

UCLA 1999-2000 Report on Outreach Programs

University of California,
Los Angeles

Co-Chairs

Winston Doby

Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

Aimée Dorr

Dean of the
Graduate School of Education
and Information Studies

OUTREACH

PROGRAMS

1999-2000 Report on Outreach Programs Introduction: Continued Works in Progress

UCLA Outreach continues to be a “works in progress.” When the Outreach Task Force was published we realized that new programs would need to be developed. A program that focused on developing competitive eligibility, the Career Based Outreach Program (CBOP), was created using the best practices of the Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP) and other campus outreach programs as a foundation. We also realized that an entirely new type of relationship with schools would need to be established. The school-university partnerships were built on the foundation of years of work with the California Subject Matter Projects and other professional development programs: Eisenhower, Math Diagnostic Testing Project, and Teacher Education Program.

UCLA Outreach programs started the 1999-2000 school year serving 58 high schools and many of their feeder schools in seven school districts. UCLA will begin the 2000-2001 school years serving 59 high schools and many of their feeder schools in seven school districts. (See Appendix A for a “List of UCLA Outreach Schools and Districts.”) The change from 58 to 59 high schools results from several changes. Three high schools previously served by UCLA transferred to UC Irvine as SUP schools supported by funding from the UC Los Angeles Basin Initiative. Three high schools dropped from *information-only* EAOPs service and one high school returned to *information/only* service after a hiatus of several years. The six high schools of the Antelope Valley Union High School District also join as UC Bound schools supported by funding from the UC Los Angeles Basin Initiative.

Although our earliest work focused on developing new programs, we viewed the division of student-centered and school-centered programs as artificial and needing to be diminished. We began by having student-centered and school-centered in place at the same schools whenever possible. Each of our school-centered, school-university partnership high schools included a CBOP component from the inception of this new outreach effort.

We have learned a great deal as we have developed this new set of outreach programs. We have focused on developing a research-based theoretical framework, establishing effective communications, coordinating and integrating our student- and school-centered programs, and evaluating our efforts. Our major tools have been meetings (ranging from retreats to regularly scheduled meetings to many informal conversations), monthly reports shared across programs, a supporting governance infrastructure, appointing individuals (principal investigators) to be responsible for program implementation and results, and creating a comprehensive evaluation system to meet both our reporting requirements as well as provide formative feedback to optimize program effectiveness.

Communications

UCLA’s first Outreach Retreat was held in June of 1998. The initial sessions of the UCLA Outreach Steering Committee Retreat were held on June 22-23 on campus at the Covell Commons, and the concluding session was held at the Outreach Steering Committee meeting on July 16, 1998. Eighty-five individuals representing UCLA outreach programs from both

campus and K-12 schools attended the retreat. The primary goal of the retreat was to update the Outreach Steering Committee on the progress of outreach programs during 1997-98 so they could provide advice and direction for program planning for this coming year. The retreat also provided the opportunity to update representatives of the participating outreach programs on the year's progress in informational outreach, academic development programs, school-centered partnerships, and research and evaluation. The retreat also provided an opportunity for retreat participants to meet each other and begin to develop an outreach community at UCLA.

During the 1998-99 school year we recognized that while CBOP and the school-university partnerships were in place, there was not enough coordination between them. As a result, a second Outreach Retreat was held in July of 1999 with virtually all outreach program staff in attendance. The retreat had three major foci. First, the theory underpinning the UCLA Outreach program, including the vision and six conditions, was presented. (Refer to Appendix B for information about the theoretical framework). Second, staff from each of the programs (CBOP/EAOP, the three school-university partnerships, the Super 8 Collaborative, community college, and student-initiated programs) made presentations so all outreach program staff could learn about the extent of UCLA's outreach programs. Third, staff from the various programs would get acquainted and begin conversations about how to better coordinate the various programs' activities.

A third Outreach Retreat was held this past September to build a common culture among outreach program staff and to extend the effort to bring together the various UCLA outreach programs into a more coordinated, integrated structure. The discussions in the various group meetings at the retreat confirmed the reorganization plans of the Leadership GROUP.

Monthly PI (principal investigator) meetings with leaders of partnerships and programs were particularly effective in keeping program staff from various programs updated. Monthly reports were distributed just prior to the meeting and discussed at the start of each meeting. Both the school-centered (School Centered Outreach Coordinating Committee or SCOCC) and student-centered (EAOPs) also had regularly scheduled meetings to foster intra-program communications. School site coordinating teams were also established, but their effectiveness varied widely from site to site.

Governance and Support Infrastructure

Our governance and infrastructure continue to evolve. We began in 1997 with an ad hoc committee of a dozen or so individuals who were involved with the new outreach effort. In January of 1998 Chancellor Carnesale appointed an Outreach Steering Committee (OSC), co-chaired by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs (Winston Doby) and the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies (GSE&IS) (Ted Mitchell), that met bi-weekly until mid-way through the 1998-99 school-year. Shortly after Harold Levine (Interim Dean of GSE&IS) replaced Ted Mitchell as co-chair, it was determined that the entire OSC did not need to meet as often, and that a small leadership group (the GROUP) should meet weekly to "manage" the outreach effort. The PI group also began meeting monthly to foster inter-program communications. The OSC then began meeting quarterly. This continued this past year when

Aimée Dorr, the newly appointed Dean of GSE&IS, became the co-chair with Winston Doby. (Refer to Appendix C for Rosters of UCLA Outreach Committees).

As a committed learning organization we continue to explore how to best organize and support our outreach efforts. As indicated earlier, we recognized from the beginning that the school-centered and student-centered programs needed to be highly coordinated, if not integrated at school sites in communities. As this report is being written, we are reorganizing our governance structure from a program-driven (i.e., school-university partnerships, student-centered programs, community college programs) control structure to a partnership-driven (i.e., district or group of program-alike schools) control structure with a partnership leader responsible for programmatic decisions and results in that partnership. The Leadership GROUP will become an Executive Committee with policy responsibilities and an Operating Committee with Chief Operating Officers (three at the present time) will be responsible for managing operations.

Recognizing that our early evaluation efforts had a programmatic focus, we have initiated development of a comprehensive evaluation structure, led by Professor Marvin Alkin from the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, that will address both our reporting requirements and our needs to evaluate the effectiveness of our programmatic efforts. That new evaluation structure is presently being implemented.

We continue to be a “works in progress” as we explore how to best accomplish our outreach goals.

Section A.1 School University Partnerships

Narrative Update

1. Describe the development of school/university partnerships over the past year. This includes changes in sites, coordination among programs, and campus support structures.

As indicated in the Introduction, UCLA Outreach programs were active in 58 high schools and many of their feeder schools in seven school districts. Nineteen of those high schools were served by CBOP. The K-12 School University Partnerships (SUP) that seek to build school capacity and work with students simultaneously were in place in three of the 19 CBOP high schools and their feeder schools (Venice and Westchester High Schools in Local District D of the Los Angeles Unified School District and Lynwood High School in the Lynwood Unified School District). Middle/high school partnerships were active in two of the 20 high schools (Inglewood and Morningside high schools in the Inglewood Unified School District). High school partnerships that are beginning to involve feeder middle schools were active in 12 high schools (Super 12—formerly Super 8) in the Los Angeles Unified School District.

The initial three SUPs continued with their basic programs. The major change this past year occurred in the Super 8 Collaborative with the addition of four high schools to form the Super 12. Funding from the UC Los Angeles Basin Initiative enabled these schools to add a professional development/school reform element to their CBOP program to move them to SUP status.

As indicated in the Introduction, campus-level coordination occurred through the weekly meetings of the GROUP. This group included the co-chairs (Vice Chancellor Winston Doby, Dean Aimée Dorr), Professor Jeannie Oakes representing school-centered programs, Assistant Vice Chancellor Jane Permaul representing student-centered programs, Associate Vice Chancellor Raymund Paredes representing community college programs and the Community Education Resource Centers (CERC), Assistant Vice Chancellor Keith Parker representing Governmental Relations, Assistant Vice Chancellor Tobi Inlander representing External Affairs, Assistant Vice Chancellor Max Benavidez representing campus communications, and Jack Sutton the Executive Officer of the OSC.

Program coordination also occurred through the monthly PI meetings that included key staff of the SUPs, EAOPs/CBOP, MESA, and members of the GROUP. The PI meetings provided a forum to maintain the connections among programs, engage in joint planning, and regularly report progress, challenges and successes.

Coordination of programs at the school sites was the responsibility of the appointed principal investigator. Site coordination teams were formed at the partnership school sites but had varying levels of success.

The major change in the sites occurred in the Los Angeles Unified School District as a district reorganization was announced in January. While the Venice-Westchester SUP was not affected in a significant manner, the Super 12 Collaborative, which was just beginning and includes the lowest performing schools in the District, had a more difficult time. Funding for the professional

development activities came from the District and funding was frozen in early Spring, while the District reorganization was underway.

On the whole, from the 1998-99 to the 1999-2000 academic year there has been a great deal of stability in partnership sites, program coordination and campus support structures.

2. To the extent that educational strategies have changed since the 1998-99 reporting, provide an update. This might include overlap with professional development activities within the University, new alliances in educational programming, or specific development in program areas.

UCLA's outreach efforts are focused on increasing diversity on UC campuses by significantly increasing the number of UC eligible and UC competitively eligible students in our Outreach schools. Our vision is that UCLA Outreach will help provide all students in these schools with the educational opportunities and supports they need to fulfill their potential. In 1998-99 a theoretical framework to guide our work was developed and clearly articulated. Informed by the research on college-going behavior and on the relationships among school structure and social organization, curriculum, teaching practices, and student achievement, six conditions were identified that seemed essential for our vision to be realized. (See Appendix B for information about the six conditions.)

This past year a concerted effort was made to discuss the theory of action internally with University personnel engaged in outreach work and with our partners. A more consistent effort was made to align partnership activities to achieve one or more of the six conditions in the schools and communities in which we work.

Discussions about a Community Education and Resource Centers (CERC) Initiative, conceived as part of University of California outreach initiatives in the Bay Area and Los Angeles, began at UCLA during the 1999-2000 academic year. UCLA Chancellor Albert Carnesale stated that the purpose of CERC "...is to increase the presence and accessibility of UCLA and the University of California in the local community and to strengthen our ability to form meaningful partnerships with community-based organizations in pursuit of our shared educational goals." The goals of CERC are:

1. To make the University's resources more accessible and more focused on addressing community-identified barriers that inhibit educational achievement of the community's youth
2. To assess UCLA's community-based activities and to develop a campus-wide, coordinated strategy in partnership with community leaders
3. To augment current UC efforts to improve overall academic performance of partner schools and colleges that are near to CERC sites
4. To serve as a clearinghouse for brokering services to communities based on the needs of its youth
5. To have a measurable impact on educational achievement and the increased capacity for communities to collaborate across the city to enhance educational opportunity

Sites for four CERC were identified at the locations of well-established community organizations and a fifth site was identified in the City of Inglewood with the 100 Black Men of Los Angeles, Inc. and City of Inglewood serving as the initial principal partners. (See Appendix D for a map showing UCLA CERC sites.) Conversations about the connections between the other four CERC sites and partnership schools were just beginning as the academic year drew to a close. In Inglewood, a new community site, a major effort was made to establish the connections between the existing Partnership and the CERC from the very beginning. Community organization leaders as well as city and school officials were invited in May to a meeting at the 100 Black Men building where UCLA Outreach and the role of CERC were presented. Building connections between CERC and partnership schools will be a major initiative in 2000-2001.

Applying for grants to support Outreach work was another goal in 1999-2000. The three Inglewood and Lynwood high schools joined with their UCLA partner to apply for an Academic Improvement and Achievement grant. Although the grant was not approved, the joint work of teachers and administrators from the three schools in two districts produced some positive results in terms of clarifying the steps that needed to be undertaken to increase college preparation levels of students.

A GEAR UP grant, focusing on one middle school in Inglewood, was written by UCLA staff and faculty with the approval of the Interim Inglewood Superintendent. The GEAR Up proposal was funded for \$4.2 million over five years. Its implementation will begin in 2000-2001.

The California Academic Partnership Program awarded the two Inglewood High Schools approximately \$150,000 a year each for five years to improve students' achievement in language arts and mathematics in order to increase college eligibility. Planning for and implementation of the grant has become a major Partnership activity.

- 3. Describe the central challenges that engage the work of partnership staff in the development and strengthening of partnership work. Three types of challenges are suggested:**
- a) Technical challenges—the design and content of partnership work;**
 - b) Cultural challenges—belief, values and expectations of the partners involved;**
 - c) Political challenges—relationships, resources, and turf battles that are part of partnership work.**

Technical Challenges

Four major technical challenges confronted University personnel working in partnership Districts and schools: communications, organizational dysfunction, data systems, and personnel turnover. University personnel accustomed to communicating regularly utilizing e-mail and voice mail found making contact with partnership school districts without the same technology in place very frustrating. Breakdowns and slow repairs to fax machines exacerbated the communications dilemma. "Phone tag" could delay contacts for many days. Clerical personnel could not be relied on to relay accurate messages, telephone calls were frequently not returned for lengthy periods of time or not at all, and follow-up to perceived agreements was spotty. Notices about meetings and

events for teachers and parents that were to be distributed through the offices of principals often sat on desks for long periods of time, resulting in missed or late registrations, or were never delivered at all.

Relationship-building over time and making adaptations to the communications process utilized helped significantly in improving communications. For example, university personnel worked diligently to get to know well district clerical personnel, stopping to talk with them when in the district and at school offices, and helping them to understand more about our work together. Redundancy was built into communications by informing teachers and parents of activities directly in addition to providing information to administrators. Copies of important notices were provided to administrators at several levels of each district's organization. Once we learned how to adapt to the conditions as they existed, many of the communications difficulties were mitigated.

Good news is on the horizon— all of the partnership districts are making significant progress in installing e-mail networks that should be functioning sometime in 2000-2001. Communications in the Venice/Westchester Partnership was facilitated by Partnership Coordinators at each of the schools. These individuals were selected by the principals from a pool of candidates who volunteered for the position requiring attendance at monthly meetings at which Partnership issues and events were discussed. The coordinators were expected to be advocates for Partnership goals and to communicate Partnership news to the teachers at their schools. They received a monthly stipend for their additional responsibilities. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that sufficient funds will be available in the future to continue the stipends and we can't be sure if the coordinators will want to continue in their role without compensation.

Various degrees of dysfunction exist in each of the Partnerships districts and in many of the schools. Several have the tendency to work in a crisis mode. Paperwork, signatures required on documents, scheduling of meetings and program development frequently get taken care of at the last moment making it appear at times that the University is not doing its job. Paper processing for purchase orders of materials and supplies requested in a timely manner is often neglected causing items essential for instruction not to be delivered when expected. Frequently, district personnel have difficulty in finding the paper work that is important to completing reports. In a number of instances personnel departments are slow to process the employment of new teachers; good candidates including some recommended by the UCLA Teacher Education Program accepted jobs elsewhere out of frustration.

Given the goals of outreach, attaining the requisite data to measure progress in student performance is essential. One of the major challenges we have had is the collection of the needed data in a timely manner. Each of the Partnership districts, in varying degrees, has had hardware, software, and personnel problems in their data processing departments. Aligning the data needs of the Partnership with District practices has been a continuous challenge with progress being measured in small increments. Some positive signs include the Los Angeles Unified School District getting its longitudinal data base system functioning effectively in 1999-2000; Inglewood has employed, beginning in July 2000, two very qualified individuals to provide leadership; and Lynwood has also recently placed in charge of their data systems department an individual who is very positive about working with the Partnership. Another activity that is helping schools in two of the Partnerships to focus more on the use of data to inform instructional decision making is the formation of data teams at each school site. The Achievement Council has been engaged in the Venice/Westchester

and Inglewood schools to train principals and teacher leaders how to gather and interpret data to improve student performance. The Lynwood District is considering a similar initiative next year.

The final and, perhaps, the most critical technical challenge has been personnel turnover, especially among administrators. In the three years UCLA has been working with its Partnership districts Inglewood and Lynwood have each had three different superintendents. Elections in Lynwood replaced two of the five school board members. During the 1999-2000 school year three new LAUSD school board members were elected, the new board replaced the incumbent superintendent with an interim appointment and at the end of the year employed Governor Roy Romer as the permanent superintendent. A new organizational structure in Los Angeles created eleven sub-districts and eliminated the cluster concept. (As of July 1, 2000, thirteen of the fourteen superintendents we work with took office, with the fourteenth having been in office for five months.) All of the Partnership Districts experiences some turnover in top level leadership including a new deputy superintendent for instruction in Lynwood and new assistant superintendent for administrative services in Inglewood. Also in Inglewood, the assistant superintendent for personnel position has been vacant most of the year. A number of schools also were assigned new principals.

The success of a school district-university partnership is largely dependent on the strong support of the school superintendent. Each time the chief executive position turns over a new pattern of relationships needs to be established. The new leader has to be satisfied that there is an alignment between his or her goals and those of the Partnership. We have been fortunate. In every instance, new Partnership superintendents have been articulate in expressing to subordinates their support for the collaboration with UCLA. Developing the required level of trust was facilitated by district boards of education that were kept informed about Partnership activities and fully embraced its goals. The trust and support of other top-level district personnel and site administrators are also essential. University personnel, as a highest priority, diligently work at building relationships and informing new administrators about Partnership activities in their district and school. They spend a great deal of time onsite visits engaging administrators, teachers and other personnel in conversations related to Partnership work. Unlike the experience that district teachers and administrators have had with universities in the past which tended to be short term and specific program focused, there is a growing recognition of and appreciation for the sustained, long term engagement with the UCLA-district partnerships.

Cultural Challenges

The actions and comments of an overwhelming number of administrators and teachers in Partnership schools suggest that they do not believe many more of their students are capable of achieving at high levels. An examination of school structures supports that conclusion. Entry to college preparatory courses, including Advanced Placement and honors classes, is restrictive. Master schedules indicate that rigid tracking systems are in place. Clearly college-going is not widely promoted. Too many teachers, as indicated by their attendance patterns, do not take their responsibility to students seriously and the attendance rates of students is also poor. Many administrators and teachers are threatened by efforts to engage parents actively in improving the quality of the curriculum and teaching. Institutionalizing the concept of “partnership” at both the district and university has been a particular challenge. Many at the school level view

the university as just another service provider while at the University there is still a tendency to view Outreach as UC work rather than as a shared responsibility. Sensitivity on the part of both UCLA and district personnel to the notion of a Partnership as the collaboration of two institutions with common goals for increasing student achievement and college attendance has grown over the past year.

Political Challenges

Two of the Partnership districts (Inglewood and Lynwood) have experienced significant demographic shifts over the past several years. The student population in both communities has changed from being majority African American to predominately Latino. Most of the administrative, teaching and school board positions in both districts continue to be filled by African Americans. The same is true in the city governments. During the past year a shift in power on the Lynwood School Board took place. Two Latinas were elected replacing two African Americans. This shift has increased the activism of Latino parents and is causing the administrative staff to be more attentive to the needs of a population that previously had been underserved.

In Inglewood, except for one Latino city council member, there is no evidence of any change in the power structure to reflect the large Latino population. There is some evidence of growing tensions between the African American and Latino communities. In Inglewood there is an eight-year term limit for board members. The political ambitions of several members have adversely impacted the quality of some personnel and fiscal decisions they have made. It is clear that one role that the Inglewood CERC can play is to help bring about the conditions that will permit the inevitable power shift without the rancor and divisiveness that frequently accompany such changes. Individuals making hiring decisions in both districts have not actively sought or encouraged the employment of Latinos. Consequently, those who are hired often find a climate that is not supportive and tend not to remain. The only Latina principal in Inglewood left the district in mid-year.

