

# Perceptions of Fellows Participation in CBOP

Leona Cheeseborough  
Marvin C. Alkin  
Holli Tonyan

Occasional Report #1

## *Outreach Evaluation*

OCCASIONAL REPORT SERIES



Graduate School of Education & Information Studies  
UCLA

# **Perceptions of Fellows Participation in CBOP**

Leona Cheeseborough  
Marvin C. Alkin  
Holli Tonyan

March, 2001

Occasional Report #1  
Outreach Evaluation Project

Marvin C. Alkin, Project Director

Graduate School of Education and Information Studies  
UCLA

## Summary and Issues

### Perceptions of Fellows Participation in CBOP

- This report examines the perceptions of seven UCLA undergraduates students (called "fellows") in the CBOP Program with respect to their experiences in the program and the impact on them and on their academic competitiveness for admission to UCLA graduate and professional schools.
- This report relied on case study data, collected through a series of three in-depth interviews with each participant. (See Methodology, pp. 4-7)
- This report describes the Optimal Learning System / PALS and the nature of the preparation received by students. (See pp. 8-10)
- Fellows initially felt prepared on a motivational level to teach students at the high school sites, however, a substantial number did not feel adequately prepared on an instructional level ----citing, in particular, concerns about curriculum development and selection and use of learning tools. (See pp. 10-12)
  - *Should fellows receive additional training on pedagogy?*
- Fellows attempted to implement PALS or elements of it, but, in all seven cases, they noted significant challenges in teaching and facilitating the optimal learning curricula at the high schools. (See pp. 12-14)
  - *Do fellows have sufficient coordination with the on-site teachers?*
  - *If not, are there better ways to structure the experience?*
- Consequently, fellows incorporated alternative subject matter into the Curricula: SAT preparation; writing skills; personal development activities. Several fellows hosted meetings for the parents of CBOP students. (See pp. 14-15)
  - *To what extent is the optimal learning curriculum the sole subject matter to be addressed by fellows?*
  - *Are the monitoring and support services afforded to fellows sufficient?*
- Fellows were very uneasy with the level of autonomy and responsibilities given them in the curriculum development process. Frustration grew in the second year because of the lack of contact with an organized training process. This led to all but one of the fellows not teaching PALS in the second year. (See pp. 15-17)
  - *How can fellows be better engaged and supported in their service learning activities during the second and subsequent years?*

- Fellows were generally pleased with the Graduate/ Professional School Partnership experience, citing mentorship from student services representatives, students, faculty, and professionals, workshops, mentor-mentee relations, and graduate exams. (See pp. 17-20)
    - *Are their aspects of the Graduate/ Professional School Partnership experience unique to some schools, which might be more widely adopted?*
  - Fellows experienced positive personal outcomes in the following areas: awareness of and empathy for others; self-confidence/ self worth; educational value and connection with the university; and leadership skills. (See pp. 21-23)
    - *Are we able to determine whether specific personal outcomes are idiosyncratic or can be partially attributable to specific program elements?*
  - Fellows experienced a number of positive outcomes related to their academic performance, including: their personal use of PALS, improved academic motivation, and some positive impact on academic grades. (See pp.23-28)
    - *What is the rate of fellows academic acceptance to UCLA graduate and professional programs?*
  - Fellows benefited from exposure to career options and many further clarified their educational and career goals. (See pp.28-29)
    - *Do fellows clarify their educational and career goals during the first year of participation in CBOP?*
- 

*-Are there changes in the program since the conduct of this study that might alter the findings?*

## Fellows' Perceptions of CBOP Participation

### INTRODUCTION

In 1995, the University of California Board of Regents voted to eliminate the use of race, gender, and ethnicity in student admissions, faculty and staff hiring, and contracting (Resolution SP-1). Shortly thereafter, in 1996, the passing of Proposition 209 completely abolished the policy of affirmative action in the state of California. State legislation banned the use of race, gender, and ethnicity in public employment, education, and contracting.

In the aftermath of eliminating affirmative action programming, selective public institutions (those that have very stringent admission requirements) are particularly vulnerable to weighty declines in the admission of historically underrepresented minorities. The impact of the new policy was noticeable the first year it went into effect at UCLA. From Fall 1996 to Fall 1997, Black/African American applicants to the UCLA Graduate Division decreased by 23.5%, Chicano/Mexican American applicants decreased by 14.9%, and Latino/Other Hispanic applicants decreased by 18.3%. One year later, in the Fall of 1998, application of the new policy eliminating affirmative action was extended downward to undergraduates. Native American freshman student enrollment declined by 43.2%, African American by 42.6%, and Latino by 33.1%.

In the Fall of 1997, the UCLA Career-Based Outreach Program (CBOP) was established by UCLA's Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Dr. Winston Doby, as an educational development effort in the aftermath of affirmative action. The program is designed to achieve the following objectives: (a) to increase the academic competitiveness of disadvantaged students in grades 9-12 for admission to UCLA, and (b) to increase the academic competitiveness of disadvantaged undergraduates at UCLA for admission to its graduate and professional schools.

CBOP uses service learning as a strategy to accomplish its objectives. In this case, service learning is a credit-bearing educational experience, with service projects conducted in conjunction with academic courses and reflection. CBOP trains UCLA undergraduate students

to teach and mentor disadvantaged 9-12<sup>th</sup> grade students at local high schools. Paralleling this, 9-12<sup>th</sup> grade students are expected to mentor 6-8<sup>th</sup> graders. Nine UCLA graduate and professional schools partner with CBOP to provide workshops for the undergraduate students on career options and on graduate and professional schools admissions and performance standards.

This report, part of a study that examines UCLA Outreach more broadly, is limited to an examination of the perceptions of undergraduate students (called “fellows”) in the CBOP component of the UCLA EAOP Programs. The study examines the fellows with respect to their experiences in the program, specifically the program’s impact on them, and on their academic competitiveness for admission to UCLA graduate and professional schools.

### **METHODOLOGY**

This report documents the experiences of the seven fellows who participated in CBOP from 1998-2000 and anticipated graduating from UCLA in the 1999-2000 academic year. Case study data were collected through a series of three in-depth interviews with each participant intended to ascertain the fellows' views and interpretations of their experiences within the program. An interview protocol for each of three phases of the study relied on open-ended questions with suggested “probes”<sup>1</sup>.

#### **Study Population**

Approximately 120 undergraduates began participation in CBOP in the Fall of 1998. Of these students, 35 were juniors. The primary investigator attended a CBOP orientation meeting at the start of Fall 1999 to identify which of the 35 planned to continue participation in CBOP during their senior year, 1999-2000. At the orientation meeting, the researcher identified only seven undergraduates who began within CBOP in 1998 and intended to continue participation as graduating seniors in 1999-2000. These individuals serve as the study group for this inquiry.

---

<sup>1</sup> Interview protocols included aspects beyond the focus of this report. They are available in the doctoral dissertation by Leona Beatrice Cheesborough entitled “The Demise of Affirmative Action: One University’s Response,” UCLA, 2000.

