded into the larger Self-Study providing objective disciplinary expertise. One department chair commented that much of the value of the review derives from the external component and the quality and insight of the external reviewers.

Although the review as described to this point is highly constructive in itself, the subsequent follow-up steps, committee reviews, internal discussions, reports, and administrative feedback give the UCSB process more teeth than at most other universities.
The Executive Vice Chancellor in particular, has strengthened the process by establishing a more direct relationship between the review and campus recognition and resources. In addition, three Faculty Senate committees, including a committee responsible for recommending faculty FTE (full time equivalent) allocations, review the documentation. Review findings now have a tangible and relatively immediate impact on academic and financial decisions. Finally, departments are asked to document progress toward goals and concerns in a one-year follow-up to the review.

The Program Review Process at UCSB is time-consuming and expensive, but effective. The campus' willingness to continue to engage in the process is testimony to its perceived benefit. When we asked a group of chairs whether the time spent in preparing and evaluating the program review documents was well spent, they endorsed the process and articulated the valuable outcomes. Moreover, the faculty we met from the PRP are proud of its thoroughness and eager to serve on what has become a highly respected committee.

One suggestion to improve this robust and highly successful process is to make even better use of the extensive data collected. For example, the student survey data amounts to an assessment in the major and graduate field; and as such could be aggregated and more fully analyzed showing trends and evidence of effectiveness to relevant internal and external audiences. Trends over time can be especially useful since most UCSB departments have completed two, three and more review cycles. In addition, between reviews, departments could use key indicators to benchmark themselves against national indicators using data
from IPEDS, CASPAR, and other sources. All of these efforts are quite minimal compared to the initial work to assemble the Self-Study.

A second more serious improvement is the extent to which the diversity goals, identified in the Self-Study guidelines, are taken into consideration by departments and reviewers. Faculty from a variety of departments felt that commitment to a more diverse faculty and student body has diminished under the University’s more ambitious research agenda. The University may want to direct greater departmental attention to questions 1c, 2c, 2i and 2d in the Self-Study guidelines (document dated November 1997) and assign greater weight to performance on these measures.

Much to the credit of the faculty and administration, a spirit of openness and candor now undergirds the program review process. As the University proceeds to grow—and to grow in selected areas—it needs to be careful that the review process is not seen simply as a way to justify reallocation of resources and to direct them to specific units. As it stands, the University has done an excellent job of balancing improvement and accountability, with improvement being in the foreground.

**Level 3 – Institutional Effectiveness**

At Level 3, we concentrated on the effectiveness indicators highlighted in Chapter 5 of the accreditation Self-Study. The UCSB Steering Committee and the Educational Effectiveness Committee did an admirable job of pulling together an array of effectiveness indicators and classifying them into three categories—inputs, processes, and outcomes. This
Input-Process-Output (IPO) Model that serves as the framework for organizing the evidence in the Self-Study is clearly an exercise that was stimulated by the accreditation visit, rather than a framework that evolved out of the regular UCSB processes. Nevertheless, it stands as a good first step toward self-reflective improvement. The IPO Model serves as a roadmap for information development and analysis.

Like most of our own institutions, UCSB has collected more data than it has the time and resources to analyze. Above and beyond the regular University records maintained for all students, we counted 62 survey databases since 1990 containing potentially useful effectiveness information. This myriad of data collection activities includes surveys of students and recent alumni on matters ranging from admissions marketing to student lifestyle, and from freshman experiences to alumni outcomes.

We suggest that the University will be better served by shifting staff and resources away from collecting new survey data and toward the more thorough analysis and packaging of data already on hand. For example, we would survey alumni less often, but in greater numbers, and spend more time analyzing the results by major, displaying trends over time, and using multivariate analysis to examine the connections between inputs, campus experiences, and subsequent outcomes—and then sharing the findings in easily digestible reports with deans and department chairs, as well as faculty committees and administrative offices. As a second example, we seriously question the value of the relatively expensive pre-freshman CIRP survey. Multivariate studies at universities like the University of Delaware, Penn State, SUNY Albany, and Virginia Tech have found few if any items from
the CIRP survey that predict subsequent outcomes, or provide useful information to faculty
and administrators. In any case, the IPO Model can serve as a guide for making decisions
about which institutional research activities are important to continue, which to initiate, and
which can be discontinued.

Finally, we should perhaps comment briefly on the UCSB future plans reflected in
Chapter 6 of the Self-Study. Recognizing that we had little opportunity to examine the
strategic planning process at UCSB, we nevertheless view the existence of ongoing planning
activity as one more sign of institutional effectiveness. The goals and values reflected in
Chapter 6 strike us as a constructive effort to focus the energies and resources of the
institution on a set of relevant and salient priorities. We do note that the themes in the Self-
Study do not seem to be fully reflected nor in sync with the priorities in the strategic plan.
This is perhaps to be expected when separate committees are charged to pursue separate
tasks, and we understand that the plan, which we did not actually see, is still a discussion
draft. However, the two documents will need a greater degree of alignment at some point.

