

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

MEETING MINUTES

FRIDAY, APRIL 27, 2018

Attending: Carrie Wastal, Chair (UCSD), Darlene Francis, Vice Chair (UCB), Deborah Willis (UCR), Mirya Runnerstrom (UCI) (telephone), Karen Gocsik (UCSD alternate), David Jennings (UCM) (telephone), Trevor Hayton (UCSB), Debra Lewis (UCSC), Joseph Biello (UCD), Brandi Catanese (UCB), Robert Cooper (UCLA), Tongshan Chang (Director, IRAP), Matt Reed (Analyst, IRAP), Jon Lang (AWPE Committee Chair/Chief Reader), Evera Spears (Associate Director, Advocacy and Partnerships, Undergraduate Admissions), Julie Lind (AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions), Laura Hardy (Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions), Robert May (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), (Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements

Following introductions, Chair Wastal described the recent Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates' Legislative Day in Sacramento.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The January minutes were approved.

III. Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) Scoring and Norming

AWPE Committee Chair Lang led a discussion on passing the Exam requirement. Notes were not recorded for this portion of the discussion due to its confidential subject matter.

IV. The Analysis of the 2016 AWPE

- *Tongshan Chan, Director, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP), UCOP*
- *Matt Reed, Analyst, IRAP, UCOP*

Chair Wastal reminded the members that the committee's discussion is confidential. Discussions about the AWPE are sensitive since many people are invested in or have concerns about the Exam. Members are asked to consider the information they want to know about the AWPE, including any additional data they would like. Decisions about the Exam may not be made today. Hearing from students who have taken the Exam would be valuable and Chair Wastal plans to contact the campus Writing Program Administrators to gather their feedback about the AWPE.

Discussion: Members suggested that the following data for each campus would be valuable: demographic data on who takes the AWPE including race/ethnicity, first generation status, and socioeconomic status; longer-term tracking of AWPE takers; learning outcomes in the courses taken after the ELWR; how many students are granted exceptions to extend the time allowed to satisfy the ELWR; whether extra time is granted to multilingual students to satisfy the ELWR; how many students are dismissed or dis-enrolled solely as a result of failing to satisfy the ELWR; and how many students re-enroll in UC after fulfilling the ELWR at another institution. In addition, members will be asked to provide detailed information about their campus's processes, programs and requirements for satisfaction of the ELWR for students who did not pass the AWPE.

The threat that students will be kicked out of UC if they fail to satisfy the ELWR within the specified time is troubling to some committee members and perhaps the time limit should be reconsidered. Some

campuses give students additional time to meet the Requirement. The AWPE provides a baseline and consistency for a standard the courses are using as the underlying presumption for what it means to pass the entry level course. It becomes the starting point for other writing courses which assume a certain competency students have attained either before coming to UC or by taking a UC course. Eliminating the Exam would make it more difficult to have a consistent program with a clear standard across campuses that can be articulated to students.

One concern is about students who score three and four on the AWPE and how these scores impact their enrollment. It is incumbent on the campuses to provide the courses that will help students who failed the Exam to succeed. Every examination must have a cut score and within each score point, there is a range of performances, some of which are close to the boundaries and others not. What the mastery of writing looks like is not necessarily always clear. The UCSD Mathematics faculty who joined UCOPE in January may have data that will help the committee's thinking about the Exam. Members would like to know as much as possible about the students who score three and four.

Members discussed the need for student feedback on their experiences with the ELWR satisfying courses. Multiple measures are needed in order to place students and UC could change its approach. Members will be asked to provide detailed information about each campus's program for satisfying the Requirement. Targeted interventions are needed to support vulnerable populations, and having more data about these students is essential to figuring out the appropriate strategies. The solutions at each campus may not be straightforward or similar across the system. Longer-term tracking of AWPE takers in post-ELWR classes that require significant writing, in History or Sociology for example, could be informative. A question is if correlation with other courses can be expected based on the AWPE score, and uncorrelated measures may be useful. Chair Wastal's question is whether what is being taught is helping students in the long-term since writing is a lifelong exercise. Campuses have started providing IRAP with student-specific data on course outcomes which could be analyzed for UCOPE.