## **Study Questions**

This report focuses on several study questions in two broad categories:

What are fellows' perceptions of their experiences in CBOP?

- What are fellows' perceptions of their service learning experience?
- What are fellows' perceptions of the graduate/professional school partnership experience?

What are fellows' perceptions of the outcomes of their participation in CBOP?

- What are fellows' perceptions of personal outcomes of participation in CBOP?
- What are fellows' perceptions of academic outcomes of participation in CBOP?
- What are fellows' perceptions of career outcomes of participation in CBOP?

## **Data Collection**

The in-depth interviews occurred in three phases. A description of each phase is presented in the following subsections.

### ***Phase 1***

Phase 1 of data collection focused on the 1997/1998 CBOP program. One-on-one in-depth interviews were conducted with undergraduate students who participated in CBOP from 1998-2000 and were graduating seniors at UCLA in 1999/2000. The seven undergraduates provided retrospective self-reports of how they experienced CBOP in their first year of participation, 1997/1998. Each subject was contacted by telephone in September 1999 and asked to participate in a one-hour interview in October 1999. Each interview was tape recorded and transcribed verbatim.

### ***Phase 2***

Data collection in Phase 2 centered on the 1999/2000 CBOP service experience at the high schools. Two of the students<sup>2</sup> who took part in Phase 1 of this study were unable to continue participation in CBOP in 1999/2000. During the interviews conducted in phase 1 (near the end of

---

<sup>2</sup> See appendix for description of the fellows.

the 1998-1999 academic year) they strongly indicated that they were planning to continue participation within CBOP through the 1999-2000 academic year. However, due to extenuating circumstances, they were unable to participate in the 1999/2000 years. One explained that she desired continuing, but given her heavy academic course load, she was unable to assume responsibilities of the program in 1999-2000. The other fellow also indicated that her primary issue was time, and that she was somewhat reluctant to continue participation in the program. Therefore, for these two fellows, only data relevant to their first year of participation in CBOP, 1997/1998, and explanations for discontinuation with the program were gathered and analyzed for this study.

One-on-one in-depth interviews were conducted with the five undergraduate students who took part in Phase 1 of the study and continued participation in CBOP in 1999/2000. These students anticipated graduating from UCLA in 1999/2000. Each graduating senior was contacted by telephone in November 1999 and invited to schedule an in-depth interview. The interviews were conducted in December 1999. The interviews examined the fellows' experiences teaching and mentoring high school students. Carrying out the interviews in December enabled the study to investigate the experiences of the undergraduates while they were actively involved in the service process, thereby increasing the accuracy of responses. The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim.

### ***Phase 3***

Phase 3 of data collection focused on the 1999/2000 CBOP graduate and professional schools and careers choices. In-depth interviews were conducted with the five undergraduate students who took part in CBOP from 1998-2000 and anticipated graduating from UCLA in 1999/2000. The interviews investigated how CBOP graduating seniors interpreted their experiences with regard to the graduate and professional school partners, career choices, and application and admission to graduate and professional schools. The five graduating seniors were contacted by telephone in February 2000 to schedule an interview. The interviews took place February 2000. They were tape recorded and transcribed verbatim.

## **Data Analysis**

Data analysis occurred at each phase of data collection (Phases 1-3). In an effort to identify emerging themes, patterns, and categories in the data, the principal investigator read through the set of interview transcripts derived at each phase of the inquiry. Codes were systematically assigned to each of the various types of attitudes, beliefs, events, and actions frequently reported across interview transcriptions. Coding is a means by which to describe segments of the text in an abbreviated format. Emerson and colleagues.<sup>3</sup> refer to the initial ascribing of codes as open coding.

After open coding, the investigator conducted a line-by-line examination of the open coded transcriptions and broke the initial codes down into more focused codes. Within this process, the investigator reduced the themes, patterns, and categories that formed the basis of the initial codes into several more refined themes and assigned them codes to create focused codes.

After all of the focused codes were identified for the interview transcripts, all of the data matching each specific code were compiled. All of the evidence, as demonstrated by quotes of participants relevant to a particular code, was gathered together in the same file folder. Each file for a particular code encompassed the supporting evidence for a particular theme that was constructed within the study. This process produced a number of salient themes concerning the experiences of the seven undergraduates in CBOP. Relevant material was extracted to provide insights into the study questions.

## **FELLOWS' PROCESS EXPERIENCE**

In this report, we focus on two major aspects of the fellows' process experience in CBOP. First, we examine the experience of engaging in service learning with high school

---

<sup>3</sup> Emerson, R., M., Fretz, R., I., & Shaw, L., L. (1995). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

students<sup>4</sup>. Then, we describe the fellows' experiences with the graduate and professional school partnerships.

### **Fellows' perceptions of the training process..**

CBOP strongly emphasized optimal learning as a means to positively affect the academic performance of undergraduate and high school students. Optimal learning was defined in a CBOP service learning course handout as "a systematic approach to acquiring knowledge generating insights, solving problems, and demonstrating learning which produces the maximum level of performance on academic tasks that a person is capable of achieving at a specific point in time." The fellows reported that CBOP attempted to help students learn optimally through the Personal Academic Learning System (PALS), learning tools, and optimal learning principles (hereafter collectively referred to in this report as optimal learning curricula). PALS was developed in Spring 1997 by the CBOP founder, UCLA's Vice Chancellor Doby. It is intended to empower learners to take more responsibility for learning rather than remaining dependent on instructors who vary in quality. PALS consists of the following cycle of learning:

- Preparation stage - reading, question preparation, and note taking prior to lecture;
- Dialogue - small group discussion and general questions prior to lecture;
- Instruction - attend class to gain further insights into the materials read and subsequently discussed;
- Practice - conduct exercises to fully absorb the material and perfect understanding after class;
- Homework - complete problem-sets, papers, projects, worksheets, etc;
- Feedback - reinforcement of the material.

There are learning tools that are particularly relevant to each stage of the PALS system. Learning tools are strategies and techniques designed to facilitate the academic achievement of students by helping them learn to become optimal learners. For example, in the preparation stage of PALS, students must know how to read, generate questions from the material, and take notes effectively. Learning tools consist of guidelines, strategies, and/or techniques designed to

---

<sup>4</sup> A follow-up outreach evaluation study is currently underway to further examine the issue.

enhance a student's ability to read comprehensively, develop questions from the readings, or highlight and review notes.

