## 2011-12 UCLA ACADEMIC SENATE REVIEW OF
## GENERAL EDUCATION FRESHMAN CLUSTER PROGRAM

**Internal Review Team**

Ellen M. Carpenter, Undergraduate Council, Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences (Review Team Chair)
Jason C.S. Woo, Undergraduate Council, Department of Electrical Engineering
John Carriero, Graduate Council, Department of Philosophy

**External Reviewers**

Edward Taylor, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Affairs, University of Washington
Patricia Turner, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, UC Davis

**Date of Site Visit:**    February 2-3, 2012
**Date of Report:**    March 26, 2012

**Approved by the Undergraduate Council:**    May 4, 2012
**Approved by Graduate Council:**    May 11, 2012

## 2011-2012 UCLA Academic Senate Program Review
## General Education Freshman Cluster Program

INTRODUCTION

The General Education Freshman Cluster Program is an ambitious and multilayered attempt to broaden and deepen the educational experience of incoming freshmen at UCLA. The goals of the program are to immerse the students in an interdisciplinary teaching and learning environment while developing foundational academic skills. Students are challenged in the first two quarters of the three-quarter sequence to use a variety of disciplinary approaches to explore a common problem; in their third quarter, they choose from a variety of capstone seminars in which they put to use the knowledge and skills acquired during the first quarters of the cluster. The clusters as a whole are designed to produce year-long academic and social experiences, in which learning occurs both within and outside the classroom, and faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and students are engaged in a unified objective. The cluster program appears to be a vibrant and dynamic element of the education offered at UCLA, described by both students and faculty as providing a "liberal arts experience" at a large research university. Both internal and external reviewers came to the conclusion that the program is working extremely well and the committee as a whole concurs with these general comments by the external reviewers:

> Throughout the two days of the review, we heard inspiring stories from students, faculty, and staff about the power of the cluster experience. Students and faculty alike maintained that the clusters had the power to be life-changing for both the young people enrolled in them, the teaching assistants who are assigned to the courses, and the instructors who teach them. Patricia Turner, UC Davis, p. 2

> In sum, this program has been unequivocally successful for all involved and is a true gem in the UCLA crown….Student learning and community building are strongly enhanced by learning inside and outside of the classroom. Ed Taylor, University of Washington, p. 5.

What follows is a description of the review process, a summation of the highlights of the program, and recognition of some potential challenges, all of which contribute to our positive and enthusiastic evaluation of goals and achievements of the Cluster Program.

**The Review**

The Freshman Cluster program was launched in 1998 by Judi Smith, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education. The program was started as a five-year initiative, and was reviewed by the Academic Senate at the end of its first five years in 2003-2004. This is the second formal Academic Senate review of the GE Freshman Cluster Program and the first review on an eight-year cycle. The review process began with a self-review drafted by a group of academic administrators in the Division of Undergraduate Education under the direction of Dr. M. Gregory Kendrick, the director of the Freshmen Cluster Program. This document was then revised in collaboration with the Cluster Program's Faculty Advisory Committee, comprised of the faculty coordinators of the clusters.

The formal Academic Senate review began with a pre-site meeting on January 5, 2012, at which the internal members of the review team met with Drs. Judi Smith and Greg Kendrick to review the materials provided for review by the Cluster Program and to discuss the schedule for the upcoming site visit. At the pre-meeting, the internal reviewers requested copies of cluster

course syllabi and any comparative information available about the learning assessments and outcomes of cluster vs. non-cluster GE courses.

The site visit was conducted on February 2-3, 2012. The review team included representatives from the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, and two external reviewers. The review team met with cluster administrators and faculty, graduate student instructors, and current and former students in the cluster program. Meetings were also held with administrative support staff including representatives from the College Library, the Office of Instructional Development, and the Office of Residential Life. At the request of review team members, a meeting was also convened with chairs of the departments from which the cluster faculty are drawn.

## Overview of the Freshman Cluster Program

The General Education Cluster Program is an intensive interdisciplinary educational experience available to students in their freshman year at UCLA. The Clusters are organized as a three-quarter series of classes on a thematically unified topic and are team-taught by groups of faculty from different departments and across disciplines. Students enroll in large lecture classes taught by the faculty for the first two quarters, then participate in small seminar courses taught by both faculty and graduate student instructors in the spring quarter. Students who successfully complete the cluster receive 18 units of credit (6 per quarter) as well as honors credit if they are in the College Honors program. In completing the cluster course sequence, students fulfill four GE requirements usually across several foundational areas in the College GE curriculum. As these courses involve substantial writing, students also receive Writing II credit, satisfying an additional requirement. These credit incentives encourage a large percentage of enrolled students to complete the three-course sequence, although based on a change in College lower division seminar requirements, attrition rates prior to enrollment in the spring seminar are increasing.

The clusters focus on topics of considerable academic and societal importance including the global environment, interracial dynamics, evolution of the cosmos, and frontiers in human aging. Cluster topics are selected in part for their ability to allow interdisciplinary exploration and a central aim of the cluster program is to expose students to the ways that different disciplines examine common problems. Nine to ten clusters have been offered annually during the years under review (2003-2004 to the present). Six clusters have been offered every year, with seven additional clusters offered during some part of the review period. Two clusters (*Inside Performing Arts: Interdisciplinary Explorations of Performance* and *Biotechnology and Society*) have been retired and three new clusters (*Never-Ending Stories: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on Myth*, *Los Angeles: The Cluster*, and *Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society*) have been developed and mounted during the review period. Cluster development is an extensive process, with Phase I encompassing topic conceptualization and faculty recruitment and Phase II encompassing development and implementation of the course proposal, structure, and organization. Phase II also includes review and approval by the relevant Academic Senate committees. Because of the extensive effort involved in cluster development, some funding is provided to support the clusters even before they are offered for student enrollment. By design, cluster faculty are drawn from several departments, which supports the interdisciplinary nature of the clusters but also complicates cluster organization and faculty recruitment. A total of 155 faculty (67 ladder faculty and 88 non-ladder faculty) have provided instruction in the clusters over the last 8 years. In addition, 277 graduate student instructors have served as cluster TAs

and capstone seminar instructors.  These individuals have served almost 14,000 enrolled students, approximately 47% of all College freshmen.  Teaching efforts are enhanced by support from a wide variety of programs including the undergraduate library, the campus writing program, the Office of Instructional Development, and the Office of Residential life.