These are the major political challenges faced in these two partnerships. In the Los Angeles Unified School District there were many political implications inherent in the restructuring. The attention and energy of many key Partnership players during the second half of the year was diverted from our mutual goals to vying for the top leadership positions that were advertised. It was difficult to determine who was authorized to make many decisions and the uncertainty had an adverse impact, especially with the Super 12 schools.

- 4. Please assess how satisfied you were with progress for the 1999-00 year. For example:**
 - a. What were the primary goals for the year and were they accomplished?**
 - b. To the extent that UC goals and partner school goals differed at the start of the year, have they converged?**
 - c. Did both the University and the partnership schools faculty and staff fulfill their expectations this year?**

Each of the Partnerships made a concerted effort to align specific goals to achieve one or more of the six conditions deemed essential to increasing the number of students prepared and competitive for college admission. The goals and outcomes for each of the Partnerships follow:

The primary goals in the second full year of the Inglewood Partnership were 1) to support and assist district teachers in the planning and implementation of effective teaching strategies, and 2) to improve literacy skills for middle and high school students. These goals and their priority are aligned with the purposes of UCLA Outreach and with the district's strategic plan. Based on written evaluations, personal interviews and on-site observations, the progress of outreach in Inglewood did, in general, meet university and district expectations. Although improvements in student achievement were modest, at best, there is a building confidence and consensus in the schools that the goals of the Partnership are obtainable and will improve student achievement over time.

In Lynwood the primary goals were to build school site leadership team capacity to improve instruction in mathematics and language arts. The long-range goal is a rigorous academic curriculum aligned with state standards and high quality teaching. At the end of year school presentations made at professional development institutes and in teacher reflections included in their portfolios, it was evident that many teachers at a number of schools showed considerable growth. Progress was made primarily at schools with principals who provided strong instructional leadership. Our challenge is how best to bring along leaders who have been less supportive.

The Venice/Westchester Partnership goals were developed by an advisory committee that included university and district personnel. The primary goals were 1) to have a literacy coach in every school, and 2) to create a college going culture at all schools. The first goal was achieved with very positive results as reported by principals, teachers and the literacy coaches. Excellent progress was made toward building a college going culture by the addition of a college coach at each middle and high school, visits to college campuses and holding a community college fair for all schools in the Partnership.

Goals for the Super 12 schools focused around CBOP as an initial step in building an academic infrastructure for all students. Principals of the Super 8 schools agreed that a minimum of eight teachers per year—two from English, Math, Science and Social Studies—would participate in a specially designed professional development program to provide them with subject matter content and instructional support. During the first two years particular emphasis was to be placed on teachers who taught CBOP Scholars. Although seventy-seven teachers participated last year, only four were CBOP teachers.

II. School-Level Narrative

Inglewood High School: In Their Own Words

“In education there are four kinds of change: knowledge, attitudes, behavior and organizational or group performance.” (Michael Fullan, 1992)

As the nearest Los Angeles city bordering the Los Angeles International Airport and in the direct path of the airport’s runway, the city of Inglewood is accustomed to the sounds of airplanes flying overhead every thirty seconds. While known to many as the “city of champions” (a reference to the LA Lakers and hundreds of athletes with ties to the city), it is also known for having one of the lowest performing high schools in the state. African American and Latino students make up 98% of Inglewood High School, with less than one third of the students eligible for admission to the University of California or California State University.

I arrive on the Inglewood High School campus at 7:00 am. I go directly to the college center where several students look like they have been working for hours: some are looking up colleges on the Internet, others huddle around the CBOP and APPI advisors discussing the previous night’s MTV Awards show or what enrichment classes they should take in the summer.

In order to prepare students for the rigors of higher education and make them academically competitive for college, UCLA has been working with the District to increase the numbers of honors, Advanced Placement (AP), and community college classes available to the high school. A community college representative is sitting with the college counselor, working on next week’s Algebra testing schedule for the Inglewood High School juniors. The college will offer Advanced Math, Algebra, Chemistry and College Preparedness classes.

I ask the two young men working on the Internet college-search to what do they credit their academic success? The shorter one replies: “Taking advantage of the more challenging courses during the past two years. Our school only had three AP courses but starting two years ago, they wanted to help us so they brought in nine! What kids have to do is take advantage.” During this response the other young man is steadily shaking his head in affirmation. “Take as many honors as you can get,” he answered. “And definitely AP...don’t say this is too many; No, don’t say that! Get AP everything! And if you can go to community college, do that too! Don’t get Math A and Math Pre-A, or whatever else is lower than that...just go a little bit extra.”

The UCLA CBOP advisor calls me over to meet a future teacher, a plump girl, with a smile that could light up New York! She has been in the EAOP/CBOP program for three years and plans to go to the California State University in Chico. “I really like that I can teach others, those who are not a part of CBOP...we get to tutor the 7th and 8th graders, too. “What do you like most about the CBOP Program,” I ask. “I really like the fact that the UCLA fellows come here...they do “hands-on” with us and tell us what classes to take and how we can reach our goals to go to any college, not just UCLA.”

Other adults come into the room. One has an appointment with the APPI Advisor. She calls me over to meet a parent who has a daughter in the APPI Program, but wants information about

UCLA's Young Writers and Mathematicians Program for his 5th grade son. "This summer we are planning a special program for the Inglewood 5th and 6th graders, and their teachers," I tell him. "The program has a twofold purpose: to improve literacy and math skills in the students and enhance teaching skills in those two areas for the teachers." He seems pleased with the information and takes my card, promising to call for more details. "But", I interrupt. "How is your daughter doing in the APPI Program?" I have noticed that he has been smiling throughout our conversation and now his face breaks into a cheesy grin: "I get to see some immediate benefits to our partnership with UCLA because my daughter has attended the APPI Program for two year...I have noticed a big difference...it has given her self-esteem and hope for the future in regards to her postsecondary options and what is expected from her." The bell rings.

At 8:15 am I am escorted by the college counselor to a 9th grade English classroom. I am emotionally moved by, as well as perplexed by (given the statistical data on college eligibility for this school), the hopeful enthusiasm of these young students when asked how many would be attending college after graduation. In response to my question, a sea of black and brown hands nearly covers the room, extending high in the air. "Should I tell them that you are from UCLA," the counselor leans over and whispers in my ear. "Why, would that mean anything?" "Yes," she responded, "most of them root for USC!"

Their teacher continues talking, working alongside a UCLA literacy coach, preparing a teaching strategy called "literature circles." I notice a look of despair on the counselor's face as the youngsters eagerly circle the desk "covered-wagon style." "How can our students excel if they don't have the background that some of these other students from middle class families have? We are trying to take our low-income students and make them comparable. What can we do about that? I mean, the students want to and their parents want to...but how can we make our students comparable if they are not exposed to it at an early age, exposed to all the tutoring and going to the private schools...and our students are just as intelligent!" For a moment I reflect.

Recognizing the need to improve the college eligibility rates of Inglewood students, UCLA formed a partnership with the school district in March 1998. The University works directly with educationally disadvantaged middle and high school students in the District to increase their academic competitiveness through school and student-centered activities. The goal of these programs is to increase the students' prospects for college by focusing on academic development as well as promoting self-esteem.

During the lesson the UCLA coach approaches to remind me that it is a minimum day and the faculty will be meeting for two hours at the end of the day with all three UCLA coaches to work on teaching methods and share content information. I asked her how the coach/mentor program is going? "Overall, I think the UCLA coaching collaboration with classroom teachers is an excellent model to use to encourage the best teaching practices. Philosophically, matching a team sport-coaching model works well in the classroom because it supports the entire school and the individuals at the same time. Trust and game plan are key factors. The principal serves as the captain, teachers are the team members, and we [UCLA] are the coaches. Everybody needs to work together, otherwise the entire team loses."

The bell rings. Many of the students rush the college counselor with variations on the theme of “when can I see you,” “I’ll miss the deadline” questions. I tell her that I will catch up with her after lunch at the teachers’ meeting and proceed to the assistant principal’s office.

I am always overwhelmed by the numbers of young people—some running, some sauntering, most just standing and talking—contained on this campus. From the outside the facility seems too small to hold 2,100 teenagers! I plow my way through a pack of young women and spot the assistant principal admonishing a young man in the hall. She motions for me to meet her in her office. Everyone is friendly, but always in a hurry. The secretary tells me that I can wait in the assistant principal’s office, a small, cubby hole space, with lots of papers, piled willy-nilly, on top of the desk. I want to know more about the progress of the work of the Achievement Council and the school’s data teams. The Council had been brought in by the University to assist the school in looking at student achievement data. Entering, closing the door, and talking simultaneously she said, “This is the first time in my 35 years of teaching that I have been a part of a group that was asking the right questions about student achievement. With the help of UCLA and the Achievement Council our data team was able to begin work on some important issues...Like what,” I interrupted. “Are students’ standardized test scores consistent with teacher assigned grades and performance assessments? That [question] really ruffled some feathers!” Her office door swings open and the principal enters accompanied by the interim superintendent.

The UCLA Inglewood Schools Collaborative extends beyond the students’ academic achievement. The University also seeks ways to bring about long-term education reform for improving the quality of education provided to these schools. Representatives from UCLA meet regularly with administrators and teachers from district schools to discuss ways to improve instruction skills through professional development workshops, education conferences, and seminars. Moreover, the collaborative allows for UCLA to work with administrators and teachers so that they can become more effective leaders and offer guidance to schools in designing a rigorous academic curriculum that will prepare students for college.

I exchange pleasant greetings with the principal and the superintendent and ask them to describe the ways in which the School/University Partnership serves Inglewood High School and the District. The superintendent responds that “ the Collaborative is impressive...key figures who are well-known in education because of their commitment in the past are here, visibly and physically present in the Inglewood Unified School District. The University people meet with all the principals, especially the high school principals regularly; they contribute and respond to our questions: like what in your opinion should a department chair or grade level chair look like? They [UCLA] commit themselves to our work.”

The Inglewood principal continues: “There have been many changes in the past two years because of our UCLA collaboration. We’ve begun to strengthen our academics with a rigorous and comprehensive curriculum. That has made a big difference in the minds of the students, the faculty and the parents. So when we increase our students’ academic opportunities through our collaboration with the University that also changes the academic culture at the high school.”

Declaring a minimum day, the bell rings at 12:35pm, releasing 2,100 students to go home, to the college office, play basketball, go to cheer practice, to the band room, or just hang out.

Although, for the most part, they have only taught for 4 1/2 hours, the teachers look weary and listless as they pile into the “cafetorium” to listen to the superintendent praise their mid term efforts and discuss the ramifications of the state’s student achievement testing, scheduled in two weeks.

I stop a science teacher, who had attended the first UCLA Outreach Teacher Leader Workshop with a team of Inglewood High School teachers. I remind him that, as a result of the workshop, one of the goals was to establish an articulation with the teachers at the District’s other high school, Morningside. “The work we did that summer at UCLA in the Leadership Conference was advantageous to our school,” he said. “It gave our team an opportunity to work with UCLA subject matter coaches and experts in developing leadership skills. My science colleague at Morningside High School also attended a science Advanced Placement workshop because of our UCLA collaboration. Out of their graduation class, three of her students are currently at UCLA and one is at Berkeley! But, out of our graduation class, four of our students are attending UCLA and two are at Berkeley!” “This is not a competition with the two high schools, is it? I just had to ask that question. “No. The only competition we have with Morningside is on the football field,” he boasted.

It’s 2:30 pm and I exit the aging and crumbling green school building on Manchester and Grevillea. I hear a voice shouting at my back. It’s the college counselor and she hopes that “you got the information you needed to complete your report.” I smile and wave at her, remembering that “the change process will always include a period of confusion.” Real life is always more complicated than the textbooks describe.

II. School-Level Narrative: Stoner Avenue School

Stoner Avenue School is a feeder school to Venice High School. As the Venice-Westchester SUP is a K-12 Partnership, a great deal of work has taken place in feeder elementary and middle schools.

This was Susan's first year at Stoner and her first year teaching. Although she had an MBA, she had never taken an education course. She was enrolled in the district intern program. Susan was anxious to learn and had many qualities that would make her an excellent teacher. What she lacked was a framework for building a learning community and strategies to use within that framework. The UCLA Venice/Westchester Collaborative, working with the UCLA Writing Project, provided Susan and many other teachers like her with a comprehensive partnership. The partnership between Susan's school and UCLA provided for professional development in many forms, including school level activities which teachers could access to help them become better teachers. The activities sponsored by the SUP provided a great deal of extra support to Susan in her first year of teaching.

Susan attended a new teacher staff development day provided by the Writing Project. At that meeting she met her literacy coach, provided by the collaborative, who would work with her all year and she learned of a series of workshops provided by the Writing Project for new teachers. Susan took advantage of both opportunities and her teaching reflected a first-year experience that is sadly too rare.

By the third week of school, Susan had assessed all her first graders in reading and math, and with the help of her literacy coach, gathered books to meet each student's level. The coach and Susan created three centers for her students to use during Language Arts, created a schedule so that she could spend 35 minutes with each small group, and created a schedule so that her assistant could do the same. She was on her way to establishing a solid structure within which her students would build their reading and writing skills.

Susan's school, Stoner Elementary, is an urban school with 760 students who are predominantly English Language Learners and who live and go to school in a neighborhood plagued by crime and poverty. Last year alone six shootings occurred just outside the school perimeter. The school serves the housing project across the street and 98% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch and breakfast.

In addition, Stoner contends with highly charged governance issues on a continuous basis. Severe disagreements between the staff and administration over school leadership and direction drain resources and morale. It is this latter issue which makes outreach at Stoner difficult yet even more necessary. A dogged determination by the staff to seek out support for improving the quality of education at their school has made outreach efforts successful even in light of a reticent administration.

The school has had strong and consistent teacher representation on the collaborative leadership board. The teacher representatives have attended each collaborative conference and have participated in each collaborative sponsored activity.

Each opportunity for partnership between UCLA and Stoner has had as its primary goals helping teachers provide high quality instruction and maintaining rigorous academic standards for students. UCLA offered Stoner a combination of four structures that addressed these goals.

Stoner's teachers who were preparing to provide intervention classes after school participated in 20 hours of professional development provided by the literacy coaches. This professional development addressed word analysis, vocabulary and concept development, comprehension and literary analysis instruction that addressed students' needs for additional instruction and challenged their thinking.

Stoner's teachers were also given priority in Governor Davis' Reading Initiatives provided by the UCLA Writing Project and the California Reading and Literature Project. In this 120 hour year-long professional development institute, the teachers worked on a repertoire of reciprocal teaching strategies that emphasized small group instruction and student-assessment-driven lesson design. The institutes began with a one-week intensive workshop during the summer and continued during the school year with monthly follow-up meetings at the school site and weekly student data meetings.

Teachers who were in neither project attended the cluster's Buy Back Days which were designed and presented by the Writing Project and the collaborative. The Buy Back Days were designed to provide an overview of the same strategies and issues presented in the intervention workshops and the institute. The teachers studied a framework for high quality intensive reading and writing instruction.

A Writing Project literacy coach tied all of these professional development projects together for Stoner's teachers. The coach spent one day a week at Stoner working in classrooms on the strategies teachers had learned in the intervention workshops and the institute. The coach presented in both of the programs and ensured that the message presented was consistent and informed by the principles of the California Writing Project.

Teachers experienced a personal connection with outreach activities in the form of their coach. They saw the university supporting their classrooms in a direct way by providing a co-teacher, co-planner, co-assessor. Professional development became a daily process that happened throughout the year rather than something that only happened at workshops or conferences. The coaching project viewed coaching as a partnership between two professionals working to solve the everyday and the complex problems of teaching. It involved everything from working with a teacher to create a literature rich environment, to diagnosing and developing reading lessons for individual students. The key to the project was the belief that a coach is no more and no less than a partner in this process and always behaves as such.

At the same time, students at Stoner were introduced to a college culture beginning in Kindergarten. Stoner created an action plan in collaboration with UCLA to help every student view college as a natural next step in their education. As part of their plan Stoner scheduled fieldtrips to the university and made sure classrooms focused on promoting a college bound culture. Classrooms did investigations of different colleges, named their cooperative groups after

universities, and interviewed their parents about their feelings regarding college.

Several classrooms had students compose their personal statement essays for college application. The coach helped teachers plan writing lessons to introduce the essay and modeled the process in two classrooms. Later in the school year, several teachers entered their students' essays in an essay contest sponsored by the Collaborative and the Writing Project. One of Stoner's fifth grade students won. She spent a day on campus visiting chemistry labs, viewing an art gallery, enjoying a private concert, and participating in a writing session with nineteen other winners.

Many of Stoner's students and families attended a college fair sponsored by the collaborative. Three of Stoner's dance groups performed and all the attending students and families had opportunities to speak with representatives from local area colleges and universities. They also attended workshops on everything from college scholarships to academic planning for college.

Three of Susan's students, accomplished dancers, attended the college fair and performed in the folklorico dance group. Of more concern to Susan, however, was the fact that they were now accomplished first-grade readers. Throughout the year Susan had continued to add proven strategies to her teaching framework. She learned how to use Guided Reading, Directed Reading Thinking Activity, ReQuest, Structured Writing, and student conferences to help her students achieve. She knew she had had a successful first year, and the partnership had helped make that happen.

In September 2000 Susan sent this email to her literacy coach.

"Hi! How are you? I wanted to call and share my joy with you as soon as I received our Stanford 9 results.... Anyway, the kids did great. Class average for math was 70, and for reading was 59. Take out Mario and Roberto's scores (VERY low!!!!), and they were significantly higher. Had one child score at the 62nd percentile in math and one at 65%. All others were above 75 (many in the upper 80's and 90's, including Pablo's in the 99th!!). Had several in the high 80's and 90's in reading, too. However, a total of 4 or 5 (including Mario and Roberto) below the 50th - so definite room for improvement (Maria, Miguel, and Luisa not quite there - my intervention kids). Clara scored at about the 75th percentile in both reading and math. :-)

I was quite proud of the kids. Could not have done it without you!!! Thanks!!!!!!"

III: Data Submission

As we have indicated previously, collecting the School Benchmark Data has been problematic. We have made great strides, but have not obtained complete sets of data as this report is being prepared. The status for each of our partnerships is different, with some data expected to be available relatively soon. Regular updates will be provided about our progress obtaining the required school benchmark data. The status of data collection for each partnership is provided below:

- Part 1: We presently have summary data from CBOP High Schools from the Los Angeles Unified School District. However, we have not been able to obtain data disaggregated by school. Access guidelines to the LAUSD longitudinal database, our source of data, were recently changed preventing disaggregation by school. Access has been re-established and the data for the 1999-2000 school-year became available last week. We anticipate data for LAUSD schools will be available in final form within the next two to three weeks. That will provide data for the Venice-Westchester SUP and the Super 12 partnership schools.
- Part 2: We have obtained an initial set of data from the Inglewood Unified School District for Inglewood and Morningside high schools. Upon examination of those data, we feel obligated to review the data with the District to determine its accuracy. Some of the requested identifiers needed to permit disaggregation by such factors as gender, LEP and free and reduced lunch, were not provided in the provided data set. We are in the process of scheduling meetings with District data staff and administration and comparing the current set of data with other sources. At this time, we are uncertain when we will have benchmark data of sufficient credibility to submit to OP.
- Part 3: We have also obtained an initial set of data from the Lynwood Unified School District for Lynwood High School. Upon examination of those data, we feel obligated to review the data with the District to determine its accuracy and completeness. Lynwood High School is in the process of evaluating courses regarding A-G status, and we want to make sure that the data that are submitted provide a complete and accurate picture of course-taking at Lynwood High School. We are in the process of scheduling meetings with District data staff and administration and comparing the current set of data with other sources.

