

**Minutes of Meeting****April 18, 2008****I. Consent Calendar**

**ACTION:** The consent calendar was approved as amended.

**II. Chair's Announcements**

*Jan Frodesen, UCOPE Chair*

Chair Frodesen noted that the AWPE budget concerns persist, and Director Wilbur will present additional data during the consultation period. Senate Chair Brown has indicated that UCOPE can recommend a joint Senate/administration workgroup to consider the issue in depth, and that such a recommendation would be funded. Members need to evaluate both short-term and long-term cost saving strategies.

The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) met April 2 in Sacramento for a legislative day. Chair Frodesen was unable to attend, but other representatives have reported that the goal was to familiarize legislators with faculty budget concerns and to illustrate the interconnectedness of the segments. ICAS next meets on April 30, and Chair Frodesen will be in attendance.

**III. UCOPE ESL Advisory Group Update**

*Robin Scarcella, UCOPE ESL AG Chair, via phone*

- Transfer Student Report

**ISSUE:** UCOPE ESL AG Chair Scarcella presented an overview of the transfer student report the advisory group has prepared (see Enclosure 2). Special attention was paid to the fact that, within the next decade, it is expected that among California's 18-24 year old cohort, as many as 85% of California Community College (CCC) enrollees will be foreign-born or recent immigrants who may require significant academic English support (up from 25% today). Currently, at UCLA, 77% of ESL transfer students require assistance with basic writing. This situation is exacerbated by student self-selection for enrollment in basic writing courses since transfers will have passed CCC composition courses per IGETC prior to acceptance at UC. UCOPE is asked to endorse the recommendations in the report and forward them to the Academic Council. (See Distributions 1 and 2.)

**DISCUSSION:** Members noted that this issue is not limited to transfer students as some incoming freshman elect to take CCC courses to satisfy UC's ELWR and other requirements; both groups may be underserved by misalignment in articulation agreements between UC and CCCs. Chair Scarcella noted that the problem did not rest with the students, per se, as they are usually dedicated and motivated; the problem is with the provision of adequate support to help struggling students. Members observed that since transfers have fully met IGETC requirements, campuses do not have in place mechanisms to track these students' progress or evaluate their needs. Others agreed that additional ESL tutorial support and cross-disciplinary awareness would further serve the needs of many types of students. Some members queried whether systemwide redress

was appropriate given the gap in student needs at the various campuses; it was suggested that closer collaboration between each campus and its main feeder CCCs could do much to work towards a solution, especially where advising and tracking are implicated. Members also queried whether campuses could exceed the minimum GPAs indicated in IGETC for admission, as departments like chemistry routinely do.

**ACTION:** Irvine Representative Alexander will circulate to the committee the agenda and resources used during an upcoming meeting between his campus and its main feeder CCCs.

**ACTION:** UCOPE will suggest to UCOPE ESL AG that an additional recommendation be made regarding closer collaboration between UC and CCCs in this area.

**ACTION:** Chair Frodesen will circulate the 2004 ESL Task Force documents on tutorial support both to UCOPE and UCOPE ESL AG.

**ACTION:** Chair Frodesen will send to UCOPE ESL AG Chair Scarcella other suggested wording changes in the transfer student report.

**ACTION:** UCOPE endorses the report as amended and will submit it to the Academic Council.

#### **IV. Norming of Exams.**

Executive Session; no notes were taken.

#### **V. Consultation with the Office of the President**

*Sue Wilbur, Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

*Jeanne Hargrove, Coordinator of AWPE and High School Articulation*

*Charles Masten, Assistant Director of Undergraduate Admissions*

**ISSUE:** Coordinator Hargrove reported to the committee that the 2008 administration of the AWPE will be May 10. In 2008, of 60,000 UC admits, 36,435 were identified as AWPE candidates; that number is approximately 1,000 less than in 2007. This year, there will be 132 test sites, up from 130 last year. New this year is a late fee of \$10 for late payment by regular admits; admits from referral and late admits will have until May 12 before the late fee is assessed. About 30% of test takers are expected to receive fee waivers, as indicated by the previous waiving of their application fees. This year, the Big Read will not be on Memorial Day weekend, but the last weekend in May; it is hoped that by not conflicting with a holiday, more readers can be enlisted. The results of the 2007 administration are available online: <https://uasother.ucop.edu/awpe/>.

**ISSUE:** The AWPE deficit is approximately \$500K, and it is expected to increase by \$100K after the 2008 administration (see Distribution 3). Director Wilbur's office has been tasked to balance the AWPE budget and to begin paying down the accrued debt by the 2009 administration; it is to be self-supporting.

