UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA   **ACADEMIC SENATE**
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
VIDEOCONFERENCE MINUTES
FRIDAY, APRIL 29, 2022

Attending: Jingsong Zhang, Chair (UCR), Eileen Camfield, Vice Chair (UCM), Sarah Freedman (UCB), Rebekka Andersen (UCD), Daniel Gross (UCI), Bruce Hayes (UCLA), Amanda Solomon Amorao (UCSD), Amy Vidali (UCSC), Madeleine Sorapure (BOARS representative, UCSB), Maryam Amin (Undergraduate Student Representative, UCSD), Kenny Smith (Lecturer, UCSB Writing Program), Jon Lang (AWPE Committee Chair), Han Mi Yoon-Wu (Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions), Julie Lind (AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions), Laura Hardy (Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions), Susan Cochran (Vice Chair, Academic Senate), Brenda Abrams (Principal Policy Analyst)

I.   Updates and Announcements

The chair of UCOPE participates on the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) which has focused on responding to Assembly Bill 928 this year. Chair Zhang was tasked with leading the ICAS Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC) Standards Subcommittee, which is responsible for updating the document with the IGETC standards. Academic Council approved UCOPE's recommendation that campuses accept satisfaction of the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) by the alternative placement processes.

Vice Chair Camfield reported that the ELWR Task Force has completed its phase two report but Council has asked that Task Force members not share any details. UCOPE's work on the writing placement values statement will be postponed until the Task Force report is released next year. The analyst explained that Council will send the report out for systemwide in the fall and the feedback from the review should be available to UCOPE in January 2023.

II.   Consent Calendar

Action: The January 28th videoconference minutes were approved with corrections.

III.   Follow-up on 2017 Recommendations for the Revised SAT and ACT and the Entry Level Writing Requirement

The analyst explained the decision UCOPE made in 2017 about whether the revised SAT would satisfy the ELWR after considering data analyzed by Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP). The committee agreed to set a threshold of 680 on the SAT Evidence-Based Reading and Writing section for meeting the ELWR for a pilot during the 2017-2018 admissions cycle during which time data would be collected. Campuses have recently asked Admissions if the pilot is over and if the threshold of 690 is permanent policy, so UCOPE needs to review an analysis of the data from the pilot period and make a determination about the policy. Coordinator Lind has discussed this matter with IRAP and will be working with the Writing programs to get an updated list of both the pre- and post-ELWR courses as the first step in the new analysis. IRAP should be able to complete the analysis in time for the committee's first meeting in 2022-2023.

IV.   Consultation with the Office of the President
- *Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Laura Hardy, Associate Director, Undergraduate Admissions*

- *Julie Lind, AWPE Coordinator, Undergraduate Admissions*
- *Jon Lang, AWPE Committee Chair and Chief Reader*

The final administration of the systemwide Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) will occur on May 21st. Admissions will only invite the students who submit a Statement of Intent to Register to one of the four campuses using the AWPE (UCB, UCLA, UCR, and UCSD), which will give UCOP an idea of how many students will take the exam. Coordinator Lind has notified the campuses still using the AWPE that the contract for the vendor who handles the exam fee payment system will end on September 30th and the campuses will need to finish their fall term testing before the vendor's payment system is shut down. The coordinator will work with the campuses over the summer on refreshing the information about the ELWR and AWPE on their websites to make sure the language is current. As soon as the May exam has been scored and the scores reported to the campuses, Admissions will switch to transition activities.

AWPE Chair Lang estimates that approximately 17,500 reads will be needed but this will depend on the actual number of students who take the exam. Currently there are enough readers to handle 16,300 readings, and the shortfall could be eliminated if people agree to read beyond their initial allotment. There are concerns about the attrition of some readers who have committed but are then unable to read. AWPE Chair Lang hopes to recruit more readers so the program can release scores to the campuses in a timely manner.