A section for Appendix E (School Benchmark Data) is provided in the report so that data can be inserted as it is forwarded to the OP.

Section A.2: Early Academic Outreach Programs (EAOPs) 1999-2000

Introduction

What is significant to note about the 1999-2000 academic year for EAOPs is the merging of the traditional Early Academic Outreach Program staff with the Career Based Outreach Program and changing the name to the *Early Academic Outreach Programs (EAOPs)*. Not only was there a physical move of the program from one building to another, but there was also a move of EAOP from the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools to the Office of Student Affairs Administration under the auspices of the Assistant Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs.

The move and merger brought many challenges and adjustments for both the EAOP and CBOP staffs. The transformation of EAOP to EAOPrograms, which included the new CBOP strategy, was met with some skepticism and resistance. This organizational change in outreach strategy was difficult to accept. Forces of stability, “the way we use to do things”, versus forces of change, resulted in fear and feelings of loss of structure and loss of identity for some EAOP staff.

Before the merger, the traditional EAOP focused primarily on academic advising and motivational activities. After the merger, EAOPrograms became a program that provided both academic advising and motivational activities and the intensive academic enrichment activities of CBOP. The special emphasis on reading, writing, critical analysis and math with a particular emphasis in teaching Scholars (CBOP high school students) the Personal Academic Learning System (PALS), and the related learning strategies and learning tools provided a new challenge to new staff members. The change of focus from eligibility (EAOP) to competitive eligibility (CBOP) was a major challenge, but one that is essential to the success of UCLA’s Outreach program.

Section A.2.I: Narrative Update

Highlights from the 1999-2000 academic year for EAOPrograms, a combined effort of the traditional EAOP and the new CBOP effort.

1. Changes

- A. Personnel – With the merger came an obvious increase in EAOPrograms staffing as the number of high schools served grew from nineteen to fifty-eight. Also, with the new program model came an increase in staff responsibilities and duties, which resulted an upgrade in the classification of Outreach Site Team. Site Coordinators were upgraded to SAO II and Site Advisers to SAO I. Additional staff, a Fellow Coordinator and Technical/Data Coordinator, was hired to coordinate expanding outreach responsibilities for the program. Approximately 65-75 undergraduate staff known as Bruin Advisers were trained, many via a pilot education course as we have done with training and support for the CBOP fellows, specifically to assist the site

- teams in academic advising and serve as role models and mentors to high school students.
- B. Participating EAOPrograms Schools for 1999-2000 included 58 high schools of which 19 had CBOP and 11 were Informational-only schools. Informational-only schools received services once per month and staff did not identify students for enrollment in the program. EAOPrograms also worked with 35-targeted middle schools. These middle schools were feeders into our full service EAOPs high schools. The schools were located in the following school districts: Los Angeles Unified, Inglewood Unified, Lynwood Unified, Santa Monica-Malibu Unified, Pasadena Unified, Montebello Unified, Culver City Unified, El Rancho Unified, and the Los Angeles Archdiocese.
 - C. Demographics of Service Area – EAOPrograms schools are spread out over a very broad area of Los Angeles. (Refer to the map in Appendix E). The socioeconomic areas range from poverty to affluent, as well as the dominant ethnic composition in that community. LAUSD, the largest school district in Los Angeles, offers Magnet programs emphasizing or promoting a particular discipline in which students from the inner city, accepted into these magnet schools, are bussed to these various magnet schools, which could be located in a more affluent area, like west San Fernando Valley.
 - D. Implementation Strategies – Services and opportunities for students were delivered via site teams. A site team consists of one full time Site Coordinator, Site Adviser, and a number of undergraduate staff (CBOP Fellows and Bruin Adviser). The site teams established a regular schedule at the schools and followed a monthly plan of action for services provided to schools. Site teams worked collaboratively with the school personnel assigned as contact personnel for the program. If there was a School/University Partnership (SUP) effort in the school, site teams tried to keep the SUP abreast of our efforts while working collaboratively where possible. A key responsibility of the site coordinator is liaison to all outreach efforts working in their school, particularly with another outreach effort from the campus.
 - E. Campus Support – EAOPrograms worked collaboratively with the five SUPs, 12 Campus Partners, which includes nine professional schools and three campus departments. The School of Education provides the Ed 193A Community Service for Student Achievement course where the CBOP Fellows are trained and taught PALS and Ed 193E High School Academic Program (HSAP) where many of our Bruin Advisers that we hire are trained. Center “X” and the four Subject Matter groups provided us with teachers for our Saturday Academies and Summer Academic Boot Camps.

2. Impact (Opportunities and Challenges)

- A. Campus Communication and Organizational Structure – As the interim director of EAOPrograms for the 1999-2000 year, I attended monthly Principal Investigator

- Meetings which included the directors from school-centered partnerships and student-centered programs, co-chaired by the Dean of Education and Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs. Each program was required to submit a monthly PI report on their project/program. The reports were helpful in learning about the activities of other programs. Information from the PI meetings was shared with EAOP staff. They also received copies of the PI reports. EAOP staff meetings were twice a month with the director and site teams meet on alternate weeks by themselves. Some site teams who had School-University Partnerships (SUPs) in their schools had regular meetings with SUP personnel. As director, I meet twice a month with the AVC.
- B. School Personnel/Practices/Polices – The MOUs that were established in the second year of CBOP was not distributed for the 1999-2000 year due to delays in trying to coordinate one MOU that incorporated all of the UCLA Outreach efforts in that school: EAOP programs, SUP and Evaluation. The lack of an MOU may have resulted in schools not fulfilling the requirements of the partnership, like identifying CBOP teachers early in the year, providing a bus for a Saturday academy and identifying a school site team. Also crucial was the constant change in key personnel in some of our schools. It seems that just when a school began to understand and fully accept our work and their responsibility and the system was working, there is a shifting in key personnel.
- C. Students – (Class enrollment patterns, test taking patterns, attitudes, behaviors regarding college preparation) Our spring administration of the PSAT exam, I believe resulted in more of our EAOP programs students taking the PSAT exam than would have taken it on their own. Also learning in some of our schools, that there is a certain tracking system to enroll in honor and AP courses was helpful for staff. Often time students must take a prerequisite course or exam to enroll in certain honor and AP courses. Sadly, students do not always know this in advance. EAOP programs staff tries to learn each school's system and procedure for enrolling in honor and AP courses so they are better able to advise our EAOP participants how to enroll in certain AP and honor courses.
- D. The Communities/Attitudes toward academic achievement and college preparation. Parents want to help and be supportive but may not necessarily know how to go about doing in it. Absence at parent meetings is not necessarily a sign that parents are uninterested or they don't care. Parent attendance at any of our parent functions has always been very high. However, attendance at school related functions have always been very low at most of our EAOP programs schools. Parents have commented that they encounter a hostile atmosphere when they enter the schools and administration are sometimes antagonistic to their needs when they begin to interact with some of our school personnel.

We are uncertain parents have fully grasped what it means to be a “competitive student.” If their child is doing well in school, they assume that he or she is a competitive student. Only those parents who have experienced or know a student with a good academic profile

who has been denied admission to UCLA or Berkeley are aware of what it means to be competitive.

Many schools view parents as not being actively involved enough in their children's education. And they see some parents/families as indifferent and hostile when they do try to communicate with them about their children. Low expectation of students is rampant in most of low performing schools. The students that are excelling in these schools don't seem to be challenged by the faculty beyond what they are currently doing. Some of the teachers themselves don't have a concept of what it takes to be a competitive student for admission to UCLA or other selective colleges.

EAOP has also met with some indifference with some schools as we become more successful in informing and empowering parents and students about actions to take to enroll in A-G, honor and AP courses, we ourselves become antagonistic with schools.

3. Academic Enrichment Services and Impact

The academic enrichment activities provided students included monthly Saturday Academies emphasizing math, critical reading, writing and analytical skills; PSAT, SAT I & II test prep workshops, and Summer Academic Boot Camps where students are actively engaged in an intensive academically challenging college experience. We hope there is impact on the students from taking advantage of these offerings. However, we currently do not any hard data to report in this area.

4. Goals and Expectations for the coming year

Our goals for 2000-01 is to continue to refine the programs offered under EAOP programs and build upon the site team model of service delivery, effectively utilizing our student staff for optimal results. We plan to offer more SAT II preparation workshops, since there is a greater emphasis on the SAT II and its importance in the eligibility index. Our middle schools will be served by a separate middle school component. This team consists of a middle school coordinator, and two site advisers with undergraduate student staff, Bruin Advisers. The new UCLA Antelope Valley Outreach Partnership will begin service in eight high schools in the Antelope Valley area this fall.

Section A.2.II: Participant Identification

Selection Criteria - the following is the selection criteria for students entering EAOP programs:

College Bound or non-CBOP students must have a 3.3 GPA, with 4 A-G's in progress. These students must also be enrolled in Geometry or Integrated Math II or equivalent. A "moving GPA cut-off" was applied to some schools depending on school performance and academic quality of the student population. Students were selected at the 10th grade level. Students are identified for the program through computer printouts and teacher/counselor referral.

CBOP scholars must have a 3.3-3.5+ GPA (3.5 is preferred) and be enrolled in English and

Algebra I (or higher). Students must have a demonstrated desire to attend a UC or other 4-year competitive university and be recommended by a teacher or counselor for the program. A “moving GPA cut-off” was also applied to some schools depending on school performance and academic quality of the student population. An application process was used to identify and select scholars for CBOP. The recruitment for new scholars began in the fall of 1999. Site Coordinators held informational sessions at various school sites during 9th grade magnet orientation meetings, back to school night, parent meetings and during lunchtime at the school sites. Students were selected at the 9th grade level.

A. Student Consent Waiver Procedure – (Refer to Appendix F)

Section A.2.III: Data Submission

The 23 Data Elements will be submitted separately via UC Gateways and ACCESS for CBOP school and some UC Bound schools..

Section A.3: Community College Outreach

UCLA's Community College Outreach has three main goals:

- To inform students in Los Angeles-area community colleges more fully about transfer opportunities and admission requirements at UCLA and other UC campuses;
- To work collaboratively with targeted community colleges to improve academic preparation and achievement;
- To work with partner community colleges to increase the diversity of their transferring students.

In our discussions with community college personnel, we have learned that many students are not informed about the University of California. The efforts of the recruitment and Admissions staff have not been enough to reach all students. At many of the colleges the representatives are inundated with students who are eager to talk with them about transferring. They do not have the time to outreach to students who may be thinking about the University or need additional support to consider the University. Another concern is that staffing does not permit optimal number of visit to the colleges, and as a result, some campuses may receive a visit from UCLA only once or twice during the semester. We are planning and developing additional programs to supplement the existing ones to increase the visibility of the University of California on the community college campuses.

We have identified some colleges with large populations of underrepresented students that are low performing colleges. These colleges are not doing very well at preparing students to transfer to the University, and we have met with faculty and administrators to develop cooperative efforts to work on this effort.

Several colleges are transferring many students to the University, and although they have large percentages of underrepresented students enrolled at their colleges, they are not doing a very good job at transferring that population. We continue to meet with faculty and administrators to develop new ways to reach these students.

The responsibility for Community College Outreach resides primarily in three units, the College of Letters and Science, Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools and the Chancellor's Office of Academic Development. We have developed close working relationships and developed programs collaboratively. Meetings are held between members of these offices on a regular basis to review, coordinate and evaluate programs and services offered at community colleges. These meetings are coordinated through the Chancellor's Office - Academic Development.

The Undergraduate Admissions and relations with Schools office is responsible for recruitment and general outreach to community college students and counselors relations. Staff in UARS work directly with students by providing advising and workshops on admission and selection to UCLA/UC. The College of Letters and Science is responsible for overseeing the Transfer Alliance Program. Administrative support to TAP is coordinated through this office. In addition, AAP staff and Peer Counselors work closely with CCO and UARS in their Outreach efforts.

The Community College Outreach office is responsible for the development of collaborative partnerships between UCLA and community colleges, in conjunction with all UCLA community college efforts.

Policy and Programmatic recommendations for Outreach are developed through discussions with the three offices (UARS, the College and Academic Development), the Community College Advisory Board and community college personnel at the community colleges.

What are the campus transfer enrollment goals (on an annual basis) for community college outreach in terms of number of applications, admissions, and enrollment Fall 2000 to Fall 2005? What disciplinary, diversity, or other emphases are subsumed by these goals? What factors influence these goals and how?

Over the last several years, transfer applications to UCLA have continued to increase. UCLA has already exceeded their enrollment goals. Our efforts have been focused on increasing the diversity and overall preparation of the applicants as opposed to increasing the total applicant numbers. The Community College Outreach plan focuses on supplementing existing programs and developing new ones where applicable.

We have undertaken an evaluation of our TAP college partners to assess the Honor programs and develop ways to increase diversity within these programs. Our evaluation includes meetings with faculty, staff and students at each of the TAP colleges. In addition, we are focusing our efforts in 3 key disciplines: Writing, Mathematics and Sciences. We are developing faculty to faculty discipline dialogue meetings for faculty from UCLA and the community colleges to discuss pedagogical issues.

We have developed a very close working relationship with the recruitment office in UARS, the CARE/BRIDGES program, AAP Transfer Student Services, Transfer Student Association and other student initiated transfer student organizations to help us reach our goal.

Which community colleges are expected to be principal feeders for achieving your enrollment goals and what are the approximate numerical expectations, college by college?

Santa Monica, Pasadena, Los Angeles Pierce, Los Angeles Valley, and El Camino continue to be the colleges which send the most students to UCLA. All these colleges have strong transfer programs, and we are working with them to ensure that all students benefit from their efforts. As mentioned above, because we have not focused on recruitment specifically, we have not set numerical goals. We are also interested in increasing the applicants from many other colleges with significant numbers of underrepresented students, e.g. East Los Angeles, west Los Angeles, Compton, and Los Angeles Southwest Colleges.

What types of assumptions make up the foundation for your campus strategy?

As mentioned above, we can attract students to UCLA, but we are interested in diversifying the pool of applicants and strengthening the applicants from colleges who typically send few students to the University. We have looked at the statistics for students who transferred to UCLA from our feeder colleges over the last ten years. We have identified those colleges who send many students but need to address the issue of diversity in their transfer pools as well as those who need to increase overall.

Did you implement different programmatic elements at each college based on your analysis of student preparation and potential for transfer to UC? If so, please describe.

Because of the differences at each college we have been meeting with community college faculty and administrators to discuss our interests in collaborating on programs to increase transfer and diversity. These meetings have resulted in our identifying the best approaches at each college, and working with the appropriate personnel at that college to reach our mutual goals.

East Los Angeles College faculty began meeting to discuss the low transfer rates to UC and ways to introduce transfer in their courses. Our meetings with this group demonstrated a sincere effort on their part to develop a stronger Honors program, evaluate their curriculum and heighten the UC awareness on campus. In addition, they are interested in exploring ways to strengthen their Social Science/Humanities program patterned loosely on the MESA model.

West Los Angeles College would like more UCLA presence on campus. The Honors program has recently been reestablished after a short hiatus. There is a commitment from the new president to establish a Transfer Center-WLAC has been without a space for a center for over 2 years. Faculty has met to discuss transfer and develop ways to incorporate transfer into the curriculum.

Compton College has not been successful in transferring students to the University over the last several years. In fact, no students transferred to UC last year. Meetings at Compton have identified the need to develop an honors program, a need for more of a UCLA presence on campus and a need to strengthen the relationships between Compton faculty and counselors and the University.

Has your campus achieved its transfer goals during the past five years? If not, what do you believe are the reasons for this?

In terms of overall numbers, UCLA continues to meet its numerical goals of transfer applicants, admits and enrolled students. While we meet these numbers overall, it is the diversity of the pool that we are trying to change. Our outreach efforts have been developed to increase the number of students from low performing colleges, and from undeserved communities, who apply, are admitted and ultimately enroll at the University.

Please outline the UC campus organizational structure for carrying out the campus transfer plan.

The Community College Partnership Program is housed in the Chancellor's Office – Academic Development. There is a UCLA community college outreach committee chaired by AVC Paredes, which includes administrators, faculty and staff. Among the various administrative and academic units involved in these efforts are the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools; Office of Student Affairs, the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies; the College of Letters and Science; and the Office of Academic Development. As part of UCLA's overall outreach efforts, community college efforts ultimately report to Vice Chancellor Winston Doby and Dean Aimee Dorr, under the UCLA Outreach Committee.

Please describe the use of outreach funds for transfer received this past year, including campus funds already being dedicated to transfer prior to 1999 and ways in which recent funding supplemented this effort. To what purpose would the campus dedicate additional transfer funds?

The following programs were developed this past year. While many of the programs described were funded by CCO funds, additional funding was provided by several offices and colleges to implement these programs.

Summer Intensive Transfer Experience (SITE)

During the summer of 1999, CCO hosted two 3-day overnight programs that were designed to provide students with assistance in developing an educational plan to transfer, before they enroll in a community college. A series of workshops and seminars related to developing skills necessary for a successful transfer was presented to students. In addition, a UCLA professor provided students with a simulated lecture and discussed note taking and other college survival skills. The first program, held in July hosted 34 students, and the second in August hosted 54 students. SITE was a tremendous success and for the summer of 2000, recommendations were made to improve the program.

In the summer of 2000, SITE became a 6-day residential program. During Spring 2000, staff visited EAOPs schools and conducted presentations about community college and transfer, and SITE. Students applied and were admitted to the program. The program essentially was developed to “teach student how to transfer.” Students were provided information and hands on experiences regarding transferring to the University (see Attachment I). This program focused on preparing students for the University, not specifically UCLA and included sessions by UC Transfer representatives and community college counselors.

TAP/Transfer Conference

The TAP Transfer Conference was held at UCLA on November 5, 1999. There were over 900 students in attendance. Approximately _ of the students were from underrepresented communities. The conference sessions were designed to provide students information about transferring, preparation, majors, careers and costs. This annual conference is co-sponsored by the College of Letters and Science, Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools office and the Chancellor’s Office – Academic Development.

UCLA Science Day

The Center for Academic and Research Excellence, Undergraduate Admissions and the Chancellor’s Office of Academic Development, coordinated a UCLA Science Day on February 11th, 2000. The focus of the program was to provide students with information about Science majors, Medical School and specifically research programs in the Sciences. The 1-day conference drew approximated 375 students, many of whom were African-American and Chicano/Latino students. The program was well received and students and counselors were pleased with the information and opportunity to meet with UCLA Science faculty, advisors and students to learn more about the majors and graduate and professional schools.

BRIDGES Expansion

CCO has assisted in expanding the BRIDGES Program, a Summer Science Research program for students to get involved in research with a UCLA faculty member to 4 additional colleges beyond the original 5. This will allow the number of students who participate in the BRIDGES Summer program to increase. The students who are selected for participation in BRIDGES are underrepresented students interested in the Sciences.

CCO and Partner Program Meetings

Meetings between CCO and some of the High School Partner program (CBOP, V/W, Inglewood, Lynwood, and Super 12) staff have been held. Those meetings resulted in shared information and ideas about how to coordinate efforts to serve students. Discussion has focused on creating stronger linkages for students involved in high school programs as they move through the community college system. CCO and UARS Community College staff conduct presentations to 12th grade students who are at EAOP/CBOP/Super12 schools who are planning to attend a community college. Similar programs are being held with the Lynwood and Inglewood collaborative. Additionally, 12th grade students are targeted to attend the SITE programs held during the summer, which are designed to “teach student how to transfer” before they enroll at the community college, and follow-up throughout their terms at the college by inviting them to Saturday Academies.