**DISCUSSION:** Members inquired as to the cost recovery percentage from campus fee collections as well as of the possibility of saving on test center costs by having campuses host AWPE administration. AD Masten indicated that requiring students to travel farther to take the exam may not be a prudent option.

Members also inquired about electronic administration and grading of the exam as a cost saving measure, noting that the College Board employs this method with apparent success. It was noted that electronic grading would yield a different set of readers—more part-timers and less faculty—but that such readers could be more thoughtful, and since

they would not have to travel, the pool of readers may increase. Electronic test administration, though, carries security concerns.

In response to questions about requiring a minimum SAT score to be AWPE-eligible (requiring ELWR enrollment for students whose SAT scores are below a certain threshold), Director Wilbur noted that such a move would involve ethical considerations as it would remove the option of “testing out” for some students. Members asked to see correlation data on how students who tested at X threshold on the SAT then performed in subsequent courses to determine whether lowering the “test out” score would be a viable option in terms of student preparedness. It was posited that lowering the opt-out score would also lower the number of paying AWPE examinees, and thus not be a viable cost-saving option.

Members asked whether UC could follow CSU’s Early Assessment Program model and append an optional essay to the California High School Exit Exam (CAHSEE). Director Wilbur reported that the data from the 2006 CSU EAP testing cohort has just become available, and though there are some qualitative differences between CSU’s EAP and UC’s AWPE, more investigation is warranted. Coordinator Hargrove noted that CSU’s EAP is not currently financially self-sustaining, either. (For more information on CSU’s EAP, please visit: <http://www.calstate.edu/eap/> ).

Members agreed that a work group may be needed to weigh the academic and financial impacts of various options. Before proceeding with this option, though, membership, charge, and timing issues must be clarified.

Also before convening a work group, UCOPE would like to see estimates on the impacts of raising the fee to \$75, eliminating fee waivers and replacing them with a reduced fee (\$20), and correlation statistics on student performance for those who score 480 on the SAT.

**ACTION:** Chair Frodesen will convey this request for data to Director Wilbur, and ask a response date of May 2.

## **VI. Systemwide Review Items**

- ITGC Report, “Creating a UC Cyberinfrastructure”  
**ACTION:** The committee elected not to opine on this item.
- Code of Conduct for Health Sciences  
**ACTION:** The committee elected not to opine on this item.
- Amendment to Senate Bylaw 337  
**ACTION:** The committee elected not to opine on this item.
- Amendment to Senate Bylaw 140- Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity  
**DISCUSSION:** Members were unclear whether the proposed change would alter the focus of the committee or if the proposed change was merely semantic. Members also thought greater explication was warranted.  
**ACTION:** UCOPE will communicate to the Academic Council its desire for a more fully developed justification from UCAAD before voting to support or oppose the proposal.
- BOARS’ Revised Proposal to Reform UC’s Freshman Eligibility Policy  
**DISCUSSION:** Some members felt BOARS’ revised proposal was disingenuously packaged as a means to expand eligibility *writ large* when language in the

proposal clearly indicated a targeted group of potential students defined by “optimal demographics” and privilege level. Others noted that the applicant pool that would become eligible under the proposal must be demonstrably different from those under the status quo, lest the proposal would not have been made. Members cited anecdotal evidence of students in Texas moving to lower performing schools so that they could automatically qualify under that state’s 10% program.

Other members noted that this proposal would not solve the underlying problem of inadequately funded and performing K-12 institutions. Similarly, taking more students from poorly performing schools could lead to an increased burden on UC to ensure those students’ academic viability; this potential is ignored entirely in the proposal, yet is already a reality at some campuses where freshman retention is at issue due to high rates of academic probation.

Finally, members observed that the proposal does not include monitoring mechanisms.

**ACTION:** Analyst Feer will draft a response for circulation to the committee prior to its submission to the Academic Council indicating the committee’s objections.

## **VII. ELWR, ESL, and CCC Course**

\*Note: Item not addressed.

## **VIII. New Business and Planning**

- UCSD Representative Famulari indicated that the review of her campus’s “outsourcing” of ELWR instruction to Mesa College is expected to be completed by early summer.
- Senate Chair Brown summarized the ICAS legislative day and provided an overview of the current budget picture, a dire situation seemingly exacerbated by certain UC behaviors.

Adjournment: 4:05 p.m.

### Distributions:

1. ESL Transfer Student Issues (summary)
2. UCOPE ESL AG Transfer Student Report (amended)
3. AWPE Budget Costs

Prepared by Kenneth Feer, Senior Analyst

Attest: Jan Frodesen, UCOPE Chair