UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA **ACADEMIC SENATE**

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION

MEETING MINUTES

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 2017

Attending: Bradley Queen, Chair (UCI), Carrie Wastal, Vice Chair (UCSD), Darlene Francis (UCB), Bill Gary (UCR), Daniel Gross (UCI), Carol Miller (UCSF), 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), Debra Lewis (UCSC), Joseph Biello (UCD) (telephone), Dana Ferris (Chair, English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group), Robin Scarcella (Member, EMS Advisory Group) (telephone), Stephen Handel (Associated Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions) Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions), Julie Lind (AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions), Linda Adler-Kassner (Professor of Writing Studies, UCSB), Carl Whithaus (Professor & Director of the University Writing Program, UCD), Jim Chalfant (Chair, Academic Senate), Shane White (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Hilary Baxter (Executive Director, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Analyst)

I. Announcements

Chair Queen reported that the most recent Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates meeting in April was Legislative Day. The legislature would like UC and the California Community Colleges to use the common course identification numbering system used by the California Community College (CCC) systems.

II. Consent Calendar

Action: The January minutes were approved with one correction.

III The AWPE Process

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

Chair Gadda provided an overview of the AWPE process as it is introduced to readers. In the beginning of this exam, the early readings were in person and readers included people from high schools or community colleges who were nominated by writing programs throughout the UC system and individuals from UC. The exam is funded by the fees paid by students and from the start there has been a fee exemption for students whose fees for the application to UC were waived. The number of students who met the economic qualifications for the waiver has increased over the years, which reduced the amount of money available to fund the exam operation and led to the move to online reading in 2005. Readers are introduced to the scoring process by a series of videos in which Chair Gadda replicates the presentation he gave in person in the past and given an outline of process.

A Test Development Team of four, including at least one English for Multilingual Students (EMS) specialist, finds passages in the summer on which to base the AWPE. The Team meets in late July, usually with Chair Gadda, to share the passages. The submissions are reviewed and the possibilities discussed which results in a ranked list of the most promising passages for development. In August, the AWPE Chair creates pre-tests using this material and works on editing and coherence building with the texts to make them accessible for the exam. Ten to thirteen pre-tests are sent for a fairness review by a reviewer engaged by the AWPE vendor. The reviewer provides comments to the AWPE Chair about accessibility and fairness issues which might lead to revisions. Based on the comments from the reviewer and the Chair's observations about the relative accessibility or interest of the passages, the AWPE Chair selects the ten that are distributed to campuses for the collection of pre-tests.

The pre-test essays are written by students at the beginning of the fall term in classes leading to satisfaction of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) and in the classes that follow satisfaction of the ELWR. In alternate years when the Team does this work in the summer, the Team has another full day meeting later in the fall to read a sample of the pre-test essays that were collected. In the other years, the AWPE Chair handles the test development work independently and may use earlier pre-tests that were deemed promising to create revised versions are sent out for pre-testing a second time. The AWPE Committee meets for two days in January to read the whole group of essays written in response to six or seven of the pre-tests. If the Test Development Team has made a preliminary sort, this helps guide the work of the AWPE Committee, otherwise the AWPE Chair makes the judgement of which pre-tests to share with the AWPE Committee based on his understanding of what are most accessible and likely to be successful. The Committee reads essays collected both from courses leading to ELWR satisfaction and those courses that follow looking for evidence that the students understand the passage; have something productive to say in relationship to the topic; that the passage and essay topic do not generate the same response from every student; and that the essays from students who have not satisfied the ELWR are distinctly different from those written by students who have.

Successful new exercises are added to the pool of potential AWPEs that UCOPE reviews each January. At the January meeting, UCOPE votes on which essays UCOPE would want to see administered in May. By the time a prospective exercise is seen by UCOPE, it has already been vetted by people with years of experience in deciding that the exercise does what it is intended to do based on the pre-test results. UCOPE indicates the most preferred exams and then the copyright permissions are sought by the AWPE operations vendor. This year, the operations vendor was able to secure permission for the top choice. The next step involves a review of all the pre-test essays by the AWPE Chair, to which are sometimes added essays from a small on-campus administration at UCLA. From this group, a set of essays representing the range of achievement on this exercise are identified by the AWPE Chair. This is the set of essays UCOPE reviews in late April to determine for each one whether it should or should not satisfy the ELWR.