STOMP Motivational Conference

CCO co-sponsored the first Annual Motivational Conference on April 28, 2000 for first year community college students who are participants in MESA, PUENTE, EOP/S and other programs targeting low-income underrepresented students. Coordinated by STOMP, a student group in UARS, the event hosted over 400 students who heard from Assemblyman Marco Firebaugh and participated in several workshops geared to motivate and assist them in preparing to transfer to a UC. In addition, a film, *Las Colonias* was screened and a discussion with the director/producer of the film was held with the students. The comments from the students and counselors were very positive.

Blue and Gold Scholarships

UCLA has expanded the Blue and Gold Scholarships to entering Fall 2000 transfer students this past year. Selection of students to receive Blue and Gold Scholarships was coordinated by CCO staff and involved staff from UARS, AAP and Financial Aid. Twenty scholarships will be offered which will cover fees for 2 years.

Increased Articulation

Articulation provides counselors and students with specific information regarding courses that transfer to the University. CCO provided funding to increase these agreements to include those colleges in Los Angeles County where we do not have Articulation and Major Preparation agreements established.

Tutoring at East LA and Pasadena City Colleges

Math and Science are two areas students often have difficulty completing for transfer. This tutoring provides assistance to students and allows us the opportunity to meet with students to encourage them to prepare to transfer.

Community College Advisory Board

This newly established Advisory Board consists of the UCLA Community College Outreach Subcommittee members and representatives of 31 colleges TAP and local colleges. The role of this group is to provide suggestions for UCLA's community college efforts, discuss collaborative programs and exchange information and ideas. The first meeting is planned for November.

UCLA/Santa Monica College Writing Program

To promote the transfer of underrepresented students from Santa Monica College to UCLA, the two institutions have collaborated on a program that has three parts:

Composition Seminars (a ten-week seminar taught by faculty from Writing programs for faculty at SMC)

The Faculty Resource Program (a program of bringing SMC faculty, ideally ones who have taken the seminar, to UCLA to teach composition)

The Writing Assistant Project (a program that matches exceptional UCLA juniors and seniors to an SMC class and professor, to work closely with SMC students to improve their writing. SMC students also gain insight into being a student at UCLA.)

Compton College

CCO staff met with faculty at Compton College at their first academic meeting of the year, and several times afterward. Discussions about Academic Excellence and strengthening the transfer focus were held. Follow-up meetings are being scheduled to develop some discipline dialogues between faculty.

FIPSE Proposal

UCLA submitted a proposal and received a FIPSE grant. We are partnering with West Los Angeles College, East Los Angeles College and Compton College to develop a rigorous transfer-focused academic culture at each campus. Each institution primarily serves students from underrepresented and economically-disadvantaged backgrounds. Weak academic preparation and inadequate academic counseling will be the primary foci of the consortium. In the area of academic preparation, the consortium will have three goals: 1) to evaluate the quality and quantity of transfer-credit courses in composition, mathematics and science available and to improve their rigor, number, or both as needed; 2) through curricular redesign and innovative pedagogies such as reciprocal and collaborative learning, to develop and institutionalize more effective practices for addressing persistent academic underpreparation; and 3) to develop and institutionalize strong academic support programs essential to a culture of academic excellence. To address inadequate academic counseling, the consortium will develop and institutionalize peer-counseling programs (involving UCLA undergraduates) to supplement the professional staffs.

Community Colleges and EAOPs High Schools

We are identifying colleges to develop and teach college courses at high schools. We believe this will be a very important part in continuing to make students more competitive at the high school, and encourage those students who may not attend a 4-year, for whatever reason to continue at a community college and transfer to UC.

Transfer Alliance Program (TAP)

Recently, the number of TAP colleges has increased to 30, and 3 additional colleges are being reviewed for inclusion. The Transfer Alliance Program operates under the direction the College of Letters and Science. Staff from L&S, UARS, AAP and CCO all serve as resource managers for TAP. Regular meetings are held to discuss TAP and diversity issues. Informational outreach to TAP and non-TAP colleges is provided primarily by UARS, supplemented by the other programs named above.

Community College Advisory Board Meeting

The first meeting for the Community College Advisory Board was held on Tuesday, November 23rd, 1999. There were representatives there from 27 of the 31 colleges in attendance. The discussion centered on the role of this group, suggestions for UCLA's community college efforts, discussion about collaborative programs and an exchange of information and ideas.

How do community college transfer efforts link to K- 1 2 outreach efforts?

Programs developed through CCO target students who are involved in K-12 programs sponsored by the University. We continue to have close working relationships with EAOPs and other staff providing services to high school students. Joint presentations to Seniors were conducted to inform students of the community college options and to encourage them to participate in the SITE program described above. The coordinators of each program meet regularly to discuss efforts and collaborate on projects. Every effort is made to coordinate UCLA's entire community college outreach strategy with the K-12 Outreach.

**Section A.4:
Graduate and Professional Outreach
UCLA School of Medicine Outreach Report**

CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND:

Founded in 1951, the UCLA School of Medicine is among the youngest of the nation's medical schools. The School is currently ranked as one of the top ten in the annual US News and World Report Survey, and is acknowledged for leadership in biomedical research, medical education and patient care. While excelling in the areas of its multiple mission, the School is also committed to training a diverse, multicultural student body, in which differences are respected and nurtured, and the likelihood of our alumni working to improve the health status and longevity of our disadvantaged citizens is increased.

Within 18 years of its founding, the School's administration recognized a need to identify and actively recruit minority students. The first underrepresented student, an African American was admitted in 1955; the first Mexican American student, not until 1968. In the autumn of 1969, UCLA School of Medicine joined a consortium of five southern California medical schools, charged with recruiting minorities to the health sciences. Thus began the School's formal efforts to identify, encourage, prepare, admit, recruit, train and graduate increased numbers of underrepresented and otherwise disadvantaged students.

The 1970s proved to be precarious and challenging years in which to support and attract minority students to the School of Medicine. During the summer of 1970, the consortium of southern California medical schools disbanded upon the withdrawal of the University of Southern California and U.C. San Diego from the group. In 1971, a minority recruitment and counseling office, later named the Office of Special Education (OSE), was established at UCLA School of Medicine. The structure and personnel, charged with identifying and responding to the unique needs of minority students in the School, changed several times during that decade. By 1978, the OSE was closed following sustained protests from minority medical students, who were concerned that the appointment of a non-minority faculty person and staff to design and administer services for minorities was inappropriate.

But the tide would turn. In late 1979, the OSE was re-opened with a Mexican American man serving the dual role of director and counselor for minority medical students. That same year, the School appointed an African American woman faculty member as assistant dean for Student Affairs, the first underrepresented minority to hold a senior position in the School's management. By the close of the decade UCLA School of Medicine entered a formal affiliation with the Charles R. Drew Postgraduate Medical School (now Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science) to train students who have an expressed interest in addressing the needs of medically under-served populations. The overwhelming preponderance of students, who have been attracted to the UCLA/Drew mission are from underrepresented and/or disadvantaged backgrounds. For non-traditional students aspiring to careers in medicine, there was now greater promise for gaining access to a UCLA medical education, and many talented and highly qualified underrepresented applicants were at the door.

The charter class of the UCLA/Drew medical education program entered in 1981 and joined a UCLA class that was composed of approximately 11% underrepresented minority students. Also in 1981, the School of Medicine was awarded a Health Career Opportunity Program (HCOP) grant, which enabled the re-established minority medical student office to expand retention services, hire support staff and, for the first time, to conduct formal premedical student outreach services. The outreach agenda was aimed at increasing interest in medical careers; enhancing preliminary education in preparation for medical training, and increasing the admission and graduation of underrepresented minority students at the UCLA School of Medicine. With the assistance of the HCOP, a formal premedical educational pipeline of services was established and educational assistance agreements were entered with targeted feeder universities: UCLA undergraduate, U.C. Santa Barbara, California State University, Northridge, and Loyola Marymount University. These campuses were selected according to their geographic proximity to the UCLA School of Medicine's campus. Later, U.C. San Diego undergraduate, along with California State Universities at Los Angeles, Dominguez Hills and Long Beach were added. In 1984, the HCOP renewal proposal submitted by the School was approved, but not funded. During that year the essential personnel and program expenses were supported by the School of Medicine and the UCLA Office of the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs. Continuity was maintained until funding through HCOP was renewed in 1985.

As a result of the affiliation with Drew and the outreach efforts, initiated with the support of the HCOP, and maintained by UCLA, increased numbers of disadvantaged students experienced UCLA School of Medicine as being supportive and accessible. Groups of students in the pipeline were mentored by members of the faculty, and many have maintained ongoing contact with their mentors, the medical students who served them as role models, and with each other. As a result, the School has been able to enroll greater numbers of underrepresented students from the medical school applicant pool. The first-year enrollment of underrepresented minority students in the School increased to approximately 27% by 1989.

In 1991, the School of Medicine Dean's Office assumed 100% of the personnel and operating expenses for outreach services when the HCOP renewal proposal was again approved, but not funded. In 1992, the HCOP funding was awarded and continued, uninterrupted for a six-year period. That same year the School joined an effort, designed and championed by the Association of American Medical Colleges, to admit 3,000 underrepresented students to the entering national medical class by the year 2000. Although funding was not provided; information sharing, statistics, and faculty development assistance became available for minority jr. faculty through the Project 3000 by 2000. A new national network of medical faculty, administrators and counselors emerged with a common goal.

In the latter half of the decade, University of California Regents Resolution SP1 and California Proposition 209 prevented the consideration of race, ethnicity or gender in the University's admissions process. At UCLA, our recruitment focus continued to be on enrolling the students we had admitted. In 1996 the entering class was composed of 36.1% disadvantaged students; in 1997, 37.9% disadvantaged; in 1998, 41.7% disadvantaged and in 1999, 42% disadvantaged. However, we now had to concentrate upon cultivating a pool of future physicians, much earlier in the educational pipeline.

What outreach challenge does the School of Medicine face?

One result of the anti-affirmative action resolution and legislation is that the pool of underrepresented applicants to California medical schools has declined by more than 30%. At the same time, the student profile for the 1999 entering class of UCLA undergraduates rose to a weighted grade-point average of 4.24 on a 4.0 system and a medial SAT score of 1,330, virtually eliminating access to UCLA by promising students from disadvantaged backgrounds and low performance high schools. Many of the very students we have traditionally served in our pipeline programs now see the State as not supporting higher and professional education for underrepresented and disadvantaged students; and the top schools, like UCLA as being well out of reach.

Our challenge is to locate the resources and to form partnerships in order to effect early academic interventions, career and lifestyle exposures, and mentoring throughout the kindergarten through college educational pipeline so that disadvantaged students can become competitive.

DESCRIPTION OF OUTREACH WORK:***MISSION STATEMENT:***

The UCLA School of Medicine aims to expand the pool of academically competitive, culturally sensitive, and well prepared students from disadvantaged backgrounds who select medicine as their profession and UCLA as their medical training site.

While the last century has seen unparalleled advances in medicine; chronic disease, under-treated common medical disorders, untimely deaths, substance abuse, domestic violence, homicide, accidents, HIV-AIDS, and infant mortality continue to threaten our disadvantaged communities. We in the health professions are therefore entering the new millennium with the intention of identifying and addressing factors such as: socioeconomic status, restricted educational opportunity, political and legislative directives, and cultural practices or biases, that have a profoundly negative impact upon attempts to improve the health status and longevity of our under-served citizens. We know that nearly 90% of the graduates of the UCLA School of Medicine remain in California to practice medicine. An overwhelming majority of those from disadvantaged backgrounds, return to their own or similar communities to provide service to those in greatest need. The School therefore sees merit in cultivating and attracting a cadre of students to address these challenges.

UCLA SCHOOL OF MEDICINE OUTREACH PROGRAMS:**UCLA ReAPPLICATION PROGRAM (RAP):**

The UCLA ReApplication Program (RAP) is a comprehensive, structured program, designed to assist students from disadvantaged backgrounds who have been unsuccessful in gaining admission to any U.S. medical school. The 11-month program is conducted for up to ten students in two sessions: the first in the summer for eight weeks, the second during the 9-month academic year. RAP consists of an intensive summer devoted to Medical College Admissions Test preparation and validation of the participants' motivation for medicine. Often following a rejection, students need support and peer approval to be able to summon the necessary level

of energy, confidence and determination to continue. This is the same energy they will need to encourage their patients. The program objectives are to:

- Identify promising re-applicants from disadvantaged backgrounds, who show potential for medical training and service,
- Encourage and establish long term mentor relationships between program participants and School of Medicine faculty,
- Assess and inform effective learning, study and test-taking skills for participants,
- Develop individual academic and personal strategies for participants to enhance their readiness and the likelihood of their acceptance to medical training,
- Assist participants with their re-application to medical school,
- Provide intensive review of the Medical College Admissions Test subject areas,
- Conduct practice/mock interviews for participants who are in the medical school admissions process, and
- Provide an educational pipeline to UCLA School of Medicine.

To be eligible to participate in RAP, candidates must:

1. Be considered disadvantaged, or from an under-served community,
2. Have been previously unsuccessful in gaining admission to any U.S. medical school,
3. Have completed an undergraduate degree or higher from an accredited U.S. college or university,
4. Be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident,
5. Have a minimum GPA of 2.7 on a 4.0 scale, and
6. Have a minimum combined MCAT score of 15.

Although not required, preference is granted to legal residents of California. Priority consideration is also granted to students who have previously participated in UCLA School of Medicine educational pipeline programs.

Selection of participants is based upon eligibility; completion of the entire application procedure; submission of requested documents, including the previous AAMCAS application transmittal notification summary sheet and all previous MCAT scores; interview, and vote of the RAP Admissions Committee, which is composed of program faculty, and the RAP advisory committee. Up to ten participants are selected annually and are followed closely throughout their re-application process, through admission and graduation from medical school. There are eight participants in the RAP charter Class of 2000.

1999-2000 funding for the implementation of UCLA RAP was \$69,558 (\$15,680 State; \$44,650 University/School of Medicine; \$9,228 Outreach/OP funds).

UCLA PREMEDICAL/ PRE-DENTAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM (PREP):

UCLA PREP is a two-tiered, eight-week summer enrichment program designed to provide disadvantaged premedical and pre-dental college students with a means of strengthening their ability and readiness for health professions training. The program objectives are to:

- identify promising disadvantaged students with an interest and potential for careers in

medicine and other health careers,

- encourage and establish long term mentor relationships with program participants,
- provide an in-depth exposure to medical specialties and access to health care delivery,
- assess and inform effective learning, study and test-taking skills for participants,
- develop individual academic and personal strategies for participants to enhance their readiness and competitiveness for health professions training,
- prepare participants for successful application to U.S. medical , dental or other health professions schools,
- provide an educational pipeline to UCLA School of Medicine

To be eligible to participate in PREP, candidates must:

1. be from disadvantaged backgrounds,
2. be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident,
3. meet the following academic requirements:
 1. **Tier I**, must have completed one year of college chemistry or biology with a grade of “C” or better and have a minimum overall GPA of 2.5.
 2. **Tier II**, must have completed 1 year of biology, 2 years of chemistry, 1 year of math, and
 3. 1 semester/2 quarters of physics with a grade of “C” or better; and have an overall GPA of 2.8, and
4. complete the entire application procedure.

Selection of participants is based upon eligibility; completion of the entire application procedure; interview and vote of the PREP Admissions Committee which is composed of program faculty, administrators and program alumni who have entered or completed health professions school.

PREP admitted its charter class of 20 students in 1982. By the Class of 1999, 528 PREP alumni had successfully completed this rigorous learning experience. The current annual class enrollment is 40 students and up to two auditors. Approximately 40% of the PREP class comes from UCLA undergraduate and graduate programs; another 40% come from other California universities, colleges or community colleges, and up to 20% come from targeted schools in the nation, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic serving institutions.

Ninety-one percent of the PREP alumni have remained in the health career tract. Seven percent have moved to other careers, primarily in teaching and science. Fifty percent are currently enrolled in various levels of the academic pipeline to medicine. Forty-one percent are practicing health professionals. The UCLA School of Medicine has admitted and trained the largest number (55) of PREP alumni. Twelve members of the UCLA School of Medicine’s Class of 2003 are PREP alumni. Other health professions schools admitting PREP alumni, in descending order, are Drew University of Medicine and Science (18), followed by USC School of Medicine (12) and UCLA School of Public Health (12), then U.C. Davis School of Medicine (11), and U.C. San Diego School of Medicine (10). Other California medical schools admitting PREP alumni are: U.C. Irvine (8), U.C. San Francisco (5), Stanford (4), and Loma Linda (1). Forty-two out-of-state medical schools, led by U of Illinois, Howard and Michigan State, have enrolled PREP alumni. Twenty-two PREP alumni have attended schools of public health, seven attended osteopathic medical schools, seven attended dental schools, five attended allied health schools, two attended pharmacy schools and one attended chiropractic college. In some cases alumni have attended more than one health profession school (e.g. medicine and public health).

1999-2000 funding for the implementation of PREP was \$101,722 (\$8,596 State; \$86,735 University/School of Medicine; \$6,391 Outreach/OP funds)

CAREER BASED OUTREACH PROGRAM (CBOP):

The School of Medicine contributed to the planning and has subsequently participated as a campus partner in the UCLA Career Based Outreach Program since its implementation in 1997. The medicine CBOP is a medical exposure and academic enrichment program, conducted during the academic year for UCLA undergraduates, who have a demonstrated interest in providing medical service for disadvantaged communities.

The CBOP objectives are to:

- encourage and establish long term mentor relationships for participants,
- provide an in-depth exposure to medical specialties and access to health care delivery,
- develop individual academic and personal strategies for participants to enhance their readiness and competitiveness for health professions training,
- assist participants with their medical school applications, and
- provide an educational pipeline to UCLA School of Medicine.

To be eligible to participate in the School of Medicine CBOP, candidates must, have a GPA of 2.5 for sophomores; 2.75 for juniors or 3.0 for seniors; have the intention to pursue a career in medicine, and have a demonstrated interest in serving disadvantaged communities. In addition to the campus application for CBOP, the School of Medicine requires a secondary application. An interview is not required.

Selection of participants is based upon satisfying the eligibility requirements, completion of the campus and secondary applications, and vote of the CBOP Admissions and Advisory Committee, which is composed of program faculty, administrators and former CBOP participants, who have entered medical or other health professions training.

Of the 21 CBOP medicine fellows from 1999-2000, one is enrolled at Harvard Medical School, 15 are currently enrolled at UCLA undergraduate, and six have graduated, but have not yet reported their status. Of the 19 CBOP fellows from 1998-1999; one is enrolled at UCLA School of Medicine, one is enrolled at U.C. San Diego School of Medicine, eight are currently enrolled at UCLA undergraduate, and nine have graduated, but have not reported their status. Of the 21 CBOP medicine fellows from 1997-1998, three are enrolled at UCLA School of Medicine, one at U.C. San Francisco School of Medicine, one at U of Illinois Medical School, two are current applicants to medical school, one is enrolled in the UCLA School of Medicine ReApplication Program (our post-bac program), one is currently enrolled at UCLA undergraduate and 12 have graduated without reporting their status.

