

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022

Attending: Eileen Camfield, Chair (UCM), Amanda Solomon Amorao, Vice Chair (UCSD), Sarah Freedman (UCB), Yuming He (UCD), Daniel Gross (UCI), Jeffrey Maloy (UCLA), Francois Blanchette (UCM), Po-Ning Chen (UCR), Stanley Lo (UCSD), Katherine Saltzman-Li (UCSB), John Tamkun (UCSC), Julie Lind (AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions), Laura Hardy (Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions), Susan Cochran (Chair, Academic Senate), Jim Steintrager (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Monica Lin (Executive Director, Academic Senate) Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Camfield welcomed everyone to the first UCOPE meeting of the 2022-2023 academic year.

II. Consultation with the Academic Senate Office

- *Susan Cochran, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Jim Steintrager, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

- The new Vice Provost for Academic Personnel and Programs is Douglas Haynes. The new systemwide Provost, Katherine Newman, will start in early January.
- During the October Academic Council meeting, members discussed how the elimination of SAT/ACT scores for admissions has made it difficult for faculty to identify students who might benefit from additional support. UCOPE might consider if there are other ways to quickly identify students needing extra help.
- The Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the Regents received a presentation on transfer from the California Community Colleges (CCC) which showed that UC is close to meeting the requirement of admitting one transfer student to every two freshmen. Another presentation was on the dual admission pilot project with UC and the CCCs for students from high schools that do not offer all of the required A to G courses.
- The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates is focusing on getting the new single pathway for transfer from the CCC to the California State University and UC approved by each segment's faculty. This new pathway was required by Assembly Bill (AB) 928.
- AB 928 also established the Associate Degree for Transfer Intersegmental Implementation Committee which is tasked with figuring out how to simplify transfer.
- The Senate anticipates that there will be labor issues at UC this year. The UAW is currently in contract negotiations which are moving slowly, and it is possible that 48k graduate and post-doctoral students may go on strike.
- Council is proposing a revised residency requirement so that students must be on campus at least one year to take in-person courses.

III. Chair's Updates

Chair Camfield reviewed the committee's charge, Senate Bylaw (SB) 192.B, noting that there is language in the bylaw that may need to be revised or clarified. The charge refers to "remedial education" which UC does not offer. The chair noted that in recent years, UCOPE's focus has been on Writing but the committee should consider preparatory Math and think about how lower division general education (GE) prepares students to be successful when they transfer into UC.

Discussion: A member asked how AB 705 and 1705, which deal with developmental Math courses at the CCCs, might relate to the revisions of SB 192.B. Members should consider broadening how “preparatory” is defined. In contemplating how students are placed correctly to give them the best UC education, UCOPE might think of its charge being about bridging high school into the first year of college instead of just about the preparation to get into college and the committee could propose being renamed the “Committee on Bridging Education.”

IV. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Laura Hardy, Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Julie Lind, AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions*

The systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) program has sunsetted and Coordinator Lind worked with the campuses still using the AWPE locally to figure out their new processes. The contract with the operations vendor has ended and the campuses had the opportunity to download information from the vendor such as training videos. All information about the AWPE has been removed from UCOP’s Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) website which now has a basic overview of the requirement including the standardized exams and college courses that can meet the ELWR, and the website directs students to the campus websites with information about their specific processes. As of now, the campuses that plan to use the AWPE locally are UCLA and UCR, and UCB is working on a redesigned AWPE. UCOP’s Institutional Research (IR) unit has analyzed data to help UCOPE decide if accepting a score of 680 or higher on the SAT Evidence-based Reading and Writing section should remain in pilot status or not. A draft report from IR has been provided to Chair Camfield for distribution to the committee and IR is available to join the committee to explain the analysis.

Associate Director Hardy reported that a draft data-sharing agreement with the California Department of Education for Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) scores is under review by UCOP. The draft agreement narrowly defines that the data would be used to evaluate students for satisfaction of the ELWR and for placement into Writing courses and access to the data would be limited to offices that are performing that evaluation. Under this agreement, the data will not be used for research purposes, but a separate agreement could be established if there is interest in conducting research. Campuses will only receive SBAC data for students who have provided consent and have accepted their offer of admission to a specific campus. Admissions will collect the data for the specific students and provide it to Admissions offices as part of the students’ application record, similarly to how AWPE scores have been shared in late spring in previous years.