The cluster program aims to assist incoming freshmen with their transition from high school to college and to provide the skills and knowledge that they will need to succeed at UCLA and in the future.  The program addresses these aims by providing students with an intellectual framework to grasp complex interdisciplinary material and to understand the contributions of different disciplines toward the study of a common topic.  Students are challenged to develop academic skills in critical thinking, problem solving, rhetorical effectiveness, and creative expression and to participate in learning communities encompassing experiences both inside and outside of the classroom.  These clusters require the active engagement of freshman students, graduate teaching assistants, faculty and administrative staff.


THREE PERSPECTIVE VIEWS OF THE FRESHMAN CLUSTER PROGRAM

The Freshmen Cluster Program, described by one external reviewer as "a true gem in UCLA's crown" (Taylor, p. 5), is highly innovative in both design and structure.  It draws together three constituencies – faculty, graduate student instructors, and undergraduate freshmen – in addressing the combined goals of providing foundational skills and knowledge through interdisciplinary teaching and learning, providing exposure to the mission and practices of a research university, and developing yearlong learning communities.  Though many institutions have similar goals,

> [t]his program reaches distinction through team teaching, integration of knowledge around real problems and issues, and multiple and nuanced ways of assessing student learning, all guided by a strong administrative foundation.   Ed Taylor, University of Washington, p. 1.

**Undergraduate Student Perspective**
Roughly 40% of UCLA freshmen elect to enroll in the cluster program each year.  As documented in the self-review, students enrolling in the clusters have on average slightly higher GPAs and SAT scores than non-cluster freshmen, and a significantly higher percentage of cluster students are enrolled in college honors than non-cluster students.  Academic advisors may preferentially steer Honors students to the clusters, as participation enables them to receive honors credit and to complete the coursework necessary to stay in the Honors program.  Cluster enrollment draws heavily from students in the Physical Sciences or Life Sciences, with fewer students from Humanities, Social Sciences, or non-College majors enrolling.  This is a shift from the first review period, where cluster students were predominantly from Humanities or Social Science majors, and may reflect a recognition among science majors of the value of the clusters in fulfilling their non-science GE requirements.

Current and former students speak very highly of their cluster experiences.  Indeed, some students view their experience as transformative, and one indicated "everything I do is because of the cluster".  They have an appreciation for the skills they are developing and for the opportunity to engage in an in-depth interdisciplinary examination of their chosen topic.  They value the contributions of the faculty, and are incredibly appreciative of and grateful to their GSIs.  Even students who did not complete the cluster sequence appreciate what they learned,

even though they ultimately decided the cluster experience was not for them. Former students valued the rigor of the courses, though some state that the cluster sequence was their most challenging coursework at UCLA.

During the Cluster Program's early years, most students who enrolled in the cluster program completed all three quarters. However, beginning in the 2008-2009 academic year, the attrition rate climbed to 26%, with most students completing the first two quarters and dropping out of the Spring quarter seminar. This spike in attrition coincided with a change in curricular requirements that eliminated a requirement for a GE seminar course. This was seen as somewhat problematic to the continued viability of the clusters, given the intensive financial and intellectual resources needed to mount this program. However, cluster course credit was increased from 5 to 6 units per class in Fall 2010 in an effort to countermand this trend, as well as to reflect the student workload in these courses and to justify allowing students to satisfy a fourth GE requirement upon successful completion of the entire three course cluster sequence. Increasing the credit awarded for completing the cluster may provide sufficient incentive to decrease the rate of attrition; this may be evident in future reviews.

In general, both current and past students in the cluster program indicate that the workload is intense, particularly in terms of reading and writing assignments. However, all indications suggest that the hours required fall within the expected 18 hours/week for a 6 unit class. Most students agree that the cluster has been a great learning experience, and that the interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary nature of the course allows them to critically analyze the subjects. Particularly, the spring quarter seminar classes were singled out by many students as rewarding capstone experiences. Several students were concerned about the coordination between lecturers and in some cases, there may be excessive overlapped materials between Fall and Winter quarters. It has also been noted that pedagogically, repeating a certain amount of the material is key to learning. Therefore, while it appears there is always room for improvement, most of the cluster course curricula have been well thought out and provide a challenging yet rewarding learning experience.

Two major ambitions of the cluster program are to develop critical thinking and writing skills and to develop a yearlong learning community. Student achievement in these areas was assessed by review of retrospective survey data from seniors as they exited the university, and by query of current and former students and graduate student instructors. In both areas, the clusters are succeeding admirably. Although many students entered UCLA following high-achieving high school careers, the cluster experience proved to be an eye-opener to many students in terms of the expectations and the rigor of the courses. One repeated theme is that the amount of reading is overwhelming, and, to some students, excessive. However, students appeared to rise to the challenge and senior survey data suggest that students developed critical reading skills, which were then used throughout their careers at UCLA. Discussions with students currently enrolled in the clusters suggested that learning "how and what" to read have been important skills to develop, allowing them to focus their reading, rather than simply plowing through everything. Cluster reading expectations do differ somewhat by topic and field, with some clusters assigning significantly more reading than other clusters.

The interdisciplinarity of the clusters is seen as one of the main strengths of the program, allowing students to be exposed to methods and expectations of a variety of disciplines in response to a common theme. While the students appreciated the different viewpoints and approaches brought by the different disciplines, they also expressed some frustration with how to integrate these interdisciplinary approaches, particularly with regard to tests and assignments.

For some students, it was hard to determine which perspective to use when answering test questions, and this became a challenging part of their education. Some students also found that they had a wrong impression about what the cluster courses would cover and how they would be evaluated, A clear description on course contents and expectations for the students is thus recommended, and should be provided as part of their enrollment packets.

In addition to classroom teaching, the clusters provide opportunities for out-of-classroom education. These ranged from "movie nights" hosted in DeNeve auditorium, to weekend field trips to collect fossils or quarter-long service learning experiences. Students viewed these opportunities as an essential part of their learning experience. In particular, a fossil-collecting field trip prompted vivid recollections from former cluster students as the geologic record unfolded under their feet. All clusters appeared to make substantial efforts to engage students with faculty and GSIs outside of the classroom, and these experiences weighed heavily as positive factors in the memories of the students. The opportunities to interact with faculty and GSIs in discussions and activities served to demystify the faculty and allowed students to witness and engage in academic debates that normally do not happen in a classroom.

Clusters are intensive experiences that demand a substantial amount of commitment from their students and set high standards for academic rigor. Although students thought they were well-prepared for high academic standards, the cluster experience often demonstrated otherwise. Students engaged in an academic topic, and achieved substantial knowledge in that topic, but they also learned critical skills that served them throughout their careers at UCLA. In particular, students increased their writing skills, as noted by the students themselves, and by the GSIs. Students who had "got[ten] by in high school writing papers that were flawless in form but lacked any significant insight" (SR, p. 31) were often stymied by the comments received after turning in their first assignments. However, the GSIs are committed to improving student writing, and work extensively with the students to ensure this outcome. GSIs said that few students wrote well upon entering the clusters, but that improvement was seen among most if not all students during the cluster, and in some cases the improvement was dramatic. However, more objective evaluations may be needed to ensure that all students achieve the needed writing proficiency, and help should be available to the students as needed. Students also developed critical reading skills to allow them to complete the sometimes substantial reading required of them in the clusters, as well as time management skills to enable them to keep up with the demands of the clusters.