1999-2000 funding for the implementation of CBOP was \$60,095 (\$7,840 State, \$23,255 University/School of Medicine, \$29,000 Outreach/OP)

HIGH SCHOOL PREMEDICAL/PREDENTAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM (HS PREP):

The structured outreach program for up to 25 disadvantaged high school students, who are interested in careers in medicine, is UCLA H.S. PREP, a six-week summer academic and clinical exposure program. Participation gives the student an in-depth view of medical practice and the possibilities for careers in medicine. Students have an opportunity to experience college life by getting exposure to UCLA campus academic facilities during the summer. In addition, students learn the importance of scientific research to health care, while they are preparing their final projects. They see the critical basis for math and science in developing the foundation for premedical studies. In addition, participants receive academic and learning skills, as well as access to School of Medicine counseling and referrals. They also experience meeting and learning from various members of the health care delivery team, in different communities to understand how access to care differs according to socio-economic condition. Participants are assigned to mentors who are from diverse backgrounds and can serve as role models to influence their motivation and success.

The goal of the program is to encourage and support high academic achievement and an interest in medical careers, in service to disadvantaged populations.

Eligibility criteria for participation are:

- Disadvantaged background,
- Minimum age of 14,
- Enrolled in Los Angeles area high school during the preceding academic year (preference given to CBOP partner high school students), and
- Minimum 3.0 GPA on a 4.0 scale

Special consideration is given to students who show potential for academic excellence by successfully completing college math and science courses while in high school. Students who also volunteering for community service and providing care to the needy are rated highly. Selection of participants is based upon confirmation of eligibility, completed application submitted on or before the deadline, individual interview and vote of the HS PREP Admissions Committee, which is composed of program faculty, staff and previous program participants.

The follow-up database for program participants was lost and is currently being reconstructed. The UCLA School of Medicine Outreach Follow Up Survey is used to track the students' progress through the educational pipeline from high school through entry to a medical or other health career.

1999-2000 funding for the implementation of H.S.PREP was \$54,465 (\$3,920 State; \$30,655 University/School of Medicine; \$19,890 Los Angeles Initiative)

ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN & ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES:

All levels of the administrative and academic structure of the School of Medicine, in addition to University faculty, participate in the School's outreach efforts. The Sr, Associate Dean of Student Affairs, at 5% effort; the Director of Academic Enrichment and Outreach, at 45% effort

to outreach; the Assistant Director of Outreach Services, at 100% effort; the Assistant Director of Academic Services, at 20% effort, and the Director of High School Outreach at 30% effort, together comprise the central structure for outreach planning, implementation and evaluation in the School. There is additional involvement by faculty members, who serve as program instructors, mentors and members of advisory and program admissions committees. Program alumni are invited to participate as teaching assistants and members of program advisory and admissions committees.

Information is disseminated regarding programs, eligibility, calendars and events and can be found on the School of Medicine's website www.medstudent.ucla.edu/oss, through presentations at conferences and in informational brochures. Parents and counselors are invited to two important conferences of major interest to disadvantaged premedical students: "Financial Planning and Debt Management" and the "So. California Premedical Counselors Conference", both sponsored by the UCLA School of Medicine annually. The outreach administrative staff holds monthly meetings and program advisory committee meetings will be held two to three times annually.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT & COORDINATION:

All UCLA School of Medicine outreach efforts for disadvantaged students in the educational pipeline are coordinated between one another and with campus-wide services and departments. The UCLA Schools of Dentistry and Public Health are collaborators in the implementation of our eight-week summer premedical/pre-dental enrichment program for undergraduates. The targeted population of students, served by our educational pipeline, are accessed through:

- the campus Early Academic Outreach Program (high schools and middle schools),
- the community colleges having articulation agreements with UCLA,
- the local California State Universities (Northridge, Los Angeles, Long Beach and Dominguez Hills) and
- U.C. Santa Barbara and Loyola Marymount University.

There is a proposal under development for extensive outreach efforts which will link the UCLA School of Medicine, the Drew University of Medicine and Science, UCLA undergraduate and graduate programs, the California State Universities in southern California, El Camino Community College, Santa Monica Community College, East Los Angeles Community College, the Lennox School District (middle schools), King/Drew Medical Magnet High School, Centinela Valley High School and the national Health Career Opportunity Program. This comprehensive project was submitted for federal funding in January, 2000 and was approved, but not funded. Following a technical assistance meeting with the funding agency, we will revise and re-submit the proposal. These activities are intended to compliment, not hinder the current outreach efforts.

EVALUATION:

Evaluation consists of two components: first, a process evaluation and second, an outcome evaluation. The purpose of the process evaluation is to determine if the activities, designed to

reach our program goals, occurred as planned and to have participants evaluate the quality and usefulness of efforts. The outcome evaluation assesses whether the recipients of our structured outreach programs, received a benefit from the experience at defined milestones (e.g. college entrance, medical school admission, enrollment) over the length of time between their entry into the pipeline and medical or other health career.

A database to record outreach participant outcomes has been developed and is under refinement. The data fields of information for programs include: name of program, selection criteria for participants, methods to advertise program, number of participants, activities schedule and location, file name for evaluation results, and responsible staff person. The data fields of information for tracking individual student progress include: student name, social security number, student I.D. current address and telephone number, permanent address and telephone number, e-mail address, emergency contact, number, high school, college or university, disadvantaged status, fathers level of education, mother's level of education, financial aid status, year participated in H.S. PREP, in CBOP, in UCLA PREP or in UCLA RAP, SAT scores and date taken, MCAT scores and date taken, DAT scores and date taken, application to health professions school, which school(s), admissions action result, enrollment data, graduation date, and residency training program. Please refer to Appendix G for a copy of the survey form.

Areas of Challenge

The areas of challenge are primarily obtaining the resources, fiscal, human, and materiel, to make a significant impact upon the cultivation and maintenance of a viable pool of competitive applicants and medical students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Plans for 2000-2001

- Develop a School of Medicine Outreach Newsletter
- Explore accreditation for elements of UCLA PREP and UCLA H.S. PREP
- Video-stream the Outreach portion of the UCLA School of Medicine website.
- Expand the UCLA ReApplication Program

DATA SUBMISSION

UCLA Medical School Post-Baccalaureate Re-Application Programs data submitted under separate cover.

Section A.4: Graduate and Professional Outreach UCLA School of Law Outreach Report

Context & Background of Graduate, Law, or Medical Outreach Work

What outreach challenges does your division or school face?

Highly selective institutions have always faced an enormous challenge when it comes to sustaining diversity in the face of broad social inequities. Recent changes in California law have made this task even more daunting. Despite the fact that our state will soon be one in which there is no racial majority, the legal profession in California is 85% white. In 1990, Latinos constituted 26% of the state's population, yet were fewer than 5% of those licensed to practice law. While 7.4% of California's population were African American, only 2.4% of its lawyers. Dramatic declines in the enrollment of African American, Latino, and other underrepresented students at California's public law schools, resulting from Proposition 209, only threaten to intensify this representational imbalance. As a law school that regards a diverse student body as a central feature of our capacities and quality as an outstanding educational institution, one thing is for certain — there is no simple, quick or cheap solution to this dilemma.

Still, because of a strong desire to continue to provide legal education in a diverse environment, to a broad range of students, the Law School has systematically investigated numerous race-blind admissions systems in the hopes of limiting effects deleterious to one of our institutional goals — providing the legal profession with lawyers who are likely to serve all California's citizenry. Our present admission system, which takes into account socio-economic factors among other things, was adopted in response to the constraints that have been placed upon us, and is currently a work in progress.

While we have been encouraged by some of the results thus far, others have disheartened us. For example, the class of 2001, which entered the Law School in the Fall of 1998, represented more than a 66% decline in Hispanic, and a more than 87% decline in African American enrollment, as compared to our average 1990-94 enrollment numbers.¹ Reversing this decline has been complicated by the overall decrease in the number of applications received from the groups most affected by mandated changes in our admissions policy. Applications for the class graduating 2001 were down by more than 38% for Hispanics and nearly 47% for African Americans as compared to our pre-209 (1990-94) averages.

What these data reflected was the predictable result, given the new constitutional constraints, resultant public perception, the nature of the law school application pool, and the lack of an immediately applicable solution. The upper reaches of the national law school applicant pool, based on grades and LSAT scores, have very small numbers of African Americans and Latinos. In the entire nation this past year, out of 66,712 applicants to law schools, there were only 111 African American and 298 Hispanic² applicants who had LSAT scores greater than 160/89th percentile and grades of 3.25 or better. While the average admitted UCLA law student for fall 2000 has an LSAT score of 165/93rd percentile and a 3.71 GPA, only 24 African Americans and

45 Hispanics³ had LSAT scores above 164 and grades of 3.5 or better during that same period. In contrast, there were 2,595 white applicants with a 164/3.5 and above, and 7,717 with a 160/3.25 and above. When we consider that 85 African Americans enrolled at Harvard Stanford and Yale Law Schools alone in 1999, we can imagine the demand for the remaining students in the higher qualification cohort.

Furthermore, the pool of local underrepresented students, likely to be highly competitive for admission to, and prefer to attend, law school at UCLA, has been greatly diminished. UCLA and UC Berkeley are the two top feeder schools to UCLA's law program, Stanford being a distant third. Their undergraduate ranks are now reflective of the post-209 era,⁴ most likely further reducing the numbers of Latino and African American applicants in our pool.

As a result, it became apparent that it would be increasingly difficult for UCLA to enroll a sizable pool of underrepresented students unless we engaged in aggressive outreach initiatives designed to increase the small number of underrepresented applicants throughout the academic pipeline who have highly competitive academic credentials. Further, we must make UCLA the most attractive first choice for all highly competitive underrepresented admits by showing them that we want, and actively seek, their presence here.

In what ways are your efforts customized to encourage students from educationally disadvantaged and underrepresented backgrounds to apply and attend your programs or school?

Our principal outreach initiative, the LAW FELLOWS EARLY ACADEMIC OUTREACH PROGRAM, from which many of our other outreach initiatives stem, gives a strong preference to applicants whose experiences reflect limited exposure to post-collegiate education, career opportunities, mentoring and social support systems, and who have come from economically and/or educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. Special attention is paid to make sure that underrepresented students who fit the socio-economic criteria are actively encouraged to participate. Each of our outreach initiatives, including the Law Fellows Program, is designed specifically to encourage students from educationally disadvantaged and underrepresented backgrounds to apply and attend law school at UCLA. The Law Fellows Program has the additional goal of equipping participants with the learning tools that will help them take maximum advantage of the opportunities available, thereby making them as competitive as possible for admission to the UCLA School of Law

What have your previous efforts looked like?

Before passage of proposition 209, the Law School's outreach activities were limited in scope, and conducted by a wide variety of faculty, administrators, and students, using a wide variety of methods, with varied goals. The Law School, though its Admissions Office, has traditionally coordinated pre- and post- admissions recruitment.

What have you changed and why?

In the post-2009 environment it became evident that new outreach initiatives, outside of traditional admissions and recruitment work, would need to be pursued and that these initiatives would require a considerable investment of human and material resources. It also was clear that a principal challenge would be to ensure that our overall outreach efforts were coordinated, cumulative, and responsive to the UC Outreach Task Force Report and Law School's unique and evolving needs.

In 1997, the Law School hired LEO TRUJILLO-COX, a UC Berkeley and UCLA law school graduate, and appointed him EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF OUTREACH and Instructor for the LAW FELLOWS EARLY ACADEMIC OUTREACH PROGRAM. Leo was charged with a broad range of academic and administrative functions including developing and implementing a wide variety of outreach initiatives designed to prepare participants for, attract participants to, and enroll participants in, law school, including participants from under-represented community groups.

Description of Outreach Work***Articulate the mission which guides your outreach work***

The Law School regards a diverse student body as a central feature of our capacities and quality as an outstanding educational institution. We seek to produce graduates who will be at the forefront of the leadership capable of working across social lines and able to further meaningful democratic values in an increasingly complex and multi-cultural world. To that end, we are committed to aggressively and imaginatively engaging in outreach initiatives designed to encourage students from educationally disadvantaged and underrepresented backgrounds to apply and attend law school at UCLA. Additionally, we have taken the initiative to engage students throughout the educational "pipeline" with the learning tools that will help them take maximum advantage of the opportunities available.

Describe the theory(ies) of action that guide(s) your outreach work: What are the beliefs, assumptions, and research foundations that have contributed to the development of your particular outreach strategies, programs, approaches.

By equipping talented and motivated disadvantaged and underrepresented students with an academically-based program, sound counseling, test preparation, and mentorship, we are confident that the Law School will better prepare participants to successfully gain admission to, and succeed at, the UCLA School of Law. Recognizing that highly competitive students have a variety of options when making admissions decisions, we are committed to making UCLA's law school the most attractive first choice for all highly competitive disadvantaged and underrepresented accepted applicants by demonstrating to them that we want, and actively seek, their presence here, with the belief that this will lead to a greater number of these accepted applicants enrolling at UCLA

For each program, strategy, and/or approach:

a) Describe.

The Law Fellows Early Academic Outreach Program

The Law Fellows Early Academic Outreach Program was launched in the 1997-98 academic year. Working in conjunction with UCLA's Career-Based Outreach Program, the Executive Director of Outreach targeted UCLA undergraduates, early in their academic careers, for admission to Program's inaugural year. Students accepted to the Program had strong academic backgrounds, but limited exposure to mentoring and social support systems. Program participants came from socio-economically disadvantaged backgrounds and were seriously interested in preparing to apply to law school. There were 19 UCLA undergraduates enrolled in 1997-98 Program.

In 1998-99, with a successful first effort and valuable experience under its belt, the Program expanded to include undergraduates not only from UCLA but also from USC, California State Universities Northridge and Los Angeles, admitting 38 students. This expansion was based on the understanding that the Law School had a duty to deepen the pool of underrepresented students in the broader community who are competitive for admission to top law schools.

The 1999-00 Law Fellows Program, then in its third year, grew to include a multi-year comprehensive curriculum designed to encourage students to consider seriously and prepare for a career in law and to increase their academic competitiveness for admission to law school. We expanded both our enrollment and the number of institutions we draw from to include 48 new students from UCLA, USC, Occidental, and California State Universities Northridge, Los Angeles and Long Beach. Together with numerous Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional School Partners, the Program focused on students' academic development while incorporating a service-learning component. Law School faculty and staff provide intensive early academic enrichment in conjunction with extensive mentoring and counseling, career development activities, and significant financial assistance including law school scholarships. In addition to attending one year of mandatory Saturday Academies, all Law Fellow are tracked, often for several years, until they matriculate to law school, and beyond, and are provided with continuous academic and career counseling. Finally, each participant is awarded a full LSAT test preparation scholarship.

Because of the multi-year, pipeline building approach the Law Fellows Program employs, the number of students being serviced each year expands. Many of the Law Fellows participating in the Program in any given year are sophomores or juniors. Law Fellows may take longer than four years to graduate, and it would not be unusual, or imprudent, for most of them to take a year or more off before applying to law school. Currently 105 students are involved in some phase of the Law Fellows Program or are currently attending law school.

In 2000–01, the Outreach Resource Center is increasing its intensity and the number of institutions from which it will recruit Law Fellows, with a renewed emphasis on the California State University system and other local UC schools. We anticipate, yet again,

increasing the number of new participants in the Law Fellow Program.

Although the criteria for admission to the Program are academic and socio-economically based the majority of the participants are members of groups underrepresented in law schools and in the legal profession. (Refer to Attachment H)

The Outreach Resource Center is engaged in many other related academically based, long-term, pipeline-building initiatives, as well as various informational and immediate outreach measures. (Refer to Attachment H)

b) List primary objectives.

Goals:

1. Increase the competitiveness of socioeconomically disadvantaged and underrepresented students for admission to top universities and law schools with the ultimate intention of having them attend the UCLA School of Law.
2. Encourage participants to approach their educational experience systematically, seriously consider a career in law, and actively seek professional-level educational opportunities.
3. Prepare disadvantaged students for leadership positions in the community by providing them the necessary structure to fulfill their educational and career goals.

Strategies Utilized:

- b) Provide participants with early academic outreach and mentoring; introduce participants to effective study techniques in order to enhance their ability to achieve maximum academic success; provide participants with a realistic idea of what is required to become admissible to law school.
- c) Articulate a clear message of support to socioeconomically disadvantaged and underrepresented students, encouraging them to strive for academic excellence in order to achieve their academic and career goals.
- d) Provide a coordinated academic action plan: Provide individualized counseling to develop a timely and organized approach to standardized test taking and the application process
- e) Integrate career-oriented academic skill development and enrichment activities.
- f) Link financial support to academic development; provide participants with preparation course and recruitment scholarships.
- g) Develop educational “pipeline” by way of integrated K-12 components.

c) Indicate when you began employing each program, strategy, and/or approach.

The groundwork for the Law Fellows Program, and most of the other initiatives described here, were laid in the fall of 1997 and have been a work in progress ever since.

d) Delineate the funds spent on each and the source of those funds.

The depth and breadth of the outreach initiatives are supported by a combination of material and financial assistance from a number of funding sources. During the fiscal year 1999-00, nearly \$230,000 was expended from funding sources specifically designated for outreach efforts. These funding sources include the UCLA Career-Based Outreach Program (C-BOP), the UCLA Graduate Division, the UC Office of the President and the California

State Legislature. Also, an additional \$170,000 was contributed to the outreach effort from the Law School and other private sources, including a generous grant from the Wallis Foundation, as facilitated by Jeff Glassman (UCLA '69) and Cecilia Aguilera (UCLA School of Law '88).

e) Identify the population you intend to effect.

The Law School's outreach initiatives are designed for high-potential underrepresented and disadvantaged students whose experiences reflect familial limited exposure to post-collegiate education, career opportunities, mentoring and social support systems, and who have come from educationally or economically disadvantaged communities, and who have demonstrated an interest in attending law school.

Organizational Design & Administrative Practices

Who is involved? To what extent?

The EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF OUTREACH is responsible for a broad range of academic and administrative functions as they relate to the outreach initiatives. The Executive Director is the primary administrator of all services in the area of outreach. The Executive Director also coordinates student sponsored outreach activities, evaluates and improves existing outreach efforts, and creates programs and systems to address current and future needs. Together with UCLA law school faculty, the Executive Director also is an Instructor of "Early Academic Outreach" and works on outreach initiatives to attract and enroll top candidates, including members of underrepresented groups, to the Law School. The Executive Director oversees program development, management, and instruction; cultivation and acquisition of program funding; creation of strategic plan for outreach; the generation and editing of curriculum and program materials; marketing and publicity; recruitment, selection, supervision and retention of program participants; production of in-house publications, proposals, and advertisements; training and supervision of staff; development of alumni and legal community networks; planning and financial budget analysis.

The ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF OUTREACH develops and implements a wide variety of Outreach initiatives designed to prepare participants for, attract participants to, and enroll participants in, law school, including participants from under-represented community groups. The Associate Director creates new programs and systems to address currently unmet needs, and evaluates and improves existing Outreach initiatives. The Associate Director provides pre- and post admissions counseling and assists with the development of the Outreach Programs web site, computer programs, systems, and databases, and is responsible for their timely update and maintenance.

The Admissions Office staff is also involved in outreach activities as indicated in Attachment I.

How are decisions made?

The Executive Director of Outreach receives general direction from the Dean, Associate Dean, and Assistant Dean of Admissions & Recruitment. The Executive Director of Outreach often exercises independent judgement regarding courses of action and a majority of job functions are

self-initiated and executed independently.

The Associate Director of Outreach works under the direct supervision of the Executive Director of Outreach. Assignments are given in terms of programmatic and organizational goals and objectives established by the Executive Director. The Associate Director meets regularly with the Director to review progress of work and attainment of goals. The Associate Director also coordinates work related to admission activities with the Assistant Dean of Admissions & Recruitment.

How are stakeholders and staff kept informed?

Program and budget proposals are distributed to stakeholders at the beginning of each year. Program and budget reports are also circulated widely at the end of each year. Oral presentations are also given at various meetings.

