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## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>ABBREVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>advance placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>Associated Students (of UCSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APCC</td>
<td>Academic Planning Coordinating Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMB</td>
<td>Biochemistry and Molecular Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>Community Affairs Board (operated by Associated Students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEPAP</td>
<td>Committee on Educational Policy and Academic Planning (a committee of the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAS</td>
<td>Campus Learning Assistance Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Community Service Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCS</td>
<td>Counseling and Career Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>Education Abroad Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOP</td>
<td>Educational Opportunity Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCA</td>
<td>Educational Program for Culture Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>full time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>Graduate Alumni Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDES</td>
<td>Graduate Division Exit Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>General Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>grade point average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Graduate Record Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>Graduate Student Association (of UCSB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSE</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERI</td>
<td>Higher Education Research Institute (at UCLA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHC</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Humanities Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT 20</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies 20 (A course to introduce students to the role of higher education in society and to their role in the community of scholars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAIS</td>
<td>Latin American and Iberian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>Media Arts and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>MultiCultural Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRU</td>
<td>Multicampus Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORU</td>
<td>Organized Research Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATH</td>
<td>Prepaid Access to Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PODS</td>
<td>Program of Determined Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRP</td>
<td>Program Review Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>resident assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAD</td>
<td>Research Across the Disciplines (award)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHA</td>
<td>Residence Halls Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT</td>
<td>Scholastic Aptitude Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHS</td>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP</td>
<td>Summer Transitional Enrichment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TADP</td>
<td>Teaching Assistant Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISE</td>
<td>Washington Internship in Science and Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 STRUCTURE OF THE SELF-STUDY

The University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) welcomes the opportunity to analyze our progress since our last WASC accreditation (1990–1991). While no single document can describe every aspect of an institution of the size and complexity of UCSB, or demonstrate the myriad interpersonal relationships that support the progress of each student and researcher in the campus community, it is possible to take a critical look at the structures and processes that underlie this complexity. Using a combination of the historic nine WASC accreditation standards and the more recently adopted “new visit model,” this self-study evaluates UCSB’s current institutional performance in education, research, and public service in light of the many changes that have occurred in the previous decade.

For several years WASC has been reviewing its nine standards and considering their simplification and clarification into four integrated standards. In developing this self-study document, we used the historic nine accreditation standards of the association to inform and guide the creation of the Policy & Data Portfolio included in the Web-based section of this report. This Web site links each of the nine standards to the relevant data regarding UCSB.

In contrast, the remainder of the self-study document draws on the “new visit model” adopted by the WASC commissioners in 1996. As such, we present two specific case studies (the Freshman Experience and Graduate Education) along with one broader topic of evaluation and analysis (Educational Effectiveness) to accompany the Policy & Data Portfolio. UCSB committed itself to evaluating these specific aspects because they are central to the educational mission of the University, and because they contribute to the overall success of our institution. The additional section devoted to Educational Effectiveness is included to indicate the bases on which we have measured perceptions of student learning. The campus formally proposed these topics for the core of this self-study on June 16, 1997.

This self-study is divided into five parts:

- An Introduction surveying major developments since the last accreditation process in 1990–1991 and presenting a description of UCSB’s administrative structure;
- A case study focusing on the Freshman Experience at UCSB;
- A case study focusing on Graduate Education at UCSB;
- An evaluation of perceptions of Educational Effectiveness at UCSB; and
- A Policy & Data Portfolio Web site.
1.2 THE SELF-STUDY PROCESS

In the spirit of shared governance, the University developed a committee structure to carry out the process of self-study and evaluation. This structure included a Steering Committee, the two case-study committees, and two committees devoted to the broader issues of policy and educational effectiveness. To facilitate faculty involvement at all levels of the self-study process, each committee included members of the UCSB Academic Senate. Members of the UCSB WASC committees are listed in Appendix A.

The steering committee consisted of the chairs and co-chairs of the self-study and general topic committees, as well as key faculty members and administrators whose input was central to the process. The function of the Steering Committee was to provide oversight and guidance in the interpretation and evaluation of data collection efforts within the various sub-areas.

The Freshman Experience Committee, chaired by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies, College of Letters and Science, was composed of twenty members; membership included the Assistant Director of Orientations, the Director of Counseling and Career Services, the Associate Director of Housing and Residential Services, the Director of Campus Learning Assistance Services, and the Director of the Writing Program.

The primary mission of the Freshman Experience Committee was to assess the academic, personal, and social development of freshmen at the University. Assessment of academic development included an evaluation of a variety of indicators demonstrating an acquaintance with a wide range of academic disciplines, increased knowledge through course work, and improvement of academic writing skills. In the area of personal development, the acquisition of attitudes and responsible behaviors that promote personal safety and health was assessed, as well as issues of personal identity and the learning of life-management skills. Social development included evaluating the degree to which students manifested a sense of belonging and commitment to the UCSB community. In assessing these outcomes, the committee used survey data, data collected from student focus groups, and additional focus group data from personnel involved in the freshman experience, including but not limited to undergraduate staff advisors, faculty of large freshmen courses, teaching assistants, residence hall staff, registrars, and Writing Program staff.

The Graduate Education Committee was co-chaired by the Associate Dean of Graduate Education and the Faculty Chair of the UCSB Graduate Council. The committee membership of twelve included the Assistant Dean of the Graduate School of Education, the Dean of the Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, the Associate Director of Counseling and Career Services, and other persons whose expertise and experience make their perspective critical to understanding the effectiveness of graduate education. The committee explored three central themes: (1) innovation in graduate interdisciplinary education, (2) preparation for non-academic careers, and (3) preparation for teaching careers. Data used to assess these outcomes came from focus groups, an alumni survey, and graduate education exit surveys.

The Educational Effectiveness Committee, chaired by a professor of education who also serves as director of the University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute, included six members whose expertise covers an understanding of educational effectiveness across
developmental levels (the Dean of Social Sciences, analysts from Institutional Research and Planning, and the Director of the Office of Instructional Consultation, among others). The Committee reviewed student learning outcomes across developmental levels in terms of inputs, processes, and outputs. Input assessments focused on the qualifications with which the students enter the University (such as GPA). Process assessments weighed the types of classes and success rates of students, while outcome assessments explored how students have developed throughout their university experiences. All of the analyses considered gender, race, educational level, generation, and income as independent variables. The primary data were derived from campus records, and data from the Budget and Planning department of the University.

The Policies and Procedures Committee was chaired by the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs of the College of Engineering and the Director of Institutional Research and Planning. This committee consisted of persons with a special understanding of the policies by which the campus is administered. The committee’s primary responsibilities included the creation of a Web site addressing WASC’s nine standards of evaluation. The Web site can be found at <http://bap.ucsb.edu/wasc>. This site provides information regarding institutional integrity, institutional purpose, governance and administration, educational programs, faculty and staff, libraries and computing, student services, physical facilities, and financial resources.

Taken collectively, the data presented herein suggest the following:

- UCSB has a set of clearly defined institutional purposes and educational objectives;
- UCSB achieves its educational objectives through its core functions of teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity and support of student learning;
- UCSB develops and aligns resources and organizational structures to ensure sustainability across (1) faculty and staff, (2) fiscal, physical, and information services, and (3) decision-making processes; and
- UCSB has created an institution of higher education committed to continuous improvement through the use of strategic planning and organizational reflection. The university has internalized the process of reexamination and self-study to ensure continuing adjustment and enhancement of both academic and administrative missions.
2 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The University of California, one of the largest and most respected institutions of higher learning in the United States, is dedicated to excellence in teaching, research, and public service. Chartered in 1868 as California’s only land grant institution, UC began classes in Oakland with 10 faculty members and 38 students. Today, the University, headed by President Richard C. Atkinson, has a $12-billion budget and encompasses ten campuses, five medical schools and teaching hospitals, three law schools, and a statewide Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. UC also manages three national laboratories for the U.S. Department of Energy.

2.1 THE SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS: 1990-2000

The institution now known as UCSB became a general campus of the University of California in 1944. As a general campus, UCSB provides a broad program of undergraduate instruction, complimented by graduate programs leading to advanced degrees in 55 disciplines. UCSB is composed of the College of Letters and Science, the College of Engineering, the College of Creative Studies, the Graduate School of Education, and the Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management. In addition to the schools and colleges, nine Organized Research Units (ORUs), two Multicampus Research Units (MRUs), and seven national research centers that foster interdisciplinary collaboration are located on the campus. The Fall 2000 enrollment was 17,699 undergraduate students and 2,357 graduate students.

Situated on the California coastline, the Santa Barbara campus is comprised of 989 acres divided among four sites. The main campus, which houses nearly all instruction and research facilities, in addition to undergraduate student housing, comprises 405 acres. Student and faculty housing, a children’s center, a conference facility, and a natural reserve are located on 236 acres on the West Campus. Recreational fields and family student housing occupy 174 acres on the Storke Campus. The campus recently purchased 174 acres near our West Campus for additional student and faculty housing. The vast majority of UCSB students live within a five-minute walk of the Pacific Ocean and less than a ten-minute drive from the boundaries of the Los Padres National Forest in the Santa Ynez mountains.

Total assignable square feet available to the campus is 3.4 million of nearly 5 million gross square feet. Approximately 1.5 million assignable square feet are used for instruction and research. Over the last ten years the campus has added 348,000 assignable square feet of academic and student support space and modernized nearly 200,000 assignable square feet in existing space. Over the next five years, the campus will construct an additional 200,000 assignable square feet in new engineering and science buildings, 65,000 assignable square feet in new student support space, and housing for 800 new students. In addition, 150,000 assignable square feet will be modernized.

The decade since UCSB’s last accreditation in 1990–1991 has been one of both dramatic gains and significant challenges. During this period, UCSB has seen remarkable advances in the
national rankings of its programs, research funding, faculty productivity, national awards and prizes, and the establishment of new interdisciplinary centers and programs. For example:

- In 1994, UCSB was classified a “Research I” University by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Learning.

- In 1995, UCSB became one of the 62 members of the Association of American Universities (AAU).

- In 1997, the Graham–Diamond study placed UCSB second in the nation in faculty scholarly productivity and journal citations among public universities.

- An Institute for Scientific Information study of 1993–1997 ranked UCSB ninth among the “highest impact U.S. universities”.

- Ten UCSB graduate programs were ranked among the nation’s 20 best programs by the National Research Council: Anthropology, Chemical Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Geological Sciences, Geography, Materials Sciences, Physics, Religious Studies, Spanish & Portuguese, and Biological Sciences/ Ecology, Evolution, and Behavior.

- The UCSB faculty now includes 18 members of the National Academy of Sciences, 13 members of the National Academy of Engineering, 3 Nobel Laureates, 76 John Guggenheim Foundation award recipients, 3 members of the American Philosophical Society, 2 National Medal of Science awardees, 1 National Medal of Technology recipient, and 18 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

- Thirty new research centers have been established at UCSB in the past decade, the majority of which are interdisciplinary in nature, including seven national centers.

- UCSB was chosen as the site for three University of California systemwide programs: the Linguistic Minority Research Center, the Digital Media Innovations Program, and the Education Abroad Program (EAP). These represent a diversity of programs, involving multiple campuses, industry, and, for EAP, international education and research opportunities for students.

- Research awards to UCSB faculty have doubled, rising from $55.5 million in 1989–1990 to $113 million in 1999–2000. These awards include:

  Three large National Science Foundation awards to the campus; a five-year renewal award of $17.3 million to the Institute for Theoretical Physics, a six-year renewal in the amount of $16.6 million to the National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS), and a $16.4 million award to continue funding the Materials Research Laboratory for five years.

  In 1999, the National Center for Ecological Synthesis and Analysis (NCEAS) was awarded an additional $3 million from NSF’s Knowledge and Distributed Intelligence
program to integrate a knowledge network to develop and test ecological theories, and $1 million to integrate marine ecology data into a community database for scientific analysis and research management.

From 1993–2000, the David and Lucille Packard Foundation awarded six young UCSB faculty the prestigious Packard fellowship. UCSB’s marine science program presently enjoys additional Packard Foundation funding of $6.5 million in support of marine conservation.

Two complementary UCSB research groups were awarded by NSF funds for $9.7 million over five years, starting in 1999. Led by a geographer and a computer scientist, the groups are exploring methods for weaving social science information into spatially integrated approaches to solving community problems and to compiling personal, custom-tailored digital libraries. UCSB is also the home of the Alexandria Digital Library project, among the first six such projects nationwide funded by multiple federal agencies to develop digital libraries. UCSB’s digital library focuses on the use of geospatial data for searching and organizing data.

The William M. Keck Foundation has made two significant awards to interdisciplinary teams of UCSB researchers, a $650,000 award in 1996 to marine scientists to establish a facility for identifying the connections between coastal ocean processes and changes in marine populations, and a $1 million award in 1999 to geologists, physicists, and chemical engineers for fundamental research to develop earthquake models.

Since 1990, one new professional school and numerous new departments, programs, and degree and certificate programs have been created, including

**Professional School:** Donald Bren School of Environmental Studies and Management (1996)

**Departments:** Film Studies (1996); East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies (1997)

**Programs:** Global and International Studies (1996); Marine Science (1997); Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (1993); Law and Society (1993); Islamic and Near Eastern Studies (1996); Media Arts and Technology (1999); Multicampus Research Group Digital Cultures Project (1998)

**Laboratory:** Materials Research Laboratory (1992)

**BA Degrees:** Computer Engineering (1999); Physical Geography (1993)

**Master’s Degrees and Certificates:** Environmental Science and Management (1996); Management Practice (1998); College and University Teaching (1999), Media Arts and Technology
**PhD Degrees**: Environmental Sciences and Management (1998); History and Public Policy (2000) (jointly with CSU Sacramento); Environmental Science and Management.

This record of growth and development is all the more noteworthy given the fact that California’s economic recession in the mid-1990s resulted in deep cuts in both the State and the University of California budgets. Although a number of measures were adopted as a result of this economic situation (i.e., a systemwide series of early retirement packages known as Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Programs (VERIP) offered to faculty and staff), each of the nine campuses was left substantively free to chart its own best course during these troubled years. UCSB chose to maintain the number and high quality of its faculty while absorbing the budget cuts primarily in the areas of infrastructure and staffing as the means by which to mitigate the long-term effects of these budget cuts. These efforts notwithstanding, the impact of these lean years (particularly 1994–1997) can be seen in several areas. Student enrollment dropped from a high of 19,082 in 1989–1990 to 17,834 in 1994–1995, recovering fully only in 1998–1999. The total enrollment of 20,056 in the Fall Quarter of 1999 represents very moderate growth over the past decade. Incoming undergraduate student academic quality, as measured through combined SAT scores and GPA, showed a similar dip during the years 1990–1994 (see Table 5.5 New Freshman by Quality Indicators: 1990–1999). Beginning in 1995, however, scores began to rise with the 1998 incoming class returning to the levels set by the 1990 freshmen class. Graduate enrollment held steady, but the significant increases envisioned in the campus long-term plans of the early 1990s were never realized. Fortunately, with the return of a healthy State economy, undergraduate and graduate enrollments, as well as incoming student quality, have risen steadily from 1995 to the present.

With the State economic crisis now past, the campus has enthusiastically embraced a renewed spirit of self-assessment and long-term planning. While planning is an ongoing process at UCSB, one particular initiative has captured the energy of the campus as a whole. In 1999, the Chancellor appointed the Academic Planning Coordinating Committee (APCC) to develop a long-term academic plan for UCSB. The APCC has worked for the past year and half to produce a plan that reflects UCSB’s strong, positive vision of itself and to formulate a strategic plan to address the challenges that will face the university over the next decade. Once approved, this plan will be posted to the UCSB Data Portfolio Web site (Section 7 of this document).

Part of the APCC’s work has involved consulting every campus department and program, as well as many student groups, about their vision and hopes for the future. Out of this extensive consultation has emerged not only a large number of innovative and exciting ideas for new initiatives, but also a portrait of a campus proud and optimistic about its commitment to UCSB as a thriving and growing intellectual community.

One of the clearest characteristics identified in this extended consultation has been the interdisciplinary nature of research and teaching at UCSB. Numerous interdisciplinary programs and research centers draw together faculty and students from disparate fields. The Interdisciplinary Humanities Center, to cite just one example, supports interdisciplinary research, conferences, and guest lectures, interdisciplinary seminars co-taught by two or more faculty members for graduate students and honors undergraduates, as well as a variety of faculty/graduate student Research Focus Groups that bring together participants from different
departments around topics such as “Religion, Ecology, and Culture,” “Gender, Media, and Globalization,” “Queer Theory,” “Human-Animal Relations,” and the like.

In 1996, the Vice Chancellor for Research inaugurated "Research Across Disciplines" (RAD) awards. This program encourages innovative partnerships among scholars and researchers not only across disciplines, but also across the larger campus divisional boundaries by facilitating collaborations between scholars in the arts, humanities, and social sciences on the one hand with colleagues in the life and physical sciences, mathematics, and engineering on the other. From 1996 to 1999, substantial funds were allocated to a variety of cross-disciplinary projects, including, for example, Quantitative Studies in the Social Sciences, the Emergence of Communicative Action in the Social Life of Very Young Children, the Research Center for the Study of Virtual Environments and Behavior, and Identifying Mayan Archeological Sites in the El Pilar Region of Belize and Guatemala with Geographic Information Systems.

The atmosphere of interdisciplinary and interdepartmental cooperation so permeates the campus that colleagues from other campuses have referred to it as the “campus without walls.” In 1998, UCSB’s Professor of Physics, Walter Kohn, won the Nobel Prize in Chemistry. In 2000, UCSB’s Professor of Engineering, Herbert Kroemer, won the Nobel Prize in Physics and UCSB’s Professor of Physics, Alan Heeger, won the Nobel Prize in Chemistry. In their respective comments upon the receipt of this magnificent honor, each Nobel Laureate credited UCSB’s commitment to interdisciplinary work as having attracted them to, and retained them at, UCSB. Interdisciplinarity is a deeply rooted element of the campus culture.

A second characteristic that was similarly identified as distinctive about UCSB is the hospitable context UCSB provides for newly emerging fields and subfields, and their rapid incorporation into the campus in the form of new interdepartmental programs, certificate and degree programs, and research centers. The thirty new research centers that have been created in the past decade are a good measure of the speed with which UCSB has allowed new fields to find a niche alongside the more established disciplines. The Donald Bren School for Environmental Studies and Management is an excellent example of this campus-wide appreciation for innovation. It trains graduate students in rigorous interdisciplinary approaches to environmental problem-solving and combines scholarly research with management skills in a unique combination aimed at meeting the rapidly increasing need for professionals with both areas of expertise.

A third distinctive aspect of UCSB is the degree to which the campus’s cutting edge research interacts with classroom teaching and research opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students. A few examples of research-based learning on campus, among the many that could be cited, include

- Antarctic seafloor investigation: Undergraduates accompany a geophysicist on his exploration of a 60-mile stretch of Antarctica’s eastern Ross Sea in an effort to find firm proof that New Zealand broke off from Antarctica some 80 million years ago.

- The Marine Science Institute’s “Young Marine Scientists Program”: Undergraduates, K–12 teachers and their students, and parents are offered research opportunities. UCSB students act as guides to the marine laboratory; in 1997–1998, more than 5300
individuals from over 190 schools and other organizations toured the marine laboratory with student guides.

- The Remote Access Astronomy Project allows undergraduates in astrophysics courses to combine theory with observations using the Remote Operated Telescope.

- Graduate students are active researchers (and sometimes also act as mentors for undergraduate assistants) in many other high-level projects, including such state-of-the-art projects as the gallium nitride-based semiconductors laboratory led by Shuji Nakamura, the bacterial virulence project, and the Research, Teaching and Technology in the Information Age project.

In short, UCSB, is a medium-sized research university that has marshaled its resources to create a distinctive institutional profile that combines the best elements of a distinguished undergraduate liberal arts university with the strengths of an internationally ranked science and technology campus, complemented by strength in humanities, fine arts and social science, all in a stunning physical location. It has developed a campus culture characterized by interdisciplinarity, innovation, and research-based education and has imbued its students, staff, and faculty with a strong sense of being a part of a rising and remarkable scholarly community.

No description of UCSB would be complete, however, without some mention of the frequency with which undergraduates, graduate students, and faculty mix on campus. Perhaps no single “snapshot” exemplifies the character of UCSB more than a group of students and faculty emerging from a lecture by an internationally ranked scholar at the Institute for Theoretical Physics, against the backdrop of the Pacific Ocean and Channel Islands National Park. This image captures the combination of cutting edge research and physical beauty that draws superb faculty, visiting scholars, and students to UCSB year after year.

Our strengths and accomplishments notwithstanding, several challenges face the campus in the coming decade. These include (1) improving the quality of the campus infrastructure and staffing now that the economic down-turn has run its course; (2) preparing for growth in the student enrollments as the UC system faces “tidal wave II” (an estimated increase of 63,000 students in the UC system over the next decade); (3) adapting to an increasingly significant housing shortage in the Santa Barbara area; and (4) preserving the distinctive profile of selective excellence that UCSB has achieved, in the face of growing enrollments and other pressures for change.

This is a particularly opportune moment for UCSB to engage in the WASC reaccreditation self-study. Given the nearly certain prospect of at least moderate growth in student enrollment over the coming decade, and the accompanying increase in financial resources, the campus now has an opportunity to act in a very substantive manner upon the assessments and suggestions generated by this process. While UCSB is poised to face the first decade of the 21st century with exceptional national rankings for an institution of its age and size, with a distinctive campus culture and profile, with a very positive and strong sense of community, and with administrative leadership prepared to create a context for constant innovation in teaching and research, we recognize that we do so in a highly competitive context.
2.2 GOVERNANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

To arrive at an appreciation for the structure of the University of California, we present next a brief overview of the nexus between the University of California and UC Santa Barbara. Because the details of the University of California’s (and UCSB’s) structure, governance, and administration are readily available on the World Wide Web, pertinent Web sites are included at appropriate junctures in this summary.

<http://www.ucop.edu>

Under the state constitution, governance of the University of California is entrusted to the Board of Regents. The board consists of 26 members: 18 are appointed by the governor for staggered 12-year terms; one is a student appointed by The Regents to a one-year term; and seven are ex officio members including the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the President and Vice President of the Alumni Associations of UC, and the UC President.

The Governor is officially the president of the board, but in practice the presiding officer is the chair, who is elected by The Regents for a one-year term.

Regents appoint the UC president and, with the president’s advice, other officers of the University including vice presidents, chancellors, and directors of the national laboratories. The board also appoints its principal officers—the general counsel, treasurer, and secretary.

Authority in academic matters is delegated by The Regents to the Academic Senate. The Senate determines academic policy as a whole, sets conditions for admission and granting of degrees, authorizes and supervises courses and curricula, and advises administration on faculty appointments, promotions, and budgets.

2.2.1 The University-wide Academic Senate

The composition and organization of the University-wide Academic Senate are governed by Standing Order of The Regents 105.1. The Academic Senate consists of all members of the faculty holding the rank of lecturer with security of employment, assistant professor, associate professor, and professor; principal administrative officers; and persons holding certain other titles. The Academic Senate is otherwise authorized to determine its own membership and organization. It may delegate authority to its Divisions (one of which exists on each campus) or to its committees.

The duties, powers, and privileges of the Academic Senate are delegated to it in Standing Order 105.2, and in certain other Orders governing the obligations of the President or the Chancellors to consult with it. The Academic Senate, subject to the approval of The Regents, determines the conditions for admissions, certificates, and earned degrees. It is delegated the power to authorize and supervise all courses and curricula under the jurisdiction of the departments, colleges, schools, graduate divisions, or other University academic agencies approved by the Board, with certain stated exceptions (Standing Order 105.2[b]).
The Academic Senate is delegated the authority (Standing Order 105.2[d]) “to advise a Chancellor concerning a campus budget and . . . to advise the President concerning the University budget.” In practice, this advisory capacity is organized in various ways on the individual campuses. The Academic Senate is also authorized to advise the President and the Chancellors concerning the administration of the University libraries. Finally, the Senate has the right, through the President, to lay before the Board its views on any matter pertaining to the conduct and welfare of the University.

2.2.2 Administration of the UCSB Campus

The campus administration is responsible for academic planning, research planning, facilities planning, resource allocation, academic and staff employment actions, maintenance of facilities, and related functions. In executing its duties, the administration solicits and receives extensive advice from the Academic Senate and from students. UCSB’s organization structure is shown in Figures 2-1 and 2-2.