The committee was asked to consider potential consequences of eliminating the AWPE. Eliminating the Exam would force students who would have taken it to instead be placed into basic writing courses. In addition, the scores of the SAT, ACT and AP would be given more weight which would require more careful and precise thinking about how these exams are calibrated. The SAT, ACT and AP scores are more highly correlated with subsequent performance than the AWPE score, which suggests that the AWPE provides no more information than the other measures. It was again stressed that the AWPE is not designed to be a predictive exam and the SAT is not a placement test. The AWPE is unique in that students are given two hours to write an essay, although many students finish in less time.

Members are asked if writing programs need the information provided by the AWPE in order to make placement decisions or if UC could use other standardized tests for placement. While correlation is important, the AWPE provides insight that other standardized tests do not, including students' readiness to begin college writing. Chair Lang remarked that the SAT is a high stakes exam with a national profile and there is a large coaching industry devoted to raising scores. In contrast, the AWPE is not an exam for which students can be coached. The AWPE requires students to respond to a long reading passage for which they cannot produce a canned response that would artificially inflate their scores.

Members agreed that reinventing the AWPE should be considered and the scoring might need to be changed. This is an opportunity to change the Exam in response to changes in pedagogical methods and to reflect what students are currently asked to do. Campuses may want to use the results to broaden their curriculum to address the needs of students who are at the margins and create courses for either strong students who either did not meet the ELWR or students who met the ELWR but could benefit from more assistance. Some of the passages currently used are outdated and ways to update them should be explored, including identifying people to write new essays.

UCOPE or the AWPE Committee could work on updating the parameters for the readings, the Exam specifications and the rubric. Students could be given three prompts. Chair Lang suggested forming a longer-standing subcommittee of UCOPE which includes representatives of BOARS and UCEP. The point was made that any changes should be more than just around the edges. Chair Lang remarked that a revised exam would need to go through pre-testing and changing the exam will be a process with multiple phases. IRAP can assist with surveying students about the AWPE and the ELWR and members will need to determine what questions should be on the survey. UCSD has a survey that can be used as a template.

Chair Wastal suggested that UCOPE may want to wait until next fall to take up the question of alternative placement models, such as directed self-placement (DSP). It is not clear if DSP is utilized anywhere at UC for undergraduate students, although last year it was reported that it has been used at UCSF and can be expensive. The success of this model might also be highly dependent on the quality of the advising provided to students. One idea is to include a question on the AWPE which asks students to pick the course they think is most appropriate for them and explain why. With DSP, a process for collecting feedback from students to be used in placement recommendations is necessary and UC could consider small-scale implementation for targeted populations which does not conflict with the regulations. However, based on the UCSD representative's experience at Dartmouth, use of the DSP model in its truest form would mean the elimination of the ELWR. UCOPE needs to consider impediments, benefits and consequences related to any placement model.

Many years ago, UCOPE decided it should receive an analysis of the AWPE from IRAP every five years. The committee is asked to think about the structure and content of the next report, especially anything that might be missing or data that is not useful. Members may share the 2012 analysis with the divisional Preparatory Education Committees to elicit their input on future reports. The number of international students at UC has increased significantly since 2012, so an analysis of AWPE scores for this population would be informative, especially if it includes scores on the Test of English as a Foreign Language.

Action: The analyst will send members a list of the information about their campuses they are asked to collect.

V. Non-UC Courses and Satisfaction of the ELWR

- *Evera Spears, Associate Director, Advocacy and Partnerships, Admissions, UCOP*

The UCD representative reported that Davis students dis-enrolled before satisfying the ELWR will take a Writing course at a California Community College (CCC) which the UCD advisors say satisfies not only the lower division requirement but also the ELWR. It is not clear if this decision is consistent with Senate Regulation (SR) 636 E.

Associate Director Spears explained SR 636 E. A student who matriculates to UC as a freshman must satisfy the ELWR at their home campus within their first year in residence. An entering junior transfer student has to complete two English Composition Literature requirements as minimum admission requirements. The course work at the CCCs has been articulated to meet the ELWR and the criteria is set by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (more information is available here: <https://www.ucop.edu/transfer-articulation/transferable-course-agreements/tca-policy/regulations-by-subject-area.html#e>).

When a student leaves UC before satisfying the ELWR within the first year and takes a course elsewhere that meets the ELWR and re-enrolls at the same UC campus, faculty can make an exception to allow that course to satisfy the ELWR for graduation but it will not count for unit credit. This student will then be enrolled in UC's freshman composition course. If a student at UC leaves before satisfying the ELWR

within the first year, takes an ELWR satisfying course elsewhere, and later enrolls at a different UC campus, the ELWR can be satisfied with that non-UC course and transferable units will be granted.