Vice Chancellor Doby established the following optimal learning principles to facilitate maximum student learning:

- Mastery and optimal performance results from painstaking preparation and hard work;
- Active engagement in learning makes the process more interesting, more relevant and more effective;
- Each person is responsible for his/her own learning;
- Each person is his/her own best teacher;
- Formulating questions facilitates thinking and improves learning;
- Making mistakes is an effective way to learn and improve;
- Self-confidence comes from our ability to persist in the face of adversity and is a fundamental ingredient to optimal learning;
- An optimal learner prepares by reading, trying to solve problems and actively thinking about subjects before teachers teach about the subject;
- Ability is variable, not constant. The harder a person tries, the more able he or she becomes;
- Certain behaviors, if practiced on a consistent basis, will ensure optimal learning;
- Grades and test scores indicate progress at one point in time;
- My academic performance is a result of my learning methods, my attitude, and my effort;
- All behavior is caused, all causation is mental, we become what we think about most of the time;
- The purpose of school is to assist students in learning how to learn;
- An effective way of demonstrating mastery of a concept is to teach it; Optimal learning results when a person learns with the goal of teaching in mind.

Students learned about the optimal learning curriculum in the service learning course. According to the fellows, the primary objective of the discussion section of that class was to develop the optimal learning curricula for high school students. Consequently, a considerable amount of time during the first quarter, Fall 1998, was devoted to brainstorming the types of learning tools that might prove useful in facilitating the academic performance of high school students and ideas for curricula presentation. Some class time was also devoted to working within individual fellow site teams to create curricula selection and development strategies.

Over and above classroom-based activities, each fellow site team met independently outside of the discussion section to develop curricula. One fellow's recount of this experience demonstrates the process by which undergraduates accomplished this task:

We meet about an hour and a half each week. We more or less made an agenda for the whole quarter, a syllabus. Tuesdays we meet outside of class. We decide on an activity, we decide who's going to make copies, who's going to make the instructions. We usually try to give them instructions on how the activity is going to go about. And we kind of call each other Wednesday or Thursday night to make sure everything's going fine, to see if everybody has done what they are suppose to do--dividing up the jobs. Then when we're actually out there we work with this.

The fellow site teams collectively developed learning tools on time management, reading comprehension, writing, note-taking, argumentative debate, listening, personal strengths, and test-taking. The discussion section also afforded each fellow site team several opportunities to present components of their curricula to the class. This exercise provided practice teaching the curricula and encouraged valuable input from classmates. At the end of the first quarter, Fall 1998, each fellow site team was to submit a curricular plan for the entire Winter quarter.

In addition to the optimal learning curricula, fellows developed curricula pertaining to admissions information. During the service learning discussion section, a representative from UCLA's Office of Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (UARS) made presentations on two occasions. During presentations, he taught fellows how to advise the high school students ("scholars") on the UCLA admissions process and how to develop individualized academic plans. The plans were prescriptions for the type and sequence of honors, and advanced placement (AP) courses and in some cases community college courses, scholars should take to increase their competitive admissibility to UCLA.

Although undergraduates initially felt prepared on a motivational level to teach students at the high school sites, a substantial number did not feel adequately prepared on an instructional level. When discussing preparedness one fellow stated:

I think a lot of students, if they evaluated the program, I would say a lot of the students weren't, I don't know if they were prepared in the high school. I know some people quit CBOP because of that. . . . because they felt like CBOP wasn't giving them enough training to go out into the sites. And I know it was like a big point that was raised. I know a couple of people who quit because of that.

The case study participants claimed that the service learning training process lacked several essential elements, the most notable being that it did not effectively teach how to develop curricula for the high school students. One fellow commented:

We would go to the class and doing the readings didn't really help me see what the students were going to be like when I got into the classroom . . . We didn't really have formal manuals or books that taught us how to write lesson plans or curriculums. I am not a teacher! I don't know how to do that stuff! I have never even seen a lesson plan before. . . I don't know what a lesson plan looks like. Some people were writing out the times like 10:05 call to order, 10: 15 start playing games. Hello, that doesn't work either! People were really doing that and the instructor was saying this is a great way to do a lesson plan. I was like, no its not. It doesn't work for me. Writing 10:10 when the students don't show up until 10:25 really doesn't help. Does it? Half your lesson plan is shot. There was no one-day they spent talking about lesson plans.

In contrast, another fellow indicated that the instructor gave them samples of curricula. The examples, however, were developed by other fellow site teams from the previous and current years. They were not curricula developed by experts within the educational field.<sup>5</sup>

Fellows identified learning tools as one of the most significant deficiencies in preparation. Students were instructed that learning tools are guidelines and for the learning techniques which are intended to facilitate optimal learning. For example, a learning tool might consist of techniques for improving reading comprehension. Fellows felt that they saw few concrete examples of learning tools with which to teach the high school students. In the absence of concrete examples, fellow site teams developed curricula based upon what they perceived as being important. They also independently identified and selected resources to support the development of the curricula. For instance, one fellow site team used guidelines that a team member's English instructor distributed. Another, common means of obtaining resources was the use of the internet.

Of the seven case study fellows, only one viewed the training received in the first year as sufficient preparation for developing curricula at the high schools. This fellow remarked:

---

<sup>5</sup> The instructor has provided the fellows with a more uniform curricular framework for 2000/2001 academic year.

I got something out of it. . . And because I wanted to do well, this class is all about that, to help you feel good about school, to do well, and to go out and help others, so I tried to learn as much as I could and he [the instructor] did as much as he could. Like every time we needed improvement, we always talked about how we can improve. Like at the end of every quarter, the professor and students talked about what can improve together. That was good enough. I didn't need anymore.

### **Fellows perceptions of teaching/mentoring**

The fellow site teams began providing services to students at the high school sites in the Winter of 1998. One fellow told of how her fellow site team taught components of the optimal learning curricula:

We would generally pick one of the optimal learning principles, say, "you're your own best teacher." Sometimes we would make up skits to show them [the high school students] the point.

We would try to make them funny. So every week we would introduce one of the points of the PALS system. We also had the principles listed on a big poster in front of the classroom. We never really taught the PALS cycle.

Another commented:

We went through the PALS principles and paradigm. We'd go over it in class and then we'd work in groups, so I guess in a way you can say they used it. But outside, in reality in their own lives, I don't think they're doing it. It's just not easy.

In all seven cases, fellows experienced significant challenges in terms of teaching and facilitating the use of the optimal learning curricula at the high schools. They asserted that the current structure and practices of the high schools were not fully amenable to the teaching and application of the PALS system and learning tools. One fellow was particularly passionate about this dilemma:

I don't think the curriculum is appropriate for the high school students. There's no way they can read ahead because they tried. A lot of the students can't take their textbooks home. You know students at that level, you can't say where there's a will there is a way, because the will isn't even there sometimes. That's where we come in and try to motivate them and tell them to try and make photocopies. But, for the students to go the extra mile and try to make a photocopy of a whole chapter, exactly who is going to do that? . . . They can't read ahead, they can't do some of these things. I'm Latino and I think a lot of Latino

parents are very strict and they won't let, especially their daughters go to their friends' house to study at night. Because according to the optimal learning system, you're supposed to study in groups. They won't even let them stay after school. So a lot of those things are very difficult for students to do or to talk on the phone, or maybe they don't have a phone. So, I don't think the curricula are very effective.