UCOP anticipates the data-sharing agreement will be in place soon, after which Admissions will put a mechanism in place to obtain consent from students who may have SBAC English Language Arts (ELA) scores to share. Admissions will use a temporary process to collect consent this year, reaching out to applicants only from California. A supplemental form will be sent to these students and their consent will be recorded in the application so Admissions can then send the data to the campuses. Moving forward, the plan is to add a statement of consent for SBAC scores along with the other consents that are currently obtained on the application in the affidavit section. Admissions hopes to get the scores to the campuses in late May or early June.

Discussion: A member thanked Admissions for their work on obtaining SBAC ELA scores and asked if the data-sharing agreement will allow local research to be conducted. Associate Director Hardy indicated that the way that the agreement is currently written is that research by IR at UCOP would be prohibited but campuses may be able to use the data to evaluate their internal processes.

Admissions will need to confirm this once the data-sharing agreement is finalized. UCB's Writing program is planning to administer its placement test on May 13th, therefore SBAC ELA scores should be provided before this date.

Chair Camfield explained that UCOPE has discussed the idea of using SBAC ELA scores to satisfy the ELWR with the logic being that this score reflects a proficiency threshold. UCOPE acknowledged that SBAC scores would not be used for placement because this assessment was not designed as a placement tool but instead to signal what students can do. UCI obtained SBAC ELA data directly from the students this past fall as one of multiple measures for placement, and the Writing program found the data to be useful in a several different ways and has not disapproved its use for placement. A separate issue is whether SBAC ELA scores should be added to the official set of exams UCOP recognizes as ELWR-satisfying.

V. Systemwide Review Item: Proposed Senate Regulation 479

The committee can opine on the proposed systemwide Senate Regulation (SR) 479 to establish the new California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) for CCC students. Cal-GETC and SR 479 will replace the long-standing Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) and SR 478. Comments are due by November 14th.

Discussion: The proposal seems to be increasing the number of course requirements and there is concern that this would disadvantage students who are transferring to Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) fields. A question is if Cal-GETC will have implications for STEM majors where students rely on partial IGETC. Senate Executive Director Lin clarified that AB 928 required that the new transfer pathway have the same number of units that are currently in IGETC and that UC's focus is on preparation for the major. UC has more flexibility compared to the CSU in terms of how Cal-GETC is received by the individual campuses and even by individual schools and colleges within a UC campus.

The executive director indicated that concerns about partial IGETC are addressed on a campus by campus basis, which is also how Cal-GETC will be handled. While it is helpful for CCC students to follow the GE pattern, UC is not requiring Cal-GETC as a condition for transfer. Students transferring to UC may be advised to take certain major preparation courses instead of the GE courses, whether they are part of Cal-GETC or not. Executive Director Lin stated that Chair Cochran is aware of concerns UC faculty have about the issues raised by UCOPE and indicated that the first goal is for the three senates to approve Cal-GETC and the next step will be to conceptualize it. The analyst mentioned that, should the faculty senates of the three segments fail to approve Cal-GETC, administrators of the segments will be given the responsibility for designing the new transfer pathway. A member commented that it is noteworthy achievement that the three faculty senates reached a compromise solution. The committee's memo should include the questions identified today but will make it clear that UCOPE endorses the proposal.

Action: The UCM representative volunteered to draft the committee's response to the proposal.

VI. Systemwide Review Item: Entry Level Writing Requirement Task Force Report and Recommendations

The ELWR Task Force was established to consider the meaning of the requirement, and as a member of the task force, Chair Camfield will refrain from sharing her opinion with UCOPE. Academic Council asked reviewers to focus on specific sections of the phase one and two reports.

The chair has prepared a Google document for break-out groups to focus on placement principles, recommendations, and proposed revisions to SR 636. Members are asked to indicate what they support and their concerns, and Chair Camfield asked for a volunteer to draft the memo to Council which is also due by November 14th.

Discussion: There is support for the placement principles and the focus on equity. One suggestion is that undergraduate advisors and other relevant staff should be asked for input on placement because they have insight into how any changes to the process impact students' progress in a major. It is important to coordinate with advisors and different departments to make sure progress in a major is not impacted by the required Writing courses. This coordination is critical for students from underrepresented groups who often need additional preparatory Writing and Math courses, especially those interested in credit intensive majors with numerous first-year requirements. The support and coordination can help with the persistence and success while also promoting equity.

The proposed ELWR Oversight Committee (EOC) should not be limited to Writing Studies experts but ought to include faculty in different disciplines. At UCD, Writing courses are taught by faculty in English and Native American Studies as well as the Writing program, so some thought should be given to including a broader swath of stakeholders on the oversight group. On the other hand, perhaps UCOPE should continue to be the group with cross-discipline representation and the EOC would be comprised of one Writing expert from each campus. There may be a benefit to the system to give Writing experts a formal opportunity to share their activities although there could be a conflict of interest if the proposed EOC is comprised only of Writing experts who are reviewing their own programs.