UCOPE's judgements about the essays ground the work the AWPE Chair does following the AWPE's administration in a two-day sample selection meeting which is the beginning of the scoring process. At this meeting, the AWPE Chair and the Assistant Chief Reader work with the year's scoring leaders, the people who will interact directly with readers during the online scoring process. This starts with a discussion about the papers UCOPE reviewed, UCOPE's judgement about whether the papers satisfy the criteria or not, and the scoring. The scoring leaders, who are experienced readers and are often ELW coordinators or the people who conduct readings of AWPE essays on their own campuses, read up to 1,000 essays provided by the vendor and as they score, they look for essays to use in training readers.

By the end of the sample selection meeting, another 100-120 essays are identified for use in the scoring process. Ten papers are needed for each of three sets of essays that readers score independently to qualify to score; 20 papers used as monitors of their scoring that every reader will encounter; a dozen papers used to open the reading that exemplify the six scoring levels; and four or five papers for each of four subsequent sets used to orient readers to scoring levels and some issues that will be encountered. The "monitor papers" are a common group of essays that scoring leaders have read in advance and know the scores so as the readers encounter them, the leaders can do a quick check on the readers' scoring accuracy.

The rest of the scoring process starts about a week later. Before this next step, the AWPE Chair constructs from the samples the sequence of papers readers will encounter and hear discussed before the point when the readers will independently read and score papers to be qualified to participate in the scoring process. Readers are told that faculty from throughout UC, not just writing specialists, are represented at UCOPE and UCOPE is the body that has selected the exam passage and set the passing standards as reflected in

the training materials. The readers are given the examination passage and the AWPE Chair shares observations about trends in the way students are responding. This helps readers understand what the student performance will be in relationship to this particular exercise. The essay topic is then discussed and the AWPE Chair points out that there are three important parts. It is important that readers recognize what comes from essay topic versus what the students have written.

Chair Gadda also discusses holistic scoring with the readers. Historically holistic scoring was developed to make it possible to do assessments that were not multiple choice. The six-point system is the most common configuration in holistic scoring. Certain principles are explained to the readers. Each essay is read against the scoring guide. Each score is a range, there are higher and lower versions of the same score and there are many different ways to achieve the same score. People are cautioned to read essays from the beginning to the end with attention. The scoring guide is then discussed. It was drafted in 1986 and presented to and approved by UCOPE at that time and it has been the same ever since. The scores are explained from the lowest to the highest score and the most important defining characteristics for each score are highlighted. The different scores have consequences at the campuses for placement beyond the ELWR.

A scoring leader might ask a reader to go back and re-read an essay on which there was significant disagreement and for which the resolution reading disagreed as well if the scoring leader thought it would be useful due to a general trend. Discrepant scores do go for a third read, as well as split scores. The third reader sees the two first scores, which is common for such exams. The third reader's score is doubled and replaces the other two scores which should give the most informed, reliable score for the student. Mechanically this is the most efficient way of adjusting the score and it is the expert reader's judgement that should prevail. The ELWR can be viewed as a way of assuring that students admitted to UC will be supported to the greatest extent possible in their academic pursuits and that they will succeed in the way that UC would like.

The online scoring system shows the scores that readers are assigning and how many they assign at each score point. The third reads are always done by expert readers. An essay with a score of four (passing) and another score of three (not passing) has to be re-read to create a composite score that is either passing or not passing. In addition, the E-designation can be assigned by any reader. When the E-designation is assigned it is confirmed or not either by an EMS specialist or a scoring leader. If the E-designation is not assigned until the second reading, there can be a third reading for the purpose of confirming it. After the description of the score of one, readers are given two essays – one with a score of one and the other with a one-E. The AWPE Chair then discusses these essays in relationship to the scoring guide's description of a score of one, which is followed by an explanation of the E-designation.

The E-designation is another feature of the AWPE process that dates back to its creation in the mid-1980s and it was the contribution of two EMS specialists. The intent was to have readers be able to identify, through the E-designation, students who should be looked at for placement in specialized instruction at their campuses. This was a way of being sure the individuals doing placement had performance based indications of who might need specialized instruction. Any reader can assign the E-designation in combination with a score of three, two or one but not with the scores in the upper half which is because there is no placement consequence in post Entry Level Writing. In the early days, individuals at UCOP involved with the AWPE were working on diversity, affirmative action issues and outreach programs. They viewed the AWPE as a way to ensure that students from diverse backgrounds would be able to succeed at UC. The E-designation is not a demographic identifier and the readers only see the essays and know nothing about the writers. The campuses receive the scanned essay, the score, the students' testing history, residence information, and demographics which can be considered along with the"E" designation if present when making course placement decisions.