AWPE Chair Lang shared that the UCB dean and vice provost have indicated that they would like the Writing program to restructure the AWPE because they feel it is too easy. The administrators may want the program to rethink the AWPE because the elimination of the SAT and ACT for admissions has resulted in the limited availability of those scores for placement. The idea is to expand the use of the new placement process to place students in a wider range of courses at UCB. In addition to ELWR-satisfying courses, the campus has courses for students who have satisfied the ELWR and a composition course that follows the ELWR-satisfying course. The dean and vice provost are anticipating that any new exam would be able to place students in one of these three courses, rather than in either of the first two courses as is currently the case.

If the campus decides to completely restructure its current approach and create an entirely new exam, this will be a long-term process involving designing the exam and then pre-testing to ensure it is a valid placement mechanism. It is likely that UCB will continue to use the AWPE in the meanwhile, and there are a number of exam passages that have been approved by UCOPE but not used for at least a couple of years. If UCB pursues designing a new exam, this will impact the potential collaboration with other campuses intending to use the AWPE and the idea of establishing a multi-campus test development effort. According to AWPE Chair Lang, UCSD is leaning towards developing its own AWPE-like placement mechanism tailored to placing both international and domestic students. It might be possible to still utilize the Test Development Committee (TDC) for UCB, UCLA, and UCR but the details will have to be worked out.

Aside from the TDC, AWPE Chair Lang thinks it is unlikely that there will be multi-campus cooperation on other elements of the AWPE. There would probably not be a spring administration of the AWPE that the four campuses manage. It would be difficult to figure out the logistics of paying readers across campuses and administering the exam across campuses. Chair Lang stated that it is possible that all of the campuses have discovered the unintended consequences of moving away from the Office of the President (UCOP) as the central administrative agency.

Some campuses that want to continue using the AWPE might be struggling to figure out how to pay their readers. AWPE Chair Lang stated that this is the case at UCLA because human resources at that campus has made it clear that there are readers who cannot be paid a stipend and must be paid using course release. The downside of devoting a large portion of a reader's salary to reading exams may not be a cost effective way of paying for reading and scoring.

V.   Future of the AWPE and Test Development Committees

The elimination of the systemwide AWPE calls into question the future roles for the AWPE Committee and the TDC. AWPE Chair Lang explained that the TDC, which generates new passages for the exam, has not met for the past few years due to budgetary constraints. The TDC met to develop the training materials for new exam passages, but the pandemic made it impossible to meet in-person. Over the past five years, the AWPE Committee was responsible for deciding which passages to forward to UCOPE.

Discussion: Now that campuses are using implementing placement in different ways, there may not be a clear role for these particular committees. However, there is a concern that disbanding them too quickly could negatively impact those campuses planning to use the AWPE locally. AWPE Chair Lang reported that UCB, UCLA and UCR have agreed that the TDC would be the easiest way to collaborate going forward. One question is if the TDC needs to operate under the purview of UCOPE. The Office of the President paid each TDC member a $2k stipend plus travel expenses while the AWPE Committee members received compensation only for their travel, and these costs were covered by the fees students paid to take the systemwide AWPE, which are no longer available. The TDC model could be viable if each campus appoints and reimburses their own representatives.

UCOPE should discuss what its interaction, as a systemwide committee, would be with a reconfigured TDC. Another question is whether campuses using alternatives processes and those using the AWPE locally will report their activities to UCOPE. It could be useful for campuses to hear about one another's placement processes. A standing committee of Writing program directors could be established for this purpose since UCOPE members might not be involved with or aware of placement activities on their campuses. Members agreed to postpone making any decisions about the future of these two committees until UCOPE has received the recommendations from the ELWR Task Force. Executive Director Yoon-Wu explained that Admissions reports to the Legislature the percentage of students entering students who have passed the ELWR upon matriculation but details about how the requirement was satisfied are not required.

VI.   Data Reports on Alternative Placement Processes from UCSB and UCSC
   - *Madeleine Sorapure, Representative, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), UCSB*
   - *Kenny Smith, Lecturer, Writing Program, UCSB*
   - *Amy Vidali, Representative, UCSC*

The BOARS representative and Writing Program Lecturer Smith reported on UCSB's Collaborative Writing Placement Program (CWPP).
   o   The CWPP was developed as an equitable and accessible placement program that introduces the curriculum for ELWR-satisfying courses as well as the first year composition requirements.
   o   A different program places international students.
   o   Students select the course they prefer, either the ELWR-satisfying or first year composition course, but their final placement is determined by faculty.

