

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

MEETING MINUTES

FRIDAY, JANUARY 27, 2017

Attending: Bradley Queen, Chair (UCI), Carrie Wastal, Vice Chair (UCSD), Darlene Francis (UCB), Bill Gary (UCR), Daniel Gross (UCI), Robert Cooper (UCLA), George Gadda (AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader), Jonathan Lang (AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader Designate), Camille Forbes (UCSD) (telephone), David Jennings (UCM), Benjamin Brecher (UCSB), Alessa Johns (UCD), Dana Ferris (Chair, English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group) (telephone), Robin Scarcella (Member, EMS Advisory Group) (telephone), Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP), Julie Lind (AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Introductions and Announcements

- *Brad Queen, Chair, UCOPE*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Queen welcomed everyone to the meeting and Vice Chair White joined the meeting to report on current issues for the Academic Senate. At the Regents meeting this week, a tuition increase was approved by a majority of the Regents. The Governor included a 4% increase in UC's base budget. About one-third of the students will actually be helped by the increase, one third will not be impacted and the final third will have an increase in their out of pocket expenses. There was resistance in principle to the increase in tuition but there were no major protests. UC would like more state support.

The Budget Framework Initiative required that UC come up with a policy limiting non-resident students and this will be discussed at the next Regents' meeting. The Senate has taken the position that there should not be an absolute cap and any cap should be linked to maintaining the quality of the University. Any fixed percentage cap would immediately hurt some UC campuses while other campuses will face problems in the long term. UC will want to demonstrate how non-residents benefit the campuses and there are a variety of very good reasons to have non-resident students in the undergraduate student body. Vice Chair White shared information about the UC Scout Program which provides assistance to high schools with the a-g requirements by offering online courses. Funding for this program was not included in Governor Brown's budget. UCOPE members were asked to think of faculty at their campuses who would be interested in volunteering in the UC Scout Program to vet the online courses and the analyst shared a link to UC Scout's website.

The committee reviewed Senate Bylaw 192 and Senate Regulation 636. Chair Queen reminded the members that UCOPE's bylaw has a variety of aspects beyond writing. UCOPE created two subcommittees, the English for Multilingual Students (EMS) Advisory Group and the AWPE Committee, both of which are vital sources of information for UCOPE. Unlike UCOPE's membership, the membership of the two subcommittees has been relatively stable over the years.

II. AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader Search

- *Carrie Wastal, Vice Chair, UCOPE*

Vice Chair Wastal provided an overview of the successful search for a new AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader. Over the summer, UCOPE reviewed various documents including the job description. The vice chair was on the interview panel which also included Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Admissions, Stephen Handel. Jonathan Lang accepted the offer and has joined today's

meeting. For about the next year, Chair Designate Lang will shadow current AWPE Committee Chair Gadda and then will take charge of the Exam. Chair Queen and committee members welcomed Chair Designate Lang. It was noted that there were several discussions in the past about who should run the search for Chair Gadda's replacement. Chair Designate Lang's background includes work on the SAT test development committee, the Advanced Placement English Language Exam, and a number of other exams. Chair Designate Lang has been a Question Leader and an Exam Leader for the AP English Language Exam for five years.

III. Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) Review and Selection of Essay Prompts

- *George Gadda, AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader*

AWPE Committee Chair Gadda reviewed the process for selecting the AWPE essay prompts, including related elements such as testing and pre-testing and administration. Every year UCOPE provides a ranking of potential prompts for the May administration of the university-wide AWPE. The potential exams being reviewed are the result of a development process in which Chair Gadda or the AWPE test development team find passages that may be appropriate for the exam in that they represent reading of a complexity that students are likely to encounter in first year classes at UC and that address subjects of general interest about which students will know from different kinds of experiences and can provide a viewpoint about their particular experience. Exam specifications approved by UCOPE drive the development of the AWPE.

The exams are created in August by Chair Gadda and then reviewed by a consultant arranged by the AWPE vendor for fairness issues. Some revisions are made based on the consultant's feedback and then the prospective exams are pre-tested with freshmen at various UC campuses. This exercise is done with the help and cooperation of instructors in writing and EMS programs on various campuses. The essays are collected, as diagnostics, on the first or second day of instruction and used as initial indications of what students' abilities are. The essays are sent to Chair Gadda who prepares them for the two day meeting of the AWPE Committee in January. The AWPE Committee reads the essays in response to the prospective new exams and looks at them to determine that the reading passage is accessible to and understood by students and that students can respond to the essay topic. The essays should demonstrate a variety of viewpoints and approaches so this is not a presentation of the issue that results in every student writing the same kind of response.