Discussion: UCSC is the only campus that uses the score to place students beyond the ELWR. Many of the campuses with multilevel programs will use the AWPE score and re-read the essays for placement in courses for multilingual students. Data over time shows that the majority of scores are around three and four. Reportedly at UCSC, there is a concern that the clock will run out for STEM majors if additional courses are needed to satisfy ELWR. If students are sent forward without being able to write, the burden would disproportionately be on already vulnerable populations. One question raised is if the scoring guide is setting students up for remediation that does not directly target their weaknesses and Chair Gadda indicated that this may ultimately be a matter of campus curriculum and placement. Chair Gadda indicated that there has been a clear distinction between the uniformity of the systemwide AWPE process and how the campuses would create the courses and shape their curriculum for students. With the change to Senate Regulations in 1995 to allow credit for courses that satisfy Entry Level Writing, most campuses have courses that are credited as well as being much more demanding and academically like the courses which follow, and this may be a better arrangement in terms of students' morale, their feeling of belonging to UC and in terms of their academic preparation.

Curriculum, assessment and placement are intertwined so what UC does with the AWPE matters because students who do not pass may have negative outcomes when it comes to subsequent placements at some campuses. It was suggested that the ELWR needs to be conceptualized and implemented at all UC campuses in the same way. A community college to which the ELWR courses were outsourced by UCD as a result of budget issues has used the requirement as a gate-keeper. According to the Professor Ferris, this community college course reportedly has a 30% or higher fail rate and students in otherwise good standing are failing out of school because they cannot pass this course. Some campuses do a better job than others with implementation of the ELWR, and it may be time for the requirement to be re-examined.

At UCLA the courses are fully credited and EMS is incorporated within the writing programs, so the idea of separateness from the students' perception may be less of an issue. The "E" stood for English for Second Language Speakers which Generation 1.5 students are not, and although students do not see the E-designation, changing the "E" to "M" for multilingual students is something that could be considered. Chair Gadda explained that the distinction between local and global linguistic features is left to the campuses to make and readers are told that they are not stigmatizing the students or making placement decisions.

IV. AWPE Scoring/Norming

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

V. Consultation with the Academic Senate Leadership

- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, Academic Senate*
- *Shane White, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

Chair Chalfant thanked Chair Gadda for his 30 years of service and presented him with a certificate of appreciation.

Chair Chalfant commented on the Public Records Act Request related to sexual harassment and assault cases at UC. A positive outcome was clarifying that the three year rule is not a statute of limitations. Vice Chair White indicated that informal resolution processes have been used so that many cases never reach the stage where the faculty disciplinary process is utilized. The Senate has spent significant time on the policy for non-resident students, which is still unresolved. The idea of a systemwide cap seems to no longer be under consideration. The funding streams model is a UC policy and it could be changed to help

campus budgets. The chair and vice chair would like to see some way of socializing the money from non-resident tuition across the campuses. A way to help all of the campuses needs to be identified.

UCOP pushed back in response to last year's audit of UC. This year's audit was very negative and President Napolitano has addressed the accusation that UCOP has hidden millions of dollars from the Regents. The California Community Colleges would like to create associate degrees for transfer for chemistry and physics which would signal that UC welcomes transfer students. Unlike the associate degrees for transfer now in place, these new degrees would remove the limitation of sixty units. Chair Chalfant mentioned that the UC Scout program provides online, a-g approved courses to middle and high school students. A UC Scout representative could be invited to a future committee meeting.

VI. Consultation with the Office of the President

- *Stephan Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Director. Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Julie Lind, AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions*

AVP Handel described the report from UC during the March 2017 legislative hearing on remediation which went very well. There is a bill about the specifics of what California colleges are doing in terms of remediation, including how many students were requiring it. UC was mentioned in the bill which was the impetus for the hearing. Legislators had reviewed UCOP's annual report on the ELWR that includes information about the number of students who do not pass the AWPE. This hearing provided a platform to talk about student preparation. AVP Handle explained UC's expectations and indicated that what the legislature thinks of as remediation is different from what UC is doing.

