

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ACADEMIC SENATE

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 2005  
UCOP ROOM 12322

**I. Chair's Announcements**

Chair Fluharty welcomed the committee members and consultants to the meeting, and thanked the committee for its hard work and dedication over the past two years in which he has been UCOPE Chair, and the four years total that Chair Fluharty has served on UCOPE. Committee members also thanked Chair Fluharty for his leadership and steadfast service to UCOPE.

**II. Consent Calendar**

- Minutes of the January 21, 2005 UCOPE meeting

**ACTION: UCOPE unanimously approved the minutes of the January 21, 2005 UCOPE meeting with two amendments.**

**III. Consultation with the Office of the President – Student Academic Services**

- Jeanne Hargrove, Analytical Writing Placement Exam (AWPE) & High School Articulation Coordinator

**REPORT A:** Update on Standard Level International Baccalaureate (SL IB) courses satisfying the Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR)

Jeanne Hargrove reported that she had obtained sample SL IB essays and distributed them prior to the meeting to Vice Chair Spafford and Member Willis for their assessment and consideration of the SL IB scoring rubric and curriculum. Vice Chair Spafford and Member Willis then led a discussion with the committee concerning the details of the scoring rubric for the SL IB exam, and their opinions as to what would be an acceptable score to satisfy the ELWR. Committee members also discussed the different formats of the AWPE and SL IB exams, and also the difference between the SL IB exam and the High Level IB exam. Upon approving a score of 6 or 7 on the SL IB as satisfying the ELWR, the committee agreed that their decision could always be revisited in the future if additional consideration is deemed necessary.

**ACTION: UCOPE unanimously approved a score of 6 or 7 on the Standard Level International Baccalaureate exam as satisfying the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement, effective starting for students graduating in 2006. The Student Academic Services office will notify high schools of this change in the near future.**

**REPORT B:** Other updates

2005 AWPE Administration: The AWPE exam date is May 14, 2005. Email notices were distributed on April 4, 2005 to 36,000 students, which includes all students who must take the AWPE. However approximately 17,000 students end up taking the exam

due to decisions to decline UC enrollment, or students' satisfaction of the ELWR by other methods. Those students who did not respond to the email notice were sent letters by postal mail. Credit card payments are now allowed, and so far, 2,000 credit card payments have been received. Jeanne Hargrove reported that in the future her office looks forward to distributing a fewer number of notices to students, perhaps by using unofficial Advanced Placement (AP) exam scores as a means of determining satisfaction of the ELWR, provided that students submit signed "truth statements" with their unofficial scores.

Jeanne Hargrove then distributed to the committee a letter sent out to school districts concerning AWPE data, which is now available on the Internet, and a copy of the annual AWPE legislative report (2003 data). The new AWPE booklets are currently being printed. Jeanne Hargrove also requested volunteers for faculty curricular review consultants, and for other faculty volunteer opportunities available in the review process.

The May "Big Read": The Big Read will occur on May 25 through May 27, 2005 at the UC Berkeley Clark Kerr campus. Jeanne Hargrove reported that her office is working with the new AWPE vendor, Pearson Government Solutions, and George Gadda to establish a more efficient reading and scoring process. This process is expected to produce immediate results due to the use of Scantron scoring sheets, which will eliminate several days' worth of data entry required in the past, and will also allow faster reporting of scores to students and the campuses. Students will still be notified of their scores by letter, which is separately written and distributed by each campus. Jeanne Hargrove said that each campus is therefore free to include any information in the letter to students concerning "next steps" if a student has not satisfied the ELWR (e.g., options to enroll in community college courses over the summer, etc.).

California State University (CSU) Early Assessment Program (EAP): George Gadda provided for the committee a brief update on the CSU EAP, which is still in its development phase.

#### **IV. UCOPE ESL Subcommittee**

- Cecilia Freeman, UCSC, ESL Subcommittee Member

**REPORT:** Cecilia Freeman distributed a report concerning the ESL Subcommittee's April 15, 2005 meeting, prepared by Jan Frodesen. Highlights of the report include the following:

Campus ESL Issues: The ESL Subcommittee is concerned about developments in ESL issues at three campuses as follows: (1) UCLA has recently decided to "migrate" the ESL courses to summer sessions in a program called the American Language Academy, a decision which some believe has occurred without Senate consultation, and also provides a questionable future for the UCLA Applied Linguistics department; (2) UCR has proposed to move its Entry Level Writing and ESL courses out of the Humanities department and into its own department, which raises concerns about how this might affect delivery of instruction to the large number of ESL students at UCR; and (3) UCSD eliminated its ESL program last year upon the retirement of its ESL director, decided to

outsource ESL courses to Mesa Community College, and has combined the coordination of Entry Level Writing and ESL courses into one FTE position – raising concerns because although the number of e-designated students at UCSD has declined, students are being retained longer in ESL as a result of exit exams.