In the two day meeting, each reader reads 25 to 30 papers responding to each of six or seven prospective exams. The pre-testing involves students from diverse backgrounds and the pool of students who participate in the pre-testing is drawn from multiple UC campuses and will not change with the transition to the new AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader. The essays are from entry level writing classes, some of which are for the general population while others are more specialized, as well as from the course that follows the entry level writing course. The essays that UCOPE reviews have been judged to make the appropriate distinction between students with the reading and writing skills to satisfy entry level writing as opposed to those who do not. At today's meeting UCOPE members, who represent faculty from all the campuses in various disciplines, will see if the potential exams represent University expectations about reading and writing for freshmen.

Chair Gadda described what the "E" designation means and its function, noting that this designation is not used systematically in pre-testing. When the exams are scored either in the May administration or campus administrations, readers assign a holistic score on the one to six scale. Some non-passing essays exhibit significant linguistic or rhetorical features characteristic of the writing on non-Native speakers of English; if those features contribute to the essay's non-passing score, the exam reader assigns the "E" designation in addition to the holistic score. The "E" in the May reading is then confirmed by another reader, and when it is confirmed, it goes back to campuses along with other pieces of information including the

holistic score, scores on standardized tests and the essay itself. Campuses can use all of this information to place students into the most appropriate courses.

The “E” means one factor that may have impacted the non-passing score may be due to features characteristic of the writing of non-native speakers of English. If one factor in that score is the non-native language or rhetorical features, the “E” is added. But the decision about the holistic score is made first. Chair Gadda indicated that a passing essay cannot be given the “E” designation, adding that the “E” is not a demographic indicator but an indicator that this is a student who should be looked at for the possibility that specialized instruction would be helpful and appropriate. Passing exams may also include markers of non-native language use, but if the exam received a passing score and therefore meets ELWR, the “E” designation is not applied as the student does not need to be placed in a course leading to ELWR satisfaction. This happens because the scoring guide in the upper half says “usually can control the mechanics of written English” so almost every essay will have some departures, and some of them by non-native speakers will be the occasional error that one can categorize as being likely from a second language background or the influence of another language. But if the essay is scored four, five or six then there is no special identification because there will be no special course placement as a result. The “E” was created by EMS instructors on the AWPE Committee (then known as the Subject A Committee) as a means of giving campus programs an indicator of which students they should look at for potential placement in specialized instruction if the campus has more than one course leading to ELWR satisfaction. The result of the “E” designation will vary campus by campus. Most campuses do read for placement the essays that receive the designation.

Chair Queen indicated that there is some talk about whether the AWPE is the mechanism for satisfying the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) but nothing else. At UCI, when a student does not pass the AWPE the campus gives the student another placement exam, allowing the campus to make a more finely-tuned placement. Students who do not pass the AWPE and do not receive the “E” designation are not tested further. Many people who do not pass the AWPE do not have the “E” designation and many non-native speakers pass the exam. The group that receives the “E” is a group whose overall performance has been judged to be not satisfactory. In these cases, one element of that non-satisfactory performance can be attributed to one particular kind of influence that suggests that in the placement process the influence of another language should be given attention.

Note: Meeting notes were not recorded for the UCOPE review and selection of the essay prompts in keeping with past practices specific to the committee’s deliberation on this specific topic.

IV. Update on Senate Travel Procedures

- *Mona Hsieh, Office Manager, Academic Senate*

The Senate’s Office Manager explained current travel guidelines and reimbursement policies.

V. Consultation with the President’s Office

- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*
- *Julie Lind, AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*

Coordinator Lind updated the committee on the AWPE program. Admission rates went up quite a bit for fall 2016 causing the AWPE test population to increase by almost 20%. In May 2015, just under 14k students were tested and in May 2016, 16,685 students were tested. The program had to make adjustments to ensure that the scoring could still be completed in a week. The same volume is expected for this year and this upward trend is expected to continue. Chair Gadda was able to shepherd the process so the exam scoring was completed on time since the summer orientation programs are waiting for the exam results. There was a slight increase in the pass rate, from 45.9% to 48.2%. Coordinator Lind noted that this is just

the California high school students taking the May systemwide exam and does not include the campus exams taken by out of state and international students.