Figure 2-1. The Chancellor’s Office. UCSB organization at the administrative level.
Five senior administrators report directly to the Chancellor. The chief officer in this group is the Executive Vice Chancellor. Other senior officers are the Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs, Administrative Services, Institutional Advancement, and Research, and the Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Planning.

The Executive Vice Chancellor is the chief academic officer. The duties include overseeing the development and implementation of policy decisions for academic affairs for the Colleges of Creative Studies, Engineering, Letters and Science, the Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, the Graduate School of Education, the Graduate Division, the Davidson Library, Summer Sessions, the Office of Information Technology, and the off-campus academic programs (Education Abroad and University Extension). The Executive Vice Chancellor is responsible for the overall planning of the academic program, for distributing resources to the areas within the academic units, for academic appointments, for implementing affirmative action programs, for campus racial and sexual harassment grievance procedures, for outreach, and for formal liaison with the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate.
The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs manages admissions and administers policies aimed at diversifying the student population. The Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs is also responsible for student services, health services, student life, and the Arts & Lectures program. This office serves as the campus liaison with the Associated Students and the Graduate Students Association, and administers student grievance procedures.

The Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services organizes the administrative services of the campus, monitors and evaluates the delivery of services, and furthers staff diversity. Duties include internal financial controls and external audit, acquiring goods and services, and managing compensation matters of salaries, benefits, and retirement. This office maintains effective working relationships with local governmental agencies.

The Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement is responsible for all areas concerned with external relations and fund raising. This office directs all of the activities, programs, and departments that advance the campus’s relationships with the external community. Duties include overseeing the UCSB Foundation and Alumni Association, developing and coordinating private fund raising, directing communication with governmental agencies and the media, overseeing a wide variety of publications, and directing campus-wide events and official entertainment.

The Vice Chancellor for Research is the principal officer in matters of research policy and administration. The Vice Chancellor is an advocate for research and its value in an educational setting. The Vice Chancellor fosters active relationships between the University, government, industry, and the private sector, and provides guidance and leadership for interdisciplinary research initiatives and technology transfer.

The Assistant Chancellor for Budget and Planning guides development, implementation, and design of campus planning and budgeting, as well as the institutional research that supports these functions.

The Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate

<http://www.senate.ucsb.edu/>

The constitutional underpinning of the Academic Senate—the Standing Orders of The Regents—provides each Division, including the Santa Barbara Division, with a high degree of autonomy. At UCSB, the Faculty Legislature, a representative assembly elected annually by the members of the Division, oversees the business of the Division.

Governance of the Colleges and Schools at UCSB

Each school and college at UCSB is headed by a Dean or Provost. Owing mostly to its size, the College of Letters and Science has a multifaceted governance structure in which the Provost has college-wide responsibility for some matters and the Division of Deans has primary responsibility for others. The Provost administers the workload budget to ensure appropriate
course coverage; the Divisional Deans oversee faculty hiring, retention, promotion tenure, and merit reviews. Both the Divisional Deans and the Provost report directly to the Executive Vice Chancellor. On matters of academic personnel, the Divisional Deans work with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel and the Executive Vice Chancellor. A comparison of the units of the campus is given in Table 2-1.

**Table 2-1. Governance of UCSB’s Colleges and Schools in 1999–2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Undergraduate FTE*</th>
<th>Graduate FTE</th>
<th>Faculty FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Creative Studies</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering</td>
<td>1,202</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>161.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
<td>15,147</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>1,108.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Bren School</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School of Education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>56.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,589</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,201</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,338.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Full-time equivalent (FTE)

The faculty of each college or school is represented in all aspects of its academic administration by an executive committee (which is also a standing committee of the Academic Senate) whose members are elected by the college’s or school's faculty at large. The Academic Senate’s Graduate Council determines policy for the administration of graduate programs, which is implemented by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

**Academic Senate Committees**

The Chancellor, Executive Vice Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Provosts, and Deans seek and receive advice on campus administration from the standing and special committees of the Academic Senate, particularly on issues involving budget, curriculum and instruction, academic planning, and campus development. This shared governance advisory mechanism derives from authority granted to the Academic Senate in the Standing Orders of The Regents.

**Qualifications and Review of Administration**

Policy regarding key administrative personnel is determined by the provisions of the University of California Executive Program. This program is administered by the Office of the President. Policies governing executive personnel, including general principles of recruitment and appointment, are supplied in the Executive Program Policy Manual.
The Office of the President conducts periodic reviews of Chancellors. Campus policy calls for periodic review of the performance of principal administrative officers. All Executive Program employees are reviewed by the Chancellors as part of the annual review process. In addition, each Academic Dean is reviewed in the fifth year of service. Review committees are composed of faculty members from the campus. Policy statements for review committees are provided, along with a statement of the relevant administrator’s job responsibilities and authorities. The review committee has wide latitude of consultation and submits a written report to the Chancellor, who makes a decision regarding possible reappointment of the Dean and conveys to the Dean the general results of the review process.

2.2.3 Role of Students in Governance

The advisory role of students in campus governance does not devolve from a special Regents’ authority and it has a different form on each UC campus. At UCSB, students serve on most administrative committees and task forces, as well as on many standing committees of the Academic Senate.

University-wide, students participate formally in University governance through The Regents’ exercise of their discretionary power to appoint a student Regent. The Board of Regents gives the student Regent full voting powers on the Board. Students also participate in University governance through membership on certain advisory and planning committees of the Office of the President, as well as through membership on some University-wide Academic Senate Committees.

In addition, University of California students are represented in California’s State government by the UC Student Lobby, which lobbies State legislators and administrators in the interests of student rights and needs.

The Associated Students of UCSB Web site carries a wealth of information about the organization on this campus.

<http://www.as.ucsb.edu/>

The UCSB Graduate Students Association (GSA) includes every graduate student at UCSB. Graduate students in each academic department elect departmental representatives to the monthly general council meetings. The UCSB GSA Web site contains the details of the organization’s structure and governance.

<http://www.gsa.ucsb.edu>
3 THE FRESHMAN-YEAR EXPERIENCE

UCSB operates on the premise that our students’ earliest experiences on campus provide an important template for their entire UCSB career. The first year is fundamental to academic achievement, personal fulfillment, and social integration. UCSB offers a variety of programs intended to assist Freshman students in making a successful transition to the University. The goal of these programs is to provide a rich, multi-entry, programmatic environment within which students can be expected to learn and to think critically, to make independent ethical judgments and sound personal decisions, and to respond proactively and supportively to the demands of a highly diverse society. Against this background, the Freshman Experience Committee evaluated the extent to which UCSB has achieved its objectives of promoting the academic, personal, and social development of its freshmen. Summarized here, the results of this research suggest that the campus has been successful in its mission to integrate freshmen into campus life and set them on the road to a rewarding university experience.¹

Academic Development: The principal goal of the freshman program is an academic one—to encourage UCSB students to view education as a lifelong experience. The freshman experience was assessed with respect to its ability to

- Teach students to learn, respect, and become excited about the search for knowledge, and to do so in ways consistent with the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity;
- Help students become educated individuals who are acquainted with a wide range of academic disciplines, and to make timely choices of an academic major that will provide them with an in-depth understanding of a specific corpus of knowledge;
- Teach students to think, speak, and write with clarity, accuracy, and purpose, and to become active participants in their own education;
- Teach students to appreciate how research and other creative activities contribute to a knowledge base that allows the individual to understand the past, as well as to prepare for the future; and
- Provide opportunities for hands-on discovery through faculty-mentored research experiences.

Personal Development: The major personal development goal of the freshman program is to assist freshmen in discovering who they are (identity), how they relate to others (relationships),

¹ New students usually enter the University of California as freshmen or as transfer students at the junior level (Table 5-2). This Freshman-year Experience study focuses on the former, much larger group. The freshman year typically begins shortly after high school graduation whereas transfer students, already having been introduced to higher education, are expected to be integrated immediately into a departmental advising structure.
and where they are heading in life (purpose). Freshman programs were examined in terms of
their ability to

- Provide opportunities and support for students to develop skills and gain experiences that
  advance their own personal growth in ways that promote personal safety, health, and
  physical well-being;

- Advance personal identity through the exploration and clarification of students’ own
  interests, values, skills, attitudes, and behaviors; and

- Acquire or enhance skills in maintaining these competencies throughout their lives.

Social Development: The principal social development goal of the freshman program is to
introduce students to the concept and practice of social living—that is, to help them realize that
they are full-fledged, adult members of a community and that they alone are responsible for their
relationships to this community. We expect students to acquire a sense of connection and a
commitment to the campus community. Belonging to the campus community entails gaining an
understanding of, and respect for, the purposes and needs of the larger UCSB community and the
smaller communities within it. In this realm, the committee assessed the extent to which
freshman programs succeeded in helping students to

- Acquire a sense of belonging and commitment to the UCSB community;

- Learn respect for the needs and purposes of the larger UCSB community and the various
  smaller communities within the University;

- Exercise civility in all social interactions within the UCSB community;

- Grow in tolerance, respect, and acceptance for ethnic and cultural differences among
  individuals within the University.

Methods

The Freshman Experience Committee was appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor in
Spring 1999. The charge was to study the UCSB freshman experience, analyzing its strengths
and weaknesses, and making recommendations for how that experience might be improved in
subsequent years. The committee consisted of a variety of academic administrators, staff, faculty,
and students (see Appendix A). Collectively, the twenty members of the committee have a total
of approximately 350 person-years of experience at UCSB.

A variety of methods were used both to characterize and analyze the freshman experience at
UCSB. Demographic data were collected and summarized to address specific issues and to
delimit key characteristics of the first-year class. In addition, the committee accomplished the
following tasks:
Conducted faculty, staff, and student focus-group interviews to gain a better in-depth, multi-perspective understanding of the freshman experience at UCSB. Focus group sessions were held during the 1999–2000 academic year with a variety of UCSB populations in order to ascertain how these groups perceived both the institution’s efforts and the students’ experiences in the freshmen year. The Freshman Experience Committee established two subcommittees—one collected data from faculty and staff while the other gathered information from current students. Each subcommittee drafted its own focus-group questions, which were reviewed and approved by the full committee. Student focus groups were composed of student peer advisors, seniors, seniors who are members of the Education Opportunity Program (EOP), freshmen who are members of EOP, freshmen who are in the honors program or are Regents scholars, and two groups of randomly selected freshmen. Focus groups ranged in size from 4 to 11. Faculty/staff focus groups were composed of staff from residence halls, financial aid, student health, Disabled Students Program, the Registrar’s office, EOP, and the Counseling & Career Center, as well as staff undergraduate advisors from various departments. Faculty participants included those who regularly teach lower-division courses, those who do not regularly teach lower-division courses, and those who regularly teach honors sections. Teaching assistants and Campus Learning Assistance Services (CLAS) tutors were included along with the faculty members. All focus-group meetings were either tape-recorded or had a notetaker present. When a notetaker was present, a transcript of the conversations was later prepared. Comments relevant to the various subsections relating to academic, personal, and social development from focus group members are included throughout this text;

Gathered survey data from the most recently available, annual (1998) Cooperative Institutional Research Program of the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) in order to learn something of the views and experiences of a sample of UCSB freshmen. To a limited extent, UCSB student attitudes and beliefs about the freshman experience were compared with those of other participant institutions. The HERI survey was longitudinal and consisted of two parts: (1) a survey of a sample of the 1998 freshman class during the summer prior to their first enrollment, and (2) a survey of the same students at the end of their first year at UCSB. This survey examined the opinions, experiences, and goals of the 1998 freshmen just prior to their first quarter at UCSB. It was administered to a stratified random sample of 2492 incoming UCSB freshmen in August 1998. The response rate on the survey was 43%. In addition to the standardized survey developed by HERI, UCSB added a supplemental questionnaire that covered items specific to our campus and concerns. In June and July of 1999, a follow-up survey was conducted in which 2,500 freshmen were sent a questionnaire that consisted of standardized questions from HERI and additional UCSB research questions. The response rate for the second phase of data collection was 24%. This pool of 2500 students included all students who had responded to the August 1998 survey, all freshmen not sent the original survey, and a random sample of those who had been sent the August 1998 survey, but who did not respond;

A glossary of acronyms and abbreviations appears in the front of this report following the Table of Contents.
Supplemented these data with student survey data about the freshman experience gathered in 1997 as part of a doctoral research dissertation by one member of the Freshman Experience Committee. These dissertation survey data came from a random sample of the freshman class of 1997. The sample size was 885. Also, 173 freshmen enrolled in the course INT 20, Introduction to the University, during Spring 2000, were surveyed.

Copies of these survey instruments are included in Appendix B.

The committee relied on analyses of data as well as on the experience and impressions of its members in formulating its final recommendations about how the freshman program might be improved in subsequent years.

### 3.1 ACADEMIC DEVELOPMENT

Enhanced academic achievement is the primary goal of any institution of higher learning. UCSB works diligently to give students a full range of academic experiences that will result in educational effectiveness. UCSB students completing their first year are expected to

- Gain acquaintance with a wide range of academic disciplines
- Demonstrate a satisfactory level of knowledge in all course work
- Make progress in the selection of a major and advancement toward a degree, and learn to strive for excellence
- Acquire and improve additional skills to facilitate learning (e.g., writing, critical and analytical thinking and reading, technology relevant to academic success, note-taking)
- Be exposed to the process of research and its role in industry, in government, and in the University
- Learn and respect standards of academic integrity
- Develop an attitude of excitement about learning and the acquisition of knowledge

---


4 Interdisciplinary 20: *Introduction to the University*. This course is designed to introduce first-year students to the University. Topics include the University as a community of scholars, student subculture, student rights, University and community, University as policy, and personal growth in college.
3.1.1 Gain acquaintance with a wide range of academic disciplines

One of the most important goals in assisting the freshman transition to the University is to acquaint the student with a wide range of academic disciplines. One way to ensure that this occurs is to provide a broad-based General Education curriculum for all students, regardless of academic major. Consistent with this principle, our academic catalog states “students receive an orientation to a broad range of intellectual disciplines: the kinds of questions that are addressed, the methods for solving problems, and the strategies for communicating findings and conclusions.” UCSB provides a broad range of courses that satisfy GE requirements, allowing students maximum choice and flexibility to follow their own interests. The program is multidisciplinary, requiring courses in reading and composition, foreign language, science and mathematics (3 courses), social science (3 courses), civilization and thought (3 courses), arts (2 courses) and literature set in various times and places (2 courses). In addition, students must take at least one course that focuses on the experiences of minority groups (the ethnicity requirement), and one course that focuses on a non-Western culture. Students must also take a course that emphasizes quantitative relationships. Finally, in addition to the required freshman writing courses, all students must complete at least six writing-intensive courses in other disciplines.

The majority of courses taken by most freshmen in the College of Letters and Science are from the General Education curriculum. Freshmen in the College of Engineering and those intending to earn a BS degree in Letters and Science may take slightly fewer General Education courses during their first year because of the requirements of their majors. The General Education requirements are not intended to be completed during the freshman year; however, the typical freshman makes considerable progress toward the satisfaction of these requirements during this year.

In the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) survey of those completing their freshman year, 83% of the respondents said they were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the General Education courses taken during their freshman year. Additionally, in the INT 20 student survey, 98% indicated that they had become at least somewhat acquainted with a wide variety of academic disciplines during their first year at UCSB (51% reported “definite” acquaintance). Strikingly, all respondents (n=173) could name at least one course they had taken in an academic discipline with which they were unfamiliar prior to attending UCSB. These surveys lead us to conclude that UCSB is introducing students to a wide variety of academic disciplines. While the committee was pleased with this evidence of exposure, students did not mention this as a relevant goal during their focus-group discussions and, less encouraging, their comments generally revolved around how to devote the least time possible to General Education requirements.

In 1999 the UCSB Academic Senate appointed a task force to consider changes in the General Education program. Some faculty are concerned that, while the current program exposes students to a wide range of disciplines, it might not provide enough coherence and depth. The task force report, due in January 2001, will likely recommend several new approaches to the goals of the program. The task force has already recommended the creation of General Education Freshman Seminars; the first two will be taught in Fall 2000. These small (18-student) seminars will not only introduce freshmen to a discipline and its intellectual style, but will also allow new
students the opportunity to work closely with faculty and fellow students in a small class environment. They will serve as a counterbalance to the large lecture courses freshmen take. Approximately 10 General Education Freshman Seminars will be offered in each of the next three academic years, at which point an evaluation will be done to determine the value and viability of this approach.

In sum, an analysis of currently available data led to the conclusion that students are introduced to a broad spectrum of academic fields during their freshman year. In addition, efforts are underway to create even greater depth of exposure through new freshmen seminars.

3.1.2 Demonstrate a satisfactory level of knowledge in all course work

New students should demonstrate a satisfactory level of achievement in their course work. Student performance is measured by examinations, performances, recitals, creative work, and papers. The vast majority of freshmen at UCSB succeed academically, with 90% of freshmen performing academically above the University’s minimum threshold.

Some data examined speak directly to the question of whether students perceive themselves to be learning. Respondents in the INT 20 survey characterized themselves as having more general knowledge of course subject matter than when they entered UCSB. Forty-five percent reported that they had “definitely improved” or had become “highly proficient,” while an additional 35% reported they had acquired a “good” proficiency of subject matter in their first year. Similarly, students completing their first year reported in the HERI survey that they had gained general knowledge (93%), more knowledge of a particular field (89%), and more problem-solving skills (67%). It is clear that student perceptions of academic achievement are high.

Focus-group responses indicate that both faculty and student perceptions of attaining satisfactory knowledge in certain courses were related to knowledge gained prior to attending UCSB. Some students reported feeling underprepared for writing, math, and technology. For example, one student reported “My schooling did not prepare me. I never did a major research paper.” Despite these disadvantageous beginnings, students also reported that CLAS (Campus Learning Assistance Services), STEP (Summer Transitional Enrichment Program), and PODS (Program of Determined Students) were very helpful on-campus resources to facilitate adequate learning in classes. Another student spoke highly of CLAS tutorial groups, “They helped me—without them I’d have been lost!” In general, feelings regarding inadequate performance are influenced by preparation levels, but students seem to know that resources exist on campus to compensate for these deficits. (These various services are discussed in subsequent sections.)

To be considered in good academic standing, a student must maintain a minimum grade point average of 2.0 out of a possible 4.0. If a student’s GPA falls below 2.0 in any given quarter, he or she is placed on academic probation. Thereafter, their curriculum and performance is monitored by the Dean of their College. Every effort is made to encourage, advise, and support students who are experiencing academic difficulty. The College of Letters and Science, for instance, has a mentorship program for freshmen with low grades (less than a 1.5 GPA) during their first quarter. This program matches freshmen with graduate students who have been trained to provide both academic and personal support. Freshmen in the mentorship program must also
attend workshops on time management and other necessary learning skills. The mentorship program appears to have had some impact on participating students. Most improve their grades during their quarter in the program, and many succeed in achieving good academic standing (2.0 GPA) by the end of their first year.

For the last two academic years, the program has been a requirement if these poorly performing new students wish to continue at UCSB. No data are available for similar students prior to two years ago and, because the program is new, graduation rates are not yet available. As a result, statistical information about the program’s success is tentative. However, in each of the program’s two years, 67% of the participants (N=96 and 97) were still enrolled at UCSB at the start of their second year. Given the high-risk profile of these students, it is reasonable to conclude that the program is having a positive effect on retention. Further, students’ comments on evaluation questionnaires indicate strong support for the program.

Unfortunately, some students cannot respond successfully to the academic rigor of the University and, after being given opportunity and assistance for improvement, are dismissed. Despite extensive efforts at retention of first-year students, 6–8% of the freshman class is dismissed for academic reasons sometime during, or at the end of, the freshman year.

In sum, our analysis shows that the majority of freshmen succeed academically, with 89% continuing on and 93% reporting increases in general knowledge after their first year. (For further consideration of these data, see Chapter 5.) In addition, students who report feeling underprepared initially, and who participate in the freshman programs designed to improve success, report improvements in their mastery of course work.

### 3.1.3 Major selection: Making satisfactory progress toward degree (45 units and at least 2.0 GPA)

Another important factor in measuring educational effectiveness is ensuring adequate progress toward the degree. This includes the expectation that freshman students will make progress toward the selection of a major or confirm a previously expressed major through completion of lower-division premajor course work.

**Major Selection**

Approximately 35% of the entering freshmen in Letters and Science have not declared a major. (The College of Engineering and the College of Creative Studies do not permit students to enter without a declared major.) All of the colleges and each department provide premajor advising. Departments with formal premajors make special efforts to help freshmen plan early in their college careers for a successful four-year course of study. Many other departments do likewise. Counseling and Career Services conducts workshops on how to choose a major. These workshops are aimed primarily at the undeclared freshmen, or at those freshmen considering a change of major. The Frosh Success Series provides workshops in all freshman residence halls.

The 1997 freshman class was studied for purposes of this review. Approximately 13% of those who entered in fall 1997 changed their major status during their first year at UCSB. Of these, the most common change was from undeclared to a major. Yet, 83% of the 35% who were
undeclared at admission remained undeclared at the end of the first year. No significant numbers of students left their chosen majors, but the premajors in Biology, Computer Science, Economics, and Psychology had the greatest number of student departures during their first year, ranging from 7 to 20%. Because of high enrollment demand, faculty in those departments (and some others) use premajor requirements to provide students with feedback about the likelihood of their success in the major. As a result, some freshmen learn early in their college careers that they have chosen an inappropriate major.

The overwhelming majority (87%) of the 1997 freshman class remained in the same choice of major, including undeclared, at the conclusion of their first year. A very large percentage of students remain with their original major through to graduation. About 7% of the students moved from one major to another, while about 6% went from undeclared to a specific major. Most of our freshmen, therefore, use their first year to select or confirm their original choice of major. Of some concern are those students still in the undeclared category as they finish their first year. Since they must select a major by the end of their second year, they start their sophomore year with some feeling of pressure to make this choice.

Information from the student focus groups highlighted problems in this area. Regular and EOP freshmen complained that there was not enough help in selecting a major. Others reported switching majors from the physical or biological sciences because classes were too demanding. Comments from the faculty focus groups did not address these difficulties for students.

**Academic Advising Regarding Satisfactory Progress**

Academic departments, college advising offices, and the Division of Student Affairs work together to aid students in planning workable programs. This effort begins during the students’ orientation visit to campus in the summer, when they meet with undergraduate advisors to talk about long-term goals and to plan their first quarter. After the first quarter, academic advisors are available both in departments and in the college advising offices to give further advice and information on major selection, curriculum planning, and graduation requirements. During the registration period for winter and spring quarters, the Frosh Success Series provides advising sessions in the residence halls.

Several students in the focus groups commented about making satisfactory progress. These reports notwithstanding, some freshmen are still trying to decide on a major, and many were surprised at the chemistry requirement for the Biology major. Most, however, reported that they had been able to get the courses they wanted. Some found enrolling for the second quarter more difficult than for the first when they are walked through registration during Orientation. Some students complained that (1) in college, no one forces you to do anything, or that there should be mandatory study halls (which some fraternity and sorority houses have), and (2) there is so much to do that it is hard to stay on track. One Engineering student complained that the Engineering curriculum is tough and that it is easy to get set back a year. Peer advisors stressed the need for students to see an academic advisor to plan curriculum and to determine how to satisfy GE requirements and graduate within four years. Also, they felt that other campus advisors need to be better informed about which courses are most appropriate for students.
Mechanisms are clearly in place to assist students in choosing a major and to monitor their progress toward the degree. Academic advising at the college, department, and peer level provide students with much needed information regarding GPA requirements, course sequencing, and enrollment. That said, some students feel the need for more advice regarding time-management and study skills. More could be done to assist students in choosing a major and making adequate progress toward completing their degree requirements early in their freshmen year.

### 3.1.4 Acquire and improve skills to facilitate learning—academic writing skills, critical and analytical thinking, use of technology

**Improve Academic Writing Skills**

Regardless of their academic discipline, all students are expected to become proficient writers prior to completing their tenure at UCSB. Consistent with this goal, the University of California administers a statewide writing assessment, known as “Subject A,” to all admitted freshmen. The exam tests basic composition skills; those who do not pass (approximately 40%) must take college-preparatory writing classes before taking the campus’s required writing courses. Most UCSB students who fail the Subject A exam take Writing 1, *Approaches to Academic Writing*, during their freshman year. This course focuses on moving students from personal writing to academic writing. Students in this course take a final exam testing their ability to read, summarize, criticize, analyze, and synthesize material into coherent essays.