Undergraduate ESL Enrollment Trends: Of those campuses with ESL programs (Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara), with the exception of Davis, all report a decline in freshman enrollment in ESL programs. Contributing factors to the decline include more competitive UC admissions, and an overall increase in the Generation 1.5 population who are placed in mainstream composition courses.

Specialized ESL Reading/Writing Instruction: Davis and Santa Barbara are proposing ELWR courses for non-native English speakers to be offered in their departments of Linguistics. Member Oropeza reported that Davis is developing a Linguistics 24 course, which if approved, will fulfill the ELWR and replace the outsourced community college courses currently offered. The proposed course has been endorsed by the Davis COPE committee, and is now under consideration of the Davis Undergraduate Council.

Placement and Tracking of E-designated Students: The Subcommittee observed that the campuses vary in the procedures and criteria used to place students designated “E” on the AWPE, and decided to discuss further the possible need for more uniformity across the campuses.

ESL Transfer Students: The ESL transfer student population is of growing concern namely because most campuses do not serve the special language needs of this population. Completion of the ESL Transfer Student Report has been postponed in order to include results from the ICAS ESL Task Force online survey.

International Teaching Assistant (ITA) Assessment and English Language Instruction: A survey of ITA assessment procedures and practices across the campuses was discussed by the Subcommittee. Upon revision, the survey will be sent to UCOPE for consideration.

ESL Subcommittee Participation in ICAS ESL Task Force Survey: An online survey will be conducted in April 2005 to gather information about identification, assessment, placement, instruction, and support services for ESL students on all UC, CSU and CCC campuses. UCOPE ESL Subcommittee members will complete the survey for their respective campuses, and three Subcommittee members serve on the ICAS ESL Task Force.

**DISCUSSION:** Committee members expressed concern for UCLA’s decision to “migrate” its ESL courses to the summer session program, apparently without Senate consultation or oversight. Committee members were also troubled over other aspects of UCLA’s proposal, including the metaphorical language being used (e.g., “migrate,” and “tether”), the various populations potentially affected by the decision, including graduate students, teaching assistants, and ELWR-affiliates, and the “tethering” of systemwide course requirements to non-University

courses. Committee members agreed to postpone further discussion of the issue until its consultation with Council Chair Blumenthal later in the meeting.

**V. Proposal for a Systemwide Entry Level Mathematics or Quantitative Research Skills and Methods Entrance Requirement**

- John Eggers

**ISSUE:** In December 2004, the University Committee on Education Policy (UCEP) proposed a plan to collaborate with UCOPE regarding the possible development of a Systemwide Entry Level Mathematics or Quantitative Research Skills and Methods Entrance Requirement, analogous to the UC Entry Level Writing Requirement. UCEP and UCOPE formed a Subcommittee following UCOPE's January 21, 2005 meeting, consisting of the following members from UCOPE: John Eggers and Ali Sayed; and from UCEP: Richard Hughey and Joe Kiskis, UCEP Chair.

**REPORT:** John Eggers alerted the committee to the document included in the agenda packet which argues against implementing a systemwide entry level mathematics requirement, and wished to make clear that the document was prepared by Alfred Manaster and Bruce Arnold, co-chair and site director, respectively, of the Mathematics and Diagnostic Testing Program at UCSD. The document was intended to represent UCSD's position on the proposal to the UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee and not intended to represent the UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee's final determination on the proposal; it was included in the agenda for UCOPE's information. John Eggers also pointed out that no significant discussion of the proposal within the UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee had occurred to date and, in particular, no argument in favor of the proposal had been offered to date.

John Eggers also pointed out that his most recent communication with UCEP was an email proposing the following questions regarding the Quantitative Reasoning Requirement (QRR):

1. At what level should a systemwide QRR be?
2. If the QRR were at the level of the current UC mathematics admission requirement (intermediate algebra), then one objection would be that the number of students not meeting the QRR when admitted would be too small to justify implementing a QRR, as is currently the case at San Diego. Is the situation different at other UC campuses? Should we ask for more data?
3. If the QRR were at a higher level, then we would be requiring a higher level of mathematical preparation than stipulated by the current UC admission requirements. Should we recommend a higher admission requirement as well?
4. What would it cost to implement a QRR? The Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) requires significant resources to maintain. If a QRR were modeled after the ELWR, it would also require significant resources.