This year, the program is working on access issues and has just created a Braille version of the AWPE and the AWPE website is also being improved to work better for students with vision related disabilities. The AWPE program is doing well financially but has extra expenses this year related to the job shadowing by the AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader Designate and programming for the website. Student exam results are available on the ELWR website - www.UCOP.edu/ELWR.

Discussion: A member expressed concern about the 52% failure rate on the AWPE. It was clarified that the students who take the AWPE have not met the ELWR by other means and are about 25 to 26% of the overall incoming freshman population across the system. Coordinator Lind indicated that of the people who do not pass the AWPE, many satisfy the ELWR over the summer with their spring AP English Exam score or by taking a course online or at a California Community College (CCC). The Coordinator shared UCOP's annual report to the State Legislature on the ELWR with the members. This report includes data on the alternative ways students satisfy the ELWR.

An issue is that some students may not have access to the resources needed to complete the requirement online or at a CCC. Unlike UCD, many UC campuses give credit for their entry level writing course. There was a discussion about remedial education and it was clarified that in the 1990s, UC stopped providing remedial education. A member pointed out that UCOPE is not only tasked with looking at the AWPE but at placement in general. Several campuses grant credit for EMS courses and there is a question about whether there should be consistency across the UC system. A member emphasized that there are historical reasons specific to each campus that resulted in the different practices. Students who do not pass the ELWR may find themselves at a disadvantage in basic writing classes.

VI. The Redesigned SAT Exam and the ELWR

- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*
- *Tongshan Chang, Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning, UCOP*

The first administration of the redesigned SAT was in March 2016 and to date there is still not much information available about it. Director Yoon-Wu is working with Director Chang to determine how UC will assess the results of the new SAT. The actual writing exam has been removed from the primary SAT and is now an optional essay, but BOARS has decided that the writing exam is required for UC admission. For fall 2017 about 80% of the applicants took the new SAT while the other 20% submitted scores from the old SAT likely taken when they were juniors. The scores for the new SAT are trending higher overall. However, when the scores of the new SAT and the old SAT are compared on the concordance tables provided by the College Board, the new scores are averaging a bit lower. UC is collecting the scores on the essay but not using them for admission.

Last April UCOPE decided to wait and see the scores on the essay before making a decision about the essay. Currently, scores from the new SAT (first administered in March 2016) are not used as a method of satisfying ELWR. UCOP is planning to validate the results of these scores, which will give them meaning, once a few years' worth of data is available after the students have enrolled in UC and taken the first year writing class. It was suggested that UCOPE could consider having the Evidence-Based Reading & Writing score from the new SAT as a method of satisfying ELWR. In the past the general feeling at UCOPE was that the scores from the multiple choice section alone would not be used since this is for the writing requirement. At this time, there is no research available on the new essays in the SAT.

Discussion: The new evidence based multiple choice section of the SAT is different from the timed writing test and it will have a new score. According to Chair Gadda, the new SAT essay provides a

passage of similar length to the passage used for the AWPE but students are not asked to understand it or formulate a response based on personal experience, but instead asked to show how the writer uses rhetorical devices and language to substantiate the position. Chair Designate Lang commented that rhetorical analysis provides the least information and requires that instructors give very specific instructions without which students will not do well. Students may not do well on other types of writing exercises but something can still be learned about their writing.

In the past, UCOPE has indicated that the score on the multiple choice section of the SAT does not alone satisfy UC's ELWR. Director Chang indicated that if any students have taken both the old and new SAT, the data from these tests can be compared. Most students take both the ACT and SAT. Half of the students satisfy the ELWR by taking one or more of the tests, one quarter satisfy the requirement with the AWPE and the rest have not met the requirement. The College Board has stated that the concordance scores are valid but Director Yoon-Wu reported that the concordance scores for the applicant pool this year are lower.

Students who do not satisfy the ELWR and who are not advised to take the ACT will likely be from disadvantaged high schools which may result in a bump to the lower end of the application pool in terms of opportunity at the AWPE. In 2015 ACT changed and instead of calculating a Combined English/Writing score, the English Language Arts (ELA) score is provided and for the time being UC is treating these as equivalent but another year's worth of data is needed before UC can study this so UCOPE can decide if the cut score should be adjusted. Based on UCOP's study of the 2005 SAT, writing is a stronger predictive factor of student success than the SAT math and reading which is one reason why the Regents decided to eliminate the subject tests according to Director Chang. A member asked what UC's comparator institutions are doing in terms of the SAT's new essay.