UCOP conducted a survey of the campuses about the kinds of courses that satisfy ELWR and found a couple of situations where UC is providing remedial courses sometimes through community colleges or in some cases where only workload credit (not degree credit) is awarded. UC does offer a few hybrid courses that include a portion that is remedial. AVP Handel would like UCOPE's perspective about what is happening at the campuses. An important point is that remediation can mean different things. Ultimately, UC has been written out of the bill and legislators had a very positive response to the stretch courses that meet students where they are and bring them up to where UC would like them to be. A concern legislators have is that too many students are being placed into remedial courses in the California State University system which prevents students from graduating on time.

Director Yoon-Wu reported that IRAP's analysis of the AWPE is in progress and should be completed by July. There is a chance that the report will incorporate additional analyses based on the 2017 AWPE results and so UC can see if there are any correlations with the SAT essay for this year which will help with deciding if something can be done with the SAT essay for next year for ELWR satisfaction. Data from the reading and writing multiple choice part of the SAT may also be available as well as data from AP courses and ACT writing scores.

Coordinator Lind mentioned that past legislative reports from Admissions will be uploaded to UCOPE's shared folder in Box. The AWPE will be administered on May 13th. The number of students selected for the exam has increased possibly because the new SAT will not be as a method of satisfying the ELWR. The final number of students who will take the AWPE is in flux because students are being admitted from the waitlist and other students are being dropped from the roster as they submit grades from community college courses or unreported test scores. UCOP is hearing from students, parents and high school counselors about the new SAT essay not being used to for the ELWR and education that the new SAT is currently not used to satisfy ELWR needs to be done at the campus level for advisors and other UC staff.

Admissions shares UCOPE's concerns about how the new SAT will be used and AVP Handel has informed people at the College Board that UC needs to do its own due diligence. For new freshmen applicants, 23% took just the ACT and 33% took just the SAT, and the remainder took a combination of the ACT and the old and new SATs. Chair Queen suggested that UCOPE may need to make a decision in July or August about the SAT because waiting until the January 2018 meeting will be too late for advisors and potential students. Admissions has cautioned the public that it may take UC a year or more to make a decision about the new SAT depending on the level of analysis the committee would like. UC tries to refrain from recommending one standardized test over the other.

Discussion: UCSD stopped outsourcing its entry level writing course to a community college and also changed the name of the program to "Analytical Writing." Issues with how the community college ran the course included that UC had no input on the instructors or what was being taught and that UC students with high GPAs failed the exit exam. Even students who passed this exit exam would not do very well once enrolled in UC courses. The redesigned basic writing program is now very rigorous and includes stretch courses. The delivery of material in the entry level writing courses is different from the delivery in college writing programs. Hybrid and stretch refer to courses that combine entry level and college level writing with the same cohort and same teacher. A good writing course will always focus on sentence-level, stylistic, mechanical work throughout. Courses that focus on basic mechanical issues only might count as remediation as described in Senate Regulation 761.

VII. AWPE Efficacy and Problems

- *Linda Adler-Kassner, Professor of Writing Studies, UCSB*
- *Dana Ferris, Chair, EMS Advisory Group, Professor & Associate Director Second Language Writing, UCD*
- *Robin Scarcella, Professor & Director of Academic English/ESL, UCI*
- *Carl Whithaus, Professor & Director of the University Writing Program, UCD*

Chair Queen introduced the presenters, indicating that they are research scholars and UC Writing Program Administrators. Professor Adler-Kassner remarked that not much information is learned about future writing ability or student success from the AWPE which gives students two hours to write about a passage. The most important factors correlated with student success include students' ability to reflect on their own writing choices in writing, to situate those within specific contexts associated with writing and about their confidence in themselves as writers. There are other kinds of writing placement exams that can provide better information about these factors. Given the investment UC makes in the AWPE, these funds could be more effectively directed to other kinds of writing assessments that would tell UC more both about students themselves as they start at UC and about student development as writers through their UC careers. The AWPE does provide an idea about student readiness and is better than tests like ACCUPLACER or COMPASS according to Professor Adler-Kassner.

More effective placement processes tend to blend guided self-placement with actual evidence of students writing that requires students to illicit some of those factors said to be predictive of success. The University of Michigan (U-M) sends students a prompt who are given two weeks to respond and students are asked to write a reflection about what they have done. The response and reflection are scored by someone at U-M who then has a discussion with the student about the confidence with writing, their experience with writing and reading and their expectation about college level writing and reading. Together the student and the U-M advisor make decisions about what the student should take and ultimately, students are allowed to make their own decisions. Effective placement processes ask students about the choices they are making about the courses available to them, help them gain a sense of what is involved about college level writing, and gather information from students that can help the campus provide information about the choices. This model is the state of the art. Portfolios are another state of the

art model which is a very expensive process and therefore probably not the direction in which UC would move.