John Eggers then reported that no further communications have occurred within the UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee.

**DISCUSSION:** Committee members discussed the potential impact of a systemwide requirement that tests at a higher level, such as testing above the trigonometry level. The committee then questioned which mathematics subjects are considered remedial, and which are

considered graduation requirements. Committee members agreed to ensure that Senate Regulation 761 would guide the UCEP/UCOPE subcommittee's future discussions regarding a possible systemwide requirement.

**ACTION: John Eggers will continue to work with UCEP representatives on the UCEP proposal for a possible Systemwide Entry Level Mathematics or Quantitative Research Skills and Methods Entrance Requirement, and provide an update to the committee upon any forward movement of the proposal.**

## **VI. Analytical Writing Placement Exam – Norming of Exams**

**ISSUE:** UCOPE engaged in its annual confidential action of norming AWPE pretest essays. Committee members discussed sample essays that had been pretested on a population of students that included University students from several campuses, many in the weeks of classes who had not yet satisfied the ELWR, but had been admitted to the University.

**DISCUSSION:** Committee members discussed a variety of acceptable approaches in responding to the essay prompt that would indicate writing skills at the University's level of expectation.

**ACTION: UCOPE members unanimously rated and agreed to a passing standard for the Analytical Writing Placement Exam.**

## **VII. Class Size for Writing Classes at UC**

- Susan McLeod

**ISSUE:** Member McLeod has prepared for UCOPE's consideration a draft report on writing class size at the University, prepared in response to Council's request for data on the effectiveness of writing instruction vis-à-vis class size.

**DISCUSSION:** Member McLeod began the discussion by distributing her draft report, *Bringing Writing Class Size in the UC System In Line with National Standards (UCOPE, April 2005)*. She expanded on the following arguments used in her report: (1) recommendations on standard class size for writing classes from three national organizations, all recommending the same upper limit on class size; (2) numerous reasons for placing a cap on writing class size, including teacher workload (see table 3 of the draft report), the effect of class size on student learning, and implications of students in AWPE or introductory courses with above-cap class size; and (3) attention to budget considerations, however providing the example of Arizona State University, which has instituted a cap on writing class size despite budget difficulties, demonstrating its dedication to the issue.

Committee members were unanimous in congratulating Member McLeod on her excellent report and thanking her for her dedicated work on this subject. Members were pleased with the hard data provided in the report, as well as the expanded arguments concerning the University's comparison institutions' dedication to lowered writing class size. Additional suggestions on the draft report offered by the committee included: (1) possible inclusion of data on measured quantities of effects of writing classes, specifically regarding the citation to Glass and Smith in

the draft report, which could assist in answering whether lower class size helps to improve student learning; and (2) possible inclusion of historical information on budget cuts at the University resulting in increased writing class size, and to further explain the aberrant UCLA example where class size has gone down.

**ACTION:** UCOPE members unanimously approved the draft report, *Bringing Writing Class Size in the UC System In Line with National Standards*, with inclusion of the suggestions offered in the previous discussion. Member McLeod will distribute the revised report to the committee for final review, upon which UCOPE will present it to the Academic Council for consideration.

### VIII. UCOPE Member Items

**ISSUE:** Committee members were encouraged to bring items of interest to today’s meeting for discussion, including issues from campus committees.

**DISCUSSION:** Vice Chair Spafford requested suggestions for items that should be brought to the attention of UCOPE in the upcoming months, and also for 2005-06 UCOPE agenda. The following items were discussed:

UCOPE Wrap-Up – The committee agreed to discuss the following issues with Council Chair Blumenthal to determine an appropriate course of action before the end of the academic year:

- Begin a campaign to better inform the campuses that courses which satisfy the ELWR may also be credit bearing courses which satisfy graduation requirements. Committee members agreed that a letter to each of the campuses to this effect would be a beneficial resource for current and future faculty members and campus administrators. Chair Fluharty reminded the committee that the original statement contained in Senate Regulation 761 states that it is the intent of the Senate that ELWR-satisfying courses should be credit bearing, but that the decision is left to the individual campuses. Campuses that do not give credit to such courses include Davis and San Diego.
- Work to ensure appropriate Senate consultation and involvement in campus decisions which impact ELWR courses, or ELWR-affiliates, such as UCLA’s recent decision to “migrate” ESL courses to summer session courses.