**Graduate Student Instructors**

A total of 277 graduate student instructors have participated in the clusters over the past eight years, with many GSIs teaching for more than one year. GSIs are primarily recruited by faculty associated with the clusters and most, though not all, enter with some prior teaching experience. GSIs are primarily drawn from the Humanities and Social Sciences; it has been difficult to attract GSIs from Life and Physical Sciences because these students tend to be supported by research grants or training fellowships.

GSIs experience an autonomy that is different from TAs associated with departmental GEs. As described in the self-review "[as a TA for a non-cluster GE course], the professor would go through the book and lecture; then the TAs would elaborate on selected points. But [in the clusters] it's different. The faculty set up the background for certain work. The only chance that the students have to devour the actual work they've introduced though is in the [discussion and/or lab] sections. So [my work] is more complementary rather than just additive or

elaborative. [In that way], our roles are qualitatively different from what regular TAs do." (SR, p. 53). GSIs are attracted to cluster teaching by the stable salary, eliminating the need to search for TA-ships each quarter and by the chance to design and teach an independent seminar. GSIs feel that cluster teaching well-prepares them to enter an academic position and current TAs indicate that cluster teaching experience has proved to be an attractive factor as they enter this market.

Cluster GSIs receive training in teaching writing, student research resources, Internet use, and seminar syllabus design. Much of this training is provided by administrative support programs such as the college writing program and the Office of Instructional Development. While GSIs value the training they receive, some feel they could use more assistance with writing instruction. In particular, GSIs noted struggles with teaching writing to students whose primary language is not English, and felt they did not have sufficient skills or administrative support to help these students improve their writing, or to develop grading strategies and rubrics that were appropriate for English learners.

GSI involvement in the cluster is intense. Although GSI contractual obligations limit these individuals to no more than 20 hours per week in teaching activities, many GSIs felt they were putting in more than 20 hours, at least in the first year of their participation. Subsequent years were seen as less intensive in terms of time commitment. While GSIs recognized the large time commitment, some felt that it was interfering with their own progress. However, others felt that their Cluster experience enhanced their progress, in part through the stimulation of working with faculty in other disciplines and also through having the opportunity to design and teach a seminar adjacent to their research.

GSIs demonstrated an impressive esprit de corps and clearly enjoyed working with each other. GSIs fed off the collective knowledge of more senior GSIs, and expressed gratitude for the accumulated wisdom of more experienced GSIs that allowed them to steer clear of pitfalls of teaching and to navigate some of the administrative tasks associated with cluster teaching. However, GSIs would appreciate the opportunity to interact with GSIs outside their cluster on a more frequent basis and feel this would help them further develop their skills. One GSI that met with the review panel said she had picked up several new ideas during the review panel meeting alone and wished there were more opportunities to meet informally with other GSIs to gather information.

GSIs work closely with the faculty in the cluster program, meeting usually once a week and occasionally more often to discuss course pedagogy and student expectations. GSIs and faculty also interacted in non-classroom activities such as mealtime discussions, and movie nights with the students. The GSIs seemed happy with the amount of faculty involvement in the courses, and appreciated the opportunities to observe multiple teaching styles and approaches. They felt this was a valuable learning experience for them as they developed their own teaching styles.

Seminar teaching was seen as the highlight of cluster teaching by most GSIs. They valued the chance to develop and teach an independent course in their own area of interest, while still under the mentorship of a team of faculty advisors. GSIs also viewed this as an opportunity to develop skills necessary for landing an academic job and comments made by GSIs currently on the academic job market seem to support this perception.

**Faculty**

Clusters are staffed by 3-5 faculty members, and cluster organizers also serve on the Faculty Advisory Committee. Cluster participants include faculty at all levels, though most seem to be at the associate or full professor level. Cluster faculty are dedicated, engaged, and interactive. They appear excited to participate in cluster teaching and many view it as the highlight of their teaching career. Some faculty enjoy their cluster teaching so much that they engage in it as an overload activity. In fact, many of the faculty we met with reported some overload aspect to their Cluster teaching and few were able to lead a spring seminar because of other teaching responsibilities. While this commitment is impressive, it suggests a basic deficit in how departments view the value of cluster teaching. Faculty view teaching in the cluster as rising to higher standards than that required in departmentally mandated teaching. They attribute this to not only teaching to the students, but teaching to the other cluster faculty as well. Faculty say that they prepare more extensively for cluster teaching and recognized that "the cluster represents a powerful opportunity to teach, mentor, and share ideas and interests" (Taylor, p. 2). Although no formal vetting process was described, cluster faculty are talented and enthusiastic and represent some of the best teachers at UCLA. Faculty suggested that the "expectations and quality of teaching in the cluster[s] rivaled the very best liberal arts colleges in the nation" (Taylor, p. 2).

The faculty appear to derive enormous satisfaction from cluster teaching, and student evaluations suggest that the faculty are doing a good job. While there are some concerns about repetition of some material in some of the clusters, most students feel the faculty lectures are well coordinated. In many clusters, all associated faculty attend every lecture, demonstrating a high degree of engagement in the cluster, and allowing points from one lecture to be reiterated or viewed through the lens of a different discipline in subsequent lectures.

Cluster faculty tend to be drawn from larger departments. This is likely due to the need of smaller departments to retain their faculty for departmental teaching. However, this may artificially limit the disciplines and views that can be included in the clusters and some thought should be given as to how faculty from smaller departments might be able to participate.

Cluster teaching has done an admirable job of drawing faculty from the main campus and integrating them into student residential life on the hill. Faculty participate in, and seem to enjoy, out of class activities such as meals and movie nights that allow them to interact with the students on an informal basis. However, faculty do express some concerns about interactions with the Office of Residential Life, in particular with respect to the availability of audiovisual assistance in the residence hall teaching spaces, and scheduling of classrooms and other spaces for out-of-class activities. Faculty also decry the lack of a clock in DeNeve Auditorium, which makes it difficult to keep to a uniform class schedule.


SPECIFIC CHALLENGES

In the view of the review committee, the Cluster Program has been enormously successful in bringing together motivated and enthusiastic undergraduates, GSIs, and faculty for an intense, year-long academic experience. For many students it is *the* experience they will most remember from the time they spent at UCLA.