- Students complete a survey and an optional placement review (both delivered through UCSB's learning management system) which each take one to two hours to complete.
- The survey involves reading typical course assignments and samples of student writing from the two courses. Students answer multiple-choice questions, write responses to three prompts that gauge their familiarity with university level writing, and write an explanation for their placement preference.
- Students who disagree with their placement can request a review that entails submitting a sample of their strongest writing and responding to contextual questions about that sample. Faculty use this information to make a final, unreviewable placement decision.
- The survey and high school grade point average are used to automatically place some students into Writing 1 (W1) or 2 (W2), and in 2021-2022, about 1500 were placed automatically.
- To date, 88% of students were placed in the course they selected.
- It is anticipated that around 40% of incoming freshman will go through the CWPP because they have not satisfied the ELWR by other means before matriculation (see information about meeting the requirement here: https://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/elwr/requirements/).
- The CWPP has been administered nine times: two times each during summer orientations in 2020 and 2021 and once at the start of each quarter.
- Only 31 of the nearly 2k students opted for a placement review and 25 of those students were moved from W1 to W2.
- Grades show that students do well in the course they are placed in via the CWPP. The majority of students placed in W1 receive As and Bs and those who selected this course do somewhat better than those who selected W2.
- Based on the data, the program plans to monitor what is happening with students who picked W2 but were assigned W1 by faculty. The program will take a close look at why students placed directly into W2 did somewhat better than students who placed into W1 and then advanced into W2.
- Most students placed through the CWPP who select W1 are more likely to be Latino, African American, or first generation students and to have Pell grants.
- The program has three ongoing assessment projects involving focus groups with students, surveys of teachers, and data from students' reflections.
- Program costs include the CWPP coordinators and faculty readers, and the program would like funding for additional assessment activities. The CWPP is free to students but charging a nominal fee is under discussion.

The UCSC representative reported on that campus's directed self-placement (DSP) process.
- The process at UCSC is grounded in research on DSP and the representative has been trying to counter the belief that DSP enables students to avoid taking certain courses.
- UCSC's program is finding that many students want more writing classes than it can provide.
- All students take the College 1 course, which is not administered by the Writing program, before moving into one of the required courses: Writing 1 (W1), Writing 1E, and post-ELWR satisfied Writing 2 (W2).
- About 8% of UCSC students go through the multilingual curriculum, which is taken at the same time as College 1.
- A website has comprehensive information about the DSP process and the courses.
- All students participate in the DSP process, providing demographic information and responding to detailed questions about the languages they speak and write and to course materials.
- The program reviews all of the data before faculty decide on the placements, which is labor-intensive. This includes reviewing the reflections written by multilingual students to ensure placement in the appropriate courses.

- o The majority of students accept the faculty recommendations.
- o Students who try placing themselves in more advanced courses are typically international students but these students tend to agree to change their placement once they receive advising.
- o About 180 students placed by faculty in W1 took W2 instead, and it was noted that faculty ultimately agreed that W2 was the appropriate placement.
- o Students are surveyed at the beginning and end of the W2 courses and the data shows that students feel that DSP captures the different high school experiences of incoming students.
- o The survey allowed the program to compare students who placed themselves into W1 and then advanced into W2 with those who self-placed in those courses. The program is looking at equity gaps in the context of race/ethnicity and language status.
- o Students were asked how they thought they should be placed: 63% of who went through DSP indicated this should be part of the process; others said they wanted DSP along with test scores; and 3% indicated only test scores should be used because DSP was time-consuming.
- o The program hoped that DSP would not take more than three hours and 96% of students indicated they completed the process in under three hours.
- o Next steps for the program include: adding videos to the DSP website; developing more opportunities for students to respond to the multilingual curriculum in the process; conducting additional equity analyses; and trying to understand how DSP impacts the broader academic literacy curriculum at UCSC.