SUMMARY

In all three areas of concentration, The Freshman Experience, Graduate Education, and
Educational Excellence, the Team was impressed with the rapid progression that characterizes
UCSB. Our recommendations fall into two categories, areas in which even greater improvements
can be made and concerns about potential problems that could disrupt or delay the growth and
development of the institution. In the first category we include such items as expansion of freshman
seminars to all students, improvement of advising and student services, more universally
outstanding TA training, and adequate funding allocated to the undergraduate initiatives. In the second category we include concern about the effects of the four-quarter scheduling, financial problems that might arise in the future, and the effect of the research and graduate growth agenda on the undergraduate programs. Each of the sub-committees also felt concern about improving campus diversity and making the campus hospitable to all minority students, faculty, and staff. The unanimity of the Team on the points described in this Report leads us to hope it will be a valuable aid to future campus development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Team makes the following specific recommendations for UCSB:

The Freshman-Year Experience

1. Recognize and make the necessary investment of funds, facilities, and faculty to support a first-rate undergraduate program. With the strong impetus toward research and graduate work, it is imperative that the investment in undergraduate excellence be made up front or the efforts to improve undergraduate education will falter.

2. Communicate the goals and vision of the Freshman-Year Experience clearly and consistently to all constituencies, students, faculty, deans and department chairs, parents.

3. Provide a strong leadership structure for the Freshman-Year Experience, leadership that can advocate for financial investment, facilities, and human resources.

4. Create the faculty incentive and reward structures to support the first-year programming fully, not relying on volunteers but embedding the freshman initiative solidly in the financial
structure of UCSB. Provide chairs the capacity to support the Freshman-Year Experience in ways that make sense in their own units.

5. Develop freshman programs for the nine-tenths of undergraduates who are not in Honors or Creative Studies so that all undergraduates can gain similar benefits.

6. After the pilot period in which goals and structure should be clearly determined, expand freshman seminars as the key to developing intellectual engagement for all students. The seminars should be writing-intensive and speaking-intensive and should demonstrably build intellectual community between ladder faculty and students. This will require a substantial investment.

7. Assess these seminars carefully to make sure they are creating the desired results.

8. Provide sufficient academic support of the quality of that provided by CLAS, EOP, and PODS by increasing capacity to serve all first-year students who need help. Improve advising for first-year students. (The first-year seminars can create the kind of informal advising that exists in Honors, as part of the solution.)

9. Strengthen the ways to identify undergraduates who wish to do research projects; identify faculty who wish to work with undergraduates on research projects, and match students and faculty according to interests. Although processes exist, students are not well enough aware of them.

10. Encourage faculty discussions of undergraduate teaching of both seminars and large classes.

11. Develop library support for these programs, both for students and for faculty. Include library leadership in the planning for these programs.

12. Focus on the effects of the new four-quarter format on all facets of the first-year experience, including advising, scheduling classes, academic support, etc.
13. Continue progress on diversity, focusing on faculty hiring, increasing the graduate student population, recruiting more undergraduates from underrepresented minorities, and improving the campus experience.

Graduate Education

1. Prioritize efforts in interdisciplinary teaching and research at the graduate level to ensure the success of the highest quality programs.

2. Make sure that funds are available for research stipends, tuition awards, new facilities and instrumentation, and library and computer facilities to cover the additional graduate students to be recruited.

3. Create an infrastructure to coordinate the various efforts that are being made to enhance TA preparation. Make sure that all TAs are trained adequately to teach; at present some are trained much better than others. Give additional attention to International TAs.

4. Provide TAs reasonable schedules, a task that will be challenged by the increase in undergraduates.

5. Increase mentoring for graduate students, including those going out to non-teaching professional careers, including more contact with alumni in these professions. Assess mentoring efforts.

6. Develop more extensive partnerships with surrounding colleges so that students can explore careers in teaching-intensive institutions.

7. Properly reward service on graduate committees.
Educational Excellence

1. Make better use of the data collected for assessment purposes, looking at data over time.
2. Include diversity evaluations in assessing departmental effectiveness.
3. Shift resources from collecting data to analyzing it more effectively.
4. Bring the Strategic Plan into alignment with the WASC accreditation report since the timing did not mesh appropriately to consider the documents simultaneously.

CONCLUSION

UCSB is a healthy and productive institution, determined to be a top tier research university and confident that its future is bright. The administration and faculty seek a future that balances world-class research with educational excellence. Their efforts are marked by intelligence, confidence, and optimism.

The Accreditation Team believes the future is bright for UCSB. We are concerned that planning be tempered by a firm grasp of budgetary requirements for competing aspirations, and that the financial backing be sufficient in particular for the undergraduate initiative to be realized. There is also concern that exigency plans be in place should the budgets not continue as strong as in recent years.

We believe the outstanding progress of UCSB since the last accreditation visit will continue in the future and the University will indeed reach its aspirations of research excellence matched by talented students and a strong educational program.