The most pressing concern for the program is the continuation of its funding. The Cluster's budget is somewhat more than two million dollars. While that is a significant figure,

especially in this time of stretched resources, it is not clear how much money the College would save if the Cluster Program were ended tomorrow.  This is because the Cluster is responsible for a great many student credit hours, GE requirements, and Writing II requirements.  Without the Cluster program, the College would have to provide other avenues for students to accumulate equivalent credit hours and to satisfy those requirements.  In addition, some faculty who teach in the Cluster do so on an overload basis.  In addition, some of the budget which goes to departments for course buyouts is used to hire temporary instructors, who generate more student credit hours.  However, there was some disagreement about whether course buyout funds are actually used to hire additional instructors.  The Department chairs that we met with suggested that most of the departmental allocation is used for course buyouts, while Vice-Provost Smith told us she believed much less of it was used directly for instruction.

In any case, we would, even in these difficult times, counsel against cutting the Cluster Programs budget.  Other campuses who have tried to emulate UCLA's successful program have failed, largely because of insufficient material support.  At a time when UCLA is trying to attract non-resident students, it gives us, in a highly competitive environment, a recruiting tool of which we can be justifiably proud.  And while the effective cost of the program is not clear, it appears to provide value equal to or above that provided by traditional GE instruction.  With all of this taken into account, the GE Cluster Program seems a real bargain.

This is not to say that the Cluster Program should not energetically seek external funding.  Though some external fundraising was used for the initial implementation of the program, no external funding is currently in place.  Although these are trying financial times, efforts should be made to identify and solicit external funding in support of this program. In keeping with campus-wide budget cuts, funding has diminished slightly for this program, although to a lesser degree than experienced by other campus units.  This is laudable, but likely not sustainable, thus external funding should be sought as a matter of course.

The cluster program currently mounts 9-10 clusters per year and serves approximately 40% of the incoming freshmen at UCLA.  The number of clusters thus meets a goal established at the initiation of the cluster program, but it is not clear if all students who want a cluster seat are able to gain entry.  Another challenge for the future is to determine if the cluster program as it stands is sufficient to meet the needs of the UCLA campus.  If it is not, efforts should be made to expand the cluster program to meet the demand, but not at the expense of quality.  Cluster topics are currently slanted toward the Humanities and Social Sciences, so we recommend directing future expansion toward the sciences.

**Undergraduate Students**

Although the clusters provide a rich and rewarding opportunity for the freshmen, there is some concern about the visibility of the clusters to all incoming freshmen and beyond the UCLA campus. Many freshmen did not learn about the cluster program until their orientation and students have indicated that orientation advisors do not fully understand the cluster program, and in some cases provided incorrect information about the clusters.  The cluster program is a unique feature of education at UCLA, and has the potential to be an excellent marketing tool to attract future students. Thus efforts should be made to introduce the concept of the clusters to incoming students as early as possible, and to increase their visibility both on and off campus.

While the cluster program was viewed as outstanding, there is little comparative data between GE education received in the clusters and GE education received on a departmental basis.  Thus it is hard to determine, in concrete terms, why the clusters are an improvement over

traditional GE education.  While learning outcomes are assessed using cluster-specific instruments, these assessments are not the same as those used by non-cluster GE courses.  Some overlap between assessment methods would facilitate this comparison.

Students expressed concern about the availability of seats within the clusters.  This in particular affects students with late enrollment dates, by which point the more "desirable" clusters are filled and students must scramble for seats in clusters whose topics are less appealing.  A more equitable distribution of cluster seats, perhaps by percentage associated with each enrollment date should be implemented so that students with late enrollment dates are not penalized by the calendar. While it is certainly not possible to provide every student with a seat in their preferred cluster, all efforts should be made to provide every eligible student with a cluster seat, if they want one.

Although demographic and academic profiles of cluster and non-cluster students are similar, there are some modest elevations in GPA and SAT scores in cluster students vs. non-cluster students. There also appears to be a slightly increased number of white, non-Hispanic students in the clusters, and slightly decreased representation of both Asian Americans and African Americans in the clusters.  One external reviewer suggests a possible "two-tiered education system" (Taylor, p. 4) resulting from this distribution.  While there does not appear to be a selection process for students entering the clusters beyond encouragement by enrollment counselors, care should be taken to make sure all entering freshmen are made aware of the cluster program and presented with an opportunity to enroll, should they choose to do so. Enrollment counselors should also be briefed on the mechanics and benefits of cluster enrollment, to avoid providing erroneous information to entering students.

**Graduate Student Instructors**

GSIs appear to reap substantial benefits from their participation in the clusters.  While anecdotal information suggests that cluster teaching is a valuable asset as GSIs enter the job market, future efforts should be made to track outcomes for GSIs who participate in the clusters. These efforts might allow development in the future of specific training resources, such as training grants or fellowship funding, geared toward cluster-based teaching.

While GSIs feel that cluster teaching does not detract from their progress toward their degree, stronger monitoring should be implemented to ensure that GSIs do not exceed their allotted hours.  In addition, because cluster teaching does demand significant preparation from the GSIs, encouraging multi-year appointments, where appropriate, would benefit the GSIs.

Cluster teaching is heavily weighted toward GSIs from the Humanities and Social Sciences.  Efforts should be made to recruit more GSIs from the sciences.  The cluster program is relatively invisible to potential GSIs, unless their faculty mentor happens to be associated with the cluster program, so efforts to improve its visibility among potential GSIs should also be considered.

**Faculty**

Although cluster faculty enjoyed their affiliations with the clusters, they expressed substantial concern about how their cluster teaching was viewed within their home departments. To address these issues, the review team requested a meeting with chairmen of the departments from which cluster faculty are drawn.  Although some department chairs expressed whole-hearted support for having their faculty teach in the clusters, there were a substantial number of department chairs that were not happy with having their faculty participate in cluster teaching.

This dissatisfaction arises from several key points. First, departments feel that they are not receiving adequate teaching credit (in terms of student contact hour credit) for the faculty that they release to cluster teaching. Although the review team was assured by Vice Provost Smith and EVC Waugh in our exit meeting that teaching credit was offered, the department chairs were adamant that it was not awarded appropriately and was not reflected in teaching statistics provided to the departments. Clearly, there is a communication problem here that needs to be addressed (and if past experience is any guide, will need to be readdressed and readdressed in the future). Second, although course buyouts are offered to faculty teaching in the clusters, they are offered at a lower rate than other departmental buyouts. Both the faculty and the department chairs felt this was unfair and should be remedied. Third, the lack of direct faculty evaluations stemming from cluster teaching is seen to impede faculty advancement. Cluster course assessments are collected, but faculty are not individually scored on these assessments, so department chairs are unable to appropriately judge faculty contributions and involvement in these courses. These issues were of great concern to the faculty and were viewed as serious enough to ultimately affect the entire cluster program.