Program Development and Coordination

In what ways, if any, are your outreach activities coordinated with those of:

a) other campus-based schools, departments, or programs?

The Law School is a partner with the UCLA Career-Based Outreach Program (C-BOP). The Law Fellows Program coordinates activities to enhance the skills introduced to the C-BOP undergraduate participants who indicate an interest in attending law school. CBOP provides the Law Fellows Program with administrative and financial support.

Law Fellows also attend a series of general information sessions designed to de-mystify other graduate and professional programs and career options. Participating program partners include the Anderson Graduate School of Management, the School of Dentistry, the School of Education and Information Studies, the School of Engineering, the School of Medicine, the School of Public Policy and Social Research, the School of Public Health, the College of Letters and Science, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools, University Extension, UCLA Campus Community Service, and Student Affairs. These program partners meet on a quarterly basis to share information and coordinate activities.

b) K-12 efforts?

Through our partnership with the Career-Based Outreach Program's service-learning approach, the Law School links our K-12 "pipeline" goal with that of increasing the academic competitiveness of undergraduates for Law School admissions. In return for the services provided to the Law Fellows by the Law School, undergraduate Fellows tutor and mentor high school students (Scholars) at local socio-economically-disadvantaged area schools. Fellows also assist Scholars in developing an individualized academic college plan in conjunction with law school enrichment activities. Additionally, Fellows aid in developing curriculum and instructional strategies to train high school students as tutors for "pipe-line" junior high students (Junior Scholars).

Our partnership with the Constitutional Rights foundation, described in greater detail in Attachment I, further allows us to coordinate and enhance existing K-12 outreach efforts.

c) Community College efforts?

As part of its “pipeline” building efforts, the Executive Director of Outreach regularly speaks at Community College Transfer fairs on campus and participates in UCLA’s Transfer Summer Program.

d) CSU efforts?

Similarly, as part of its “pipeline” building efforts, the Law School has increased dramatically its attendance at CSU information and recruitment functions. The Law Fellows Program has been, or will be actively recruiting applications to its Program from students at many of the local CSU campuses.

Evaluation

Evaluation strategy

The School of Law is committed to adhering to an effective methodology for its outreach evaluation efforts. The Executive Director of Outreach designs and monitors the assessment tools and methodology. Recommendations on programmatic issues and design are made at various stages of all outreach efforts so that adjustments can be made as needed.

Indicators of success (include a description of the indicator, an explanation of why you chose it as an indicator of success, and the data collected).

Given that the Law Fellows Program and its component parts, are, at their heart, long-term “pipeline” endeavors it will require some time to gauge adequately the success of the Program. However, there is some evidence that we are making a significant impact on individual students:

- Surveys and evaluations involving outreach participants are conducted widely. Law Fellows Program and Instructor Evaluations have consistently reflected extremely high scores in all areas. All evaluations are available upon request.
- Preliminary statistical data show that participants in the Law Fellows Program showed an increase in their cumulative UGPA from 3.31 to 3.46 in the first nine months of their participation in the Program. We are in the process of creating a database that would include nearly all program participants in order to chart their undergraduate performance from the time they begin at the University until they graduate.
- In the 1998 - 1999 law school admission cycle, the Program had its first four Law Fellows apply to law schools. All applied, and were accepted with scholarship offers, widely. One Fellow chose to attend George Washington with another choosing to attend USC with a full three-year scholarship. The other two Law Fellows were admitted to, and chose to attend UCLA. Both Fellows were awarded a highly competitive Graduate Opportunity Scholarship. These Law Fellows told us that they expect that their success in the admissions process was due, in no small part to their participation in the Law Fellows Program. Additionally, the

Law Fellows who were admitted and came to UCLA told us that they most likely would have attended a law school other than UCLA had they not previously developed such a close relationship with the Law School through the Program.

- The 1999-2000 admissions cycle saw at least 16 Law Fellows applying to law schools with 15 of those applying to UCLA. Four of those Law Fellows were admitted to UCLA's fall 2001 entering class. Three of those Law Fellows enrolled at UCLA, with one deciding to go to Yale. Again, these Law Fellows tell us that they might have attended another law school if they had not felt such an affinity for the Law School and so valued by it. We anticipate that the numbers of Law Fellows applying to, and getting into, law school, and those choosing to attend UCLA, will only increase in the years to come.

Mechanisms for providing information to students, faculty & advisors

As with the stakeholders, Program and budget reports are circulated widely at the end of each year and oral presentations are also given at various meetings.

Areas of challenge

Perhaps the most daunting aspect of conducting proper evaluation of our current outreach initiatives is related to the fact that our efforts are multi-year pipeline initiatives and thus requires extensive long-term tracking of a highly mobile student population.

Describe outreach plans for the 2000-01 year that have been informed by this year's progress, with particular attention to: program expansion, administrative structure, coordination with other campus and external outreach efforts, and evaluation.

The Law School, and the Outreach Resource Center, are encouraged thus far by the short-term fruits of our outreach initiatives. With the number of underrepresented minority students who were part of the fall 2000 entering class constituting a 85% increase from the class enrolled in 1999, we are cautiously optimistic that we have turned a corner with respect to diversity in our entering classes. We have reason to suspect that this improvement is due, in no small part, to our outreach efforts pursued aggressively and imaginatively. Accordingly, as the projected increase in the 2000-01 outreach budget suggests, this initial success only strengthens our resolve, as we enter the 2000-01 academic year, to enhance and expand our outreach efforts on all levels

The Outreach Resource Center hired UC Santa Barbara, and Harvard Law School, alum, ANTHONY TOLBERT, to fill the position of ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF OUTREACH. Mr. Tolbert is scheduled to begin work in early November 2000. Additionally, the Law School has just completed the construction of a new Outreach Resource Center in order to house the expanding Outreach staff.

UCLA Graduate Division

The UCLA Graduate Division continues to emphasize that diversity and outreach is everyone's responsibility. We have tried to reflect that philosophy within Graduate Division operations. All staff in all areas have been trained in outreach. During the 1999-2000 year, 20 staff were involved in 30 graduate recruitment visits. For the 2000-2001 year, Graduate Division staff from all areas were again participating in the graduate information day fairs.

In addition, a key strategy has been the development and sharing of information from our institutional databases that keeps diversity in the forefront of planning and informs relevant administrators and faculty about the status of graduate diversity on our campus.

We are increasingly guided by the notion that we are most successful when working at the local level. The involvement of faculty and graduate students in outreach and diversity efforts has yielded more positive results resulting in the redirection of our resources to facilitate this objective.

We have shifted Graduate Division efforts and staff activity to work collaboratively with faculty and graduate students to achieve outreach and diversity goals. In this capacity, there has been an increasing effort to work with other programs such as the Center for Academic Research and Excellence, The MARC Program, and the Howard Hughes program.

The main objective remains to diversify the enrollment in graduate education in all graduate degree programs at UCLA. We also continue to examine a variety of programs and reconstruction efforts in ways that yield a more diverse applicant pool to UCLA graduate programs.

1. Admissions:
 - The role of GRE scores in the admissions process has been under scrutiny. There has been a great deal of discussion regarding the salience of GRE scores on admission decisions. Decisions based heavily on GRE may disadvantage certain groups. Appropriate versus inappropriate uses of the GRE have been the subject of a number of presentations by the Vice Chancellor/Dean Claudia Mitchell-Kernan who recently served as Chair of the GRE Board.
 - Less emphasis on undergraduate institutions and GPA. Elements of academic elitism.
 - Currently conducting empirical examinations on the data comparing variables such as time to degree, attrition, etc. to see what kind of predictor undergraduate institution, GRE, and GPA are. This is done to discourage applicant ranking and cut-offs.

2. Funding: The Graduate Division generally over allocates support funds and takes into consideration issues of diversity in reallocating savings resulting from “declines.” (E.g. The Graduate Division has in some instances awarded more than one Cota Robles per department)
3. Have been working with the Chancellor’s Committee on Diversity, the Graduate Student Association, and the Graduate Council to establish a sub-committee of the Outreach Steering Committee which would focus on graduate student diversity.
4. In conjunction with the “Women 4 Change 2000” scheduled in Spring, the Graduate Division sponsored a reception honoring the academic accomplishments and contributions of UCLA’s women graduate students and developed an exhibit on women PhDs which was displayed for six months.
5. In conjunction with the Graduate Council, scheduled a retreat (now termed an “advance”) in March 24, 2000. With discussion focused exclusively on graduate student diversity issues, participants included representatives from OP (i.e., Ellen Switkes, Kate Jeffery, Shelia O’Rourke), UC Regents (Velma Montoya, Peter Taylor), as well as UCLA administrators, academic deans and faculty from various areas of campus.

We have increased our efforts to ensure all relevant constituencies from faculty, department chairs, graduate students, graduate student associations, graduate council, and administrators are kept fully informed of the status of graduate student diversity and some of the issues involved. We have begun meetings with key faculty and staff who have responsibility for diversity in different sectors of the campus with the overall goal of coordinating and planning activities in ways that are complementary rather than competitive and to better link elements in a more fully conceptualized pipeline approach. The data are disseminated electronically to relevant campus constituencies and are made available on-line.

1. Production of the *Graduate Focus* article summarizing issues, concerns and activities relating to ethnic diversity at UCLA and distributed this ‘status report’ to all faculty on campus. Two related articles are in process, one focusing on women and the other on international students.
2. Production of the *Graduate Quarterly*: We feature graduate students and ensure that underrepresented students are included as a means of relaying a sense of welcome and belonging to the campus.
3. Production of the Annual Report. Sections of our annual report distributed internally and externally. Always provides summary information, which comprises another status report, which deals with application, admissions, enrollment and financial support of underrepresented students as well as other demographic groups.

We continue to track participants in our Summer Research Program and in Special Fellowship Cohorts to monitor their activities as a measure of the effectiveness of the programs. We are at the beginning of the process of enhancing our student tracking systems of the various outreach and diversity related interventions and activities. This has been assigned to our education information and technology specialist as a special assignment.

1. Diversity Component of Graduate Council Department Reviews reinstated. Removed as a result of Proposition 209.
2. Departmental Profiles. Each year institutional research prepares a diversity profile of each department, which presents longitudinal data on application, admissions, and enrollments

by underrepresented student and other demographic groups. Circulation of these data also enhances faculty awareness.

3. Highlight the placement success of underrepresented students that over the past 5 years has been excellent across the full range of academic disciplines and employment sectors for PhDs.
4. Program Review. The Deans' letters, which are sent to review teams routinely, bring issues of diversity into focus and seek the advice of external visitors on how our efforts can be improved. This is another tactic to make it the responsibility of all.

Successfully communicating that diversity is everyone's job and getting faculty more proactive in outreach and recruitment efforts continues to remain a challenge. During 1999-2000, the Graduate Division continued proactive efforts to help ensure a more diverse graduate student population. Major activities were as follows:

1. Recruitment Allocation Funds – The Graduate Division has made special provisions to increase funding for applicant visits to campus. The yield of a more diverse admissions population has been enhanced by such visits. These funds enable applicants to have direct meetings with faculty. Departments would then be able to get a different sense of the applicant and have information other than GPA, GRE, and undergraduate institution to evaluation potential students.
2. Developed and administered a small grant program to encourage and support innovative outreach efforts, which increase the involvement of faculty and graduate students at the departmental level and help expand and diversity the applicant pool. In 1999-2000 we funded 16 proposals in amounts ranging from \$700 to \$8,000.
3. Expanded Graduate Division outreach and recruitment activities to include new and non-traditional venues such as the Foreign Area Officer University Fair at the Defense Language Institute and private foundation scholar programs.
4. Worked with faculty affiliated with the Center for Afro-American Studies in submitting a grant proposal to the Mellon and Woodrow Wilson Foundations. The proposal is to develop a Summer Research Institute for undergraduates interested in pursuing graduate education, in various disciplines, whose primary interests involve research and scholarship in African American Studies. Recruitment of student participants will focus specifically, although not exclusively, on HBCU's. To date, we have received no decision on this proposal.
5. Organized and hosted a University of California Conference titled "Achieving Graduate Student Diversity: Who is Responsible? What Works and What doesn't" (November 12, 1999).
6. Special receptions were held for Chicano, African- American, and American-Indian graduate students to identify individuals interested in participating in outreach efforts and to provide a forum for the discussion of diversity issues as they may affect graduate careers.
7. Continued Graduate Division's Summer Research Program for Undergraduates interested in pursuing doctoral educations. In the Summer of 2000, 30 students participated in this program. This program pairs students with faculty mentors who work with their own research projects and provide a variety of programmatic activities intended to enhance their motivation and preparation for graduate study.

8. The Graduate Division increased stipend amounts for special fellowships targeted for diversity by \$2500 each beginning the 2000 – 2001 academic year. We will continue efforts to increase the number of funded positions from campus resources.

UC LEADS

The program is designed to prepare educationally or economically disadvantaged undergraduates pursuing courses of study in science, mathematics, or engineering who are likely to succeed in graduate school for entry and success in UC graduate programs.

The UC LEADS program is currently in its inception year. As a result, the challenges we have faced regarding our outreach efforts are more a result of early program development and implementation. Due to time constraints, the nine scholars for the 2000-2001 cohort year were identified and selected by a faculty review committee.

The application process for the 2001 - 2002 cohort is currently in development and will be promoted to all eligible students, potential faculty mentors, department chairs and undergraduate student advisors in the targeted academic fields. Through this method, we anticipate obtaining a greater student interest and program awareness.

The program is collaboratively run along with the Center for Academic Research and Excellence, the MARC program, the Howard Hughes program. Students in each program will participate in several overlapping events including participating in programmatically unique events. The Graduate Division administers the UCLA UC LEADS program and works closely with a Faculty Advisory Committee in establishing programmatic guidelines, curriculum, and application procedures. The Faculty Advisory Committee is composed of UCLA faculty in the sciences with a strong interest and commitment to diversity and outreach programs.

In order to further meet the program objective the following program curriculum has been developed for the UC LEADS scholars.

Program Components

1. Undergraduate Mentorship Experience (Pipeline model)
 - Scholars to have a faculty advisor/mentor
 - Scholars to mentor a high school or university level student
 - Scholars to have a graduate student mentor: graduate student mentor can invite scholars to participate in “mid stream seminars, dissertation defense, etc” to demystify the graduate education experience.
2. Campus Academic Enrichment Opportunities (see below)
3. Annual University-wide Symposium
4. Summer Research Program Experiences
5. Involvement in Professional and Scientific Societies
6. Scientific Research and Presentations

7. Travel to Other UC Campuses for Training and Exposure to Campus Graduate Study Opportunities

Educational Enrichment Activities

First Year

Summer

CARE/Graduate Division Summer Research Program

1. Research with faculty advisor/mentor
2. GRE Preparation course
3. Enrichment Workshops
 - Scientific Writing
 - Preparing Academic Presentations

Academic Year

4. Mentoring component (Pipeline model)
5. Other UC Campus visits
6. Conference Participation: SACNAS or NMRS
7. 2-unit seminar course (e.g. Chem 196)
 - Journal Club (9 meetings over the academic year): training in reading and discussing scientific literature
 - Research Presentations (9 meetings over the academic year)
 - Scientific Ethics (3 meetings over the academic year)
8. Joint activities with MARC and HH Programs
 - Graduate Education Workshop (Financing, applications, etc.)
 - Academic Career Planning Workshop
 - Research seminars (3 meetings over the academic year): brief written summaries required
 - Computer Resources Workshop
 - Library Resources Workshop
 - Field Trip: Amgen, etc.
9. Poster Presentation at UG Science Poster Day

Second Year

Summer

Summer Research Program at other UC campus

Academic Year

1. Mentoring component (Pipeline model)
2. Two-unit seminar course (e.g. Chem 96)

- Journal Club (9 meetings over the academic year)
- Research Presentations (9 meetings over the academic year)
- Scientific Ethics (3 meetings over the academic year)
- 3. Joint activities with MARC and HH Programs
 - Research seminars (3 meetings over the academic year): brief written summaries required
 - Workshop on Graduate School Admissions
 - Fellowship Workshop
- 4. Other UC Campus visits
- 5. Research Presentations at Systemwide Symposium
- 6. Conference Participation: National Meeting of Appropriate Scientific Society

UCLA Outreach School Status

7/1/2000

LAUSD Local District A: *Superintendent Debbie Leidner*

Canoga Park	From no relationship to Info-Only Outreach
Chatsworth	From Informational Outreach to UC Bound
El Camino Real	From UC Bound to Info-Only Outreach
Granada Hills	Drop from service (from Info-Only Outreach)
Monroe	UC Bound
Kennedy	Info-Only Outreach

LAUSD Local District B: *Superintendent Judy Burton*

San Fernando	New Super 12 (CBOP started 2000-01)
North Hollywood	UC Bound
Polytechnic	UC Bound
Sylmar	UC Bound
Verdugo Hills	No UCLA Outreach relationship

LAUSD Local District C: *Superintendent Bob Collins*

Birmingham	From UC Bound to Info-Only Outreach
Cleveland	UC Bound
Grant	UC Bound
Taft	UC Bound
Reseda	Info-Only Outreach
Van Nuys	Info-Only Outreach

LAUSD Local District D: *Superintendent Merle Price*

Venice	SUP and CBOP (USC MESA)
Westchester	SUP, CBOP and UCLA MESA
Hamilton	CBOP and UCLA MESA
LACES	CBOP and UCLA MESA
Palisades Charter	CBOP and UCLA MESA
Fairfax	UC Bound and UCLA MESA
University	Info-Only Outreach

LAUSD Local District E: *Superintendent Lilliam Castillo*

Eagle Rock	No UCLA Outreach relationship
Franklin	Moving from UC Bound to Info-Only Outreach
Marshall	UC Bound
Los Angeles	UC Bound
Hollywood	No UCLA Outreach relationship

LAUSD Local District F: *Superintendent Richard Alonzo*

Belmont	UC Bound
Bravo Medical Magnet	UC Bound
Wilson	UC Bound
Lincoln	Info-Only Outreach
CERC: Hope Street	

LAUSD Local District G: Superintendent Renee Jackson

Crenshaw	Super 12, CBOP and UCLA MESA
Dorsey	Super 12, CBOP and UCLA MESA
Manual Arts	Super 12 and CBOP
Washington Prep	Super 12 and CBOP

LAUSD Local District H: Superintendent Bonnie Rubio

Garfield	Super 12 and CBOP
Jefferson	Super 12 and CBOP
Roosevelt	Super 12 and CBOP
CERC: Dolores Mission	

LAUSD Local District I: Superintendent George McKenna

Fremont	Super 12 and CBOP
Jordan	Super 12 and CBOP
Locke	Super 12 and CBOP
CERC: Watts Labor Community Action Committee	

LAUSD Local District J: Superintendent Dale Vigil

South Gate	New Super 12 (CBOP started 2000-01)
Bell	UC Bound
Huntington Park	UC Bound
CERC: Elizabeth Street	

LAUSD Local District K: Superintendent Dick Vladovic

Carson	UC Bound
Gardena	UC Bound
Narbonne	UC Bound
San Pedro	No UCLA Outreach relationship
Banning	UC Irvine EAOP

Inglewood Unified: Superintendent James Harris

Inglewood	SUP, CBOP and UCLA MESA
Morningside	SUP, CBOP and UCLA MESA
CERC: City of Inglewood and 100 Black Men of Los Angeles	

Lynwood Unified: Superintendent Harold Cebrun

Lynwood	SUP and CBOP
----------------	---------------------

Antelope Valley Union High School District: Superintendent Robert Girolamo

Antelope Valley	UC Bound
Highland	UC Bound
Lancaster	UC Bound
Littlerock	UC Bound
Palmdale	UC Bound
Quartz Hill	UC Bound

Archdiocese:**Cantwell
St. Bernard****UC Bound**
From CBOP to **UC Bound****Culver City Unified:****Culver City****From Info Only to UC Bound****Pasadena Unified:****Muir
Pasadena****UC Bound**
Drops from service**Santa Monica-Malibu Unified:****Santa Monica****Info-Only Outreach**

Cathedral High School

Drops from service

El Rancho Unified

El Rancho

Transferring to UC Irvine as SUP School

Montebello Unified

Bell Gardens

Transferring to UC Irvine as SUP School

Montebello

Transferring to UC Irvine as SUP School

LEGEND**SUP and Super 12 and CBOP****CBOP and UC Bound****EAOPs UC Bound**

(academic advisement and informational outreach)

Info-Only Outreach

UCLA's Outreach "Theory of Action": A Work In Progress
Jeannie Oakes
(10/29/2000)

Determined to open college doors for students in schools and communities that have not traditionally sent large numbers of graduates, UCLA has embarked on an ambitious Outreach initiative. The strategies we employ reflect research about college preparation, generally, and about the conditions that educationally disadvantaged schools and communities require to foster high achievement and college access for young people. For the most part, these are the same conditions that middle and upper-middle class youngsters from college-going families routinely enjoy:

- A College-Going School Culture
- Opportunities to Develop a Multi-Cultural College-Going Identity
- A Rigorous Academic Curriculum
- Access to Qualified Teachers
- Intensive Academic and Social Supports
- Connections with Parents and Community Supporting Advanced Study

Together, these conditions provide a comprehensive, research-based theory of action for mapping out meaningful partnerships between UCLA and Los Angeles schools and communities. Our years of working to improve urban schools and teaching, combined with our experience with tutoring, mentoring, college information programs, academic "boot camps," Saturday Academies, campus visits, and more for close to 10,000 students a year, underscore the importance of creating a comprehensive, integrated set of services and supports. While specific activities must be tailored to the needs of particular schools and communities, in every site we must provide direct services to students and help build the capacity of teachers, administrators, parents, and community members to ensure deep and systemic change.