The Area A section of the General Education program requires students to take two quarters of composition. Most UCSB students take the first course as freshmen (Writing 2, *Academic Writing*); for the second course, students have a choice of taking an intermediate research writing course (Writing 50, *Writing and the Research Process*) or one of a series of upper-division courses focused on specific disciplines or professions, such as law, business, health professions, social science research, or visual arts. Students in the College of Engineering take writing courses specifically designed for engineers; they complete this area of General Education in their freshman year.

In addition to the Area A requirement, students must take six courses that require substantial writing (1,800 words or more) outside of examinations. Courses satisfying the “Writing Requirement” are reviewed and approved by the Academic Senate Committee on General Education. Approximately 475 courses meet this writing requirement. Most of the General Education courses freshmen take in the social sciences and humanities meet the writing requirement.

The Division of Student Affairs administers the Campus Learning Assistance Services (CLAS), a learning assistance lab that provides tutorial services for students enrolled not only in writing courses, but in any course that requires students to write papers. CLAS also offers workshops for students working on assigned papers in designated freshman courses.

Seventy-three percent of the respondents to the follow-up HERI survey reported that their writing skills were “stronger” or “much stronger” at the end of the freshman year. In the INT 20 survey, 44% of the students said their ability to write in support of an argument or statement had “definitely improved”; an additional 6% characterized their writing as “highly proficient.”
Despite these survey results, many faculty report their dissatisfaction with the writing skills of upper-division students, implicitly suggesting that the students’ perceptions of their writing proficiency may be exaggerated.

The faculty perspective, as expressed in the focus groups, indicates a concern about the failure of many high schools to inculcate the analytic and mechanical writing skills necessary for effective written communication. Many lament the fact that writing in high school was either for comprehension of material (summary) or the presentation of personal opinion, without reference to sources. Students often do not appreciate that professors expect something different at the college level: interpretation, reflection, and the development of a point of view—for some, a huge intellectual leap. While the Writing Program does a great deal to bring these students to the appropriate level, some faculty felt that more resources should be committed for this purpose.

On the basis of our analysis, we conclude that the writing skills of freshmen clearly improve as students move through their first year. There remains some uncertainty, however, about the campus’s ability to incorporate writing instruction effectively into the curriculum beyond formal writing courses.

**Thinking Critically and Analytically**

Introductory courses taken by freshmen are designed to foster learning skills in addition to pursuing the acquisition of knowledge. Whether it is a large introductory psychology, political science, or history class or a smaller writing course, instructors build learning skills into their classes. Research papers—the first such effort for many freshmen—are routinely assigned in most large introductory courses. When used properly, these assignments can encourage freshmen to learn and to develop new critical thinking and analytical skills, as do the papers required in all Writing Program courses. In addition, some sections of the freshman composition courses (Writing 1 and 2) are linked to GE courses, enabling students to develop critical thinking skills in the context of their GE course content. The library offers one-unit courses in library research techniques at both introductory and advanced levels. In addition, freshman writing instructors work closely with librarians to introduce students to the Library and Internet resources.

Seventy-three percent of the respondents to the follow-up HERI survey reported they were “stronger” or “much stronger” in their critical thinking ability after a year at UCSB. Seventy-one percent reported they were “stronger” or “much stronger” in their computer skills at the end of their freshman year, and 54% said their reading speed and comprehension was either “stronger” or “much stronger.”

In the INT 20 survey, student responses to several questions regarding their reading and thinking skills suggest improvement in these skills during their freshman year. For instance, 68% said that they now had “good” or “definitely improved” skills in reading and finding evidence or logic supporting a point of view. Similarly, 56% reported a “good” or “definitely improved” ability to find flaws or alternative explanations to a written or oral argument.

Despite these student perceptions of improvement, during the focus groups with faculty, several commented on the difficulties in teaching and assessing critical thinking skills. One commented “I used to use bluebook exams, but have moved toward multiple-choice exams,”
noting that it is difficult to efficiently test students’ critical thinking abilities in large classes. Another commented that students seem to have trouble thinking in abstract terms. Still another noted that “students like concrete stuff; as soon as they start discussing schools of thought, things miss a beat somewhere in there.” Being more at ease with specific “concrete stuff” is not necessarily surprising, since the freshman year often marks an important intellectual transition toward more abstract reasoning and an awareness of subtleties.

**Technology in the Classroom**

Virtually all research assignments require some familiarity with the Internet; students must meet challenges related to use of this technology. Instructors in most large General Education courses use Web pages to post assignments, supplement lectures with additional or elaborated material, and provide links to other relevant Web sites. Seventy-five percent of the respondents in the follow-up HERI survey indicated that they received course assignments through the Internet; 54% said they turned in assignments electronically. Ninety-six percent of the respondents in the follow-up HERI survey said they had email contact with at least one of their instructors, with 42% indicating at least weekly email contact.

All students receive free campus email accounts. Instructional Computing provides introductions to numerous software programs during quarterly orientation sessions. The rooms in the freshman residence halls are wired with Internet ports. The University maintains computer laboratories for both classroom and open-access student use. Freshmen are introduced to these facilities during Orientation. Many freshman classes use these labs as part of regular instruction.

Virtually all of the Writing Program faculty teach at least part of their classes in the Instructional Computing labs located around campus. In writing courses for the sciences and engineering, this practice has allowed faculty to teach students to use the array of word-processing tools and graphing software available to enhance the writing process.

**Tutorials**

Outside of the classroom and laboratory, numerous support services are designed to complement the faculty’s efforts. For example, CLAS helps students increase their mastery of course material through course-specific group and drop-in tutorials, and through academic skills workshops. Approximately 55% of freshmen use CLAS services. While each year UCSB admits more students with progressively higher high school grades and SAT scores, the number of first-year students using CLAS has remained relatively constant. For incoming students, tutorials do not carry the stigma of “remediation”; instead, they view tutorials as providing a competitive edge in the academic setting.

According to records from CLAS, over 40% of the most recent freshman cohorts have participated in 2.4 group tutorials totaling at least 22 hours in their first year at UCSB. Freshmen group tutorial hours were highest in chemistry and math. Small group tutorials provide an intimate academic environment in which to connect with fellow students and interact with successful upper division or graduate student tutors. CLAS tutors are role models for biology or chemistry or economics students at a research university; they share with freshman students their passion for research and problem solving.
CLAS also offers one-on-one drop-in tutoring labs in math, science, economics, writing, foreign language, and English as a second language. On a first-come, first-served basis, students can receive assistance with homework assignments, a lab report, or a paper. In the 1998–1999 academic year, nearly one-third of the freshmen used drop-in services, primarily in math, science, and writing. This practice resulted in 3993 student contacts with CLAS and a mean of 3.8 contacts per student.

Time management was the most frequently mentioned problem in every focus group. Many freshmen reported that when they were released from the “homework system,” they procrastinated and had to learn to set deadlines for themselves. Frequently, time management was tied to taking responsibility for personal habits and choices. Complaints about too much freedom fell into this category and were most frequently made by seniors looking back on their college experience. One student remarked, “I had to do it on my own…. I had to not study and then brag about the B I got. I needed to have the experience. Nobody could have told me how to use my freedom.”

Faculty members also commented on the same skills issues in their focus groups. Many felt that a substantial number of students are unable to manage their affairs effectively, being unable to allocate time appropriately among competing academic, social, and recreational activities. They noted that STEP and CLAS seemed to be effective in helping students develop time-management skills.

In response to the need for students to learn time-management and notetaking skills, during “Discovery Days” in the week before the beginning of fall quarter and throughout the academic year CLAS offers skills workshops in time management, test taking, notetaking, reading, and learning styles. In collaboration with faculty, CLAS offers applied skills workshops for most of the large General Education courses. These workshops are designed to help freshmen apply learning skills to specific course-related tasks. Over 750 freshmen attended one or more skills workshops during the 1999–2000 academic year. CLAS was the most frequently mentioned service in helping students develop good study habits. TAs were also instrumental in developing skills, “if they’re good.”

In sum, this section demonstrates that structures are in place to assist students with writing, critical thinking and analysis, technological innovation in learning, time management, and notetaking. While students perceive an improvement in their writing and in their critical analysis skills, UCSB believes that it is essential to sustain and to expand efforts to instill good writing and critical analysis skills in its freshman students.

3.1.5 Expose students to the process of research: An avenue of discovery for all

UCSB has an obligation to help students understand, appreciate, and actively participate in the process of creating new knowledge. Indeed, one of the chief advantages of attending a research university is the opportunity for undergraduate students to interact with talented faculty at the vanguard of research in their disciplines. Lectures, discussions in class and afterward among peers, and conversations with faculty during office hours offer occasions for transmitting new ideas and information.
From their first days on campus, new students become aware of the University’s fertile environment for collaborative research. They are encouraged during Discovery Days to attend a faculty/student panel presentation about the undergraduate research opportunities that exist in virtually every department. In addition, every freshman and transfer student receives a list of campus contacts and information about joining a research project or conducting an independent faculty-supervised investigation. Undergraduates also attend residence hall workshops led by faculty, students engaged in inquiry, and the Vice Chancellor for Research to inspire them to embark on a voyage of discovery with faculty and graduate researchers.

At special events and in the classroom, researchers strive to give new students a sense of possibility and personal potential as they describe, for example, field work undergraduates conduct in remote locations around the world. Students are also introduced to the pioneering attempts UCSB researchers are making to develop the potential of extreme environments. Opportunities abound in which teachers, investigators, and students exchange ideas to collaborate in efforts that enrich education with the excitement of discovery and research. In the sciences and engineering, the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts, each and every learner, whether faculty member or student, works in an environment in which exploration and hands-on discovery are highly valued.

Approximately 20% of upper-division students and 10% of all undergraduates participate in research activity. Currently, an expanded effort is underway in virtually all centers and academic departments to involve more undergraduates in research projects. Still further proactivity on behalf of all undergraduates is deemed valuable across campus; greater support for undergraduate research efforts is sought so as to enable each student to become an active participant in discovery through inquiry. This effort will ensure that students have a larger menu of options—from individual student-designed independent mentored studies to participating in large-team multi-faculty endeavors from which to select.

The INT 20 survey posed several questions to explore freshman awareness and involvement in research activities. The first question asked students whether they had engaged in research for a class assignment during their freshman year. Fifty-three percent reported doing research assignments a “few times,” 30% said “several times,” and 5% claimed “extensive” research assignments. Only 13% indicated no class-related research activities.

Ninety-five percent of the INT 20 respondents reported hearing their faculty or teaching assistants talk about their own research during lectures or discussion sections. Eighty-three percent learned about research processes from their course readings, and 30% reported that special UCSB events, lectures, or exhibits had contributed to their understanding of the research process.

Most UCSB faculty welcome undergraduate participation in their research. While it is difficult to involve freshmen in these efforts because of their limited educational foundation, 6% of the respondents in the follow-up HERI survey said their professors provided an opportunity to work on a research project with them. The participation rate for undergraduates in faculty research more than quadruples as students move into upper-division standing.
Focus group comments suggest that students have limited exposure to research during the freshman year, although there were indications that faculty did incorporate their current research into their teaching. It appears that the groundwork is being laid for students to appreciate research experiences, although most freshman are not yet directly involved in the process.

Finally, because elementary and secondary education is critical to the research-based discovery that tomorrow’s undergraduates will lead, UCSB is committed to an extensive program of community outreach. Undergraduate and graduate students guide thousands of people each year through campus research facilities. Faculty researchers, often with students’ assistance, develop curriculum modules and demonstrations for regional schools, train teachers in specific areas of research, administer summer science camps for students and teachers, present lectures and give demonstrations at area schools, and provide on-line services to students and teachers. Through alliances with community colleges, local school districts, and community organizations and businesses, UCSB researchers work to ensure that a diverse population is prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st-century workforce.

3.1.6 Learn and respect standards of academic integrity

The academic community’s standards require complete honesty in the preparation and presentation of information. It is a clear violation of those standards to use someone else’s ideas, words, or findings without attribution. Freshmen must learn how to conduct research and present their findings and conclusions so that they benefit from other scholars’ work while carefully attributing what they have used or quoted. Similarly, performance on an examination should be the result of a student’s own work.

Plagiarism or cheating on an examination violates UCSB’s student code of conduct. Sanctions run from giving the student an opportunity to redo an assignment, to giving a failing grade on the assignment or course, to reporting the incident to the student conduct committee for a disciplinary hearing. Depending upon the circumstances and its findings, the committee can recommend a variety of sanctions ranging from an official warning to suspension for a specific time, to expulsion from the University.

Freshmen are informed during orientation about the code of conduct and the requirements of academic integrity. Most faculty who teach the large freshman General Education courses routinely remind their classes about the importance of academic honesty and the potential sanctions for violations of the norms. Instructors in the Writing Program emphasize attribution, citation, and the meaning of plagiarism in their courses. In a 1998 faculty survey about academic honesty, faculty respondents gave a very clear picture of how the matter is viewed at UCSB: cheating is taken seriously. Faculty support UCSB’s student discipline policies. Some faculty prefer to handle cases of academic dishonesty unilaterally because of a feeling that sanctions against inexperienced freshmen should be modest. On the other hand, each year about ten cases are referred to the Student Conduct Committee; formal punishment usually ensues. There are additional cases of dishonesty that are handled by instructors alone or with the assistance of the Associate Dean of Students.

After a year in college, 72% of the respondents on the follow-up HERI survey disagreed strongly with the statement that “sometimes cheating on an exam or paper is justified”; an
additional 18% disagreed somewhat. Similar percentages agreed that the penalty for getting caught cheating is severe. Conveying the same impression, 53% of the INT 20 respondents said the University takes academic honesty seriously, while an additional 31% characterized the University policy toward dishonesty as “zero tolerance.” When that class was asked how important academic honesty was to them, 42% reported “very important,” 44% said “important” and 14% said “somewhat important.”

In sum, while there are instances of academic dishonesty at UCSB, our freshmen clearly do not condone it; and, they apparently understand and appreciate the University’s strong stance against it.

3.1.7 Develop an attitude of excitement about learning

Beyond making adequate progress toward their degrees, first-year students should also become enthusiastic about the subject matter they are studying. The University provides a number of options for students to become fully engaged in their academic and creative work. The Office of Research organizes a panel of faculty and student researchers from all the colleges for Discovery Days at the start of each year to make new freshmen and transfer students aware of opportunities for undergraduate research. The Writing Program, together with the Letters and Science Office of Special Programs, also uses faculty/student research panels to convey their excitement of discovery to freshmen in their writing classes.

The two honors programs on campus are intended to engender enthusiasm for learning among academically talented, high-achieving students. The College of Letters and Science Honors Program invites approximately 10% of the entering freshmen to join the program. Honors students must maintain a 3.5 GPA and complete a community service requirement. They enjoy special benefits, including priority registration, noncredit opportunities to interact with visiting scholars and artists, discussion sections taught by senior faculty, opportunities to join mentorship programs, and graduate student library privileges. About one half of the entering honors freshmen choose to live in a “Scholars Hall,” a designated floor in a residence hall for students in the honors program. This living arrangement fosters a sense of community among these academically talented students and permits some programming of special activities and events.

The College of Engineering Honors Program is relatively new. It is administered by each department in the college. Students in the program are encouraged to pursue research projects with faculty.

The College of Creative Studies, a special college intended for talented students capable of advanced independent work (and unique in the University of California), offers a curriculum of maximum rigor and flexibility so that students may embark on research and creative projects in art, biology, chemistry, computer science, literature, mathematics, music composition, or physics. Approximately 75 new freshmen enroll in the College each year. They participate in small, specialized classes as freshmen and enjoy opportunities for interaction with equally committed and talented students in their chosen major. Requirements are intentionally flexible. Each freshman in the College of Creative Studies designs an individual curriculum with the assistance of a faculty advisor. Most Creative Studies courses are open to all undergraduates.
Two special programs also deserving of mention require prior planning efforts by freshmen if they intend to participate later in their college careers. The first program is the UCSB Washington Center Program; this program supports and supervises undergraduates who pursue internships, research, and creative activities in the nation’s capital. Freshmen do not typically travel to Washington for this program, but they are encouraged to plan a curriculum and earn grades that will make them eligible as juniors or seniors. Engineering students do not participate in the Washington Center Program, but can participate in the Washington Internship in Science and Engineering (WISE).

The second program is the Education Abroad Program (EAP), which offers overseas study at 120 universities in 36 countries. Because students typically apply to EAP at the start of their sophomore year, it is important for freshmen to take the appropriate courses and earn the required grades during their first year on campus.

In addition to the above, the Office of Residential Life monitors and helps to establish “theme” residence halls in all disciplines. These provide a format for faculty participation in the freshmen residence halls throughout the year, often in the form of dinner or lunch discussions; they provide an opportunity for faculty to share information about their research and their disciplines with students in a relaxed setting.

Despite all of the campus efforts to excite students about learning and to integrate them into the culture of research, the results are unclear. Comments from the student focus groups pointed to both positive and negative experiences during the freshman year. Students in all groups cite the size of classes and lack of personal attention as the greatest impediments to motivation.

On the positive side, smaller classes and individual relationships with faculty were the two chief reasons for reported excitement and passion for learning on the part of students. One EOP student indicated that “more student-friendly seminars would be good.” Honors students reported having the best relationships with faculty and the greatest interest in knowledge. This group found faculty approachable and cited getting to know them as important. They also believed that they mattered to these professors. Regrettably, some students found faculty less than approachable.

UCSB is committed to providing an array of mechanisms through which students can feel and generate excitement for learning. Discovery Days, honors programs in the Colleges of Letters & Science and Engineering, the College of Creative Studies program, programs sponsored by the Office of Student Life, and smaller discussion sections are all intended to provide critical, more personal touches to enhance a student’s enthusiasm for learning.

3.2 PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT

In the area of personal development, the University tries to assist freshmen on their path toward determination of who they are (identity), how they relate to others (relationships), and where they are going in life (purpose). UCSB does this by providing opportunities and support for students as they develop skills and gain experiences that advance their growth in these areas including
• Committing to behaviors that promote personal safety, health, and well-being, particularly with regard to choices about alcohol and drug use, nutrition, and exercise

• Advancing a sense of personal identity through the exploration and clarification of interests, values, skills, attitudes, and behaviors

• Acquiring or enhancing adult life-management competencies, including conflict management, responsibility for deadlines, realistic assessment of personal needs and resources, and healthy interpersonal relationships

3.2.1 Developing Responsible Behavior

One of the most important goals for freshmen is the understanding of what constitutes responsible behavior. The casual environment of the campus along with the freedom of the student social/living environment can give students a false sense of security, which could in turn foster risk-taking behavior. In an attempt to channel these newly felt freedoms, students at UCSB are offered outlets for healthy behavior, including, but not limited to, participation in athletic activities. In the follow-up HERI survey of freshmen completing their first year, 65% of UCSB freshmen found the campus health facilities to be “satisfactory” or “very satisfactory.” Additionally, in the 1997 doctoral survey, 80% of UCSB freshmen believed that “there are plenty of opportunities for students to participate in recreational athletic activities.” And 17% of UCSB freshmen met their closest friends at UCSB through participating in or attending athletic activities. In the INT 20 student survey, 30% of freshmen exercised weekly while 37% exercised daily. Additionally, 61% of freshmen enrolled in INT 20 participated in some kind of team sport. The follow-up HERI survey indicated that 37% of UCSB freshmen participated in intramural sports.

With regard to making healthy choices, the survey of students who participated in the INT 20 survey indicated that most students (61%) do not smoke cigarettes while 9.1% smoke daily. Fifty-one percent of freshmen feel that they get adequate sleep on a weekly basis while 12% believe they do so daily. With regard to sleep, one student said that, “There were a lot of complaints to the RA because she wasn’t enforcing quiet hours.” Despite a wide range of anti-alcohol and drug messages, nearly 62% of freshmen drink alcohol on a weekly basis, an additional 13% monthly, 15% a few times, with only 8% reporting that they do not drink alcohol. Twenty percent use illegal drugs on a monthly basis and 23% have tried drugs “a few times.”

The follow-up HERI study indicated that, due to some of these unfortunate lifestyle choices, 58% of freshmen reported a decline in health habits relating to alcohol use while 19% reported a decline relating to substance/illegal drug use. Twenty-four percent stated that in the past six months, they had had five or more drinks at a sitting more than 12 times. In the campus’s ever expanding attempts to reduce to zero alcohol and drug use, it was instructive to hear a student comment: “I think it would help if students had more information about the consequences of their actions. I had students on my hall doing Ecstasy and they thought it wouldn’t hurt them. Students have to make their own decisions, but I think they have to have better information about the consequences.”
To counter these serious problems, the campus has introduced numerous prevention/education efforts. One major effort attempts to raise student awareness of the relationship between alcohol and other drug use and abuse, physical violence, and sexual assault. This is followed by workshops on topics such as self-defense and sexual harassment. Weekly rape prevention education programs and sexual harassment prevention/education workshops are provided in the residence halls, as well as through direct responses to specific incidents as they occur. The residence hall programs of the Women’s Center reach more than 1000 students. Because of campus concern about physical and sexual assault, the Campus Police Department encourages students to travel with a friend or in a group. The Community Service Organization (CSO) provides a free escort service at any time on campus or in Isla Vista.

The Student Health Service (SHS) is similarly active in addressing health issues common to freshmen (alcohol and other drugs, eating disorders, nutrition, sexual health, relationships, and stress). These are also a focus of the training of Resident Assistants, done through a course Community Health (Sociology 91F). SHS offers professional and peer presentations directly to students in the residence halls. A recent initiative places a Health Outreach Specialist on campus to be more accessible to students. Freshmen can take credit courses through Student Health to learn about these health issues and to become peer leaders.

Freshmen, athletes, sororities, and fraternities are targeted by collaborative programming efforts of Student Health, the Dean of Students Office, Counseling and Career Services, and other campus and community entities concerned about alcohol and other drug problems for anti-alcohol and drug programs.

In response to growing concerns about undergraduates without health insurance, the UC Board of Regents has established mandatory health insurance as a non-academic condition of enrollment for undergraduates, effective with the fall term 2001. UC is believed to be the first major multi-campus educational system to enact a mandatory health care policy for its undergraduates.

Moreover, UCSB has required the Student Health Service to provide not only primary medical care but also auxiliary services (lab, x-ray, pharmacy, eye care, and dental care) and specialty clinics/services for orthopedics, podiatry, women’s health, psychiatry, acne, HIV testing, and assessment and referral for substance abuse and eating disorder problems.

First-year students have typically relied on their parents to monitor their health care; the freshman year away from home offers the challenge of self-care. Because students may lack awareness in these matters, Student Health Services recently developed a packet of information on self-care for distribution at Orientation. SHS gets involved in both the STEP (Summer Transitional Enrichment Program) and PODS (Program of Determined Students) to reach this population early in the freshman year. The Women’s Center works with issues of gender violence and sexual harassment and assault to complement the programs offered by Student Health Services.

Because medical studies show that physical activity reduces stress and tension, and can help to ward off depression and anxiety, active student involvement in positive outlets is encouraged. UCSB students make extensive utilization of our state-of-the-art Recreation Center which houses
an aquatics complex, a fitness center, racquetball courts, gymnasiums, and cardio-weight training equipment. Students recently voted to tax themselves to expand this popular center to better meet current and future needs. Each fall, the Physical Activities and Recreation Department invites freshmen to a Fun and Fitness Festival to introduce them to the wide variety of recreation and sport activities available to students. In addition to the more than 100 leisure arts programs offered each quarter, 14 intramural sports and 17 intercollegiate sport clubs offer students opportunities for participation at many levels of ability and interest. The recent crediting of Physical Activities courses toward meeting the College of Letters and Science graduation requirements and the development of four minors (athletic coaching, exercise/health science, fitness instruction, and sport management) reflects the institutional value attached to this aspect of student development.

Other means of stress management are available through Counseling and Career Services’ programs.