**Administration**

Vice Provost Judi Smith has been a dynamic and dedicated supporter of the cluster program. She has selected an able faculty director, Dr. Greg Kendrick, to carry out the administrative oversight of the cluster, and has enlisted substantial commitment from many areas of the UCLA campus. With Dr. Smith's impending retirement, it is imperative that her successor assume an equally engaged role with the cluster program. Her successor should have a strong commitment to maintaining the excellence and visibility of the cluster program.

SUMMARY

On many levels, the GE Cluster Program has been a resounding success. A large number of freshmen are provided with an extraordinary interdisciplinary experience within the confines of a large research university. Freshmen, graduate student instructors, and faculty all reap benefits based on their association with the program. This vibrant program is clearly worth protecting and continuing for the foreseeable future.

RECOMMENDATIONS

**To the Executive Vice Chancellor and the Dean/Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education:**

1. *Essential:* The cluster program must be protected at all costs. Even in the face of impending campus-wide budget cuts, we encourage continued financial support for the cluster program at a minimum at its current level. Resources should also be dedicated to seeking external funding opportunities.
2. *Essential:* Increase transparency and clarify the awarding of teaching credits to individual departments for releasing their faculty for cluster teaching.

3. Equalize the course buyout rate to parity with established departmental rates, or consider a campus-wide elimination of course buyouts for all programs and departments.
4. Increase the visibility of the cluster program in outreach activities to potential students, and especially to potential donors.
5. Include a specific charter for the support and development of the cluster program in the search for a successor for Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Judi Smith.

**To the Cluster Administrative Team:**

1. *Essential:* Continue the development of new clusters to add to the existing cluster lineup.
2. *Essential:* Revise the cluster assessments to include comparable metrics to non-cluster GE courses. Also include specific assessment tools for individual faculty that can be provided to the faculty's home department to assist in faculty advancement.
3. *Essential:* Improve the quality and visibility of cluster information provided to admissions enrollment counselors including descriptions of cluster content and evaluation methods. Provide training to enrollment counselors in the mission of the clusters and the advantages (and disadvantages) for enrolled students.
4. *Essential:* Work with the Office of Residential Life to improve AV support for cluster teaching on the hill and to ensure installation of a clock in the DeNeve Auditorium.
5. *Essential*: Re-evaluate the training in teaching writing offered to cluster GSIs. Work with the writing program to provide additional training to the GSIs, particularly in offering writing instruction to students where English is not their first language.
6. Improve the visibility of opportunities to become GSIs in the clusters across the campus, but particularly within the sciences.
7. Establish global informal GSI meetings at a reasonable frequency, perhaps once per quarter, to allow exchange of ideas and teaching practices among GSIs across clusters.
8. Develop a mechanism for monitoring GSI hours devoted to cluster activities.
9. Establish a tracking mechanism and maintain a database for GSI post-cluster activities.
10. Establish an enrollment schedule for the clusters whereby entering students with late enrollment dates are not penalized with respect to obtaining a seat in the more popular clusters, perhaps by allotting a certain percentage of seats to each enrollment date.

**Final Recommendation:**

The Undergraduate and Graduate Councils recommend that the next review be scheduled on the regular 8-year cycle in AY 2019-20 pending a satisfactory progress review report.

Respectfully submitted:

Ellen M. Carpenter, Department of Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences, Undergraduate Council, Review Team Chair
John Carriero, Department of Philosophy, Graduate Council
Jason S. Woo, Department of Electrical Engineering, Undergraduate Council

**Appendix I: External Reviewers' Reports**

Edward Taylor, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Affairs, University of Washington

Patricia Turner, Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education, UC Davis

## REPORT ON THE UCLA FRESHMAN CLUSTER PROGRAM
### 2/15/12

Ed Taylor
University of Washington

The Freshman Cluster Program at UCLA is an ambitious, multilayered and innovative way to accomplish undergraduate education goals. The program has established four program components based on recommendations of a 1994-95 general education workgroup. They are:

1. *Interdisciplinary Teaching and Learning.* Yearlong courses "designed to introduce freshmen to the ways in which different disciplines address common problems" (p. 4, Self Review, 2003-11).
2. *Foundational Academic Skills.* Strengthening the critical thinking, problem solving and creative expression skills of UCLA students.
3. *Spring Seminars.* A capstone experience that challenges students to expand their skills and knowledge at the end of the cluster.
4. *Yearlong Learning Communities.* Created through the year-long academic experiences and curricular and co-curricular activities involving instructors, graduate students and freshman.

These aims help students make the transition from high school to college students by introducing them to a wide range of academic themes, disciplines, methods and approaches before they select a major. In many ways these goals are similar to those set out by peer institutions. They represent what we know to be some of the most important skills and knowledge in research universities. This program reaches distinction through team teaching, integration of knowledge around real problems and issues, and multiple and nuanced ways of assessing student learning, all guided by a strong administrative foundation.

### *Is the Cluster Program Meeting its Goals?*

**Undergraduate Student Perspective**
Indeed, the program is meeting its goals. First, the program is serving the needs of UCLA freshman in a variety of ways. Interviews with students who are currently enrolled in the cluster and students who had completed the cluster were very consistent and categorically good. The students repeatedly mentioned that being involved in the program gave them a "sense of comfort in adjusting to college." Many spoke of the value of a "close, hands on learning experience." Some students described the interdisciplinary goals of the program quite succinctly—"the science cluster teaches you how to learn and how to think critically and analytically. The intellectual back and forth is critical to our learning." Some mentioned how their thinking has changed through their work in the cluster: "the program helped me re-evaluate how I view the world and has prepared me to learn for the rest of my life."

UCLA students come to college having experienced academic success in high school. However, the work they have experienced in the program has represented a "step up" for the vast majority of the students in the cluster. This is in large measure due to the intensive work done with the graduate students. As one student noted—"the graduate students really teach you how to read well."

The majority of students reported being close to their faculty throughout the program and felt a responsibility and reciprocal relationship to their professors. Students spoke in thoughtful ways about how they are integrating their knowledge. They described the intellectual "back and forth" as core to their courses. They spoke of being taught to think critically and analytically.

The "social effect" of making friends in the first year that lasted for their four years of college meant a great deal to undergraduate students. The cluster clearly is meeting an important goal of forming learning communities. The benefits of the year-long learning community came through clearly as many of the upper level students who have completed the cluster program described having lasting relationships with peers, faculty and graduate students from the program.