A College-Going Culture

Condition: Teachers, administrators, parents, and students share the belief that all students should have the opportunity to go to college, and they believe that college going is expected and attainable. Moreover, they also consider the effort and persistence that preparation for college requires as a normal part of growing up.

Why This Matters: Because students' learning is strongly tied to the expectations of those around them and the quality of their opportunities to learn, an overarching theme of a college-going culture is the importance of educators maintaining a belief that all of their students can learn at high levels. A number of studies have documented the power of a school culture that expects all students to spend time and effort on academic subjects and believes that that effort will pay off in high levels of academic achievement.¹ And we also know, for example, that low-income students, in particular, perform poorly when their teachers do not believe in their abilities.² Of course, high expectations, in themselves, are not enough. But when those expectations are present, teachers seem more able and willing to provide rigorous academic instruction and press for high standards; in turn, students respond with greater effort, persistence, and achievement.³ Research also supports the centrality of adult advocates who provide specific information and encouragement for college going.⁴ But, schools can also construct peer groups that help create and support a culture for adolescents where college going and the hard work it takes seem "normal."⁵ In such groups, students support one another's aspirations, share critical information, and counter the many forces in low-income communities that work against high achievement. When such

groups are built into the culture of schools, they have proven successful at facilitating close, supportive relationships among students and the caring adults who keep tabs on their progress.⁶

Developing a Multi-Cultural College-Going Identity

Condition: Students see college as integral to their identities; they have the confidence and skills to negotiate college without sacrificing their own identity and connections with their home communities

Why This Matters: Attacking head on the role that race and culture play in shaping students' identities is crucial to building a college-going school culture. In contrast to commonly held views that low income students devalue education, studies suggest that they more likely turn away because of a real or perceived lack of opportunities.⁷ A recent RAND study of low-income high school graduates who were eligible to attend the University of California, but chose not to found that the students were most deterred by their beliefs that the university is “not for people like me,” and that that they weren't prepared for the university's high demands.⁸ These perceptions arise, in part, as students internalize negative labels assigned to their racial and cultural groups. Black and Latino students are most susceptible to what Claude Steele terms “a stereotype threat.”⁹ Students who perceive that their race plays a role in their test performance perform poorer on tests. Creating community and school-based role model programs helps create environments where college attendance is the norm, not the exception. Moreover, developing a multicultural college-going identity also means confronting explicitly a hidden assumption often made when universities reach out to low-income schools to provide services and supports to their students. That is, that college going will enable students to leave their urban communities behind and gain economic access to more affluent communities. Rarely is the focus of outreach and college-going learning meaningfully located in the worlds students inhabit, however there is extensive research documenting the benefits of locally situating student support and student learning.¹⁰

Participation in Rigorous Academic Courses

Condition: All students are prepared for and have access to algebra in middle school and college preparatory and AP courses in high school.

Why This Matters: The more academic courses students take, the more positive their schooling outcomes. Advanced courses, in particular, have positive effects on student achievement, particularly in science and mathematics, in students' preparedness for college, and in their success in college-level work.¹¹ Recent data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress show, for example, that 8th graders who take algebra perform considerably better on the NAEP mathematics exam, and the more math they take the better they do.¹² So, for example, when New York City eliminated all of the non-Regents level courses (non-college preparatory courses) in academic high school subjects, the number of Hispanic students passing Regents Science tripled in a single year, and the number of African American students passing doubled.¹³ Moreover, the intensity and quality of students' high school courses (a combination of the number and difficulty level of academic classes taken, and perhaps best symbolized by completing one math course beyond Algebra 2) is the most powerful factor in increasing their chances for completing a four-year college degree, and that the impact is far more pronounced for African American and Latino students than any other pre-college opportunity.¹⁴ Not surprisingly, then, the College Board advises high-minority schools to revise their curriculum offerings to make all 9th and 10th grade academic classes “pre-AP” courses.¹⁵ Taking one step further, preparing for these challenging high school classes demands a rigorous middle grades curricula—one undifferentiated by ability groups or tracks. Most students learn more in high-level classes (ability groups or tracks) than do students with comparable prior achievement who take lower level classes.¹⁶

Access to Qualified Teachers

Condition: Well-qualified teachers provide instruction that engages students in work of high intellectual quality. Importantly, in diverse communities, such teaching makes valued knowledge accessible to students from diverse backgrounds.

Why This Matters: Probably the most powerful factor in students' academic success is their access to well-prepared teachers. Considerable research supports the significant and positive relationship between teacher quality including teacher certification status, degree in field, and participation in high-quality professional development with student outcomes.¹⁷ Many studies also find that improving the quality of teaching in the classroom has the greatest impact on students who are most educationally at risk, and that, in some instances, the effects of well-prepared teachers on student achievement are stronger than the influences of student background factors, such as poverty, language background, and minority status.¹⁸ The powerful impact of well-qualified teachers can be explained, in part, by the fact that such teachers provide a wide range of teaching strategies, including the ability to ask higher order questions, respond to students' needs and curriculum goals, and make subject matter accessible to diverse groups of students.¹⁹ Poorly qualified teachers spend more time on drill and practice, while those better prepared can engage students in higher level thinking about content.²⁰ Moreover, well-prepared teachers of students of color and language minority students use strategies that bridge students' home culture and language with the knowledge and skills that matter at school. They demonstrate a valuing of all cultures in the academic curriculum.²¹

Intensive Academic and Social Supports

Condition: Students are provided a support network of tutors, material resources, counseling services, and summer academic programs; they have access to SAT prep, coaching about college admissions, financial aid, and other assistance in navigating the college-going process. The combination of academic and social support enables students to navigate the complex pathway through high school to college admission.

Why This Matters: Interventions that provide special assistance to low-income minority students boost their achievement, their success in college preparatory middle and high school classes and increase their likelihood of admission to and success in college. This help is more effective when it provides additional instruction on the material in students' regular classes than when it consists of a separate remedial curriculum. As the College Board makes clear to schools offering Advanced Placement courses to disadvantaged minority students, "[S]chools with successful AP programs realize that not only should students be challenged with a rigorous curricula and motivation for learning, but the support network should also be present that makes it possible for them to succeed and difficult to fail."²² Moreover, in addition to the academic gains students can make, the social networks that they develop when they work one-on-one or in after-school settings with college students and adults savvy about the college-preparation process can provide a form of access that students lack elsewhere in their families and communities.²³

Connections with Parents and Community Supporting Advanced Study

Condition: Parents and the community-at-large are actively involved with meeting the other objectives described here. Moreover, connections between families and schools build on parents' strengths and consider them a valuable education resource for students.

Why This Matters: School success is enhanced by increased communication between schools and families in low-income, as well as more affluent, neighborhoods.²⁴ Going beyond the annual parent-teacher conference, successful urban schools engage parents in seminars, workshops, and

other outreach efforts in order to provide parents with knowledge about education issues ranging from national standards and assessment to tracking and access of underrepresented students to post-secondary education so that they can become effective advocates for their children.²⁵ Part of the essential learning is to help parents understand the post-secondary education system and how to negotiate a successful pathway toward it.²⁶ As the College Board notes, parents also need skills “to link schools and government efforts with those based in the community.”²⁷ Community organizations such as local churches and boys' and girls' clubs can help communicate to parents the importance of providing their children with challenging curricula. Moreover, as countless current reform documents emphasize, coordinating community and social services to best serve students and their families is an essential scaffold for school success.²⁸

References:

- ¹ Considerable research supports the impact on students' achievement of schools where they experience access to knowledge, an institutional “press” for achievement, and conditions that support teacher efficacy. See, for example, Jeannie Oakes, “What Educational Indicators: The Importance of School Context,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11 (2), 181-199.989; D. Berliner, “Research On Teaching: Concepts, Findings and Implications,” in P. Peterson and H. Walberg (eds.), *Tempus Educare*, 120-135, Berkeley, CA: McCutchan; S.S. Peng, J.A. Owings, and W.B. Feters, “Effective High Schools: What Are Their Attributes?” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, Cincinnati, OH, August, 1982; W.H. Schmidt, “High-School Course Taking: Its Relationship to Achievement,” unpublished manuscript, 1982.
- ² See, for example, Ronald Ferguson, “Teachers' Expectations and the Test Score Gap,” in C. Jencks and M. Phillips (eds.), *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, Washington, D.C: The Brookings Institute, 1998.
- ³ V. E. Lee, A. S. Bryk, and J.B. Smith, “The Organization of Effective Secondary Schools” in L. Darling-Hammond (Ed), *Review of Research in Education 19*, 171-268, 1993; H. M. Marks, K. B. Doane, and W. G. Secada. “Support for Student Achievement.” in F.M. Newmann & Associates (Ed.), *Authentic Achievement: Restructuring Schools for Intellectual Quality*, San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1996; V. E. Lee and J. B. Smith, “Social Support and Achievement for Young Adolescents in Chicago: The Role of School Academic Press,” *American Educational Research Journal*, 36, 907-945, Winter 1999.
- ⁴ See, for example, Patricia McDonough, *Choosing Colleges*, Albany: State University of New York, 1997.
- ⁵ See, for example, Hugh Mehan and others, *Constructing School Success*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- ⁶ See, for example, Jeannie Oakes, Karen Quartz, Steve Ryan, and Martin Lipton, *Becoming Good American Schools: The Struggle for Civic Virtue in Education Reform*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- ⁷ See, L. Steinberg, *Beyond the Classroom*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996.
- ⁸ C. Krop, D. Brewer, S. Gates, B. Gill, R. Reichardt, M. Sundt, and D. Throgmorton, *Potentially Eligible Students: A Growing Opportunity for the University of California*, Santa Monica: RAND, 1998.
- ⁹ See, Claude Steele, “A Threat in the Air: How Stereotypes Shape Intellectual Identity and Performance,” *American Psychologist*, 1997.
- ¹⁰ For the critical value of community and school-based “role model” programs see Catherine Cooper et. al., “Bridging Students' Multiple Worlds: African-American & Latino Youth in Academic Outreach Programs,” in R. F. Macias and R. G. Garcia Ramos (eds.), *Changing Schools for Changing Students*, Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, 1995; see also Phelan, Davidson, and Yu, 1996.
- ¹¹ Adam Gamoran, “The Stratification Of High School Learning Opportunities,” paper prepared

for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1986; Valerie E. Lee, "The Effect of Curriculum Tracking on the Social Distribution of Achievement In Catholic And Public Secondary Schools," paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1986; Valerie E. Lee and A.S. Bryk, "Curriculum Tracking as Mediating the Social Distribution of High School Achievement," *Sociology of Education*, 62, 78-94, April, 1988.

¹² Education Trust, *Education Watch 1998: State and National Data Book*, 2, Washington, DC: author, 1998, p. 21.

¹³ Education Trust, *Education Watch 1998*, p. 10.

¹⁴ Clifford Adelman, *Answers in the Tool Box: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns, and Bachelors' Degree Attainment*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 1999.

¹⁵ The College Board, *The Advanced Placement Challenge: Providing Excellence and Equity for the Future*, New York: author, 1993, p. 5.

¹⁶ J. Oakes, "Two Cities: Tracking and Within-School Segregation" in Ellen Condliffe Lagemann & La Mar Miller (Eds.), *Brown v. Board of Education: The Challenge for Today's Schools*. New York: Teachers College, 1996; J. Oakes, "Grouping and Tracking" in Alan E. Kazdin (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2000.

¹⁷ P. P. Hawk, C. R. Cobble, and M. Swanson, "Certification: It Does Matter," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 36(3), 13-15; D. H. Monk and J. King, "Multi-Level Teacher Resource Effects on Pupil Performance in Secondary Mathematics and Science: The Role of Teacher Subject Matter Preparation," in R. G. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *Contemporary Policy Issues: Choices and Consequences in Education*, Ithaca, NY: ILR Press, 1994, 29-58; L. Darling-Hammond, "What Matters Most: A Competent Teacher for Every Child," *Phi Delta Kappan*, 77, 193-201, 1996; Ronald Ferguson, "Teachers' Expectations and the Test Score Gap," in C. Jencks and M. Phillips (Eds.), *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, Washington, D.C: The Brookings Institute, 1998:

¹⁸ Tennessee researchers estimated that about 40 percent of the black/white achievement gap would disappear if poor and minority students simply had access to teachers of the same quality as other students. William L. Sanders and Joan C. Rivers, "Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement," 1996. Texas students in school districts that hired better qualified teachers showed achievement gains far greater than those students in schools with less qualified teachers. Ronald F. Ferguson, "Evidence that Schools Can Narrow the Black-White Test Score Gap," 1997. See, also, P. Ferguson and S.T. Womack, "The Impact of Subject Matter and Education Coursework on Teaching Performance," *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44, 1, 1993.

¹⁹ See, for example, T. L. Good, "Recent Classroom Research: Implications for Teacher Education," in D.C. Smith (ed.), *Essential Knowledge for Beginning Educators*, Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983. Formal teacher education significantly impacts these effective practices. See, for example, Linda Darling-Hammond, "Teaching and Knowledge: Policy Implications Posed by Alternative Certification for Teachers," *Peabody Journal of Education*, 67, 3, 1992.

²⁰ That such differences matter for learning is documented in a recent report from the Educational Testing Service finding a positive relationship between students exposure to high level applications in mathematics and their mathematics achievement. *Education Week*, "Technology Counts '98," Washington, DC: Editorial Projects in Education, October 1998.

²¹ S. Rousseau, Culturally Revelant Dialogical Relationships Between White Teachers and Students of Color in America, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine Univeristy, 1998; Also relevant here is work by scholars Michelle Foster; Au and Jordan; Moll and Diaz; Carol Lee; Jacqueline Jordan Irvine; Wade Boykin; Shirley Brice Heath; and Gloria Ladson Billings.

²² The College Board, *The Advanced Placement Challenge: Providing Excellence and Equity for the Future*, New York: author, 1993, p. 9.

²³ McDonough, *Choosing Colleges*, 1997; Stanton-Salazar, 1997; J. Kahne and K. Bailey, "The

Role of Social Capital in Youth Development: The Case of ‘I Have a Dream’ Programs,” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 21(3), 321-343, 1999.

²⁴ See Joyce Epstein, “School and Family Connections: Theory, Research, and Implications for Integrating Societies of Education and Family,” in D.G. Unger and M.B. Sussman (eds.), *Families in Community Settings: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1991.

²⁵ See, for example, Pedro A. Noguera, “Transforming Urban Schools Through Investments in the Social Capital of Parents,” in M. Warren (ed.), *Social Capital in Poor Communities*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Russell Sage Foundation Press, 1999.

²⁶ McDonough, *Choosing Colleges*, 1997.

²⁷ *The Advanced Placement Challenge*, p. 10.

²⁸ See, for example, J. Dryfoos, *Full Service Schools: A Revolution in Health and Social Services for Children, Youth, and Families*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994.

ROSTERS OF UCLA OUTREACH COMMITTEES

Outreach Leadership GROUP Roster

Co-Chairs

Vice Chancellor Winston Doby (Student Affairs)
Dean Aimée Dorr (Graduate School of Education & Information Studies)

Members

Professor Jeannie Oakes (GSE&IS/Center X)
Associate Vice Chancellor Raymund Paredes (Academic Development)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Tobi Inlender (External Affairs)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Keith Parker (Governmental Relations)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Jane Permaul (Student-Centered Programs)
Jack Sutton (Executive Officer)

Principal Investigators Meeting Roster

Co-Chairs

Vice Chancellor Winston Doby (Student Affairs)
Dean Aimée Dorr (Graduate School of Education & Information Studies)

Members

Assistant Vice Chancellor Jane Permaul (Student-Centered Programs)
Debra Pounds (EAOPs)
Edmund Harris (Urban Collaborative)
Rosa Pimentel (Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools – UARS))
Professor Jeannie Oakes (Co-PI Venice-Westchester SUP and Co-Director of Center X)
Associate Vice Chancellor Raymund Paredes (Co-PI Venice-Westchester SUP, Community College and CERCs)
Jane Hancock (Director, Venice-Wetchester SUP)
Jody Priselac (PI, Lynwood SUP)
Toni Protti (Director, Lynwood SUP)
Professor Gene Tucker (PI, Inglewood SUP)
Lois Hunter (Director, Inglewood SUP)
Alfred Herrera (Community College Outreach)
Gayle Byock (CERC)
Rick Ainsworth (MESA)
Professor Marv Alkin (Evaluation)
Diana de Cardenas (Campus Communications)
Mary Silva (UC LABI)
Sid Thompson (Super 12)
Sylvia Rousseau (Super 12)
Rae Jeane Williams (Super 12)
Jim Turner (Graduate Outreach)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Tobi Inlender (External Affairs)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Keith Parker (Governmental Relations)
Jack Sutton (Executive Officer)

Outreach Steering Committee Roster**Co-Chairs**

Vice Chancellor Winston Doby (Student Affairs)
Dean Aimée Dorr (Graduate School of Education & Information Studies)

Administration

Associate Vice Chancellor Raymund Paredes (Academic Development)
Vice Chancellor Claudia Mitchell-Kernan (Graduate Division)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Tobi Inlender (External Affairs)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Keith Parker (Governmental Relations)
Vice Provost Judith Smith (Letters & Science)
Director Rae Lee Siporin (UARS)
Dean Robert Lapiner (UNEX)

Program

Professor Jeannie Oakes (GSE&IS/Center X)
Assistant Vice Chancellor Jane Permaul (Student Affairs)
Adjunct Professor Gene Tucker (GSE&IS/Center X)

Faculty

Professor Donna Vredevoe (Academic Senate)
Professor Vickie Mays (Academic Senate)
Professor Charles Buchanan (CUARS)

Graduate Students

Dora Cervantes (Graduate President)

Undergraduate Students

Michael de la Rocha (Undergraduate President)
Ana Lynn Rocio (Undergraduate Academic Affairs)
Brad Stein (Undergraduate Community Services)

UCLA Foundation

Keenan Behrle (UCLA Foundation)
Willie Nauls (UCLA Foundation)
Minoru Tonai (UCLA Foundation)

Alumni Association

Executive Director Keith Brant (Alumni)
Linda Zimring (Alumni)

K-12 Representatives

Barbara Johnson – Lynwood Partnership
Adriana McNally – Inglewood Partnership
Linda Wootan – Venice-Westchester Partnership

Executive Officer

Jack Sutton

**University of California
Parent Authorization and Waiver/Release
Early Academic Outreach Programs/CBOP**

I, _____, parent or legal guardian of _____, a minor child, hereby give permission for my child to participate in Early Academic Outreach Programs (EAOP) activities conducted by the University of California. I understand that the primary objective of the program is to encourage students to enroll in college preparatory courses, to participate in EAOP academic development services, and to become eligible for admission to the University of California. I also understand that such activities may be available until he/she enrolls at a college or university campus.