Fellows contended that the optimal learning system is more appropriate for college level studies than high school.<sup>6</sup> As part of the PALS cycle, fellows were instructed to encourage students to complete course reading assignments at least 48 hours before they were discussed in class. Yet, high school teachers typically did not provide students with course syllabi.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, the students did not necessarily know which material to read before class. Furthermore, several fellow site teams reported, as did the fellow whose comment is quoted above, that their students were not allowed to take books home because the school could not afford books for each student. In these cases, reading 48 hours ahead of instruction was not possible. In addition, the fellows indicated that the high school students had no time to conduct the group dialogue component of PALS.

Fellows felt frustrated; while recognizing the potential importance of PALS, they found difficulties in implementing it. Difficulties were not only related to the high school student context, but also inadequacy in the fellows' own skills to teach PALS.

From talking to other CBOP friends, we felt we were never given a concrete thing to teach. It was like PALS and then we had to improvise. So we wanted something more concrete. More concrete stuff, because it was really about how to teach but not what to teach. Having concrete things to teach will make our teaching easier, our work easier. Then we would actually know that we were helping them.

---

<sup>6</sup> In contrast to high schools, colleges and universities typically provide students with syllabi at the onset of an academic term. Moreover, college students are more likely to have the freedom to conduct group meetings with various constituents such as classmates, professors, and teaching assistants. In addition, college students do not have to depend solely upon the institution to supply reading materials.

<sup>7</sup> The fellows maintained a high scope of autonomy and responsibility within the service component at the high school sites. They essentially planned and implemented all aspects of the teaching process which included content, methods, resources, and behavior management. Within this process, most fellows had minimal contact with the service learning instructor and high school teachers and principals. If any teachers were present during instruction, most were because they could not legally leave the high school students unsupervised.

The case study participants conveyed that their individual fellow site teams drifted away from teaching the optimal learning curricula because they felt it was not appropriate for high school students. Consequently, they autonomously incorporated alternative subject matter into the curricula. The most common subject areas built into the curricula were SAT preparation, writing skills, and personal development. The inclusions were subject areas that fellows believed suitable for facilitating the admission of high school students to UCLA. One fellow described how he and his fellow site team taught SAT preparation:

We started doing SAT preparation with our students because we thought they needed some. So we [fellow site team members] shared that and if it was helping them [high school students] or not. People were doing different things. Even in like learning SAT prep, we were trying to teach them the PALS system and how they can help each other learn and study together. . . . No we just came up with it. We were trying to come up with other ideas. We couldn't teach one subject because they were taking all different classes--not all of them, but a lot of them. They were on different tracks, there's an A, B, and C track. This class was held after school at 3:15 p.m. . . So we had to teach them something that they all could do and that's how we came up with the SAT idea.

In the following vignette, another fellow provides an example of the emphasis fellows placed on the development of writing skills:

We taught the PALS system, how to write better. We just did free-writes. We would come in and tell them today the topic is. . . . and we would come up with something. We're trying to help them create their personal statements for the future. We tell them to write about their goals or we'd tell them to write about themselves, extracurricular activities, what they like to do, or their families. Then we give them like ten or fifteen minutes and sometimes we have them share it. Sometimes we would just collect them...And then we also did grammar lessons like verbs, nouns, agreements and all of that. Because, through their writing, we saw that they needed help in that.

Furthermore, the fellows chose to include personal development activities as part of their curricula for the high school students. One fellow provided an example of the personal development curricula the fellows incorporated into the CBOP curricula:

Workshops on real life stuff, like what other people's perceptions of them are. What do people expect out of them and how they are going to work to get out of that stereotype. And, if they do get out of that stereotype, what will they be facing? Some people in their community might not regard them very well. So, we are trying to get them prepared for

that. It's not easy either.

Another way in which three of the case study participants attempted to foster personal development was by hosting organized meetings for the parents of CBOP students. The following vignette describes what two of the fellows and their site teams did at a high school:

What we did at Fremont, we worked with parents, we had two parent meetings. So we met with the parents and seeing them come in each meeting. . . . We had about 25 parents. We had 50 students who showed up on a consistent basis. So we had half the family there. It was such a nice turnout having about 80 individuals in a room when you repeatedly hear that those parents aren't interested in helping their kids. It's mostly at Fremont and it is a 90% Latino population, so we've heard, you know, parents don't really care about education. Sometimes they don't, but not all parents are the same. So it was nice to see the parents get involved and that also helped me. . . . It was something I wanted done, because I wanted the parents involved. So our group agreed and we got them.

Overall, the fellows were very uneasy with the level of autonomy and responsibilities afforded them in the curriculum development process:

You see we had to develop our own curricula and, see, that's, I hope they change that because a lot of people were having problems with that. Because, it was like we had to develop our own. He gave us all the paper work we had to do. But we had to kind of extrapolate it on our own, which is good in one point, because, I think every school needs a different type of, they have different needs. But that depends on how much experience the student has. Because if a student doesn't have any experience in that, they could just be wasting their time at the school. . . I know there were some students that were like, what are the needs of the school? They didn't really know.

One interviewee noted that a number of fellows were uncomfortable with the idea of having to develop curricula. It led to their decision to discontinue participation in CBOP in the second year of the program. In these particular cases, the fellows did not feel adequately prepared.

During the second year, fellows were even less inclined to teach the optimal learning curriculum. In part this was attributable to the challenges they had experienced in the first year and the belief that the optimal learning curricula had not been beneficial for the high school students. Another factor was that they were not required to attend the service learning class or

report to the service learning instructor concerning the curricula, and, thus, felt no obligation to focus on optimal learning.

One fellow reported that his site team did not teach the optimal learning curricula at all in the second year because team members felt it did not work. However, because they were unable to teach the optimal learning curricula they were previously trained to teach, the team experienced difficulty in coming up with subject matter for the high school students. Thus, they had to work harder to come up with appropriate curricula.

We started focusing first quarter, Fall, on their writing skills so that we would get passages, poems, short stories. We'd read them in groups, teach some of the differences between summarizing and reflecting, what it means to be reading, what to look for. That's what we started doing last quarter. We focused mostly on vocabulary, word power, SAT type words. This quarter, we focused on math and the best thing we did, I have an SAT prep book from my brother who is in high school. It was his gift actually, so I took it and we've been xeroxing arithmetic and algebra sections. We're going over that as a group. That's what we did this quarter. We were getting little tid bits, but we never actually got like a packet from a book, like here is a sample of what SAT problems are like. That's what we would do and that's what we've been working on. So we're actually teaching this time. This is how you do a fraction, this how you do a decimal, this is how you do a percent. We don't have enough time to actually teach a lecture and this [is] why you do this. We're just saying, just remember to do this. Last year we might have just shown it but not gone into detail like we are this year, and we didn't do math last year. Last year the focus was PALS and this year it has been more on subjects. . . . now we're focusing on the SAT. We wanted to improve their grades through tutoring, but that didn't work. There are just too many tracks, too many students, too many levels. So we gave that up and now were just focusing on the SAT. If they get the basics for the SAT that should really help them.