Not all of the cluster discussions were categorically positive. One student we interviewed dropped out of her cluster after her first quarter. She found the work to be hard and fast paced. She noted that she didn't want to satisfy the GE requirement through the cluster if she could get into her major of choice. Yet, even though she did not complete the program she managed to learn a great deal and formed relationships in her first quarter that have persisted during her time at UCLA.

**Faculty Perspective**
Here again, the cluster program is meeting its goals. There is a high level of cohesion and esprit de corps among the faculty teaching in the cluster. While there does not seem to be a specific protocol for how faculty are chosen to teach in the cluster, there is a clear vetting process that invites highly talented and enthusiastic faculty to teach in the program.

The faculty spoke of the importance of keeping debates fresh and finding ways to fight inertia. There is a clear sense of accountability to one another as part of the team teaching model embedded in the program. Several mentioned that the expectations and quality of teaching in the cluster rivaled the very best liberal arts colleges in the nation. One faculty member described the culture of teaching as "epic. . . I taught at Dartmouth and Princeton before coming here and this has been the pedagogical highlight of my career. I live in fear that this program will go away."

The common sentiment among the faculty was that the cluster represents a powerful opportunity to teach, mentor, and share ideas and interests.

Faculty expressed the importance of interdisciplinary thought yet at the same time expressed belief in their own disciplines and the importance of disciplinary depth.

Members of the faculty appreciated being "forced" to be frank with each other due to the team teaching approach. The team and interdisciplinary approach "helped students see beyond false dichotomies" that oftentimes drive classroom discussion.

When asked how faculty assess student learning, some described using large data sets in order to give them hands on experience with data and to begin challenging their assumptions. One faculty member described evidence of learning as observing that students are "asking very different questions when they leave than when they entered. They show their maturity through the questions they ask."

**Teaching Fellows**
The needs of the Teaching Fellows are being met. Indeed, the program is meeting its objectives for all students involved. The experience of the graduate students and teaching fellows is particularly impressive. They spoke of how interdisciplinary teaching allowed them to work closely with faculty and students and to understand "freshman issues" in new and intimate ways. All of the fellows interviewed mentioned being prepared for the job market and nearly all of them aspired to faculty positions in the near future. There is indeed an esprit de corps among the graduate fellows as well, "teaching fellows are some of the best teachers on campus." The graduate students work many hours to assure the experience is rich and challenging for students--so much so that we worried some about what appeared to be work above and beyond their graduate positions. This came up specifically with the amount of time they spend helping improve student writing. Yet, none of the graduate students expressed regret about the amount of work they put into teaching.

Overall, there was consistency throughout the interviews with teaching fellows and students. All talked about the power of the learning environment and described the learning to be reciprocal and dynamic.

Teaching fellows put in extensive amounts of time teaching and caring for the students. While they are busy teaching and reading student work—they mentioned that teaching in the cluster did not impede their own graduate work. In fact, one teaching fellow stated, "One of my favorite parts of teaching in the cluster is that the teaching work is directly relevant to my dissertation. We are encouraged to follow our work."

The Cluster Program is carefully guided and supported by a dedicated and knowledgeable team of administrators, lecturers, librarians, writing program consultants, and representatives from the Office of Residential Life and the Office of Instructional Development. Over the years, the Cluster Program team has cut across institutional boundaries to create seamless learning opportunities for students.

## *What Might Improve the Program?*

The amount of reading required in the cluster came up throughout our discussion. Many of the students mentioned that there was too much reading to truly comprehend and that some of the reading "was not always necessary." Others mentioned that there was not enough accountability for the amount of reading required. On the other hand, faculty seemed quite aware of the amount of required reading and seemed determined that teaching students to read, discern what is important in the readings, the process of time management and material management was an important part of the cluster experience.

Given the intensive writing in the cluster, it is not altogether clear that the graduate students receive ample support throughout the program to serve the students with the kind of consistency they would like. Beyond the initial instruction and training for graduate students at the outset, there is consultation available for graduate fellows. However, some clusters appear to consult regularly, others do not seek help when needed. Both students and graduate fellows mentioned the challenge that arises when trying to assess some of the nuances involved in grading student writing. That being said, we heard consistently that student writing improved dramatically for many students during the

course of their experience. As one graduate fellow said, "Most freshman are poor writers. But I see phenomenal improvement over time in the cluster."

Continuity in providing assistance for teaching and assessing student writing would help strengthen the experience for graduate fellows and ultimately for students. This will be particularly important should the number of international students increase as part of UCLA's admission trend.

A second recommendation is to find ways to create community for faculty and graduate students working in the clusters. On several occasions, participants commented on how wonderful it was to find time just to share ideas and hear what each other is doing across clusters. Such opportunities should be built into the program.

A third recommendation is to consider ways to broaden the profile of this wonderful program. Many of the students did not know about the program until after they arrived at UCLA. The program also has the potential to be a model for other public institutions. This begets the question, how might other universities develop and sustain such a program?

Table 2-2 of the self-study. As table 2-2 of the self-study shows, the program serves fewer African American students than in the non-cluster population. Also, the program's population comes in with higher average HS GPAs and SAT scores and there are more honors students in this group than in the non-cluster group this raises the question of whether students in the cluster are more able than those outside the clusters—creating a kind of two-tiered education system—one for 40% of the most able incoming students (if we can guess that from their GPA, SAT and honors statuses) and another for the remaining 60%. Interestingly, the self-study did not say how students get into the cluster program, but it did say that there was an incentive for honors students to take it. I think you need to recommend that the program try to better represent the full incoming class.

### Challenges

The evaluation of the program, for the most part, is not comparative. In other words, what the cluster students say they are learning is not compared with what students not in the cluster say they have learned. Therefore, it is not completely clear if the clusters are helping students learn/achieve these things or if non-cluster students have similar experiences in their first year at UCLA. Assessment could have two pieces. First, cluster students' perceptions of their experience and their evaluation of it could be compared with those of non-clustered students about their experience. The same instrument could be used to gather the perceptions of both groups. Without a comparison that shows that students learn more or better in the cluster program than students not in it, there is no clear way to tell if the cluster experience is worth the higher cost. Such a comparison of the responses of cluster and non-cluster students to the same survey would count as indirect assessment and further support the long term case for the clusters.

Finally, it is quite important that the greatest challenge the Freshman Cluster Program faces now is finding a suitable replacement for the current Dean and Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education. Judi Smith, in addition to being the founder of the program, has been a source of inspiration, leadership, and advocacy for the program. This will be an important moment to assure that the administrative team is well supported and that a visionary leader is recruited to replace the current dean.