The EOC should instead be an "advisory" committee because it will not have the power to enforce anything as implied by "oversight" in addition to the fact that "oversight" is a loaded word. Chair Camfield reminded members that last year's Senate chair was worried about Writing programs taking vastly different approaches to placement even though the ELWR is a shared requirement in the UC system. UCOPE has the authority to determine problems with the campus placement processes and based on its charge, the committee is responsible for conducting periodic reviews of campus curricula and placement, so the EOC could suggest the best practices for reviews but would not be responsible for conducting them.

The authority of the EOC versus the authority of UCOPE should be carefully teased out to avoid conflicts of interest and to ensure that the responsibilities of the two bodies are well-defined. The ELWR Task Force proposal also raised a question about what UCOPE's assessment and review process should look like, the frequency, and who conducts the reviews including if there are outside reviewers. The committee's memo will highlight these questions and UCOPE should think through how the EOC is structured and how it will interact with UCOPE. The EOC could be tasked with designing a review process to propose to UCOPE outlining the data campuses should collect. Members discussed the need to manage disagreements among EOC members and whether the ELWR is focused on first year writing courses or if the idea is to ready students for university education in any department or discipline. UCOPE members commended the Task Force for its work on the reports and recommendations, and shared that the reports have led to helpful conversations on the campuses.

Action: Vice Chair Solomon Amorao volunteered to draft the memo outlining UCOPE's feedback.

VII. California Community College Transfer Issues

- *Monica Lin, Executive Director, Academic Senate*

- *Yuming He, UCOPE Representative to the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI)*

Executive Director Lin joined UCOPE to discuss issues related to CCC students transferring to UC and the opportunities for improvement. The idea is to broaden how the committee is defining preparatory education to include the preparation of transfer students. Currently, there is a greater focus on Mathematics curriculum standards and how California K-12 public schools are trying to improve Mathematics preparation for students. In 2014-2015, the State adopted new K-12 curriculum standards in both English Language Arts and Math, and since then public schools around the State which are held to these standards have been challenged by the need to reformulate Math and English courses to meet college preparation expectations. The new standards raised the bar for standard English and Math courses to be at a college preparatory level.

In 2020-2021 the State commissioned a writing team to review and revise the curriculum framework for Math courses. The standards dictate what students need to learn in the subject and a curriculum framework provides a roadmap for the design and delivery of courses. The framework authors wanted to expand the options for how students can gain Quantitative Reasoning skills by way of advanced courses which could include AP Statistics or AP Computer Science or even advanced level Statistics and Computer Science. There was controversy in the past two years about these proposed revisions to the framework in terms of what courses might look like and what UC and CSU would accept.

What is happening at the K-12 level is a backdrop for the questions raised for higher education including what solid preparation for incoming students at both the freshman and transfer level should be. There are questions about what students need to keep in mind if they do not go straight from high school to UC but instead go from high school to a CCC and then to UC. Executive Director Lin explained that how students are preparing at CCCs in the context of Math and Quantitative Reasoning is under debate. There is a lot for UCOPE to weigh in on with respect to policy matters having to do with admissions, clarifying expectations, and offering shared guidelines for what constitutes solid preparation for students coming to UC at either the freshman or transfer levels.

Discussion: One question is how UCOPE can contribute to the work of ACSCOTI. Executive Director Lin posits that UCOPE can help identify key considerations related to what defines solid college preparation for UC which the committee has done over the years in the realm of the ELWR and AWPE. The idea is to translate that level of attention and concern to another fundamental area of academic preparation, Mathematics and Quantitative Reasoning. UCOPE could develop an understanding of the different policy pieces that connect Mathematics preparation for K-12 to higher education and develop an understanding of the specific challenges CCC students may face when preparing to transfer to UC. Recent legislation has eliminated remedial or developmental course work at the CCCs because research has shown that students who enter community colleges and are stuck in this lower-level loop of taking and then failing non-college transferable Math courses do not advance to the next level of Math to get to a point where they can take a Math course with transferable credit. These students end up dropping out of community college all together and do not reach their ultimate goal to transfer to either to CSU or UC.