The lack of connection to service learning led to a felt need for more feedback. The second year training process<sup>8</sup> was not viewed as sufficient: "Like activities that work in one school, share them with us and we might try it. That's the only thing we've missed. We need feedback, we never see anybody any more." Every fellow interviewed contended that he/she needed more feedback and connection in the second year.

We have less structure, less guidance, because before we took the service learning class. We don't know what anyone else is doing. We don't know what their ideas are. We don't

---

<sup>8</sup> Two Saturday workshops on free-writes, history, and optimal learning.

have other people to bounce ideas off from.

There was only one case in which the fellow site team said they taught some components of the optimal learning curricula in the second year:

Pretty much same as last year. Still teach PALS and do more of our own thing, how to learn and memorize better. One of the fellows is a psychology major so they teach stuff on memory, time management, you are your own best teacher, PALS principles, not the cycle that much. Give them words and synonyms and then have them do free-writes using those words. We'd give them different topics: family hardships they had to overcome. We did some words, but found that it doesn't work that well because we say we are going to quiz you, but they won't learn them because they know that we can't give them grades, or weekly words [and] then quiz [them] after four or five weeks. We still give them words but no more quizzes this year. PALS, some words, SAT math, play more fun games to get them involved. Thirty students with three fellows. Our curricula is less of PALS and more of what we put into it. Maybe if we find stuff on the internet, test-taking strategies.

Although this fellow site team taught some components of the optimal learning curriculum the second year, they primarily emphasized SAT preparation. All of the case study participants agree that CBOP did not provide training that was critical to their ability to successfully teach the high school students in their second year. In part, this was a function of the undergraduates not being associated with the service learning class in the second year. As a result, they did not receive valuable input into their curricula for high school students.

### **The Graduate/Professional School Partnership Experience**

Another facet of the process experience was the fellows' association with graduate and professional schools. Each undergraduate was matched with a graduate or professional school whose educational emphasis was compatible with his/her educational and career interest. The graduate and professional schools conducted a series of Saturday workshops designed to introduce undergraduates to careers, admissions, and performance demands at the graduate and professional school level. The fellows interviewed in this study were matched with the School of Education, the School of Medicine, the School of Law, and School of Public Health.

The graduate and professional school partners made it possible for fellows to receive mentorship from student services representatives, students, faculty, and professionals in relevant career fields. The partnerships facilitated workshops on admissions information, descriptions of the degree programs, and introductions of key individuals including students, faculty, staff, and relevant career professionals. A law fellow explained:

I feel like I have learned so much about that profession already that I know this is something I want to get into. Every single person that has been involved in it — we've had professors, we've had financial aid advisors, librarians even - every single person has been energetic and so informative and given their time to us. We've gone straight through admissions to the types of law practice to actual case studies.

The School of Law, School of Medicine, and School of Public Health provided undergraduates opportunities to have mentor-mentee relations with graduate and professional students. The Law School representative invited law students to speak with the undergraduates about their experiences. In addition, the School of Law assigned a mentor to each undergraduate. The mentors were instructed to eat lunch with their mentee each time the school hosted activities for the law fellows. One fellow indicated that she kept in contact with her law school mentor beyond the designated luncheons:

I call her and e-mail sometimes to ask, for example, when is the LSAT offered? She'd tell me. I'd say what do you think about me taking a year off? She'd tell me it's a good idea, it's not a good idea, for this reason and that reason. How's law school? Same thing, do you have a boyfriend? Is it hard? You know, that kind of thing.

The School of Law facilitated a workshop wherein UCLA professors presented a law school lecture to the fellows. The purpose of the lecture was to provide undergraduates with an experiential understanding of the content and performance demands of the law school curricula. According to one fellow:

It was cool and we got to meet some of the professors. They would teach us classes just so we could see what classes were like in law school. They would show us the cases system. We would have cases to read beforehand and discuss them in class. That's actually how they do classes in law school. We had a binder and every week they would mail us our cases. It would be 40 pages of information about a certain case and we would read it. You were supposed to write the answers but you didn't have to. We would talk about it, the professor would come and we would talk about it. Sometimes half the room would play this attorney and half would play that attorney. We would go outside to discuss it and present to the whole room and have a debate. The cases were all related to real life issues.

Fellows reported a variety of experiences with other professional schools. The Medicine fellows interacted with doctors from the School of Medicine. They spoke with the undergraduates about the types of research they were conducting on cancer. Following the presentation, the fellows were afforded a tour of research laboratories. The Public Health fellows were invited to attend a banquet featuring public health professionals from the community. These fellows also interacted with the faculty at the School of Public Health through a series of round-table discussions:

They would have like Saturday mornings when they would have workshops, kind of informal. They had bagels and orange juice for us then a professor would present at a round table, kind of like a lecture, and then we were allowed to ask questions. I remember one time a doctor spoke about the tobacco industry, smoking, and insurance. I think it was health and family issues that we touched on.

Professional schools provided another unique service to fellows—graduate exam preparation. The Graduate School of Education offered a GRE review course to which *all* fellows were invited:

I have not taken the GRE, but I took the courses the School of Education offered. They offered it through CBOP and ended up opening it to all of the fellows. They gave us a GRE review book and those were very, very helpful. It was for two weeks like two times a week for three hours each or something like that. It was like 7:00 – 10:00 or 6:00 – 10:00 pm. It was like Monday, Wednesday, and Saturdays. Saturdays were like the long one from 9-4 or something like that.

The School of Law mentored the law fellows through the review process for the LSAT. The School of Law partner paid 100% of the cost for law fellows to take an LSAT review

course. One case study participant took advantage of the review course. The Law School offered the choice of taking the Kaplan (\$900.00) or Test Masters (\$1,200.00) review course. The student opted to take Test Masters, because she was informed by current law students that it provided the best review for the LSAT examination.

In addition to these mentoring activities, fellows indicated that student service representatives communicated with fellows on a one-on-one basis. This approach offered opportunities for undergraduates to receive individual attention. Here are three students' comments:

- We were allowed to go in and speak to her [the student representative] or e-mail her at anytime. She was very accessible to us. I would email her if I had a question, but not too much, like when is such and such meeting. I wouldn't hesitate to go ask her a question.
- If I ever had problems, I got to e-mail the student affairs professional a little bit—concerning classes, my GPA, whether I had a future in even considering the medical school, that type of thing. So he would help me with that.
- We are still in contact with the student services professional. He made appointments with each one of us, I think, once this year just to check up on our progress to see when would be the best time to apply to law school. I have seen him more than once because I always have questions about stuff, I go to see him. He is really helpful. He looked over my personal statement and gave me input. I had questions about applications, the UCLA law school. And whether he knew about scholarships. I met with him five or six times. He contacted us once through e-mail and I followed up... He also let me turn in my resume to one of the ladies that does resumes there for students who are trying to get jobs after they graduate from law school. She looked at my resume even though I am not a law student yet. So I still get a lot of good assistance from them. . . I wanted to look for an internship the year I am taking off.