Professor Ferris, chair of UCOPE's English for Multilingual Students, agrees that student efficacy and using multiple measures or approaches to making placement decisions. An ongoing concern about the AWPE is related to its fairness and accuracy with regard to diverse students, especially UC's large and growing international student population. Other concerns are that the reading passages and topics used for the AWPE are not as accessible for second language readers and writers, research has found that timed writing exercises unfairly disadvantage second language students, and international students who arrive at their campus are given the exam during a hectic orientation period and may not perform as well or might have to delay the exam until later which is a structural inequity in the system.

Professor Scarcella expressed concerns about California's Latino students which is a large population. The assessment and curricula needs to support all UC students be they international or from California, and specifically for minority students who are California natives. It is good that the AWPE is a direct language assessment and that it does not ignore language. Any assessment needs to be reconsidered over time because the situation changes. It is important to be sensitive to and understanding about the writing valued at UC today and be sure that this is being evaluated, and be sure that the assessment is sensitive to the pedagogical and curricular goals of the composition programs which may vary. UC should be attentive to the type of professional development opportunities UC's assessment advances. Instructors may take what they have learned about assessment and teach directly to this. An assessment that gives more time will provide UC with the best writing performance. A test should not penalize students and Professor Scarcella is concerned that the AWPE may be used as a gatekeeper and prevent students from enrolling in certain classes at the campuses.

Professor Whithaus expressed agreement with the other panel members especially with respect to the changing demographics and language backgrounds of UC students. Language, writing and rhetoric could be viewed as things that develop over time rather than things that a single exam or a single course of entry level writing course can fix. The more challenging the intellectual material students are given, the more difficult it will be for students to write in a clear fashion. UC might implement a system that acknowledges what we know about learning, writing and writing development rather than using an exam that only looks at a single, timed snapshot of language performance instead of a larger picture. Professor Whithaus likes guided self-placement but thinks portfolios are a challenge due to their expense. A system that uses multiple measures and considers development over time could end up being more beneficial for the students than the AWPE. Even though the AWPE is a placement exam, it become a gate, or exit exam rather than a general placement tool. Multiple measures might include looking at high school English and history GPAs, a reflective statement from the students about their writing, perhaps an exam like U-Ms where students are given prompts and time to work on it and looking existing data sources like the Smarter Balance Assessment Consortium. These would be effective and would not duplicate what is already being done.

Discussion: A member commented that in light of AVP Handel's report to the legislature on remediation, the rigor of the AWPE is clearly something that is a positive for UC politically. Professor Adler-Kassner suggests it is important to start with foundational questions about the AWPE and there are other models of guided self placement that UCOPE could look at in addition to what is used at U-M. Writing faculty across UC should be brought together to discuss what processes could be in place. Professor Scarcella recently reviewed literature on directed self-placement to learn more about its effectiveness and found that the evaluations are heavily based on faculty and students' opinions about student writing. But no one has looked at the direct assessment of the features of writing we hope will improve over time. Whatever assessment is used, it is important to look at whether students' writing improves and use something

beyond just self-reports. A placement exam that is a starting place to look at how writing does or does not develop over time would be valuable.

A member asked what measure UCOPE is looking for in terms of the measure of success, for example is a goal a better time to degree or grades in subsequent writing courses. Chair Gadda indicated that unlike the SAT or ACT, the purpose of the AWPE is to identify students who are likely to need assistance and was never intended to be used for predictive validity in a one to one way. The AWPE is supposed to disrupt its own predictive validity because it targets students for intervention. One measure of success is, once students have completed an entry level writing course and move on to the subsequent course, whether they are performing at an equivalent or close to equivalent level as students not required to take the preliminary class. At UCD the AWPE is used in a binary way to determine if a student satisfies the ELWR or not while at other campuses the scores and other pieces of information are used to place students into different levels of courses. Some campuses have multiple courses that lead to satisfaction of the ELWR and there are campuses that do not have courses below the ELWR, which AVP Handel commented is a concern of the legislature. The AWPE was meant to provide an important metric but how the exam is ultimately used is based on the campuses and their curriculum.