It is necessary to understand what it means for UC to say there is a Math requirement that is part of IGETC or the forthcoming Cal-GETC as well as the Math requirement that is embedded in the A to G. Beyond thinking about a certain number of years of preparation, UCOPE should think about what three years of college preparatory Math looks like in terms of courses, content, knowledge, or skills and consult with faculty colleagues in Mathematicians, Statistics, and Data Science as needed. The

committee would discuss how its work interfaces with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and to understand the different placement options into Mathematics and Statistics courses.

Unlike with Writing where the ELWR and AWPE provided some systemwide guidance for how students could be placed into college-level Writing, there is not an equivalent in Math which may pose a shared challenge across the UC campuses in terms of how they determine what new freshman are ready for. There are questions about what students should be taking before they enroll, if those courses are available at the CCC, and if incoming freshmen who are not yet prepared to take Calculus courses are sent back to CCCs to finish that preparatory work. The findings of UCOPE's landscape analysis would then be compared across the entire system. The challenges each campus experiences are probably not unique but learning about practices that some campuses are engaging in might be beneficial to other campuses. Executive Director Lin mentioned UCSD's Mathematics Diagnostic Placement office which supports all the colleges on that campus.

A department at UCR is assessing how placement is working, looking at whether the lower-level classes students are placed into are achieving what they are supposed to, and making minor changes to the placement test and pre-Calculus courses. The ELWR Task Force report has helped a member in Mathematics look at their program from a different perspective. A systematic examination of Math placement across the system would be valuable. Executive Director Lin commented that UCR recently received a State-funded grant to revamp its calculus course and UCM has received a similar grant from the California Learning Lab. These campuses are making inroads into looking at how best to support incoming students in Mathematics preparation and at the kind of support the campuses could be offering to incoming students who might not have had the strongest level of preparation.

The executive director asserted that it helps to have a broader systemwide view because when either high school or CCC students apply to multiple UC campuses with differing expectations or requirements, it is essential that the requirements are clearly defined. External critics often fault UC for either not being sufficiently clear about what is expected or for having too many divergent requirements which they claim makes it almost impossible for a student to take the right set of courses, especially when it comes to advising transfer students about the right set of CCC courses to take in preparation for transferring to UC. UC faculty in relevant disciplines could weigh in on when it is essential that students take Calculus versus when students going into other fields could take other Math courses and this would help ensure that students are pursuing a level of rigor in Mathematics or Statistics as well as in their academic preparation for university level study, regardless of their intended major.

VIII. Entry Level Writing Requirement Fee

In July, President Drake authorized the campuses to charge students an ELWR fee that would be used for placement to replace the \$110 fee students paid to take the systemwide AWPE. The president has authorized the campuses to levy a fee for their students which, theoretically, is to be used for Writing placement. However, there is a worry that campuses will use the funds from the ELWR fee for something else, so UCOPE might want to send a memo to President Drake through Academic Council about making sure that the revenue from the ELWR fee is earmarked for placement. Chair Camfield asked if there are any objections to this memo.

Action: Members expressed support for sending the memo which Chair Camfield will draft.

IX. Plan for In-Person Meeting at UCOP

Chair Camfield explained that UCOPE has the opportunity to meet in-person at UCOP once this academic year but the committee should also discuss whether there should be shorter videoconferences on a more frequent basis or if the current schedule is fine. To meet in person, there should be at least five hours of business on the agenda.

Discussion: Members did not express the desire to have shorter, more frequent videoconferences but there is willingness to meet in Oakland.

Action: A motion was made and seconded to have one of UCOPE's future meetings in-person and the committee agreed this would be the April 27th meeting.

X. Fulfilling UCOPE's Charge

The chair would like UCOPE to be more proactive this year and has created a list of priorities the committee can work on for the next two years which includes:

- Revising UCOPE's charge and possibly proposing changing the committee's name
- Responding to the ELWR Task Force report including the recommendation for the EOC
- Assessing college-level Writing courses along with entry-level courses
- Determining how the committee should monitor and conduct periodic reviews of preparatory and remedial education
- Looking at how students are placed into preparatory Math, what the requirements are, and how preparatory Math is being taught
- Increasing the committee's involvement with issues related to transferring to UC
- Considering the impact of the pandemic on UC students in terms of college readiness and how to offer interventions to optimize success

Discussion: A member commented that because UCOPE only has a few meetings each year the committee has not had time to address everything in its charge and Writing has been a predominant topic. It would be good to make Math a high priority and it will also be important to learn more about the CCC transfer issues and provide input to ACSCOTI. Chair Camfield invited members to continue adding their comments to the priorities document.

XI. New Business

There was no New Business.

XII. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 3:20 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Eileen Camfield