## **STUDENT OUTCOMES**

The analysis of in-depth interviews indicated specific patterns of gains and declines experienced by undergraduates in the CBOP service learning process. The most salient themes related to personal, academic, and career outcome are described in this section. Many of the outcomes have a positive relationship with the program objective of increasing the academic

competitiveness of disadvantaged undergraduate students for admission to graduate and professional school.

### **Personal Student Outcomes**

The student responses revealed that undergraduates experienced personal outcomes in the following areas: awareness of and empathy for others; self-confidence/self-worth; educational value and connection with the university; and leadership skills. This report utilizes the term *personal* in reference to outcomes other than academic and career- related outcomes.

Most of the case study participants agreed that providing services to high school students increased their understanding of others and made them more empathic to the needs of others. The undergraduates worked primarily with 9th and 10th grade students from disadvantaged backgrounds. This interaction made them more sensitive to the needs of individuals who had not reached the same developmental and educational level as they had. Aside from differences in educational and developmental levels, undergraduates gained an understanding of the social, economic, and educational limitations students from disadvantaged backgrounds contend with, particularly in terms of gaining admission to UCLA.

Gaining an awareness of and empathy for the needs of others inspired a sense of confidence in one fellow's personal ability to make a difference in the community. She also experienced an increase in her belief that she should make a difference in society.

Every person in the whole entire world should be involved in making sure the next generation is going to be okay. A lot of people forget that. I think that's what I've learned the most - is that these kids have taught me so much. You guys are making me become better when I get older and even give back to the community and know what problems are in the community. I've been in East Los Angeles and that's where I grew up. But I would have never known the problems of South Central - never. I would never have realized the problems kids are having today. I mean I'm not that old, but things have changed.

Providing services to students who were both in high school and from predominantly disadvantaged backgrounds gave this fellow an opportunity to see how her talents and skills could be utilized to produce positive change in the lives of others. Consequently, she gained a

sense of confidence in her capabilities.

Four fellows reported that their experiences in CBOP increased their feelings of connection with the university and the value they placed on their educational experiences. One fellow was deeply challenged by feelings of resentment about attending school. These feelings were lessened when she developed a connection to the university through her involvement in CBOP.

I feel better and I am doing better in school. Before I used to resent going to school. Sometimes I still am resentful. I feel like I am confined in a cell or something. It's like you're confined in a cell like the dorm room or something. You live in there, you go there. I just have a pessimistic attitude towards it. Some times I still do have it. But I guess because of my experiences working with people and getting connected at the university, I feel I have a more firm grip on it and I don't feel as resentful I guess. So CBOP makes you feel a little more connected and unresentful.

Another fellow explained how his interaction with the high school students helped to increase his connection with the university:

It made me more appreciative. So, I was like I'm lucky to be here. I'd be lucky if two of these kids made it to where I'm at right now. So, I need to work hard at what I'm doing, the position I am in order to go back and help other people.

The sense of connection experienced as a result of their participation in the service process translated into their increased persistence at UCLA. One fellow stated that the students reenergized something in him that had essentially burned out:

It affected me last year. Because it got to the point of where I was really getting tired of being here. You get caught up in this whole UCLA thing where you become more of a number than a person. And what you accomplish was just easily wiped away. At least I did, I wiped it away easily. They [high school students] made me go back to reality. It has been a nice little change. It is really one of the best parts of my week that I look forward to is going to go see them. It's nice, I missed my brothers and missed having my family here and sharing with them.

In addition to building a connection, as the above comments show, the undergraduates also became more appreciative of their educational opportunities. Through their experiences, the fellows better understood how difficult it was for disadvantaged students to gain admission to a

selective institution such as UCLA. This knowledge made them realize the extent to which their educational opportunities at UCLA were invaluable. Consequently, the fellows showed greater consideration for the value of their educational opportunities.

Two fellows reported that their leadership skills were strengthened through their participation in CBOP. Both fellows attributed this outcome to their taking part in the service process. One remarked:

Well, I think I feel a little more like a leadership role. I think there was a part of me that would get nervous when I would talk to groups. So maybe, I don't get that nervous when I talk to groups.

### **Academic Student Outcomes**

Through participation in the service learning process, fellows experienced a number of positive outcomes related to their academic performance. Some of these outcomes were related to the personal use of PALS. Other outcomes included improved academic motivation, and some impact on academic grades.

Six out the seven undergraduates in this study reported using some components of the optimal learning curricula in their academic studies in the first year. Although UCLA's Vice Chancellor Doby originally designed PALS to be used as a cycle of learning (i.e., preparation, group dialogue, lecture, practice, homework and feedback), the undergraduates in this case study were more likely to apply components of it to their academic studies. The issue of time was at the heart of their tendency to use components rather than the entire system of PALS.

For us we're college students already. We take the CBOP class and learn about group study and all of that. I tried it because it was a requirement, but then I was so busy it was just hard. We teach it to high school students but it's hard for them to apply it. Because we are smarter, we realize it better that we really have to do it. We try, even then it's hard to do it.

The way in which undergraduates applied the PALS components was highly dependent upon the dynamics of the courses in which they were enrolled:

I think that the whole system as a circular paradigm doesn't work as well for me as does using parts of PALS toward the classes where I need it. Such as for some classes I know

that I will need to prepare more, for others I will need to work on being an active listener during instruction. I do want to use practice and group discussion more, especially because I don't think that tutoring will be offered for my classes this quarter. Last quarter I used the tutoring as a place for practice and group discussion, and this was very helpful. Also, I want to keep preparing and improve on my preparation skills this quarter because I find it so important in order that I am confident throughout the class, and so that exam times will be much less stressful than it was last quarter.

Reading assigned course materials before attending class in the preparation phase of PALS was the most frequently applied component of the optimal learning curricula. Five of the fellows reported that they read ahead in their classes on a consistent basis.

This study found that four fellows (three overlapping the prior group) utilized group dialogues in their study regimens. Group dialogue was primarily executed through discussions of assigned readings, papers, problem sets in small groups (two to three people), tutorial sessions, and faculty and teaching assistant office hours. Although Vice Chancellor Doby intended group dialogue to take place before instruction in the PALS system, the fellows were most likely to conduct group dialogue after lecture. This was due in part to the difficulty of finding classmates who both read the course materials and were willing to dialogue before class.

Individual fellows applied other components of the optimal learning curricula. For example, one fellow reported that she applied the learning tool of writing down the things she did not understand in the lecture. She conducted this exercise the same day that she attended lecture. Two fellows recopied their notes from class the same day they were taken. Only one case study participant reported that she did not use any components of the optimal learning curricula in her studies in the first year. She disapproved of the system:

[T]hey force people to learn one set system that is supposedly going to change the way that they think, the way they study, and improve their grades. Now that may work for some and it might not work for others. . . . I did not use PALS. We made up stuff on our reflections and said what the professor wanted to hear. People who said PALS was great were getting good grades, those who did not were getting bad grades.