Chair Queen asked if members agree to postpone considering using the new SAT to satisfy the ELWR until after 2017-2018 when data is available and members voted in favor of this. UC cannot promote the SAT or the ACT. The ACT is still an option for students to satisfy the ELWR although they may not be aware of this alternative if they do not receive good counseling. The only data UC currently has is the concordance table. Chair Queen asked if the committee would be opposed to using the concordance table as a stop gap measure to satisfy the ELWR. Director Chang proposed comparing the scores for students who took the old SAT and AP to students who have taken the new SAT and the AP to see how the results correlate, and this might be one way to validate the new SAT. However, this data may not be available this year. Students self-report their AP scores and the official AP scores are not sent to UCOP so the campuses have to collect the official data.

Members discussed the issue of disadvantaged students and the potential harm to students required to take the AWPE. An issue for students from disadvantaged high schools is that they may not have good advising at school or from family, will not take AP courses or the IB, and may not necessarily take the ACT, while many will take the SAT. The harm for these students is that they will need to take the AWPE which is an additional hurdle and burden, even if the students do well. While data from UCLA shows that most students are taking both the SAT and ACT, data from other campuses may be very different. There is also a stigma associated with having to take the AWPE. Students who pass the ELWR at UCB are not officially allowed to enroll in the most basic course that leads to ELWR satisfaction and a number of students are unhappy with this policy because they want the stimulus of the basic course and feel unprepared. Chair Queen recommended that UCOPE members should take the new SAT online at the College Board.

VII. Campus Reports/Meeting Items

UCSD: Three items are planned for discussion at the local committee's upcoming meeting. The curriculum being used for math preparedness and readiness will be reviewed. The basic writing program has been moved back to the campus after being taught at a CCC and its success will be evaluated. The exit exam has been eliminated and instead a portfolio will be used to assess student success. The third matter is the re-enrollment in ELWR for those students who are unable to satisfy the requirement. In the past, students who did not pass were required to retake the course and then given a redemption exam but the COPE is considering a proposal from the provost of the college and the heads of the basic writing programs to use a re-enrollment challenge portfolio.

Members were reminded by Chair Queen to check in with their divisional preparatory education committees.

VIII. Request for Analysis of 2016 AWPE Data

A request to UCOP's Institutional Research unit for analysis of AWPE data has been drafted. The Institutional Research (IR) unit conducted an analysis in 2011-2012. Chair Queen hoped that there would be predictive validity data since the fall 2012 spike of international students in the system but the most recent predictive data is from 2003. Chair Queen explained that the draft memo in front of the committee today is in some ways a follow up to the 2015 report from the Writing Program Administrators. The signatories of the memo each have a significant presence in the field of writing studies.

Discussion: A member remarked that the 2012 report indicated that, at UCR and UCM, the AP and SAT are identified more academically prepared students than the AWPE. UCOPE should gather more data and take a big picture approach by asking the signatories of the data request memo to discuss how placement works at UC, how it works nationally, and comparative models. Chair Gadda commented that it is a good idea for the 2012 study to be replicated and explained that when the Educational Testing Service was involved, data reports were produced on a yearly basis but this was cut back for budgetary reasons. Coordinator Lind explained that the current vendor is not a testing company but can generate raw data.

Director Chang indicated that the best statistic to use for the analysis will be determined with Chair Queen and the chair of the EMS Advisory Group. Chair Designate Lang shared that third readers are more likely to be long-term readers and are more likely to produce fair results. But by design the AWPE process will always bring in new, inexperienced people from across writing programs to help them develop skills in assessment, not just as it relates to the AWPE but in terms of becoming better assessors of writing in general. The process is intended to get new people to understand the AWPE process and the Entry Level Writing Requirement, to get them invested in the results and gain some type of professional development. Because the AWPE only meets once a year there will always be less experienced readers which is an important part of the overall process, so focusing narrowly on issues of reliability as it relates to readers short-changes the rest of the process.

Director Chang explained that in 2012 IR did not have data on courses from all the campuses and three campuses volunteered to provide it. In 2012-2013, IR started collecting the course data from all UC campuses so for this replication the analysis will include information for all campuses. The raw, third read scores are not provided by the current operations vendor and Coordinator Lind will discuss how this could be done with the vendor. Past third read scores may be more difficult to get as they are archived and there will be a cost and it will take some time to retrieve that information. Chair Queen indicated that the goal is to identify how much data is available and the memo is not a hard pressing demand. The reliability data is just one data point. Chair Gadda remarked that it not clear what data the campuses maintain from the campus administration of the AWPE. UCLA maintains a spreadsheet data about course placements but not about individual readings, and it would require someone going through essays by hand to get the scores. At least UCOPE will know that it is too cumbersome to collect certain data.