### 3.2.2 Advancing Personal Identity

UCSB assists students in advancing personal identity through the exploration and clarification of interests, values, skills, attitudes, behaviors, and goals. The sudden transition from parental home to a peer living environment often disorients a student’s sense of self and place in the world. New experiences both in and out of the classroom can result in the questioning of one’s identity. The development or redevelopment of identity involves the student’s comfort with body and appearance; comfort with gender and sexual orientation; sense of self in a social, historical, and cultural context; self-acceptance and self-esteem; and clarification of self-concept through roles and life style.

The residence hall provides an environment for informal exploration of identity issues, allowing students to discover differences and commonalities in the course of everyday living. Educational and informational programming is offered in the halls to raise awareness of these aspects of personal development.

Other campus services provide assistance for specific group members who may experience a lack of connection to the larger campus culture. These include the Educational Opportunity Program, the Women’s Center, the Disabled Students Program, International Students and Scholars, the Queer Resource Center, the MultiCultural Center, and the Educational Program for Cultural Awareness. Each offers programs, speakers, forums, training, and exhibits that support, validate, and engage students with identity issues.

Low-income and first-generation college students are often presented with special challenges. As such, they are encouraged to contact the Educational Opportunity Program as an initial conduit for identity exploration. EOP counselors assist students in managing their academic, personal, career, and financial concerns as they try to balance academic demands and cultural challenges with home responsibilities. Each student is assigned a counselor and a peer advisor who provides connection and advice throughout the first year. Starting in Fall 2000, peer advisors will hold weekly office hours in residence halls to make support even more accessible. For students attending the Summer Transitional Enrichment Program, many of these issues are first addressed during this two-week residential program. Similarly, the Program of Determined
Students organizes EOP students in small groups for an ongoing orientation during the first two quarters. Most EOP students in the focus groups commented very positively on the services and experiences at their disposal.

More intensive assistance for students is available at Counseling and Career Services. The three main concerns for which students seek personal counseling are depression, anxiety, and relationship issues. On average, approximately 700 freshmen seek counseling during an academic year. The INT 20 survey indicates that 15% of freshmen had attended counseling or therapy “a few times,” while 10% sought counseling once per month. Less than 2% sought counseling weekly or daily. The majority of freshmen (73%) had not attended any counseling or therapy sessions during their first year.

Counseling and Career Services offers students avenues to relate their interests, values, and skills to a career. Freshmen take an inventory called “My Vocational Situation” during summer orientation. Those with limited or unclear direction are invited to see a career advisor. Workshops on choosing a major and computerized career exploration programs are reportedly seen as particularly helpful to freshmen. The Writing Program integrates career exploration into its assignments. Results from the follow-up HERI survey indicate that 55% of UCSB freshmen found the career counseling and advising to be “satisfactory” or “very satisfactory.”

SHS offers a public lecture series on relationships each year. For those dealing with gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgender identity concerns, the Student Affairs Division has established a Queer Resource Center to provide education, advocacy, and support. In addition, Counseling and Career Services has facilitated support groups for these populations since 1980. One openly gay student commented on the Queer Resource Center during the student focus groups. “As a member of the gay community, the Queer Resource Center really helped me. The student organizations also really helped. They provided a network of support, and for some, it changes their lives.”

There is little question that identity issues can be significant for a first-year student entering the University environment. The campus responds to these issues through its many programs; students report that these are useful in their identity development.

3.2.3 Life Management Competencies

The residence halls serve as a living laboratory for issues related to community, ethical, and appropriate behavior. They promote the notion of community standards and responsibilities and provide important learning about the consequences of violating these norms. The campus views these situations as opportunities for personal growth. The staff frequently refer offending individuals for counseling and other educational programs, including courses such as ethics in philosophy, sociology, and psychology.

Leadership opportunities are readily available in residence hall governance and programming. Others arise within campus clubs and organizations. During the freshman year, RAs encourage students to develop their leadership potential by seeking out peer positions for their sophomore year in the many Student Affairs units on the campus.
The INT 20 course, *Introduction to the University*, is the arena for approximately 200 freshmen to examine their own personal development and issues of community and society within the context of the University. Students learn about the structure of higher education in California; the roles faculty and students play in shared governance; the importance of research; the roles and responsibilities the university has to society at large and to the local community; the influence of racism, classism, and sexism in higher education; student development theory; and opportunities available for personal, academic, and professional development.

In the past, students who have completed INT 20 have gone on to serve in active campus leadership roles, including student body president, resident assistants, peer advisors, and various student government positions. Research has shown that INT 20 students are more likely to persist to their sophomore year, talk with instructors, feel satisfied with campus services, seek help with homework, view faculty as interested in students, attend study skill and library workshops, attend campus events, attend advising sessions and club meetings, participate in honors programs, and serve in student government.

Typical comments from INT 20 students are “As a student, I am much more enthusiastic about learning and receiving the highest education possible. This class showed me that education should not be a four-year thing or even an eight-year thing. Education is an all-time thing. Before taking this class, I considered education to be the key to financial rewards but now I know that the rewards of education are priceless.” “This course…taught me to be aware of society, to look at things from different perspectives, to respect others’ opinions…, to stand up for my opinions, to say what is on my mind, and…to understand my parents because they are going through tough times too.” “Because of INT 20, I am more aware of the things that go on at this campus. I understand the role of professors and lecturers. I am more aware of racism. I hope to make a change in this world. This course made me aware of how important it is to get involved.”

The follow-up HERI study indicates that UCSB students were much more likely to be politically aware and/or active than other students. UCSB students were more likely to vote in student elections (19% vs. 8%), participate in organized demonstrations (23% vs. 19%), vote in national/state elections (53% vs. 31%), and discuss politics (11% vs. 8%). Forty-one percent of felt that it was “essential” or “very important” to keep up to date with political affairs.

One major transitional task for freshmen is the need to take responsibility for self and to initiate appropriate interactions with those in their new environment, a skill developed often through trial and error. To help students learn to anticipate demands of the University environment, a collaborative Student Affairs Programming group—Frosh Success Committee—arranges workshops on particular issues such as Getting What You Want from the Academic Scene, Discovering Undergraduate Research Opportunities, Scoping Out Summer Jobs, Managing Stress and Test Anxiety, Choosing Majors and Careers for the Millennium, and Preparing for the Sophomore Year. To help students develop ambition, Counseling and Career Services, in conjunction with the Women’s Center, offers Assertiveness Training Workshops. To encourage them in their mastery of an array of skills, the Student Affairs Division sends a
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5 The collective data from the other universities that participated in the HERI survey that year.
quarterly newsletter to parents, Campus Connections, which announces upcoming events and deadlines.

Redefining and establishing relationships is another major transition with lifelong implications for freshmen. This is brought to the attention of parents at the summer orientation program through two sessions. The first, called Parents in Transition, alerts and informs parents of the changing nature of their relationship with their sons or daughters as they develop intellectually, socially, and personally. The second, Your Student’s First Year, introduces parents to the types of challenges their sons or daughters may face during the freshman year and how parents can play a supportive role from home. (This second presentation has received national acclaim and has been adopted by nearly 100 colleges and universities worldwide.)

Despite the best efforts of many, it is almost inevitable that some relationships will produce conflict. The residence halls, Counseling and Career Services, EOP, the Women’s Center, and the Ombuds Office all provide skill-building assistance in conflict management/resolution. Students are reminded of the fact that developing the capacity for managing emotions while deepening the intimacy of relationships is a lifelong challenge. Steps are taken during the freshman year to inculcate a commitment to balance between self-control and self-expression.

Finally, because the University of California draws from the top 12.5% of high school graduating classes, it has long accepted its special obligation to develop the future leaders of California. This expectation is communicated to freshmen when they enter UCSB. The Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs reiterates on numerous occasions our expectation for “scholarship, leadership, and citizenship” from our students while they are here and after they graduate. This goal is embraced repeatedly through the educational experience.

3.3 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

In the social realm, students are introduced to the concept of social living (that is, community life) versus familial living, which has been the experience of most students prior to enrolling to UCSB. At UCSB, students are treated as adult members of a community in which they alone are responsible for their relationship to it. A recent doctoral study (see footnote 3) of the UCSB freshman-year experience in 1997 indicates that students who develop a sense of connection to their campus community are more successful academically and better prepared for life beyond the university.

Our students receive the message that community life requires students to exercise civility in all social interactions. While at UCSB, students are expected to

- Exercise civility in all social interactions within the UCSB community
- Learn respect for the needs and purposes of the larger UCSB community and the various smaller communities within the University
- Acquire a sense of belonging and commitment to the UCSB community
- Show respect and tolerance for diversity in all its manifestations.
A goal of UCSB is to create opportunities for students to engage one another socially, to contribute to the creation of community life and social space on campus, and to practice sound social skills. Several challenges attend these goals. The first is providing accessible points of entry into the UCSB community. The second is reducing the larger campus community of 20,000 students and several thousand faculty and staff to more manageable human-scale groups. The third is making clear statements about the campus’s expectations for students’ behavior.

3.3.1 Acquire a sense of belonging and commitment to the UCSB community

Students make their formal entry into the campus community through the Summer Orientation Program, a two-day introduction to the campus for both students and their parents. While students’ decisions to attend Summer Orientation may be determined by the promise of academic advising and early registration for quarter classes, one of the primary goals of the program is to initiate the socialization process.

Orientation offers a preview of residence hall life with an overnight stay in a campus residence hall and meals in the dining commons. This experience is intended to start the students' preparation for a living situation that is dramatically different from that to which they have previously been exposed. A number of workshops and activities during Orientation are designed to introduce themes and issues related to community living, to establish and convey standards of behavior expected of UCSB students, and to alert students to the opportunities on campus that can hasten the development of connections to the UCSB community. Summer Orientation is also a place where new friendships can be formed and continued when students return to campus in fall quarter.

While not mandatory, Summer Orientation attracts approximately 90% of the freshman class to one of its twelve two-day sessions. About 3500 parents accompany their students each summer. Each student attending Summer Orientation receives a copy of the Kiosk, the UCSB Student Handbook. The Kiosk is a guide to the campus that students and their parents can read as part of their preparation for entering the UCSB community. Much of its content addresses issues related to initial social adjustment at the University, ideas on how students can spend their free time, the roster of registered student organizations, and campus programs that rely exclusively or primarily on student participation.

Orientation Programs are offered throughout the freshman year to encourage ongoing social development. Discovery Days, for example, is a full calendar of activities, programs, and workshops scheduled between residence hall move-in and the first day of classes. The intent is to repeat and reinforce/extend the engagement with community issues introduced in Summer Orientation.

One of the newest Discovery Days events is the New Student Convocation. This formal rite of passage for all beginning students was held for the first time in Fall 2000. Convocation is the ceremonial induction of new students into the community of scholars to which they will belong. It is attended by faculty in full academic regalia. The tone of the event is meant to underscore the significance of the intellectual adventure on which students are embarking.
UCSB is fortunate to be able to guarantee every freshman a space in a residence hall and thus to provide all first-year students with a ready-made peer community. Of the nine residence halls, six are University-operated and three privately owned. The six University-operated halls house approximately 2000 freshmen while the privately owned halls accommodate some 1500. More than 90% of UCSB’s freshmen opt to live in a residence hall. In the 1997 doctoral study, 85% of freshmen indicated that they met their closest friends at UCSB in a residence hall.

The University strives to maintain close ties with the privately owned halls and to foster rich social opportunities within the students’ living environment. The University-owned residence halls are recognized nationally for their extracurricular programming and community building efforts; among them are numerous workshops, field trips, dances, talent shows, and team sports. In addition, the Residence Halls Association (RHA), the governing body of and for students living in the residence halls has proven to be an excellent and frequently used point of entry for students seeking involvement in campus life. The Association is also the primary source of many recreational and social activities.

Data collected from student focus groups indicate that small group settings serve as an ideal medium for cultivating social skills needed for successful and productive community membership and for fostering a sense of connection to the community. One of the best examples of this principle in practice is the Program of Determined Students operated by the Educational Opportunity Program. PODS students work in groups of approximately fifteen members organized by academic major. These groups provide a mechanism for an extended orientation to University services, a means of meeting faculty and staff, and a forum for dealing with difficult issues. Each year PODS attracts over one hundred freshmen.

One of the most common ways for new students to forge a connection to the UCSB community is through student clubs and organizations. These number almost three hundred in a given academic year. Coordinated by the Office of Student Life, registered student organizations comprise several departmental honor societies, over thirty fraternities and sororities, eighteen religious organizations, myriad special interest, cultural, and ethnic clubs, and numerous community service organizations. Indeed, clubs and organizations offer students almost limitless options in terms of group size, type, and focus. The ethic of club involvement is conveyed in various ways from the very beginning of a student’s enrollment. In addition to the Kiosk and Summer Orientation presentations, the message of club involvement and community service is conveyed to students at an all-day, campus-wide Activities Faire occurring early in fall quarter.

The Community Affairs Board (CAB), operated by Associated Students, is devoted entirely to enticing students to look beyond the campus borders and become involved in volunteer opportunities in over four hundred local nonprofit agencies. CAB is one of the largest and oldest student-run volunteer organizations in the United States.

In the 1997 doctoral study, freshmen indicated that they attended an average of six club or organization meetings during their first year, and joined an average of 1.2 clubs or organizations. Comments from students in the focus group illustrated some of these issues: “I’d encourage other freshmen to get involved with social clubs or something because the lecture halls don’t have the social atmosphere like high school classes.” “I’m much more outgoing than when I first arrived.
I was pretty shy in high school. Here, I’m taking leadership positions and trying to fill my experience well.” “I feel more comfortable and a lot happier since I joined an organization.”

Both student government (Associated Students and its many boards and committees) and student media outlets afford freshmen easy access to campus life. Associated Students, the official undergraduate student government, offers avenues for student involvement not only through elected positions as executive officers and legislative council members but also through appointments to boards and committees that address a broad range of campus issues. Results of the 1997 doctoral study indicate that freshmen participated in some form of student government an average of 1.6 times during their first year.

A final means of “finding a place” on campus—of becoming part of the fabric of the community—is campus employment. Hundreds of jobs are available to students in departments across campus. The largest student employer, Housing and Residential Life, intentionally hires its student workers at the beginning of the year in order to give freshmen a chance to be employed in a program called Work-Live by which students live and work in the on-campus residence halls. In the 1997 doctoral study, 26% of the freshmen interviewed worked while students. The average number of hours worked per week was 3.5.

The 1997 doctoral study found that 83% of freshman had a sense of belonging at UCSB. A content analysis of the follow-up question about why they felt that way revealed five patterns of explanation: (1) academic—reputation of campus, interactions with faculty, availability of majors and programs, (2) social—interactions with friends, living situation, experiences with diversity or ethnicity, (3) atmosphere—the physical environment, attitudes of students, (4) personal—financial situation, personal crises, and (5) general—overall satisfaction and happiness with the college life. The experiences mentioned most were social, general, and academic. Moreover, 56% of these same students indicated that during their freshman year they never seriously considered leaving UCSB. In the survey of INT 20 students, 89% of freshmen indicated that they “belonged” at UCSB while 11% felt they did not. While the overall numbers of ethnic minority students are small, a very modest correlation appears to exist between those experiencing a sense that they did not “belong” and ethnicity.

In sum, UCSB provides many opportunities through summer orientation, dorms, social groups, and employment for students to be involved and feel that they belong.

3.3.2 Grow in tolerance and respect for diversity

An important element in becoming a successful member of an adult community in the eyes of the University is developing tolerance for differences, and respect for all members of the community. Toward this end, a number of campus departments address issues of living in a pluralistic community. Many provide dual service as points of contact and community for students from groups historically under-represented in higher education. Housing and Residential Life, the Office of Student Life, Orientation Programs, the MultiCultural Center, the Education Program for Culture Awareness, the Educational Opportunity Program, the Women’s Center, the Queer Resource Center, Disabled Students Program, and the Office of International Students and Scholars all view their work with students through the lens of pluralism. Some of these departments offer freshman-focused programs while others feature more general programming to
which first-year students are invited. One particular program occurring in fall quarter with a focus on pluralism and community is “Celebration of Communities,” which includes a series of events, the purpose of which is to highlight the diverse groups that make up the campus community, and the benefits of diversity.

Comments from the student focus groups confirmed the importance of such programs, especially for students of color: “There were events at the MCC [MultiCultural Center] that had a positive impact for me. It’s important to have a sense of your identity as a student of color. You learn the language of empowerment, to see that part of you is being appreciated, whether it’s a concert or a movie or whatever.” “My roommate used to tell me that I was the only brown person on campus. A lot of people say, ‘It’s such a white campus, why would you want to go here?’ Don’t look at some chart and decide you won’t like it. Don’t think you’ll be unhappy if everyone is not like you. Claim your education wherever you can. There are things like EOP where you can get support if you look for it.”

Freshmen who participated in the INT 20 survey had similar perceptions. In comparing UCSB’s diversity to the diversity of students in their high school, 39% felt that UCSB was less diverse, 24% felt it was about the same, and 37% felt UCSB was more diverse. Forty-two percent of the freshmen reported that had “interacted with people who are different from [them]” many times while another 30% stated that these interactions occurred “very often.” In answer to the question “To what degree are you aware of the concerns or needs of groups different from your own?” 34% felt they were “very aware” and another 52% felt they were “somewhat aware.” Sixty-three percent of freshmen ranked diversity as either “very important” or “important” to them.

The results of the follow-up HERI survey indicate that UCSB freshmen are engaging in multicultural interactions. Sixty-seven percent of UCSB freshmen socialized with someone of another racial/ethnic group and 15% have participated in an ethnic/racial student organization. In addition, 37% of UCSB students believed that promoting racial understanding was “essential” or “very important.” More than three-quarters, or 78%, of UCSB students also rated themselves as “above average” or “highest ten percent” in the area of “understanding of others.” Chapter 5 presents further data on this subject.

3.4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our examination of the freshman experience of UCSB students highlights the considerable effort and resources the campus devotes to freshmen, as well as the success of UCSB’s efforts in integrating new students into campus life. New students at UCSB have an array of opportunities and experiences provided for them. The academic and curricular program is rich in its breadth and in the way new students are exposed to academic standards and expectations. The vast majority of freshmen do well academically and make a sound transition to their new intellectual environment. Freshmen are also presented with multiple opportunities for personal growth and for making connections to the UCSB community. The University provides support services and programs to facilitate this.
Our assessment of the freshman experience affirmed the strengths of UCSB in assisting students’ academic, personal, and social development. Academically, freshmen become acquainted with a wide range of disciplines through General Educational requirements. They demonstrate a satisfactory level of knowledge with course work; over 90% of freshmen successfully complete their first year. Further, they make satisfactory progress toward their degree by declaring majors at the appropriate time. University programs, such as the Writing Program and CLAS, help students to improve their writing and critical analysis skills. Students also learn to respect academic integrity while they are exposed to the processes of research and its role at UCSB. Through involvement in smaller classes, such as honors sections and programs like the College of Creative Studies, students are able to find flexible forums for the acquisition of knowledge. Through the many programs on campus designed to promote healthy habits, students learn to develop responsible behavior. Students acquire life management skills through a sense of community and belonging on campus. Students also report enhanced social development through this same sense of community and belonging, learning to exercise respect and tolerance, and to appreciate diversity. Overall, UCSB’s freshman experience appears to provide the foundation for future success in University life.

These positive conclusions notwithstanding, the Freshman Experience Committee’s own observations and experiences, coupled with the focus group and survey data collected, suggest several areas where UCSB’s efforts could be improved, expanded, or redirected. Improvements in the academic arena as well as in the services and programs supporting student personal development are still essential. Similarly, the campus can improve its efforts at encouraging a social environment conducive to furthering the academic and personal goals of every new student.

While no complete blueprint for improvement resulted from this self-study, a set of recommendations emerged as being appropriate priorities as the campus moves to devise a strategy for self-improvement. These recommendations include strategic efforts to

- Develop a more coordinated approach to helping freshmen meet the goals we have for them. This entails creating a coordinating entity to facilitate interactions and planning by faculty, staff, and students.

- Create an on-going opportunity for faculty who teach freshmen to discuss mutual educational issues with and to seek guidance and support from colleagues. A regular meeting of faculty who teach large introductory courses, such as has occurred on occasion in the past, would provide a forum for the exchange of ideas, techniques and experiences, thereby increasing the effectiveness of lower division teaching.

- Continue with programs for freshmen that promote a commitment to campus standards of scholarship, leadership, and citizenship. These qualities will build a foundation for freshmen, ensuring a successful experience in their academic careers and in their personal development.

- Facilitate more faculty-freshman interactions outside the classroom. We can encourage, for example, faculty involvement in the residence hall environment, faculty involvement
with co-curricular student activities and organizations, and more faculty participation in career planning.

- Increase efforts to improve the writing skills of freshman by (1) linking more General Education courses with writing courses, (2) encouraging faculty who teach introductory courses to incorporate an emphasis on writing into their courses, (3) helping teaching assistants learn how to critique student writing, and (4) providing the encouragement and resources for teaching assistants to be able to evaluate student writing on all relevant assignments.

- Develop more opportunities for small-group involvement for freshmen in both academic and social experiences. In all small-group experiences, faculty and staff should be encouraged to adopt styles and techniques that promote a sense of connection and belonging. The recently initiated General Education freshman seminars are an example of such an opportunity.

- Continue to support and find ways to better integrate CLAS services into freshman courses. We encourage sufficient support for CLAS so that it can meet the growing student demand for its services.

- Find ways to increase the rate of participation in programs designed to help freshmen with their transition to university life. PODS and INT20 are two examples of effective initiatives that promote successful transition to the university environment. Expansion of the programs should be considered and the model they provide replicated.

- Redouble efforts to make freshman living environments, especially those off-campus, as conducive as possible to a successful transition. We encourage increased efforts to enrich the academic and extracurricular programs offered to freshman in the residence halls. We should ensure that all freshmen are afforded equivalent living-learning opportunities with the primary focus on creating and maintaining a campus environment that is conducive to academic success.

In sum, the Freshman experience is critical to UCSB’s success, for it is during this first year that we have the opportunity and the responsibility to transform a group of academically talented youth into the intellectual and moral leaders of the future. UCSB, while proud of its past successes, is committed to doing whatever is possible to ensure that the potential of all of our students is realized, and that the successes of which we are now proud pale in comparison to what we hope to accomplish in the future.
4 THEMES IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

Notwithstanding its faculty, no single group has more influence on the quality and productivity of a research university than its cadre of graduate students. As peers to one another, research assistants to faculty members, teaching assistants and role models for undergraduate students, graduate students are essential to the functioning of an institution with the national stature of UCSB. Both the campus’s research and its contributions to baccalaureate education depend to a great extent on the continued strength of its program of graduate education.

Structure and Goals of Graduate Education at UCSB

It is the goal of the University of California, Santa Barbara to promote academic excellence in its graduate degree programs; to foster a diverse and inclusive graduate community of domestic and international students; and to cultivate for all graduate students both an intellectually challenging environment and a socially supportive climate. The Graduate Division and Graduate Council together facilitate and coordinate graduate education and student services for all graduate academic and professional programs at the UCSB.

The Graduate Council is a standing committee of the Academic Senate; it represents all academic disciplines and colleges. Graduate Council consists of twelve faculty members, a representative of the Graduate Students Association, and the Dean of the Graduate Division, as an ex officio member. Graduate Council reviews guidelines and sets policy and standards for graduate education in the following areas: graduate admission; distribution of fellowship money (including selection of recipients for certain fellowships); appointments for student academic apprentice titles; degree milestones and degree requirements (including timely degree completion); and service on master’s and doctoral committees.

Graduate Council also reviews proposals for new graduate degree programs and modifications to existing programs. Because Graduate Council strives to keep abreast of developments in graduate education at UCSB, academic departments must inform Graduate Council of proposed or pending changes in their academic programs, particularly those affecting graduate students.

The Graduate Division is the administrative arm of the Graduate Council. Led by the Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean, the Graduate Division employs a career staff of about fifteen people who are assisted by part-time student workers. The Graduate Division has three sections to carry out its functions: Outreach, Admissions, and Retention; Academic Services; and Financial Support. Outreach, Admissions, and Retention facilitates the recruitment, admission, and enrollment of highly qualified and diverse student applicants, and provides supportive services, special events and programs for the development and retention of enrolled graduate students. Academic Services monitors and encourages the progress of students toward degree completion, enforces academic standards, and processes student petitions. Financial Support administers fellowship and loan programs, maintains an extramural funding database and certifies student eligibility for academic apprentice appointments. All are involved in the
recruitment, admission, and retention of a diverse and highly qualified graduate student population.