In sum, this program has been unequivocally successful for all involved and is a true gem in the UCLA crown. This program is a great success. Student learning and community building are strongly enhanced by learning inside and outside of the classroom. The partnership with student life to create living/learning community is particularly noteworthy.

In this time of financial austerity and rising tuition, the cluster program must be supported and protected and perhaps even continue to grow and ultimately include more UCLA freshmen.

OFFICE OF THE PROVOST
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8501
TELEPHONE (530) 752-2070
FAX (530) 752-6359
INTERNET: http://provost.ucdavis.edu

February 10, 2012

UCLA Academic Senate

RE: GE Freshman Cluster Program Review

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the review of UCLA's General Education (GE) cluster program. Before offering my comments on the review itself, I would like to commend all of the individuals and constituencies who contributed to making the review experience a pleasant and productive task. From the initial inquiries about my availability to the securing of the cab ride to LAX, UCLA staff, faculty, and students crafted a coherent and manageable process.

I am quite confident that the report penned by the team chair will contain an accurate reflection of my recommendations. We had ample time to work together, and there was very little disagreement amongst us about the caliber of the program. What follows in this letter reflects my perspective as an academic administrator, a vice provost of undergraduate education, from a sister UC campus.

As an administrator, I am attentive to infrastructure, workload, and budgets. The GE cluster program owes much of its success to the initial generous financial investment made in it. Many research university leadership teams would have eschewed the kind of investment, I believe in the neighborhood of two million dollars, required to launch and sustain this program. We learned over the course of our visit that some other universities have tried to implement a UCLA-style cluster program but have not been successful. In each case, it seems that initial endeavors were under-resourced and, as a consequence, were not sustainable. In this environment of reduced state funding, there might be some temptation to decrease the support for this program. While I often say on my own campus that we can't hold any entity completely harmless from our fiscal realities, cuts to the cluster budget should be monitored with great care.

The GE cluster program's success also stems from the investment of human capital in its operation. I was particularly impressed by the session with the administrative team, and I was also intrigued to hear about the role played by the cluster coordinators. In order for a program like this to succeed, faculty members have to be free to focus their energies on the nuts and bolts of the course itself. The details of making it happen are best delegated to professional staff, and the conspicuous enthusiasm the faculty have for this program can be traced not only to the quality of students and colleagues with whom they get to interact but also to the fact that there are others charged with operationalizing the clusters. Again, these are days when we are all required to justify expenditures on staff support. I encourage UCLA to avoid making the support for the clusters too lean.

Throughout the two days of the review, we heard inspiring stories from students, faculty, and staff about the power of the cluster experience. Students and faculty alike maintained that the clusters had the power to be life-changing for both the young people enrolled in them, the teaching assistants who are assigned to the courses, and the instructors who teach them. These were just the kind of stories that development officers often covet for convincing individual donors, corporate officials, and foundation officers of the wisdom of giving money to the university. If it is not already seeking external support for the cluster program, I encourage UCLA to determine the feasibility of soliciting such revenue streams specifically for it.

My administrative responsibilities also include the role as UCD's accreditation liaison officer for the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC). WASC's expectations for evidence of student learning continues to increase. I, like Dean and Vice Provost Smith, find many of their plans for collecting this data from institutions problematic. Nonetheless, my research into nation-wide practices leads me to conclude that UCLA, like other large public research universities, will be called upon in its next WASC review to provide evidence of student learning as is relevant to the goals of a general education curriculum. In order to meet WASC's current guidelines, UCLA has launched data collection relevant to its capstone courses. I recommend UCLA begin to contemplate how direct evidence of student learning could be collected from the clusters.

Given the overall satisfaction that students and faculty have with the cluster program, it is tempting to encourage the institution to make it available beyond the current 40-45% of students who enroll in it. I suggest that UCLA should continue to try to provide a cluster space (not a first choice cluster space) to every student who seeks one, and the current 9-10 clusters per year seems to meet that standard. I do think that if any expansion could be contemplated, some kind of program that would provide transfer students with the educational opportunities "native" students have should be advanced. I recognize that transfer students frequently are admitted with their GE requirements already satisfied, but it seems unfortunate that this population, which often contains many first generation students, will be unlikely to have access to the many positive attributes of the clusters.

I appreciate the opportunity I have had to familiarize myself with UCLA's cluster program. I will continue to follow it with great interest. I am happy to answer any questions you may have regarding my observations.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Turner
Vice Provost – Undergraduate Education

**Appendix II: Site Visit Schedule**

**2011-2012 UCLA Academic Senate Program Review**
**GE Freshman Cluster Program**

Review Team
Edward Taylor, University of Washington
Patricia Turner, UC Davis
Ellen M. Carpenter, Undergraduate Council, Review Team Chair
Jason C. S. Woo, Undergraduate Council, Review Team Member
John Carriero, Graduate Council, Review Team Member

SITE VISIT: FEBRUARY 2-3, 2012
*All meetings on Feb. 2nd will be held in 3135 Murphy.*
*All meetings on Feb. 3rd will be held in 1215 Murphy, unless otherwise noted.*

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1:

**7:00 p.m.** Dinner Meeting: Initial Organizational Session for *Review Team Members Only*
**WEST Restaurant**, Hotel Angeleno *(170. N. Church Lane, LA, CA 90049; 310-476-6411)*

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2:

**8:00 a.m.** Breakfast Discussion with Dean/Vice Provost Judi Smith

**9:00 a.m.** Meeting with Director M. Gregory Kendrick and Convener of the Faculty Advisory Committee Professor Joseph Nagy

**10:00 a.m.** Meeting with Administrative Team:
Lucy Blackmar, Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Initiatives
M. Gregory Kendrick, Director, Freshman Cluster Program
Jeff Decker, Instructional Coordinator, Freshman Cluster Program
Marc Levis-Fitzgerald, Director, Survery Research and Curricular Assessment, Center for Educational Research
Jennifer Lindholm, Director, Learning Assessment and Special Projects, Center for Educational Research

**11:00 a.m.** Meeting with Faculty Advisory Committee:
Joseph Nagy, Professor, English (Committee Convener)
Keith Stolzenbach, Professor, Civil and Environmental Engineering
Theodore Porter, Professor, History
Tobias Higbie, Associate Professor, History
James Larkin, Professor, Physics and Astronomy
Abigail Saguy, Associate Professor, Sociology
Rita Effros, Professor, Pathology and Laboratory Medicine (on behalf of JoAnn Damron)
Tamara Black, Lecturer, Sociology (on behalf of Abigail Saguy)