Discussion: The UCD scenario involves students who leave Davis and later re-enroll at this campus and are allowed to satisfy the ELWR with a non-UC course that meets the lower division writing requirement. Associate Director Spears explained that, in this specific UCD situation, the individual evaluating the transfer credit for returning students in either the Admissions or Registrar's offices should know that the ELWR cannot be satisfied by and no transfer unit credit granted for the CCC course. The Dean of the School or College would need to make exceptions in these cases. According to Associate Director Spears, historically the Admissions Office has evaluated the transfer credit for continuing students. But, as a result of a legislative ruling that found that Admissions Offices do not have this authority, the decision-making has been disseminated to the Registrars, each School or College or each academic unit. This has resulted in disparate enforcement across the campuses and a statement from UCOPE to the campuses (through Academic Council) about who should be handling the evaluation process would be helpful.

The UCSB representative shared that there are questions about the origin of SR 636 E and about the problems it is trying to address. From a certain perspective, it seems punitive and unfair to not allow a UC student who leaves and later re-enrolls at the original UC campus to satisfy the ELWR with the same non-UC Writing course that a transfer student uses to satisfy the ELWR. It is within UCOPE's purview to recommend a change to 636 E. When a student wants to re-enroll at UCSD, a portfolio of their writing and an onsite essay in conjunction with consideration of the non-UC course are used to make the decision. While this can be a difficult situation for students to deal with, for some students it is an opportunity to take a break and return to UC in good standing.

It is problematic for UC to have a systemwide regulation that is administered differently by each campus. The point was also made that a systemwide regulation needs to be written as clearly as possible to avoid situations where administrators and faculty either do not know how to interpret it or grant exceptions inconsistently or in the majority of cases. UCR produces an annual report that includes data on the number of students dismissed or dis-enrolled after failing to satisfy the ELWR and some Writing programs are tracking this information, but other campuses may not have it readily available.

Another question is about the rationale for the three-quarter time limit for satisfaction of the ELWR and some campuses allow more time. English Language Learners and first generation students, among others, may need more time than is currently allowed and they may need to be tracked differently. Associate Director Spears offered that completing the ELWR in three quarters may have in part been driven by concerns, particularly at UCB, about time to degree. Some students may delay satisfying the ELWR until their graduation date is approaching. Satisfying the ELWR within a specified amount of time also may give students the foundation in writing needed to succeed in subsequent courses. In contrast to when SR 636 E was amended in 2008, Writing programs may not have the funding or other resources needed to manage the number of students who would benefit from early intervention or to support specialized faculty and programs.

Strategies that are not punitive but recognize the time-sensitive nature of satisfying the Requirement are needed and these may need to be campus-specific strategies based on the student population at each campus. It can be difficult for campuses to implement practices that are consistent and compatible with systemwide regulations as written given the variation in student populations. Implementing a good program can result in fewer dismissals or dis-enrollments involving the failure to satisfy the ELWR. Sharing best practices will be helpful until adjustments to systemwide policies can be made. The committee thanked Associate Director Spears for sharing her expertise and members can contact her with any follow up questions.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

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

The annual administration of the AWPE will be on May 12th and 32,000 students have been notified that they need to take the Exam, which is down by about 2k from last year. It is difficult to anticipate how many students will show up on Exam day. Of the 32k students notified about taking the AWPE, approximately half will not show up because they have satisfied the ELWR by another method not previously reported to UC or because they have chosen to attend another institution. About 1k students decide to not enroll in UC between May and the fall. Coordinator Lind reviewed highlights of the annual legislative report on the May administration of the AWPE and encouraged members to visit the ELWR website (<https://www.ucop.edu/elwr/>).

A \$20 reduced fee (instead of a complete fee waiver) initiated when the AWPE faced some financial difficulties several years ago has been eliminated. The goal is to keep the AWPE fee about the same as the fee for the AP. Fifty percent of students have the Exam fee waived. The readers for May have been identified and are independent contractors paid by the vendor. Each testing center has a site supervisor, one proctor in every classroom, and roving proctors at each site and a large part of the income is used to pay testing center staff. The AWPE will be administered at 125 high schools throughout California. Upgrades to the scoring system and the website's accessibility are ongoing focuses. Across the system enrollment this fall is expected to be up by about 2k students.