In cooperation with UCSB faculty, students, and staff, the Graduate Division and Graduate Council

- Implement outreach and recruiting programs to achieve a highly qualified and diverse student body reflective of the State of California and the greater academic community.
- Provide information about and admission to all UCSB graduate programs.
- Administer graduate standards of scholarship and policy as defined by the University of California and the Graduate Council of the UCSB Academic Senate.
- Encourage the development and success of students through workshops, training activities, counseling, and initiatives which promote timely degree completion.
- Seek and administer internal and external funding sources for students and programs.
- Administer UC and campus policies concerning graduate academic apprentice appointments.
- Participate in the development and review of new and current graduate academic programs.
- Support departmental initiatives to advise, train, and place UCSB graduate students in academic and professional positions.

**A Decade of Success**

The past decade has seen a remarkable increase in the national recognition of the quality of UCSB’s graduate programs. A number of objective indicators highlight and confirm the quality of UCSB’s graduate programs, including

- UCSB’s classification as a Research I University by the Carnegie Foundation in 1994
- Membership in the Association of American Universities in 1995
- Ranking as second among American public universities by the 1997 Graham-Diamond study of faculty scholarly productivity and rate of journal citations
- Growth in the number of graduate applications (up 6% in the last five years);
• A slight rise in the average upper-division GPA of incoming graduate students over the last five years along with an increase in cumulative GRE score averages (see Standard 4 on the UCSB WASC Web site, <http://bap.ucsb.edu/wasc>)

• An increase in the percentage of students from across the United States from 22% to 32% reflecting the increased recognition of USCB graduate programs as national in stature

• A significant augmentation in financial support available to graduate students per capita, to over $19,500. The University is also providing an increasing amount of funds that allow departments to offer graduate student support packages for longer periods of time—4, 5, and 6 years).

The quality of graduate education at UCSB has been further enhanced by new systems of collecting and distributing information about and for graduate education. The Graduate Division has centralized its collection of data regarding graduate students, academic records, and financial support. These electronically stored data are being made available to graduate programs to assist them in overseeing graduate students in their programs. This system has permitted departments and other agencies to access relevant data and interact more efficiently with the administrative side of graduate education at UCSB.

The transmission of information directly to graduate students has also increased in importance. The Graduate Division Web site <www.graddiv.ucsb.edu> provides information about policies and procedures governing academic life at UCSB, intra- and extramural funding opportunities, academic and career-related workshops, and general information concerning quality of life issues (housing, leisure activities, etc.).

**Planning for the Future**

In the early 1990s, UCSB planning envisioned significant growth in the number of graduate students on campus, with slow or no growth in the number of undergraduates in the same period. During this period, almost all departments on campus submitted academic plans proposing to increase the number of graduate students in their units. This growth, however, was not realized, due primarily to economic conditions in the state of California and the subsequent budget cuts experienced throughout the University of California system. Over most of the past decade, the number of graduate students attending UCSB has averaged about 2,200 per year with the potential for increased enrollment becoming evident only in the last few years. Fall 2000 graduate enrollment stands at 2424.

The past decade has been one of marked success for graduate education at UCSB. Objective benchmarks such as those cited above indicate growing national and international recognition of our graduate programs. Increased financial support has helped produce a more selectively chosen student body while the centralization of data collection and transmission has enabled UCSB to be more supportive of students. The result is better-trained students graduating in reduced time. The coming decade bears the promise of growth in undergraduate enrollments and financial resources. Campus planning now envisions not only augmenting the number of graduate students, but an overall increase in the percentage of graduate students vis-à-vis undergraduates over the next few years. One of the challenges for UCSB in this period will be to further enhance
the quality of its graduate programs at a time when systemwide and statewide resources are being focused on the anticipated drastic increases in undergraduate enrollments (“tidal wave II”).

**Themes of the Graduate Education Self-Study**

The Graduate Education Committee focused its study on three basic themes:

- Interdisciplinary activity in graduate education
- Preparing graduate students for non-academic positions
- Preparing graduate students to become educators

These themes attempt to identify ways in which UCSB can position itself for further intellectual distinction; better train its graduates students to meet the demands of technological and informational change; produce graduates who can disseminate the research for the economic and social benefit of the state’s population; and enhance UCSB’s attractiveness to the highest quality potential students in a climate of increasing competition. The themes do not reflect the view that graduate training at UCSB should be reinvented. Instead, they emphasize ways in which MA and PhD training can and should be redirected to address the goals of the University and its many constituencies.

The first theme concerns the current state of and potential for *interdisciplinary activity* on the campus. This focus acknowledges both the unprecedented rapid change of the state of knowledge in most fields, and recognizes that many important questions in the future will require interdisciplinary approaches for their understanding, resolution, and management. It is likely that many, if not most, of the innovations in the humanities, technology, business, and education that catalyze future change will come at interdisciplinary interstices.

As the distinction between basic and applied research continues to blur, and as the university seeks to take seriously its obligation to have its graduates benefit society as a whole, many of our graduate students should, and will, seek employment outside of academe. Consequently, our second theme is intended to explore the current performance and future potential of the campus in *preparing students for non-academic positions*. Of particular interest are barriers (institutional, perceptual, curricular, or otherwise) that prevent graduates from leaving the university confident that they are prepared for non-academic positions, and that prevent the non-academic public and private sector from being confident that our graduates can make significant contributions in those positions.

Preparation for teaching has always been part of the traditional mission of the University. How and where our students will teach, however, are likely to reflect the many demographic and social changes noted above. Accordingly, the third theme bears on how well the University is *preparing its graduate students to be educators*. Of particular concern are innovative programs that focus both on situations where teaching is predominant over research in a student’s career goals, and on preparation for a diverse range of teaching positions. We assume that many graduates will use their education to teach at smaller universities, at community colleges, and, increasingly, in the private sector.
Methods

The Graduate Education Committee was appointed by the Executive Vice Chancellor in Spring 1999. It was charged with the task of studying the UCSB graduate experience, analyzing its strengths and weaknesses, and making recommendations regarding potential improvements in years to come. The committee consisted of 11 members including a variety of academic administrators, staff, faculty, and students (see Appendix A).

In examining these themes, the committee organized a series of focus group discussions in the spring of 2000, considered the results of surveys of graduate students taken from various academic program reviews done by the campus, reviewed graduate student exit surveys, interviewed faculty and staff members, and drew on the expertise of its members.

4.1 THEME 1: INTERDISCIPLINARY EDUCATION

Given the rapidly changing nature of graduate education and subsequent employment opportunities, interdisciplinary education at the graduate level is imperative to ensure the future success of our graduate students. UCSB’s efforts to promote interdisciplinary training are recognized by our faculty and students and by colleagues who visit the campus from other institutions. Indeed, we are often called “the campus without walls.” The establishment of several federally funded national research centers on the campus is a direct result of its collective advocacy of interdisciplinary activities and the perceptions of others regarding the quality of these efforts. These centers with their sponsoring agencies are

- Institute for Theoretical Physics (NSF)
- Optoelectronics Technology Center (DARPA)
- Southern California Earthquake Center (NSF)
- Materials Research Laboratory (NSF)
- National Nanofabrication Users Network (NSF)
- National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NSF, UCSB)
- Center for Spatially Integrated Social Science (NSF)
- UCSB Middle East National Resource Center (U.S. Dept of Education)

---

6 Further details regarding the focus groups are found in Appendix C.

7 An important element of internal quality control at UCSB is the Program Review Panel process. Each academic year, under the direction of a faculty committee, and with significant institutional staff support, five or six departments of the campus are extensively reviewed. These reviews include a departmental self-assessment, an analysis by a panel of off-campus evaluators and in-depth surveys of departmental graduate and undergraduate students. Appendix C-1 indicates questions that departments are expected to address as part of their self-study in the course of a PRP review. Appendix C-2 presents the questions from the graduate student survey. Departments under review as well as the Graduate Division, make considerable efforts to encourage graduate students to participate in the survey and provide free form comments.

8 The Graduate Alumni Survey was conducted by the campus Office of Institutional Analysis. Results of the survey are available on the WASC Web site. More discussion of the survey is given in Appendix C-3.
4.1.1 Current Mechanisms for Interdisciplinary Activity

Interdisciplinary activity by graduate students is supported by a number of formal and informal mechanisms. Within existing degree structures, a relaxed set of committee requirements generally makes establishing interdisciplinary committees easy and facilitates informal interdisciplinary projects. Rules for formation of committees were made more flexible within the last two years to facilitate interdisciplinary work. At a more formal level, the Individual Interdisciplinary PhD degree permits students, guided by the Graduate Council, to tailor a specific interdisciplinary thesis to their particular needs outside of existing programs. Finally, a number of formally organized and recognized structures exist to facilitate interdisciplinary research and study. These include programs that can confer degrees independently of traditional departments, emphases, programs organized among departments, intra-campus programs, and entire schools.

Interdisciplinary Research

Over the last decade in particular, the research enterprise at UCSB has flourished. UCSB affirms its cross-disciplinary vision in its academic planning statements that explicitly call for multidisciplinary research and creative activity through spontaneous collaborations as well as through formal centers and organized research units. The plan also calls for increased undergraduate and graduate-student participation in and production of original research and creative activity through additional opportunities for student interaction with ladder faculty, particularly for students at the lower-division level.

This cross-disciplinary educational vision often nucleates research programs that are among the most inventive and exciting investigations possible. UCSB’s commitment to that vision has attracted faculty who are dynamic leaders in research and education. Notably, nearly 70% of more than 7150 courses are taught by ladder faculty, ensuring that research excitement is transferred to the classroom. Since the inception in 1964 of the first Organized Research Unit (ORU), more than 9 interdisciplinary ORUs and 15 federally funded centers have been established. Through active collaborations with other academic institutions, national laboratories, and the private sector, our departments, centers, and ORUs not only are centers of research innovation but provide learning opportunities for both undergraduate and graduate students. They catalyze educational creativity that transfers to academic programs. The NSF-funded Materials Research Laboratory (MRL) has supported more than 100 UCSB undergraduates and more than 60 graduate-student mentors since its establishment in 1992 and provides them with a broad set of skills and experience. Graduate students become mentors of undergraduate researchers and high-school students, for example, and in doing so learn such important skills as defining well-focused projects and communicating and teaching effectively.

In one integrative model that UCSB has helped pioneer, graduate students and postdoctoral fellows work on interdisciplinary teams, with space in two different departments or academic units. These students become immersed in the laboratory environments of two different disciplines; this experience provides them with a kind of professional cross-training that is very valuable; e.g., a student with an engineering, chemistry, or materials background may work in the biotechnology/molecular biology laboratories and vice versa. This approach has resulted in intellectual cross-pollination among faculty, students, and postdoctoral and professional
researchers. Intensive seminar programs, in which the entire group of faculty, students, and postdocs meet in an informal format, allow discussion of data, ideas, recent literature, and new results from scientific meetings.

Funding from sources such as the federal government (e.g., NSF Integrative Education and Research Training, U.S. Department of Education Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need), the state (e.g., UC Biotechnology Research and Education Program), and private organizations (e.g., Sloan Foundation, Dow Chemical) has leveraged UCSB funds to create a dynamic graduate educational experience for those pursuing both academic and non-academic careers.

**Interdisciplinary Degree Programs**

The most innovative and complex modes of interdisciplinary education at UCSB are four separate degree-granting programs. These are the Graduate Programs in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (BMB), Latin American and Iberian Studies (LAIS), Marine Science, and Media Arts and Technology (MAT).

The **Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Program** is an interdepartmental PhD program committed to training biomolecular scientists. A diverse group of 29 program faculty selected from the Departments of Chemical Engineering, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Materials, Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology, and Physics afford BMB graduate students unique opportunities for intensive research training at the interface between the physical and life sciences. Established in 1973, the BMB program at UCSB is among the first interdisciplinary life science graduate programs within the University of California system.

The MA in **Latin American and Iberian Studies** is designed for students wishing to pursue an interdisciplinary degree at the graduate level. Although there is no doctoral program in Latin American and Iberian Studies, many successful graduates of the MA program go on to pursue doctoral study in traditional academic departments such as anthropology, communication, economics, history, literature, or political science, or enter professional schools to study business administration, education, law, or public health. The broad, interdisciplinary nature of the MA program allows students a great deal of scope to define and develop special interests.

**Marine Science** is a discipline that encompasses many traditional disciplines including biology, geology, chemistry, physics, and engineering. The investigation and understanding of the ocean requires an interdisciplinary approach to the study of the ocean as an integrated system. UCSB's graduate program brings together 34 marine faculty drawn from six departments on the UCSB campus. Some students focus on a particular disciplinary area for their research (e.g., biological oceanography, marine geology, ocean physics), while simultaneously seeking a broader training in marine science than can be provided within the framework of traditional departmental programs. Others complete interdisciplinary dissertations involving the development of expertise in two or more subdisciplines within marine science.

The **Media Arts and Technology** master’s degree program is intended for students who have a strong background in either the arts or technology (for example, visual arts, film/video, music,
computer science, or electrical and computer engineering), and who wish to earn a degree that integrates aspects of art and technology for the recording or creation of new works of art. Burgeoning media industries have a growing need for capable media practitioners including programmers, engineers, designers, directors, producers, artists, and composers. This program addresses this growing need.

Interdisciplinary Emphases

Interdisciplinary emphases are employed by UCSB to formally promote interdisciplinary activities. Emphases are cross-department programs used to add a special supportive component (the emphasis) to a traditional, existing, PhD degree. Table 4-1 lists the degree programs at UCSB that offer optional interdisciplinary emphases. Further information on the interdisciplinary emphases of the campus is given in Appendix D.

Combined Programs

In addition to the above, UCSB has several degree-granting combined programs that function as organized interdisciplinary programs between departments. These include programs in East Asian Languages and Cultural Studies, Geological Sciences, a combined Engineering BS/Materials MS, and a combined Engineering BS/Economics MA.

Interdisciplinary Professional School Programs

The Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management trains graduate students to apply interdisciplinary approaches to environmental problem solving. The Bren School has offered a professional degree, the Master’s of Environmental Science and Management, for several years. It has recently added a research-oriented PhD in Environmental Science and Management. The Bren School’s program builds on solid disciplinary pillars, including hydrology and climate, ecology and biogeochemistry, and environmental and natural resource economics. It has links to University of California, Irvine’s Graduate School of Management and University of California, Berkeley’s Boalt Law School.

Intercampus Degree Programs

A new PhD program in Public History has been implemented with CSU Sacramento as UCSB’s partner. The program uses the faculty and library resources of both UCSB and CSUS, and distance learning technologies. A joint PhD program with CSU San Diego in Geography also exists.
Table 4-1. Interdisciplinary Emphases and Their Core Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cognitive Science</th>
<th>Human Development</th>
<th>Language, Interactions, and Social Organizations (LISO)</th>
<th>Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences (QMSS)</th>
<th>Women’s Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling Psychology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Computer Engineering</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic, Slavic, and Semitic Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics and Applied Probability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Evaluation

Based on the campus' review of its Graduate Programs, we believe it appropriate to conclude that UCSB has responded well to the challenges of creating a supportive environment for interdisciplinary graduate education. The various graduate student surveys and the focus groups’ discussions make clear that this is a topic taken seriously on campus, that there is a definite campus commitment to such activity, and that few institutional barriers are encountered when interdisciplinary activities were pursued or interdisciplinary curricula are put in place. Of the hundreds of students completing the Graduate Division Doctoral Exit Survey since 1996, many
indicated that the interdisciplinarity of their training, program of study, or department was the best part of their UCSB training.

These positive indicators notwithstanding, we believe that even more encouragement of interdisciplinary work would be beneficial and are working toward this goal.

A number of recommendations for enhancing interdisciplinary education emerged from the self-study:

- **Developing an Interdisciplinary Faculty:** A factor often limiting the development of effective interdisciplinary programs is the lack of faculty who are truly able—and willing—to bridge the gaps of developing interdisciplinary niches. The first challenge is in hiring persons with a truly interdisciplinary focus. Such faculty are usually hired through joint appointments and, therefore, must be ranked as the top priority for hiring in each participating department. The difficulty is that such positions are at the interface(s) between departments. As such, they are sometimes seen as peripheral to the core mission of each department. A possible solution would be to establish an FTE pool that would be tapped solely for joint appointments. Requests for such positions would necessarily come from a set of departments and would not be counted toward “normal” FTE departmental allocations. Such positions would then be seen as an opportunity rather than a diversion from core departmental needs.

- **Rewarding Collaborative Efforts:** A second possible impediment identified by some is the sense that efforts to develop interdisciplinary programs are not adequately rewarded. Faculty advancement is based on scholarly activity and publication. Development of broadly interdisciplinary activities takes a substantial investment of time and effort before these activities bear fruit in terms of external recognition. Such considerations may be particularly apparent in the humanities, where individualized and solitary models of scholarship still predominate. In this regard introduction of the more typical collaborative or team approach more common in the sciences (where diffusion of specialized technological skill and knowledge bases make teams more necessary) to the humanities may be possible. Similar problems of how to reward group or collaborative efforts are encountered when graduate training is considered. Most interdisciplinary projects are group efforts, involving team members with different outlooks and expertise. By tradition, however, graduate student projects are individual efforts, with the result that the extant culture of graduate education can be in conflict with truly interdisciplinary PhD work. A possible way to address this problem is to expand the use of group MS projects. Group projects are required in the Bren School instead of more traditional master’s theses. During focus group discussions, one person argued convincingly that multiple-authored PhD dissertations would be an ill-advised idea, but that multiple-author MS theses could work. Another approach may be established more easily: to retain traditional individual theses/dissertations but have students work in larger integrated research projects. This would require that faculty take the initiative to develop such programs, assure their financial feasibility and stability, and that they engage students in the work. A campus model for this approach is the new Long-Term Ecological Research project focused on coastal ecology.
• **Recognizing Inherent Differences in the Nature of Interdisciplinary Training:** Interdisciplinary training should follow a “T” model in which students develop a core expertise, yet understand the intersection of their expertise with related disciplines well enough to communicate and interact effectively with scholars in the other areas. One drawback is that training effective interdisciplinary scholars will likely take longer than training more narrowly focused students. As the pressures to shorten the normative time to degree increase, realization of the “T” model may create obstacles to the timely completion of interdisciplinary degrees.

• **Interdisciplinary Workshops to Encourage Cross-Disciplinary Projects:** Developing truly interdisciplinary projects usually requires active intervention and support from the University to bring faculty in disparate areas together. Although creating funding opportunities (such as the Research Across Disciplines initiative) provides important incentives, they will have limited impact if faculty in the separate departments have difficulty assessing with whom to interact to effect such an endeavor. A series of workshops on targeted themes for a carefully selected audience could provide a mechanism to motivate such broadly based interactions. A campus Web site that announces the existence of interdisciplinary study or working groups or calls for appropriate collaborators on particular problems or issues might also be useful. None of this is easy; even the NSF has had problems generating meritorious, broad interdisciplinary proposals, despite new programs designed to fund work across disciplinary divides.

### 4.2 THEME 2: PREPARATION FOR NON-ACADEMIC CAREERS

The tradition in the academy has been for faculty to reproduce their own experience in graduate education, with a focus almost exclusively on training for the professoriate. The expectation was for students to go on to teaching positions at research universities. That expectation has changed, both by necessity and by desire. UCSB recognizes that many of its graduates will seek employment outside of academe. Accordingly, the second theme considered by the Graduate Education Committee was the institution’s current performance and future potential in preparing graduate students for non-academic positions. Of particular interest were the barriers (institutional, perceptual, curricular, or otherwise) that prevent graduates from leaving the University confident that they are prepared for non-academic positions.

The importance of this theme is confirmed by responses to the Graduate Alumni Survey (GAS). Fifty-six percent of the advanced degree recipients who responded are working in an educational institution, 31% are employed in business or industry, 7% in a government or military position 3%, work for a nonprofit organization and 3% or are self-employed. Although 84% of the respondents occupied positions that required or preferred their advanced degree, 16% held positions for which a graduate degree was not required.

#### 4.2.1 Current Mechanisms for Non-academic Preparation

**Graduate Program in Management Practice Certificate (GPMPC).** In 1997, the Graduate Division at UCSB initiated the Graduate Program in Management Practice, a certificate program geared toward specific training in areas that increased the non-academic marketability of PhD
graduate students. The mission of this certificate program is to provide advanced degree students with a sound introduction to the fundamentals of business management in preparation for successful careers using their graduate training beyond the university. The program is governed by a Faculty Advising Committee that includes the Deans of the College of Engineering, the Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, the College of Arts and Science, the Graduate Division, as well as program faculty. The program consists of two components, academic course work and management practice. The first component includes four courses taught in the College of Letters and Science, the College of Engineering, and the Donald Bren School of Environmental Science and Management. The second component is a 160-hour internship in an approved organization.

The certificate program accepted its first cohort in 1998; the first five students to graduate from it became eligible for certificates in Spring 2000. Demand for admission into the program far exceeds the available slots. The program has received favorable press coverage and positive feedback from internship advisors and supervisors. Because of budgetary constraints, participation in the certificate is currently limited to students in engineering and in the mathematical, physical, and life sciences. It is our intention to make the program available to students in all disciplines in the future.

Career Advising and Counseling

Career advising and counseling efforts are essential if graduate students are to achieve both academic and non-academic employment. The Graduate Education Committee devoted considerable effort to examining the resources the campus provides in helping students obtain their first positions after graduation. Studies revealed an extensive but uneven distribution of these services across the departments and other units of the campus. In the alumni survey, most students indicated that they received career advice in the form of faculty mentoring. Print advertisements and professional conferences were used in seeking postgraduate positions. Fewer than 30% of respondents used Counseling and Career Services.

Career advising and counseling efforts on the campus are briefly described below.

Departmental Counseling: Probably the most important sources of career advice and counseling for graduate students are faculty and other members of their cognate departments. Appendix E summarizes efforts made by individual departments at UCSB to assist in the placement of their graduates. These departmental efforts are limited by budgetary considerations. The extent of such efforts reflects departmental decisions to allocate a portion of their personnel and budgetary resources to such activities. Decisions are often driven by the need to be competitive with other top-ranked departments in the U.S. in addition to concerns for success of departmental graduates. Although many departments make strong efforts to advise and place their students in non-academic positions, faculty are traditionally best suited to give advice about what they know: academic positions.

Workshops: Each quarter, Counseling and Career Services offers a series of workshops on writing a resume or vita, interviewing, and using the Campus Interview Program. CCS critiques a resume or vita on a drop-in basis and its Career Resource Room contains reference books on the preparation of graduate student resumes and vitae. Personal counselors or career advisors are
available by appointment. CCS sponsors a weekly support group for graduate/older students seeking support. Testing and assessment instruments to help focus career choices are also available. The Graduate Division, in conjunction with CCS, sponsors additional quarterly workshops on such topics as job search, the experiences of alumni graduate students, development of curriculum vitae, and skills analysis. During the 1998–1999 academic year, these workshops were very well attended. A drop-off in student participation in 1999 may reflect increased advising efforts in departments, increased on-campus recruiting by employers, and a better job market.

**Career Information:** The Career Library at CCS collects information on 250 careers. CCS maintains several Web sites of particular interest to graduate students including a digital college catalog collection that provides catalogs for all post-secondary schools in the United States <http://career.ucsb.edu>. Current job listings are available for positions at all educational levels for faculty, administration, and student service positions. Online information on job openings for K–12 positions are available through JobTrak, a third-party database that Counseling and Career Services supplies through a contractual arrangement.

**Interviews:** Graduate students seeking employment outside of academe can meet employers at CCS. Most of the approximately 250 employers who visit the campus each year are large corporations, recruiting most often in engineering, accounting, consulting, and technology fields. Interviews with prospective employers may also take place within departments.