**12:00 p.m.   Faculty Center.** Lunch – *Review Team Members Only*

 **1:00 p.m.**   Meeting with Representative Faculty:
Wolf Buermann, Assistant Adjunct Professor, UCLA Institute of the Environment and Sustainability/Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, GE Cluster M1 *(The Global Environment)*
Martie Haselton, Associate Professor, Communication Studies/Psych Interdiscplinary, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society)*
Paul Hsu, Assistant Adjunct Professor, Public Health – Epidemiology, GE Cluster 80 (Frontiers in Human Aging)*
Christopher Kelty, Associate Professor, Center for Society and Genetics/Anthropology, GE Cluster 21 *(History of Modern Thought)*
Lynn Vavreck, Associate Professor, Political Science, GE Cluster 60 *(America in the Sixties)***
*will be leaving at 2pm to teach class; **will be arriving late, around 1:30pm*

 **2:30 p.m.**   Meeting with Representative Graduate Students:
Wayne Bass, GE Cluster 30 *(Perspectives on Myth)*, AY 2009-2012
Dorian Deshauer, GE Cluster 21 *(History of Modern Thought)*, AY 2011-2012
Cory Goodling, GE Cluster 20 *(Interracial Dynamics)*, AY 2009-2012
Laura Griffin, GE Cluster 70 *(Evolution of the Cosmos and Life),* AY 2009-2012
Lianna Hart, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society)*, AY 2011-2012
Andrew Hill, GE Cluster 80 *(Frontiers in Human Aging)*, AY 2011 – 2012
David Hull, GE Cluster 21 *(History of Modern Thought)*, AY 2010-2012
Catherine Macris, GE Cluster 70 *(Evolution of the Cosmos and Life)*, AY 2011-2012
Raul Moreno, GE Cluster 20 *(Interracial Dynamics)*, AY 2011-2012
 Bryan Moy, GE Cluster M1 *(The Global Environment)*, AY 2011 - 12
Tuck Ngun, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society)*, AY 2009-2012
Zahra Tehrani, GE Cluster 80 *(Frontiers in Human Aging)*, AY 2011-2012

 **3:30 p.m.**   Meeting with Representative Current Undergraduate Students:
Saundra Albers**,** GE Cluster 60 *(America in the Sixties)*
Savanah Badalich, GE Cluster 21 *(History of Modern Thought)*
Natalie Charney, GE Cluster 80 *(Frontiers in Human Aging)*
 Emily Cheng, GE Cluster 30 *(Perspectives on Myth)*
 Adrena Collins, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society)*
 Yamuna Mary Haroutunian, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society*
Jessica Juwono, GE Cluster 80 *(Frontiers in Human Aging)*
Jessica Lee, GE Cluster 30 *(Perspectives on Myth)*
 Ellen Lomonico, GE Cluster M1 *(Global Environment)*
Marlon Meyerson, GE Cluster 60 *(America in the Sixties)*
 Natalie Richards, GE Cluster 80 *(Frontiers in Human Aging)*
Julia Sommer, GE Cluster M1 *(Global Environment)*
Cyrus Sinai, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society)*
Erin Sakakibara, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society)*
Nico Valencia,GE Cluster 80 *(Frontiers in Human Aging)*
Lauren Vaughn, GE Cluster 30 *(Perspectives on Myth)*
 Jordan Waite, GE Cluster 20 *(Interracial Dynamics)*
Katie Westbrook, GE Cluster 72 *(Sex: From Biology to Gendered Society)*

**4:30 p.m.**   Meeting with Representative Former Undergraduate Students:
Amy Franklin, GE Cluster 20 *(Interracial Dynamics)*, AY 2008-2009*
Irene Gilchriese, GE Cluster 70 *(Evolution of the Cosmos and Life),* AY 2008-2009
Kris Holz, GE Cluster 60 *(America in the Sixties)*, AY 2008-2009
Gus Johannsen, GE Cluster 70 *(Evolution of the Cosmos and Life)*, AY 2008-2009
Jarrett Johnson, GE Cluster M24 *(Work, Labor, and Social Justice)*, AY 2009-2010*
Alex Romanak, GE Cluster 60 *(America in the Sixties)*, AY 2008-2009
Eena Singh, GE Cluster 20 *(Interracial Dynamics)*, AY 2009-2010
David Tracy, GE Cluster 70 *(Evolution of the Cosmos and Life),* AY 2008-2009
 *will be leaving at 5pm to go to class*

**5:30 p.m.**   Closed Session for *Review Team Only*

**6:00 p.m.**   Reception Dinner in Westwood hosted by Dean/Vice Provost Judi Smith:
Director M. Gregory Kendrick, Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education
Initiatives Lucy Blackmar
**Tanino Ristorante Bar** (1043 Westwood Blvd., Los Angeles, CA 90024, 310-208-0444)

**8:00 a.m.**   Breakfast Meeting for *Review Team Members Only* (to be arranged by ASO)

**9:00 a.m.**   Meeting with Instructional Support Group:
Diane Mizrachi, Librarian, College Library
Larry Loeher, Assistant Vice Provost, Office of Instructional Development
Bruce Beiderwell, Director, Writing Programs
Jenny Byrd, Program Support Coordinator, Office of Residential Life

**10:00 a.m.**   Individual 15 Minute Meetings with those faculty, students, and staff who request:
10:00
10:15
10:30
10:45   Tim Tangherlini, Chair, Scandinavian Section
11:00
11:15   Tony Friscia, Instructional Coordinator, Freshman Cluster Program

**11:30 p.m.**   **Faculty Center.** Lunch – *Review Team Members Only*

**1:00 p.m.**   Meeting with Participating Department Chairs
Dan Blumstein, Professor, on behalf of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
George Dutton, Associate Professor, on behalf of Asian Languages and Cultures
Robert Fink, Chair, Musicology
Craig Manning, Chair, Earth and Space Sciences
David Myers, Chair, History
Suzanne Paulson, Vice Chair, Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences

**2:00 p.m.**   Closed Session – *Review Team Members Only*

**3:00 p.m.**   Review Team Wrap-Up Meeting with Dean/Vice Provost Judi Smith and Director M. Gregory Kendrick

**4:00 p.m.**   **2121 Murphy.** Exit Meeting with Dean/Vice Provost Judi Smith, Director M. Gregory Kendrick, Assistant Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Initiatives Lucy Blackmar, Executive Vice Chancellor/Provost Scott Waugh, Vice Provost for Faculty Diversity and Development Christine Littleton, Undergraduate Council Vice Chair Troy Carter, Graduate Council Vice Chair Evelyn Blumenberg, CPB Representative Massimo Ciavolella, and FEC Michael Gutperle

## Appendix III: Self-Review Report

*The self-review was previously distributed.*
*If you need a hard copy, please contact the Academic Senate Office at extension 62959.*