Authorization.

I hereby authorize Early Academic Outreach Program directors, staff, and their assistants to engage in the following:

1. To have access to, and to make and receive copies of, my child's academic school records through the completion of 12th grade. I understand that these records will be kept in strict confidence and will be used solely to: a) monitor my child's academic progress; and b) determine when academic support services are needed.
2. To have access to, and to make and receive copies of, my child's standardized test records, including tests taken through the Educational Testing Service (ETS), through the completion of 12th grade. I understand that these records will be kept in strict confidence and will be used only for the purposes of assessing student performance and advising student and not for recruitment purposes.
3. To have access to, and to make and receive copies of, my child's academic school records and standardized test records contained in electronic databases and warehouses, including but not limited to the UC Gateways data warehouse, through the completion of 12th grade. I understand that these electronic records will be kept in strict confidence and will be used solely to; a) monitor my child's academic progress; and b) determine when academic support services are needed.
4. To disclose information from my child's academic school records to designated representatives of colleges and universities so that they may determine by child's eligibility for admission at their institutions, his/her need for special services, and for general use in planning outreach and recruitment activities.

These records will be maintained by the University of California consistent with the Federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, applicable state laws and University policies.

5. To allow my child to attend field trips to colleges and universities, sponsored and coordinated by the Early Academic Outreach Program. I understand that my child will have adult supervision while on these field trips.

Waiver and Release

I certify that my child is physically fit such that he/she is able to participate in EAOP activities and that I have read and understand any rules and safety provision established for this program. Knowing this, and in consideration of being permitted to participate and/ or receive instruction in EAOP, I hereby voluntarily release the Regents of the University of California from any and all liability resulting from or arising out of my participation and/or receipt of instruction in EAOP. I understand and agree that I am releasing not only the entities set forth above, but also the officers, agents, and employees of those entities. I understand and agree that this Waiver/Release will have the effect of releasing, discharging, waiving, and forever relinquishing any and all actions or causes of action that I or my minor child may have or have had, whether past, present or future, whether known or unknown, and whether anticipated or unanticipated by me or my minor child, arising out of participation and /or receipt of instruction in EAOP except for the acts or omissions of The Regents of the University of California, its officers, agents of employees which are found to be negligent by a court of competent jurisdiction.

I understand and agree that by signing this Parent Authorization and Waiver/Release, I am assuming full responsibility for any and all risk of death or personal injury or property damage suffered by me and/or my minor child while participating and/or receiving instruction in EAOP. I understand and agree that by signing this Parent Authorization and Waiver/Release, I am agreeing to release, indemnify, and hold harmless The Regents of the University of California and their officers, agents, and employee from any and all liability or costs, including attorney fees, associated with or arising from participation and/or receipt of instruction in EAOP. I understand that this Waiver/Release will be binding on me, my spouse, my heirs, my personal representatives, my assigns, my children, and any guardian ad litem for said children.

I acknowledge that I have read this Parent Authorization and Waiver/Release and that I understand the words and language in it. I also understand that this Parent Authorization and Waiver/Release is valid for the duration of time that my child participates in EAOP unless rescinded through my written instructions.

Print Name of Parent/Guardian: _____

Signature of Parent/Guardian: _____

Home phone number: (_____) _____ business number: (_____) _____

Print Student's name: _____

Student's School: _____ Grade level: _____

Student's date of birth: ____/____/____ Student's Social Security #: _____ - _____ - _____

Student ID #: _____

UCLA School of Medicine

Outreach Programs

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE



University of California, Los Angeles
UCLA School of Medicine
Office of Academic Enrichment and Outreach

GENERAL INFORMATION

Date: _____

Name: _____ Year in UCLA Outreach Program: _____

- Please check which program you attended:
- Career Based Outreach Program (CBOP)
 - High School Premedical Enrichment Program (H.S.PREP)
 - Premedical Enrichment Program (PREP) Tier 1 ___ Tier 2 ___
 - Re-Application Program (UCLA RAP)

Social Security No _____

e-mail address _____

Current Address: _____

Number Street Apt.

City State Zip

Tel. No. (____) _____ (____) _____

Permanent

Address: _____

Number Street Apt.

City State Zip

Work

Present Address: (if different)

Number Street Apt.

City State Zip

Tel. No. (____) _____ (____) _____

Home Work

Birth Date: _____

Marital Status: (1) Single _____ (2) Married _____ (3) Separated _____ (4) Divorced _____

No. of Dependents: _____

Current Classification:

(Circle One)

- (1) High School
- (2) College Sophomore
- (3) College Junior
- (4) College Senior
- (5) Post Baccalaureate
- (6) Graduate Student
- (7) Medical Student
- (8) Dental or Veterinary Student
- (9) Osteopathy/Optomety/Podiatry Student
- (10) Intern or Resident
- (11) Practicing Health Professional
- (12) Employed
- (13) Other _____ (specify)

Appendix G: Medical School Survey

UCLA

High School _____ Year of Graduation: _____

Location: _____
City State

Undergraduate College: _____ Year of Graduation: _____

Location: _____
City State

Degree(s) Earned & Date(s) Received

- B.A. or B.S. _____ (3) M.D. or Ph.D. _____
- (2) M.S. or M.A. _____ (4) Combined MS/MD or MD/Ph.D. _____
- (5) Other (specify) _____

College Major _____

College Minor: _____

Science GPA prior to program: _____ Science GPA following program: _____

Indicate Date(s) MCAT Taken: (1) ____ / ____ (2) ____ / ____ (3) ____ / ____
mo yr mo yr mo yr

Did you take any other MCAT preparation courses? _____ Yes _____ No Date taken _____

Did you participate in any other Summer Program? ___ Yes ___ No

If yes, please list:

- **SECTION A** - For those enrolled in college, graduate school, post-bac., employed or "other."
- **SECTION B** - For those currently or previously enrolled in a health professional school.
- **SECTION C** - For interns, residents and practicing health professionals.

SECTION A - For those enrolled in college, graduate school, post-bac., employed or "other."

1) If you submitted applications to a health professional school, please mark which one.

Medical ___ Public Health ___ Dental ___ Osteopathy ___ Other _____

2) Please indicate the entering class(es) for which you filed applications:

a.) _____ yr. b.) _____ yr. c.) _____ yr.

3) List where you have applied and your status at each school (i.e., accept, alternate). (If you have applied several times, only list those schools to which you last applied.)

SCHOOL	<u>DEGREE</u>	STATUS
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

4) If accepted to a health professions school, which school do you plan to attend?

5) Did you apply to UCLA School of Medicine? ___ Yes ___ No _____ Year

6) If by some chance you are not accepted to a health professions school, what alternate plans have you made for this year?

Graduate School ___ Post-Baccalaureate Study ___ Health Related Employment _____

Other Employment _____ Other (specify) _____

7) Do you plan to reapply? ___ Yes ___ No ___ Not applicable

If yes, for what entering class? _____ yr.

8) If you are currently applying, do you plan to apply for financial aid? ___ Yes ___ No

Type, if known: _____

If you are currently in graduate school, a post-bac., employed, or "other," please complete SECTION D.

SECTION B - For those currently or previously enrolled in a health professional school.

- 1) Which health professions school are you attending or have attended?
 Medical _____ Veterinary _____ Dental _____ Osteopathy _____ Other _____
- 2) Name of School: _____ Location: _____
 Year Entered: _____ Year of Expected Graduation: _____ Degree _____
 Present Classification: (i.e., soph., jr.) _____
- 3) How many times did you apply before being accepted?
 One time _____ Two times _____ Three Times _____
- 4) To how many schools did you apply? (Indicate number in the appropriate blank.)
 Medical ____ Veterinary ____ Dental ____ Osteopathy ____ Other _____
- 5) To how many schools were you accepted? (Indicate number in the appropriate blank.)
 Medical ____ Veterinary ____ Dental ____ Osteopathy ____ Other _____
- 6) Did you apply to UCLA, School of Medicine? _____ For what entering class: _____
 What was the status of your application (i.e., accept, alternate): _____
- 7) How is your education being financed?
 a) Scholarship _____
 b) Loan _____ Type: _____
 c) Military or Public Health _____
 d) Combination of Above _____
 e) Other _____ Specify: _____
- 8) Did you repeat a year in school? _____ Yes _____ No
 If yes, which year? _____
- 9) Were you ever enrolled in an extended medical curriculum (fifth pathway)? _____
- 10) Have you used support services at your institution?
 a) Tutorial _____ b) Note Service _____ c) Counseling _____ d) Other _____
 _____ (specify)
- 11) If you know, please indicate your future area of specialization:
 _____ Medicine _____ Pediatrics
 _____ Surgery _____ Family Practice
 _____ Ob/Gyn _____ Other/ (specify) _____
 _____ Psychiatry
- 12) If you attended a health professions school, but have withdrawn, were the reasons:
 a) Academic _____ b) Personal _____ c) Financial _____ d) Other _____
- 13) Are you continuing your education? Yes _____ No _____
 Degree you are pursuing _____
- If you have withdrawn, please complete **Section D**.

SECTION D - For those in the categories of "employed, graduate student, post-bac. or other":

- 1) a) Post-Baccalaureate; where? _____
Courses Taking: _____
 - b) Graduate School: _____
School _____ Location _____
Field: _____ Degree Sought: _____
Yr. of Completion: _____
 - c) Employed? ___ Science Related? ___ or Nonscience Related? ___
Field: _____ Title _____
Where? _____
company or organization _____ location _____
 - d) Other? Please specify: _____

- 2) Do you plan to apply or reapply to a health profession school in the future? ___ Yes ___ No
Please specify _____
If yes, for which entering class: _____ yr.

Please return this completed form to:

Office of Academic Enrichment and Outreach
UCLA School of Medicine
13-154 Center for the Health Sciences
Box 956990
Los Angeles, CA 90095-6990

(310) 825-3575
Fax No. (310) 206-7180

Attachment H**1997-1998 Law Fellows**

Participant Schools: UCLA

African American	7
Asian/Asian-American	1
Latino(a)	9
Caucasian	1
Total:	20

1998-1999 Law Fellows

Participant Schools: UCLA, USC, Cal State Los Angeles, and Cal State Northridge

African American	6
Asian/Asian-American	10
Latino(a)	17
Caucasian	3
Filipino/Philipino	3
Total:	39

1999-2000 Law Fellows

Participant Schools: UCLA, Occidental College, USC, Cal State Univ. Northridge, Cal State Los Angeles, Cal State Long Beach

African American	10
Asian/Asian-American	3
Caucasian	8
Filipino/Philipino	2
Latino(a)	23
Unknown	1
Total:	47

Attachment I

I. Academically-Based, Long Term, Pipeline-Building Initiatives

Professional School Advisor

The Outreach Resource Center hires, trains, and provides UCLA's Academic Advancement Program (AAP) a UCLA School of Law student, to work as a Professional School Advisor/Mentor. This Advisor provides services for transfer and undergraduate AAP students who traditionally have had limited access to law school and who are planning to pursue legal studies. Of the nearly 7000 students currently participating in AAP, approximately 75% are Latino, African-American, or Native-American students. The Advisor encourages students to seriously consider and prepare for a career in law and to increase their academic competitiveness for admission to law school by assisting undergraduates in exploring their research interests, choosing appropriate legal programs, and applying to law school. Additionally, the Advisor holds application workshops and faculty and professional student roundtable events.

High School Scholars' Day

In conjunction with the Constitutional Rights Foundation, the Career-Based Outreach Program, and in support of Law Services National Minority Recruitment Day, the Law School brings approximately 125 high potential high school students from 48 of the most disadvantaged high schools in Los Angeles to participate in a day-long event each February at the Law School. The event includes an ice breaking exercise, breakfast, a law school admission workshop, interactive workshops, lunch and a panel discussion with currently enrolled law students. The goal is to expose the high school students to law school and excite their interest in eventually gaining JD degrees.

Street Law

"Street Law" is a law school outreach course in which law students teach law-related material to high school students. In light of the change in University of California admissions policy, and because the contact between law students and high school students has proven to be a very positive experience, the Street Law Professor has doubled the enrollment. The law students offer both informational and academic development components. Each law student is assigned to a particular class at a local high school for one day a week, receiving instruction in basic teaching methodology from the Professor. The law students serve as positive role models to the high school students while exposing the high school students to the law and legal issues, encouraging them to begin considering the advantages of attending college and law school.

Summer Law Camp

In conjunction with the Constitutional Rights Foundation, and with support from the Los Angeles Basin Initiative, the Law School co-sponsors two residential "Law Camps" at the Law School. Law Camp is an intense week-long program offered to high school students interested in learning more about the American legal system. Students live on campus for seven days and six nights, attend law-related classes and engage in discussions led by university professors, participate in trial skills workshops facilitated by experienced attorneys, play a role in debates, and gain new skills in team building and leadership. Through these activities, reading, and writing assignments, students strengthen skills in critical and analytical thinking and

communication. Off campus activities include attending a trial, interacting with prominent judges and attorneys, and visiting law and government offices.

Community Outreach Legal Clinic

The Outreach Resource Center and the Public Interest Law Program are in the process of evaluating the feasibility of working with UCLA's Community Education Resource Center Committee to develop a site-based Legal Outreach Center. Initial proposals contemplate the following:

- Regular "Know Your Rights" workshops for community members, addressing issues such as immigration law and landlord/tenant matters;
- A walk-in legal clinic for families and community members;
- An introduction to the legal system for the high school students through exercises such as mock trials and law-focused discussion groups integrated into ongoing high school classes.

The primary goals of the program would be for the law faculty and students to become mentors and serve as positive role models for the elementary and high school students in disadvantaged areas. In addition, the program would seek to involve parents of the students, who would then become more invested in the school and education process, and encourage their children to maximize their educational opportunities and chance of being UC competitive upon graduation from high school.

II. Recruitment Outreach

Development of UCLA School of Law Diversity Web Page and Brochure

The Office of Outreach Programming is developing material for a new Law School "Diversity" web page and brochure. The new publications will highlight the Law School's recognition that diversity of the Law School student body has been historically a hallmark of the Law School's excellence, and that, in a post 209 environment, the Law School still considers racial, ethnic, economic, social and geographic diversity to be essential to producing graduates who are capable of leading a multi-cultural society. Furthermore, the literature will stress that diversity remains a core institutional value and will be a substantial commitment of resources to maintain diversity at the Law School and enhance the experience of underrepresented students.

Law School Information Sessions

The Offices of Admissions and Financial Aid, along with the Outreach Resource Center, lead periodic informational Outreach sessions at the Law School. The goal for these sessions is to help Los Angeles-based applicants (and specifically UCLA undergraduates) learn more about the law school and its commitment to enrolling a diverse student body. The sessions are advertised widely and attract a sizable number of minority students.

Increased Pre-Admissions and Post-Admissions Recruiting Outreach

The Law School also has dedicated additional staff time for both pre-admissions and post-admissions outreach. Using available Outreach funding, the Law School staff, students and faculty have significantly increased their attendance at recruitment events at the state, national,

and local levels, with a new emphasis on the California State University system. We have also pooled our efforts with the other UC Law Schools by holding several joint events. Over the last three years, participation in recruiting events has more than doubled. In the 1997-recruiting year, we attended 26 events. In 1998, we attended 39 events and in 1999, we attended 56 local and national events. We anticipate the same high level of attendance for the 2000-recruiting year

Additionally, two Admissions Office staff have been assigned substantial outreach responsibilities, including coordinating the law school tour schedule for applicants and admits, leading law school tours and training current law students to do the same. They also coordinate the travel arrangements and events for admits whom have been invited to visit the school as part of our outreach efforts. Additionally, their responsibilities include planning receptions for new admits both on-campus and in other cities, coordinating the classroom visitation schedule for new admits, overseeing the maintenance of the candidate nomination system for specific scholarships and awards and acting, in general, as liaisons between all new admits and the law school community

III.Immediate Outreach

Minority and "Targeted" Scholarships

Each year, the Executive Director of Outreach makes scholarship offers to each member of the Law Fellows Program who receives an offer of acceptance to the UCLA School of Law. This, together with the "good will" built up over time, and aggressive recruiting, has helped contribute to the fact that five of the six Law Fellows accepted to the Law School decided to attend UCLA even though each had acceptance and scholarship offers at other prestigious law schools.

The Law School is continuing to work with the Los Angeles County Bar Association's (LACBA) Committee on Diversity in the Profession supporting their initiative, which awards one-year scholarships in the amount of \$5,000 to minority students who matriculate to a Southern California Law School. The Law School informs admitted applicants about the programs, distributes and collects applications, disperses the applications to the LACBA and helps facilitate the actual monetary award. The inaugural program awarded a total of 25 scholarships, 18 of which were directed to UCLA School of Law admits. Of those 18, 15 matriculated to our first year class.

The Law School acts in a similar capacity with the UCLA Law Faculty Scholarship and the Beverly Hills Bar Association Scholarship programs. Both of these scholarship programs were designed to help attract underrepresented minorities to the UCLA School of Law.

Finally, the Law School was pleased to receiving additional funding from the UC Office of the President. This funding was used as "matching scholarship funds" to recruit recently admitted law students who had been offered scholarships at other law schools.

Welcome Weekend for Underrepresented Minority Admits

The Law School increased its outreach efforts to recruit and enroll underrepresented minorities admitted for fall 2000 by inviting them to visit the Law School and participate in a series of activities. Invitations were sent to 89 admits nationally (72 Hispanics, 13 African Americans and

4 Native Americans) and 40 people accepted the invitation (30 Hispanics, 7 African Americans and 3 Native Americans.) Public and private outreach funds were used to pay for all transportation, housing and food costs incurred during the weekend.

The admits were taken on a bus tour led by the Dean and the Director of Admissions. The admits met and talked with alumni at a law firm in Beverly Hills, at the Santa Monica Courthouse and with the Santa Monica BayKeeper who conducted a boat tour of the Marina area with lunch being provided at the Third Street Promenade. The day's activities concluded with a catered dinner in the new Law School library attended by Law School Deans and administrators, faculty members, current students and some of the school's most active alumni.

The Welcome Weekend was in no small part responsible for a very good enrolled minority yield rate for fall 2000. Of those admitted minority students attending the weekend events, we had a 60% enroll yield rate, with 17 Latinos, 4 African Americans and 3 Native Americans enrolling in 2000. In contrast, we had an overall minority enroll yield rate of 30% for all minority students admitted in 2000.