In summary, a substantial number of the case study participants stated in the first year interviews that by taking part in CBOP and learning PALS they gained a greater awareness of

the process of learning and improved their study skills. This heightened awareness led undergraduates to try new learning strategies, enhance existing strategies, and/or abandon ineffective strategies in an effort to determine which ones worked best for them. Further, undergraduates who prepared adequately throughout the academic quarter utilizing methods such as reading before class and participating in group dialogue, indicated that they were less likely to cram for midterms and finals, found exam preparation easier, felt more confidence and less stressed about midterm and final examinations. Furthermore, the learning strategies helped fellows improve their ability to manage time by learning the bulk of their material prior to attending the lecture.

As noted, undergraduate fellows did not attend the service learning class during the second year. As a result, they were not required to complete worksheets or journal reflections chronicling their use of the optimal learning curricula. This study found that with the exception of one fellow, none of the fellows believed that he/she applied components of the optimal learning curricula to his/her own academic studies in the second year. However, the fellows' comments about study skills and the process of learning in which they engaged belie this assertion, at least in part.

The majority of the fellows reported that participation in CBOP enhanced their motivation to excel academically. Although most of the fellows experienced this outcome, the sources by which this outcome was derived varied according to each fellow. Three features of the CBOP service learning process were suggested as contributing to the academic motivation of fellows.

First, two fellows indicated that their interaction with the high school students and their parents were major factors in facilitating their academic motivation. One of them said:

Up until my third year, I was losing interest in school. I felt in my life that I was just getting drained. I was physically stressed and worn out. When I spent the first year in CBOP talking to the kids, it was just as the service learning instructor was telling us - they're going to be looking up to you because they want to be where your at. I lost sight of that because we're at UCLA, we're supposed to be here. It's a whole different world. I

found out from the kids, in talking to their parents, I had done something different and special. So it reenergized some part of my motivation. I'm not sure if it was designed for CBOP, but that's what I got out of it.

Second, the service learning class strongly emphasized the topic of motivation.

Undergraduates were encouraged to make connections between concepts and theories of motivation and their academic motivation as students at UCLA. Consequently, they learned how to increase their academic motivation as well as motivate the students whom they served.

The attainment of competitive grades is a critical factor to increasing the preparation of undergraduates for admission to UCLA graduate and professional schools. Four of the fellows reported that their grades increased as a result of their participation in CBOP. Before participation in CBOP, one fellow had a 2.8 grade point average. After participation in CBOP, her grade point averaged increased to a 3.0.

My quarter GPA shot up. It was the quarter I had the service learning instructor or a quarter after I had him. I was taking five classes and I only received one B. I got four A's and one B. After taking this class my grades just went. I've never had a GPA like that.

Another fellow commented.

It was so hard for me to get an A. I was getting like B+, B and one A-; B, B+, A-. Well, finally I started getting half and half A's and B's.

The fellows collectively attributed their increased grades to participation in self-assessment exercises within the service learning class, interaction with disadvantaged high school students, the optimal learning curricula, and the increased academic motivation they experienced in CBOP. One fellow stated:

In general, my grades have gone up tremendously the last three quarters. I started using parts of PALS. It helped a bit. This whole new sense of motivation to be here at UCLA and to be proud of what I've done has really assisted me in it. So now I take a little more pride in my work rather than what it's supposed to be. It's really helped me improve my academic grades. They have actually given me pride in what I do and the pride has also assisted me in what I do here at UCLA. So it's given me a new sense of pride and a new sense of motivation. They don't realize they've had an impact on me.

This outcome of increased academic grades is consistent with the program's objective to increase the academic competitiveness of undergraduates for admission to UCLA graduate and professional schools. Academic grades are significant factors in determining whether a student is adequately prepared for and gains admission to graduate or professional school.

While a significant number of the fellows improved their academic grades, their cumulative grade point averages increased only by a small amount. This is due in part to their having begun participation in CBOP as juniors and continued participation through their senior years. The program is unable to impact the cumulative grade point average of students who are juniors and seniors as it would that of freshmen and sophomores.

Only two of the fellows indicated no improvement in academic grades as a result of participation in CBOP. Both were doing well prior to entering CBOP. One fellow simply indicated that CBOP did not have any effect on her grades. She maintained a 3.3 grade point average prior to and during participation in CBOP. Another maintained the 3.9 GPA she held prior to participating in CBOP in the academic year of 1998/1999. However, she pointed out that her involvement in CBOP made it easier to earn the type of the grades she was already getting.

I noticed that it was easier for me to study. Like even though I got good grades before, the PALS system kind of broke it down for me. So I studied better. . . . I didn't have to spend as much time studying.

Another aspect of academic outcomes — and ultimately one of the main goals of CBOP — is increasing the academic competitiveness of fellows for entry into graduate or professional schools. This is measured partially by success in graduate entrance examinations. Only one case study participant took a graduate or professional school admission examination (i.e., LSAT, GRE, or MCAT) during the course of this study. The majority of the case study participants planned to take the admissions examination in the summer of 2000 and apply to

graduate or professional school for Fall 2001. Thus, there is not an adequate basis for judging the influence of CBOP on graduate or professional school application and acceptance.

The one fellow who took a graduate/professional school examination was very successful. The School of Law partner covered the cost of that fellow's LSAT review courses. She performed exceptionally well on the LSAT examination for admission to law school with a score range from 120-180 and average for the country 150 (UCLA law school 164). She received a 178. The fellow was accepted at UCLA, Stanford, and Harvard, and, chose to go to Harvard.

### **Career Outcomes**

Career outcomes were experienced by the case study participants in the areas of exposure to career options and clarification of educational and career goals. Because CBOP is a community service learning program that requires fellows to teach scholars, fellows gained exposure to scholarly literature and practical experience dealing with scholars' unmet needs. This form of involvement afforded fellows the opportunity to clarify their own interests.

One fellow disclosed how teaching at the high school sites in the second year increased her interest in pursuing a career in social welfare and education:

Its encouraged me and piqued my interest in working a little more in education - a sense of fulfillment. My teaching experiences had an impact on my wanting to work in social welfare and education. I am considering getting my Masters in either social welfare or education. I am going to take a year off. I think it did help a lot working with the students and providing services. It gave me sort of a sense of fulfillment that I was doing something positive for them.

Another fellow stated: "I think just working in those communities just reinforced why I wanted to work in those communities [in the health field]." Another fellow reported that participation in the service process reinforced his feeling that he should not pursue education as a career field and it affirmed his interest in becoming a doctor.