VII. Consultation with Academic Senate Leadership

- *Robert May, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Vice Chair May joined UCOPE to provide updates on recent events. President Napolitano and Chancellor Oakley signed a memorandum of understanding to guarantee admission into UC for transfer students with a specified minimum grade point average (GPA) in a Transfer Pathway. Students who do not meet the GPA requirement at their preferred campuses will be offered a space at a Transfer Guarantee pool campus, which will be UCR, UCSC and UCM. This is different from the Transfer Admission Guarantee which guarantees a spot at a specific campus. A concern is that the Transfer Guarantee could have a negative impact on diversity. This guarantee is not dependent on the transfer student having a CCC degree. BOARS is also working on other issues related to transfer students. The Master Plan requires UC to meet a 2:1 ratio of freshmen to transfer students and this has always been interpreted to be systemwide. The governor withheld \$50M from UC's current budget to force the University to meet this requirement at each campus. The CCCs are committed to preparing students for UC.

The budget for UC is intertwined with tuition. Yesterday, the president announced that UCOP will not ask the Regents to consider a 2% increase in the tuition for in state students in May, a decision that has already been postponed twice. In the past week, the CSUs announced that their system will not increase tuition next year. Student leaders are actively involved with lobbying the Legislature. It is possible that UC can convince the Legislature to increase UC's budget but Governor Brown could still red-line it. Deferred maintenance is a major issue.

The report from Huron Consulting about the structure of the Office of the President recommended a number of potential changes. The budget for the UC Education Abroad Program will run through UCSB instead of UCOP and changes have been proposed to the governing structure of this program. Another recommendation was to make UC Health and UC Agriculture and Natural Resources separate locations that would still report to the president.

President Napolitano will soon make an announcement on faculty salary and Vice Chair May believes it will be an improvement over the salary increases faculty have received in the past few years. The Senate has put forward a proposal that would eliminate the salary gap between UC and the Comparison 8 institutions. The president had a positive meeting with the Committee on Faculty Welfare and Vice Chair May commented that the chancellors would like to make decisions about how the funding for salary increases is applied. The Senate had an aggressive plan to address the salary gap. One or two campuses have salaries that are close to the Comparison 8 but UCM is 27% below.

Retiree health has been an important focus for the Senate this year and Chair White and Vice Chair May are on a task force working on this matter. The task force has not made any decisions yet, focusing first on understanding the current landscape. The differences between retirees with and without Medi-Care are complex. The cost drivers and strategies to manage them in the future are being identified and the task force is considering consequences of potential changes. The University's contribution is below inflation and two potential solutions are either less expensive plans or increasing how much retirees pay out of pocket. All health care costs ultimately comes out of campus budgets. The task force has two more scheduled meetings and the president has asked for recommendations by June. The task force intends to make a short-term recommendation for 2019 but will propose that it should continue to meet to identify long-term strategies to protect this benefit. Members are encouraged to contact Vice President Dwaine Duckett (Dwaine.Duckett@ucop.edu) or Associate Vice President Peggy Arrivas (Peggy.Arrivas@ucop.edu) at UCOP with any concerns.

The main candidates to be California's next governor have made supportive comments about UC. Vice Chair May also noted Tuesday's ruling against the federal government's effort to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program although there is a 90 day stay while the Trump administration decides if it will appeal the ruling. This is the third favorable ruling and DACA students at UC appreciate President Napolitano's support. The analyst will share information about an upcoming UC conference on first generation students. Vice Chair May thanked the members of UCOPE for their hard work and service.

VIII. New Business

Members briefly discussed incidents when students have experienced a mental health issue during class. Faculty need information about managing these situations and about what to say to other students who are present. Counseling resources are available at the campuses. Coordinator Lind reported that UCOP worked with the campuses to develop protocols for what happens when readers flag essays that indicate a possible need for mental health interventions. It is especially complicated since these students have not enrolled in UC yet.

An additional in-person meeting can be added to UCOPE's schedule in the fall and Chair Wastal noted that the committee needs time to focus on preparatory education in disciplines besides writing. Vice Chair Francis and the analyst will sort out the details for a fall meeting. The committee thanked Chair Wastal for her service and she encouraged members to consider participating in committee leadership.

IX. Executive Session

Executive Session was not held.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:50pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Carrie Wastal