Discussion: The UCSB representatives remarked that it would be counter-productive for students to cheat by making something up about their writing experiences but the program is mindful of concerns regarding academic integrity. The program has not yet analyzed student reflections in term of their meta-cognitive reasoning skills but this is of interest. The CWPP gives teachers the opportunity to learn about their students, which also informs how the curriculum is presented. One benefit of the centralized UCSC program is that it is easier to locate students who need to complete the follow-up surveys. The UCSC program would also like to conduct focus groups with students to obtain more data. The UCSB and UCSC representatives were asked to share their presentations with UCOPE members. Until the campuses have formal reports, the slides should not be shared broadly.

VII.   Consultation with the Academic Senate Office
- *Susan Cochran, Vice Chair, Academic Senate*

- o The Academic Assembly passed, with near unanimity, a climate Memorial calling for at least a 60% reduction of campus carbon emissions by 2030 and 95% by 2035. The next step is a vote by the divisional Senates.
- o The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates recently approved a plan for a single general education transfer pathway called for Assembly Bill (AB) 928. The proposed plan will be sent to the Senates for each segment for review. It was noted that UC emphasizes the importance of students being prepared for their major.
- o There are problems with the Navitus pharmaceutical benefit and changes being made to improve the situation include moving management of the program to Human Resources at UCOP.
- o The workgroup with the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs, the Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) and administrators has completed examining the review process for self-supporting graduate degree programs and confirmed that the current process should be continued. The administrators indicated that this is acceptable for now and this issue may reemerge once the new provost is hired.
- o The search for Provost Brown's and Vice Provost Carlson's replacements are underway.
- o Monica Lin, who has helped ICAS with various transfer issues, will replace retiring Senate Executive Director Hillary Baxter.

- o The workgroup on mitigating the impact of COVID-19 on faculty submitted its final report to Provost Brown who will forward it to the campuses. UC Davis Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Croughan and Chair Horwitz will present the report to the Regents in May and President Drake will be asked to endorse it. The key concept is achievement relative to opportunity which is recognition in the merit and promotion process of how the pandemic disrupted research.
- o The faculty survey is underway and the data from this survey last year was valuable for the workgroup on mitigating the impact of COVID-19. The survey results were also important to convey how teaching went during the pandemic to the Office of the President and Regents.
- o Academic Council sent the proposed revision of Senate Regulation 424 to add the Ethnic Studies requirement back to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS).
- o Council also asked the Committee on Academic Freedom to revise its recommendations about posting political statements on department websites.
- o The administration is eager to put an abusive conduct policy in place and the revised policy will be sent out for systemwide review in the fall.

VIII. Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI)
- *Jim Chalfant, Chair, ACSCOTI*

Chair Chalfant, who chaired the systemwide Academic Senate five years ago, described some of the history behind creation of the new Special Committee on Transfer Issues. There is outside pressure on UC to streamline the process for transferring from a CCC to a UC and to improve time to degree for transfer students, and one issue is that the CSUs and UCs have different transfer requirements. Chair Chalfant explained problems related to associate degrees for transfer (ADTs), Transfer Pathways, the Pathways Plus program, and transfer admissions guarantees. One requirement from Assembly Bill 928 is for the CCC, CSU and UC systems is to align the ADTs with UC's Pathways. Legislators and other outside groups do not want to make the two years at a CCC more difficult but transfer students find that they are not prepared when they arrive at UC and need to take additional courses, making it difficult for them to graduate from this system in two years without exceeding 60 semester units.

The goal is for ACSCOTI to work with the Committee on Educational Policy, BOARS, and UCOPE to prioritize what needs to be done to improve transfer to UC campuses. This may include groups of discipline faculty reviewing and determining if the requirements for a major are appropriate. Chair Chalfant would like a member of UCOPE to participate on ACSCOTI and members were invited to contact him with any questions.

IX. New Business

There was no New Business.

X. Executive Session

There was no Executive Session.

Videoconference adjourned at: 1:45 PM
Minutes prepared by: Brenda Abrams
Attest: Jingsong Zhang