One fellow told of an experience she had with a high school student that had a profound

impact on her potential career choices:

At first, I thought I wanted to do something that will make a lot of money for a little while and then maybe go into other things once I get my loans paid off and that sort of thing. Now I am leaning into juvenile crime. I've been to court. . . I went to court with a CBOP kid and stood up for him and I talked to the judge for him. He went to jail anyway. It was out of my control. All I could say was that he attended all of my sections. What I didn't know was that he hadn't been going to school. Then that's why they put him in jail. He had had, I don't know how many absences and I didn't know about that. He's out. So that kind of thing, I saw the lawyer cry. You don't see that everyday. She started crying and saying you just don't see good kids like that, you don't see it very often. She saw it, I saw it, so maybe I want to do that. Help those kids and maybe even get a little counseling in there. He was sent to jail only a couple of days. But the problem was that he was sent through Christmas and New Years. It was sad. . . The judge said can you account for him at school. I said I can't. All I know is that he has been to every single one of my after school CBOP classes. But I don't know what he does during school. He said okay, sorry and sent him to jail. It was sad because I had to take his mom home and that was sad.

The fellow's exposure to the field of juvenile crime law was not necessarily an intentional objective of the service process, but came about as indirect consequence of her participation in the program. The experience changed her career objective:

It has affected me. At first I was like I'm going to be a blood-sucking lawyer. I don't care and I'm just going to go out there and make money. Because I didn't have anything growing up, and it's like this is taking back and I'm going to show everyone who didn't believe in me. It wasn't even for me all the way. It was like I am going to show these people. I'm going to have, I guess, I thought money, power, and success. Now I've changed, just changed. I mean, I've always been a good person and I wanted to help people and maybe give my money back. But I think it is more than money now. It's more than setting up a scholarship fund. It's more giving yourself. Sharing experiences. I think that sharing your experiences part is just the best thing. I mean telling the kids this is what happened to me. I don't want it to happen to you.

## **APPENDIX**

### **STUDENT PROFILES**

This section presents the profiles of the seven case study participants : Tyler, Cameron, Juan, Lydia, Kateland, Summer, and Amber. Each profile identifies the undergraduate's major, career and educational goals, personal interests, and motivations for participating in CBOP.

#### ***Tyler***

A native of Ukraine, Russia, Tyler came to live in the United States eight - and - a - half years ago. She graduated from Fairfax High School with a GPA of 4.3 and SAT score of 1460. Tyler is an international economics major at UCLA. She has taken part in the UCLA International Students Association for the past three years, serving as president in 1999-2000. Tyler was also involved in a hunger project where she tutored children in transitional housing for one year; and an AIDS shelter for half a year. Tyler plans to graduate from UCLA in the Spring of 2000 and pursue a career as an attorney.

Tyler identifies herself as a disadvantaged student because she was unable to speak English when she came to America as a child. In addition, as immigrants, her parents were forced to rely on welfare.

#### ***Amber***

Amber grew up in Southeast Asia. She moved to California at the age of twelve, graduated from high school, and attended UCLA. Amber is a biochemistry major who plans to pursue a Ph.D. in biomedical engineering. During her collegiate experience, she volunteered at the UCLA Medical Center as a patient escort.

Although Amber's family received welfare, she did not consider herself disadvantaged until she experienced academic challenges at UCLA. Amber now believes that her poor performance resulted from being a first generation college student. Her motivation for

participating in CBOP was that the program reportedly helped undergraduates increase their chances of attending graduate school.

### ***Juan***

Juan is a Latino from a small California town of approximately 40,000 people. He graduated from high school with a GPA of 3.6/3.9 and SAT score of 1050. Juan majors in biology and minors in Chicano Studies to provide diversity in his education. Juan, who desires to become a pediatrician, works in the UCLA Child Life and Development department, has assisted with dental check-ups for children as well as language translations at UCLA health fairs. He has also volunteered at the Santa Monica/UCLA Hospital as a care-extender. He plans to take one year off to work in a student outreach capacity before pursuing medical school.

Juan identifies himself as a disadvantaged student in a number of ways. He is the first in his family to attend college; neither one of his parents speak English; and he is from a low-income family background (his father has been a mushroom picker for the past 23 years). In addition, Juan's mother has always worked thereby leaving him to take a surrogate parental role to his siblings.

Juan became involved in CBOP because he missed the volunteer activities with the homeless he was involved with back home, and he desired to continue participation in a similar effort through UCLA. Furthermore, CBOP enabled him to work with disadvantaged populations.

### ***Lydia***

Lydia is a Mexican American who graduated from high school in Orange County, California with a grade point average of 3.3. She was not required to take the SAT exam because she began her college career at a California community college. Lydia transferred to UCLA as a third year student in 1998 and is majoring in pre-psychology. She plans to take one year off to teach after she graduates from UCLA in the Spring of 2000. At the conclusion of that year she will attend graduate school in social welfare or education.

Lydia was motivated to participate in CBOP because she was told that the program

increased the potential of prospective graduate students for admission to graduate school. She looked forward to teaching high school students as part of her required service learning course study. In addition to participating in CBOP, Lydia served as a teaching assistant at an elementary school while attending UCLA. She does not consider herself disadvantaged.

### ***Summer***

Summer was born in Fullerton, California. Her family is from Ghana, Africa. She graduated from high school with a grade point average of 3.4 and an SAT score of 1000. She is majoring both in international development studies and pre-medicine. Her career goal is to become a pediatrician or to work in health policy as it relates to the development of communities and health care for children. Summer plans to attend medical school in the Fall of 2001. She enjoys being a well-rounded individual at UCLA, which includes participating in the Gospel Choir, Watts Tutorial Program, Amigos de UCLA, Black Pre-Health Society, African Arts Ensemble, and COPE.

Summer participated in CBOP because she wanted to pursue a career working with children in underprivileged communities. She does not consider herself socially or economically disadvantaged.

### ***Kateland***

Kateland is an African American female from Northern California. Her high school grade point average was a 3.5 and SAT score 1260. Because Kateland graduated from a private high school, she does not regard herself as being disadvantaged. She is a business economics and Afro-American Studies major with a minor in accounting. She plans to enter law school and apply to the business school to obtain an MBA-JD. After graduation from the MBA-JD program, Kateland plans to enter private practice in child advocacy law/family law.

As a student at UCLA, Kateland has taken part in a number of extracurricular activities including the African Education Project, Black Pre-Law Society, Multicultural Alliance, House Government in the dorms, Gospel Choir, and High School Conference.

Kateland began participation in CBOP to determine whether she wanted to teach high school students.

***Cameron***

Cameron, a mixture of Latina and Asian, is a native of California, and entered UCLA as a freshman. She is a sociology major who has been involved in a number of extra curricular activities including a women's group she founded with friends, the Latin American Student Association, and mentoring two young women who just entered high school. She completed high school with a grade point average of 3.4 and SAT score of 1110. When asked whether she considered herself disadvantaged in any way, she stated:

Kind of, but I don't like to have that kind of mentality. I guess under other people's definition I am disadvantaged because I am poor or what ever you want to call me, a minority. But I don't feel like I'm disadvantaged. Some things are unlucky. I am not on a level playing field with everybody else. But I am kind of conservative in that sense. I think that if everyone works hard enough and they really want it, they can.

Cameron joined CBOP because she wanted to be a mentor and to receive mentoring. She plans to take one year off from school after graduation to teach and then attend law school in the Fall of 2001.