### 4.2.2 Evaluation

Results of the Graduate Alumni Survey are given in Table 4-2. These results confirm that, according to those who responded, the UCSB experience prepares a majority of graduate students well in the skills for which higher education degrees have traditionally been valued: research, critical thinking, problem solving, and writing and oral communication. In fact, of 115 responses to the question in the GAS, 71 indicated that research, writing, critical thinking, analytic thinking, and problem-solving skills are what prepared them best for their current position. Such results confirmed the committee’s conviction that basic PhD training in innovative thinking and analytic problem solving was the best preparation for careers inside and out of academe. At the same time, it is clear that the campus does less well in developing other types of skills, those suited to the evolving nature of society and work critical in non-academic positions—computer technology, leadership, teamwork, and coping with change and diversity.

Responses to both the Graduate Alumni Survey and the Graduate Division Doctoral Recipient Exit Survey, almost with a single voice, request more extensive, more focused, and more open-minded assistance in learning about, preparing for, and securing non-academic employment. Fifty-seven percent of GAS degree recipients reported finding faculty career advising somewhat or very helpful in gaining employment (although many of these respondents no doubt sought academic positions). Advice through the Counseling and Career Services was sought less frequently (75% said they didn’t use it; 12% said it was unhelpful). Only 23% had attended a Graduate Division career search workshop. Of these, 62% found them somewhat or very useful. Less than 17% had held an internship while a graduate student at UCSB. Of those
Table 4-2. Graduate Alumni Survey Results—How well their UCSB education prepared them for non-academic employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Less than Adequate</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>More than Adequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Presentations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

who did, more than 75% found them to be very helpful. Importantly, when asked if the institution provided adequate employment assistance to graduate students, only 33% of degree recipients felt that it did. Comments from the Doctoral Exit Survey reflect similar concerns. Twenty-six comments were made concerning some aspect of career training and advising. Of these, ten focused on the poor academic job market and seven asked for more help before and during the job search.

Nine respondents to the same survey commented that the nature of employment had changed and that there was a need for training for careers outside academia. Comments ranged from “Make PhD work relevant to real life” to “The University should also invest more energy in preparing MAs and PhDs for the possibility of non-academic employment” and “… should systematically address the changing employment prospects for PhDs across the disciplines. Obviously, the model of graduate study as an apprenticeship to full time academic employment is outdated in some, if not all disciplines.” Consistently, of 83 suggestions for improvement, 50% requested “more emphasis on jobs outside of teaching,” “business training for engineers [and others] starting their own companies,” and “faculty/staff knowledgeable in non-academic career choices.” A significant subset of these suggestions focused on the potential benefits of having the Counseling and Career Services help graduate students in these domains.

Other suggestions focused on resources such as networking, internships, workshops, and Web-based search mechanisms that the University could provide. These suggestions were often
linked to others about the type of skill set that could/should have been emphasized more by UCSB. One respondent summarized these sentiments by commenting “A large gap in my UCSB education was the absence of any courses, workshops, programs, that provide a skill set that can be used in any work environment; e.g., academic governance. Skills everyone should have included (1) verbal, (2) writing, (3) business, (4) leadership, and (5) working with multidisciplinary teams.” Another summarized a belief about a prevailing theme with the comment: “Often one gets the idea that a research/teaching job is the only/best job one can get and any other job is second-rate.”

4.2.3 Planning for the Future

The University is committed to improving its delivery of non-academic career training and services to graduate students, to meet both the requirements outside the academy and the needs within it. Suggestions for enhancing the training, counseling, and careers services provided to graduate students were all aimed at mechanisms to foster non-academic employment:

• **Expanding the GPMP and Other Certificates**: Demand for the kind of training that the newly developed certificate offers is high; the preliminary feedback from the private sector has been positive. While the program has been restricted to science and engineering students, the need for access to non-academic careers and the variety of contributions to non-academic sectors that can be made is provably even greater in the social sciences and humanities. The addition of funding, courses and staff support to increase access of this and similar certificates to a broader range of graduate students is an important next step in better preparation of UCSB students. The development of more focused certificates might also be usefully considered. For example, there is an increasing demand for competent technological and scientific writers in many sectors of the economy. Programs that combine preparation for non-academic employment with content that complements the skills of already highly accomplished writers might have particular appeal in providing greater career diversity to students in the humanities and social science.

• **Focusing Counseling and Career Services on Graduate Employment Concerns**: It is clear that CCS programs specifically geared to the needs of graduate students are needed. Such changes need to range from preparing on-campus employers for opportunities to meet with and hire graduate students, to providing job search workshops aimed more at graduate level employment, to facilitating networking and interaction with successful alumni who are employed outside of the academy. One of the differences between the needs of undergraduates and those of graduates is that the latter need more field and discipline specific information made available.

• **Enhancing Visibility of Graduate Students Seeking Non-Academic Employment**: Graduate students prefer the university to be more proactive in helping them in the non-academic job search. The institution might increase non-academic employment by increasing the visibility of graduate students to possible employers. Some suggested means for achieving visibility include better use of computer technologies to make lists of available students, their specialties, and contact information readily available to employers. Further, university offices need to coordinate with industrial personnel who participate in UCSB Extension programs to
enhance the visibility of available UCSB graduate students. With regard to interdisciplinary students, better coordination of departmental career-placement efforts would make it easier for students working in these areas to be visible to employers.

- **Better Interaction with Our Most Valued Asset—Successful Graduate Alumni:** One of the major concerns of the Graduate Education Committee was the lack of systematic institutional knowledge and tracking of our graduate students (note for example, the percentage of Graduate Alumni Surveys returned for incorrect addresses). Enlisting the skills, connections, assets, and good will of this group is one of UCSB’s most promising untapped resources. Institutional support and funding for departmental alumni tracking could facilitate placement of new graduates by building on the fact that firms often return to the campus that produced a successful employee to find another one. Better tracking of our graduated students would also have positive effects on alumni loyalty and on fund-raising efforts by departments and the campus.

### 4.3 THEME 3: PREPARATION FOR TEACHING CAREERS

The third theme considered by the Graduate Education Committee focused on how well the University currently prepares its graduate students to be educators, with a particular view to the assumption that many graduates will use their education to teach at a wider variety of educational venues, and, increasingly, to teach in the private sector. The committee was also concerned with support for graduates whose primary goal was a teaching career but whose training occurred in an environment in which high priority was also placed on research training.

#### 4.3.1 Current Mechanisms of Teacher Preparation

UCSB supports preparation of graduate students for teaching careers by formal degree or certification programs and by providing opportunities for extensive training and teaching experience through appointments as teaching assistants and associates. The Graduate School of Education at UCSB provides the education and skills needed to reshape K–12 educational systems and through its Masters and PhD degree programs.

**Teaching Assistant Training:** The principal way UCSB prepares its graduate students for a career in teaching is through its preparation of them in their role as teaching assistants. While training graduate students to function effectively as teaching assistants is important to their careers, it is also of fundamental importance to the education of the campus’s undergraduates. A large array of training and evaluation tools are used to ensure that graduate student teaching assistants are competent to fulfill their obligations to undergraduate students; the majority of these graduate students become highly regarded and effective instructors. Because of the narrow age gap that typically separates them from their undergraduate charges, TAs are often important role models and a source of advice for students who are hesitant to approach ladder faculty.

The University of California requires that all graduate student teaching assistants receive a program of teacher training prior to or concurrent with their first TA appointment. UCSB provides both campus wide and departmentally based TA training. Additional training is
Many departments have created TA handbooks that focus on departmental policies and procedures, as well as teaching methodologies used within the discipline. Other departmentally based training includes activities such as workshops on specific instructional topics, TA training seminar courses that meet weekly or biweekly, and interdisciplinary panels on specific teaching issues. Every ten years the Graduate Division requires departments to submit updated TA Training Program plans. The Office of Instructional Consultation’s campus-wide TA Development Program (TADP) serves as an academic and financial resource in assisting departments in carrying out these plans. Most academic departments and programs that use graduate student TAs require their first-year TAs to attend the one-day campus-wide TA Orientation, while the remaining departments encourage attendance. For the last four years, between 260 and 360 first-time UCSB TAs have attended the campus-wide orientation.

The TADP also operates a videotaping and consultation program to provide TAs with the opportunity to be videotaped while instructing discussion or lab sections. Between 160 and 200 first-time TAs are videotaped each year. In fact, most take part in one-hour consultations conducted by experienced TAs who serve as peer consultants. These consultants are given orientation and training sessions to prepare them to assist other TAs in viewing and critiquing the videotapes of their classroom teaching. Feedback from peer consultants indicates that they find this experience invaluable for their own teaching and in their interviews for faculty positions.

To make this program more specific to individual departments, many departmental TA training programs select a lead TA who is funded by the campus-wide TADP departmental training grants. Lead TAs attend a three-day institute to prepare for their role in assisting faculty in developing and implementing the department’s formal TA training programs for new TAs.

In addition, a one-unit course (Interdisciplinary Studies 505: Preparation for Faculty Roles in Higher Education) is taught by a senior faculty member and the coordinator of the campus-wide TADP. It is designed for graduate students who will be applying for faculty positions in research universities, doctoral and MA granting universities, four-year colleges, and community colleges. The course focuses on a variety of topics including how colleges and universities differ, expectations for faculty among the various types of colleges and universities, preparing for a teaching position, discussing various teaching methods, and developing a teaching portfolio.

Finally, a program of instructional grants is made directly to TAs for the purpose of supporting their efforts to design and develop new instructional materials and procedures for their courses. This grant program has produced many exceptionally effective products, including computer-based tutorial programs, interactive Web pages, and a variety of print and nonprint instructional materials in the social and physical sciences.

**Certificate in College and University Teaching:** Starting in Winter 2000, the campus began to offer the Certificate in College and University Teaching to graduate students in any campus department. Designed by the Graduate Division, this certificate signifies that the applicant has demonstrated five competencies: (1) the ability to plan and conduct discussion or laboratory sections, (2) the ability to apply appropriate research, theory, models, and/or principles of student
learning to their teaching, (3) the ability to recognize and use appropriate instructional technologies, (4) the ability to instruct a class effectively and independently, and (5) the ability to cogently discuss and demonstrate both the theory and practice in support of their teaching. The certificate requirements stipulate that students must gain these skills in the context of concerned mentoring from a faculty member, and that they demonstrate their teaching competencies by preparing a teaching portfolio that aids in securing competitive teaching positions.

4.3.2 Evaluation

The quality of UCSB’s teacher training is recognized by its graduate students. Of 115 responses to the Graduate Alumni Survey question regarding the aspect of the UCSB graduate program providing the best preparation for their current career, 34 cited instructing undergraduates or being prepared or trained to do so as the most important aspect. Most respondents felt that their teaching preparation was more than adequate or adequate (76%). At the same time, there were requests for more action on this front. In the Doctoral Exit Survey, 19 students indicated some aspect of teaching as their worst experience at UCSB and 6 commented on it in response to a later question. Negative comments focused on teaching without adequate training or preparation, mentor instructors who did not value teaching, or teaching in a climate where teaching was perceived as not being valued. Such comments were echoed in such free responses as “Include courses on pedagogy, not just research.” “My only dissatisfaction is lack of training for future teaching.” “More attention to teacher training for those going into university teaching jobs.” “Real training for teaching.” “Many well-qualified researchers…did not even value the teaching profession.”

Consistent with these views were the responses of UCSB graduates already in their first positions. One alumni question specifically asked how UCSB might have helped graduate student career preparation. Fourteen percent requested better training for teaching, a more open-minded attitude toward alternate teaching careers, or both.

4.3.3 Planning for the Future

A number of strategies for the enhancement of existing programs for the preparation of graduate students for careers in education emerged during this study.

- **Expanding TA Orientation.** A suggested multiple-day, in-depth orientation was proposed for new TAs, particularly for those whose country of origin is not the U.S. Additional emphasis on the administrative structure at UCSB, procedures for scheduling classrooms and equipment and for dealing with disciplinary problems would be helpful. An extended orientation could benefit from inclusion of the sponsorship and participation of all Colleges, the Office of International Students and Scholars, the Graduate School of Education, Graduate Student Association, and other campus units.

- **Teaching Courses Counted Toward Degree Requirements.** Since advanced degrees are a prerequisite for many teaching positions, it is suggested that classes in education and teaching experience be made a more formalized part of degree requirements. The campus could develop a formal curriculum that identifies skills and content for the education of
graduate students intending to be higher education teachers. This might make it possible to address the unevenness in the quality of TA training across departments. The expertise within the Graduate School of Education should be brought to bear in this effort.

- **Enhance the Rigor of Departmental TA Training Courses.** Recognizing that there is a lack of consistency in TA training across campus, UCSB should utilize procedures already in place, and implement new ones where necessary. While many departments have TA training seminars, these do not always equal in rigor other graduate courses offered by these departments. Faculty who teach such courses often do so as an overload and, in practice, many leave much of the instruction to a senior TA who is funded as a Lead TA by the Instructional Development grant program. Genuine faculty participation in these seminars should be expected, evaluated, and rewarded.

- **Raise Faculty Awareness of and Involvement in the Importance of TA Training and Mentoring.** The TA role was originally conceived as an apprenticeship in teaching parallel to the apprenticeship in research. There is, however, a level of accountability in the latter type apprenticeship that does not seem to be paralleled by the former. Some faculty take their mentoring responsibilities in teaching seriously; others view teaching as a skill that can be acquired only by experience and thus adopt a hands-off policy with their TAs. A continuing cross-disciplinary, campus-wide faculty forum on the education of graduate students as instructors would raise faculty awareness of their role as mentors in the socialization of future faculty.

- **Continuing Education in Teacher Effectiveness.** Most TA training at UCSB occurs prior to or concurrent with the graduate student’s first TA appointment. There is little continued training or education in teaching and learning beyond that point. Ongoing courses, conferences, seminars, and other mechanisms for exchange of experiences in teaching are needed if a graduate student’s ability to teach is to grow in parallel with the ability to perform research.

- **Involve the Graduate School of Education in Training Efforts.** UCSB’s Graduate School of Education could play a larger role in the campus-wide preparation of graduate students as future faculty. Expertise within the GSE related to curriculum development, technologies for teaching, educational psychology, and the education of non-English speakers is especially needed as the demographic mix of the campus’s graduate student and undergraduate student bodies changes in the years ahead.

### 4.3.4 Summary

The Graduate Education section of the 1991 Reaccreditation Self-Study emphasized the development of a strong infrastructure to support graduate education at UCSB. The results since that time have been impressive. UCSB is now a Research I university; it is a member of AAU; the quality of its programs, students, and faculty attract increasing attention in academic and non-academic circles. This decade since the last self-study has also seen additional pressure on graduate education to meet the developing and changing needs of both the academy and industry. In the present self-study we have tried to place the evolution of graduate education at UCSB within this broader context. It takes as a positive the fact that the number of enrolled graduate
students at the end of the decade 1991–2000 is virtually the same as when the decade began. That graduate enrollments have held steady in the face of drastically escalating living costs in the Santa Barbara area—and an extraordinarily robust economy that offers highly remunerative positions without graduate-level education—makes this accomplishment doubly impressive. The challenge UCSB faces is to fine tune its programs in graduate education so that the campus can continue to compete effectively for the resources and students needed to maintain a high-quality program in graduate education, with perhaps modest growth in student numbers in the future.

While our studies of the three selected themes in graduate education at UCSB indicate many areas where improvement of campus performance can and should be made, the Graduate Education Committee was pleased to find that the basic enterprise of graduate education on the campus is sound. Given the changing nature of graduate education, UCSB graduate students are given opportunities for interdisciplinary education, training appropriate to non-academic jobs, and effective teacher training for all types of academic positions. The data we reviewed indicates that UCSB is effective in training graduate students to adapt to a highly competitive job market. In the interest of serving our graduate students even better, several suggestions for improvement have been offered from this self-study.

- With regard to interdisciplinary education, future efforts in this area should (1) ensure that interdisciplinary education is thorough, (2) encourage group projects at the masters level, (3) develop interdisciplinary workshops to encourage cross-disciplinary projects, and (4) further develop an increasingly interdisciplinary faculty.

- Mechanisms should be put into place that foster non-academic employment. Such mechanisms might include (1) more involvement by Counseling and Career Services, and (2) enhancing students’ visibility through computer technologies, coordination with industrial personnel in the UCSB extension program, and funding of departmental alumni tracking.

- Strategies to enhance the current programs for preparing graduate students for teaching careers should include (1) expanding TA orientation, (2) counting teaching courses toward degree requirements, (3) enhancing the rigor of departmental training courses, (4) raising faculty awareness of the importance of TA training as part of academic mentorship, (5) continuing education in teacher effectiveness, and (6) involving the Graduate School of Education in training efforts.

Many indicators point to the increased quality of UCSB’s graduate education programs. Enrollment has remained strong, with particular increase in PhD programs. Graduation rates and time to degree have improved over the last few years, and stand to improve further if UCSB is successful in raising funds to increase fellowships and financial support. Implementation efforts in these venues should further serve to strengthen UCSB’s graduate education in the areas of interdisciplinary study, preparation for non-academic jobs, and teaching preparation.
5 EDUCATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

The WASC accreditation process has long recognized the importance of educational effectiveness. Historically, this focus was subsumed in Standard 2: Institutional Planning, Purposes, and Effectiveness. In recent years, WASC has elevated the topic to a more central position. In March 1998, WASC published *An Invitation to Dialogue*, outlining six key principles that it believed should underlie the revision of its accreditation standards. WASC circulated the document and asked some leading national experts working in higher education to respond to the proposed principles. The most consistently supported was Principle #3:

**Greater emphasis is needed on evidence of educational effectiveness and student learning.**

This chapter addresses this principle. It provides a conceptual framework for assessing perceptions of educational effectiveness as these relate to student learning outcomes. A series of data exhibits are reviewed as indicators of UCSB's performance.

5.1 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK AND SOURCES OF INFORMATION

To assess educational effectiveness, it is important to have a conceptual framework that identifies its key components. Although the full mission of the University of California includes research and public service, in addition to teaching, we present a framework for analysis of educational effectiveness that relates only to student learning outcomes. The framework is based on a vast research literature that uses indicator systems to assess educational effectiveness in elementary and secondary schools,9 as well as WASC responses to its six proposed principles, *Eight Perspectives on How to Focus the Accreditation Process on Educational Effectiveness* [December 1998]. The key aspects of the framework are shown in Figure 5-1.

![Figure 5-1. Conceptual Framework for Analyzing Educational Effectiveness](image)

The framework is built around an economic model of educational production whereby educational outcomes are taken to be the result of two major factors: (1) the inputs to the production process, and (2) the processes or activities that take place within the educational

---

institution. Both sets of factors influence the learning outcomes that occur and should be accounted for in any indicator system designed to monitor educational effectiveness. The first factor, particularly student quality, can have a significant impact on outcomes that have nothing to do with what happens within the institution. As Professor Alexander Astin points out in his paper in the *Eight Perspectives* report:

> The fundamental weakness in simple “outcome” measures like retention… is that such measures are heavily influenced by the characteristics of the students who enroll…. Indeed, recent research suggests that at least 50% of the variation among institutions in their degree completion rates is attributable to differences in the characteristics of admitted students rather than to differences in institutional “effectiveness” in retaining students [p. 9].

Astin goes on to suggest several ways of dealing with this problem. One method is to use longitudinal data so that raw outcome measures can be adjusted for input characteristics of students. Unfortunately, this is difficult to do because it requires linking outcome data to input characteristics of students several years earlier. Another method is to use measures that reflect the learning or “value added” that takes place while students actually attend college. This is the approach we use here in reporting most measures of student learning outcomes.

The second factor focuses on educational processes—practices and activities at the institution that can have a direct effect on student learning outcomes. The research literature on higher education, particularly on student departure, suggests that two types of educational practices and activities influence student outcomes—academic experiences and social experiences—and those experiences can take place in formal settings, such as classrooms, as well as in informal settings, such as dormitories. Astin further suggests that most effective educational practices generate a high level of student involvement [p. 8].

Finally, the framework identifies a broad array of student learning outcomes. These outcomes cover both traditional academic skills and social skills. While some of these outcomes may be related to the stated goals or mission of the University, other outcomes may be a product of the informal learning that goes on, and be every bit as valuable the product of a university education.

The remainder of this chapter presents a series of data exhibits that provide specific measures of the concepts described in the framework. The sources of data for the measures and concepts are shown in Table 5-1. In most cases, data exhibits are presented for the ten years, from 1990 to 1999, which cover the period subsequent to the last accreditation review in 1990–1991. Where possible, data are presented for the entire population of students and for subpopulations of students in order to examine whether there are differences in the inputs, process, and outcomes of students from different demographic groups. The demographic subgroups examined are defined by gender, race/ethnicity, first-generation college, and income. The University of California has made extensive efforts to increase K–12 outreach activities in order to attract and

---

retain more educationally disadvantaged students. Consequently, we believe it is important to monitor UCSB’s performance in meeting this commitment, not only with respect to the students it enrolls, but also with respect to the students it graduates.

Table 5-1. Concepts, Measures, and Sources of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Student quality</td>
<td>• SAT scores of incoming students</td>
<td>University records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High school GPA</td>
<td>University records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic experiences</td>
<td>• Overall quality of instruction</td>
<td>Course evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Social experiences</td>
<td>• Graduate survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduate survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement</td>
<td>• Retention rates</td>
<td>University records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Graduation rates</td>
<td>University records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic skills</td>
<td>• Writing, reasoning skills</td>
<td>University records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social skills</td>
<td>• Speaking, leadership, teamwork skills</td>
<td>University records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural skills</td>
<td>• Understanding</td>
<td>Graduate survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social involvement</td>
<td>• Community service</td>
<td>Graduate survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Political participation</td>
<td>Graduate survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 INPUTS

Student quality: UCSB currently enrolls approximately 20,000 students, with about 89% undergraduates and 11% graduates (see Table 5-2). Enrollment has increased a modest 9% over the decade. About three-quarters of new undergraduates arrive as freshman and one-quarter as transfer students. These proportions have remained steady throughout the decade.

---

Table 5-2. Overall Enrollment by Type: Fall 1990–1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18391</td>
<td>18519</td>
<td>18655</td>
<td>18581</td>
<td>17834</td>
<td>18244</td>
<td>18531</td>
<td>18940</td>
<td>19363</td>
<td>20056</td>
<td>1665</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>15975</td>
<td>16176</td>
<td>16277</td>
<td>16331</td>
<td>15525</td>
<td>15934</td>
<td>16281</td>
<td>16704</td>
<td>17059</td>
<td>17699</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>2416</td>
<td>2343</td>
<td>2378</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>2309</td>
<td>2290</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>-59</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New freshman</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>3218</td>
<td>3239</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>3464</td>
<td>3744</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>3781</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New transfers</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>1185</td>
<td>1177</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>1314</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New graduate students</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Student information system.

Freshmen enrollment trends of demographic groups have varied over the last decade (see Table 5-3). Female enrollment has grown faster than male enrollment. Enrollment of Chicano/Latino and Asian students has grown faster than enrollment of American Indian, African American, and White students. Enrollment has grown faster for first-generation college students as well as for low- and medium-income students. These trends partly reflect the changing demographic composition of California’s high school graduates.12


<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/K12ethtb.htm>
### Table 5-3. New Freshmen by Demographic Groups: 1990–1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>3218</td>
<td>3239</td>
<td>2881</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>3464</td>
<td>3744</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>3781</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1479</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2108</td>
<td>2080</td>
<td>2072</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>1389</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>1636</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented Sub-total</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1893</td>
<td>2091</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>2178</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>212%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income(^1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>193*</td>
<td>38%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Income(^1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>194*</td>
<td>48%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income(^1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>1826</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>231*</td>
<td>14%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Not Reported</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>197*</td>
<td>43%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects change or percent change since 1991.

\(^1\)Low, Medium, and High income categories are indexed to median family income in the Western U.S. region for each year. “Low” income is defined as family income which is less than 75% of median income, “medium” income is within 75% and 125% of median income (inclusive), “high” income is family income exceeding 125% of median income.

\(^2\)The SAT test was recentered beginning in 1996. Scores prior to 1996 have been converted to recentered equivalents.