Professor Ferris questioned whether students have ever been asked about their experience with the AWPE. The committee discussed if failing students on this exam is harmful or beneficial. It can be demoralizing for students who fail the exam and are placed in remedial pathways although sheltering students instead of failing them can be problematic, and both of these perspectives should be thoughtfully considered. At U-M, students who realize they need to place themselves a lower level course have the opportunity to do this. A question is how UC can have a common metric across the campuses that is not about failing or passing but placing students on a spectrum. Campuses would have to think more carefully about placement to replace the pass/fail culture. Professor Whithaus recommended that UCOPE think about a common metric based on what is known about writing. Chair Gadda indicated that there are ways of using the AWPE results beyond just an up or down decision. Professor Scarcella emphasized the importance of understanding that international students are in need of support. UCOPE might consider developing protocols on self-directed placement. There should be an opportunity to have a discussion with students about their options.

As next steps, a subcommittee of UCOPE could look at various models of self-directed placement. At UCSF, a model that is facilitated by coaches is employed but it is very labor intensive and self-directed placement would be consistent with the approach used in professional programs. Chair Designate Lang noted that today UCOPE heard the point of view from one group of people interested in this issue and suggests that a broad range of Writing Program Administrators across all the campuses should be consulted about the direction the discussion takes. There is a lot of expertise on the campuses that is oriented around the culture of particular institutions. UCB students are not reacting the same way that students at UCD and UCI to their placements and the culture at Berkeley is very different. The UCR representative indicated that John Briggs from UCR would be a valuable resource and that UCOPE needs to consult more broadly. Chair Queen mentioned that he has spoken with Professor Briggs and reiterated that the presenters are Writing Program Administrators. Chair Gadda suggested that resources must also be factored into any potential changes and also made the important clarification that UC does not fund the AWPE but is fully funded by the fee students pay, so there is actually no funding to redirect to a new mechanism. Advising would be a costly endeavor but a survey system might be developed for use as a first screening to identify students who need to meet individually with an advisor. AVP Handel inquired about U-M's measures of success and reportedly large numbers of students are not failing the first course into which they place themselves.

Based on the upcoming analysis of the AWPE, UCOPE may be able to identify alternatives to the exam or ways to supplement it. One question is if the amount of time students are given to respond to the

AWPE could be increased or if students could receive the prompts in advance. Chair Gadda indicated, anecdotally, that most students complete the exam in less than two hours and that for most students the two hours is sufficient. Increasing the time limit would have enormous implications for the exam's administration and it might be a disincentive for some test sites. If the material is provided in advance, some students would be tempted to write and memorize an essay beforehand. While this may be seen as the students only harming themselves but there are implications on the other end of the process in terms of repercussions for the students and programs into which they are placed. Another idea is that students could be told in advance what they will be asked to write about and understanding these expectations might be a clear benefit for students. The AWPE website has previous exams, sample essays and other information and students are directed to this website. A member asked if UCOPE has outcome data about the AWPE that should inform the committee's decisions including data that suggests that specific groups of students are being significantly disadvantaged or that students are given an advantage when we know where they stand and appropriately placed where they can thrive going forward. The proposed survey of individuals involved with the AWPE are people involved over the long term with entry level writing programs at the campuses including people that have created the exam and have also supervised the courses into which students have been placed as a result of the exam.

VIII. Request for Analysis of 2016 AWPE Data

Chair Queen suggested that after the data report is completed by UCOP's Institutional Research unit in July the committee should meet by videoconference. The chair will work with the vice chair to generate proposals for the committee's consideration that are based on the analysis and the panel discussion. The committee will see where things are with this current discussion during the videoconference. UCOPE may be able to make a decision about using the new SAT for ELWR before fall, but may need to wait until more data are available.

Discussion: Some members may not be available in July but the committee agreed to convene by videoconference and members could submit their votes by email. It was noted that high school counselors would like a decision from UC about the new SAT in relation to ELWR in order to advise students.

IX. California State Auditor's Report

- *Stephen Handel, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions, UCOP*

AVP Handel briefly described the California State Auditor's Report. The auditors met with Monica Lin in Admissions and the report reflects UC's process of reviewing the a-g courses submitted by the high schools. This is an important piece of overview that UC has performed for over 100 years which is central to UC's public service mission and to the mission of faculty. The quality of high school curriculum is central to a student's success and the Senate faculty reaffirm that UC wants well prepared students who have been prepared in a certain way.

Meeting adjourned at: 3:50 pm
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Bradley Queen