Vice Chair Wastal suggested it would be valuable for members to share the draft memo with the divisional committees to discuss and get campus input and another member indicated that Undergraduate Councils/Education Policy Committees would be very interested in this data analysis. One campus is grappling with an influx of international students, many of whom are not proficient in English, and is not sure how to manage this problem. In addition, academic dishonesty is a significant issue so the more data and information about what is working and how students are passing exams would be helpful. The analyst proposed that the systemwide Committee on Education Policy may want to consult with UCOPE on the data request as was done in the past. Chair Gadda noted that the EMS Committee would also be interested in having this data. A member of the EMS Committee agreed that information about test efficacy as it relates to international students and long-term English immigrant students as well as more specific aspects of the efficacy will be helpful.

It was suggested that “Writing Program Administrator” should be defined broadly to include people beyond the program directors so that entry level writing coordinators, people responsible for the conducting the testing and people in the EMS programs will be surveyed. Chair Queen will work with Chair Gadda to create a list of who should be surveyed. Director Chang indicated that IR has an application that will enable them to conduct the survey so it can be institutionalized and replicated on a regular basis. Chair Gadda suggested that he and Chair Queen should communicate with the people to be surveyed to let them know they will be asked these questions and that UCOPE is interested in their responses.

Chair Queen stated that the request for yearly reporting on the AWPE structure will be pulled out of the draft memo. Members voted in support of submitting the request for data. Members voted in support of sharing the memo with their local committees by April for input if possible. The analyst will ask the systemwide Committee on Education Policy to discuss the memo in March. Chair Queen will send an updated draft to the members to share with their local committees. Director Chang indicated that the analysis Chair Queen has described will be possible to conduct. However the proposed timeline is not realistic and a more viable date for the replication study is January 2018. Director Chang, Chair Queen, Coordinator Lind, and Chair Gadda will confer after the meeting about the timeline for producing the report.

IX. UCOPE’s AWPE Committee

Chair Queen explained that the request for yearly reporting on the AWPE Committee structure will allow UCOPE to look at the people involved and how the system is working.

Discussion: Chair Gadda indicated that the packet UCOPE members receive includes a cover letter which identifies the members of the Test Development Team and of the AWPE Committee. To his knowledge, Chair Gadda does not believe that UCOPE has ever expressed interest in the reading or reviewed the list of readers. When the exam was established and UCURPE (as it was called) originally described having oversight over the selection and training of readers, the Educational Testing Service was responsible for this aspect of the program. ETS had its own pool of readers so the intent was to establish that the University, rather than ETS, had control over this aspect of the program. Reviewing the list of readers seems to be a very detailed task for a policy committee to undertake.

Every year, Chair Gadda asks for the submission of reader nomination lists from the campuses. Typically, the entry level writing coordinators construct these lists. Chair Gadda asks for people who have demonstrated their ability as holistic readers on writing samples on campus. People submit lists of general campus readers drawn from English departments or writing programs, lists of EMS specialist readers, lists of former UC readers no longer affiliated with UC but who have experience reading AWPE, and

writing project sites on campus nominate high school or CCC teachers with whom they have worked. In the past when there was a lot of outreach by UC to high schools that used the then-Subject A exam as the basis for working on student preparedness, a lot of the people nominated had been part of those programs. UCR still has an extensive program like this.

Chair Queen indicated that the request is not for UCOPE to select readers, but rather to see who they are, their institutional affiliation, how long they have been involved, and how much compensation they have received. Chair Queen has heard anecdotal information about AWPE readers on a campus who have been involved for a long time and have received additional money and other people want a chance to be involved, so this is an opportunity to question why these people have been in place for so long. If a goal is professional development, Chair Queen suggested these individuals should do something beyond being readers. Chair Gadda clarified that the only people who receive compensation are members of the Test Development Team who are asked to work in the summer for a couple of months identifying passages that might be developed for AWPE use and they attend two all day meetings. Coordinator Lind shared that for 2016, over 300 hundred regular readers and scoring leaders were invited. Of the regular readers, 259 were invited, 128 accepted and 118 actually participated. Everyone is paid \$80 for the training and then they receive \$2 per scored exam. Split readers receive an extra \$50, scoring leaders are paid \$1200, the Assistant Chief Reader is paid \$1400, and the Chief Reader receives \$1500. AWPE Committee members receive no compensation. The split readers are paid extra because they commit to working on Sunday if there is extra work for them to do.