**SOURCE:** Student information system.

Similar enrollment trends have occurred among transfer students, with the exception that male enrollment has increased faster than female enrollment (Table 5-4).
Table 5-4. New Transfers by Demographic Group: 1990–1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Change from 1990</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1090 1185 1177 1402 1186 1301 1376 1223 1355 1314 224</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>568 578 566 667 573 616 667 611 704 669 101</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>522 607 611 735 613 685 709 612 651 645 123</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>16 15 11 9 13 15 21 11 18 11</td>
<td>-5  -31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>24 22 12 52 29 31 21 19 8 14</td>
<td>-10 -42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>120 126 128 148 165 157 193 144 175 167</td>
<td>47 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented Sub-total</td>
<td>160 163 151 209 207 203 235 174 201 192</td>
<td>32 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>61 68 96 139 108 171 175 141 112 134</td>
<td>73 120%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>758 803 782 871 750 792 813 754 743 785</td>
<td>27 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>111 151 148 183 121 135 153 154 299 203</td>
<td>92 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>109 158 132 194 178 193 257 195 210 177</td>
<td>68 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income1</td>
<td>0 192 152 144 137 189 206 176 259 231 39*</td>
<td>20%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Income1</td>
<td>0 158 156 143 119 164 180 137 180 198 40*</td>
<td>25%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Income1</td>
<td>0 471 499 466 434 459 484 480 583 547 76*</td>
<td>16%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Not Reported</td>
<td>1090 364 370 649 496 489 506 430 333 338</td>
<td>-26* -7%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Reflects change or percent change since 1991.
1Low, Medium, and High income categories are indexed to median family income in the Western U.S. region for each year. “Low” income is defined as family income which is less than 75% of median income; “medium” income is within 75% and 125% of median income (inclusive), “high” income is family income exceeding 125% of median income.

SOURCE: Student information system.

Quality of Entering Students. How has the quality of entering students changed over the last decade? The two most common indicators of student quality are combined SAT scores and high school GPA. Both are used to determine eligibility to the University of California. Interestingly, during the first half of the decade, SAT scores and GPA declined, reaching a low point in 1994; since 1994, both SAT scores and GPA of entering students have increased.

Table 5-5. New Freshmen by Quality Indicators: 1990–1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Change from 1990</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2789 2966 3218 3239 2881 3361 3464 3744 3584 3781</td>
<td>992 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Scores (combined)</td>
<td>1165 1151 1134 1105 1097 1107 1116 1146 1163 1179</td>
<td>14 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school GPA</td>
<td>3.57 3.57 3.51 3.46 3.45 3.50 3.53 3.58 3.67 3.69</td>
<td>.12 3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Student information system.
**New Transfers.** The grade point average of new transfer students is the most common measure of student quality. Based on this measure, the quality of new transfer students to UCSB changed very little during the past decade (Table 5-6).

**Table 5-6. New Transfers by Transfer GPA: Fall 1990–1999**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Change from 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer GPA</th>
<th>Change from 1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| SOURCE:  Student information system.

**Faculty quality.** Student-faculty ratios over the past decade have remained essentially constant, although the mix of ladder and temporary instructors has fluctuated somewhat due to the effects of three voluntary early retirement plans. The disruptive impacts of these unanticipated and unprecedented early retirements on departmental teaching capabilities have now mostly passed through the system; department capabilities are very slightly different than they were at the start of the decade.

Simple measures of faculty quality are difficult to obtain. Data evaluating faculty performance are included in the individual departmental reviews referenced in the graduate education self-study. The aggregate research stature of the faculty has been recognized through the University’s inclusion in AAU, its classification as a Research I university by the Carnegie Foundation, its ranking as the second best public university on certain measures used in the Graham-Diamond study, and the 100% increase in extramural research funding achieved over the past decade. Numerous additional rankings for faculty in various graduate departments affirm the quality of UCSB faculty. For example, for the period from 1993 to 1997, the Institute for Scientific Information ranked UCSB ninth among “the highest impact U.S. universities” based on citation studies. And, the number of Nobel Laureates, National Academy of Science, National Academy of Engineering, and other honorific society members among our faculty, given our size, confirms the excellence of this group.

**Resources.** The campus resource base is still recovering from several years of budgetary stringency within the State.

In the analysis of educational outcomes presented below, we make the assumption that the inputs of faculty quality and resources in the framework indicated in Figure 5-1 have remained approximately constant over the decade.
5.3 PROCESSES

The quality of the institution is reflected in the quality of the processes and activities that take place within it. One of the most important activities that contribute to the learning outcomes of students is what goes on in the classroom. All students at UCSB are asked to evaluate the quality of the courses they take and the quality of the teaching they receive. These evaluations are a central part of UCSB’s institutional monitoring. These data indicate that, from the students’ perspective, UCSB is delivering high-quality instruction to its undergraduate students. Ninety-percent of undergraduates have rated the quality of their courses and teaching highly over the last decade (Table 5-7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of course</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of teaching</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Course Evaluations.

The academic quality of the institution can also be ascertained from responses to the Survey of Recent Graduates that UCSB routinely administers to cohorts of its undergraduates. Three such surveys were administered in the 1990s to the graduating classes of 1993, 1996, and 1998. The results of several survey questions about students’ satisfaction with their academic experiences at UCSB are shown in Table 5-8. These data indicate that undergraduates at UCSB report that they have been provided a high-quality academic experience. Recent graduates rate the quality of faculty instruction and course content very highly. The vast majority report being satisfied with the availability of faculty outside of class.

The above good news notwithstanding, the academic experiences of some demographic groups appear to be less favorable, although drawing conclusions from the data in these cases is complicated because the number of responses is small. For the larger demographic groups—Asians, Chicano/Latino, and Whites—the results are fairly uniform across groups. We remain concerned that underrepresented minorities from groups that have few students may experience their institutional experience differently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall quality of faculty instruction</th>
<th>Faculty instruction in major field</th>
<th>Availability of faculty outside of class</th>
<th>Course content in major field,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83 87 88 n/a 92 91 n/a 72 74 n/a 84 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82 89 90 n/a 92 92 n/a 73 75 n/a 86 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>85 82 85 n/a 92 89 n/a 69 72 n/a 82 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American*</td>
<td>67 100 63 n/a 83 88 n/a 50 75 n/a 83 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, E. Indian, Pakistani, or Filipino</td>
<td>75 82 88 n/a 94 92 n/a 70 70 n/a 84 82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano or Latino</td>
<td>70 86 91 n/a 90 91 n/a 74 71 n/a 76 88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American*</td>
<td>100 100 60 n/a 100 60 n/a 50 60 n/a 100 60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>86 87 90 n/a 91 91 n/a 71 76 n/a 85 80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, unknown, or foreign</td>
<td>78 91 82 n/a 91 89 n/a 82 82 n/a 82 86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>78 92 93 n/a 95 93 n/a 72 74 n/a 79 81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fewer than 10 African American responded for the 1996 and 1998 surveys and fewer than 10 Native American responded for all 3 years.


Social Experiences. It is also important to consider the social experiences of students. The Surveys of Recent Graduates asked a number of questions about the campus atmosphere and opportunities for community and political participation. The responses to those questions are shown in Table 5-9. Although the level of satisfaction is not as high as it was for academic areas, the overall level of satisfaction was still quite high. About two-thirds of the graduates were satisfied or very satisfied with their social experiences at UCSB. As was the case for academic experiences, the level of satisfaction was fairly consistent among the larger demographic groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Atmosphere of ethnic, political, and religious understanding</th>
<th>Exposure to multi-cultural programs and issues</th>
<th>Opportunities of community and political participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n/a 62 65</td>
<td>57 63 68</td>
<td>n/a 60 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n/a 63 66</td>
<td>52 68 70</td>
<td>n/a 64 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n/a 61 65</td>
<td>60 53 63</td>
<td>n/a 53 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American*</td>
<td>n/a 17 37</td>
<td>42 67 38</td>
<td>n/a 60 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, E. Indian, Pakistani or Filipino</td>
<td>n/a 60 71</td>
<td>45 57 77</td>
<td>n/a 52 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano or Latino</td>
<td>n/a 59 69</td>
<td>52 69 69</td>
<td>n/a 51 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American*</td>
<td>n/a 100 20</td>
<td>50 100 40</td>
<td>n/a 60 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>n/a 64 65</td>
<td>61 63 67</td>
<td>n/a 63 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, unknown, or foreign</td>
<td>n/a 59 61</td>
<td>35 60 63</td>
<td>n/a 62 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>n/a 63 66</td>
<td>56 68 64</td>
<td>n/a 64 58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fewer than 10 African Americans responded for the 1996 and 1998 surveys, and fewer than 10 Native Americans responded for all 3 years.


5.4 LEARNING OUTCOMES

Persistence rates. Ultimately, educational effectiveness must be evaluated in terms of student outcomes. Two types of outcomes are important to consider. The first focuses particularly on the proportion of entering students who graduate from the institution. A university cannot be effective if it is unable to graduate most of its entering students. In one well-known guide to colleges and universities, persistence and graduation rates are just behind academic reputation (25%) in its ranking system.\textsuperscript{13}

Persistence and graduation rates at UCSB have remained high throughout the past decade. Of the four cohorts of freshmen who entered in the early 1990s, more than two-thirds graduated from UCSB within six years (Table 5-10). This compares favorably with the graduation rates for

the UC system as a whole.\textsuperscript{14} Graduation rates for new transfer students were even higher (Table 5-11).

\textit{Table 5-10. Persistence and Graduation Rates of New Freshmen: 1990–1998}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1-year</th>
<th>2-year</th>
<th>4-year</th>
<th>5-year</th>
<th>6-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2789</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3218</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3239</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2881</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3361</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3457</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3738</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3581</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{SOURCE: Student information system.}


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>4-year</th>
<th>5-year</th>
<th>6-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1006</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{SOURCE: Student information system.}

If we parse the data somewhat further, we find that graduation rates vary among demographic groups (Table 5-12). Females have somewhat higher graduation rates than males. American Indian and Whites have the highest graduation rates, while Chicanos and Latinos have the lowest. Overall, underrepresented minorities have lower graduation rates than Asian and White students. First-generation college students have graduation rates somewhat below average, although their rates have been improving since the beginning of the decade.

\textsuperscript{14} For example, the six-year graduation rate for the 1991 entering freshman cohort was 76\% for the UC system as whole. See University of California, \textit{Undergraduate Persistence, Graduation & Time-to-Degree: First-time Freshman Students.} Retrieved on July 7, 2000 from the World Wide Web: \url{http://www.ucop.edu/sas/infodigest/ff.html}
Table 5-12. Six-Year Graduation Rates of New Freshmen by Demographic Groups: 1990–1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented sub-total</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Student information system.

Student learning. The second type of student outcome focuses on what students actually learn as a result of their university experience. As pointed out earlier, evaluating the effect of the university on student learning is difficult because it is influenced by the background and preparation of students before they enter the university. Student outcomes are also influenced by a student's major since academic departments dictate the majority of the course requirements and formal learning experiences of students. As a consequence, learning outcomes, at least as evaluated from student comments, should be expected to vary widely from student to student. These observations notwithstanding, it is possible to ascertain what students perceive that they have learned from their experiences from responses to the Survey of Recent Graduates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Writing skills</th>
<th>Quantitative reasoning skills</th>
<th>Computer skills</th>
<th>Problem solving skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American*</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, E. Indian, Pakistani or Filipino</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano or Latino</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American*</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, unknown, or foreign</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Learning Outcomes. The first area of learning outcomes focuses on academic skills. The majority of recent graduates indicated that their preparation at UCSB in writing skills, quantitative reasoning skills, and problem-solving skills was excellent or more than adequate (Table 5-13). In contrast, only one-third of our graduates indicated the same about computer skills. These percentages declined somewhat during the decade, especially in the area of problem-solving skills. These responses did not vary greatly among demographic groups (those with adequate numbers of responses) except that women were much less likely than men to report that their preparation in computer skills was excellent or adequate. That difference could be due to differences in exposure to computers by college major, since men are more likely to earn degrees in engineering and science fields that traditionally include more computer use.

The second area of learning outcomes focuses on social and interpersonal skills. The majority of recent graduates indicated that their preparation at UCSB in interpersonal and teamwork skills was excellent or more than adequate, while less than half felt that way about speaking and leadership skills (Table 5-14). There were some gender differences in these responses: women were more likely than men to indicate excellent or adequate preparation in interpersonal, leadership, and teamwork skills—although it is likely that women self-select classes in this area more than do men. There were also some differences in responses among ethnic groups: more Asians and Chicano/Latinos than Whites felt their preparation in speaking skills was excellent or adequate, while more Asians and Whites than Chicano/Latinos felt their preparation in teamwork skills was excellent or adequate.
Table 5-14. Social Skills. Percent of Graduates Indicating Preparation was Excellent or More than Adequate by Demographic Groups: 1993, 1996, and 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Speaking skills</th>
<th>Interpersonal skills</th>
<th>Leadership skills</th>
<th>Teamwork skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53 36 39 n/a</td>
<td>63 59 n/a</td>
<td>45 45 n/a</td>
<td>58 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>52 37 38 n/a</td>
<td>66 64 n/a</td>
<td>47 47 n/a</td>
<td>59 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>54 36 41 n/a</td>
<td>58 51 n/a</td>
<td>41 41 n/a</td>
<td>57 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American*</td>
<td>50 67 33 n/a</td>
<td>83 36 n/a</td>
<td>67 29 n/a</td>
<td>57 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, E. Indian, Pakistani or Filipino</td>
<td>54 32 46 n/a</td>
<td>58 57 n/a</td>
<td>45 41 n/a</td>
<td>59 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano or Latino</td>
<td>57 39 45 n/a</td>
<td>61 51 n/a</td>
<td>43 45 n/a</td>
<td>57 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American*</td>
<td>75 33 25 n/a</td>
<td>60 20 n/a</td>
<td>50 25 n/a</td>
<td>50 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53 37 36 n/a</td>
<td>66 63 n/a</td>
<td>46 46 n/a</td>
<td>59 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, unknown, or foreign</td>
<td>44 38 40 n/a</td>
<td>50 50 n/a</td>
<td>27 50 n/a</td>
<td>52 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>63 40 58 n/a</td>
<td>57 56 n/a</td>
<td>45 47 n/a</td>
<td>58 56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fewer than 10 African Americans responded for the 1996 and 1998 surveys. and fewer than 10 Native Americans responded for all 3 years.


A third learning outcome concerns accumulation of cultural and general knowledge. The majority of recent graduates reported feeling that their preparation was excellent or more than adequate in these areas (Table 5-15). Again, there were gender differences in these responses: women were more likely than men to indicate satisfactory preparation in cultural appreciation and in understanding of different philosophies, while men were more likely than women to indicate satisfactory preparation of their understanding of science and technology. These differences could be due to gender differences in self-selection of academic majors and the preparation that they provide. Some interesting ethnic differences are reflected in these responses. For example, Chicano and Latino students were more likely than other major ethnic groups to indicate satisfactory understanding of different philosophies and culture, whereas Asians were more likely than Chicano/Latinos or Whites to indicate satisfactory preparation in their understanding of science and technology.
Table 5-15. Cultural Skills. Percent of Graduates Indicating Preparation was Excellent or More Than Adequate by Demographic PGroups: 1993, 1996, and 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appreciation of art, music, and literature</th>
<th>Understanding of science and technology</th>
<th>Understanding of history, society, political affairs, economic affairs</th>
<th>Understanding of different philosophies and cultures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian, E. Indian, Pakistani or Filipino</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano or Latino</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, unknown, or foreign</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Fewer than 10 African Americans responded for the 1996 and 1998 surveys, and fewer than 10 Native Americans responded for all 3 years.


A final type of learning outcome explored is the extent to which students engage in community and policy activities. One important function of education is to encourage civic involvement. Data from recent graduates show that UCSB graduates were very active. Half of all recent graduates said they did community service or volunteer work, and almost three-quarters voted in the last presidential election.

5.5 SUMMARY

The sections above focus on reports of educational effectiveness of UCSB in producing student learning outcomes. This is an important goal for any university, albeit one that is difficult to measure and document. Our committee examined multiple sources of data in an effort to discern some base line measures of student learning when students entered the University, so that we might estimate how the experience at UCSB has transformed the values and abilities with which students began. Wherever possible, the interactive effects of gender, race/ethnicity, income, and college generation are considered as well.

Overall, the data indicate that UCSB has continued to attract good students over the last decade. In the first half of the decade, the quality of new freshman, as indicated by SAT scores and high school grades, actually declined, but over the past five years this index of preparation and academic quality has increased.
The quality of the institution has also improved in terms of attracting more nontraditional students. While the enrollment of non-White and first-generation students has increased faster than enrollment of White students, enrollment of underrepresented minorities has lagged overall enrollment trends. UCSB remains committed to increasing its efforts to recruit students from these groups.

The quality of the educational activities that students experience at UCSB has also remained strong over the past decade. Academic quality, as reflected in student course evaluations and surveys of recent graduates, has been consistently high. These indicators are uniformly high among major demographic groups. Student opinions of these social experiences, both cultural and political, have also remained consistently high over the past decade. These indicators are also uniformly high among major demographic groups.

In sum, as part of our self study, two types of learning outcomes were examined. The first focused on retention and graduation rates. Overall graduation rates for students who entered in the first half of the decade have remained fairly strong, albeit graduation rates for underrepresented ethnic minorities have remained below those for Asian and White students. We are buoyed by some very recent data that suggest an increase in retention rates for students from underrepresented minorities, but it is too early to conclude that we have accomplished our goals.

The second type of learning outcome focused on the academic, social, and cultural skills that students acquired while at UCSB. The majority of recent graduates indicated that their preparation in most academic skills was excellent or more than adequate; preparation in social skills was generally positive as well. Preparation in general areas of cultural appreciation and understanding of science, technology, culture, history, and political affairs was also rated uniformly high. There were some demographic differences in these responses that could be attributed to differences in college major. Finally, a majority of recent graduates report that they participated in elections and community activities.
6 PLANS FOR THE ACADEMIC FUTURE OF THE UCSB CAMPUS

Academic planning is a continuous process at UCSB, with faculty, staff, students, and administrators involved in the formulation of an academic vision for the future of the institution. In 1990, such efforts led to an Academic Planning Statement and Long Range Development plan that provided a set of institutional goals relevant to the current WASC evaluation. These included (1) developing a diverse faculty of exceptional quality as the foundation for academic excellence, (2) increasing the stature of campus research and creative activity, (3) ensuring excellence in both undergraduate and graduate instruction, (4) continuing the commitment to diversity and the quality of the student body, and (5) enhancing the quality of life on the campus and in the surrounding community. These five goals form a backdrop for present planning efforts.

Our current campus planning initiative incorporates the 1990 goals, and expands upon them with a more precisely defined vision for the future, as well as a more strategically developed plan for moving the campus toward the evolving vision. UCSB is attempting to implement strategies that are consonant with WASC standards, and to include the notion of a "culture of evidence" in the pursuit and refinement of campus goals.

Our current planning calls for us to build on academic strength in areas that are regarded as "core" academic endeavors. Long-term development of plans that build on existing strength to enhance core academic endeavors must begin by recognizing those core strengths that are present on the campus. The determination of what are core strengths follows from a process that considers high rankings relative to peer departments or programs; the number and contributions of faculty with distinction in fields of research; identifiable excellence in faculty, undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, and support facilities; special recognition or distinction in subfields; the presence of unique or highly developed educational or research facilities; success in bringing focused centers or institutes to fruition; viable connections with the local community; relevant industrial or governmental interest in a field; and an identifiable body of successful graduates.

A second long-term goal is the development of a distinctive profile of unique programs and centers, and the provision of a supportive context for newly emerging interdisciplinary teaching and research initiatives. We seek to identify areas where campus resources can be brought to bear upon new endeavors that are not regarded as well-established or core enterprises. Planning efforts have identified a first set of three thematic strategies that will be used to pursue this goal: interdisciplinarity, intellectual diversity, and internationalization.

Many UCSB faculty are engaged in interdisciplinary efforts. Through a combination of actions that will be determined by standard campus consultation mechanisms, we will build upon this interdisciplinary identity.

The strategy—based upon intellectual diversity—will seek to create initiatives to increase research project development in areas that deal directly with concerns of underrepresented
groups as well as to increase the presence of underrepresented groups among UCSB’s faculty, staff, and students.

Internationalization of UCSB has a long history, founded on its once-envisioned development as “The International Campus of the UC System.” Although the campus is indeed the system-wide headquarters for the UC Education Abroad Program, because of budgetary constraints in years past, overall the campus has not evolved as planned in this area. In current strategic planning we now see the opportunity to develop UCSB as a campus with stronger international orientation. Some actions being considered to catalyze this transformation include (a) creation of International Visiting Professorships to bring more senior international scholars to UCSB to teach and conduct research in their areas of expertise, (b) establishment of new international, inter-institutional links, (c) transformation of one of the existing dormitories into an “International House”, and (d) increased campus emphasis on the importance of language in the selection and education of UCSB undergraduate students.

A third long-range goal is to embrace a plan for moderate growth in undergraduate and graduate studies. Because of concerns about the nature and pace of urban development and the environmentally sensitive areas surrounding the campus, long-range development plans (LRDP) of the campus must be negotiated with various local and state governmental agencies. However, the State of California is in the midst of a massive expansion in the population of students who qualify for higher education under the State's master plan. The current LRDP for UCSB calls for an enrollment cap of 20,000 students based on a three quarter average. For the near term, the campus plans to expand enrollment capacity by taking advantage of an expanded summer quarter that will provide incentives to attract summer quarter students. Other mechanisms that will be used to enhance capacity will include increased use of off-site education programs, such as Education Abroad, campus learning centers, such as the one presently located in Ventura, and the UC–DC programs administered by the UC system in Washington DC.

A second aspect of the plan for moderate enrollment growth is to gradually increase the percentage of graduate students relative to undergraduate students, from its current level (about 11%) to approximately 15% over the next ten years. As indicated in the chapter of this self-study dealing with graduate education, graduate students play a pivotal role in both the research and teaching missions of the campus. A modest increase in graduate students will facilitate enhancements in undergraduate education through reduction of student/faculty ratios in classes and laboratories led by graduate teaching assistants, while contributing to the research portfolio of the campus.

A fourth goal is to develop a high-profile undergraduate honors program and to refine the current general education program. The current honors program, housed in the College of Letters and Science, has grown and thrived since it was founded. The campus intends to promote further development of this program. The honors program will enhance opportunities for undergraduates to participate in campus research programs, engage in direct mentoring relationships with faculty and graduate student researchers, and participate in special interdisciplinary courses.

Development of undergraduate programs will focus too upon the General Education program. The courses of study will provide all undergraduate students with an education that will
serve their life and career goals while providing a distinctive orientation that serves to identify UCSB graduates. Current efforts in this area are being led by an Academic Senate Task Force, and will result in initial offerings of new freshman seminar courses beginning in 2000–2001.

A fifth goal of the current long-range academic planning effort is the initiation and completion of UCSB’s first major capital campaign. With the development of long-range planning goals and subsequent implementation of the shorter-term strategies that flow from these goals, the campus will define a palette of academic programs that can be used to provide a focus for fund raising efforts. Such efforts could include (a) enhancement of core strengths as identified by academic planning, (b) development of a distinctive campus profile using the three strategic themes of interdisciplinarity, intellectual diversity, and internationalization, (c) enlarged support for manifestations of widely shared campus values including scholarships for graduate and undergraduate students, fellowships for students and faculty visitors, library facilities, information technology resources, and physical facilities such as classrooms and research laboratories, and (d) support for facilities and services that enhance the quality of campus life in order to attract the best faculty, students, and staff.

A sixth long-term goal is the development of new professional schools. Currently under consideration are faculty proposals for professional schools in areas related to business and to global studies. A special committee appointed by Chancellor Yang at the request of the Academic Planning Coordinating Committee is studying these proposals. Proposals for the development of one or more professional schools at UCSB are anticipated in the time horizon of the next ten years.