Planning for the 2005-06 UCOPE agenda – The committee brainstormed the following topics as suggested agenda items for next year:

- Possible reevaluation of the accepted scoring rubric of the Advanced Placement exam, and whether the University should consider raising the currently accepted score of 3, to a score of 4 or higher. Some committee members inquired into the possibility of looking at some sample Advanced Placement exams, with their assigned scores, for further evaluation.

**ACTION:** Jeanne Hargrove will obtain sample Advanced Placement (AP) exams for UCOPE to consider in 2005-06 re: UCOPE’s possible reevaluation of the currently accepted score of 3 on the AP exam as satisfying the Entry Level Writing Requirement.

- Inquire into the development of ELWR courses at the new Merced campus, and whether Merced will have a UCOPE representative on the 2005-06 UCOPE roster.
- Possible evaluation of campus' accommodation of students with learning disabilities, and specifically what diagnostic procedures are in place at each of the campuses. Vice Chair Spafford observed that accommodations are typically adequately provided at the campuses because the law requires it, but that diagnosis of students is unclear. She is concerned that affected students with financial difficulty often have to pay for their own diagnosis. Chair Fluharty suggested that UCOPE make an inquiry to the campuses regarding these issues, and afterwards the committee can consider a recommended course of action.
- Continue to monitor the issues surrounding international teaching students, and the forthcoming report on the subject from the ESL Subcommittee. Cecilia Freeman reported that Jan Frodesen should have the final report submitted to UCOPE by the end of the spring quarter.

#### **IX. Committee Business – Updates**

- George Blumenthal, Chair, Academic Council

**ISSUE:** Council Chair Blumenthal was invited to the meeting to update UCOPE on recent Council actions which potentially impact the committee, and any additional items of interest for general discussion.

**DISCUSSION:** Council Chair Blumenthal discussed with the committee and provided updates on the following issues:

1. Updates:

- a. *Senate Bylaw 128: Membership of Standing Committees of the Assembly:* Council has endorsed Senate Bylaw 128, which seeks to ensure appropriate membership representation on subcommittees and task forces, and also to ensure appropriate oversight of their activities and actions. Council Chair Blumenthal assured the committee that Council took into consideration UCOPE's unique ESL and AWPE "subcommittees," which often have representatives who are non-Senate members and/or members who are not affiliated with the University. Council recognized the importance of this type of membership to UCOPE's overall mission, and decided to treat UCOPE's subcommittees as "advisory groups," and thus outside the restrictions of Senate Bylaw 128. This "exception" granted to UCOPE and its "advisory groups" will be memorialized in the justification for Senate Bylaw 128, and not specifically in the bylaw itself. The bylaw change will be presented at the May 11, 2005 Assembly meeting for final approval. On a related issue, Chair Fluharty inquired into whether members of UCOPE's advisory groups could receive thank you letters in order to properly recognize their service to the committee. Council Chair Blumenthal replied that he was already planning on sending such letters to all Senate committee members at the close of the academic year.
- b. *Draft Excess Units Fee Policy:* Council has expressly not endorsed the Draft Excess Units Fee Policy in a formal letter to the administration, but also included in that letter a lengthy list of exceptions which must be included in the draft policy in the

event that it is implemented. UCOPE will receive an update on the final decision to implement the draft policy when more information becomes available.

- c. *Resources Required to Lower Class Size for Writing Classes*: Provost Greenwood has inquired into the cost required to implement writing class size reduction at each campus, and preliminary data has been received. Council expects to receive the final report from the Provost's office soon.

2. Discussion Items:

- a. *ESL Subcommittee Concern re: UCLA*: Council Chair Blumenthal agreed to discuss with the UCLA division chair, at the April 27, 2005 Council meeting, the concerns surrounding UCLA's apparent decision to "migrate" ESL courses to summer session courses, and the possible lack of Senate consultation in the decision making process.
- b. *ESL Subcommittee Concern re: Credit for ELWR Courses*: Council Chair Blumenthal agreed that an information letter concerning this subject would serve as a beneficial resource for current and future Senate members. Vice Chair Spafford agreed to draft a letter to this effect, and upon receipt, Council Chair Blumenthal George agreed to forward the letter to the appropriate divisional representatives, and also suggested that the letter should be posted in an accessible public forum on the Academic Senate website.

**ACTION: Vice Chair Spafford will draft a letter for UCOPE's review and approval, and eventual submission to Council Chair Blumenthal, alerting the divisions of Senate Bylaws 636 and 761, and reminding them that baccalaureate credit may be offered for the courses listed in Senate Bylaws 636 and 761.**

**Meeting adjourned at 4:00p.m.**

Attest: Arvan Fluharty, UCOPE Chair

Prepared by: Michelle Ruskofsky, Committee Analyst