Chair Queen indicated that someone selected the Assistant Chief Reader and no one on UCOPE was aware of this or possibly even aware that the position existed. Chair Gadda noted that the Assistant Chief Reader position did not exist until the online reading was implemented in 2010. This yearly reporting could be a short discussion item and Chair Queen believes this is part of UCOPE's role. Coordinator Lind will be happy to provide UCOPE with information, and noted that there are numerous details and with UCOPE meeting only twice a year it is not clear how viable this is. Chair Queen proposed that UCOPE could hold a short videoconference in the fall where this information is reviewed. To avoid the risk of slowing down the AWPE process, Coordinator Lind suggested that UCOPE could review the list of the readers from the previous year.

One member asked if something prompted the need for UCOPE to review this information and Chair Queen explained that the changeover in the management of the AWPE Committee is an opportunity for UCOPE to look at this committee and how it functions. Members of UCOPE rotate off the committee after one or two years while the AWPE Committee members have been involved for a long time. The duties of UCOPE have been assumed by the AWPE Committee over time. Chair Gadda mentioned that the processes UCOPE members see today were established by UCOPE in years past. New UCOPE members may experience the AWPE process as something that Chair Gadda is leading while in fact the processes is based on decisions UCOPE has made over the years and therefore the processes can change.

The data will be helpful going forward. Director Yoon-Wu pointed out that there is a fine line between policy oversight and administrative oversight. Administrative and implementation oversight has been granted to Student Affairs to manage the actual administration and operations of the test itself. This includes contracting with the vendor and monitoring the vendor's work. The AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader is the liaison between the policy side with UCOPE and the administrative side of the program. Approving the list of readers prior to the operation of the exam is noted in the memo and this gets into the administration of the exam.

The roster of the AWPE Committee could be posted on the UCOPE website. One member questioned the purpose of UCOPE receiving lists of individuals involved with the process and stated that the lines of authority need to be clear. Chair Gadda is curious about the objections UCOPE would have about the

reader pool and Coordinator Lind added that it is sometimes difficult to line up enough readers. Chair Queen shared that he met a reader last year who stated she had no affiliation with any educational institution and Chair Gadda expressed surprise that he was not informed about this. Since the majority of readers are suggested by writing programs, except individuals who have retired from UC and are approached due to their past contribution to the program. The Chief Reader is responsible for administrative aspects of the program such as identifying qualified people to score the exam. Coordinator Lind wants to be transparent but wants to avoid introducing risk and invites UCOPE to report concerns about certain types of people who are reading. A member recommended that UCOPE should discuss what structures make sense and clarify the administrative and policy roles and how these work together.

Director Yoon-Wu proposed that the Coordinator's report could be formalized into a written report for UCOPE with high level information about the number of exams administered, how many readers were involved, and the budget for the year, and Chair Queen agreed that this is the information that would be desired. Some of the details described in the draft memo would be a challenge to gather every year. For UCOPE to set policy it is important for the committee to have this type of information. Executive Director Baxter suggested that UCOPE could provide policy guidance to the AWPE Committee about the selection of readers or of AWPE Committee members. A member suggested that having a mechanism for turnover of the AWPE Committee members will bring in evolving perspectives. Chair Gadda clarified that there is no turnover mechanism because the AWPE Committee members have been directors of the entry level writing programs at their campuses and has been a very stable group for many years. Chair Gadda stated that in general stability and long term experience have been valued but a member expressed disagreement with this. Perhaps UCOPE should discuss whether there should be some standard mechanism for turnover and what that would be. UCOPE members need data in order to make informed decisions. It was also suggested that UCOPE members should serve longer terms on the committee. A member asked if there are documents that explain what UCOPE does, its authority, and its oversight over the AWPE and EMS committee. A central location for background documents would be helpful and the analyst could also develop a briefing for new members. A list of policies this committee has adopted or implemented would be helpful.

X. Executive Session

No minutes were taken during Executive Session.

XI. New Business

April Agenda Items

- 1) *Update on the redesigned SAT*
- 2) *Update on the Smarter Balanced Assessments of California's Common Core*
- 3) *UCOPE member suggested items*

Meeting adjourned at: 4 pm

Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams

Attest: Bradley Queen