In sum, our academic plan embraces a set of goals that include efforts to

- Build upon strength
- Invest in the highest-quality faculty
- Encourage and enhance interdisciplinary studies
- Encourage innovative teaching and research
- Strengthen graduate education
- Enhance undergraduate education
- Create a greater sense of community for undergraduates
- Create a greater sense of intellectual community for faculty
- Maintain and increase diversity
- Build the campus endowment
- Increase external funding
• Promote university/industry connections
• Improve public/private partnerships
• Promote the case for higher education as an integral part of society
• Increase support for the Library
• Promote better use of information technologies
• Promote internationalization/globalization of the student body and the faculty
• Enhance effective management of the campus through its administrative bodies

6.1 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

UCSB is dedicated to an ongoing process of improvement, facilitated by strategic planning and organizational development. This reaccreditation document emphasizes UCSB’s commitment to, and internalization of, the process of reexamination and self-study in order to ensure a continuous cycle of enhancement of both academic and administrative missions. UCSB has a clearly defined set of institutional purposes that are pursued with integrity; these educational objectives are achieved through the core functions of teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity, and support of student learning. Our goal is to develop and align resources and organizational structures to ensure sustainability across faculty and staff; fiscal, physical, and information services; and decision-making processes so that we can contribute all that is possible as an institution of higher learning.
7 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES:

Policy and Data Portfolio on the World Wide Web

<http://bap.ucsb.edu/wasc/policy>

In support of the accreditation process, UCSB has prepared an electronic policy and data portfolio organized around the nine standards published in the Handbook of Accreditation [July, 1997]. Our goal in producing this portfolio is to demonstrate UCSB’s compliance with the “spirit and broad intent” of the WASC standards. In keeping with the new paradigm of accreditation, the bulk of the institution’s focus has been placed on the two self-study topics rather than on a demonstration of compliance with the standards. The organization of relevant policy statements and data displays in our electronic policy and data portfolio are intended to quickly and definitively illustrate UC Santa Barbara’s compliance with WASC standards.

The electronic portfolio is housed on an Internet Web site which the review team can access from any computer with an Internet connection and an appropriate Web browser (we recommend Internet Explorer 4 or 5, or Netscape 4.x). The portfolio has links to most of the documents and data displays that show compliance with the standards. The URL for the Web site is:

<http://bap.ucsb.edu/wasc>

The main page for UCSB’s WASC Web site contains a brief explanation of the intent of the Web site, electronic images of UCSB’s “Letter’s of Accreditation,” and a list of UCSB faculty, staff, and students who played a role in the self-study, and the preparation and presentation of the policy and data portfolio.

7.1 NAVIGATING THE POLICY AND DATA PORTFOLIO

To access the policy and data portfolio, click on the link entitled “Policy and Data Portfolio”; once there you will be taken to a screen similar to the display found in Figure 7-1. To view links to the policy statements and data displays presented to show compliance with the standards, click on one of the standards. For example, clicking on “STANDARD 1” takes you to a display that gives a brief summary of the standard, and a tabular listing of exhibits and sources that support our adherence to that standard. In most browser configurations, statements that are in color or underlined represent links that can be selected. Statements under the “ITEM” column can be selected to show policy and data displays. As a further navigation aid, the Web site contains a frame at the top of the web page display that may be used to easily move from one standard to the next.
Figure 7-1 Policy and Data Portfolio Web Site.
7.2 CREATION OF THE WEB SITE

The identification and selection of material for the Web site was a collective effort involving the direct participation of a UCSB committee. Each member of the committee was responsible for identifying material relevant for a particular standard. If the material in question was available on the Web, then the committee member simply reported the URL. Otherwise, documents or data displays were converted to HTML and made available on the Web site.

While many documents and data displays could have been placed on the Web site for review, in the interest of parsimony, we have selected what we feel are the most important documents relevant to the WASC review. In some instances, however, further questions may be raised. The Office of Budget and Planning will be able to refer reviewers with further questions to appropriate sources of information.

The UCSB WASC Accreditation Web site pages are included in Appendix F.
APPENDIX A: UCSB WASC SELF-STUDY REACCREDITATION
REPORT COMMITTEES

Accreditation Steering Committee

Tom Gerig, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Co-Chair
Beth Le Poire, Department of Communication, Co-Chair

Associate Students Representative
Stanley Awramik, Acting Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Personnel
France Cordova, Vice Chancellor for Research
Richard Church, Chair, Graduate Council
Robert Kuntz, Assistant Chancellor, Budget & Planning
Charles Li, Dean, Graduate Division
Diane Mackie, Associate Dean, Graduate Education
Duncan Mellichamp, Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Long Range Planning
Michael Perry, Graduate Student Association Representative
Robert Rinker, Associate Dean, College of Engineering
Russell Rumberger, Department of Education
Ronald Tobin, Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Programs, WASC ALO
Steven Velasco, Institutional Research and Planning
Richard Watts, Chair, Academic Senate
Alan Wyner, Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Letters & Science
Michael Young, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

Educational Effectiveness Committee

Russell Rumberger, Department of Education, Chair

Ed Donnerstein, Dean, Division of Social Sciences
Richard Hecht, Department of Religious Studies
Stan Nicholson, Director, Office of Instructional Consultation
Frank Stevens, Alumni Association
Holly Carmody, Institutional Research and Planning
Salvador Castillo, Institutional Research and Planning
**Freshman Experience Committee**

Alan Wyner, Dean, Undergraduate Studies, Letters & Science, Chair

Britt Andreatta, Associate Director, Orientation Programs
Glenn Beltz, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Sal Castillo, Institutional Research and Planning
Charlene Chew-Ogi, Associate Director, Housing & Residential Services
John Doner, Department of Mathematics
Nick Duggan, Associated Students Representative
Abraham Friesen, Department of History
Yolanda Garcia, Executive Director, Educational Opportunity Program
Carol Geer, Director, Counseling & Career Services
Michael Glassow, Department of Anthropology
Yonie Harris, Dean of Students
Carol Hiles, Director, Campus Learning Assistant Services
Glyn Hughes, Graduate Student Association, Sociology
Judith Kirscht, Director, Writing Program
Beverly Lewis, Registrar
Loy Lytle, Director, Summer Sessions and Department of Psychology
David Marshall, Dean, Humanities & Fine Arts
Luke Roberts, Department of History
William Tingle, Writing Program
William Villa, Director, Admissions

**Graduate Education Committee**

Richard Church, Chair, Graduate Council, Co-Chair
Diane Mackie, Associate Dean, Graduate Education, Co-Chair

Richard Appelbaum, Department of Sociology
Julie Carlson, Department of English
Carol Dixon, Assistant Dean, Graduate School of Education
John Lammers, Department of Communication
Gene Lucas, Associate Dean, College of Engineering
Dennis Nord, Associate Director, Counseling & Career Services
Michael Perry, Graduate Student Association Representative
Shirley Ronkowski, Office of Instructional Consultation

Joshua Schimel, Department of Ecology, Evolution, & Marine Biology
Policies and Procedures Committee

Robert Rinker, Associate Dean, College of Engineering, Co-Chair
Steven Velasco, Institutional Research and Planning, Co-Chair
Lee Bliss, Department of English
Claudia Chapman, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Meta Clow, Administrative Services
Allyn Fleming, Student Affairs
Jody Kaufman, Executive Director, Academic Affairs
Mary McMahon, Assistant Dean, Graduate Division
Duncan Mellichamp, Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Long Range Planning
Louise Moore, Director, Office of Research
Eric Sonquist, Director, Institutional Advancement
Gwen Kuhns, Institutional Research and Planning
APPENDIX B: INTRODUCTION TO THE UNIVERSITY SURVEY

Survey instruments used in the student surveys discussed in Section 3.1.1 where the details of data collected and methodology are presented.

See the printed version of the Self-Study for a copy of the following surveys:

- UCSB FRESHMEN EXPERIENCE SURVEY
- 1998 HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE (HERI) SURVEY
- SPRING 1999 FOLLOW-UP HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE (HERI)
- UCSB FRESHMEN SURVEY: WASC 2000
APPENDIX C: FOCUS GROUP PROCEDURES AND QUESTIONS

In March, April, and May of 2000, the WASC Subcommittee on Graduate Student Education conducted a series of eight focus groups on “Innovation in Graduate Education.” Two subcommittee members attended each group to act as facilitators; however, apart from what was required to keep the groups on schedule, the facilitators tried to assume a fairly passive role. Trained and experienced note takers took notes for the session. Notes of all sessions are available for review.

More than 60 faculty, graduate program support staff, and graduate students attended these groups. It was thought that not mixing members from the various groups would lead to the frankest expression of ideas, and so faculty, students, and staff attended separate sessions. Each group was asked to respond to the same six questions, which the subcommittee had prepared to reflect the general themes of the self-study. The questions follow.

1. How easy is it to pursue interdisciplinary activities on the UCSB campus? What other types of interdisciplinary activity might we pursue? What changes could be made to further foster and encourage such pursuits? How do you see programs evolving, especially towards interdisciplinary programs?

2. In many fields, the types of research careers that Masters and PhD graduates pursue are changing (non-academic, self-employment, for example). Should our training of graduates change given these more varied futures, and if so, how? What barriers stand in the way of making these changes? What other campus resources/activities/programs need to be developed or changed to help students prepare for and secure these more varied options?

3. Even when students pursue careers in academic settings, the nature of those settings is becoming more varied (smaller, more varied, junior college, etc.). Should our training of graduates change given these more varied futures, and if so, how? What barriers stand in the way of making these changes? What other campus resources/activities/programs need to be developed or changed to help students prepare for and secure these more varied options?

4. UCSB is an AAU Research I University. With particular regard to graduate education, what can be done to make sure that our eminence in this group is maintained and even strengthened in the next decade?

5. What institutional barriers do you see in providing quality graduate education? e.g. do some programs lack critical mass in terms of faculty and students? Do classrooms have appropriate resources to demonstrate latest technology? Is there a lack of quality lab space for graduate students? Can we make better use of the Internet and distance learning?

6. Are there specific examples that can be cited that demonstrate new and innovative graduate instruction at UCSB?
APPENDIX C-1: DEPARTMENTAL PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY QUESTIONS RELATED TO GRADUATE EDUCATION

a. What is your current departmental situation in relation to the goals and objectives for graduate programs?

b. Discuss the rational for the content, structure, and specialties of your graduate program(s).

c. Discuss your success in attracting and retaining graduate students. How would you characterize the applicant pool at the graduate level in terms of quality, size, diversity, etc.? How do you advertise your program? What procedures and criteria do you use to select the students you wish to admit? What percentage of your graduate students admitted in the past five years have had an undergraduate GPA of under 3.0? What efforts are you making to recruit and retain students so as to achieve an appropriate ethnic and gender balance in your department?

d. How is the quality of student performance assessed at various stages of students' graduate careers? Do your graduate students' grade show a range sufficient to encourage the better scholars and discourage the poorer ones? Do they do so early enough to weed out students who lack the appropriate preparation and motivation?

e. What is the attrition/success rate for your department? What factors contribute to your department's attrition/success rate? Are there differences in attrition/success rates related to gender and ethnicity?

f. Evaluate the adequacy of support for your graduate students. How are financial aid and fellowship decisions reached in your department?

g. How does the department provide academic advising? What other assistance does the department regularly provide graduate students?

h. What is the average time-to-degree for master's students? Doctoral students? How do these compare with similar programs at UC or other major institutions of higher education? How do you ensure that students progress toward the completion of their degrees in a timely and orderly manner?

i. How would you describe the climate for graduate study that your department fosters (a) in general, (b) for women, and (c) for historically underrepresented students? If there are problems, what specific efforts are you making to address them?

j. What assistance is available for career planning and job placement? Comment on your placement record for graduate students who have received their degrees in the last five years.

k. How would you characterize the results of the graduate survey? Do you believe they are generally representative of the experience of graduate students in your department?
APPENDIX C-2: PROGRAM REVIEW PANEL GRADUATE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

See the printed version of the Self-Study for a copy of the survey instrument.
APPENDIX C-3: GRADUATE ALUMNI SURVEY

The Graduate Alumni Survey was sent to the majority of past graduates of graduate programs. Of some 2500 survey forms mailed, approximately half were returned due to an outdated address and no forwarding address.

Of the 477 responses, 259 (54%) held a PhD. The majority of the responses graduated 4–8 years ago. Of the graduates, 85% are employed full-time: 30% work in industry, and 56% work in educational institutions. The majority (77%) of the respondents indicated that their graduate experience was related to or highly related to their current job. Almost 40% of the jobs held by the respondents required a PhD. Many of these held a position at a four-year college or university. (It should be cautioned here that the chances of an address being correct for a graduate is probably better for those who left UCSB for teaching/research jobs. Consequently, the lack of keeping a good address database is likely to be biased toward accurate addresses for such professionals.)

That more than 87% of the graduates responding indicated that they were satisfied (47%) or very satisfied (41%) with their graduate experience is gratifying. Approximately 19% of our graduates cited that they were dissatisfied (11.9%) or very dissatisfied (6.9%) with their financial assistance. This is an issue of continuing concern for those involved in graduate programs.

We are delighted that 91% of those surveyed indicated that their graduate program was intellectually stimulating. Other survey results will also help us to prioritize needs in our graduate programs. For example, 92% of the respondents noted that “teamwork ability” is either somewhat important or very important in their jobs. It may be important to have more team projects integrated into our graduate programs, like the group-oriented masters projects in the Bren School. Nearly 80% of our graduates also state that “teaching ability” is “somewhat important” or “very important.” We hope that our recent Certificate program in College and University Teaching will help to better meet this need.

Since this survey was only recently completed, faculty and administrative officials have not had the opportunity to analyze the implications of the results in depth or consider possible responses. This will be a task for the Graduate Council and others the years ahead.
APPENDIX D: DESCRIPTIONS OF INTERDISCIPLINARY EMPHASES

Cognitive Science

The program creates an organizational structure that facilitates sharing of research interests and collaboration among faculty in Anthropology, Education, English, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Geography, Linguistics, Psychology and Sociology. It helps translate these activities into training opportunities for graduate students. The goal of the program is to give students an appreciation of the interdisciplinary study of thinking, perception, and intelligent behavior, as determined jointly by the nature of the environment and by the internal architecture of the intelligent agent, whether human, animal, or machine.

To be admitted to the emphasis, students must be accepted to a PhD program in one of the participating departments and must petition the Coordinating Committee. Petitions for admission to the emphasis must be endorsed by at least one home department faculty member who is also participating in the interdisciplinary emphasis and who is willing to advise the applicant on all matters leading to completion of the emphasis requirements.

Human Development

Students completing doctoral training in Communication, Education, Linguistics, Psychology, or Sociology may add the graduate emphasis in human development. Courses to be offered within the program are taught by participating faculty within the Departments of Anthropology, Black Studies, Communication, Counseling, Education, Linguistics, Psychology, Sociology, and Speech and Hearing Sciences. Graduate training is concerned with biological influences, changing cognitive capacities, and sociocultural influences across the human life span.

All students meet the graduate requirements of their home departments. Written doctoral qualifying examination procedures within departments are adapted to include representation of the student’s focus on developmental issues. The student’s doctoral advisory committee usually includes at least one faculty member from the Human Development Program.

Language, Interactions, and Social Organizations (LISO)

Students pursuing a PhD in Education, Linguistics, and Sociology may petition their department to add an interdisciplinary emphasis in Language, Interaction, and Social Organization (LISO). This emphasis draws upon three approaches: interactional functional linguistics, ethno-methodology and conversational analysis, and interactional sociolinguistics.

Permission to pursue the PhD is contingent upon passing a screening review, which ordinarily takes place upon completion of the MA. Under the guidance of a committee of faculty members, the student must complete the following: a minimum of two years (six quarters) of academic residence; 48 units of graduate course work beyond the nine courses required for the
MA; two substantial research papers of publishable quality in different areas of linguistics; an oral qualifying examination; a dissertation prospectus; a colloquium presentation of dissertation research; and an original dissertation.

**Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences (QMSS)**

Students pursuing a PhD in Communication, Education, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, and Statistics and Applied Probability may petition to add the interdisciplinary emphasis in Quantitative Methods in the Social Sciences (QMSS). The QMSS emphasis helps students to attain the competencies needed to conduct quantitative social science research through core design and analysis classes, courses in advanced and specialized methodologies, and participation in interdisciplinary colloquia and research projects.

Students pursuing a PhD in any of the participating departments may petition to add the interdisciplinary emphasis. Each admitted student develops, with his or her advisor, an individual contract listing the QMSS requirements to be completed.

**Women’s Studies**

The Women’s Studies Program, involving over thirty core and affiliated faculty members in over eleven disciplines, addresses the epistemological and pedagogical bases for studies that take gender and sexuality as centrally constitutive categories. Two seminars form the core of the emphasis; offered as a sequence, they offer graduate students the opportunity to present and critique each other’s dissertation-in-progress.

Applicants must first be admitted to, or currently enrolled in, a UCSB PhD program participating in the Women's Studies graduate emphasis: Anthropology, English, French, Germanic, Slavic and Semitic Studies, History, History of Art and Architecture, Religious Studies, or Sociology. Candidates complete four graduate courses and select a member of the Women’s Studies faculty or affiliated faculty as a part of their PhD exams and dissertation committee.
APPENDIX E. DEPARTMENTAL CAREER COUNSELING

Anthropology

In the Department of Anthropology, career advising is done informally in conversations between dissertation committee members and students. The Department tracks the careers of its graduate students but not in a formal or structured way.

Biological Sciences

The primary mechanisms for career advising in the department are discussions with the Graduate Program Advisor, discussions with mentors, particularly the thesis advisor, and attendance at scientific conferences where students can interact with representatives from prospective employers in industry and academe.

Bren School of Environmental Science and Management

The Donald Bren School operates its own Career Development Program. The Career Development Program and is committed to helping students develop the necessary job search and career development skills needed to transition successfully into rewarding environmental careers after graduation. Under the direction of the Career Development Officer, students receive individual and group assistance on any career-related topic or issue.

Chemistry and Biochemistry

The Department does much in-house career advising though a departmental staff career advisor. In addition, faculty members provide contacts and mentor their students into positions. The department provides CV and resume development advice and coaches interviewing skills. Additionally, the department works directly with industrial and academic contacts to create research collaborations and employment networks for its graduates.

Economics

A faculty member is assigned as the placement advisor. He or she supervises the job search of PhD students throughout their dissertation year. The placement advisor handles counseling about academic, government, and the private sector markets. Most of the effort is spent in preparing for the winter meetings of the major national association. Since many MAs have already had some professional experience in government or business, so job coaching is less important.

Electrical and Computer Engineering

The most common form of advising occurs during informal conversations between dissertation advisors and individual graduate students. Networking with alumni who now have
their own businesses has also been a successful way of initiating the department’s graduate students’ careers. The College of Engineering also provides an email/Web service “TECH OPPS” to which both graduate and undergraduate students can subscribe. The ECE Student Office tries to keep track of at least the first job opportunity that a graduate student receives after an MS or PhD has been awarded. Most of the jobs graduate students accept after completing the MS or PhD programs are in industry.

**Geography**

Career advising within the Department of Geography is done mostly on an informal basis between students and their advisors. A limited amount of career advising is done in a course “Introduction to Geographic Research” (Geog 200A and B). The department maintains a computer database of local, state, national and international opportunities. Undergraduates and graduate students access this information within the department and through the departmental Web site.

**Geology**

Each fall, many companies come to the department to interview students for summer internships and job opportunities. All career/job information sent to the department is emailed to graduates and faculty. A job binder also lists open positions by category and position. A small library of books covering topics such as writing cover letters and resumes, interviewing, and mounting job searches is available.

**History**

The Department informs its graduate students of career norms, processes, and opportunities in many ways. Most of the socialization to the profession occurs between student and mentor; job openings are likely to be known first to the mentor. The Department offers a course, *The Academic Profession of History* (History 209AB), intended to prepare students for the job market. It also appoints a professor as Graduate Placement Officer.

**LAIS Latin American Iberian Studies (LAIS)**

LAIS offers career-counseling event each Fall which is open to graduate students. It is held at the Career Counseling Center and LAIS usually facilitates it. It covers job tracks and getting into a PhD program (LAIS is a terminal MA degree). Most advising is informal and one on one with faculty mentors. LAIS maintains an email list of opportunities for jobs and further education.

**Marine Science**

This interdepartmental graduate program was new the in fall of 1998 and has no formal career advising in place up to this point. Career advising takes place in informal conversations between dissertation advisors and individual graduate students. Most students in the program
attend the American Society of Limnology and Oceanography meetings each year and participate in employment-related symposia.

**Mathematics**

Almost all career advising in Mathematics is done individually. Every two years there is a panel consisting of mostly our own graduates discuss their work and answer questions from students.

**Mechanical and Environmental Engineering**

Mechanical and Environmental Engineering has no formal career advising for graduate students. However, career advising is done informally, one-on-one, between faculty and students.

**Music**

Other than the usual and assumed faculty-student advising done on an *ad hoc* basis—generally mentor-to-student or, on student-initiated queries, discipline-specific faculty-to-student advising—the Music Department currently has no formal career advising.

**Philosophy Department**

While there is the natural, informal career guidance students receive from their dissertation supervisors and their committee members, the formal career guidance program in our department is fulfilled by the duties of the Departmental Placement Director. His duties include hosting annual meetings for students planning to enter the job market, providing critiques of candidates CV's and letters of recommendation, helping students in the participation in national conventions, arranging on-campus interviews, and provision of coaching in interview and negotiation techniques.

**Political Science**

The Department of Political Science maintains a placement database for all PhD students and alumni. The primary focus of the department’s placement assistance is in the academic job market, although it also works with Counseling and Career Services to develop more non-academic job-related assistance for students. The department presently provides notification of job openings, placement workshops and a professional skills forum.

**Spanish and Portuguese**

The Department provides workshops on employment-related topics during the previous quarter, addressing such topics as: marketing strategies, asking for letters of recommendation, planning courses, secondary fields, generation and revision of CVs and preparation of cover letters, and interview and negotiation techniques.
APPENDIX F: UCSB WASC ACCREDITATION WEB PAGES

UCSB WASC Accreditation

http://bap.ucsb.edu/wasc/
Statement of Intent

The University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB) is conducting a self-assessment that is part of the process by which it seeks to retain accreditation as a university in good standing in the academic community. The Senior College Commission of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) is empowered to make the decision regarding UCSB’s continued accreditation and requires a self-examining report and a site visit every ten years. This website contains pertinent data and links to support the findings of that self-study and respond to other questions that WASC may have about the university.

WASC last reaffirmed accreditation for UCSB in 1991. For more information on the findings of the last accreditation visit, you may review the Letters of Accreditation posted on the UCSB Accreditation website.
Suggested Timetable for WASC Self-study

(July 1999 Revision)

Spring 1998
Develop organizational structure/consultation process for self study. [DONE]

Winter 1999
Appoint Steering Committee, Task Groups for Freshmen Experience, Graduate Education, and Data Portfolios and/or other Committees. [DONE]
Initial meetings of Steering Committee and Task Groups [DONE]
Visit to campus by WASC representative (Judie Wexler) [DONE]
Begin development of preliminary policy and data portfolios [IN PROGRESS]
Develop overall plan to approach special topics. [IN PROGRESS]
Develop charges and tasks for sub-committees. [DONE]

Spring 1999
Appointment of sub-committees [DONE]
Campus Recommendations of Review Team (6-9 Members) [DONE]
Administer follow-up survey to 1998 entering freshmen [DONE]

Summer 1999
Collection of data for Special Topics and Data Portfolios. [IN PROGRESS]
Administer alumni survey to MA and Ph.D. recipients [IN PROGRESS - securing funds]
Analyze entering freshmen (initial & follow-up) survey data [IN PROGRESS]
Begin development of WASC web-site [IN PROGRESS]

August 1999
WASC Commission invites team members
Administer alumni survey to BA recipients.

Fall 1999
Review of information and reports from sub-committees
Analyze alumni surveys
Administer survey to enrolled students and faculty for 1st-Year Experience Committee [?]
Focus group discussions for both Special Topics committees

Winter 2000
Analyze data from enrolled student and faculty surveys
Begin draft of Narrative Report and Special Topics Reports

June 2000
Complete development of policy and data portfolios and short narrative report.

August 2000
Begin planning for pre-visit. Prepare comprehensive narrative report and self-study report outlines for Team Chair and Judie Wexler by Aug 18, 2000.

October 2000
Complete reports from Special Topics Committees

November 2000
Steering Committee reviews reports

December 1, 2000
Submit data portfolios, narrative report, and the special topics self-study report(s) to WASC and review team.

February 2001
Visit by external peer advisory group to review self-study report

September 2001
Reaffirmation of WASC accreditation.

2001 - 2006
Follow-up on Special Topics and Five-Year Review
1999-2000 WASC Accreditation Committees

Accreditation Steering Committee
Educational Effectiveness Committee
Graduate Education Committee
First-Year Experience Committee
Policies and Procedures Committee